

present volume has virtues the Czech product does not have (better coverage including pre-Communist law and writings, technical apparatus), the bibliographies yield most if used together. It is to be hoped that the Library of Congress will find it possible to produce the remaining bibliographies and complete the series, for their usefulness extends far beyond the legal profession.

San Fernando Valley State College

MARIN PUNDEFF

LETTERS

TO THE EDITOR:

The review of Donald Zagoria's book, *The Sino-Soviet Conflict*, in the December issue seems to attack the author with too heavy a hand. It appears unjust to say that "there is no scholarly method in the book." The reviewer also refers to the "overwhelming number of facts and documents intended to convince the reader that . . . international communism is disintegrating." In the book, actually, Zagoria disclaims any such intent, and takes a middle-of-the-road stand on the future of the Sino-Soviet conflict. Other gratuitous ascriptions of motives to the author occur in the following words: "The title of the book is evidence that the author had his mind made up when he wrote it." ". . . the reader is expected to accept the author's theory that Mao, when speaking of revisionism, has Khrushchev in mind, and Khrushchev, when defending 'peaceful coexistence,' is attacking Mao."

It would be more fair to conclude that the author presented his documents and other data in the knowledge that the readers would reach their own diverse verdicts. Certainly the book is neither niggardly nor unbalanced in the data made available for the 1956-61 period.

The reviewer also regrets that the book is limited to the above five-year period and that it thus lacks historical perspective. That is regrettable in a sense. The reader will have to look elsewhere for the historical and cultural perspective. However, Zagoria's book is some 400 pages in length. To add such material without making it much too long would entail large deletions from the present text. Then the reviewer's charge of eclectic empiricism might have been more easily sustained.

FRANK H. TUCKER
University of Maryland

TO THE EDITOR:

For several years now, some circles in this country have been very unhappy about the existence of the Sino-Soviet conflict. Their basic fear—one which I believe to be unjustified—is that American policy makers will interpret the dispute as a sign of the rapid disintegration of communism and will lower the Western guard. Those who share this obsessive fear stolidly refuse to recognize the facts of the Sino-Soviet dispute. Three years ago, the word from the Right was that the dispute was all a big hoax specifically designed by the Communists to deceive the West. The mounting evidence of Sino-Soviet tension, recently discussed by the President of the United States him-