

role of A.T. in his (Ehrenburg's) expulsion. (At that time France had not yet recognized the Soviets.) They made up only in the 1930s. I heard this story from Ehrenburg himself, in the summer of 1922, in Berlin.

NINA BERBEROVA
Princeton University

TO THE EDITOR:

I have no complaint against Professor Elwood's review of my book, *The Triumph of Bolshevism*, which appeared in the December 1968 number of the *Slavic Review*, as it was eminently fair. As to his stricture that my interpretation is old-fashioned, I must plead guilty if being old-fashioned is to try to view the Russian revolution in a broad context rather than in complete isolation. With my background, I could not do otherwise.

As van Zandt pointed out in his book *The Metaphysical Foundations of American History*, most American historians start from basic assumptions that have long been out of date. Yet so far as I have been able to find out, this book has been almost completely ignored. American historians (and for that matter other English-speaking historians) have refused to re-examine these assumptions, and history has continued to be written as though nothing had changed.

A somewhat similar complaint was long since voiced by Carl Becker, who deplored the tendency of American historians to regard their function much the way a manufacturer of bricks regards it his business solely to make bricks without making any pretense of building a house. So many historians think they have completed their task when they have made a brick perhaps one day to be used by a master builder for erecting a building.

So perhaps there is more than one way of being old-fashioned.

STUART R. TOMPKINS
Victoria, British Columbia