

that deviant ideas or ways of thinking become acceptable. Some of the natural sciences gained such a status after World War II, with the rise of nuclear weapons and space technology. Economists began to do so in the past decade, as political economy gave way to mathematics and cybernetics as their main stock in trade. The Soviet Union being an intricately changing society, a determined and omniscient state could conceivably come to depend on the sociologists' practical ideas and data on "social engineering" as much as it does now on atomic scientists and some economists.

Barring this turn of events I do not anticipate any early transformation of sociology along the lines of the partial but far-reaching secularization of economics, unless the system itself changes greatly.

July 8, 1965

GEORGE FISCHER  
*Russian Institute*  
*Columbia University*

TO THE EDITOR:

Perhaps mere zoologists should not read *Slavic Review*. I picked up the latest issue [March 1965] and found the very first page remarkable. Surely Professor Haimson exaggerates the importance of "sympathy strikes" "in Moscow and Warsaw, Revel, Riga, and Tallin, Kiev, Odessa, even Tiflis." In fact, we might say he exaggerates quite exactly by a factor of  $\times 0.114$ , for the simple reason that Revel and Tallin are the same place, so that there were seven and not eight such strikes!

You may say it's trivial, but it's also rather incredible. Here is presumably a professional specialist writing in a scholarly journal who does not recognize the names of the capital of Estonia. Not only so, but his article was considered sufficiently important to be commented on, in the same issue and at considerable length, by two other specialists. Yet no one spotted this. It may be trivial, but it shakes one's confidence in that kind of scholarship. Alas, there is not much in the rest of the article to help restore it.

Zoologists should not read *Slavic Review*; I do, and I protest. As a university teacher I protest because American universities are cluttered with solidly established professors of Russian language and other Russian matters who in plain language don't know their own subject. An attempt on my part to speak Russian to such colleagues has, in several instances, resulted in that colleague's precipitate flight across the campus. Keep them out of *Slavic Review*.

Need I explain that the usual English equivalent of the Russian *Revel* is Reval.

May 21, 1965

A. C. FABERGE  
*University of Texas*