

successful notables in all areas of recognized human endeavor. The entries mark the milestones in professional careers, as well as individual accomplishments, awards, and published works. An appendix gives the key personnel of major party, government, military, scientific, and many other organizations, both on the federal and on the union republic levels.

The present volume is an improvement over its forerunner, prepared by the Institute's staff in 1958, and it exceeds in detail—though not in the number of persons listed—Hans Koch's *5,000 Sowjetköpfe* (Cologne, 1959). Works of this sort, to satisfy the needs of their users, should be brought up to date regularly, the more so since in the Soviet Union the rise to prominence and fall of leading personalities has often been rapid, unexpected, and drastic.

Library of Congress

PAUL L. HORECKY

LETTERS

TO THE EDITOR:

For several years now, some circles in this country have been very busy producing a certain image of East Europe, its past and present. The Russian historical school has celebrated victories without being challenged by critical opinions which differ in many aspects. One of the most controversial areas is the period of the Kievan State, which is considered an integral part of Russian history.

The whole structure is rather weak since it does not explain basic questions: When did the Ukrainians conquer Kiev from Russia? How did it happen that Kiev was and is the capital of the Ukraine? Of course, there are many other questions and problems which are in direct contradiction to the "Russian scheme."

Therefore, it is to be applauded that finally this subjective interpretation of Russian history was questioned in the June issue of the *Slavic Review* in articles by Professors I. L. Rudnytsky, A. E. Adams, and, especially, O. Pritsak and J. S. Reshetar, Jr.

In keeping with the best tradition of *sine ira et studio*, it is to be hoped that the *Review* will support and further the endeavor of clarification of the true history of East Europe.

Finally, it must be pointed out that there exists a certain abnormality in our universities which are engaged in research and teaching of East European history. One may wonder about the training of our future scholars who are denied the study of the history of non-Russian nations even in our largest universities and research centers. Publishers and university presses are preoccupied with Russia only, and to prove it, one need merely consider the "List of Current Paperbound Books in the Slavic Field," compiled by R. Lednicky (*Slavic Review*, June, 1963). Just a few books from a list of almost four hundred titles are devoted to non-Russian problems.

Is it really true that sensationalism rather than the curiosity of search for the truth dictates the areas of research for our scholars and experts?

Why not offer our students courses in the history of non-Russian nations? Why not spend dollars instead of pennies on research in this area? Efforts in both directions may pay a rich return one day: to the scholar the satisfaction of having accomplished a task worthy of his effort, and to our nation the respect for her opposition to imperialism in its various forms, including the distortion of historical facts.

STEPHAN M. HORAK
Indiana University

TO THE EDITOR:

In the June, 1963, issue of the *Slavic Review* (pp. 395-96), Ladis K. D. Kristof raised objections to my review of *Bukovyna: її mynule i suchasne*, which appeared in the September, 1962, issue of the *Review*.

For the record I would like it known that I stand by my original appraisal (in the fifty words allotted) of the volume. One must judge a book by its content and not merely by excerpts from its preface. It is, of course, easier to examine three pages of preface than to read the entire 926 pages. The title (*Bukovina: Its Past and Present*), by the way, corresponds fully to the content.

BASIL DMYTRYSHYN
Portland State College

SURVEY

A Journal of Soviet and East European Studies

January 1964

Our FIFTIETH JUBILEE NUMBER is devoted to three topics:

The Present State of West-East Relations

is discussed by Sir William Hayter, Denis Healey, Louis Halle, and Raymond Aron.

Soviet and East European Studies

a critical review from various parts of the globe; reports by Adam Ulam, Alexander Gerschenkron, Victor Frank, Walter Laqueur, Basil Kerblay, Jens Hacker, and Leopold Labedz.

Sovietology — Pro and Contra

contributions by Alec Nove, Arthur Adams, Peter Wiles, and Harry Rigby.

SURVEY is published quarterly.

One year's subscription: 30s or \$4.00
Special Student Rates

Write to: SURVEY
Ilford House
133 Oxford Street
London, W.1

Our Agents in the United States:
Franklin Square Subscription Agency
545 Cedar Lane
Teaneck, New Jersey