Those who continue to think of themselves as "Jews," national, emotional, or otherwise, have some sort of relationship, even if residual or marginal, to the religion. Consequently, it is logical to expect that an essay on "Jews and *Judaism* in the Soviet Union" (italics added) in a book entitled *Religion and the Search for New Ideals in the USSR* would deal primarily with religious problems, issues, and developments. This has been the case with the other chapters. Hence, I have characterized a treatment that emphasizes matters other than religious as having "little to offer on religion" and as "but vaguely related to the theme of the book."

Mrs. Dunn's annotated bibliography of selected brief references to Jews in Soviet writings is interesting but irrelevant, in my opinion, to Lamm's article and to my review. One cannot obtain reliable information on the religious life of Soviet Jewry from books that are dedicated to opposition to Judaism. Interestingly, Mrs. Dunn omits T. M. Kichko's *Iudaizm bez prikraz* (1963) and other recent attacks on the Bible and the Talmud as "scientific" references on Soviet Jews. Specifically, she might have mentioned Belen'kii's *Chto eto Talmud?*, an attack upon Judaism and the rabbis, published by the Akademiia Nauk SSSR in 1964. I see no point in commenting on other points mentioned by Mrs. Dunn, such as Communist intolerance of anti-Semitism.

Lamm's treatment of the impact of the Soviet nationality policy on religion adds very little to our knowledge of the situation of Judaism in the USSR. The information adduced by him is familiar and accessible. This was my basic point.

Mrs. Dunn, whom I consider one of the "serious scholars" (her term), states that "he [Brickman] thinks that Lamm's unfamiliarity with Jewish life leads him to feel that 'only a small remnant cares for Jewish life.'" She calls for documentation. In the first place, the serious scholar should note that I wrote: "Largely because of *his apparent unfamiliarity with the Jewish religious scene in the Soviet Union . . .*" (italics added). I have read some of Mr. Lamm's writings in German and I am aware of his familiarity with Jewish life. What I simply said is that his survey in the USSR was based on secondhand and superficial data and observations.

Mrs. Dunn ignores two sentences in my review in which I mentioned Talmud study circles and indicated that religious education of Jewish youngsters has been taking place in the USSR. For reasons of safety, it is not wise to provide documentation. Other visitors and I have reported such educational activities in the literature. The existence of classes in Tanach, Mishnah, Talmud, and other sacred Jewish studies can be observed by any traveler who takes the least bit of trouble. To write about Jewish religious life without discussing the adult education is not to do justice to the subject. This is one reason why I felt that Lamm's paper does not measure up to the requirements of the subject. If he did not observe religious activity in depth, he might have referred to reports published in Hebrew, Yiddish, and English journals and newspapers.

May 20, 1968

WILLIAM W. BRICKMAN
University of Pennsylvania

TO THE EDITORS:

In the March 1968 issue of this journal there was a review by C. Jay Smith of my book, *Communism in Finland: A History and Interpretation.* Both the tone and substance of Professor Smith's review lead me to make the following comments.

In his first paragraph Professor Smith summarizes the contents of my book. But it should be noted that even here there are misleading statements. The readers of the

review are likely to think that the Finnish Communist Party was founded over a two-year period (rather than in August 1918), that the periods 1920–22 (united front) and 1934–35 (popular front) are left out of my analysis, that there was a rebirth of Finnish Communism "within" (*sic*) the Social Democratic party, and that chapter five (twenty-six pages in length) is "skimpy." Professor Smith was careless either in his reading of my book or in his writing of the review.

More important is Professor Smith's assertion that my "purpose has been to propagate in the English-speaking world the views expounded during 1947–49 by the Finnish historian Juhani Paasivirta on Finnish history from 1899 to 1918." One should note that Paasivirta's most valuable contribution, his volume on 1918, was published not in 1947–49 but rather in 1957. Paasivirta's book on 1918 was at one time controversial, although it has now come to be accepted by most Finnish scholars as a major contribution to a better understanding of Finnish history in the year 1918. It is unfair to argue, as Professor Smith does, that Paasivirta's works have "doubtless served well the exigencies of Finnish domestic politics since 1945"; it is also unfair to accuse those who have praised Paasivirta's works, including the undersigned, of being "stridently partisan" in tone. It is, moreover, of significance that Professor Smith, who does not know the Finnish language, apparently has not read Paasivirta's distinguished trilogy.

As seen by the author rather than by the reviewer, my purpose in writing a book on Finnish Communism was not to reproduce "faithfully" anyone's thesis—least of all the thesis of a scholar, Paasivirta, who has not studied Finnish Communism and whose trilogy covers only the period up to the founding of the party. The question which I set out to answer in my study is clearly stated on page 225: "For many observers the presence of a large Communist group in the Finnish Parliament is a paradox. How is it possible that a Communist party can be so strong in a country which fought the Soviet Union twice during the Second World War, first in 1939–1940 and again in 1941–1944, and which is an independent, democratic nation? The preceding pages, an attempt to answer this question, end with an analysis of an election which took place over two decades ago, but even the six elections since 1945 can be explained through reference to the 1945 election." The interpretation which I advance as a major explanation for the strength (as distinguished from fluctuations in strength) of Finnish Communism is found on the first two pages of the preface: "The history of independent Finland has been more turbulent than that of the neighboring Nordic countries, and many Finnish workers have consequently sought a radical, non-Scandinavian variety of Socialism. In its absence, there has been an acceptance of the obvious alternative." This perhaps clears up any misunderstanding as to the purpose of my research.

With respect to my use of source material, Professor Smith charges that I have carefully and consciously selected material to support a specific point of view. But he feels constrained to admit that my book includes an "impressively long list of Finnish-language sources." Selectivity for Professor Smith seems to refer more to Russian-language sources. He states that I have used only a "handful of Russian sources." In actual fact, however, there are more than forty Russian-language sources listed in my bibliography. Moreover, written source material in a number of languages was supplemented by a series of interviews with twenty-nine respondents.

Finally, Professor Smith sees no merit in my book; it is not a contribution to knowledge. But might I remind him of a passage in the preface to my book: "In Finnish there are few scholarly analyses of Finnish Communism, and, quite

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