

To the Editor:

Robert Hayden (*Slavic Review*, 55, no. 2) characterized my *Social Currents in Eastern Europe* as based on a teleological system centered on democracy and allegedly optimistic about the prospects of democracy in the region. And yet the pivotal value is not democracy, but tolerance, and the book is cautiously optimistic only about the prospects in Slovenia and the Czech Republic (see 458). Moreover, why does Professor Hayden consider sarcasm an appropriate mode of scholarly discourse? How is it that Professor Hayden is able to understand only "in hindsight" my predictions in the spring 1984 issue of *Orbis* that "... it is probably only a matter of time before another bloodbath occurs between Serbs and Croats" and in the Spring 1991 issue of *Global Affairs* that "as of late February, it appears likely that within a matter of weeks, Yugoslavia could be in the grips of a full-scale civil war centered in Croatia, Bosnia..."? How is it possible that Professor Hayden could conceal my defense of ten prescient scholars by name against Ash's charge of complete ignorance and pretend that it is I who was assailing the field? How can he claim that I claimed to have predicted the 1989 revolution myself, when I claimed only to have predicted the collapse of Yugoslavia and when I drew attention to the works of others? How is it possible that he considers that Slovenia and Macedonia have been in the grips of chauvinistic nationalism since 1990? Why does he omit to mention that tolerance is a major theme in the book?

SABRINA P. RAMET
University of Washington

Professor Hayden replies:

"Aspects of the Transition from Authoritarianism to Pluralism" is the title of Ramet's first chapter in the book; I questioned the teleology inherent in this model in my review. The pivotal thematic priority of tolerance over democracy was apparently also missed by the book's indexer, since "democracy" rates about two column inches while "tolerance" gets one line, indicating two appearances. I did not say in my review that "Slovenia and Macedonia have been in the grips of chauvinistic nationalism since 1990," but that in the elections in Yugoslavia in 1990 "the ideology that won everywhere was ethnic nationalism," a point argued at length in my "Constitutional Nationalism in the Formerly Yugoslav Republics" (*Slavic Review* 51, no. 4). Finally, Ramet might look again at her pages 11–12, where she rebukes "scholars who failed to see the tea leaves at the bottom of their cups" and who "fail to keep up with the writings of other scholars," and thus were surprised by the events of 1989. While Ramet chose Ash to exemplify this sorry tribe, most of the profession other than Ramet's "10 prescient scholars" would also seem to belong—but, of course, "prescience" can only be determined in hindsight.

ROBERT M. HAYDEN
University of Pittsburgh

To the Editor:

Professor Janet Martin has synthesized my basic position very fairly in the first paragraph of her review of *Rus' and Ukraine in Medieval Times* (*Slavic Review* 55, no. 1). Some additional clarifications might be of interest to your readers. My methodology is a mitigated and corrected form of Hrushevsky's approach, which is becoming increasingly popular among Ukrainian historians and will no doubt continue to be so. It is founded on careful collation and exegesis of passages long available in the *Primary Chronicle*, but heretofore largely ignored by Russian and Russian-influenced hermeneutics. The most important of these passages, s.a. 898, identifies the erstwhile Kievan (Kyivan) Polany as the only regional ethnic group specifically called "Rus" in the late tenth to mid-thirteenth centuries (after the disappearance of the Scandinavian "Rus") and denies this peculiar self-appellation to all other ethna otherwise included in the larger politico-ecclesiastical territorial notion of "Rus". My view of Andrei Bogoliubskii derives from information provided in the Hypatian Chronicle, which is a better source for the events of 1169–1174 than the Laurentian Chronicle. I very much concur with Professor Martin that reinterpretations of the medieval history of Slavs of the East should not minimize "institutions that provided political and ecclesiastical organization to those populations." The political dimension of these common processes,