

EMBASSY OF
THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST
REPUBLICS
78 CANBERRA AVENUE, CANBERRA, A.C.T.
TELEPHONE X1033.

Ref: 00-15.

10th February, 1966.

Mr. I. J. Leibler,
116 Kooyong Road,
Caulfield North, S.E.7,
Vic.

Dear Mr. Leibler,

In connection with your letter of 20th December, 1965 I advise you that it is beyond my scope as an official representative of the Soviet Government and not of the CPSU Central Committee to comment the interview of the Australian citizen E. Aarons about his discussions with representatives of the CPSU Central Committee during his visit to the Soviet Union.

As to the position of the Soviet Jews and their emigration you must be aware that there is no discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union. Equality of their rights with other nationalities and races in my country is safeguarded by the Constitution of the USSR in accordance with which "any direct or indirect restriction of the rights of citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, are punishable by law".

*Yours faithfully,
(signed)*

*V. LOGINOV,
Ambassador of the USSR to
Australia.*

(VI)

A FURTHER EXCHANGE

Mr. Lloyd Churchward is a Senior Lecturer in Political Science at Melbourne University and a member of the Communist Party. He submitted a critical review of Mr. Leibler's book to the Editorial Board of Arena. The Board allowed Mr. Leibler to write a reply of equal length. The full text of both articles, of which Arena published abridged versions, is printed below.

SOVIET JEWRY by Lloyd Churchward

J.K.'s review (*Arena* No. 7) of Isi Leibler's book *Soviet Jewry and Human Rights* accepts the argument of the book virtually without criticism. Yet the book surely demands criticism. Mr. Leibler claims that his book is an objective analysis of Soviet anti-Semitism and that it is not intended to be anti-Soviet propaganda. Let us consider his survey on this basis. Is it or is it not an accurate account of the position of Soviet Jews?

The thesis argued in the booklet is clearly stated at the outset;

"This survey is designed to demonstrate that Jews in the Soviet Union are denied the same rights as other Soviet nationalities and religious denominations; that as a group, Soviet Jews are discriminated against in certain areas of Soviet society, and that the general image of the Jew is being blackened by the projection of anti-Semitic stereotypes throughout the Soviet mass media." (p. 11).

Let us look carefully at this claim and at the arguments and evidence advanced to support it.

Firstly, are Soviet Jews denied the same rights as other Soviet nationalities and religious groups? Leibler asserts that this is proved by the 'virulent Soviet press campaign against Judaism', which, he says, 'has no parallel with the treatment of any other religion.' (p. 19). While other religions are attacked only Jews are attacked in such a way that their loyalty as Soviet citizens is questioned. Attacks on the Jewish religion have ethnic overtones.

Press attacks on Jews are not countered by any positive educational campaign against anti-Semitism. (p. 21). Jews are subjected to special discrimination and restrictions on their religious practice. Soviet Jews are not accorded the same rights as other nationalities to educate their children in their own

language. Jews are being increasingly discriminated against in education, job placement and in politics. (p. 30). Jews have been singled out for attack in the trials for economic crimes. Popular anti-Semitism has not been countered but has been officially encouraged. A book such as Kichko's *Judaism Without Embellishment* is not an isolated aberration but is characteristic of official publications on the Jews. (p. 36).

While such assertions have frequently been made in recent years they are difficult to prove, especially on the basis of the evidence produced by Mr. Leibler. Soviet religious communities in recent years (and especially during the last five years of the Khrushchev era) have been subjected to much pressure by party and state authorities, central, regional and local. Not only Jews but Moslems, Christian sects and the Russian Orthodox Church have been subjected to restrictions under one pretext or another (1). Forcible closure of churches and mosques has run parallel to the closure of synagogues. The evidence collected by Leibler on this point demonstrates an intensification of the anti-religious policy of the Soviet Government. It is not specifically anti-Semitic. Nor are Jews the only religious group whose loyalty has been questioned. Catholics, Protestants and Muslims have all been accused of 'cosmopolitanism' and of maintaining links with 'international finance capital.' Churches and mosques (2) as well as synagogues have figured in press reports of economic trials as locations for currency speculation, shady dealings, etc. Likewise, the relaxation of the pressure on Christians which has been reported since the removal of Khrushchev has been quickly followed up by concession to Jews. Thus in July 1965 the Chief Rabbi of Moscow announced that the government was now permitting the baking of unleavened bread in state bakeries, the issue of a new prayer book and the expansion of a seminary.

Secondly, let us take the charge of educational discrimination against Jews. Now the charge of educational discrimination is often levelled against the Soviet Union by expatriate representatives of Soviet national minorities. (3) Thus it is frequently raised by Ukrainians, Uzbeks, Tartars, Tadjiks, Armenians and others, as well as by Jews. But cultural assimilation of Jews and other national minorities is a natural process which continues whatever the modifications made in the government's educational policy. Under present conditions parents who belong to national minorities frequently insist on the right to have their children educated at Russian schools since these schools provide a better grounding in science and in Russian, both prerequisites for higher education. Soviet educational practice does not provide for separate schools for all nationalities wherever they may be. What it does provide for is a dual system of primary and secondary schools wherever

there are sufficiently large concentrations of a particular national minority. Thus in Kiev there are Ukrainian and Russian schools, in Baku Armenian and Russian, in Tashkent Uzbek and Russian, and so on. Mr. Leibler cites no clear evidence to prove his claim that there is a quota on Jewish students entering universities. The percentage (but not the number) of Jewish students seems to have declined but so has the percentage of students of some other national groups including Russians. This is a natural consequence of the increasing number of students coming from formerly underprivileged national groups. Admissions to Soviet Universities are restricted today but not, as far as is known, on an ethnic basis. Thus 70% of first year places are reserved for persons having two or more years experience as workers in industry or agriculture. Restrictions operate in all faculties on the basis of the planned expansion of employment for various categories of specialists.

Thirdly, while Mr. Leibler concedes that some Jews occupy high posts in society and government he asserts that Jews are under represented in the government apparatus. Jews form 1.08% of the Soviet population and less than one half of one percent of deputies in local Soviets. (p. 30). But Mr. Leibler should know that there is no law of proportional representation in the Soviets. While the Soviet Union describes itself as a 'multinational state' the nationalities are hierarchically organized and many do not have administrative recognition. Thus an Autonomous Republic has a greater number of local Soviets and more representatives in the USSR Soviet of Nationalities than does an Autonomous Province or a National Area. Thus the only guaranteed representation of the Jewish minority of 2,268,000 (1959 census) is through the Soviets of the Hebrew Autonomous Province and the five representatives of this province in the USSR Soviet of Nationalities. More than 95% of Jews live outside their autonomous region and if they are returned to local Soviets it will be because they are regarded as worthy representatives of factory workers, scientists, teachers, engineers, doctors, collective farmers, etc. Furthermore, the structure of the local Soviets is such that 60% of all deputies are members of village Soviets. Hence Jews (95% urban) and all other urban dwellers, are in a sense discriminated against.

Fourthly, Leibler claims that there is a strong current of anti-Semitism in the Soviet press. Such an assertion is made in ignorance of the Soviet press. There are at present 6,595 Soviet newspapers (central, republican and local) with more than 90 million copies being issued. Most of these are in the Russian language. Mr. Leibler does not read Russian so he cannot claim to have read any of these papers. He doesn't even use a reliable English source for his survey of the English press such as the Current

Digest of the Soviet Press (published by the Joint Committee of Slavic Studies, U.S.A.) or the Supplement to the Glasgow journal *Soviet Studies*. Instead he accepts without question the extracts, prepared, edited and interpreted by Emanuel Litvinoff, editor of the journal, *The Jews in Eastern Europe*. Now Litvinoff is an assiduous collector of references to Jews appearing in Soviet newspapers, no matter how obscure the paper or the reference. But to accept Litvinoff's evaluation of this material without an independent examination is surely an unscientific procedure. Leibler seems completely unaware of the difficulties of handling Russian newspapers and of arriving at generalizations on the basis of what is to be found there. Thus it is not difficult to present a black and unbalanced picture of any aspect of Soviet life purely on the basis of published criticism contained in the Soviet press. I speak with some knowledge on this subject as I have for the past decade been reading several Russian newspapers and periodicals regularly. Moreover, I recently spent three months in the Soviet Union (February 9-May 8) during which time I read daily five separate Russian newspapers, *Pravda*, *Izvestia*, *Sovetskaya Rossia*, *Moskovskaya Pravda* and *Vechernyaya Moskva*, and frequently consulted other central Russian, provincial and city newspapers. When I say that anti-Semitism is rarely met with in the Soviet press I am confident that every other regular reader of the Russian press will bear me out.

Mr. Litvinoff adds colour to his picture of Soviet anti-Semitism by the frequent citing of news items which are not anti-Semitic. Thus an article appearing in *Izvestia* 28 August 1962 which was interpreted by Litvinoff as an anti-Semitic attack on the Rothschilds (*The Jews in Eastern Europe*, December 1962, p. 21) was in fact an analysis of the Common Market prepared by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Moscow. Two other cases cited in the same issue of the journal are attacks on Jews through the medium of reports of economic crimes. To illustrate just how anti-Semitic a Soviet news item has to be to merit inclusion in Mr. Litvinoff's statistics I have included here complete translations of both items.

Item 1: Sovetskaya Rossia 11 August, 1962. Page 2.

A small item in a column headed "Echo of Our Correspondence".

Item Headed *No Matter How the Rope Twists . . .*

Cdes. Dorofeeva and Ismagilov.

(Sernovodsk-Kavkasky Rest Home, Chechen-Ingush ASSR)

The facts reported by you have been substantiated.

By means of machinations S. Grossman received an allotment of 870 square metres and on it he constructed a house

of 126 square metres. And there will be a second one ready soon. While building these houses S. Grossman used without payment the Sanatorium's trucks, he enticed workers and used government money to pay them.

The Chechen-Ingush Provincial Party Committee which verified your letter has advised that Grossman was expelled from the Party and removed from his position as Chief Doctor. The matter has been handed over to the Procurator's Office.

Item 2: Sovetskaya Rossia 21 September, 1962. Page 3.

In the section of the paper headed "We Verify, Ask and Remind".

Item headed *Will There be an end to this Tangle?*

That evening the Grosny T.V. Studio put over a mixed program. Reportage, a play, a film . . . But these were not the main features of the transmission.

The announcer related with pleasure how a disinterested man had sacrificed his personal goods for the sake of the interests of the community. He had transferred his house to the City Housing Fund without payment.

The name of this man, stated the announcer, was Dr. S. M. Grossman.

All went off well. But then many viewers began to remember—Dr. Grossman? Wasn't he the one who was recently written up in the newspaper *Sovetskaya Rossia*?

And so it was. On August 11 the newspaper reported on the misdeeds of S. Grossman, Chief Doctor of the Servodak-Kavkazsky Sanatorium. In the city of Grosny he illegally seized an allotment and began the construction of a luxury home. He built it. He appropriated yet another allotment. Another house rose up. It was easy for him to build: he got free transport and manpower. His materials were at cut prices.

A paragraph in the paper entitled *No Matter how much the Rope Twists* . . . And so it came out. The grasper was caught and Grossman was expelled from the party and removed from his position as Chief Doctor. Material on him was handed in to the Procuracy to institute court proceedings.

And suddenly . . . the grasper is a T.V. hero. How could this happen? However, everything can be explained.

Things were turning out badly for Grossman. The

Criminal Court would confiscate the illegally acquired houses. And so Grossman decided on an 'honourable action'. He gives one of his two houses to the City Council. And so a 'sensation' was born.

While the Procuracy is prepared to prosecute Grossman for his crimes he poses as a hero. True, right now Grossman doesn't have the position of Chief Doctor but of an ordinary doctor. But this doesn't alter the position. When will the tangle be ended?

Presumably the 'anti-Semitism' here consists in the publication of the name of the offender. But this is the customary practice in the Soviet press in such cases.

On this matter of economic crimes it is necessary to state quite clearly what the evidence does reveal. Some cases of economic crime in which Jews were involved were undoubtedly written up in local papers in a way which sought to identify the Jews as 'alien elements' and 'capitalist survivals' in Soviet socialist society and such reportage threatened to stimulate any latent anti-Semitism in the population. When this matter was brought to the attention of the Central government (and whatever Mr. Leibler may think local papers are not directly controlled or censored from Moscow) it cautioned local party and state organs against the dangers inherent in such reporting so that cases involving Jews were played down or not reported. Even this is cited by Litvinoff (and accepted by Leibler) as a particularly cunning method of anti-Semitism. Finally, no statistics are available on which to check Mr. Litvinoff's claim that at least 60% of persons executed for economic crimes were Jews.

Litvinoff and Leibler adopt a curious scale in their assessment of the policy or intentions of the Soviet government. Whatever it does it has to be anti-Semitic. Thus the fact that Jews in universities form more than three times their proportion in the population is taken as evidence of anti-Semitism. It is also anti-Semitism no Jewish names are mentioned. The Soviet Government withdrew Kichko's book in Moscow, where says Leibler, few copies were on sale. He doesn't mention that it was withdrawn throughout the entire Soviet Union. He acknowledges the issue of the Central Committee statement against anti-Semitism and the Kichko book but regrets the fact that the Central newspapers did not reprint an earlier critical review of this book which had appeared in a local Ukrainian paper. The fact is of course that central newspapers do not make a practice of reprinting reviews from local newspapers. The opinion flow is in the reverse direction.

Mr. Leibler's book is careless and unscientific not merely in

its handling of sources but in its argument. He never defines anti-Semitism. Nor does he discuss the connection between anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism, or anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism. He assumes that any change in the percentage of Jews in universities, government or the professions is sufficient in itself to prove a deliberate anti-Semitism on the part of the Soviet Government. But the indices of Soviet anti-Semitism are not so clear cut as this. That anti-Semitism (hostility to Jews because they are Jews) exists in the Soviet Union is clear enough and it is generally admitted within the Soviet Union. There is a long tradition of anti-Semitism in Russia and it was strengthened by Nazi policy during the occupation and by the inclusion of many new people in the Soviet Union in 1945. The Soviet government has generally followed a course of opposition to anti-Semitism even to the extent of deliberately retarding the natural assimilation of Jews over the years 1917-1930. (4) This policy wavered somewhat in 1939-41 (during the Nazi-Soviet Pact) and during the latter years of the Stalin era (1948-53). But even here Soviet policy never became persistently anti-Semitic. If the denunciation of Stalin at the 20th Congress did not specifically include a denunciation of anti-Semitism this was because Stalinist terror was directed at the entire Soviet people and not merely at the Jews. Likewise the Jews have benefited and are still benefiting from the de-Stalinization campaign and the rehabilitation of those wrongfully punished. Yet the position of Soviet Jews is still far from satisfactory. Australian progressives and especially members of organizations such as the A.S.F.S. should continue to urge the Soviet government to strengthen its policy against anti-Semitism, to enforce the law against persons clearly guilty of acts of anti-Semitism, to wage a more active educational campaign against anti-Semitism, especially in the Ukraine, Belorussia, Moldavia and the Baltic republics; to provide more opportunities for Yiddish culture, and to reverse its present policy of petty persecution of Jewish and other religious communities. If Leibler's booklet helps to achieve this it will serve a useful purpose notwithstanding the errors and distortions of its picture of the plight of Soviet Jewry.

Notes:

- (1) One authority on Soviet Christians has recently written ". . . one must now speak of an outright persecution of Christianity." (John Lawrence, *Soviet Policy Towards the Russian Churches* 1958-64. *Soviet Studies* January 1965, pp. 278-84). About half of the 20,000 Russian Orthodox Churches existing in 1958 had been closed by 1964 and seminaries existed only at Zagorsk, Leningrad and Odessa.

For reference to recent attacks on Muslims, see *Soviet Studies*

Information Supplement April 1964 p. 6.

The evaluation I have given of this problem co-incides with that contained in a letter issued May 28, 1962 by Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant U.S. Secretary of State;

"The anti-Jewish measures are a more apparent part of a general campaign against religious practices and groups in recent years, which itself falls within the context of a broad regime effort towards greater ideological orthodoxy and political consciousness among the population."

Quoted in *The Jews in Eastern Europe*, December 1962, pp. 60-62.

- (2) Cf. *Izvestia* 2 October, 1962, which charged that Moslems were engaged in illegal gold trade in the mosques of Tashkent, Ufa and other Islamic centres.
- (3) Cf. the journal *Problems of the Peoples of the USSR* (Munich). Thus the issue for March, 1963 contains articles on "The Soviet Campaign of Cultural Genocide."
- (4) Cf. Alfred A. Greenbaum, "Soviet Jewry during the Lenin-Stalin Period", *Soviet Studies* April 1965.
Soviet Jewry—A Reply to I. Leibler—Statement of the Political Committee, Communist Party of Australia (June 1965).

SOVIET JEWRY—A REJOINDER TO LLOYD CHURCHWARD

BY ISI LEIBLER.

Lloyd Churchward's contribution to the dialogue on Soviet Jewry is particularly exasperating. One is surely entitled to expect better from a professional political scientist and specialist on Soviet affairs.

On the question of religious discrimination, Churchward attempts to demonstrate that anti-Jewish discrimination is part and parcel of the general drive against all religions. Now I have never suggested that Soviet religious minorities other than the Jews are living in a Paradise. Yet, it can be demonstrated that Soviet Jews experience far greater pressures qualitatively and quantitatively than is the case with other religions. In contrast to other Soviet religious minorities, Judaism is denied a central organization, cannot produce the necessary religious, literary and devotional articles, and is prevented from participating in international meetings of co-religionists or to maintain any official contact with them.

The anti-religious campaign has also been applied far more violently against Jews than others. Churchward states that of 20,000 Russian Orthodox Churches, half were closed down between 1958 and 1964. Yet how does this compare to official Soviet figures conceding the "reduction" of synagogues from 450 to 91 in the same period? As for seminaries, despite repeated promises, Soviet Jews still have no effective seminary of any kind. Churchward's one example of mosques being associated with subversion is not typical or comparable to the constant refrains in the Soviet press questioning the loyalty of Soviet Jews and identifying synagogues as depots for gold, speculation and currency dealings. I can present Mr. Churchward with sufficient Soviet press extracts on this theme to fill volumes.

It must also be borne in mind that when the religion of the Russian Orthodox, the Armenian Orthodox, the Georgian Orthodox, the Baptist or the Moslem is assailed, it does not have the same implications and consequences as when Jews are involved. Unlike the Jews, the mass of non-believing Russians, Armenians, Georgians or Uzbeks do not consider themselves involved when the religious members of their nationality come under attack in official propaganda. Attacks on religions other than Jewish are conducted without ethnic overtones, implications or innuendoes.

On the question of cultural discrimination, I have never denied that Soviet ethnic or national groups other than the Jews were suffering as a result of enforced Russianisation. But, unlike the Jews, the Ukrainians, Uzbeks, Tartars, Armenians and others who Churchward mentions, are allowed expression of their national identity through the medium of cultural institutions, schools, newspapers, theatres, etc.—in both their own language and Russian.

Mr. Churchward is ignorant of the Soviet constitution when he states that "Soviet educational practice does not provide for separate schools for all nationalities, wherever they may be". It is clearly stated in paragraph 121 of the Soviet Constitution, that any Soviet citizen has the right to obtain for his children, education in his own language. It does not insist on "sufficiently large concentrations of a particular national minority".

Churchward is apparently unaware of the basic principles enunciated with regard to the Soviet German minority, who number less than half the total of Jews and are also scattered throughout the Soviet Union. By a decree of the Supreme Soviet in December, 1964, the Soviet Germans were guaranteed their right to schools, and other national cultural institutions. Surely, if such facilities are made available to Germans and not Jews, this is clear evidence of discrimination. Mr. Churchward would be

well advised to read the recent anguished public appeals and protests along these lines from Western Communists who confirm this deplorable state of affairs.

As for discrimination against Jews in universities and other sectors of Soviet society, Churchward only has to refer to public statements made by Soviet leaders. No better authority can be quoted to confirm this than ex Premier Krushchev, who in 1956 warned that Jews in prominent positions must make way for "the indigenous inhabitants". Again on December 17, 1962, at a meeting of Soviet artists and intellectuals, Krushchev rationalised the imposition of a numerus clausus against Jews, claiming that the prominence of too many Jews in top positions would create anti-Semitism. Madame Furtseva, the Soviet Minister for Culture, also made similar remarks. These statements were bitterly criticised at the time by prominent Communists and progressives as smacking of "Great Russian Chauvinism" and representing "an unforgivable violation of socialist democracy".

On the question of political under-representation of Jews, Churchward presents a particularly weak case. It is the official Soviet propaganda blurbs which persist in raising the "7623 Jews elected to local Soviets" in an effort to mislead public opinion. When one realises that over 1,800,000 such deputies are elected, it is clearly a microscopically small figure—less than half of one percent. This minute representation of Jews, notably an active and political people, can surely not be simply dismissed as a natural decline brought about by the increased participation of "formerly underprivileged groups". If Churchward were to take account of the very high representation of Jews in such bodies during the twenties and early thirties, he would find it difficult to explain the drastic contrast in terms other than deliberate exclusion.

And what on earth is Churchward talking about when he refers to the "Hebrew Autonomous Region"? Krushchev himself admitted that the only Jewish aspect to Birobidjan was "the Yiddish sign on the railway station". Jews would not even represent 10% of the population. Birobidjan was one of the greatest pre-war Soviet propaganda stunts, but it is surely somewhat grotesque for an expert on Soviet affairs in 1965 to refer to Birobidjan as a Jewish region. Possibly anticipating criticism along these lines, Churchward concedes that since "more than 95% of Jews live outside their Autonomous Region (sic) . . . if they are returned to local Soviets it will be because they are regarded as worthy representatives . . ." Is it not strange that in contrast to the early Bolshevik period, so few of them are today regarded as "worthy representatives", by the Soviet public?

Churchward accuses me of being "ignorant" for claiming that there is a strong current of anti-Semitism in the Soviet press, and maintains that "anti-Semitism is rarely met with in the Soviet press". One might have expected Churchward, as a Marxist, to demand that it should not be found at all. But what does he mean by rarely? I can present him with volumes and volumes of complete photostatic reproductions from the Soviet press that are anti-Semitic. I have only superficially touched on this in my study, but surely it already presents sufficient evidence to demonstrate the point.

Mr. Litvinoff may indeed be an assiduous collector of references to Jews appearing in Soviet newspapers. But Churchward must admit that this assiduity has produced an amazing quantity of anti-Jewish material. Neither Mr. Litvinoff nor Mr. Churchward can claim to scrutinise "6,595 Soviet newspapers". But in those covered, Soviet anti-Semitism is encountered. In fact, over the last few years, examples of anti-Semitism can be produced from one Soviet newspaper or another in practically any week of the year. They may also appear in the vast number of other newspapers circulating in the U.S.S.R. not seen by Mr. Litvinoff or Mr. Churchward. In fairness, I must confess that I share Mr. Churchward's joy and relief that anti-Semitic articles do not appear in the central press every single day of the week.

Mr. Churchward attempts to discredit Mr. Litvinoff by quoting extracts from his Newsletter out of context. These have no direct bearing on my study but do reflect the intransigence and dogmatism of Mr. Churchward's attitude to this question. He is naive and unaware of the social atmosphere in the Soviet Union if he does not appreciate the significance of the mention of the Rothschilds as a symbol of Western Capitalism. The Rothschilds traditionally symbolise in Russian anti-Semitism, the sinister and all powerful activities of Jewish moneybags. What might be a relatively innocuous reference to the family in some countries is loaded with significance when it appears in the Soviet Union.

The items in *Sovetskaya Rossia* were quoted by Mr. Litvinoff merely to demonstrate the pattern of highlighting economic crimes cases in which Jews allegedly predominated. This has been a most disturbing feature of the barbaric reimposition of the death sentence for alleged economic crimes by the Soviet Government. It is clear from the published trial transcripts that some of these cases were rigged. In recent months a number of those previously sentenced were found to have been tried unjustly, and reprieved (e.g. *Literaturnaya Gazeta* 21/11/64, *Komsomolskaya Pravda* 8/1/65). Such rehabilitation may have posed problems for those already executed but presumably their families received pensions.

Churchward cannot dispute the high percentage of Jews executed. Throughout the country, Jews represented between 55% to 60% of all those publicly sentenced to death. In the Ukraine, their proportion has been as high as 90%. These statistics are based exclusively on names officially released in the Soviet press and I am willing to submit the entire list to Mr. Churchward for inspection. The percentage of Jews could in fact be greater, as some Jews may have adopted Russian names. It is, of course, feasible that the unpublished death sentences could increase or decrease the percentage of Jews amongst the victims. But if the latter is the case, it would surely confirm that there was a deliberate effort to highlight the role of Jews as anti-social creatures.

Churchward must concede that public show trials are an important educational medium in the Soviet Union. Throughout the economic crimes trials, the Jewish origins of the accused were highlighted, Synagogues frequently depicted as "depots" for the nefarious activities, and the defendants dubbed "Shylock cockroaches", "servants of the golden calf" and other commonly accepted Soviet euphemisms for Jews.

Possibly in an effort to avoid these questions, Mr. Churchward accuses me of accepting as a particular cunning method of anti-Semitism, "central government directives" to local and state organs, warning of the dangers inherent in highlighting Jews in such cases and asking that they be played down. I have of course, never made such an extraordinary statement, nor have I ever heard of such a directive. I would in fact, challenge Mr. Churchward to disclose his source of information concerning these hitherto unheard of "directives" from the central government.

Churchward is again banking on the supposed ignorance or credulity of Arena's readers when he refers to the curious scale of values allegedly employed when assessing Soviet policies. When have I (or Litvinoff) presented as evidence of anti-Semitism the fact that Jews in universities form more than their due proportion of the population? Where have I stated that it is anti-Semitic not to mention Jewish names in reports of criminal cases? On the other hand, I have questioned the motives of the Soviet authorities when they eliminate references to the positive contribution of Jews in Soviet life and instead highlight only the negative aspects. When the works of men like Gorky and Lenin are published in the Soviet Union and positive reference to Jews or attacks by these men against anti-Semitism deleted, it is no wonder that a Pravda editorial containing a passing reference to a warning against anti-Semitism by Lenin creates a sensation.

Churchward again misrepresents me when he comments on my evaluation of the Kichko book episode. The contents of the

Kichko book were originally defended and justified by the Soviet authorities and only withdrawn after tremendous pressure, particularly from Western Communist Parties. An obscure Soviet provincial newspaper's critical review of the book was highlighted by Tass for overseas consumption but very few Soviet citizens ever saw it. The ultimate CPSU condemnation of Kichko on April 4, 1964, was luke-warm and the following day Izvestia published an article entitled "Concerning an Incomprehensible Up-roar" in which strong reservations were expressed about condemning the Kichko book outright.

Churchward may not be aware that the CPSU Kichko resolution actually commended as a "reliable anti-religious work" Osipov's "Catechism Without Embellishment". This book, published by the Moscow State Publishing House for Political Literature in an edition of 105,000 is in some respects, just as bad as the Kichko book. For example, on P 276, Osipov states that "Where Jews are concerned, the principal blood sucker turns out to be God Himself" or on P 281 "the first thing we come across is the preaching of intolerance, the bloody extermination of people of other faiths . . . God recommends real racial discrimination to the Jews . . . God promises the Jews He'll cast out and destroy other nations and advises them to outrage other religions".

In such a climate, is it surprising that no reference appeared in the Soviet press as to whether Kichko was tried in accordance with the Soviet and Ukrainian Criminal codes for "inciting national or racial hostility or discord"? It may also explain why to this day, a host of other anti-Semitic tracts, pamphlets and books are still freely circulating in such areas as the Ukraine where they can cause the most harm. These wretched published caricatures of Jewish life depicting Synagogue worshippers and Rabbis as "ticks", "lice", "money grubbers" and "exploiters"; identifying synagogues as depots for "shoddy profiteering agreements" and "centres of Israeli intrigue", do nothing to influence believing Jews against religion. They do encourage hatred of all Jews amongst the non Jews to whom this propaganda is primarily circulated and who do not perceive a non existent demarcation between Soviet so called "scientific atheistic propaganda" and actual crude anti-Semitic denigration of Jews.

Churchward gives vent to his true feelings when he denies that there was an anti-Semitic policy during the latter years of the Stalin era (1948-1953). This is a monstrous untruth and has been publicly exposed as such by leading Jewish and non-Jewish Communists. I would refer Mr. Churchward to the 1958 Report of the British Communist Party; to the moving document written by the leading French-Jewish Communist, Dr. Chaim

Sloves; to the dramatic editorial which appeared in the Polish Communist daily "Folkshtymme" entitled "Our Grief and Our Consolation", and not least, to the outspoken statements by Yev-tushenko condemning Stalinist anti-Semitism.

But what is Churchward in effect trying to prove? Is the Cult of the Personality Era any less odious to a Marxist or a humanist if it can be demonstrated that under Stalin the Soviet Regime extended the Black Hundreds policy of the Tsars to encompass all minorities? Unlike Mr. Churchward, I have never defended or justified Stalinism and I do not require his guidance to convince me that the whole Soviet System was one gigantic nightmare under Stalin. But it is surely bad form, merely for the sake of trying to score a point, to suggest that Jews as a national group and as individuals were not at the forefront of those minorities who suffered the brunt of Stalin's inhumanity.

The facts are indisputable. In 1948, virtually overnight, Stalin suppressed all Jewish cultural expression and instituted a deliberate anti-Semitic campaign against Jewish cosmopolitans and Jewish writers. Many Jewish communist intellectuals were executed and imprisoned on charges of Jewish nationalism, Zionism and espionage on behalf of the alleged Jewish spy organization, "The Joint". The anti-Semitic campaign reached its climax with the so called Moscow Doctors Plot just prior to the fortuitous demise of the Soviet Dictator. In view of all this evidence, the exasperating stubbornness of Churchward and some other Marxists in refusing to face the reality of anti-Semitism during the 'Black Years' can only be explained in terms of a residual Stalinist syndrome.

The recognition of Stalinist anti-Semitism by the Soviet authorities is not merely an academic question. Without formally rehabilitating the Jews and conceding Stalinist crimes, the Soviet approach to the problem is bound to be unsatisfactory. In this regard, it is pertinent to point out that whereas minor nationalities who suffered under Stalinism were officially rehabilitated, and a group such as the Volga Germans had their rights reinstated, a conspiracy of silence is still maintained by the Soviet authorities with regard to the Jews.

In this context, the minor religious and cultural concessions recently granted to the Jews by the authorities leave the fundamental issues untouched. The main importance of these concessions rests in the implicit admission of the existence of injustices that were being vehemently denied as fabrications only six months ago. They are primarily a concession to the evergrowing crescendo of public protests which have now extended to the Left and (as in Australia) even included official Communist Parties.

Unfortunately, the question of basic cultural and religious rights (the discriminatory origins of which are to be found during the Stalinist period) and a genuine reassessment of the status of Soviet Jewry in Marxist ideological terms is not yet in sight.

Likewise, the Pravda editorial on national enmity, which appeared on September 5th and incorporated a paragraph on anti-Semitism was welcome, particularly as it was reproduced in sections of the Soviet provincial press. But it has not brought an end to the continued circulation throughout the Soviet Union of books and pamphlets which can only fan anti-Semitism by their vicious negative stereotypes of Judaism and Jewish life.

The approach of Mr. Churchward to the question of Soviet Jewry is reminiscent of similar views ventilated amongst Marxists and progressives in 1956 and 1957. It will be a tragedy for Soviet Jewry if progressives today again are going to utilise a few minor concessions as a pretext for stifling principled protest on the question of Soviet Jewry and reassume the posture of merely acting as public relations centres for the Soviet Union. However, in effect the implications of adopting such a posture would be much wider. They would amount to a victory generally, for the dogmatic and conservative elements in the U.S.S.R. and in the West, who correctly assess the Jewish issue as a measuring rod as to how far deStalinisation and liberalisation tendencies can be resisted.

The Soviet leadership must be convinced that a few token concessions and a passing criticism in an editorial will not satisfy the Protest Movement. Nothing short of a genuine restitution of rights for Soviet Jewry can be accepted. This will involve facing the reality of cultural and religious discrimination; ending rationalised policies of discrimination based on the "numerus clausus"; issuing clear directives to cease the flow of anti-Semitic articles in the mass media and other official publications; conducting a ruthless purge against anti-Semitic elements within the bureaucracy and judiciary; and instituting a clear cut educational campaign to combat anti-Semitism.

Above all, the Soviet authorities must be induced to sanction the reunification of Jewish families separated from their kinsmen in other countries as a result of the war. Such a step is justifiable on humanitarian grounds alone, but there are ample precedents in post war Soviet policy for this. Soviet Armenians today appeal to Armenians in the West to return home, and Poles, Ukrainians, Greeks and Spaniards have all been granted the opportunity of uniting with their families in other countries. Such facilities have also been accorded to Jews in Communist countries other than the Soviet Union.

The whole question of Soviet Jewry revolves on enabling Soviet Jews to have the same rights as other Soviet religious and ethnic minorities. Mr. Churchward, I hope, would not deny that Soviet Jews have an unparalleled history of persecution extending back to the whole Tsarist period, reaching its climax with the Nazi occupation, and continuing on a different level during the Stalinist "Black Years". The plight of Soviet Jewry therefore has no bearing on the Cold War. It is exclusively a question of granting human rights to a people with an unparalleled history of persecution.

The Soviet authorities cannot possibly defend or justify their existing policy towards the Jews. The events of the last six months are a clear illustration that the Soviet leadership is sensitive to open protests and the impact of public opinion. It is the responsibility of all men of good will who respect human rights to ensure that the fires of the Protest Movement be maintained so long as Soviet Jews continue to experience discrimination.

*Another Human Rights Research
Publication*

SOVIET JEWRY

AND

HUMAN RIGHTS

By ISI LEIBLER

PRICE \$1.05

*' . . . Incontrovertible evidence of
the plight of Soviet Jews . . . '*

A Companion Volume

