

but strictly with respect to the following places: Petrograd, Moscow, Tambov, Rostov-on-Don, Novocherkassk, Kislovodsk-Pyatigorsk. All the remaining places not embraced in my design long ago have been put away in books and files. I am hopeful that the publishers may take upon themselves the work of collecting for me any materials that are sent in." Replies on this subject should be addressed to the Director of YMCA Press, Mr. Jean Morozov, 11 rue de la Montagne Sainte Genevieve, Paris V, France.

PAUL B. ANDERSON
YMCA Press

TO THE EDITOR:

In her review of *Soviet-Polish Relations, 1917-1921* by Wandycz, Professor Cieniciala [*Slavic Review*, September 1970, pp. 533-34] says that article 87 of the Versailles Peace Treaty "left the settlement of the Polish eastern border to the Great Powers in consultation with Russia." In reality the article runs as follows: "The boundaries of Poland not laid down in the present Treaty will be subsequently determined by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers." Not a word was said about any consultation with Russia.

J. W. BRUEGEL
London

PROFESSOR CIENCIALA REPLIES:

Mr. Bruegel is quite right in stating that article 87 of the Versailles Treaty did not mention consultation with Russia on the eastern borders of Poland.

This was careless writing on my part. What I had in mind was the background or *coulisses*, as the French say, of article 87. Here Russia was, in 1919, decisive. The Second Report of the Commission on Polish Affairs of April 22 recommended "that a final settlement of the question of the Eastern frontier of Poland should be made as soon as a Russian Government is established with which the Great Powers can deal in regard to this question" (cited in T. Komarnicki, *Rebirth of the Polish Republic*, London, 1957, p. 487). In a note to Kolchak of May 26, it was stated that if the matter of frontiers between Russia on the one hand and Finland and Poland on the other were not settled by agreement, it would be left to the arbitration of the League of Nations (*Documents on British Foreign Policy*, 1st ser., vol. 3, pp. 331-32). In the treaty between Poland and the Principal Allied and Associated Powers of May 28, it is stated that "the Government of Russia assented to the re-establishment of an independent Poland." Finally, Mr. Bruegel is no doubt aware of the fact that the Supreme Council decision of December 1919 laid down that the Polish government had the right of provisional administration in territories occupied by Polish troops east of what was considered as ethnic Polish territory.

The Foreign Office papers for 1919, now available in the Public Record Office, London, show consistent British opposition to Polish territorial claims roughly east of Congress Poland. It is clear that the British government wished to have good relations with a non-Communist Russia which, with British and French support, was hopefully going to emerge out of the Civil War. While many younger

F.O. officials sincerely believed in the principle of self-determination, the political aspect was, in all major cases, decisive. As Professor James Barros says: "all cases of self-determination where great power interests were involved were in fact decided by power considerations" (*The Aaland Islands Question: Its Settlement by the League of Nations*, New Haven, 1968, p. 341).

TO THE EDITOR:

Am I guilty of "ex cathedra pronouncements" and "metaphysical subtleties"? Mr. Abouchar says so [*Slavic Review*, June 1971, p. 360], but his proof requires him to misquote me. He had pointed out that proposed maximum livestock holdings by Soviet peasants, published in a draft charter, exceeded actual holdings by large percentages. I wrote: "The draft charter certainly never intended to increase numbers . . . by the percentages there given" (given, that is, by Mr. Abouchar). He omitted the italicized words, thereby implying that I claimed special knowledge of their intentions, which indeed I do not have. But it requires no "metaphysics" to be certain that officials neither expect nor desire increases up to the maximum. On the contrary, if peasants give up keeping cows, because they are able to purchase dairy produce from their farm, this is regarded as a welcome development. Because keeping animals is a labor-intensive task, it becomes less attractive when and if peasants are paid better for their normal work. This is one reason why livestock numbers are far below the *existing* maxima (shortage of feed is another). The difference between permitted maximum and actual private holdings is indeed much smaller in the case of cultivated land, as Mr. Abouchar noted, but for some reason he considers this to be part of the case against me. However, there must still be a fair number of peasant families who would own more livestock if this were allowed, and they would try to take advantage of relaxation of the rules, which may indeed have been contemplated for hogs and sheep. Not, however, for cattle. The rule about "one cow and offspring" has been in existence since 1935.

ALEC NOVE
University of Glasgow

TO THE EDITOR:

In the March 1971 issue of the *Review* (p. 231), Professor Nikola Pribić reported on American participation in the Sixth International Congress of Comparative Literature, held in Bordeaux, France, from August 31 to September 5, 1970. Papers by American Slavists omitted by Professor Pribić's report may be of additional interest: "Critics of Literature and Society in 20th-Century America," by René Wellek (Yale University), "Symbolism, Acmeism and Africa," by Professor Ralph Matlaw (University of Chicago), "Theatre of the Absurd as Theatre of Commitment," by Professor Andrzej Wirth (Lehmann College, CUNY), "Gogol as Man of Letters: Writer and Audience in 19th-Century Russia," by Professor Donald Fanger (Harvard), and my own "Baroque Literature and Islamic Culture."

HAROLD B. SEGEL
Columbia University