

assigned the book to a Gypsy-activist (he admonishes me for “having little sympathy for the Gypsy”) even though a cursory glance at the volume would have revealed that it was written by a social scientist who deplores the subjectivity and “research methods” of Romanologists. But I am astonished that the editors sent out a book for review to someone who is repeatedly criticized by name—which duly appears in the index—in the same book. Would you have asked Andrei Zhdanov to appraise Anna Akhmatova’s poems or Gustav Husák to assess Václav Havel’s essays?

ZOLTAN BARANY
University of Texas

Dr. Kenrick replies:

It has been suggested that I might like to reply to Zoltan Barany’s letter. For any reader who wishes to keep up with the specialist literature in the Gypsy field, but has not yet read Edward Acton’s and my edited *Scholarship and the Gypsy Struggle* (Paul and Company Publishing Consortium), which includes my biography, I can say that I have three degrees and two diplomas, all from the University of London. I have retired from teaching, but am not sure whether I was an academic for I have only delivered occasional lectures at universities and I am anything but a Platonic philosopher. Although committed to helping individual Gypsies with the problems they face in a society that barely recognizes their right to exist as a minority, I am acknowledged as an “expert,” that is, as a neutral witness in this field by the courts in the United Kingdom as well as by immigration and planning tribunals. I approached this book review in the same way, ignoring attacks on my own data (which I will clarify in my future writings). Ethnic cleansing is unfortunately a worldwide phenomenon, as we can read in the papers every day. In my review I concentrated on Barany’s thesis and the facts on which it was based so that readers of the *Slavic Review* could decide whether they want to purchase it for their libraries and perhaps read it themselves.

DONALD KENRICK
London, England

Editor’s note: In selecting book reviewers, the editor seeks to avoid conflicts of interest that might prejudice the reviewer either favorably or unfavorably toward the book under review. We regret that it is not always possible to realize this goal.

To the Editor:

George Enteen’s review of my book, *Rewriting History in Soviet Russia: The Politics of Revisionist Historiography in the Soviet Union, 1956–1974*, as part of his review essay “Recent Writings about Soviet Historiography” (*Slavic Review*, vol. 61, no. 2), was extremely generous. He was also highly critical of certain aspects of my book, however. With a view to initiating discussion, I would like to respond briefly to some of the important issues he raises.

First, Enteen suggests that I have exaggerated the new accounts of collectivization advanced by V. P. Danilov, N. A. Ivnikskii, and their colleagues in the 1960s as a “paradigm shift” because they were “blinded” by the “myth of the kulak.” This criticism misrepresents my argument. I did not state that they achieved a paradigm shift in the 1960s. In fact I noted that in many respects theirs was a moderate critique. True, not until the late 1970s did Danilov explicitly repudiate the myth of the kulak as the “last exploiting class,” but it did not simply “implode.” It was undermined by his group’s strivings to establish the real social dynamics in the countryside on the basis of sustained empirical research, rather than Stalinist stereotypes.

Second, Enteen suggests that I underestimate “the influence of foreign scholarship” on the New Direction historians. I found no evidence whatsoever for external influences on their thinking. Few of these historians had foreign languages. While some might like to credit western scholarship as leavening Soviet revisionism, rereading Vladimir Lenin, intensive research on Russian agrarian and commercial history, and comparative analysis with the developing world were the wellsprings of New Direction new thinking.

Third, Enteen suggests that I understate Ia. S. Drabkin’s challenge to the Stalinist “lie” that Lenin had repudiated world revolution. This seems a matter of emphasis. Drabkin was