

explain in my book. The trick is to find a government that will do the job.

But when I make suggestions as to the most promising type of government, the reviewer complains that I am "impatient" with British and American policy and that I do not appreciate the difficulty of giving "material aid" and "unsolicited advice" to a "proud and independent people." No one will deny that it is necessary to be tactful and diplomatic in day-to-day contacts with the Greek people, whose temperament I believe is as familiar to me as to the reviewer. But surely more is at issue here than a problem in public relations. The fact of the matter is that, because of her geographic position and small size, Greece has never been free in modern times to make her own history. When Churchill feared that a Communist-dominated regime would be established in Greece after liberation, he did not hesitate to intervene with armed force. For the same reason we enunciated the Truman Doctrine in 1947 and intervened with arms and dollars and missions. Whether we like it or not, what happens in Greece today depends to a very great degree upon decisions in Washington. The question, therefore, is not whether we should intervene, but rather, what should be the aim of our intervention? I point out in my book that this is a most difficult question to answer. Far from being "impatient," I analyze at length (pp. 226-29) the dilemma we face. In fact, one reviewer commented that the word "opportunity" should be deleted from the subtitle *American Dilemma and Opportunity*. Nevertheless, I do reach a conclusion which Professor Dawson chose to ignore completely. I urge support of the Center as against a Left that is Communist-dominated and a Right that I believe cannot cope with the country's basic ills.

The unpleasant truth is that we run a risk regardless of the policy we adopt. The weakness of the center is obvious and serious. But barring a sudden revolution in our relations with Russia, the only alternative is the right. It is very doubtful that it could stay in office for any length of time without establishing an authoritarian regime disguised as a "strong-man government" to curb the Communists. And if we should waver in our support of such a government, it would soon be replaced by an equally authoritarian regime disguised as a "peoples' democracy" (p. 229).

Future events will demonstrate whether or not this is a "completely unsafe guide" to what is going on in Greece.

L. S. STAVRIANOS

Northwestern University
Evanston, Ill.

Dear Sir:

In your issue for October 1953 you published a paper by Mr. Harold Orel entitled "The Forgotten Ambassadors: Russian Fiction in Victorian England." One of the statements he makes will no doubt shock many lovers and students of Russian literature in England, and perhaps in this country. I have in mind his reference to the late Maurice Baring. He writes: "Men who were not primarily poets or novelists in their own right served as sponsors and mediated between English and Russian cultures. These individuals—W. R. S. Ralston, C. E. Turner, W. R. Morfill, the Maudes, Constance Garnett, and Maurice Baring—responded to the Russian novel in

a good-natured, energetically direct, and uncritical fashion. Often enough they amplified or modified the statements which other critics had made about Turgenev, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and Gorky, but the important matter lay in the contagion of their enthusiasm, rather than in the intellectual content of their articles, reviews, and books."

Now, all these statements may or may not apply to Ralston, Turner, Morfill, Aylmer Maude, and Constance Garnett, but some of them are certainly quite inapt with regard to Maurice Baring. Apart from the fact that it seems strange to bracket Baring—a typical Edwardian who lived well, and fitted into the Georgian era (1874-1945)—with such Victorians as Ralston, Turner, and Morfill, it is even stranger to dismiss the fact that Baring not only *was* a poet and novelist in his own right, but that he was a poet, novelist and essayist of distinction. Steeped in the Greek and Latin classics, at home in France and French literature, Maurice Baring brought to the study of Russian literature a wide culture and a fine critical perception. To describe him as responding to the Russian novel "in a good-natured, energetically direct, and uncritical fashion" is highly inadequate. The fact that Mr. Orel was writing about Russian *fiction* does not justify him in not even mentioning—once he decided to bring in Baring—the latter's fine Introduction to the *Oxford Book of Russian Verse*, which contains some of the best and most perceptive things ever said about Puškin, or to ignore his translations of Puškin, Lermontov and other Russian poets, which are among the best in any language. It is precisely the fact that in Baring we have to do not with a mere translator or an enthusiastic scholar but a poet with a fine sense of poetic values, that makes him a unique mediator between Russian and English cultures. Such fine interpreters of Russian literature are rare in any country. By his rash remark, Mr. Orel has done a great injustice to the memory of Maurice Baring.

GLEB STRUVE

*University of California
Berkeley 4, Calif.*

CONTRIBUTORS

MATHEW S. ANDERSON, Lecturer in Political History, London School of Economics and Political Science, University of London

EUGENE ARDEN, Lecturer in English and American Literature, Hofstra College, and Instructor in the English Language Institute, Queens College

HERBERT E. BOWMAN, Assistant Professor of Slavic Languages, University of Oregon

EDWARD T. BROWN, Associate Professor of Russian, Brown University

ROBERT V. DANIELS, Assistant Professor of Slavic Studies, Indiana University