

From the *Slavic Review* Editorial Board:

*Slavic Review* publishes signed letters to the editor by individuals 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 restricted to one paragraph of no more than 250 words; comment on an article or forum should not exceed 750 to 1,000 words. When we receive many letters on a topic, some letters will be published on the *Slavic Review* Web site with opportunities for further discussion. Letters may be submitted by e-mail, but a signed copy on official letterhead or with a complete return address must follow. The editor reserves the right to refuse to print, or to publish with cuts, letters that contain personal abuse or otherwise fail to meet the standards of debate expected in a scholarly journal.

To the Editor:

John Quigley's confusing review of my book, *The Costs of Justice: How New Leaders Respond to Previous Rights Abuses* (vol. 70, no. 4), leaves the reader with an empty feeling. Without mention of the actual research question, a serious discussion of the theoretical or methodological approach, or a critique of my evidence, based on 250 interviews and media analyses in four cases, Quigley limits his review to a scattering of contested details. It is regrettable he did not have sufficient time or interest to provide a substantive discussion of the "sound analysis" (907) he agrees (in the end) I delivered.

The review consists of three main points. The first was based on a passing mention of universal jurisdiction (used merely to illustrate that transitional justice is increasingly becoming a staple in international law), in which I was attacked for referencing secondary rather than primary literature. Quigley continues commenting that, while accurate, a similar illustrative, passing note on Lithuania (not one of my cases) should have been expanded (suggesting a reference to his own work). Finally, he nitpicked a specific date—again, not pertinent to my central argument—which he falsely calls inaccurate (without checking the primary document explicitly cited), as well as an honest and embarrassing typo, in order to question the "editorial procedures of Notre Dame University Press" (907). I regret that *Slavic Review* could not identify a reviewer more familiar with the theoretical work on transitional justice who could have done a much greater service to those interested in the subject of my book.

BRIAN K. GRODSKY

*University of Maryland, Baltimore County*

Professor Quigley chooses not to respond.