

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:

I am surprised that *Slavic Review* published Steven Cassedy's sarcastic remarks about Ewa M. Thompson's book *Imperial Knowledge: Russian Literature and Colonialism* (*Slavic Review*, vol. 60, no. 4). Instead of providing a balanced critique of Thompson's groundbreaking study, Cassedy indulges in facetious comments and fails to address the main thesis of her book, which states that the benign image of Russia presented by Aleksandr Pushkin, Lev Tolstoi, Fedor Dostoevskii, and others has been internalized in western scholarship and public opinion, obscuring the nature of Russian imperialism. Cassedy's flippant tone in describing a colleague's work is unprofessional; his statements reveal his bias but say nothing about Thompson's book. In addition, he is not listed in the AAASS Directory of Members. This raises the question why the book review editor went outside the association to procure a piece of writing that does a disservice to the readers of *Slavic Review*.

MICHAEL J. MIKOŚ
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Professor Cassedy does not wish to reply.

Editor's note:

The authoritative review of scholarly work is an important element of the mission of *Slavic Review*. For this reason, it is our policy to seek reviewers who have already published one monograph or the equivalent in refereed articles. Scholarly expertise, not membership in the AAASS, is the only consideration when inviting scholars to review books; for the record, however, Professor Cassedy is a member of AAASS.

To the Editor:

George V. Strong's review of Alice Freifeld's book *Nationalism and the Crowd in Liberal Hungary, 1848–1914* (*Slavic Review*, vol. 61, no. 1) offers a distorted view of the book, the recipient of AAASS's Barbara Jelavich Prize. This work is a path-breaking study of how crowds in Hungary were not merely objects of manipulation by the elites but active agents in the shaping of their country's destiny. A scrupulously researched and logically constructed work, it is not an "impressionistic picture" or "a sort of potpourri." The reviewer is mistaken in several of his objections. Freifeld did not exclude criticism of Lajos Kossuth (86, 110, 146), nor did she fail to distinguish between Magyars and non-Magyars (276, 283, 295). The reviewer's claim that Francis Joseph was the kaiser (and not the king) to citizens in both halves of the monarchy would be contradicted by any thorough survey of Hungary for this period. Strong's dismissal of Hungary as a liberal country is equally erroneous, as liberal constitutionalism had a significant effect on curbing authoritarian tendencies. The reviewer is correct in pointing out that developments in Hungary should be situated

Slavic Review 61, no. 3 (Fall 2002)