

into a direct progression from the *Peredvizhniki*, via the *Akhrovttsy*, to Socialist Realism.

Several prominent themes of this mythmaking are reflected in the book. The publication of a later, "updated" version of reminiscences by E. Katsman, a close associate of V. Perel'man, gives the misleading impression (as do some memoirs written in the 1960s) that the *Akhrovttsy* regarded and represented themselves, from the beginning, as the successors of the *Peredvizhniki*. The introduction presents a distorted version of Soviet cultural policy in the 1920s by insisting that the party always had a definite policy, not merely regarding the function of art but also regarding style. Similarly, the selections from Lunacharskii's speeches and reviews slight those pronouncements in which he warned against the perils of an official line for the mode of artistic expression. Furthermore, the more savage attacks on the art and policies of AKhRR, written by its opponents, are not included.

It is, of course, useful to have texts of the manifestoes issued by AKhRR, a sampling of reviews, facts about the wide network of AKhRR's activities as provided in some of the memoirs, a listing of exhibits and exhibitors, and a select bibliography. But anyone seeking a full picture of the role and fortunes of the AKhRR will not be spared the trouble of digging through the various publications of the 1920s. Even the small selection of documents printed in two earlier general anthologies—P. I. Lebedev, ed., *Bor'ba za realizm v iskusstve 20-kh godov* (Moscow, 1962) and I. Matsa, ed., *Sovetskoe iskusstvo za 15 let* (Moscow, 1933)—provide a more well-rounded story.

ELIZABETH KRIDL VALKENIER  
Columbia University

## LETTERS

### TO THE EDITOR:

The late Professor Schiebel came to Georgetown University in the fall of 1966 (not 1976, as the obituary in the March 1977 *Slavic Review* reads). *Mea culpa*.

DAVID M. GOLDFRANK  
Georgetown University

### TO THE EDITOR:

In her review of my Wicksell Lectures (*Slavic Review*, March 1977), Dr. Padma Desai raises some interesting questions regarding the comparisons of Soviet and Western productivity and consumption growth that I made there. Unfortunately, the questions are also more or less technical, and I have reluctantly concluded that this is not the context in which to explain my feeling that her strictures are not nearly as telling as she apparently assumes.

According to Dr. Desai, I concluded that the Soviet performance in respect of output per worker and consumption per capita is "impressive but not imposing." Dr. Desai, I am sure, has only by inadvertence attributed such an inanity to me. My principal conclusion, as I stated it, was that in the spheres in question "the famous Soviet model, though no doubt effective, still appears not especially imposing in a comparative perspective."

ABRAM BERGSON  
Harvard University