

quarterly or annual basis by one of the appropriate American periodicals or the newly established Slavic Bibliographic and Documentation Center in Washington, D.C.

MARIN PUNDEFF
San Fernando Valley State College

LETTERS

TO THE EDITOR:

I have every reason to be pleased with Professor Fisher-Galati's kind remarks concerning my study, *Double Eagle and Crescent: Vienna's Second Turkish Siege and Its Historical Setting*, reviewed in the September 1969 issue of your journal. However, I should like to take mild exception to one of his criticisms. If, as he notes, the external and internal motives for Kara Mustafa's actions remain unclear in the book, this is precisely because of the Turkish sources, which are of little help in this respect. While the volume is not based upon personal research in the Turkish archives, it does draw quite extensively upon the published German version of the two contemporary Ottoman accounts of the siege. The reader is referred to my discussion of them in footnote 88, chapter 5. The translator, Dr. Richard Kreutel, who has done much work in Istanbul and who placed certain nonpublished portions of his material at my disposal, is skeptical about the chances of new sources being discovered. To be sure, part of the problem is due to the organizational status of the Turkish archives, and so the possibility of fresh revelations cannot be excluded.

THOMAS M. BARKER
State University of New York at Albany

TO THE EDITOR:

Professor John H. Hodgson's review of my book *Finland, Germany, and the Soviet Union, 1940-1941: The Petsamo Dispute* (December 1969, pp. 652-53) leaves me no substantive grounds for complaint. It was a generous review, which is always welcome.

I was rather unhappy, however, to learn that my discussion of a particular point "degenerates into petty polemics" against the British historian Anthony F. Upton, allegedly one of my *bêtes noires*. Mr. Upton, whom I know and respect, will be as surprised as I am by this charge. In a review of his book *Finland in Crisis, 1940-1941* (*American Historical Review*, January 1966), I referred to it as "the first objective scholarly study to appear in any major language of how Finland in June 1941 became a cobelligerent of Germany against the Soviet Union." I called it "well balanced, lucidly written, and factually reliable." I gave his book equally high marks in another review (*American-Scandinavian Review*, December 1966). But I also registered my disagreement with a couple of his major conclusions, for which I found no solid evidence.

Because these conclusions were accepted completely by a number of scholars,

including Professor Hodgson it seems, I organized some of the argumentation in my own book around Upton's statements. This, certainly, did not offend him. He and I have enjoyed many lengthy discussions about our differences over the past several years, and some of my ideas were tested on him. As for my interpretation of Soviet intentions vis-à-vis Finland in the late summer of 1940, Upton found it "very plausible," to use his own words. He did not yield completely, since, as we readily agreed, the question cannot be conclusively answered until the Soviet archives become available.

As for Professor Hodgson's wish that I should have "explored more deeply" the hypothesis that Hitler's interest in Petsamo until the end of 1940 was strategic (as he believes) rather than economic (as I claim), I can only refer the readers to my book. All of the available evidence is presented there.

H. PETER KROSBY

State University of New York at Albany

TO THE EDITOR:

Professor Krosby persists in his belief that the Soviet Union in the summer and fall of 1940 had "sinister" motives and that Finland was threatened by "planned aggression" and "annexation." Might I point out that Krosby has reached this conclusion without having read Finnish-language and Russian-language source material? Might I also contest Krosby's above assertion that he has presented all of the available evidence concerning Hitler's interest in Petsamo? Neither Krosby's book nor his letter answer the question raised in paragraph 2 of my review: Were German stockpiles of refined nickel, coupled with German production, sufficient for a war of short duration?

JOHN H. HODGSON
Syracuse University

TO THE EDITOR:

My attention has been drawn to a most unfortunate and annoying slip of the pen in my review of Pasternak's *Letters to Georgian Friends* (December 1969, p. 685): it was, of course, Paolo Yashvili who committed suicide, and Titian Tabidze who was arrested and shot, and not the other way round.

GLEB STRUVE
University of California, Berkeley

TO THE EDITOR:

Professor Shimkin, in his review of Simirenko's *Social Thought in the Soviet Union* (March 1970) complains that it deals insufficiently with social thought, as distinct from the sociology and content of particular professions. Would it not then have been well to note that at least one contribution, my own, does deal precisely with social thought? He also feels that such a book "might well have less representation from the technicians of social science and more from writers, politicians, natural scientists, and others." I happen to be as much a writer and political activist as scholar. How much of any of these is, of course, for others to judge.

WILLIAM M. MANDEL
Berkeley, California