TO THE EDITOR:

I always follow with great respect the views of my esteemed friend Professor Wandycz. However, de Jouvenel's opinion does not seem to be relevant; Stresemann's policy and Locarno time were different from Hitler's. If Poland was justifiably critical of Locarno, how damaging to the European peace was the reversal of her policy in 1934? If this is not "generally recognized," maybe Professor Wandycz will generously concede that this opinion is at least prevalent.

JOSEF KORBEL
University of Denver

TO THE EDITOR:

Deborah Hardy ("Tkachev and the Marxists," March 1970, pp. 22-34), has, frankly, misinterpreted my discussion of Tkachev's *would-be* Marxism. Far from maintaining that Tkachev was a full-fledged Marxist, I went to great pains in my book, *The First Bolshevik: A Political Biography of Peter Tkachev*, to point out in what ways Tkachev *deviated* from Marxism. Mrs. Hardy refers to "pp. 129–35 and passim," and implies that I termed Tkachev a Marxist. Evidently Mrs. Hardy's reading of those pages was more passim than attentive. For I wrote: "[Tkachev] scorned dialectical materialism and historical materialism with its assumption . . . that a capitalist stage would *necessarily* have to be passed through before the proletariat and, indeed, all society would be prepared . . . to move to the higher phase of socialism." In several other places in my book I demonstrate how strongly Tkachev *disagreed* with Marx and Engels; pages 113–16 are devoted to Tkachev's polemic against Engels. It is most disturbing when a scholar-colleague does not pay close attention to another colleague's labors, or, to buttress his argument, finds a nonexistent point of view in another's work. I invite Mrs. Hardy, and other readers so interested, to examine my discussion of Tkachev's anti-Marxist "historical jump" theory in the section of my book entitled "Tkachev Substitutes *Skachok* for the Rigidity of Dialectic" (pp. 118–24).

ALBERT L. WEEKS
New York, New York

TO THE EDITOR:

Professor Weeks has read a great deal into my statement that he "tends to emphasize 'Tkachev's Marxist inclinations,'" a phrase borrowed from his book (p. 162). I did not imply that Mr. Weeks thought Tkachev a "full-fledged Marxist." I do contend that he considers Marxist influence on Tkachev in much greater detail than that of Blanqui, whose name appears only infrequently in his book; one would anticipate this in a book entitled *The First Bolshevik*. Although we disagree on a number of points, such as the source of Tkachev's economic ideas (see Weeks, p. 229), I am sure we agree that any attempt to make Tkachev into a Marxist would, in Professor Karpovich's words, be "doomed to failure."

DEBORAH HARDY
University of Wyoming