

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-