

From the Editor:

Slavic Review publishes letters to the editor with educational or research merit. Where the letter concerns a publication in *Slavic Review*, the author of the publication will be offered an opportunity to respond. Space limitations dictate that comment regarding a book review should be limited to one paragraph; comment on an article should not exceed 750 to 1,000 words. The editor encourages writers to refrain from ad hominem discourse.

D.P.K.

To the Editor:

A vitriolic review should be based on careful reading; Robert Hayden's attack on my book *Ethnic Cleansing* is not (*Slavic Review* 56, no. 3). A look at any of the index tables would have shown him that my index has four, not three, variables. (I start with three, then add another one—all he had to do was turn the page.) He claims that I don't discuss group mobilization. Had he looked, he could have found it on pp. 81, 96–97, 114, and 283. (I also discuss it for every collective identity as part of the process of group evolution.) And had he read the book or the article in *Foreign Affairs* he would not have made the mistake of saying that a part of the book, written in 1995–96, was used in the article written in 1993. Hayden's sloppiness is matched by his ignorance. He appends a "[sic]" to my use of the word *ethny* unaware that it has been in common usage for at least seven years, edging out the more awkward *ethnic group*. He denies the role of intellectuals in spreading Marxism and nationalism and calls my book anti-intellectual because I don't. (He should read Anthony Smith's *National Identities*, not to mention Arthur Koestler, Julien Benda, and many others.) Hayden calls my case studies "superficial." Did he really expect in-depth studies in 10 to 15 pages? The objective was to provide background information for readers unfamiliar with the areas under consideration and lay the foundation for the index. But neither sloppiness nor ignorance nor willful distortion explains Hayden's vitriol. The reason, of course, is that I do not conform to the established orthodoxy. Yet, my "simplistic" approach will ultimately save lives while Hayden's false sophistication will leave the Bosniaks in the "killing fields," to be massacred 20, 30, or 50 years from now. His is the sophistication of the Vance-Owen plan and the Dayton Accords, unworkable solutions maintained by force and arm-twisting, a "sophistication" based on the dogmatic certainty that identities are constructed and therefore should not matter, that if people kill each other, it is because nasty politicians make them do it. The review reveals a profound misunderstanding of ethnicity and nationalism which is, unfortunately, all too typical. How many scholars had predicted the disintegration of Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union, and Czechoslovakia? Fortunately, others have a better understanding of the issues involved: *Choice* named *Ethnic Cleansing* one of the outstanding academic books of the year.

ANDREW BELL
Bradford, Massachusetts

Professor Hayden replies:

My review accurately quoted p. 239 of the book: "The justice of the transfer and, conversely, the right to stay, is measured by three parameters." Bell's other parameter involves "feasibility," not "justice," and I was specific in my discussion. I admit ignorance of the edging out of "ethnic group" by "ethny" over the last seven years; oddly enough, though, all of the editors with whom I've dealt over that time seem similarly ignorant. As for my motives in writing the review, Bell is perhaps the first person ever to assert that I support the Dayton Accords, a claim that does not inspire confidence in his scholarship. My support of Dayton will certainly be news to those familiar with my work, itself not usually regarded as "established orthodoxy." At the same time, it *Slavic Review* 57, no. 2 (Summer 1998)