

Another point concerns the text itself. Khrushchev mentions the former commissar of internal affairs, A. I. Uspensky, and allegedly says (page 109): "He was a Russian even though his name was Polish." Anyone who knows Russian and Polish cannot be in doubt that his name was purely Russian, and was borne by the writer Gleb Uspensky and the historian Fiodor Uspensky among others. Is it conceivable that Khrushchev forgot that the name of one of the Kremlin churches is "Uspensky Sobor"?

W. W. KULSKI
Duke University

See review by Sidney Ploss on pages 178–80.

TO THE EDITOR:

An article by Rodney Barfield in the March 1971 issue correctly points to the utopian aspects of Lenin's *State and Revolution* and aptly remarks upon similar traits in other writings of Lenin. But the article also emphasizes, as a discovery of some importance, that *State and Revolution* was essentially completed before March 1917, the author concluding that since it could not have applied to the Russian revolution it was composed by Lenin, pessimistic with regard to the prospect of an early revolution, as a tract for the guidance of a future generation.

That Lenin passed through states of depression early in 1917, as indicated by Barfield, would not have been unusual, since he fluctuated between manic and depressive moods. But to derive from the above information, and various irrelevant if not ignorant comments by Trotsky and Louis Fischer, the notion that *State and Revolution* was intended by Lenin as a blueprint for some distant revolution is a product of Barfield's total failure to comprehend the train of Lenin's thought in the course of World War I. Part of this I have dealt with in my *Lenin and World Revolution*, published in 1959, and in this book I specifically stress the significance of the pre-March 1917 date of the compiling by Lenin of the data from Marx and Engels, and I also take up in considerable detail the function of *State and Revolution* in Lenin's scheme not for a Russian but for an imminent European revolution. "Never, I think," writes Krupskaya, "was Vladimir Ilyich in a more irreconcilable mood than during the last months of 1916 and the early months of 1917. He was profoundly convinced that the revolution was approaching" (see N. Krupskaya, *Memoirs of Lenin*, 2 vols., London, 1930, 2:197).

STANLEY W. PAGE
The City College of the City University of New York

Editor's Note: Though we have evidence that Mr. Barfield has received our inquiry whether he wishes to reply, he has not answered that inquiry.

TO THE EDITOR:

On opening the current June issue of the *Slavic Review* I was struck by its unusually well-distributed contents, and it occurred to me to write to that effect. Then I saw the Jacobs and Tompkins letters and lastly the "Editor's Note" and invitation. Hence this letter.

I used to gripe about the, to me, overemphasis on Soviet studies, as did most of my non-Russian-Soviet colleagues. To give adequate coverage to the par-

ticipating disciplines in the AAASS and to the Russia, Soviet, and East European (North, Central, and South) areas would be impossible. But inasmuch as history is the one common denominator, this at least can and should be emphasized.

Four out of the twelve June contributors are historians. Most of the editors of the *Slavic Review* have been historians. This is as it should be.

At the Denver annual meeting the inappropriateness (as well as awkwardness) of the name AAASS was successfully raised. Should an appropriate change be voted, will there not also be a change in the name of this journal, which is neither a "Slavic Review" nor a "Quarterly of Soviet and East European Studies"?

JAMES F. CLARKE
University of Pittsburgh

Editor's Note: I am sure Henry Roberts joins me in thanking Professor Clarke for his expression of confidence in historians as editors of the *Review*. In fact, however, the other three of the five professors who have edited the journal were not historians; S. H. Cross and Ernest J. Simmons were specialists in literature, John N. Hazard a political scientist and specialist in law, and their terms total twenty out of the thirty-one years the *Review* has been published.

TO THE EDITOR:

I was taken aback when I found that Professor Zbigniew Folejewski in his review of Roman Pollak's book *Od Renesansu do Baroku* (September 1971, p. 710) reproved the author for dealing in some of his papers with "chiefly political writers (S. Herakliusz Lubomirski)." There is a queer misunderstanding in such an exemplification. True, Lubomirski wrote some politicophilosophical treatises (incidentally, not devoid of literary significance), but he was also a dramatist of interest (as was brilliantly proved by Wanda Roszkowska's monograph, one of the best books in the field of Polish baroque literature) and, above all, a major baroque poet. From among his enthusiasts I would like to quote two non-Polish voices. For Andreas Angyal he is a "genius" ("dieser sonderbare aber geniale Mann," *Die slawische Barockwelt*, Leipzig, 1961, p. 189), while Dmitry Čiževsky writes of him as one of the best Polish baroque poets in his article "Zu den polnisch-russischen literarischen Beziehungen" (*Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*, 23, no. 2 [1955]). "Genius" or not a genius, S. H. Lubomirski certainly is a major literary figure.

WIKTOR WEINTRAUB
Harvard University

PROFESSOR FOLEJEWSKI REPLIES:

I agree that my term "chiefly political writer" in reference to Lubomirski was not quite accurate. However, thinking of him as a chiefly nonpolitical writer, especially in the context of Pollak's essay, devoted to some aspects of Lubomirski's biography as a historical and political figure, typical of the mentality of his time, would not be very accurate either. He was a political writer of importance, and I do not think I did him any injustice. Need I point out the obvious, that far from "reproving" Pollak, I paid him the highest compliment, stating that even in the essays of limited general interest (and such is the essay on Lubomirski) "the author displays an ability to point out the often unexpected wider significance of the discussed phenomena, and his comparative skills are truly impressive."