

time in locating services and sources," and to codify "practices sometimes found confusing." Volume 1 has four parts. The first consists mostly of short essays by Columbia professors in twelve disciplines, each discussing the nature of the discipline as applied to Russia and the USSR and evaluating major periodicals and study guides. The second describes holdings of major libraries in this country and abroad. The third deals with activities related to study of the USSR in American governmental and private organizations, including publishing houses and book dealers. The fourth discusses problems of style, translation, and transliteration. The title of the second volume well describes its contents.

The intention is to revise this still understandably Columbia-oriented manual to make it suit the needs of graduate students throughout the country, and the editor invites suggestions to that end. In the meantime all graduate students specializing on Russia will find the handbook useful in many respects, and it is a rare professor who will not learn something from it.

D.W.T.

LETTER

TO THE EDITOR:

I would very much appreciate if you would bring to the attention of my American colleagues a case which I consider a violation of professional ethics.

At the end of 1969 a certain Danubian Press (Astor Park, Florida) published a *History of the Hungarian Nation*. According to the title page, Part I of this volume was based on my "works and former publications," "updated and re-evaluated by the Danubian Research Center." The foreword gives me "special recognition" for my alleged "extremely valuable contribution to this book."

These statements are misleading. In reality the first part of the book is simply a reprint (excluding the foreword, the introduction, and the chapters dealing with the period after 1919) of the text of my *History of Hungary*, published in the United States by the Benjamin Franklin Bibliophile Society in 1941. The volume called *History of the Hungarian Nation* was prepared and published without my previous knowledge and consent. The "recognition" of my "contribution" is apt to give the entirely false impression that I had agreed to and participated in the preparation of the book. In fact I protested against it as soon as I first heard about it from a young American historian, Steven B. Várdy, when he visited Hungary at the end of last year. He introduced himself as the author of Part II of the same volume, expressed his astonishment that I had no idea of the venture, and declared that he had been misinformed in this respect by the Center and that he would try to stop the book. He was unsuccessful.

As a result of this incident, the "moderator" of the Center, a Mr. A. Wass, wrote me that he "deeply regretted" that I had not been informed of the undertaking and that they had obtained the copyright from my former publisher in 1967. He also sent me some royalties.

Had my objections been motivated by material considerations or by hurt vanity, I could have accepted this gesture, although I was a little surprised to hear of this transfer of the copyright. I did not know that anybody existed who had the

right to transfer it and to permit, in the name of the Franklin Society, the reprinting, *in spite* of the fact that my original "agreement" signed on June 20, 1941, by Joseph Fodor, secretary-treasurer, explicitly stipulated that no second edition could be published "without first obtaining the consent of the author." I was also puzzled by the fact that this copyright, which did not expire until 1969, was transferred in 1967 without my being consulted.

I at once wrote a letter of protest to the publisher and objected to the unauthorized use of my name. I cooperate only with scholars of my choice and if and when I choose to do so. In the same letter I also objected to two possibilities, not knowing what had happened: the reprinting, in original form, of an old, outdated text, or its rewriting by somebody else, a procedure not allowed, as far as I know, by the copyright either.

I wrote the original book as a young professor of the Eötvös College (Budapest) in 1940. I was asked to do so first by my old professor and paternal friend, Gyula Szekfű, the greatest Hungarian historian at that time, who also wrote a foreword to my book. His request was supported by Count Pál Teleki, professor of geography, who was then prime minister of Hungary and the *curator* (president) of my own college. They wished to maintain and to strengthen our intellectual and scientific ties with the allied countries in the dark days of Nazi aggression. Teleki attached so much importance to this idea that he invited me to go to the United States to supervise the printing of my book and to prepare the way for further publications. I was in New York when the Germans attacked Yugoslavia in April 1941, and he committed suicide. I dedicated the book, which came out in September 1941, to his memory. Some American historians, among them Professors Carl Becker, Walter Consuelo Langsam, Ferdinand Schevill, and Bernadotte E. Schmitt, were kind enough to give me critical comments and advice on certain parts of the text. I still have their letters as souvenirs. Professor Watson Kirkconnel of McMaster University (Canada) checked the final English text. The book was published also in Hungarian in 1943 and in Swedish in 1944.

In 1940 I wrote the best book I was able to produce, but after thirty years I see its shortcomings. Although it tried to introduce some new ideas, such as the notion of East Central Europe as a historical region, the book bore the evident marks of the influence of the old, traditionalist, and nationalist school of Hungarian historians, which prevailed in the interwar period and from which my generation received its education. It reflected the outlook and results of contemporary literature, particularly that of the synthesis of Gy. Szekfű and (for the Middle Ages) of B. Hóman, a fact which I acknowledged at the time. Furthermore, the results of our research during the last thirty years, including my own, are naturally missing from the book. To reprint it unchanged, as the Center finally did, with a bibliography stopping in 1940, is tantamount to a total disregard of recent scholarship. This I could not accept; my name could be associated only with a completely rewritten text.

Mr. Wass informed me that he had decided not to ask for my cooperation on the ground that the Center did not wish to involve anyone living in a country "where certain scholastic fields are being influenced by the ideological doctrines of a totalitarian government." This imputation, that we are, in a state of intellectual infancy, unable to do our job properly and on an international level, is a very silly insult, which in this case was directed against my own person. How unwarranted this assumption was is proven by a recent letter from the Columbia University Press asking me to write, together with Professor Gy. Ránki, a book on Hungarian history, a summary of our present views and conclusions. Such a book would, evi-

dently, not be good enough for the higher requirements of the Danubian Press. How I react to the dictates of a real totalitarian government can be seen in a "certificate" awarded to me by Field-Marshal Alexander, Supreme Allied Commander, Mediterranean Theater, "as a token of gratitude" for my help given to Allied soldiers during World War II.

After my letter of protest the polite and empty phrases were gone. Forgetting the "deep respect" he so eloquently expressed for my "contributions to the field of history," Mr. Wass went so far as to insult me by suggesting that the Center "now" had in its files the copy of a letter which, allegedly, "properly" informed me of the undertaking and that he had "affidavits" stating the "fact" known to them "long before" the publication of the volume, that the original book, though signed by me, was not my own work, but a "condensation" made (by whom?) under the "supervision" of Count Teleki. This went pretty far, although I could still suppose, with a great exertion of *bona fides*, that Mr. Wass was misinformed by some other people and misguided into making false statements. In the spring of 1970, invited by several American universities to give lectures in the United States, I visited the International Research and Exchange Board (IREX) in New York. I was astonished to hear that IREX had received from Mr. Wass a document signed by a Mr. B. Báchkai who, in transferring the copyright of my book to the Center in question, suggested neatly and simply that I was not the author of the book, that only my name had been put on the text compiled, presumably, by other people. As a matter of fact Mr. Báchkai-Payerle and his wife were the translators of my original manuscript when I was supervising its edition personally in New York. Consequently he must be well aware of the fact that he made a ludicrously false statement, which he would be unable to prove.

Finally, it was hardly fair to combine my text, without my knowledge and consent, with another section propounding opinions with which I definitely disagree. I have no reason to question Dr. Várdy's statement that he, as a junior scholar, accepted the assignment of writing the second part of the volume (from 1919 to our days) with reluctance and in the firm belief that the Center had obtained my consent. The fact remains that, misguided, he produced a text the coupling of which with any text of mine I would certainly have opposed, and not only because of the evident political bias corresponding probably to that of the Center. It is not my purpose here to go into a critical analysis. I can only say that had he consulted me, if only out of courtesy, before completing his manuscript, he would, I think, be more satisfied with his contribution than he is. We all learn by experience, by trial and error. I hope he will do so with success and reach his own conclusion.

I have taken advantage of you and your readers' patience simply to dissociate myself from a work which is now appearing in your university and public libraries, reflecting views which are not mine, although my name was used. Anybody who would be treated in your country as I was by the Danubian Press would seek prompt redress in your courts. I do not know how this is done or if I will ever try to get satisfaction in this manner. It was much more important for me to receive the moral satisfaction that my colleagues in your country whom I know and respect be informed of the facts in connection with this publication. I thank you very much for having given me the chance to talk to my fellow historians through your pages.

D G. KOSÁRY
Budapest