

Pravda (October 17, 1970) is clearly indicative of their concern as he discussed Western efforts to "drive a wedge between the USSR and its friends, etc.," as it seemed to be a signal from the Nixon Administration of the desire for improved Egyptian-American relations.

Third, Rubinstein raises questions with my assertion that the murder of Israeli athletes by Palestinian terrorists set off a chain of events that greatly upset the pattern of Egyptian diplomacy (p. 89) and helped to bring about an improvement in Soviet-Egyptian relations. The terrorist action precipitated Israeli raids against terrorist bases in Lebanon and Syria, which, in itself, had two effects. In the first place, the Egyptians, who had hoped for a quid pro quo from the West for ousting the Russians, now found their diplomatic offensive aborted, particularly in the United States, as Israel received extensive Western support in the United Nations and elsewhere following the Munich events. Second, while Israeli planes roamed at will in Lebanon and Syria, Egypt came under considerable pressure to take action against Israel, but was militarily and politically still unable to do so. As a result of these events, the polemics between Egypt and the Soviet Union, which had become very hot, quickly ended and Sadat made several gestures to improve Soviet-Egyptian relations, and these resulted in a resumption of Soviet weapons shipments to Egypt.

Finally, Professor Rubinstein asserts that I have "bandied the term 'influence' about indiscriminantly." As a matter of fact, in the first chapter of the book, I drew the distinction between influence as behavior modification and influence as behavior reinforcement, and I concluded, at the end of the book, that the USSR has been very unsuccessful in modifying the behavior of its client states, but it has been rather more successful in reinforcing the behavior of its clients where their goals matched those of the USSR (for example, Iraq's nationalization of the Iraq Petroleum Company in 1972).

ROBERT O. FREEDMAN
Baltimore Hebrew College

Professor Rubinstein does not feel that a response is necessary.

TO THE EDITOR:

Since I am presently a visiting professor at the University of Vienna, Austria, the March 1976 issue which includes a review of my *History of the Habsburg Empire 1526-1918* by Professor Keith Hitchins came to my attention only very recently. Thus I can only at this point make a few comments.

Professor Hitchins who qualifies unquestionably as an expert on the history of the Rumanians in the Habsburg Empire charges that, contrary to my statement, "there were translations of the Scriptures into Rumanian well before Tordassi's." Here is what I actually said: "Luther's fundamental work of translating the Testaments into German was paralleled . . . by that of Jan Blahoslav among Czechs, of Primož Trubar and Jurij Dalmatin . . . among the Slovenes, of Gaspar Heltai among the Magyars, and of Michael Tordassi, who translated Heltai's version into Roumanian." From this context it should be quite clear that I am comparing the impact of translations into vernacular languages. I am not listing first translations. Whether the Magyar national university of Kolozsvár (Cluj) at the end of the sixteenth century could have become a Rumanian national university may be conjectural. My remark in this respect is, however, very cautious.

I am perfectly aware that Alexander Odobescu was not a Transylvanian by birth. Yet, as stated clearly in my book, I have not made the discussion of personalities in

the cultural orbit dependent on the accident of birthplace but on the specific contribution to an ethnic or territorial unit. This seems to me the only sensible procedure in an empire where a continuous migration of intellectuals from east to west occurred, particularly in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Constantin Daicoviciu and Miron Constantinescu refer in their standard history of Transylvania to the specific extraordinary impact which Odobescu's archaeological studies had on Transylvania.

There seems to be little point in getting into a discussion of Professor Hitchins's ruminations about so complex a subject as the social and political problems of the Habsburg Empire as a whole. Judging from his publications this is patently a rather secondary interest for him. Accordingly, I won't contest observations on this score. On the contrary, I will confess to a so-called hidden crime which, as any student of criminology knows, may be far more serious than the comparably petty offenses for which a defendant will be tried in public. Even an eagle-eyed, Rumanian-oriented observer like Professor Hitchins may have overlooked that, because of strict limitations of space, I was unable to list his valuable study, *The Rumanian National Movement in Transylvania, 1780-1849* in the bibliography of my book which, incidentally, is not confined exclusively to works in English, French, and German. This omission will be corrected in a slightly revised and enlarged German edition to be published within the next few months.

ROBERT A. KANN
University of Vienna

Professor Hitchins does not feel that a response is necessary.

TO THE EDITOR:

I must object to Colette Shulman's comment on my "selection" of materials in her review of my *Soviet Women* (*Slavic Review*, June 1976). I deliberately made no selection whatever among data casting a *negative* light on the status of Soviet women, incorporating everything I could find, including personally-transmitted information no other foreigner seems to know. This was an attempt to falsify my own hypothesis.

I fail to understand her denial that "obstacles" in "the simplest tasks of everyday life . . . have been lessened." All the following data pertain to a single decade, 1965-74. Families with refrigerators have risen from 11 percent, meaning that only the elite had them, to 55 percent (a majority of families). Washing machine ownership rose from 21 percent to 62 percent of families. Vacuum cleaner output rose fourfold, and is in the millions. Production of women's ready-to-wear dresses doubled. Meat convenience-food manufacture increased by nearly half. Retail store floor space rose 50 percent. Places in preschool child-care facilities rose by more than the total number now available in the United States.

Regarding the relative status of U.S. women, how does one get round the fact that the USSR is alone in the world in having women comprise a majority of persons in the combined employment of all professions requiring higher education? Regarding upward mobility, the percentage of women among Soviet factory managers has risen 50 percent in the decade. Female Party membership is climbing at the fastest rate in history.

That I sought to popularize: most certainly. But the level of the research is suggested by the fact that my bibliography of Russian and English books on the sub-