

present volume has virtues the Czech product does not have (better coverage including pre-Communist law and writings, technical apparatus), the bibliographies yield most if used together. It is to be hoped that the Library of Congress will find it possible to produce the remaining bibliographies and complete the series, for their usefulness extends far beyond the legal profession.

*San Fernando Valley State College*

MARIN PUNDEFF

## LETTERS

### TO THE EDITOR:

The review of Donald Zagoria's book, *The Sino-Soviet Conflict*, in the December issue seems to attack the author with too heavy a hand. It appears unjust to say that "there is no scholarly method in the book." The reviewer also refers to the "overwhelming number of facts and documents intended to convince the reader that . . . international communism is disintegrating." In the book, actually, Zagoria disclaims any such intent, and takes a middle-of-the-road stand on the future of the Sino-Soviet conflict. Other gratuitous ascriptions of motives to the author occur in the following words: "The title of the book is evidence that the author had his mind made up when he wrote it." ". . . the reader is expected to accept the author's theory that Mao, when speaking of revisionism, has Khrushchev in mind, and Khrushchev, when defending 'peaceful coexistence,' is attacking Mao."

It would be more fair to conclude that the author presented his documents and other data in the knowledge that the readers would reach their own diverse verdicts. Certainly the book is neither niggardly nor unbalanced in the data made available for the 1956-61 period.

The reviewer also regrets that the book is limited to the above five-year period and that it thus lacks historical perspective. That is regrettable in a sense. The reader will have to look elsewhere for the historical and cultural perspective. However, Zagoria's book is some 400 pages in length. To add such material without making it much too long would entail large deletions from the present text. Then the reviewer's charge of eclectic empiricism might have been more easily sustained.

FRANK H. TUCKER  
*University of Maryland*

### TO THE EDITOR:

For several years now, some circles in this country have been very unhappy about the existence of the Sino-Soviet conflict. Their basic fear—one which I believe to be unjustified—is that American policy makers will interpret the dispute as a sign of the rapid disintegration of communism and will lower the Western guard. Those who share this obsessive fear stolidly refuse to recognize the facts of the Sino-Soviet dispute. Three years ago, the word from the Right was that the dispute was all a big hoax specifically designed by the Communists to deceive the West. The mounting evidence of Sino-Soviet tension, recently discussed by the President of the United States him-

self, precludes such a position today, and so the new line of the Right is that strains have always existed in international communism and present strains are no worse than previous ones.

I am accustomed to this kind of political pathology in the pages of such journals as the *National Review*, but I must confess surprise at finding it in the *Slavic Review*. I am referring to the "review" of my book by Richard Wraga in your December, 1962, issue.

To begin with, Mr. Wraga's qualifications for pronouncing judgment on my book are far from self-evident. So far as I am aware, he has not published a single article in the English language on any aspect of Soviet or Chinese Communist politics, even for the Research Institute on the Sino-Soviet Bloc, of which he is a member, and which, for the past several years, has been dedicated to the denial of Sino-Soviet conflict.

Leaving Mr. Wraga's qualifications aside, his review makes two points of criticism. First, and more serious from my point of view, he impugns my honesty, going so far as to suggest that my title indicates my mind was made up before I wrote the book. (Is Mr. Wraga really ignorant of the fact that book titles are selected at the very last, usually in conjunction with, if not by, the publisher, and are designed to convey what the book is about?) Elsewhere he writes: "Some facts are commented on arbitrarily; the analysis of others seems to be carefully avoided." I am also charged with using "obvious forgeries," and it is not clear whether in this particular case Mr. Wraga believes I was duped by Communist intelligence agencies or am merely not as sophisticated as he in identifying such "obvious forgeries." These rather sweeping charges, it should be noted, are not supported by even the slightest documentation. If Mr. Wraga has evidence that some of the documents I used in my book are forgeries, let him bring it forward. If I am to be accused of "carefully avoiding" rather than judiciously selecting facts, it seems to me that it behooves the reviewer to specify how he reached his conclusion. Perhaps Mr. Wraga, unaccustomed as he may be to writing for scholarly journals, needs to be reminded of some of the elementary rules of scholarship.

Wraga's second criticism seems to center on my methodology. There is certainly much about the problems connected with utilizing Communist materials which needs to be discussed, and I would be the first to warn of some of the pitfalls. But it is clear to me that Wraga has no understanding whatever of the problems. What for instance does his charge of "eclectic empiricism" mean? Wraga goes on to attribute to me the "theory (*sic*) that Mao, when speaking of revisionism, has Khrushchev in mind, and Khrushchev, when defending 'peaceful coexistence' is attacking Mao." Where precisely does he find this "theory" put forth in my book?

The most unfortunate thing about this review is not what it says but where it appears. Had it appeared in the popular press, it would not merit an answer. Because it appeared in what has always been a scholarly journal, I feel obliged not to let its irresponsibility pass without comment. It is most regrettable that the editors of your journal should have published a review which seems so clearly based on political rather than scholarly standards.

DONALD S. ZAGORIA  
*Columbia University*

## 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