

## LETTERS

Dear Sir:

I would like to correct an error which I have discovered in one of the footnotes to my article, "The Nazis and the SS Volunteer Division 'Galicia'", in the February, 1956 issue of *The American Slavic and East European Review*.

Footnote 3, on page 2, states that the photographic copies of the Himmler files concerning the SS Division "Galicia" held in the Hoover War Memorial Library are "uncatalogued and unorganized". This is a misstatement. The Himmler files in the Hoover Library are organized as they were in Himmler's office, and are inventoried.

Sincerely yours,

BASIL DMYTRYSHYN

P. O. Box 207  
Berkeley 4, California  
June 6, 1956

Dear Editor:

I must call on your courtesy, for Mr. Wolfe's reply to my analysis of his *Three Who Made a Revolution* (this Journal, Vol. XV, No. 1, p. 86) went beyond a matter-of-fact refutation of my statements.

First of all, I must take exception to the virulence of its tone which at times assumes an insulting character. The competent reader will judge of the value and magnitude of my corrections, whether they are "smallish," "false" and based on "misrepresentations." Such expressions, however, as "a series of absurdities," "pedantic impertinence" (what does it mean?) or "inability to comprehend the text he is reading" are not proper in a scholarly discussion. Although Mr. Wolfe calls the tone of my study "invidious," no epithets and expressions of this kind have been used by me. I expected Mr. Wolfe to follow my example of restraint and urbanity in his reply: he, obviously, allowed his irritation to break the usual rules of reciprocal scholarly politeness.

Second, Mr. Wolfe's article contains imputations of motives which might create a misunderstanding and call for clarification. I owe it both to the readers and Mr. Wolfe himself. I did not know Mr. Wolfe's book well enough to discuss it in detail before the end of 1953 when the Swiss review *Erasmus* asked me to review the French translation of the book. The review was written during the Christmas vacation of that year, and out of it a more intensive study developed which led to my article in the *American Slavic and East European Review*. No "secrecy" nor "strange silence" were involved. I did not know that Mr. Wolfe was preparing a second edition at the time I was writing my article; otherwise, I would

have been glad to help him. The book I have been writing on *Russia between 1907 and 1914* covers the field of Russian institutional development, and thus will not compete with *Three Who Made a Revolution* which far from obstructing "my path" stimulates interest in the epoch I am dealing with, without encroaching on my field. . . . As to "unconscious reasons," it seems to me that Mr. Wolfe would be better inspired, if he did not attempt psychoanalysis at distance.

Third, Mr. Wolfe overstates my critical position. Although my judgment of Mr. Wolfe's treatment of general Russian history (*i.e.* outside of Marxian developments) might be severe, I have praise for the biographical and the Marxian parts of his book and I expressed it in my review in the *Erasmus* (Vol. 8, Nos. 17-18, Sept. 25, 1955, pp. 561-67). My "*but's, stills and howevers*" which Mr. Wolfe dislikes so much are the tools of a judgment which tries to be fair and balanced. I never had any intention "to read Mr. Wolfe out of the precincts of history," never read his book in "a *hanging judge* spirit" nor even, as he takes it for granted, in the spirit of "unfriendly criticism." I only registered what struck me as inexact (more than I published in the article) and never thought that it might be construed as a *crimen laesae majestatis* by Mr. Wolfe in his reply.

Sincerely yours,

MARC SZEFTTEL

*Ithaca, N. Y.*  
*February 23, 1956*