

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

the seventeenth century, when actually the title page and the outside cover state clearly that this is a collection of essays (not a history of the commercial relations), illustrating certain aspects of Russian commerce of scholarly interest. Apparently, the reviewer had overlooked the title page. He then refers to the word "Asiatization," a concept alien to my thought which occurs once in one essay, put ironically in quotes by myself, in connection with Russia's trade turning from westward to eastward. You will have trouble to detect it at all, as I had myself! And then he discusses "serfdom" (which you will have equal trouble in finding mentioned in my book), as well as other "effects" on Russia's internal situation. They do appear in the same essay in a paragraph introduced by my sentence warning against unscientific speculations and making no more than a few asides for the sake of comparison. They do not in the least represent a "position" of mine.

A few lines taken out of 1 1/2 pages, completely out of context, are thus all that the reviewer refers to in a book of 332 pages, while the remaining 330 1/2 pages, based on years of wide research and much new source material, are *nowhere* mentioned.

Certainly, the reviewer deals with questions that may be in his mind, but they do not constitute topics of my book.

I would appreciate it if these points could be brought to the attention of the readers of the *Slavic Review*. Those who are interested in seeing a pertinent review of the book should be referred to, for instance, the *American Historical Review*, where Professor Bickford O'Brien reviewed it in Vol. LXXIII (December 1967), p. 463.

June 9, 1968

WALTHER KIRCHNER
University of Delaware

TO THE EDITORS:

Professor Kirchner regrets that I did not discuss the individual articles in his collection. Considering the space allotted for the review, this was not possible. And Professor O'Brien likewise did not discuss them, perhaps for the same reason. The articles are very closely researched and tend to deal with quite specific topics, and many of them are already well known. It was necessary, therefore, to discuss those elements of the book which presented Professor Kirchner's general interpretation of the "Commercial Relations Between Russia and Europe, 1400 to 1800." Although I am still critical of his interpretation, I do agree that it is peripheral to the main purpose of the book, which is to republish a number of articles.

June 19, 1968

THOMAS ESPER
Case Western Reserve
University

TO THE EDITORS:

Professor Robert D. Warth's thoughtful and eminently fair review of my book *The Young Stalin: The Early Years of an Elusive Revolutionary* (*Slavic Review*, June 1968) indicates that I tried to "expose" Stalin.

It may be of interest in this regard that several years ago I signed a contract to do a book tentatively entitled *Stalin and the Terror*, dealing with the 1930s. Each book has a natural life of its own, and as my research progressed I found myself delving into Stalin's early life to determine his character and personality before 1917. From that searching and study *The Young Stalin* evolved.