

The foregoing does not speak to the indubitable validity of some of the points Dr. Weinryb makes. But when one of the components of his speculations is the belief that contact between Soviet and Western Jews is discouraged—"any contact"—one must be skeptical about the soundness of conclusions based in any part upon such a notion. Shouldn't at least a tourist trip to the USSR be a minimal requirement for any writing on contemporary Soviet society?

October 27, 1966

WILLIAM M. MANDEL  
233 Lake Drive  
Berkeley 8, California

TO THE EDITOR:

Mr. Dunn was good enough to mail me a copy of his "Letter to the Editor" [appearing in this issue]. I would like here to make a few brief comments.

(1) When I mentioned in my "Note" (*Slavic Review*, September 1966) that one should define what he means by anti-Semitism, I did not mean to say: anti-Semitism "to each according to his needs." I am afraid that Mr. Dunn's contention is neither historically nor sociologically correct. After all, "anti-Semitism" is a "branch" of prejudice and may, as such, take both covert and overt forms and may be "acted out" (using Gordon W. Allport's categories) by antilocution and avoidance as well as discrimination, physical attack, and extermination (either form is regarded as prejudice, or, in our connection, as anti-Semitism).

(2) Nor can Mr. Dunn's contentions about Jewish "nationality" (or "ethnic group") be of any value in the Soviet context. In this connection attitudes (Mr. Dunn's, mine, etc.), or even the official recognition of "Jewish nationality" in the Versailles Minority Treaties following World War I, are irrelevant. The decisive factor here is the recognition of Jewish nationality in law and official pronouncements in Soviet Russia. These range from a speech by Mikhail I. Kalinin, chief of state, in November 1926 about the task of preserving the Jewish "nationality" to a decree of 1924 and the Constitution of the Belorussian SSR in 1927 about publication of important legislative acts in Yiddish (as one of the four official languages), the founding of Jewish schools and publications, Jewish municipal soviets, sections in the academies in Minsk and Kiev, departments at the universities in Odessa and Moscow, and many other acts along these lines.

Even that which was carried over to the post-Stalin era clearly designates Jews in Russia as a "nationality":

(a) Official classification of Jews in their internal passports (fifth paragraph) as of Jewish nationality in accordance with the passport regulations of 1932, which required indication of the bearer's nationality. This classification is compulsory except in cases of individuals born of mixed marriages, who may choose the nationality of whichever parent they wish.

(b) Officially there still exists a "Jewish Autonomous Region" (*Oblast'*), which was established in Birobidzhan in 1934.

(c) In the publications of the results of the 1959 census (the various *Itogi* and others) the Jews are classified as a nationality along with the other nationalities (*natsional'nosti*) of the USSR. The general category of "native language" (*rodnoi iazyk*) is divided into "language of their own nationality" and "language not of their own nationality." Of the nearly 2.27 million Jews, 487,786 gave the "language of their own nationality" (meaning mainly Yiddish) as their "native language," and

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 usesoiuznoi 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 descriptive 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-