

JEWISH AFFAIRS

25¢

Vol. 2, No. 1

January 1971

CONTENTS

Editorials

- The Leningrad Case 1
- The "Jewish Defense League"--
Anti-Soviet Spearhead 3
- Hyman Lumer, The Leningrad Trials
and the Anti-Soviet Drive 6
- Sholom Aleichem, A Letter to Dr.
Ferfel 12
- Lee Carr, The Jewish People and
the Fight to Free Angela Davis 13

From DER VEG

- Why the World Doesn't Believe the
Israeli Government 16
- Soviet Jew Tells How He Was Misled
by Zionist Propaganda 17
- On Anti-Soviet Incitements in Israel 19

Communications

- A Reader, Right-Wing Violence and
"Law and Order" 20
- Charles Selikson, Jews in the Soviet
Union 22

EDITORIALS

THE LENINGRAD CASE

(The following editorial is reprinted from the Daily World of December 29, 1970.)

The statements of Premier Golda Meir and of the Israeli Kneset, that the 11 hijackers convicted in Leningrad are "innocent," are refuted by the statements of the hijackers in court, and by the statements of Mrs. Meir and the Kneset.

The Kneset statement, for example sought to subvert Soviet citizens to "fight for Zion's sake," and to incite "Jewish national awakening" and "yearning to settle in Israel."

Involved in this Tel Aviv enterprise is only a handful of Soviet Jews entrapped by the Meir-Dayan regime. The millions of Soviet Jews are Soviet patriots, part of the great collective building socialism. They have not been, nor could they be, gulled by the CIA's agents in Israel.

The Tel Aviv operation is, in fact, one facet of the worldwide, anti-Soviet, anti-socialist enterprise to which U.S. monopoly capital and, especially, its CIA are dedicated.

That is the cause which the Tel Aviv regime serves and through it the 11 hijackers, whether Jews or non-Jews.

The Israeli regime's attempt to portray the hijackers as innocents is especially hypocritical. Last March an Israeli security guard killed a hijacker at Munich in Western Germany: six months later, two Israeli security guards killed one hijacker, and wounded another hijacker and two passengers and a steward aboard a plane which was diverted to London. Earlier this year the Israeli government sought to have sanctions invoked against any government giving refuge to hijackers.

The U.S. government, similarly, condemned all hijackings early in September, ordered armed guards aboard planes, called for the extradition of hijackers by treaty, and warned that danger to passengers was inevitable in hijackings.

Any attempt to portray the Leningrad hijacking plot as somehow different is simply cold war hypocrisy.

The Soviet government's vigilance prevented the hijacking attempt. The possibility of deaths aboard the plane, had it succeeded in taking off, is clear. Only weeks ago, a stewardess was murdered aboard a Soviet plane by two hijackers who forced the plane to land in Turkey.

The Leningrad hijackers had weapons: their intentions were desperate. The guns were not department store toys or dummy weapons

for an attempt at make-believe. They were lethal weapons to be used to take over a Soviet plane whatever the price.

Mark Dymshits, one of the two sentenced to death, is reported by the New York Times (which has its sources) to have said at the trial: "Many of us met only on the last day" before the hijack attempt. This points clearly to a widespread plot whose direction came from outside the Soviet Union. It began in 1969, months before the arrests in June 1970. The operating center was undoubtedly Tel Aviv, with the main plans "Made in U.S.A." and financed out of the CIA's \$3 billion budget.

The 11 were recruited by Tel Aviv and the CIA not to fulfill their alleged yearnings for Israel, but as cannon fodder in the war against the Soviet Union and socialism.

The venomous anti-Soviet and anti-socialist character of the Leningrad attempt, and of the wider conspiracy of which it is a part, was made evident in the burning of the Soviet flag at a demonstration last Friday near the Soviet embassy in Washington.

The true spirit of the Meir-Dayan regime is expressed not in its cries of injured innocence, but in its military seizure and refusal to restore the stolen Arab lands and, above all, its lick-spittle attitude to the U.S. White House. It has been the most shameless in seconding the murderous aggression in Vietnam. It has applauded the murder of Vietnamese men, women and children, so that it could have Washington's support to conquer the Arabs. Its cries about the Leningrad 11 will not cover up its guild in the theft of the Arab lands.

None the less, on examination of the hijack plot, its nature and ramifications, we come to the conclusion that the interests of mankind will best be served if, while continuing their Socialist vigilance, the Soviet authorities commute the two death sentences.

o o o o o

JEWISH AFFAIRS is published monthly by the Communist Party, U.S.A. Price per copy 25¢. Subscriptions: one year \$2.50, six months \$1.25. Address all correspondence to JEWISH AFFAIRS, 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.

o o o

THE "JEWISH DEFENSE LEAGUE"
ANTI-SOVIET SPEARHEAD

As time goes on the despicable gang of hoodlums calling itself the Jewish Defense League becomes more and more brazen and violent. And increasingly prominent among the targets of its stormtrooper attacks are Soviet institutions and cultural activities in this country. The following is but a partial account of these hoodlum exploits, both open and covert.

Last February a concert by violinist David Oistrakh and pianist Sviatoslav Richter at Carnegie Hall in New York City was disrupted by the JDL. This followed upon earlier disruptions of performances by the Moscow Philharmonic Orchestra in Washington, D.C. and Brooklyn, New York.

In March, 28 pictures at a USSR Photo '70 exhibit in New York were defaced. The JDL praised this vandalism though it publicly denied having done it.

In June a JDL gang raided the offices of the Amtorg Trading Corporation, causing much damage and beating up the head of the organization. Twenty-seven of them were later arrested.

In August 3,500 spectators were evacuated from a Chicago theater after tear gas grenades were thrown as a performance of the Moiseyev Dancers was about to begin.

In November a bomb was exploded at the Aeroflot and Intourist agency offices in New York. This action, too, was publicly praised but denied by the JDL, but like others it was accompanied by anonymous telephone calls employing typical JDL expressions.

This last outrage compelled the Nixon Administration, "embarrassed by a string of incidents against Soviet offices in Washington and in New York" (New York Times, November 26, 1970), to issue a statement condemning the "senseless, criminal" bombing. It is notorious, however, that almost no effort has been made to put a stop to these acts or to punish those responsible. Indeed, the toleration and coddling of these fascist-like elements stands in glaring contrast to the murderous assaults by the police, the courts and other ruling-class agencies on the Black Panthers and other militants.

There is no doubt that it is primarily the JDL which is responsible. Indeed, in a television interview on December 27, the JDL's mentor, Rabbi Kahane, declared that this gang aims to break up all cultural exchange between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

But the outrageous acts have continued. This month a lead-pipe bomb was exploded at a Soviet office and residential building in Washington, D.C., doing considerable damage to the building and to neighboring houses. In New York a plate glass window

of the Aeroflot office was smashed. Soviet diplomats in New York and Washington were followed by JDL hoodlums and cursed and insulted. And Kahane threatened that Soviet diplomats would be assaulted.

It is not only Soviet offices which have been affected. Recently Arab and African representatives in the UN called attention to terrorist acts against their Permanent UN Missions. Thus, Ambassador Mohamed Alwan of Iraq, as reported by Winston Berry in his weekly newsletter United Nations Report (December 23, 1970), spoke of attacks by the JDL on Arab UN Missions and on the quarters of other Arab organizations. He demanded to know why these elements, which had terrorized diplomatic missions and even attempted to hijack a plane were left free to pursue such activities without government restraint. They raised the question of moving the UN headquarters to another country in view of the failure of the U.S. government to assure the security of UN Missions and representatives.

Soviet spokesmen have also repeatedly protested the failure of the U.S. authorities to take adequate measures against these acts. Finally, on December 11, the U.S. Ambassador to the USSR was given a note in Moscow stating that the visits of the Bolshoi opera and ballet companies, scheduled for the coming spring, were being cancelled.

The reason given was "provocations perpetrated by Zionist extremists against Soviet institutions in the United States, as well as against Soviet artistic groups...." Moreover, it was charged, the U.S. authorities, despite repeated protests, "do not take the required measures to stop these criminal actions, thereby actually encouraging them."

More recently, on January 5, the Soviet government delivered a second note calling attention to the continued failure of U.S. authorities to protect Soviet facilities and personnel. It stated: "Zionist extremists not only interfere with the normal functioning of the Soviet representatives in the United States, but also venture to threaten openly Soviet diplomats and other Soviet citizens with physical reprisals."

Moreover, the note charged, though the U.S. government had promised protection, it was in fact "conniving at criminal actions" with those perpetrating them. Under these circumstances, it warned, the United States could hardly expect the assurance of normal working conditions for U.S. premises in the USSR.

So far only a bare beginning has been made toward curbing these fascist hoodlums. Some have been indicted for certain of their actions and Kahane has been arrested. But this is far from enough to meet the situation.

In the light of these developments the reason for the Soviet actions would seem to be quite clear. But for Zionist spokesmen in this country, this is entirely too simple. Judd L. Teller states, in a letter to the New York Times on the cancellation of the Bolshoi visit (December 21, 1970): "The conduct of the Jewish Defense League, however reprehensible--and it has been denounced by all responsible Jewish bodies--is not the true reason." The real motivation, according to Teller, was the forthcoming hijacking trials. He says:

"The cancellation of the tour and the reasons given for it would seem to be a curtain raiser for these forthcoming trials. It is also an advance effort, it would seem to me, to confuse American public opinion about the true purposes behind the trials and dissuade American authorities from remarking on them."

The meaning of the trials is discussed elsewhere in this issue. But Teller's "explanation" (for which he offers not one bit of evidence) reveals not the "real" Soviet motives but rather his own intense anti-Sovietism and his own liberalism toward groups like the JDL. It is true, as he says, that the JDL has been denounced by every significant Jewish organization. But the denunciations are based simply on tactical considerations.

The objection of these organizations is not to the JDL's anti-Soviet aims (which the leaders of these organizations share) but only to its methods, which are condemned on the grounds that they are counterproductive. Teller seeks to "liberate" the Soviet Jews no less than does Rabbi Kahane; he condemns the JDL only on the grounds that its tactics "hurt the Soviet Jews." And this community of goals blinds Teller to the gravity of the failure of U.S. federal and local agencies to insure the safety and security of Soviet, as well as Arab and African institutions, and also of Soviet artists performing in this country. It blinds him to the ominous meaning--for U.S. Jews themselves--of the whole assault on the Black, Puerto Rican and Chicano peoples.

What is required is not mere verbal denunciations but action to put an end to the criminal activities of the JDL and similar elements. And what is required is condemnation of their anti-Sovietism and their racism. It is these things, whether on the part of a Kahane or a Teller, that threaten the future of all Jews.

Finally - and not least - the demand must be raised on all sides that government authorities end their collusion with these hoodlum elements and put a stop to their criminal activities.

THE LENINGRAD TRIALS AND THE ANTI-SOVIET DRIVE

By Hyman Lumer

With the trial of the eleven Leningrad hijackers* the long-standing disgraceful campaign conducted in this country against alleged "Soviet anti-Semitism" reached an unprecedented pitch of hysteria. Now, it was charged, Soviet Jews were to be imprisoned and even executed for no other reason than desiring to migrate to Israel.

Characteristic of this whole unreasoning onslaught is a total disregard of facts or logic and a readiness to accept at face value any libel whatever against the Soviet Union. Illustrative of this is a letter which appeared in the New York Times on December 30, 1970, signed by Theodore M. Hesburgh, Arthur Miller, Hans J. Morgenthau, Bayard Rustin, Telford Taylor and twelve others whose names are not given.

The defendants, says the letter, "were not accused of an actual hijacking or of a physical or violent attempt to hijack, or of actual or planned violence of any sort." They were sentenced to prison or execution "merely for having discussed and planned emigration to Israel." Even more, says the letter, "their real crime, as one of them put it, 'was that they were born Jews and wished to remain Jews.'" In short, say the letter's signers, the trial was nothing more than an outrageous act of anti-Semitism perpetrated by the Soviet government.

But the facts tell a different story. These people were arrested at the airport as they were preparing to board a plane with arms in their possession and with the intention, as they themselves admitted, of hijacking it. (And we have yet to hear of a non-violent hijacking.) If they failed to carry out this act, it was only because they were caught before they could do so. Moreover, they were charged with seeking to leave the country illegally, which Soviet law treats as a serious crime. The signers of the letter may not like this particular law, but this in no way lessens the right of the Soviet government to try people for violating it.

In any case the defendants did confess in court to attempting to hijack a plane, and this is regarded as a very serious crime not only by the Soviet Union but also by virtually all other countries, including Israel--at least when the hijackers are Arabs, in which case no punishment is too severe. Let us recall that two Soviet planes had already been hijacked to Turkey, and that in one instance a Soviet stewardess was killed. Let us recall, too, that

*The twelfth of the group, Vulf Zalmanson, was later tried separately in a military court and also sentenced to prison.

in an attempt to hijack an El Al airliner in London, Israeli guards killed one hijacker and seriously wounded another. And the Israeli government insisted on the arrest and extradition of Leila Khaled, one of those involved, and strongly opposed any deal to free her in exchange for the release of the passengers held hostage. This, be it noted, despite the fact that her motive--the freedom of her people--was certainly no less noble than wanting to live in Israel.

On December 16 the International Civil Aviation Organization adopted a convention against hijacking, calling for severe penalties. And in the United States armed guards have been placed on planes, ready to shoot if need be. In a word, everywhere hijacking is looked upon as a plague to be stamped out by whatever means are required. And this is the nub of the question. As Meir Vilner, general secretary of the Communist Party of Israel, said in a recent speech in the Knesset, the real question is: "Is it permitted or forbidden to hijack a Soviet aeroplane for political reasons? This is the question and there is no other one. Whoever doubts the very possibility that in Leningrad it has been attempted to hijack a Soviet plane is nothing but a demagogue who is not at all interested in the facts."

To be sure, it was widely felt that the death sentence was too harsh and many urged commutation, among others the Daily World. But this has nothing in common with the kind of campaign waged by the crusaders against "Soviet anti-Semitism." From the very day the arrests became known they set up their cry that here were people arrested only for being Jews, and that all charges against them were trumped up. Thus the Jerusalem Post of September 20 declares: "The ostensible reason provided for the arrests by the Soviet authorities was that the Jews had planned to hijack the plane out of the U.S.S.R. There is however evidence that the secret police dreamed up the charges to provide an excuse for the arrests."

During October the New York Times carried a steady stream of ads in its pages, each headed "Another Kangaroo Court?" Each contained the picture of one of those arrested, with the caption: "This man and 30 other Jews are being held in Soviet prisons!" And each concluded with: "Premier Kosygin, Free Soviet Jews!" The sponsor of the ads was the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, chief clearing-house for the whole anti-Soviet drive. The inference is plain. If 31 Jews are arrested in the Soviet Union it can only be an act of official anti-Semitism. What are the charges against them? Could they be true? Such questions are not even asked. What we have here is not an effort to develop a position based on ascertaining the facts but rather a deliberate campaign to build a case against the Soviet Union, and this is the essence of the whole fraudulent campaign against "Soviet anti-Semitism."

It is worth noting that those who are so concerned about alleged injustices to Soviet Jews show little concern about real in-

justices done to others. The Leningrad trial coincided with that of 15 Basques in Franco Spain. The latter, members of a guerrilla group whose declared aims are Basque freedom and socialism, received a travesty of a trial at the hands of the fascist Franco government and were given sentences considerably harsher than those imposed in the Leningrad case. Indeed, they were "far harsher than had been expected even in Spanish political circles of the hardest line." (New York Times, December 29, 1970.)

Many throughout the world protested these sentences and, as in the Leningrad cases, the death sentences were commuted. But in this obvious instance of fascist repression did the signers of the above letter protest them? Did the Jewish organizations which are devoting themselves so wholeheartedly to castigating the Soviet government do so? Hardly. After all, Basques are not Jews. And after all, Franco is easing restrictions on Jews in Spain.

Or when a Soviet plane was hijacked to Turkey and a stewardess killed, did these Jewish leaders and organizations join in demanding the extradition and punishment of the hijackers? On the contrary. After all, it was a Soviet plane. And after all, anyone who escapes from the Soviet Union, by whatever means, performs a noble act.

Such is the weird morality engendered by hidebound Jewish nationalism. And such is the virulent anti-Sovietism bred by Zionist ideology.

The disregard for facts exhibited in the Leningrad case is by no means confined to it. In fact, it is characteristic of the whole anti-Soviet crusade, which is itself based on an extensive tissue of lies. To illustrate the point the letter cited above also speaks of "a nationally concerted secret police action aimed at militant Jews who have [among other things] secretly dared to study Jewish history and the Hebrew language." The canard that the teaching of these subjects (and of the Yiddish language) is illegal in the Soviet Union is widely propagated. But it is an outright lie.

In Leningrad itself, where the trial took place, it happens that at Leningrad University, according to the Soviet journalist, Solomon Rabinovich:

... A very important course of lectures is delivered by Professor Isaac Vinnikov, the universally acknowledged head of the Leningrad school of Semitologists and Hebraists, a linguist and ethnographer of world importance, an expert on the Hebrew, Aramaic, Syrian, Phoenician, Ugaritic and Arabic languages. His lectures on Biblical texts always evoke great interest. Recently on Professor Vinnikov's initiative, a course in spoken modern Hebrew was included in the curriculum.

Isaac Vinnikov's pupil, Gita Gluskina, teaches Hebrew grammar at the University and with the students reads Biblical texts containing folklore and also historical and philosophical treatises. Under her guidance students learn to appreciate the beauty of the medieval poetry of Yehuda Halevi, Moses ibn Ezra and Solomon ibn Gabirol and acquaint themselves with the fundamentals of Jewish poetry.

Professor Vinnikov's pupil, Greta Demidova, teaches students Aramaic.... She also conducts lessons in the Hebrew language. (Jews in the Soviet Union, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1967, p. 78.)

In addition to this a comprehensive Hebrew-Russian dictionary was published only a few years ago. Moreover, Soviet news sources reported early last year that in Leningrad special courses in Yiddish had been organized by a group of parents. The authorities had aided them in getting teachers and classrooms, for which they paid a nominal fee. And to this may be added the fact that the Yiddish monthly Sovietish Heimland has for soem time been presenting lessons in Yiddish in its pages.

Yet we are asked to believe that these "militant Jews" were being compelled to conduct secret classes in Hebrew! And more, that they were being punished for doing so!

This is only one of many fabrications touching on all aspects of Soviet Jewish life. Indeed, the general picture which is being painted of an official Soviet policy of anti-Semitism is itself a monstrous lie. Space prohibits our dealing with all this here; however, we shall do so in later articles.

- - -

Today the anti-Soviet offensive is geared to the slogan, "Let my people go." Not only are Soviet Jews persecuted in the Soviet Union, it is alleged; they are also forbidden to leave to escape their persecution. Not only are Jews forbidden to live as Jews; they are also forbidden to go to Israel where they may do so. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is invoked, which assures to everyone the "right to leave any country, including his own."

It is true that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have followed a policy of restricting emigration, not only of Jews but of all citizens. Emigration is regarded not as an automatic right but as a privilege.

Why has such a policy been adopted? The basic reason is that the ruling circles in the capitalist countries (and above all in the United States), motivated by a desire to destroy socialism, have sought systematically to undermine the economies of the socialist countries in every possible way. Among other things, they have sought to accomplish this by draining these countries of skilled and scientific personnel. In addition to this, they have

worked to acquire a body of emigres and defectors who could be used as instruments of propaganda against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The CIA and other official agencies of subversion devote much of their energies to achieving these aims. It may be recalled, for example, that at the time of the unsuccessful counterrevolution in Hungary in 1956, many thousands of Hungarian youth were induced to flee the country by painting rosy pictures of the blessings that awaited them in capitalist America. Later a considerable part of them returned, disillusioned. However, a substantial number remained, including highly trained people, thus weakening the building of socialism in Hungary.

Under such circumstances, to allow unrestricted emigration would be fatal. This the German Democratic Republic learned at great cost when the open border between East and West Berlin was used by the Bonn regime in a systematic campaign (financed with American dollars) to plunder it of its manpower, goods and finances. Only by building the Berlin Wall and severely restricting emigration did it become possible to halt this and to register the great achievements in the building of socialism which have since occurred in the GDR.

In the Soviet Union every application for an exit permit is considered in the light not only of the desires and interests of the applicant but also of the effect on the interests of the country as a whole, as well as on the relations of the Soviet Union with the rest of the world. With regard to requests to go to Israel, the recent pamphlet Soviet Jews: Fact and Fiction (Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1970) states:

In view of the exceptionally strained situation in the Middle East brought about by incessant acts of aggression on the part of Israeli extremists, Soviet emigration authorities carefully consider each application to go to Israel. In so doing they seek to foresee all possible consequences of permitting their citizens to go there.

The situation that has developed in that part of the world compels the Soviet emigration authorities, in considering such applications, to take into account not only the interests of the applicants but those of the Soviet state and the friendly Arab countries--victims of continuing Israeli aggression.

The Israeli government has been carrying on a policy of de facto annexation of the occupied territories and of seeking to populate them with Jews. It is this which underlies the officially sponsored campaign of anti-Soviet slander in Israel with the

aim of compelling the Soviet Union to permit Jews to migrate freely to that country. But the Soviet Union considers that the conquered territories do not belong to Israel and must be returned to the Arab countries from which they were taken. Therefore it does not propose to lend itself to any schemes for helping to secure their annexation through the immigration of Soviet Jews.

In past years the Soviet authorities had issued permits to go to Israel at the rate of some 200 a month, primarily for the purpose of reuniting families. After the 1967 war the number was sharply reduced, but more recently it has been somewhat increased. According to Louis A. Pincus, head of the Jewish Agency in Tel Aviv, about 1,000 Soviet Jews had come to Israel in 1970. Undoubtedly, if the situation in the Middle East changes, in particular if the Israeli ruling circles abandon their present aggressive policies, Soviet policy on Jewish migration to Israel will change accordingly.

It does not follow, however, that if the barriers were lowered there would be a mass exodus of Jews. The estimate being peddled here that half a million or more would leave for Israel if they could represents little more than wishful thinking. And those engaged in the present clamor for migration, despite the efforts of Zionist and other anti-Soviet spokesmen to inflate their numbers, represent only a comparative handful.

There are some progressives who argue, therefore, that the Soviet government would do better to let this handful of trouble-makers go, thereby both ridding itself of an internal nuisance and depriving the anti-Soviet slanderers of a propaganda weapon. But one cannot put an end to slander by capitulating to it. When the Polish government, after the 1967 war, sought to solve a similar problem by opening the doors to Jewish migration to Israel, this was promptly attacked as an act of gross anti-Semitism. "Why are Polish Jews permitted to go only to Israel?" it was asked, implying that other Polish citizens could migrate freely wherever they pleased--which was obviously not true. Actually an exception to the general emigration laws was being made for those Jews who might want to go to Israel. Because of these attacks the Polish government was eventually compelled to rescind its action, whereupon it was promptly attacked for not allowing Jews to go to Israel!

By the same token, the Soviet Union cannot solve any problems by tolerating hijacking. Were it to proceed on the path of basing its policies on depriving its enemies of propaganda ammunition, it would end by going out of existence. It must therefore determine its policies, having carefully weighed all aspects of a question, on the basis of its own best interests and of those of the world forces of peace, national freedom and socialism at whose head it stands.

Here in the United States the primary responsibility of progressive forces is to combat the eternal campaigns of subversion

and counterrevolution plotted by U.S. imperialism in the socialist and newly-liberated countries, as well as the imperialist policies of the Nixon Administration in the Middle East.

o o o

A LETTER TO DR. FERFEL

By Sholom Aleichem

(The following letter, discovered a few years ago, was written to a Dr. Ferfel, editor of the Vegetarian Observer of Kiev. It was published in Yiddish in the Jewish Day and Journal and later in English translation in the Jewish Week of Washington, D.C.)

My honored friend Ferfel:

A remarkable coincidence! Simultaneously with your lovely letter, I also received a letter from Dr. Zamenhof, the creator of Esperanto. He asked permission to translate some of my stories into Esperanto. Vegetarianism, Esperanto, spring from virtually the same ideological base. I am deeply convinced that in the very near future, let us say within a thousand or two thousand years, the whole of mankind will become Vegetarian; everyone will speak one language--Esperanto; and everyone will adopt one religion, obviously the Jewish faith.

I am astonished at your saying that in my works you detect a sympathy for Vegetarianism. How right you are! You have guessed the truth! I have many times wanted to become a Vegetarian, but first my sinful soul didn't let me, and presently my illness.

I am indeed grateful for the pamphlets you sent to me. I have read your magazine with great affection, and I ask you not to leave me without it in the future. I regret that I, personally, cannot participate in your publication because I am not a specialist in that genre. You may, if you wish, publish the last two chapters of my story, "The Couple." Somewhere I also have a piece, entitled "Tsar Baleh-Chayim" (Have Pity On the Animals). If I find it, I shall gladly send it to you. Perhaps it will be useful to you.

There is only one question that bothers me: If all Jews were to stop eating meat, what would happen to all "Shochtim" and "Rabanim"? What would happen to all the Dietary Laws? What would happen to "Milchiks" and "Fleishiks"? God of the Universe, what a revolution! Nothing to laugh at.

Yours,

Sholem Aleichem

THE JEWISH PEOPLE AND THE FIGHT TO FREE ANGELA DAVIS

By Lee Carr

The attempt of the U.S. ruling class to murder the militant Black Communist woman leader, Angela Davis, has as its basic aim the undermining of the Black people's struggle for freedom. The Reagans, the J. Edgar Hoovers and the Nixons seek to make her an example of what can happen to any Black leader who embarks on the path of Marxism-Leninism and uses this science to set Black people free.

The frameup of Angela Davis is not, however, an isolated case. It is part of a larger pattern of political repression against those who oppose the government's policies of racism and imperialist aggression. The murders of Fred Hampton and other Black Panther leaders and the trials of Bobby Seale and other Panthers are especially striking evidence of the way Washington intends to silence and behead its critics.

For the Jewish people of our nation in particular this attempt on the life of Angela Davis represents a great peril. Reactionary ruling classes have long used anti-Semitism as a divisive weapon and as a basis for political frameups of those among the Jewish people who fought for democratic or revolutionary change. To be sure there were, as there are today, Jewish capitalists and others who lined up with the ruling-class reactionaries, who sought to keep the Jewish masses silent and isolated from the non-Jewish democratic forces, who sought respectability and favors at the table of the oppressors. But there were many others among the masses of Jewish working people who saw their interests in joining hands in struggle with their non-Jewish brothers against feudal and capitalist oppressors. The Jewish workers in Tsarist Russia who joined the movement for socialism were just such an example. And with this tradition and understanding, many Jews were involved in struggles against ruling-class frameups--the Dreyfus case, the IWW frameups during World War I, the Sacco-Vanzetti case, the Tom Mooney case, the cases of the Scottsboro Boys and the Martinsville Seven, the Rosenberg case, and today the Black Panthers and other frameup victims.

Many Jewish people see the Angela Davis case as an attack on the Black people's freedom movement and therefore an attack on them. They well remember the statement: "Scratch a Negro-hater and you will find a Jew-hater." They also remember how the biggest anti-Semite of them all, Adolph Hitler, walked out on the Black American athlete, Jesse Owens, at the Olympics. They remember that you cannot fight anti-Semitism without fighting white racism, and they see these as two sides of the same coin of oppression. These facts must be recalled to those Jewish Americans who have temporarily fallen victim to racist attempts to drive a wedge between Black and Jewish people.

Today, to keep the Jewish people from speaking out for Angela Davis' freedom, reaction is resorting to the vilest anti-Soviet and anti-Communist campaign in history. It falsely slanders the country whose Red Army saved the lives of millions of Jews, while it covers up the fact that it was the capitalist countries whose delay in opening up the second front and whose restrictions on immigration were responsible for the needless deaths of great numbers of Jews. It strives to blur the fact that the Birchers, Klansmen and other assorted pro-fascist and anti-Semitic elements rallying behind the Reagan-Nixon-Hoover attempt to murder Angela Davis would not hesitate to commit genocide against the Jews should the situation arise.

The major Jewish organizations have avoided the Angela Davis case, as if the issue didn't exist. The reason for this may be gleaned from a recent article in Congress Bi-Weekly by Judd Teller. He writes: "Even if it were true that the Black Panthers are the victim of a judicial conspiracy--and this is yet to be proven, even as their guilt is yet to be proven--there are a number of questions that a Jew should consider before striking an instant liberal posture. Is there not good reason to fear that the monies raised for the Black Panthers' defense will be deflected to their political purposes, even as were monies raised by the Communists in the 1930's for the defense of both real and fictitious victims of that time?" To Mr. Teller, apart from his slanderous allegations, fictitious stories of political repression in the Soviet Union are real, while real cases of political repression in the United States in the 1930's are fictitious. He says further: "The abstention of Jews from contributing to the Black Panthers' defense or from conducting their defense will not jeopardize the outcome of their case. Jews are a very small percentage of the population.... Moreover, the Black Panthers are anti-Israel and anti-Jewish. Beneath all the euphemisms the two positions remain identical."

There we have it. The big Jewish organizations do not need to speak out against repression since the Jews have little influence in any case (though this argument is discarded when it comes to whipping up hysteria against the Soviet Union). And besides, the victims are against the policies of the Israeli government and therefore anti-Semitic. That they are victims of brutal persecution and as such deserve to be defended apart from their political views, is apparently of little import. To such grovelling before U.S. ruling circles have these Zionist leaders been reduced!

Small wonder then that when the defense of Angela Davis is raised with some Jewish leaders, they state that they are aware that she is the innocent victim of a frameup but that they can do nothing, since to support her would ally them with groups that are "anti-Israel." And this presumably includes the Communist Party of which she is a member. Here we see once again how support of the reactionary Zionist position in the Middle East leads to

abandonment of the struggle against reaction on other fronts and to strengthening the same forces of imperialist reaction which are also the most dangerous enemies of the Jewish people.

But not all Jewish organizations have been silent. Two progressive Jewish organizations have spoken out. The Emma Lazarus Federation of Women's Clubs came out against extradition and said that "Miss Davis has been a forceful fighter against repression and racism in the struggles of her people. We Jewish women are deeply concerned for we know what it is to be a member of an oppressed minority." The Jewish Cultural Clubs called upon Governor Rockefeller "to refuse to send Angela Davis back to the repressive and racist mercies of those powers in California who would figuratively 'burn her at the stake' for being a heroic and fearless fighter for her people and true democracy in our country."

Rank-and-file groups in unions with large Jewish memberships have also spoken out. Among these are the Garment Workers' Committee for Angela Davis in New York City and the Teachers' Action Committee, a group within the United Federation of Teachers. The leaderships of these unions, however, have evaded the issue.

The actions are important and an omen of things to come. But they have not yet touched the major elements of Jewish life, and this remains the most urgent task. Every effort must be made to involve the main sections of the Jewish community in the fight to free Angela Davis. Jewish politicians and legislators must not be allowed to duck the issue. The campaign must break into the press --for example, through newspaper ads initiated and signed by Jewish individuals and groups.

The struggle for the freedom of Angela Davis and for an end to political repression will be a hard one, and the Jewish people of our country must be in its front ranks. Their own freedom is at stake.

- - - -

Among the conclusions reached in the American Friends Service Committee study, Search for Peace in the Middle East (Philadelphia, 1970, price 75¢) are the following:

"It is the judgment of the authors of this paper that without certain definite first moves by Israel, which only the militarily dominant power can make, progress toward a settlement of the Middle East situation cannot be made. These first moves should involve firm public commitments to withdraw from the Arab territories and to aid in the search for positive solutions to the Palestinian refugee problem. Such moves will be proof of strength, not 'confession of weakness.'

From DER VEG

(The following items are translated from the progressive Yiddish weekly, Der Veg, published in Tel Aviv. For the information of our Yiddish-speaking readers, air mail subscriptions to it are available at the rate of \$12.00 a year. Write to: Der Veg, 61 Maze Street, Tel Aviv, Israel.)

WHY THE WORLD DOESN'T BELIEVE THE ISRAELI GOVERNMENT

(November 18, 1970)

The influential Israeli newspaper Haaretz (October 25, 1970) published a letter by Z. Sobol, Assistant Dean of the Faculty for the Study of Humanities at Haifa University. Professor Sobol was highly critical of a statement made on October 7 by a member of the Meir Cabinet, I Galili, in which this hawkish Minister admitted that the Israeli Government intends to keep the Gaza Strip, occupied in the 1967 War. He gave his full support to this annexationist line, saying: "Each time I visit the Gaza Strip I become more and more convinced that our Government came to the right conclusion that the Strip should never again come under foreign domination and must not ever be separated from the territory of Israel."

Professor Sobol takes sharp exception to this. He points out that such a chauvinistic and annexationist statement by an Israeli Minister undermines the confidence of world opinion in the peace declarations of the Meir government. His letter follows:

"I have read in Haaretz, dated October 8, that the policy of our government is not to return the Gaza Strip. This was made clear in a statement by Minister Galili who fully supports this line.

"We say that we cannot understand why the Arabs do not trust us and why world public opinion is inclined to oppose the political position of the Israeli government.

"To me this trend in world public opinion is fully understandable. On the one hand, we are told by the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Abba Eban) that the world does not realize the extent to which our government is willing to go in order to meet the conditions of the Arab States for peace negotiations. On the other hand we find out, through statements made by other Ministers, that we cannot allow ourselves to be generous in respect to the occupied territory on the West Bank of the River Jordan, which must not be abandoned; that Hebron and Bethlehem are holy cities which cannot be returned to the Arabs; that Jerusalem must remain within the Israeli borders and that any consent by our government to share Jerusalem

with any other country is out of the question. Our government is unwilling to give up the Golan Heights and the Sinai Peninsula, and now the same appears to apply to the Gaza Strip, with its 400,000 inhabitants.

"If these government statements are intended to establish a basis for negotiations we must say that they do not make any sense at all. A sound basis for negotiations must rest on mutual trust and the confidence of world public opinion in the credibility of Israel. Considering the statements made by our leaders that they have no intention of relinquishing any of these occupied territories the question arises: How can our government expect the Arabs to believe in our willingness to negotiate and the world to rely on our professed desire for an honorable peace?

"I think that despite the fact that the 'Party for a Greater Israel' failed to elect a single representative to the Knesset, its ideas enjoy a great deal of popularity among our leaders. If this is the case, we are faced with a dismal failure of our whole democratic process.

"It's about time to muzzle those Ministers who try to propagate their ideas of extended Israeli borders and are spreading maps of a greater Israel if we expect to come to an understanding with the other side regarding meaningful negotiations. I am tired of listening to speeches of the 'empire builders' and to all the defenders of religious influence. I think this problem merits further discussion."

o o o o o

SOVIET JEW TELLS HOW HE WAS MISLED BY
ZIONIST PROPAGANDA

(October 12, 1970)

The Moscow newspaper Moskovskaya Pravda published on September 8, 1970, an interview with a Soviet citizen, Simon Ladzenski, who was persuaded to emigrate to Israel. But he did not stay there very long. He soon realized that he had made a serious mistake in coming to the "promised land," which offered him nothing but hardship. Ladzenski was glad to be able to leave the capitalist "paradise" and return to his socialist homeland.

Before Ladzenski embarked on his ill-fated adventure, he and his family had a secure life in the Soviet Union, earning from 400 to 500 rubles monthly. They lived, as many millions of

Soviet families do, free from financial worries, without fear that they might lose their jobs and have to face an uncertain future. They were not saddled with high taxes, were not harassed by ruthless, rent-gouging landlords and their earnings did not shrink due to galloping inflation. Ladzenski did not have to worry about his old age; he knew that he and his family would be amply provided for by the comprehensive Soviet social security system. However, this did not satisfy him. He left his family and homeland and went to Israel where he hoped to go into business and amass a fortune.

How did this change in Ladzenski's thinking come about? The article explains that he changed his ideas after coming in contact with certain officials of the former Israeli Embassy in Moscow. (After the 1967 war the Soviet Union broke diplomatic relations with Israel and the Embassy was closed.) Ladzenski got acquainted with the Israeli representatives at religious services in the Moscow Synagogue. It is needless to say that the Israeli officials were not motivated by religious fervor but visited the Synagogue in order to spread Zionist propaganda.

We are told that the Israeli "diplomats" tried to gain information from their innocent victims which could be of value to the military intelligence of their country and to Western imperialist powers. It was not a mere coincidence that one of Ladzenski's acquaintances, the Secretary of the Israeli Embassy, M. Gabish, was later expelled from the Soviet Union for conducting activities unbecoming a diplomat. Among the members of the Embassy staff involved in these activities were also Messrs. Bartov, Katz, and others. During his stay on Israel, Ladzenski met one of them in the Bureau of Military Intelligence Service.

Ladzenski told the journalist who interviewed him: "They asserted that a life of abundance awaits me in Israel. I was confused by their lavish promises and did not pay any attention to the warnings of my sister who lives in Israel, my family and some friends here, in Moscow, not to be misled by their Zionist propaganda."

Ladzenski told a sad tale of the hardships and the privations that he had had to endure in Israel. He soon found out what it means to live under capitalism, to be exploited, and to work under speedup conditions. There was little left of his wages after tax-ex, rent, monthly repayments of his traveling expenses and payments on other debts. Hardly anything remained for his living expenses, let alone his cultural needs.

"They need us in Israel only for propaganda purposes; to create the impression that the Jews want to leave the Soviet Union because they can't live there," Ladzenski stated. He added that it was not easy for him to get out of Israel. The authorities demanded full reimbursement of his debt that amounted, according to their figures, to thousands of pounds. He finally succeeded in leaving

the country claiming that he had to go to Vienna in order to take his family out of the Soviet Union. After arriving in the Austrian capital, he at once contacted the Soviet Embassy and asked for a re-entry permit. He waited anxiously for an answer and was a happy man indeed when his request was granted.

"I will never forget the humane approach of the Soviet authorities to my problem. The Soviet Union always was and will forever remain my homeland," Ladzenski concluded his story.

• • • •

ON ANTI-SOVIET INCITEMENTS IN ISRAEL

(November 25, 1970)

To the Editors:

The writer of this letter is a disabled war veteran who fought against the Nazis.

I am one of those who were misled by Zionist propaganda. I am a new immigrant. One of the reasons for my coming to Israel was to be reunited with relatives and friends. Like many others, I have become disillusioned by the callous attitude towards friends, relatives and people, in general, that prevails in this country.

My disappointment stems, among other things, from the discrimination and abuse to which our mother tongue--Yiddish--is being subjected. It is noteworthy that at the same time the Soviet Union is being attacked for allegedly discriminating against Yiddish. The attackers completely forget what they are doing to Yiddish in their own country--Israel.

Let me cite an example. In a television appearance a noted Israeli figure, M. Madan, labeled Yiddish as a cadaverous language. Madan is a Hebrew University professor and a television official, in charge of programming.

Those of us who spilled our blood in battles against the Nazis fighting for the survival of our mother tongue must now direct our struggle against the Jewish anti-Semites who disdain the sacrifices of our heroes that perished in the ghettos and on the guerrilla battle lines. These fighters against fascism spoke Russian, Polish, Yiddish and many other languages.

Israel owes its very existence to these fighters against the German fascists as well as to the Soviet Union, which was among the first to help establish the Jewish state. Where is the gratitude that Israel should

express to the Soviet Union and to all those who fought the Nazis and the fascists?

Due to the anti-Soviet line taken by the Israeli rulers, many people in this country forgot who their saviors were and are now behaving like hooligans. Many of those whose lives were saved do not wish to remember that the Soviet people shared with them their last piece of bread. These people forget that the Soviet "grub," which they ridicule now, helped to sustain them. They have joined the hue and cry that "their brethren must be saved from the Soviet Union where they are perishing."

Those of us who realize now that we were misled by Zionist misrepresentations must, in my opinion, do everything to counteract this propaganda.

P.I.

• • • •

COMMUNICATIONS

RIGHT-WING VIOLENCE AND "LAW AND ORDER"

The growing arrogance and bellicosity of Rabbi Kahane and the Jewish Defense League have been set forth and denounced not only by virtually the entire Jewish community, but by all democratic-minded persons and forces in our land who struggle for peace and human progress. It has been made more than clear that this Jewish "Brown Shirt" force means to serve by violent expression and lawless actions, as a striking force for reaction.

They have built a rapid record with canons of anti-Sovietism and racism. They have invaded concerts and cultural events under the aegis of the U.S. State Department. They have created violence at meetings and picket lines, illegally entered offices and businesses and criminally assaulted individuals. They have been connected to airplane bomb plots and have taken credit for a series of bombings and similar acts of planned violence.

For all this, they brazenly accept the publicity and credit with a confidence of police passivity or indifference. We need not recount these well-documented criminal acts and their boasts of continued escalation of such activity.

But the situation does underscore the index of political violence from the Right, and the reactions of our state police apparatus to these activities. The authorities, by their inaction, or silent approval, give a green light to these criminals. This form of acquiescence or collaboration is in sharp contrast to the massive national oppression of all peoples' movements for peace, equality, civil rights and security. While there are no important ar-

rests or indictments with regard to the activities of the Jewish Defense League to date, we are victims of, and participants in one of the most repressive campaigns in this nation's history, aimed at any and all voices for peace and progress.

This intensifying, systematic repression stretches from the classroom to the local police apparatus and to the nationally-controlled secret police forces, all under the encouragement and direction of the White House in a cynical, self-righteous call for "law and order."

The paramilitary hate groups which foster a rhetoric for violence, store massive arms, and threaten death to all with whom they disagree, go undisturbed. The KKK, Minutemen, National Socialist Party, Christian National Crusade, and National States Rights Party organize and plot freely. But the students of Orangeburg, Jackson and Kent were slaughtered for peacefully demonstrating. Black Panthers have been hunted down and murdered in "search and destroy" missions. Sister Angela Davis is threatened with death for allegedly purchasing fire arms.

Peaceful demonstrations are provoked into violence, heads are split open without pretext on a mass scale, the jails are full of peaceful protestors, provocations and plots are rampant to break and enter homes, to shoot almost at will. Police agents abound, representing all branches of government, from local police to the Army and FBI stepping over each others' feet in huge networks of spies and informers to feed the dossiers, computers and jails. Where no plots exist, they are conjured up and manufactured to order, and to suit the need. The victims and the dead of this repression stretch through every city of America and through every level of activity and organizations that are anywhere to the Left of Martha Mitchell.

All this underscores the wide gap between the stated ethics and actual conduct of this government. It is obvious that these same dedicated, proficient regulatory forces could at once contain and effectively check these clearly criminal plots and acts committed by these extra-legal vigilante, racist hate groups.

The euphemistic plot of this nation's ruling circles, in a hypocritical call for "law and order," is in reality a design for the entire, massive state apparatus to ruthlessly repress the Left and to protect its status quo. It uses violence to defend its wealth, its clients and elite, its institutions, and all that is rotten, exploitative and criminal in this culture of violence and avarice. And in this process, our regulatory and enforcement forces and legal system serve as a hypocritical instrument of the state for monitoring and suppressing selectively the peoples' advancement to establishing equality of civil, economic, social and political rights for all, and for peace.

JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

I want to tell you of my impressions of Jewish life in the USSR. At the time that I went there, in the United States many Jewish people were involved in anti-Soviet demonstrations, supposedly organized for the benefit of the suffering Soviet Jews, who are allegedly being persecuted by the Soviet government. It is charged that Jewish identity is considered as treason to their country, that Jewish citizens of the USSR are denied normal participation in the political, economic and cultural life of the country, that they have a burning desire to go to Israel but the government "doesn't let them out."

As I have a lot of family in Leningrad, Moscow, Riga, I naturally asked my relatives first of all about this "denial to Jewish citizens of the right to participate in the life of their country." They all denied that anything like this exists or, in their opinion, is even possible in their socialist Soviet motherland.

All of them had had tragedies in their lives. All had husbands, fathers, brothers, children in the war to defend their country. And they don't themselves sense or see in their neighbors any hostility to themselves as Jews.

Many of my relatives are engineers, doctors, teachers, librarians, etc. Some are working in shops and are studying in the universities. One is a retired general, one is a high-ranking Navy officer and commander of a military port, one is a major in the engineering corps of the Army, one is an official in the Academy of Science, and one is a chief engineer in a plant.

I had a conference with a rabbi in a synagogue. He told the same story and expressed his indignation at the misleading and harmful activities of the so-called leaders of American Jewry.

I also had a long conversation with a professor at Leningrad University, who is not Jewish. He told me the same story. And though he is a member of the Communist Party and a teacher in a Marxist training school, he was critical of many government policies with regard to economic management and bureaucratic duplication in many institutions. He told me that criticism and suggestions for improvement are not prohibited but are welcomed and encouraged by the government. In fact, they are considered a patriotic duty of every honest citizen.

In Tselkuba I lived for three weeks with 400 people from many parts of the USSR and had many conversations on many aspects of Soviet life. I can honestly say that I did not notice any hostility toward Jews or Asians. I was very sensitive about that and was on the alert for any signs of it.

I was impressed by the visible improvement in the dress of the people I met in the streets in comparison with my first visit to the USSR, with the tremendous number of new buildings going up, and with the attitude of the people. Every time I got into a crowded street car or bus, younger people always got up. I want to tell you about the "new Soviet man."

I visited a nephew who had lost his parents in the war. He himself had fought in the Army as an officer. He was wounded and has several medals and an order for bravery. Now he is working as an engineer in a plant. His wife had fought as a Komsomolska in the defense of Leningrad, and as a nurse at the front had also been wounded and received several medals.

Her first husband fell in the war. She had two children, a girl and a baby boy, who were taken care of by her elderly parents. Her mother and the baby boy, on the way to get milk for the child, were hit by a bomb and killed. The father died of starvation as he fed his rations to the little girl, who survived.

After the war and her marriage to my nephew, she gave birth to a boy who is now grown and working in a plant and studying at night at the university.

At present all four live in one room, part of an apartment which they share with three other families. I asked: "Are you not entitled to a new apartment?" She slammed her fist on the table and said: "Uncle, why are you talking about what we are entitled to? How about the people living downstairs in the basement apartment which was flooded last year? Aren't they more 'entitled' to a new apartment than we are? We will wait, and after they get one we will apply."

This, to me, is the new Soviet man.

Charles Selikson

o o o o

Have you read:

Soviet Jews: Fact and Fiction, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1970,

Hyman Lumer, Israel Today: War or Peace?, New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1970, 45¢.

These may be obtained at your local progressive bookshop.