

versity and the Berlin Karl-Marx Allee are nothing more than tardy and inept mimicries of American skyscrapers like the New York Municipal Building or the Pure Oil and Wrigley Towers in Chicago. Nor is this idiom actually an exotic Russian importation into the satellite capitals. The whole of downtown Budapest, much of central Prague, and such remaining fragments of prewar Warsaw as the Telephone Building—all of these show us that Renaissance-Beaux Arts eclecticism got there long before the Russians.

Communist architects have now been permitted to discard this whole creaking apparatus, which is a mercy. But it by no means follows that the only proper use for this new freedom is a slavish adoption of current American conventions. Moscow architects are doing just this, in the new curtain-walled skyscrapers along Kalinin Prospekt, and they will live to rue the day they adopted this particular American error. Indeed, according to Ada Louise Huxtable, writing in *The New York Times*, the first summer has proved how ill adapted they are functionally to the Moscow summers. (Wait until the Moscow winter closes in!)

A "third world" may not be possible in foreign policy. But if Claes Oldenburg's empty grave behind the Metropolitan Museum of Art, in which nothing was ceremoniously interred by the artist, or Cage's four minutes of silence, or the apartment which Rudolph has designed for himself—if these represent the only alternatives which we can offer to socialist realism and the Stalin Style, then a third (or fourth or fifth) way out for art seems mandatory. It is fatuous to pretend that only Communist architects are in trouble: the architects of the whole world are in trouble and, fundamentally, it's the same trouble everywhere!

October 30, 1967

JAMES MARSTON FITCH  
School of Architecture  
Columbia University

TO THE EDITORS:

I enjoyed reading Marc Raeff's interesting and informative survey, "Filling the Gap between Radishchev and the Decembrists" (*Slavic Review*, September 1967), but I wonder why he has omitted mention of several Soviet works on literary criticism and journalism which would have been relevant to his topic. I have in mind such books as V. G. Berezina, A. G. Dement'ev, et al., *Istoriia russkoi zhurnalistiki XVIII-XIX vv.* (Moscow, 1963); V. G. Berezina, *Russkaia zhurnalistika pervoi chetverti XIX veka* (Leningrad, 1965); and N. I. Mordovchenko, *Russkaia kritika pervoi chetverti XIX veka* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1959). Mordovchenko's book—originally written as a doctoral dissertation in 1948 and not published until after its author's death in 1951, obviously for ideological reasons—is particularly important for a study of the Decembrists' predecessors. He maintains, among other interesting thoughts, that in their aesthetic views the Decembrists were more influenced by the Shishkovites than by their more progressive predecessors—a thought that supports Professor Raeff's own idea of the lack of a rectilinear descendancy from Radishchev to the Decembrists.

October 13, 1967

PAUL DEBRECZENY  
The University of North Carolina

TO THE EDITORS:

Professor Martin Horwitz of Cornell University has kindly called my attention to the following two facts in connection with statements I had made in my recent article

"Filling the Gap between Radishchev and the Decembrists" (*Slavic Review*, September 1967):

1. Contrary to my statement (note 27) that Popugaev's "Negr" had not been reprinted, it has been published in the body of the article of V. A. Desnitskii, both in the anthology *Poety Radishchevtsy* and in his *Izbrannye stat'i po russkoi literature XVIII-XIX vv.* which I quote.

2. According to Volume IV of *Krathkaia literaturnaia entsiklopediia*, I. K. Luppold died in 1943, "illegally repressed . . . posthumously rehabilitated."

I apologize for the oversight with respect to the republication of "Negr" and am sorry to see my suspicion of Luppold's tragic end confirmed.

November 23, 1967

MARC RAEFF  
Columbia University

TO THE EDITORS:

Recently two major conferences devoted to studies of the Hapsburg Monarchy have taken place on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. One, in Bloomington, Indiana (April 1966), was concerned with the role of the different nationalities in the disintegration of the Empire. The other, in Bratislava, Czechoslovakia (August 1967), discussed the effect of the Austro-Hungarian compromise of 1867.

Both conferences tackled the various aspects of the history of Austria-Hungary: questions of nationality, geography, economics, international relations, religion, and so on. It seems rather strange that modern scholarship on the history of Central Europe, while dealing with complex and perplexing issues, feels that one topic is unique and should be left to a special scholarly discipline. I mean the role which the Jews played in this part of Europe—which has been left almost entirely to Jewish studies.

While discussing Galicia, neither conference was interested in its Jewry, though the Jews constituted the third largest national group of the region, or 15 percent of all its inhabitants. The Jews in the lands of the Crown of St. Stephen were often described as a Magyarizing force; yet no lecture was given on their significance in the life of this kingdom. Also, the Jewish population of Vienna was recognized as important for the development of the Austrian capital, though its impact on the political and intellectual life of Cislethania was disregarded in the proceedings of the conferences.

I do feel that there is a place to raise the following questions: Should Jewish history be studied in an independent way, divorced from general history? And should "Slavic" studies, which customarily discuss the Magyars, the Rumanians, and the Germans, not deal also with the Jews in the history of Central and Eastern Europe? The independent study of Jewish history is turning into a sort of clannish business while important aspects of the territorial, social, and cultural development of Central and Eastern Europe remain outside the picture. *Mutatis mutandis*, how is it possible to elucidate the history of the Jews while isolating it from the natural background and making it a part of a specialized discipline? Historiography of the Poles or the Croats was not damaged by the concept of areal and comparative research. Nor would Jewish historiography be.

October 4, 1967

YESHAYAHU JELINEK  
University of Minnesota