

naturally, the topic has received even less attention in English. This study focuses on events which seem most important to the author; those questions which do not receive extensive treatment here will, hopefully, be dealt with in future research by other scholars." In other words, I do not claim to have written a flawless or complete history of Communism in Finland. But I do claim to have written a study of some value. Unfair and unfounded is Professor Smith's assertion that my book creates "a distorted impression of Russian Bolshevism in the time of Lenin" and does not "add much to our knowledge of world Communism in the time of Stalin."

April 20, 1968

JOHN H. HODGSON
Syracuse University

TO THE EDITORS:

Professor David MacKenzie and Mr. Frank G. Siscoe, participants in the "Forum" on Eugene Schuyler, General Kaufman, and Central Asia (*Slavic Review*, March 1968, pages 119-30), discuss the subject in substantive detail but fail to clarify the background of Schuyler's function as an observer. When one wants to evaluate observations, one should know the observer's background to make such value judgments.

Eugene Schuyler was not just another traveler producing a book on the "mysterious East." Nor was he just another myopic diplomat, for the myopia of the embassy compound was as strong ninety years ago as it is in many cases today. Rather, Eugene Schuyler was a highly trained and observant scholar, and his observations on Central Asia should be viewed in this context.

Schuyler was the first American Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, and received one of the first three American Ph.D.'s, which were awarded at Yale University in July 1861. He had postponed entering Yale for one year because of ill health, but at fifteen years of age he was still the youngest member of the class of 1859. Graduating fifth in his class, he reaped many coveted honors, one of which was a rare fellowship for postgraduate study. During his two years of graduate study, Schuyler served as an Assistant in Etymology under Noah Porter in the revision of the Webster Dictionary and worked with the noted Orientalists Josiah W. Gibbs and William D. Whitney. As he was especially interested in the philology of European languages, Schuyler became proficient in Greek, French, German, and Italian. He later added Finnish, Russian, and Bulgarian. Schuyler's dissertation, of which all copies have been lost, was written on Wedgwood on English philology.

Before he reached Russia as a diplomat in 1867, Schuyler had ample opportunity to view at first hand "bad administration" in the United States. Following his doctoral work at Yale, he went on to Columbia University Law School and graduated in 1863. (In his "not-so-Moot Court," he managed to marry the daughter of the President of Columbia University.) For four years, during the late Civil War and immediate postwar period, Schuyler practiced law in turbulent New York and obviously saw machine politics operate in all phases of municipal administration. By the time he reached Russia, Eugene Schuyler had sufficient academic and practical background to be a better than average observer.

As a prolific scholar, Schuyler's insights into Russia's cultural heritage and international role were not limited to a two-volume work on Turkestan. His translation of Turgenev's *Fathers and Sons* in 1867 sparked America's literary fancy. Eleven years later his translation of Tolstoy's *Cossacks* was the first work of this master under American imprint. Schuyler also wrote a *History of Peter the Great*. On

foreign affairs, he wrote *American Diplomacy and the Furtherance of Commerce*, a highly controversial book in 1886, and numerous magazine articles.

Named Consul General in Turkey in 1876, Schuyler was recalled for his support of the Russian demand for Bulgarian independence. He was sent to Rome and was later appointed the first American diplomatic representative to Rumania. This duty was later expanded to include Greece and Serbia. Schuyler's publication of the book on American diplomacy subsequently prevented his appointment as Assistant Secretary of State.

In the decade preceding his death at the age of fifty, Schuyler's academic achievements were widely recognized. He taught briefly at Johns Hopkins and Cornell and was awarded honorary Doctor of Laws degrees by Yale University and Williams College.

Even though a representative of equalitarian America, Schuyler saw no particular vice in imperialism. He saw Turkestan through eyes colored by European power politics. Honesty, "appreciation of what is due himself and others," and "delicacy of mind and feeling" he ascribed to those natives who acclimatized to European ways. In general terms, Central Asians who strictly adhered to traditional ways fared less well in Schuyler's analysis. The "Kara-Kirghiz" (a misnomer of the period for Kirghiz), for example, were classed as "light-minded and fickle, easily influenced by the person with whom they are for the moment associated . . . and . . . in war they are generally cowardly." Tajiks were called "fickle, untruthful, lazy, cowardly, and boastful, and in every way morally corrupt."

In Professor MacKenzie's defense, it should be noted that Schuyler's preparation for his Central Asian journey did not meet all requirements for a scholarly analysis. Schuyler mistakenly studied Tatar in the belief that it was the lingua franca of Turkestan!

I strongly endorse Professor MacKenzie's recommendation that Mr. Siscoe offer a significant contribution by writing in detail on this interesting scholar/diplomat.

May 29, 1968

GARÉ Lecompte
University of Hartford

TO THE EDITORS:

In the March 1968 issue of the *Slavic Review*, I saw some remarks, in the review section, purporting to refer to my recently published book on Russo-European commercial relations. At first I thought that an error had occurred and that my book of essays was not meant at all. For it contains twelve essays and an Introduction—the latter serving to tie the various essays together. Two of the essays deal with Denmark and Russia, three with France and Russia, two with emigration to Russia, one with Siberian industries, two with entrepreneurship, one with the Reformation, one with the Narva trade. Where in the review do you hear of France, Denmark, entrepreneurship, emigration, Siberia, etc.? Where of all that which makes up the contents of the book: trade, trade treaties, exports, imports, trade balances, Black Sea commerce, trade rivalries, etc.? By no stretch of the imagination can any of this be connected with the review, or vice versa. I happen to have before me the instructions for reviewers for the *American Historical Review*. They begin with: "Give the informed reader a brief, clear idea of the nature, content, and purpose of the volume and indicate its place in the literature of the subject. . . . Evaluate the book as history for the information of the potential reader and purchaser. . . ."

Instead, the reviewer of my book speaks of the omission of some periods, such as