

places heavy explanatory emphasis on imputed motives and hypothetical mindsets; and he fails to pay sufficient attention to key situational factors affecting the army's response, including the principled nonviolence of demonstrators influenced by the church. Her spring's defensive appeal to the enthusiastic endorsements of former participants, whether a former East German colonel or a former Protestant pastor (in the person of Rainer Epelmann), is simply symptomatic of these methodological shortcomings.

I also happen to agree that the role of the military was critical. It is absolutely crucial to understand the conditions under which a professional army that has not been defeated in violent confrontation will willingly renounce the use of force. But, if we are to understand the transformation of the NVA from instrument of dictatorial repression to facilitator of democratic unification, more will be required than an extended expression of gratitude.

MARY FULBROOK
University College London

To the Editor:

Thomas Cushman's review of my book *Blueprints for a House Divided* (*Slavic Review* 60, no. 1) is marred by inaccuracies, as might be expected from someone who has said that the AAASS is "dominated by scholars with pro-Serbian sympathies" and called my several articles in this journal "propaganda masquerading as scholarship" (Tribunal Watch List Archives, August 1997 [message #80, 10 August 1997; message #100, 11 August 1997; message #125, 12 August 1997]; <http://listserv.buffalo.edu/archives/twatch-l.html> [last consulted 16 April 2001]). He is, however, correct in stating that my book "lacks any serious account of how Serbian nationalists mobilized" against other groups, but neglects my reasons for doing so, discussed in the book quite explicitly on pages 18–23 and referred to as well in chapter 10, "On Scholarship and Responsibility." One reason is that I analyzed a phenomenon common to all of the formerly Yugoslav republics, including Serbia, the Republika Srpska and the "Republika Srpska Krajina," and treated it accordingly. Another is that I take strong issue with those who, like Cushman even in this "review," denigrate as "moral relativism" work aimed at determining, rather than presuming, what happened and why. Confronted by Cushman's view of the relationship between morality and inquiry, I think I understand why Socrates so willingly drank the hemlock: for relief.

ROBERT M. HAYDEN
University of Pittsburgh

To the Editor:

I would like to comment briefly on Thomas Cushman's review of Robert Hayden's book, *Blueprint for a House Divided: The Constitutional Logic of the Yugoslav Conflicts* (*Slavic Review*, 60, no. 1). The essays assembled in this volume are not, as Cushman claims, an attempt to "historicize the basic tenets of Serbian nationalist propaganda." Nowhere does the reviewer see fit to mention that these essays have had a wide audience, both in the United States and abroad. The term *constitutional nationalism*, coined by Hayden in his essay "Constitutional Nationalism" (chapter 4 of the book), has become commonplace in the literature. Hayden's critique of the Badinter Commission's decisions are now widely accepted by scholars of international law, and his lengthy and detailed analysis of the unworkability of the Bosnian constitution adopted at the time of the Dayton accords has proven all too correct, as recent events have shown.

Let these few examples warn the reader that the review fails to deal with the substantive issues Hayden raises in his book. Something is deeply amiss if our discussions of the Balkan tragedy become "ethnicized," as Cushman seems determined to do. In any case, it is not only the Serbs who are fair game when examining the course of events leading to the dismantling of Yugoslavia and its aftereffects. It is precisely this point that Hayden makes so brilliantly in his book, and to which Cushman has reacted so violently.

PAUL SHOUP
University of Virginia