

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

others had their antennae turned westward; we were interrogated about computer use, etc., but also about ideas, and our ideas had an impact even as they were challenged in conversations.

3. Ia. S. Drabkin's challenge. Markwick is right; this is a matter of emphasis. I gave it weight, perhaps editorializing, because I think it is an extremely important and neglected issue.

4. The so-called totalitarian school. "In short, 'totalitarianism' was western sovietology's '*Short Course*.'" This sentence clinches my point about Markwick's unduly polemical stance, which influenced, in fact misguided, his reading of the historiography. To equate the western literature, whatever its shortcomings, with the devil's own bible of falsification, which is possibly the worst book ever written, the *Short Course*, is egregious. The name Robert Conquest, springs to mind, a scholar who has given so much to our field, and to the general public, including the citizens of the former Soviet Union.

5. Paving the way for radical revisionism. I agree completely, but I did not think Markwick made that point clearly. I guess I am at fault for misunderstanding, but I believe that, in principle, the writer should take part of the rap.

6. Nowhere did I suggest that Iosif Stalin's letter in 1931 was a "mere 'milestone.'" It was a major milestone enlarging controls and fears and broadening the scope of myths and fictions. At issue was much more than the elimination of Lev Trotskii's views. The slate was wiped clean of all constructs, even some ideas hitherto deemed Stalinist that were inconsistent with the current version of Stalinism. Continuity and enlargement—I no longer perceive Stalin's letter as a turning point, hence the trope, milestone. I place even greater weight on this event than does Markwick.

7. I never wrote, "the Stalinism of the older generation was mere 'pretense.'" Instead I wrote, "much of their [the Stalinist leaders of the historical profession] earlier behavior had been pretense." Markwick here shows a carelessness absent, fortunately, from his book. Stalinism is composed of many elements. I had in mind the most extreme administrative and police controls and the most glaring falsifications, such as Stalin's policies in March 1917 and the accusation that Nikolai Bukharin plotted the arrest of Vladimir Lenin in 1918. The twisting of Russian history to the bed of Marxist-Leninist ideology was as natural to these historians and as close to them as their own skin. By the way, when I confessed disappointment about the neglect of my own writings, I did not have in mind my writings about Pokrovskii, but rather my articles about these very matters.

GEORGE ENTEEN
Pennsylvania State University