

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, *Ruskaia zhurnalistika pervoi chetverti XIX veka* (Leningrad, 1965); and N. I. Mordovchenko, *Ruskaia 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 preceders—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