

done for other nationalities in the Soviet Union.

I hope that it will reestablish the Jewish cultural institutions suppressed during the period of the cult. As is well known, there were numerous Jewish (Yiddish) state theaters, including the foremost Mikhoels State Theater in Moscow. There were publishing houses, including the Emes Publishing House in Moscow; Yiddish newspapers, including the daily *Emes*. There were Yiddish children's schools, seminars for teachers in Yiddish, Yiddish scientific institutes (or subsidiaries of the Academies of Science) in Kiev and Minsk, Communist clubs for lectures, poetry readings, etc., in Yiddish. And there was a magazine in Russian (*Tribuna*) devoted to Jewish affairs, for Jews who do not understand Jewish. I fully support the draft resolution which calls, among other things, "for the restoration of such institutions as a Jewish state theater, Yiddish newspapers, education, and other means of Jewish culture."

Putting the Resolution into Practice

The draft resolution made a deep impression not only in the ranks of the Marxist movement, but also amongst wide circles of Jewish workers, intellectuals and small business people that are not Marxists, and are even op-

ponents of Marxism. Only professional red-baiters and agents of the cold war have attacked the resolution with cynical irresponsibility and with the lamentable spirit of McCarthyism. These are the arch-enemies of democracy and therefore of the Jewish people.

It is, of course, regrettable that the American Jewish Committee, which represents the interests of the upper Jewish bourgeoisie, and which has in recent years shown great sensitivity to the upsurge of anti-Semitism and in the struggle for civil rights found it necessary to make an attack against the resolution and mouth the words of the professional red-baiters and reactionaries. By doing so, the leaders of the American Jewish Committee seek to find grace in the eyes of the reactionaries of the Un-American Activities Committee and of all other non-Jewish reactionary circles who support the military ventures of our "saviors" in Washington and their partners in Bonn.

Honest opponents of the Communist Party who are seriously concerned with the rise of anti-Semitism and racism and who are seriously interested in peace and good will among nations, will see this resolution as an important event for the interests of the Jewish people in our own country and abroad, and for a democratic America.

The Draft Resolution: Some Negative Aspects

The draft resolution on the Jewish question prepared by the National Jewish Commission and published in the August *Political Affairs* contains some positive ideas necessary for a sound final resolution. At the same time, however, the draft also contains a number of negative concepts of a national chauvinist and anti-Soviet character that tend to vitiate whatever is good in the resolution. I shall discuss these negative concepts.

The Fallacy of the "Jewish Community"

Throughout the draft the Jewish people are dealt with abstractly without class content and differentiation. For example, the draft repeatedly refers to "the Jewish community of the U.S.," which is highly organized, possessing over 200 national organizations and thousands of local groups. The impression is definitely created that this is a unique situation where there exists a homogeneous "community" of Jewish people above class.

The reality of the matter is that there is no such "community" as depicted in the draft resolution, either of Jewish people or of any other people in any capitalist country. The one exception exists among the Negro people. There we have the nearest thing to a community because more than 85 per cent of the Negro people are

working people and because of the very special nature of the system of Negro oppression, especially the rigid confinement of the mass of Negro people within slum ghettos.

This false concept is a throwback to historic narrow nationalism reflected in such expressions as "Jewishness" and "Jewish spirit" (Dos Pintele Yid). Such a "community" has no realistic meaning to the Jewish workers in the fur shops or garment shops where there is a daily sharp class struggle with their Jewish bosses, or to Jewish workers in more basic industry controlled by big banks with rich Jews on the boards of directors.

The over 200 national Jewish organizations which include, on the one hand, such organizations as the Workmen's Circle and similar organizations with a socialist background and, on the other hand, Zionist and other organizations with a national chauvinist outlook, do not constitute a "community" even if all of them are also against anti-Semitism. In fact, some Jewish organizations even pull their punches in the struggle against anti-Semitism.

It is revealing that Judah Cahn, a prominent Rabbi, attacked the recent meeting of 40 Jewish leaders, supposedly representing "the Jewish community," with Arthur Goldberg, U.S. representative in the U.N., at

which they discussed President Johnson's expression of disappointment with the lack of support among Jews for his policies in Vietnam, in view of U.S. support of Israel. Rabbi Cahn stated to the press that the 40 Jewish leaders could not represent the Jewish community because "the Jewish community is actually not a community" (*New York Times*, October 2, 1966). But the writers of the draft resolution insist that "the Jewish community retains its existence as a distinct cultural entity, as is demonstrated among other things by the membership in the organizations and religious institutions listed above." Here again is a new entity—this time a "cultural" entity. But like the "community" it is bereft of any class content or differentiation.

This abstract concept of "the Jewish community" is maintained throughout even though on pages 25 and 26 there is reference to different "currents" and to "opposing trends and class pressures within the Jewish community." This differentiation is vitiated by such repeated declarations as "The Jewish community today plays a noteworthy role in the fight for peace and progress." Which current, which trend or class pressure plays that role? It is from such mystic concepts that there arises the fantastic demand on the Soviet Union to organize their "Jewish community" and let it establish contact with "the Jewish community" of other countries.

Another uncritical generalization in the draft is the reference to the growth of Jewish children's schools, mostly under religious domination, with an enrollment of over 600,000, and of the orthodox parochial schools, the Yeshivas, with an enrollment now exceeding 50,000. It is apparently unimportant that much of this growth is due to a chauvinist desire to keep the children away from integrated schools. Nor is there any reference to the reactionary, obscurantist character of these parochial schools. It is precisely such an uncritical approach that feeds the demands of anti-Soviet forces for the establishment of "Jewish schools" in the Soviet Union. In this connection, the draft correctly refers to the Party's draft program where it urges the need to avoid a sectarian approach to religion and religious people. But this reference is one-sided and misleading in that it completely ignores point 2, expressing our disagreement with the supernatural, mystical elements of religion, even though we recognize many positive, humanist values in ethical and moral precepts of the several religions.

The Soviet Union

I must say regretfully that Section IV, dealing with the Soviet Union, in its overall tone and content, can only make it harder to combat the vicious campaign of "Soviet anti-Semitism" in this country. In fact, its con-

tents will probably be used to promote that falsehood.

This section of the draft opens with the statement: "There is also a deep interest among American Jews in the life of Jews in the socialist countries, above all in the Soviet Union." Is this the limit of their interest? Or is this statement the reflection of narrow nationalism in our ranks and departure from class concepts? There is certainly much more proletarian internationalism among many American Jewish workers than is reflected in that opening statement. There is also deep appreciation among many Jews and non-Jews of the role of the Soviet Union in the defeat of Hitler Germany as well as in building socialism.

At this time, when most reactionary forces in the U.S. fan the fires of their "Soviet anti-Semitism" campaign, this draft resolution reopens such "shortcomings" as the Kichko and Schaknowitz anti-religious pamphlets, although fully aware of the fact that these pamphlets have been withdrawn long ago. It repeats again and again the complaint about "the slowness in restoring Jewish culture" while ignoring the fact that there is more Jewish culture in the Soviet Union than in any other country, including Israel. It reaffirms its agreement with the approach in the editorials of *Political Affairs* of June and July 1964 with reference to combatting remnants of anti-Semitism in the USSR, the approach to religion and anti-re-

ligious propaganda, knowing that the situation today is quite different from 1964.

The draft resolution renews the call for the restoration of a Yiddish State Theater, Yiddish newspapers, education and other means of Yiddish culture. It calls for *full* restoration of all the suppressed Yiddish cultural institutions, and declares that failure to meet these demands has enabled the cold war instigators of the "Soviet anti-Semitism" campaign to meet with considerable success.

The truth of the matter is that these irresponsible repetitions and demands for "full" restoration of Yiddish institutions are not only grist to the mill of the anti-Soviet forces, but also provide these forces with a convenient excuse to continue indefinitely their campaign on "Soviet anti-Semitism." This is so because most of these demands have no more to do with the real needs of Soviet Jews than of New York or of Israeli Jews.

Why is there no permanent Yiddish theater in New York? Because the Jews of New York, except perhaps a handful of them, don't want it. Even the *Freiheit* doesn't conduct a campaign for it. Even the rich Jews who can establish such a theater overnight don't do it, because it is cheaper and more advantageous to shout "Soviet anti-Semitism."

The fact that a Yiddish theater existed in the Soviet Union until 1948 doesn't mean that it can exist now with greater linguistic

integration of Soviet Jews. In fact, as far back as 1932 the writer was told that the famous Yiddish Art Theater existed because more non-Jews than Jews attended the shows. The same is true today of the Yiddish theater in Poland. And why is there no demand for a Yiddish theater in Israel?

The 160-page *Soviet Homeland* has 25,000 Jewish readers—probably the biggest Yiddish publication in the world. Yet 470,000 Soviet Jews still consider Yiddish as their tongue. Why then doesn't *Soviet Homeland* have a larger circulation? My guess is because when 470,000 Soviet Jews state on a questionnaire that their mother tongue is Yiddish, it doesn't mean that they are still using that mother tongue. With a Jewish population of 5,500,000 in the U.S., probably more than 470,000 would declare their mother tongue to be Yiddish. Yet the combined circulation of all three Yiddish newspapers in New York is only about 100,000. And these papers feel obliged to have English sections.

Already in 1955 an English authority said that "it is surely unrealistic to look forward to a flourishing Yiddish literature in England or America." The reason is, of course, that the overwhelming majority of the Jewish people in England and the U.S. are clearly linguistically integrated. This is even more true of the Soviet Union, because of the extraordinary educational opportunities available and used by

the Jewish people there.

Therefore, to demand from the Soviet Union the "full" restoration of all Yiddish institutions is sheer irresponsibility. When Communists make such demands, they reflect national chauvinist tendencies and unwittingly help the spread of the falsehood of "Soviet anti-Semitism."

This does not mean that we must gloss over wrong and harmful practices in socialist countries. It *does* mean that we must be responsible and tell the truth. At the present time what is called for is an offensive against all campaigns of slander and falsehood directed against the Soviet Union from the U.S. and Israel. It is our sacred obligation to expose every lie and intrigue against the socialist countries, remembering that such lies and intrigues are directed against the interests of the American people as well as the people of the socialist countries. When reactionary haters of the Soviet Union attempt to send prayer books to the Soviet Union as a means of smuggling in secret messages for anti-Soviet intrigues under the cover of religion, we must expose them. Such people do not propose to send them because of an interest in prayer books or prayers. For them the prayer book is an anti-Soviet weapon and not a religious book.

When Israeli leaders promote a campaign of falsehoods against so-called "Soviet anti-Semitism" to blackmail the Soviet Union with the aim of advancing the

Zionist objective of "ingathering of all Jews in the homeland of Israel," we must expose them.

When apologists for racism and Negro oppression in the U.S. compare the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union with the treatment of Negroes in this country, we must expose their lies with the truth about the limitless opportunities for Jews in the Soviet Union for the fullest participation and creativity in every phase of Soviet life.

We must repeat a thousand times the fact that the Soviet government took immediate and timely steps to evacuate Jews from the danger spots of Nazi invasion and thus saved millions of Jews from Hitlerite extermination. Let the anti-Soviet propagandists explain what kind of "anti-Semitism" can exist in a country capable of such humanism. It is particularly dastardly that a campaign against "anti-Semitism" should be directed against the one country that did

more than any other to destroy anti-Semitism.

Comrade Novick's article on "national nihilism" deserves special attention, which cannot be given here. I will only say this much now: nations and nationalities will not exist forever. The historic process will be that of national amalgamation, and that process will be set in motion under socialism not by hurried and forcible means, but by the higher needs arising from a higher, more human and more reasonable social, economic and cultural order. The process of national amalgamation is beginning to develop and will continue to develop even while at the same time new nations arise as a result of the liberation of peoples from the yoke of colonialism. One does not contradict the other.

I have concentrated on the negative features of the draft resolution because these features must be removed for the resolution to be meaningful and sound.

DANIEL RUBIN

Comments on the Resolution

Focus of the Discussion

A discussion is now taking place on the draft resolution prepared and issued by the Jewish Commission of the Communist Party. That we are holding such a discussion is, of course, a step forward. But unfortunately, judg-

ing from written materials in the discussion and reports of it from around the country, its focus is not always the best, in this writer's opinion. Too often it is focused on one or more of the following: Israel, Jewish life in the USSR, how much assimilation is there in the U.S., and as a less significant