

not under the control of the reading room administration, and regulations forbade their transmittal to foreign researchers. They were very apologetic, *glasnost* had not reached that far, etc., but the effect was that I saw none of those materials in Moscow. I finished my work with correspondence from 1861. . . that was a disappointment, but the things I did see almost made up for it. I found that the most valuable documents were the very secret or very confidential letters sent to St. Petersburg by senior Russian diplomats like Kiselev in Paris, Brunnov in London, Budberg in Berlin, and Balabine in Vienna. Those letters were looked at by both Alexander II and Prince Gorchakov, and both of them, and especially the tsar, annotated them at the beginning and in the margins. So I could see the processes of thought and discussion which went on at the top level. . . . I was also allowed to submit an order for photocopies of certain pages (a limit of 100 pages altogether is set per researcher, and I was told that there is now a photocopy machine on the premises) of essential documents, and I am waiting now to see if they will actually come through [they did arrive finally, almost six months after the order was placed in Moscow, courtesy of the Soviet embassy in Wellington, and at a very reasonable price.]

If I was not allowed to see the 1863 Polish insurrection documents, I was allowed to see material from 1860 and 1861 which reflected the growing discontent in Poland. I suspect that one of the reasons why I did not get to see the 1863 materials was the fact that in the 1860 and 1861 materials there were references to disturbances in Poland (Kingdom Poland) and in "the Western provinces" (which I assumed to be parts of Lithuania, White Russia, and the western Ukraine). Anyway, I did get to see important 1863 Polish material when I got to Stanford. There at the Hoover Institution archives I found a good deal of Gorchakov correspondence in the Crimean War period (used by Curtiss), but more to the point, in the series Russia, Legatsiia (Stuttgart), boxes 11 and 12, I found the reports from Warsaw of Tengoborsky (a senior person at the Warsaw Diplomatic Chancery) on the current situation in Poland, sent fortnightly or oftener throughout the period from July 1862 to November 1863.

I hope that the knowledge that much of the 1863 Polish material is available to researchers at the Hoover Institution will encourage the Soviet foreign ministry to make available their own much more abundant resources for western scholars in this field. In the long run, that will be to everyone's advantage, including theirs. It appears that they are now coming to understand this.

J. H. JENSEN
University of Waikato

TO THE EDITOR:

Professor Ladis K. D. Kristof, in his review of *The Polish Dilemma: Views from Within*, ed. by Lawrence S. Graham and Maria K. Ciechocinska (*Slavic Review*, Summer 1989), has deployed a novel methodological approach which certainly merits attention. In the very first sentence he applauds the fact that the book was "not written by Polish emigrants, Poles who write for the underground press, or foreign scholars." Given such impressive credentials, the authors could not but produce, in Kristof's judgment, "an excellent book."

I appreciate Kristof's attentive scrutiny of an author's nationality or country of residence as the fundamental strategy to judge and validate his or her published work. Until now, I blithely ignored such considerations and was concerned merely with authors' expertise, with the scope and depth of the investigation they undertook, with the intellectual integrity and critical coherence of the work they published.

HALINA FILIPOWICZ
University of Wisconsin, Madison