

MR. WRAGA REPLIES:

Every book may meet with an unfavorable review and every review may encounter objections. Such is the price of free expression. Conformity in criticism is dangerous.

Needless to say, I read Dr. Tucker's comments with profound attention. I persist, notwithstanding, in my opinion that Mr. Zagoria's work cannot be qualified as scholarly, nor am I inclined to think that he is well versed in methodology.

International relations can be viewed from either the standpoint of scholarship, intelligence, or journalism. Each approach has its own objectives and problems, and each requires the application of different methods. The intermixture of methods can only produce confused thinking and generate hoaxes. Dr. Tucker, who is experienced in Soviet affairs, will undoubtedly agree that a superficial approach to the contradictions observed in the USSR in the twenties caused Western scholars to appraise the Soviet potential incorrectly.

Although I am no expert in journalism, I have studied the scholarly and intelligence approach for over thirty years. I judge from my experience that, while perhaps highly commendable as a journalistic effort, Mr. Zagoria's book is of no value as the product of a scholar or intelligence expert. *The Sino-Soviet Conflict* is a news article expanded to monstrous proportions. Moreover, it appears to be an attempt to satisfy the political demands of the moment. The subordination of scholarly studies to the objectives of governmental policies is fraught with serious danger for both science and government. We need only to recall Napoleon, a most skillful statesman and strategist. Napoleon's fate was sealed when scholars anxious to support him strained their conclusions to conform with his ideas. Charles Louis Lesur, one of these scholars, in *Des Progrès de la Puissance Russe depuis son origine jusqu'au commencement du XIX Siècle*, tried to justify the Russian campaign and to prove that France had every reason to expect victory. The outcome was Waterloo.

My statement that Mr. Zagoria "neglected historical perspective" was not intended to signify that he should have included the background of present Sino-Soviet relations in the book. I simply felt that his argumentation revealed a lack of knowledge of history and that a scholarly study of the Sino-Soviet relations of today is impossible without consideration of their background.

As regards Mr. Zagoria's letter, I feel that the tone and contents spare me the need of a reply.

TO THE EDITOR:

In the September, 1962, issue of the *Slavic Review* Basil Dmytryshyn briefly reviewed D. Kvitkovsky, T. Bryndzan, and A. Zhukovsky (eds.), *Bukovyna: ů mynule i suchasne* (Paris, Philadelphia, and Detroit: "Zelena Bukovyna," 1956). The reviewer states that the work is a "product of careful research and great erudition" and deals with the "history of the area" and the many facets of its cultural and political life, and he commends the editors "for a

splendid job." In my opinion, it was the duty of even the briefest review to note that the title of the book is wholly misleading; it does not correspond to the content. Instead, the reviewer abets the misrepresentation by writing that this is a presentation "encyclopedic in scope." This is precisely what the book is not. All topics are discussed exclusively in terms of the national Ukrainian group, but this narrowness of bounds is not made clear except for a passing remark in the preface that "special attention" is given to the Ukrainian element (p. 5). It is stated that the book "is the fruit of a common effort by practically all the Bukovinians living in the free world today" (p. 7), although in fact there are today a considerable number of Bukovinians, some internationally known, in history, linguistics, letters, music, and other fields who live in the West and who have not been drawn into this volume, merely because they happen to represent not the Ukrainian but other national groups (Armenian, German, Jewish, Polish, and Rumanian). The book deals exclusively with Bukovina's Ukrainian national group, its point of view, and its cultural and political life. As such it is unique in scope, and even if it does not quite live up to the editors' claim of filling the gap in "objective information" (p. 5), it is nevertheless a welcome addition to the literature about this corner of East Europe.

LADIS K. D. KRISTOF
Temple University

TEN YEARS PAST — TEN YEARS AHEAD

In the current issue of

SURVEY

(April 1963)

A JOURNAL OF SOVIET AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

a number of experts review the decade in the USSR since Stalin's death and give their opinions on what is likely to happen in the next ten years. Contributors include

DANIEL BELL — ABRAM BERGSON — Z. BRZEZINSKI — GREGORY GROSSMAN
WOLFGANG LEONHARD — RICHARD LOWENTHAL — CHRISTOPHER MAYHEW
ALEC NOVE — LEONARD SCHAPIRO — PETER WILES — C. M. WOODHOUSE

The number also contains the articles:

Conversations with Trotsky.....	Fritz Sternberg
The Dynamics of Destalinisation.....	Herbert Ritvo
On National Democracy.....	Richard Lowenthal
Reflections on the Cult of Stalin.....	Georg Lukacs
and others	

We would like to remind new readers of some particularly interesting and well-received special numbers published during the last year, of which limited supplies are still available (single copies 5/-): "The Western Image of the Soviet Union" (April 1962); "Polycentrism" (June 1962); "Nationalism, Communism and the Uncommitted Nations" (August 1962); "Russia and Germany" (October 1962); "New Wave in Russia?" (January 1963).

SURVEY

is published quarterly. Yearly subscription rates: £1 or \$3.00; Special student rates.

Write to:

SURVEY, ILFORD HOUSE, 133 OXFORD STREET, LONDON W.1.