

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 pleased that *Slavic Review* has again (vol. 54, no. 4) reviewed my book *The Slave Soul of Russia: Moral Masochism and the Cult of Suffering*. However, Laura Engelstein has mis-attributed one of her quotations. It was the late Nicholas Vakar, not I, who said that "Russian habits of obedience have been the cause, not the result, of political autocracy" (*The Taproot of Soviet Society*, 1961, 40). I made my source perfectly clear on page 2 of my book.

Another misrepresentation is Engelstein's assertion that my book is "based on quotations from a smattering of oddly chosen literary works" (870). In fact my evidence includes, in addition to literary works, Orthodox attitudes regarding the importance of *smirenie*, Russian proverbs such as "Derzhi golovu uklonnu, a serdtse pokorno," other kinds of folklore such as bridal laments and folktales about Ivan the Fool, Russian cultural practices such as beating oneself with a birch switch in the hot *bania*, observations of many Russian philosophers from Petr Chaadaev to Nikolai Berdiaev on the prominent role of submissiveness among Russians, and key historical changes such as Petr Stolypin's reforms and the post-Soviet antimasochistic trend. Surely my evidence is not as narrow as Engelstein suggests. It includes both of what she terms the "representational" and the "actual."

Most unfortunate is Engelstein's assertion that Russian masochism, as I describe it, is an "allegedly pathological disposition" (870). On the contrary, I stated: "no claim is being made here about whether masochism is 'pathological'" (*Slave Soul of Russia*, 7). By assuming that psychoanalysts deal only with "pathological" matters in the clinical context, she is confusing what a psychiatrist does with what a psychoanalytic scholar of culture does.

DANIEL RANCOUR-LAFERRIERE
University of California, Davis

Professor Engelstein does not wish to reply.

To the Editor:

Our reactions to William T. Lee's comments on our book, *Soviet Defense Spending, A History of CIA Estimates, 1950–1990* (*Slavic Review* 58, no. 1), are best described by a quotation from Benjamin Franklin. In a letter written to his sister over 230 years ago, Mr. Franklin eloquently noted, "As to the Abuses I meet with . . . you must know I number them among my Honours. One cannot behave so as to obtain the Esteem of the Wise and Good, without drawing on one's self at the same time the Envy and Malice of the Foolish and Wicked, and the latter is a Testimony of the former" (Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., and Leonard W. Labaree, eds., *Mr. Franklin, A Selection from His Personal Letters*, 1956). Since he left the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) as a disgruntled employee about thirty years ago, Mr. Lee has had almost exclusively negative and harsh words for CIA analyses and analysts. His attack on our book sustains this record. We recommend that in order to obtain a more balanced perspective your readers should also consult the judgments of our book made

Slavic Review 58, no. 3 (Fall 1999)