

biography, of either Thomas or of both Thomas and Jan Masaryk. Whether this biography will be written by me or someone else is immaterial.

I did not think that it was necessary to make this point in the book, because I assumed that it would be obvious to anyone acquainted with the historiography of the subject. I did not then know who would review the book.

It is, for instance, clear to your reviewer that "Jan Masaryk's career, which takes up a quarter of the book, is irrelevant to 'the making of Czechoslovakia.'" Many historians, myself included, would beg to differ. By 1947, the state had a different shape, different ethnic structure, different foreign policy from the Czechoslovakia of 1918; Jan Masaryk was a member of the government which supervised the transformation.

Later, Professor Winters complains that I provide "no coherent psychological understanding of the wellsprings of their [the Masaryks] outlook and behavior." This is a matter of opinion. I should only like to claim to have pushed our understanding of the two men slightly further, if only by contrasting their totally different characters. There are other points the book makes concerning the Masaryks' outlook and behavior, and they have been picked up by other reviewers.

The "deft handling of T. G. Masaryk's World War I adventures, especially those involving Russia" with which the reviewer credits the book, is another questionable statement. Masaryk's political work in that period has been examined often enough; but there are still inconsistencies, I would venture to suggest, between the documentary material and its historiographical surface. For instance, Beneš and Štefánik, in Paris, gave their consent, it seems, to the use of the Czechoslovak Legion in Russia in the Allies' war of intervention, at a time when Masaryk was far away and advocating a policy of strict neutrality. I should have liked to have had more time, when writing the book, to examine that point. It is one of crucial importance.

Your reviewer clearly finds it difficult to avoid making snap, easy judgments; to an author who has been around the ambiguities of his subject several times, the reviewer's judgments sound rather like the pronouncements of the pope on the day after the proclamation of his infallibility.

Z. A. B. ZEMAN
University of Lancaster

Professor Winters does not feel it necessary to respond.

TO THE EDITOR:

In his review of G. Maude's *The Finnish Dilemma* (*Slavic Review*, June 1977) Thede Palm gives, I believe, too negative a picture of Finland's position vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. He was right to note the caution with which Finns deal with anything Soviet, but his statement that "some authors (Solzhenitsyn, for example) are not printed—but are sold—in Finland," is not totally accurate. While it is true that the first volume of Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago* (parts 1–2) was printed in its Finnish translation in Sweden (Wahlström & Widstrand, 1974), because of political considerations in Finland itself, the second volume (parts 3–4) was published in Finnish in Finland (Tampere: Kustannuspiste OY, 1976). Mr. Palm seems to have given too much credence to articles appearing in the Swedish press (which undoubtedly had the best coverage of Finland anywhere), particularly to those by Andres Küng whose long article in *Svenska Dagbladet* ("Why is the publication being stopped?" November 27, 1975) suggested that a creeping "Finlandization" was stopping the publication in Sweden of the second volume of the Finnish translation. Küng detailed some interesting facts of the controversy over this second volume. The real reasons

for the decision of Wahlström & Widstrand not to publish the second volume in Finnish would no doubt be interesting for the light they shed on Swedish political considerations, the point which Kung was trying to make. Be that as it may, the issue was resolved by the publication of volume 2 by one of the smaller Finnish publishing houses. Needless to say, one can obtain anything one wants in the major Finnish bookstores.

While Finland certainly faces limitations on its freedom of action, the publication of Solzhenitsyn is no longer a case in point.

PAUL M. AUSTIN
McGill University