1.78 million gave as their native language a "language not of their own nationality" (1.73 million "Russian," and about 47,000 "other") (*Itogi vsesoiuznoi perepisi naseleniia 1959 goda: SSSR,* Table 53). And even in regions where the number of Jews is small, they are classified as a separate nationality (Table 54).

December 20, 1966

BERNARD D. WEINRYB
The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning

TO THE EDITOR:

Surprisingly, Robert V. Daniels, in his review of Chalmers Johnson, *Revolution and the Social System* (*Slavic Review,* September 1966) made the same error as Johnson did in his discussion of the so-called "Jacobin-communist" type of revolution. The error is twofold.

First, Johnson did *not* place the Russian Revolution, per se, within this category: in fact, considering his specificity of description (revolution of February 1917 as opposed to the revolution of Petrograd in October 1917) and his later reference to Goodspeed's book on the *coup d'état,* it seems obvious that Johnson places the Russian Revolution of October in his category of the *coup,* while only the prelude to this, the revolution which resulted in Kerensky's Provisional Government, is to be of the Jacobin-communist type. The first part of the error, therefore, is Mr. Daniels's failure to make the same sort of distinction made by Johnson. The second part of the error is that Mr. Johnson made the distinction in the first place. Following the abdication of the Tsar a governmental vacuum existed, a vacuum which was filled by the Duma then sitting in defiance of the Tsar's earlier dissolution order when disturbances first began in February. Johnson himself, in stating that the descriptional elements of a Jacobin-communist revolution included, among others, concurrent disturbances, an ideology, and particularly mass involvement, effectively ruled out the February situation as a revolution of this type—if a revolution at all.

Overall, however, Mr. Daniels is correct in pointing to Johnson's placement of the Russian Revolution proper in the *coup* column while describing its conditions in the Jacobin-communist column. All this leads to three possible conclusions: Mr. Johnson is not particularly conversant with the Russian Revolution, his typology lacks validity through its inability to place correctly one of the most significant revolutions of all time, or all efforts at typing revolutions are lost from the beginning. I cannot agree with the last, and I would prefer not to believe the first.

Finally, on another matter in the same issue, I would like to express my appreciation for the Discussion section on quantum mechanics in the Soviet Union. I found it a most informative and interesting treatment of a subject which has recently engaged my attention, Soviet science. While remembering that it is necessary to know *what* happened before one can analyze *why* it happened, I feel strongly that the more significant question is "why," and I would hope that Mr. Graham will in the near future continue what he has so excellently begun. Studying the Soviet controversies in physics and chemistry and comparing them with the earlier genetics problem, it seems quite clear that the political dynamics of the Soviet state and ideology are better and more subtly seen working in the physical sciences than in the personality-ridden heredity dissension of the 1940s and 1950s. The controversies in Soviet science—whether they center on genes, quanta, time and space, or human thought and computers; whether they are philosophical or scientific; whether re-

sulting in personal or professional disaster or fought on less sanguinary grounds—must be related to the dynamics of a state-supported and -supporting ideology.

November 7, 1966

DAN C. HELDMAN
University of Texas

TO THE EDITOR:

In his review of my book *Stalin's Russia* (*Slavic Review,* December 1966), Professor Sidney Heitman quotes me as saying that Stalin was "probably the greatest" man who ever lived. The first sentence of the book actually reads (page 1), "Stalin was probably the most important man who ever lived." There is a moral world of difference.

January 6, 1967

FRANCIS B. RANDALL
Sarah Lawrence College