

assigned the book to a Gypsy-activist (he admonishes me for “having little sympathy for the Gypsy”) even though a cursory glance at the volume would have revealed that it was written by a social scientist who deplores the subjectivity and “research methods” of Romaniologists. But I am astonished that the editors sent out a book for review to someone who is repeatedly criticized by name—which duly appears in the index—in the same book. Would you have asked Andrei Zhdanov to appraise Anna Akhmatova’s poems or Gustav Husák to assess Václav Havel’s essays?

ZOLTAN BARANY  
University of Texas

Dr. Kenrick replies:

It has been suggested that I might like to reply to Zoltan Barany’s letter. For any reader who wishes to keep up with the specialist literature in the Gypsy field, but has not yet read Edward Acton’s and my edited *Scholarship and the Gypsy Struggle* (Paul and Company Publishing Consortium), which includes my biography, I can say that I have three degrees and two diplomas, all from the University of London. I have retired from teaching, but am not sure whether I was an academic for I have only delivered occasional lectures at universities and I am anything but a Platonic philosopher. Although committed to helping individual Gypsies with the problems they face in a society that barely recognizes their right to exist as a minority, I am acknowledged as an “expert,” that is, as a neutral witness in this field by the courts in the United Kingdom as well as by immigration and planning tribunals. I approached this book review in the same way, ignoring attacks on my own data (which I will clarify in my future writings). Ethnic cleansing is unfortunately a worldwide phenomenon, as we can read in the papers every day. In my review I concentrated on Barany’s thesis and the facts on which it was based so that readers of the *Slavic Review* could decide whether they want to purchase it for their libraries and perhaps read it themselves.

DONALD KENRICK  
London, England

Editor’s note: In selecting book reviewers, the editor seeks to avoid conflicts of interest that might prejudice the reviewer either favorably or unfavorably toward the book under review. We regret that it is not always possible to realize this goal.

To the Editor:

George Enteen’s review of my book, *Rewriting History in Soviet Russia: The Politics of Revisionist Historiography in the Soviet Union, 1956–1974*, as part of his review essay “Recent Writings about Soviet Historiography” (*Slavic Review*, vol. 61, no. 2), was extremely generous. He was also highly critical of certain aspects of my book, however. With a view to initiating discussion, I would like to respond briefly to some of the important issues he raises.

First, Enteen suggests that I have exaggerated the new accounts of collectivization advanced by V. P. Danilov, N. A. Ivnikskii, and their colleagues in the 1960s as a “paradigm shift” because they were “blinded” by the “myth of the kulak.” This criticism misrepresents my argument. I did not state that they achieved a paradigm shift in the 1960s. In fact I noted that in many respects theirs was a moderate critique. True, not until the late 1970s did Danilov explicitly repudiate the myth of the kulak as the “last exploiting class,” but it did not simply “implode.” It was undermined by his group’s strivings to establish the real social dynamics in the countryside on the basis of sustained empirical research, rather than Stalinist stereotypes.

Second, Enteen suggests that I underestimate “the influence of foreign scholarship” on the New Direction historians. I found no evidence whatsoever for external influences on their thinking. Few of these historians had foreign languages. While some might like to credit western scholarship as leavening Soviet revisionism, rereading Vladimir Lenin, intensive research on Russian agrarian and commercial history, and comparative analysis with the developing world were the wellsprings of New Direction new thinking.

Third, Enteen suggests that I understate Ia. S. Drabkin’s challenge to the Stalinist “lie” that Lenin had repudiated world revolution. This seems a matter of emphasis. Drabkin was

bold, but necessarily circumspect. I agree entirely that Drabkin contested “the fundamental lie of Stalinist historiography.” But the *shestidesiatniki*, despite their radical challenge to the *Short Course* paradigm, never broke out of the “socialism in one country” framework.

Fourth, I am accused of waging a “struggle against an ill-defined totalitarian school.” I made clear how I understood “totalitarianism,” however: a simple, state-centric model that denied any possibility of meaningful intellectual life within Marxism-Leninism. As such it was a real impediment to western scholars appreciating the recrudescence of historical thinking with the thaw. In short, “totalitarianism” was western sovietology’s “*Short Course*.”

Do I “exaggerate the extent of the defeat of the *shestidesiatniki*”? I think not. Routed organizationally, as I argue and Enteen agrees, they stuck to their guns even as the official discourse of Marxism-Leninism was becoming a “hollow shell.” It was the *shestidesiatniki* who paved the way for radical revisionism under Mikhail Gorbachev. This was the fundamental rationale for the book.

Enteen reserves his harshest judgments for my interpretation of the nature and origins of Stalinist historiography. He takes issue with my depiction of Iosif Stalin’s sinister October 1931 letter to *Proletarskaia revoliutsiia* as a “sea change” in historical scholarship. But when he suggests that 1931 was a mere “milestone” he understates the rupture in the intellectual environment wrought by Stalin’s intervention. Agreed, it enabled Stalin to gain “absolute control over the facts of his own biography,” but this was not “the most important development.” It was the elimination of Lev Trotskii’s challenge to Stalin’s views, once and for all.

My alleged “second misunderstanding” concerns the origins of the *Short Course* and its implications for post-Stalin revisionism. Enteen argues that my abbreviated exposition gives the erroneous impression that this paradigm was created overnight, notwithstanding that I deem it the “culmination of the merciless ‘*auto-da-fe*’ against the historians set in train in 1931.” Further, he questions any “irony” in the older generation of seeming Stalinist stalwarts initiating de-Stalinization. My “misunderstanding” of their contribution he attributes to my underestimation of the symbolic significance of M. N. Pokrovskii’s partial rehabilitation. In this respect he is right (and I regret not making much more use of Enteen’s own writings on Pokrovskii). However, it seems too simple to suggest that the Stalinism of the older generation was mere “pretense” that they could throw off at will once Stalin died. All of the older generation had imbibed the precepts of Stalinism codified in the *Short Course*, which in Mikhail Gelter’s phrase, “pressed on the consciousness” of the revisionists, old and new alike. Hence the struggle for revisionism was such a protracted mental journey. In this regard, I agree with Enteen. Stalinist “totalitarian” lies and murder had done their work.

ROGER D. MARKWICK

*University of Newcastle, Callaghan, Australia*

Professor Enteen replies:

1. The kulaks. It did seem to me that Roger Markwick understood these writings as a paradigm shift. “Accordingly, with the emergence of a genuine community of historians in the mid-1950s, what was being put in place was a genuine *scientific* paradigm” (12). I thought he had all of his case studies in mind. Sorry for the misunderstanding. Perhaps the metaphor “implosion” regarding the kulak myth was inappropriate. My point was that the myth came to an end in years outside the author’s period of investigation, when V. P. Danilov was professionally isolated. I am sure that there is more to the matter and that my understanding is incomplete. I spoke to Danilov this summer and he expressed a wish to discuss the matter and, presumably, to correct me, but we could not arrange a meeting.

2. I agree with Markwick completely about the “wellsprings of the New Direction,” but I believe that western scholarship had a significant presence. For one thing, A. Ia. Gurevich, who subtly subverted the Marxist-Leninist theory of socioeconomic formations, shows a familiarity with western philosophy. I mentioned the surfacing of nineteenth-century German academic traditions, which is something I observed in public discussions, including doctoral examinations. I was delighted because to me, an American, great formality and rigor with respect to source analysis and historiography were new. Scholars and