

position at the "scene of . . . palace intrigue." As it happens Zhdanov was transferred from his Leningrad posts in January 1945, and according to educated latter-day guesses replaced Shcherbakov as the CPSU(b) secretary responsible for foreign Communists and for cultural affairs. Though in 1944 and 1945 Zhdanov traveled conspicuously to Finland, where he was head of the Allied Control Commission, anyone who knew Zhdanov's prewar foreign policy and "cultural" record, and who read *Bol'shevik*, should have deduced by October 1945 that Zhdanov was squarely back in power in Moscow. Kennan's document reveals, thus, that even as knowing a Western authority as himself was not, in 1945, doing his Kremlinological homework. The document recalls, indeed, that Kremlinology did not exist in 1945, and that hardly anyone in the West could do the homework which today every specialist in Soviet affairs does as a matter of course.

To sum up, the value of the Kennan document lies in its recollection that the strange goings on in the Kremlin in 1945 were not given proper attention by the outside observers who have molded today's understanding of Soviet politics in the war and postwar era.

WILLIAM O. McCAGG, JR.
Michigan State University

Mr. Kennan has replied that he is sure most of what Mr. McCagg says is justified and that the date should have been 1946. He adds: "I should perhaps have explained, in publishing this fragment, that I had been absorbed for many months, at the time when this draft letter was written, with wartime administrative duties, and had not been engaged in what is now called Sovietology. What Mr. McCagg says about Zhdanov is probably true; but I do not recall that any announcement had been made of Zhdanov's transfer to the center. I believe we still thought of him as occupied primarily with Finland and the Leningrad military district."

TO THE EDITOR:

I read with great interest the well-documented article of Professor Robert C. Williams on "Changing Landmarks" (December 1968). However, certain bits of information seem to me not put in their right light. May I correct them? I hope Professor Williams will not object to this.

1. Writing "Vladimir Nabokov" now is misleading, when speaking about Nabokov Senior, the K.-D. leader. The "conservatives," as Professor Williams labels them, gathered not only around Vladimir Dmitrievich, but mainly around Iosif Vladimirovich Gessen, another leader of the K.-D. and former editor of *Rech*.

2. The "Eurasians" did not come at the same time as the "Scythians." They came at least three if not four years later.

3. *Rossia* and *Novaia Rossia* (in this order) were published in Russia and therefore cannot be labeled *Smena vekh* publications.

4. *Novyi mir* started publication in 1925. In 1922 there was no *Novyi mir*.

5. Aleksei Tolstoy was not a friend of Ehrenburg. They were not on speaking terms at that time. A year before (probably in 1921) at the time when A.T. was a hard-boiled "counterrevolutionary" and lived in Paris, Ehrenburg came to Paris with a Soviet passport, of course, and loyal to the Soviet government. A.T. denounced him to the French police as a dangerous Communist, and Ehrenburg was deported to Belgium. The facts can be found in Ehrenburg's memoirs, but A.T. is not mentioned. As far as I know, Ehrenburg never wrote about the subject

role of A.T. in his (Ehrenburg's) expulsion. (At that time France had not yet recognized the Soviets.) They made up only in the 1930s. I heard this story from Ehrenburg himself, in the summer of 1922, in Berlin.

NINA BERBEROVA
Princeton University

TO THE EDITOR:

I have no complaint against Professor Elwood's review of my book, *The Triumph of Bolshevism*, which appeared in the December 1968 number of the *Slavic Review*, as it was eminently fair. As to his stricture that my interpretation is old-fashioned, I must plead guilty if being old-fashioned is to try to view the Russian revolution in a broad context rather than in complete isolation. With my background, I could not do otherwise.

As van Zandt pointed out in his book *The Metaphysical Foundations of American History*, most American historians start from basic assumptions that have long been out of date. Yet so far as I have been able to find out, this book has been almost completely ignored. American historians (and for that matter other English-speaking historians) have refused to re-examine these assumptions, and history has continued to be written as though nothing had changed.

A somewhat similar complaint was long since voiced by Carl Becker, who deplored the tendency of American historians to regard their function much the way a manufacturer of bricks regards it his business solely to make bricks without making any pretense of building a house. So many historians think they have completed their task when they have made a brick perhaps one day to be used by a master builder for erecting a building.

So perhaps there is more than one way of being old-fashioned.

STUART R. TOMPKINS
Victoria, British Columbia