

of the contributors to this volume, I am fully aware that the area of Poland was multinational and would like to see work done on non-Polish women within those territories, but I am not doing it and neither I nor my fellow contributors should be faulted for the “exclusively Polish” nature of our work. That is what we know and it is what we are writing about. If I live long enough and have learned enough about the subject matter of women within Polish territories, perhaps I can expand my work. But, for the time being, I would like it considered within my own framework and not someone else’s.

BOGNA LORENCE-KOT
California College of Arts and Crafts

Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak chooses not to reply.

To the Editor:

I am writing to state my objections to Michael Katz’s review of Robin Miller’s excellent book on *The Brothers Karamazov* (Winter 1994). Professor Katz opens by stating that the book’s intended audience “is high school students and undergraduates coming to Dostoevskii’s novel for the first time,” a statement that would undoubtedly surprise the Twayne series editors and may mislead the review audience into believing that it is not intended for us—college teachers, graduate students and Dostoevskii specialists. As a Dostoevskii specialist, I do not think it hyperbolic to claim that this small book will be on reading lists and in the bibliographies of major scholars for as long as serious scholarship on Dostoevskii continues. Professor Katz next disregards the series format and criticizes the book’s first three sections for their brevity and content without, however, tackling Miller’s claims about the role of Russian censorship in the history of this and other great Russian works, her argument that the debate between writers and radical critics over the topicality vs. the universality of literature is part of an ongoing debate about Russia’s future and identity that could not be discussed openly in the press, and her argument in defense of the canon: “I suspect that certain works, among them *The Brothers Karamazov*, will continue to be read, not because they subtly support the existence of certain reigning power structures, but because of their aesthetic qualities, their passion, and the frisson of recognition they incite in their readers.” Most seriously, Professor Katz neglects any mention of Miller’s discussion of Dostoevskii’s reader as an *implicated* reader, who, in *The Brothers Karamazov*, is confronted time and again with the problem of evil. Finally, he criticizes the author for a fault of the publisher’s—the omission of dates on one page of the chronology. This latter criticism especially bespeaks a bias that must be addressed.

DEBORAH MARTINSEN
North American Dostoevsky Society

Michael Katz replies:

Deborah Martinsen misreads my review, which was largely positive. Some clarifications: although the “Guidelines for Authors” of the series claim that the studies are “intended, first, for college and university students,” the glossy brochure contains the following quotation from the *School Library Journal*: “These studies are well written and readable, and provide more depth than Cliff’s Notes ... [and] will be useful in all high school libraries.” As for the reading lists and bibliographies of major Dostoevsky scholars, I suspect that they are more likely to include Victor Terras’s *Karamazov Companion* (1981) and Robert Belknap’s *Genesis of the Brothers Karamazov* (1990). Re: my “bias that must be addressed.” I made no accusation. I merely pointed out that the dates on p. xii were missing.

MICHAEL KATZ
University of Texas, Austin

To the Editor:

Alfred Rieber’s review of *The Secret World of American Communism* is both gratuitously nasty and filled with factual inaccuracies. He accuses us—with no evidence—of “frequently” engaging in “the notorious tactic of guilt by association.” When he does get around to discussing the documents in our book, he commits so many mistakes that we cannot respond to all of them in the one paragraph the editor has allotted us to reply. We will be pleased to send interested readers a more detailed response but, for now, let us note that Rieber confuses the CPUSA with the CPSU, confuses the Com-

intern with Soviet government agencies, mistakenly believes that J. Peters, who headed the CPUSA's "secret apparatus," was a key figure in the Comintern, mistakenly claims that we reproduce "only" one stolen government document and totally confuses what we say about Alger Hiss and Whittaker Chambers. Professor Reiber also had the bad fortune to have his review ridiculing the notion that there was serious Soviet espionage directed against the US in the 1930s and 1940s appear just as the US government released the first 49 of some 2,000 decrypted Soviet cables from World War II detailing "the KGB's extensive contacts with the American Communist Party." Historians, of all people, ought to be open to new evidence. They also ought to be able to describe accurately the books they review.

HARVEY KLEHR
Emory University
JOHN HAYNES
Library of Congress

Alfred Reiber replies:

Professor's Klehr's intemperate response to my review of *The Secret World of American Communism* is a good example of the tone that pervades his scholarship. He accuses me of all sorts of confusions. But it is he who is confused. First of all I nowhere ridicule the notion that there was serious Soviet espionage directed against the US in the 1930s and 1940s. What I ridicule in his attempt to assign the major role in this espionage to the American Communist Party. As for J. Peters, I never said he was "a key figure in the Comintern," but rather "a key figure in the clandestine activities of the American Communist Party." In other words, it is Professor Klehr and not I who cannot keep track of the difference between the Comintern and the CPUSA. Nor did I claim that there was "'only' one stolen government document" reproduced, but only one dealing with "political espionage." If I "totally confuse" what he and his colleagues "say about Alger Hiss and Whittaker Chambers," then the responsibility is his; my review quotes exactly what he has written on the relationship. In other words Professor Klehr's recital of my "so many mistakes" turns out to be another set of tendentious judgments to match those he scatters throughout his published commentary.

ALFRED J. RIEBER
University of Pennsylvania
Central European University

To the Editor:

In her recent review of Daniel Rancour-Laferriere's *Tolstoy's Pierre Bezukhov: A Psychoanalytic Study* (*Slavic Review* 54, no. 1 [Spring 1995]), Anna A. Tavis with gratuitous snideness dismisses the book as "a case of critical narcissism" and casts aspersions on a project that deserves praise for its originality and the scholarly dedication with which it is carried out. Whether one agrees or not with Rancour-Laferriere's proposition that a character can be psychoanalyzed (and shown to be a narcissistic personality), he has made a strong test case for it and thereby a valuable contribution to our field. Why should it be subject to (the reviewer's) ridicule that according to a psychoanalytic critic, "Tolstoi [...] may be a master of representation, but he is a poor therapist, he only leaves signs which are for the critic to interpret"; that the critic "gives the story [of Pierre's maturation] a freudian twist"; or that "[t]he character [Pierre] whom we meet in these pages is not Tolstoi's or the reader's but Rancour-Laferriere's own"? Does this mean that all criticism should have stopped after Tolstoy's 1878 letter to Strakhov about critics trying to "know better" than the author? I find the book straightforwardly written (not "meandering"), informative, useful in many ways, stimulating, at times brilliant (especially the interpretation of Karataev's death and Pierre's attendant dreams as Pierre's symbolic loss of mother in childbirth).

One passage in the book, however, does require correction. On p. 233, the author draws far-reaching psychoanalytic conclusions from the fact that in the Epilogue, Pierre's and Natasha's infant son Petia seems to say to her: "You are [...] jealous, you would like to pay him [Pierre] back [...] but I am he, I am he [a ia vot on. A ia vot on] ..." In equating, on the strength of this, Petia ("I") with his father ("he"), Rancour-Laferriere finds himself in the good company of the Maudes, W.W. Norton, and George Gibian (p. 1286). I believe he is also right on a symbolic level; indeed, on the next page, as Pierre finally arrives, Natasha refers to him in the same words ("Vot on"). However, linguistically this is a mistake. The Russian phrase "A ia vot on [ia]" means strictly "Here I am [right here]." The use of the pronoun "on" is similar to that in the