

greatest myths of all time. Conscientious historians should not whitewash him without sufficient proof.

FOLKE DOVRING
University of Illinois

TO THE EDITOR:

1. It is at least gratifying to learn that the affair of "Lise" is not a dead issue, as I had feared it might be. It is also gratifying to think that I am considered partial to Lenin rather than the reverse, which seems to be a more likely pitfall for American scholars. On the other hand, not everyone will assume as quickly as Professor Dovring that the alleged affair blackens Lenin's character. If true, would it not be a sign of the *prostor* that he so painfully lacks in most of his life?

2. *Fjords and rowboats*: While several reference works confirm my belief that the word "fjord" is not used to describe the low-relief inlets around Stockholm, I concede that Alexinsky's usage was derived from the similar Swedish term. Although I have done some rowing near Stockholm in late June and checked my impressions of the seasonal practices of boat hiring there with a person who has lived in the area, I now repent raising this matter because it is inconclusive, not that this in itself strengthens the case for "Lise."

3. *Letters*: There are striking dissimilarities between Lenin's authenticated hand and the published excerpts from his alleged letters to "Lise." One of the most obvious is the formation of the Russian *v* as a preposition. Judging by Bertram Wolfe's comment, to which I alluded, the Columbia University library, which presumably had a better look at the evidence than Professor Dovring did, was unconvinced that the letters were Lenin's. I do not, however, find this question crucial to my case. The published excerpts of letters could have been forged and "Lise" still could have existed, or they might have been by Lenin and written to someone else.

4. *Alexinsky*: What is crucial is Alexinsky's reliability, for one must depend wholly on him as the link to "Lise" and her story. Professor Dovring has not disposed of the contradictions that I noted in Alexinsky, undermining his credibility. While there is no need to repeat these contradictions, I do wish to point out that in one connection Professor Dovring might have spared himself some trouble if he had checked the Russian version of the story. In it Hanecki supposedly tells "Lise" in Paris during the World War, "On [Lenin] *v* Tsiurikhe." There is no basis for stating that this is merely a "mailing address."

ROBERT H. MCNEAL
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

TO THE EDITOR:

Alvin Rubinstein's review of my book *Soviet-East European Dialogue: International Relations of a New Type?* (December 1969) has little relevance to its major ideas. His use of descriptive terms such as "turgid," "opaque," and "jaded" is unsupported by any telling example; and what is more, quoted passages are divorced from the very adjacent ideas he cites as shortcomings of the book, to wit: