

Mr. Roy A. Miller, who for the past year has been working on the Thai-English Dictionary Project of the Institute of East Asiatic Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, has been awarded a Ford Foundation Fellowship for the next two years. His subject for research is Tibetan linguistics and Inner Asian cultural studies. He will remain at the University of California for one year and will spend the second year in India.

OBITUARY

Mr. Willys R. Peck, of the U. S. Foreign Service, died in Belmont, California, September 2, 1952. Born in China, Mr. Peck occupied various posts in China, including Consul General (1931-41) and was Minister to Thailand (1941-2). Before his retirement in 1946 he was in charge of the China program and later the Far Eastern and Near Eastern Branches of the Division of Cultural Cooperation.

COMMUNICATIONS*

To the Editor of *The Far Eastern Quarterly*

In reply to the "Notice" which appeared in the November, 1952 *FEQ*, may I make the following statement:

1. In the portion of my article "The Hinduization of Indonesia Reconsidered" (pp. 19-26) dealing with van Leur's work, his *Eenige Beschouwingen* ... is cited thirteen times, inclusive of direct quotations (notes 13, 18, 21, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33 (twice) 40, 42, 44). In my opinion there can be no question that this portion is a summary of van Leur's work, for in the text itself repeated reference is made to van Leur, e.g. "Thanks to the work of van Leur..." (p. 19); "But as van Leur has pointed out..." (p. 19); "As van Leur has put it..." (p. 20).

2. The pages of van Leur cited in my article are pp. 118, 119, 120, 122, 73-74, 123, 117, 170, 151-152, nt. 89, 128, 129, 130. No idea of van Leur or of any of the sources cited by him has gone without due acknowledgment in my article.

3. The "reconstructed text" of van Leur, offered as proof by the editors consists of sentences and paragraphs taken at random from van Leur, without proper reference to van Leur's own sources (cited by me where necessary), arranged in such a way as to allow them to coincide with the statements of

*The editors of *The Far Eastern Quarterly* have agreed to publish a "Communications" section once a year or as often as material may justify it. Contributions to this section will be accepted under the following conditions:

1. Communications to be brief, preferably 250 words.

2. The editors reserve the right to accept, reject, or edit communications in the interests of the subscribers as a whole.

van Leur used in my article, conveniently eliminating sentences following directly below in the article where notes duly refer to van Leur's work. The profession is urged to compare van Leur's original text with the "reconstructed text" offered as evidence by the editors, and with the article in question.

Michigan State College

JUSTUS M. VAN DER KROEF

[The Editors of *The Far Eastern Quarterly* join Dr. van der Kroef in inviting our readers to consider the evidence. As stated in our Notice in the November 1952 issue, a copy of the reconstructed Dutch text will be sent to any subscriber who requests it.]

To the Editor of *The Far Eastern Quarterly*

I take this opportunity to make three brief comments on the review of *Korean-American Relations, Documents Pertaining to the Far Eastern Diplomacy of the United States, Vol. 1: The Initial Period (1883-1886)* (*FEQ*, Feb. 1952, pp. 252-254).

1. I do not object to a highly critical or even hostile review. But I cannot hold valid a review whose central criticism is that the conclusions of the book being reviewed are different from the findings of earlier scholars on the same subject—or what seems to the reviewer to be the same subject. Mr. Oliver states (p. 253) that other authorities have digested essentially the same material and that *their* work is "tempered by further research and judgment."

Our sources were secured by the senior editor at Seoul and supplemented by the resources of the National Archives. We felt that we had much more material to work with than past or present students have had or will have access to. I submit that we exercised some judgment. I further submit that our findings lose no value because they conflict with those of Dennett (1923), Pollard (1932-3), Treat (1934) and Nelson (1934) as cited by the reviewer. It is conceivable that the contributions of pioneer authorities may be added to in the light of later materials and interpretations.

We do believe the history of Korea would have been different if Foulke's requests had been granted by the Congress in 1885. Admittedly this is conjecture but surely Mr. Oliver will not object to sound conjecture even though it may contradict the authorities whom he idolizes.

2. This book was not *completed* two years after the death of its senior editor. It was *published* two years later. The senior editor had read and was satisfied with the manuscript prior to his death. He was the top man in the small group of American scholars of things Korean. His grasp and interpretation of Korean sources, history and language was unequalled in this country. He had a high competence in American, Japanese and Chinese sources. Nothing I have come across in rather extensive research in the four years since his death has changed my mind on the validity of the opinions of George McCune on Korea and Korean history.

3. The reviewer's objection to our statement that the history of the United States in Eastern Asia is "little known and badly told" is understandable in one who seems to believe that the history of this subject reached its apex in the excellent but dated work of Tyler Dennett. This history remains to be written from the materials in the National Archives, the Library of Congress, private collections and East Asian sources. We did not try to write it. We have placed some documents inexpensively at the disposal of those who will carry on. These documents are exact and we hope they will be of use. This series will be continued (with an index in the final volume) and I do not doubt but that the conclusions of future volumes will disagree with older authorities.

University of Florida

JOHN A. HARRISON

To the Editor of *The Far Eastern Quarterly*

I have read many reviews of my *Chinese Communism and the Rise of Mao* both favorable and unfavorable, and none of them has moved me to write letters of rebuttal. Certainly there is ample room for disagreement on this most complex of subjects. However, Mr. Isaacs' review of the book in the *FEQ* XI No. 4 (August 1952) 484-5 seems to me so singularly unfair that I feel that I must express myself on this subject.

Mr. Isaacs maintains that I "barely catch a glint" of what he considers to be the central fact of Chinese Communist history, namely the fact that theory had become the hand-maiden of "strategic desirability." It is significant, however, that Mr. Isaacs' whole exposition of this subject in the preceding paragraph of the review leans heavily on quotations drawn from the book itself. To have stressed this theme more than I have would have exposed me to legitimate charges of monomania.

Mr. Isaacs maintains that Mao "as a theoretician remains a rather over-inflated figure in these pages." I would challenge Mr. Isaacs to produce one phrase or paragraph to substantiate this charge.

I suspect that the real difference between us lies somewhat deeper. In brief, I do not accept the view which seems implicit in Mr. Isaacs' writings that until the rise of Stalin "the original animating ideas" of Marxism-Leninism were completely alive and that since Stalin they have been completely dead. Nor do I think that they have been completely "devoured by the Communist power mechanism." On the contrary, I believe that they have had a great deal to do with the development of that mechanism. I heartily agree that the general trend of Marxism-Leninism has been one of general decay; that now one element of doctrine and now another becomes a dead letter. I would maintain, however, that this process of decay began when Lenin made Marxism a handmaiden of party strategy; that both Lenin and Trotsky used doctrine in the same specious way as Stalin. On the other hand, I would maintain that some elements of doctrine have remained alive with both Stalin and Mao. In the light of these premises, the task of the book was not simply to prove the flat thesis that Communist theory had died *in toto* with Stalin and Mao, but to

try to ascertain what has died and what has remained alive. By laying Marxism-Leninism safely in its grave with the emergence of Stalin, Isaacs absolves "the animating ideas" of any further responsibility for what has been done in their name. In my view they are a factor still to be reckoned with.

Now this is a legitimate difference of view but I wish that Mr. Isaacs had made this difference clear instead of indulging in claims which cannot be substantiated.

Harvard University

BENJAMIN SCHWARTZ