

sources for Rumanian studies at the Library of Congress. Its shortcomings can be explained largely by the incomplete nature of these holdings. Hence while useful as an introduction to the subject, it must be supplemented with bibliographies drawing upon the wealth of additional material available in Rumanian libraries. In history, for example, helpful lists can be found in the multivolume "official" work, *Istoria Romîniei* (1960—).

Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia

GLENN TORREY

LETTERS

TO THE EDITOR:

I have just read the German version of Dr. David L. Hoggan's work *Der Erzwungene Krieg . . .* (Tübingen, 1961). In the publishers' Preface, I found a quotation from the author's Introduction in which Dr. Hoggan thanks twelve American historians, including Professors W. H. Langer, M. M. Karpovich, and Raymond Sontag, for their alleged help in writing his book. Professor Karpovich is dead; Professors Langer and Sontag have emphatically denied any responsibility for the content of Dr. Hoggan's controversial book.

The reason why I have not voiced my denial thus far is that it never occurred to me to look up the published German version. I saw the English manuscript twice. It was submitted to me by two American publishers. In both instances my advice was against publishing it because the manuscript lacked balance and objectivity.

Dr. Hoggan was my colleague during graduate studies at Harvard (1947-51). On several occasions I helped him locate various sources for his doctoral dissertation, especially those concerning the two Polish initiatives of launching a preventive war against Hitler (March, 1933, and March 7, 1936). This, however, cannot be interpreted as helping him write a book which originated from his Ph.D. thesis, a decade or so later, a dissertation which, by the way, I never saw.

The expression used by Dr. Hoggan: "*Das Buch ist mit der entscheidenden Hilfe amerikanischer Lehrer und Kollegen entstanden* [italics added]," without the customary formula about the sole responsibility of the author, but with the addition of the sentence, "Jeder von ihnen hat einen *grossen* Teil beeintragen . . .," is an unfair attempt to associate twelve innocent people with his work permeated with Nazi bias and prejudice.

M. K. DZIEWANOWSKI
Boston College

TO THE EDITOR:

Professor Lewis S. Feuer's article "Problems and Unproblems in Soviet Social Theory" (March, 1964) is quite valuable in some respects. But it gives a definite expression that the field he is covering has not been covered, from the same point of view, and from the same comparative aspects, by other

studies. He is either unacquainted with such studies, or unwilling to acknowledge that they exist.

This might sound rather personal, but let me cite the following references:

Joseph S. Roucek, "The Development of the Concept of Ideology," *Indian Journal of Social Research*, IV, No. 1 (Jan., 1963), 76-85, and numerous references in footnotes. Roucek, "Ideology as a Means of Social Control," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, III (Oct., 1943), 35-54; III (Jan., 1944), 179-90; III (Apr., 1944), 357-70, and numerous footnotes. Roucek, "A History of the Concept of Ideology," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, V (Oct., 1944), 479-88, and numerous footnotes. In this case I am referring especially to Dr. Feuer's footnote on page 120.

As far as the whole treatment of his article is concerned, may I refer him to:

Roucek, "Russian Sociology and 'Sociology' under Communism," pp. 892-921, in Roucek, ed., *Contemporary Sociology* (New York, 1958). V. V. Mshvenierdze and G. V. Osipov, "Sociology in the U.S.S.R.," *Social Sciences Information*, Vol. I, No. 3 (Oct.), 1962, pp. 49-73; Leopold Labedz, "Sociology as a Vocation," *Survey*, No. 47 (July, 1963), pp. 57-78. G. Osipov and M. Yovchuk, "Some Principles of Theory, Problems and Methods of Research in Sociology in the U.S.S.R.," *American Sociological Review*, XXVII, No. 4 (Aug., 1963), 620-23.

Shall I go on? I can produce numerous other studies.

There is nothing particularly wrong if his article is to be only his personal impressions. But since his footnote refers to a few "other" works in that field, I am wondering whether this is exactly fair to the whole idea of scholarship.

JOSEPH S. ROUCEK
University of Bridgeport

CORRECTION

In the article "Religion as an Instrument of Culture Change: The Problem of the Sects in the Soviet Union," by Ethel and Stephen P. Dunn (September, 1964), the third line from the bottom of note 45 on page 475 should read: ". . . 50 are between twenty-five and forty, and 19 are under twenty-five."