

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