

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