

U.S. postwar policy that shuts its eyes to the rebirth of Nazi ideas, encouraging and financing militaristic attitudes and programs in West Germany. A Pentagon official on duty in Nuremberg at the time of the Berlin blockade is seen urging leniency for the Nazi judges. His grounds for this are similar to the ones heard during the Hitler era. Russia is the enemy to watch. Germany is the key to survival "and we are going to need all the help we can get!"

One of the important aspects of Kramer's film is that it does not go along with the official line. In the end, Judge Haywood finds that he cannot honestly shut his eyes to the murder of 6,000,000 Jews. The four judges, including the repentant one, are given life imprisonment, over the dissenting vote of one of the three U.S. judges.

At this point the Counsel for the Nazis offers to bet the life sentences won't last five years.

A final statement on the screen declares that of the 99 men sentenced to prison by the time the judges' trials had ended in 1949, not one is still serving his sentence in 1961.

Ten years later, moreover, there were, according to the London *Jewish Chronicle*, Nov. 29, 1959, no fewer than 1,000 former Nazi judges, almost all of them responsible for thousands of deaths of liberals, Jews, anti-fascists and other innocent people, again practicing at the same old stand in West Germany. Add all these things together to get an accurate picture of what is really causing tension in the world today.

If *Judgment at Nuremberg* were to be widely seen and discussed it could perhaps help revise our unnatural and unrealistic policy toward rearming Adenauer Germany. Kramer is to be saluted for a fearless and inspiring film.

January, 1962

## The "Soviet Encyclopedia" Article on "Jews"

By M. MIRSKI

AFTER the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the Soviet press published sharp criticisms of various articles in the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*. They dealt mainly with false presentations of historical facts and problems. And it is understandable that the *Encyclopedia* could not have been exempt from the consequences of the "cult of the individual."

Here I want to discuss a section in the *Encyclopedia* which in my opinion deserves a critical analysis. I am referring to the article "Yevrei" (Jews), in Vol. 15, which appeared in 1952.

One is immediately struck by the brevity of the article. Together with information about the Jewish Autonomous Region (Biro-Bidjan), it takes up eight columns, of which four deal with Biro-Bidjan. Of the four columns on Biro-Bidjan, the geographical and economic description takes up more than three columns. The only thing we are told about the Jews in Biro-Bidjan is that "in the region live Jews, Russians and Ukrainians," that in the library named after Sholem Aleichem there are 80,000 volumes and that two newspapers are published, one in Russian and one in Yiddish. Subtracting these four columns on Biro-Bidjan, only four remain on the Jews in the rest of the Soviet Union. If we compare these four columns to the 160 columns devoted to the subject of Jews in the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* published in 1932 (Vol. 24), it becomes clear to every reader that the reduction of the information to one-fortieth in the 1952 edition reveals a certain attitude of the editors. The 1952 article cannot pretend to give exhaustive, encyclopedic data on this subject.

It is characteristic that the editors of this four-column article did not even find it necessary to include a bibliography. The authors and editors were apparently of the opinion that the Soviet reader can get along without bibliographical data about Jews. They (the Jews) do not deserve the attention which the Nenets people (Samoyeds), nomads of the Far North (for whom the Soviet government established a stable way of life and national culture), were given in the

*Encyclopedia*. The data about the Samoyeds contains a bibliography, and rightly so.

Another fact is worth noting: nowhere are the names of the authors of the articles given. The 1932 edition, however, notes not only the name of the editor, S. Dimanshtein,\* but also the writers who worked on various aspects of the material.

How is this fact to be explained? I do not wish to enter into an analysis of the subjective intent of the editors of this article or of the editorial staff of the *Encyclopedia* as a whole. In order to get an answer to this question, in order to explain this phenomenon, one needs only to discover the connection between the methodology used and the political and moral atmosphere in which the articles were written and edited.

I CALL THE ATTENTION OF THE READER TO THE FACT THAT THE ARTICLE ON "Jews" appeared in 1952. This year was especially marked by the intensification of Beria's activities both in the Soviet Union and in the Peoples' Democracies. That was the year of the political trial of the Moscow doctors, most of whom were Jews. In that year the flower of Soviet Yiddish culture was executed. (The arrests took place in 1948.) That was the year in which Beria arranged the Slansky trial in Czechoslovakia. And this was the year in which Volume 15 of the *Soviet Encyclopedia* containing the article on "Jews" was published. This objective relationship makes it possible to explain the meagerness of the information, the approach to it, and its peculiar methodology.

On page 357 of Volume 15 we find the following: "In their overwhelming majority, the Jews speak the language of the nations among whom they live. At the same time, in their everyday life, a number of the Jews (in the countries of Central Europe and those who stem from those countries) speak Yiddish. The roots of Yiddish are in one of the Middle German dialects. Yiddish is spoken by Polish, German and some British and American Jews. In the past, the Jews of Russia spoke Yiddish." Upon reading this article, a simple question arises: on what scientific basis, with what scientific methods did the authors and editors of this article arrive at these conclusions?

It is really plain ignorance to say that the German Jews speak Yiddish. Today there are very few Jews in Germany. Before the war there were about half a million Jews in Germany. But one does not have to be an "encyclopedist" to know that both before and after

\* Dimanshtein was the leader of the Jewish Section (Yevsektzia) of the Soviet Communist Party who disappeared from the scene after 1937.—Ed.

the war the German Jews did *not* speak Yiddish. German Jews spoke and speak German, regardless of their social position. It would be interesting to know from what sources the editors of the *Encyclopedia* drew their material. They may deem it permissible to omit bibliographical data, but this does not mean that the reader has surrendered *his* right to request it. The reader requires scientific evidence for every stated thesis.

In regard to the second point, that Jews in Russia spoke Yiddish "*in the past*," we ask the same question: on what scientific basis, by what scientific methods did the authors and editors reach this conclusion? Were any investigations made? Was a census taken? What were the objective criteria used in this census? Whence comes the conclusion that Jews in Russia spoke Yiddish "once upon a time," in the past? (Since the authors do not mention the Ukraine, White Russia, Lithuania, Latvia or Moldavia, the term "Russia" must be understood as tsarist Russia.) And today? What language do they speak *today*?

There can be no doubt that many Jews in the Soviet Union speak Russian, especially the younger generation. But to conclude that the Jews of Russia spoke Yiddish only in the past, does not correspond to reality.

Let the authors and editors of the *Encyclopedia* go to the Jewish masses (not merely to a few score Jewish homes) in Kiev, Minsk, Odessa, Chelyabinsk, Riga, Vilna, Kishinev, Czernowitz. Let them walk through the Krestchatik Square in Kiev, or on whatever street they wish in Vilna, Minsk, Odessa, Lemberg, where Jews live in compact masses and let them listen to the Jews speak today, in 1957. Will they then be able to maintain their position that Jews in Russia spoke Yiddish *only in the past*? Let them go to a concert of Yiddish song and poetry, no matter where it is held. Will they maintain their thesis?

Certainly we know that more than 20 years have passed since the Yiddish schools in the Soviet Union were disbanded. Almost ten years have passed since the newspaper *Einigkeit* and the Yiddish theater in Moscow and the Yiddish publishing houses were liquidated. We know that by an administrative act the development of Soviet Yiddish culture and literature was cut off, the development of the Yiddish language impeded. We know all this quite well and it is all true. I believe, however, that the authors and editors of the article are certainly acquainted with the Marxist position on the stubborn persistence of languages for generations. Why did they not, in their scientific practice, reckon with this position?

I have said that the editors should get down to realities and check their thesis with life. But there are other criteria, historical criteria. I will cite various statistics which, if not directly, at least indirectly, throw light on this matter.

In the latter 1920's, the Soviet government put into life the Leninist policy of national equality for the Jewish population. It set up separate Jewish nationality soviets in areas where Jews were a majority of the population. The growth of these Jewish nationality soviets in the Ukraine and White Russia is seen in the following figures (cited from the 1932 edition of the *Encyclopedia*):

In White Russia the Jewish nationality soviets increased as follows: 1924-7; 1925-11; 1926-18; 1927-22; 1931-27.

#### JEWISH SOVIETS IN THE UKRAINE

	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930
<i>Village</i>	19	34	56	77	94	94
<i>Town</i>	19	52	69	69	66	66

These figures show that in the Ukraine and White Russia the process of establishing nationality regions for the Jewish population, of building Jewish nationality soviets, continued until the 1930's. In the Ukraine the number of Jewish nationality soviets increased by 421 per cent from 1925 to 1930; in White Russia, 385 per cent from 1924 to 1931. (In addition to the Jewish nationality soviets there were also soviets of mixed nationalities.) Their number grew constantly. It should be noted that the separate Jewish nationality soviets were established according to *language*. In these soviets the administration was conducted exclusively in Yiddish. In the mixed soviets the administration took place in Yiddish and one of the languages of the local population. Beside the rural and urban Jewish nationality soviets there were in the Ukraine several Jewish *nationality regions*, where the Jewish population had lived since tsarist times and worked the land (Kherson, Dniepropetrovsk, Crimea).

THE LENINIST POLICY OF GRANTING EQUAL NATIONALITY RIGHTS FOR THE Jewish population found expression in various forms. Thus, for instance, throughout the Ukraine and White Russia there was a network of Jewish nationality courts, where the proceedings were in Yiddish. This was done not only for utilitarian purposes; it was basically an expression of the higher level of Soviet democracy. Fig-

ures for the development of the Jewish nationality courts from 1928 to 1930 were as follows:

	<i>Ukraine</i>	<i>White Russia</i>
1928	36	6
1929	39	6
1930	46	6

In 1926-7, 70 per cent of the Jewish children of school age attended Soviet schools. Of these, 51.1 per cent used Yiddish in the elementary schools and 48.9 per cent in the schools generally. With the introduction of compulsory education the number of Jewish children in the Jewish schools rose. In White Russia and the Ukraine the Jewish schools included 55-58 per cent of the children of school age.

The picture was the same in the publishing field. In 1923 there were 11 printing houses which issued 266 titles in 155,100 copies. In 1927 there were 298 printing houses which published 1,027 titles in 1,136,200 copies. The Yiddish press consisted of three daily newspapers: *Emes* (Truth) in Moscow, *October* in Minsk, *Der Shtern* (The Star) in Kharkov. There were also a number of monthly journals of art and literature, local newspapers and magazines in Odessa, Kiev, Berdychev and other places. Also, there were institutes for Jewish culture in the scientific academies of the Ukraine and White Russia. There was a Jewish Scientific Society in Moscow. There were 16 Jewish theaters throughout the country.

The rise, development and growth of Jewish nationality institutions were the expression of the higher level of Soviet democracy. The principle of Soviet democracy consists not only in the complete civic equality of Soviet citizens as individuals, but in their *national equality*, which guarantees economic progress and establishes with government financing a full national life, the development of the progressive elements of the national culture of every national minority and national group. Such a principle and such practice could not be claimed by any bourgeois government, even the most advanced.

Unfortunately we have no data to show the process of Soviet Jewish cultural development in the first half of the 1930's. But even the meager information concerning the latter 1920's and the early 1930's gives evidence of the steady increase and growth of the national Jewish institutions in the Soviet Union. The evidence shows an upward tendency.

In the light of this information, what are we to make of the claim of the editors of the *Encyclopedia* that Jews in Russia spoke Yiddish "in the past"? This claim is baseless.

The authors and editors can argue: but your statistics cover the early 1930's. Since then a generation of Jews has grown up who never went to a Yiddish school or read a Yiddish book, who have become assimilated with the surrounding non-Jewish population.

No one denies that in the Soviet Union a generation of Jews has grown up who never went to a Yiddish school and who do not know Yiddish, who never participated in what we call Soviet-Jewish cultural and community life, who have become linguistically assimilated. This is true. But this truth is only a part of the picture and not the whole. The whole picture is quite different. This generation of Jews began to emerge in the mid-thirties. Until that time there had been a Jewish national cultural life and half the Jewish children of school age not only spoke Yiddish at home, but had studied the language in school and received their education in that language.

In addition, there are still two generations of Jews living of which one was born at the beginning of the 20th century and the other during the first world war and the years of the revolution. These two generations of Jews, which comprise more than half of the Jewish population, were brought up in Yiddish. Yiddish was their mother-tongue, their everyday speech and particularly the language of study in school. These were mostly Jews in the small towns. That is what the whole picture looks like. That is the *actual* situation. Then how can one advance a thesis that Jews in Russia spoke Yiddish "in the past"? This thesis is scientifically unfounded.

Here and there, opinions are being spread that Jews in the Soviet Union *voluntarily* gave up the use of Yiddish, rejected their Soviet-Jewish culture, did not want it and don't want it now. Naturally, this opinion is offered without any evidence, and is not based on any scientific data. The only "proof" is the fact that in the 30's the Yiddish schools began to close down in the Ukraine and White Russia. But is this fact really a proof of the correctness of the above-mentioned opinion?

Of course, the fact is a fact. But its one-sided interpretation today should be considered with extreme caution. Certainly it is true that significant sections of the Jewish population in the Soviet Union voluntarily became assimilated (linguistically). I want to express my doubt, however, whether linguistic assimilation is the only reason for this phenomenon. Today, in the light of Stalin's distortions of the

Leninist nationality policy, not everything can be explained by "voluntary assimilation."

One should bear in mind that the dissolution of the Yiddish school system and generally of Soviet Jewish cultural activities took place in the 30's, and we know what kind of years these were. Not only was Soviet Jewish cultural activity liquidated; this was also the time when Soviet Polish cultural activity in the Ukraine and White Russia was liquidated.

These were the years when Stalin's theory of "sharpened class-struggle" as socialism develops began to be put into practice. This was the eve of the monstrous provocation against the Communist Party of Poland which led to its dissolution. This was a period when Jewish leaders were accused of political diversion and espionage. During that time the ordinary Jewish person began to move away from the arena of Jewish cultural and social activity, where arrests were taking place for political diversion and espionage. A feeling arose among the Jewish population to stay away—the further the better—from this activity, from Jewish communal leaders, from Jewish teachers, etc.

In this way the administrative and moral pressure on the Jewish population began and the process went on with lightning speed. In a short time the Yiddish school system almost disappeared. Formally it was said that the Jewish population had voluntarily rejected the Yiddish school. Actually, this was a voluntariness of quite dubious character in which there were elements of Russification.

That administrative pressure played its part is evident from the fact that even much later, in 1939-41, the same results could be observed in the Western Ukraine and Western White Russia, which were liberated by Soviet armies after Hitler's attack on Poland in September 1939. In these new Soviet territories a network of national schools were set up—Ukrainian, White Russian, Yiddish, Polish, Lithuanian. During the nearly two years preceding Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, a widespread system of Yiddish elementary and higher schools quickly grew. Soviet Jewish culture in these areas experienced a renaissance. But already in 1940-41 attempts at administrative pressure on the Jewish population could be felt here and there to change the Jewish schools to Russian.

These are all facts which the editors and authors of the *Encyclopedia* article would have done well to know; they should have verified the accuracy of their facts before they wrote that the Jews of Russia "spoke Yiddish in the past."

THE "Bund" is characterized by the authors of the article on "Jews" in the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, on page 378 of Volume 15 (which appeared in 1952) as follows: "A nationalist organization among the Jews in Russia. A petit-bourgeois, opportunist party, which stood for the separation of the Jewish Social Democrats from the general Social Democratic movement in Russia. V. I. Lenin and J. Stalin, leading a fight against the nationalist position of the leaders of the Bund, pointed out that for the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia, the complete unity of the proletariat was necessary, the union of all the nationalities, the unification of the working people of all countries against their class enemies. 'Jewish national culture' is the slogan of the rabbis and the bourgeoisie, the slogan of our enemies," wrote Lenin in 1913."

On reading this characterization everything seems to fall into place: the characterization of the Bund and the reference to Lenin's struggle against Bundist nationalism and separatism—everything checks. And yet the question arises:

How could the writers of the article accompany Lenin's statement about Bundist nationalism, about the necessity for unity of the proletarians of all nationalities against a common class enemy—how could they accompany this with a quotation out of context about Jewish national culture as a slogan of the rabbis and the bourgeoisie?

I would not bring this question up—because, after all, everyone cites texts according to his own understanding—were it not for the fact that the authors committed a great sin against Lenin. What did they do?

They tore the above question out of its original context of problems of national culture in general, which Lenin dealt with in the above article, and thereby they distorted Lenin's thought on Jewish national culture. What conception of Jewish national culture can the reader of the *Encyclopedia* obtain on the basis of the sentence they quote? Only that Jewish national culture is a reactionary phenomenon, because it is the slogan of the rabbis and the bourgeoisie, of our enemies.

But what did Lenin really say? In the same article from which the authors quote ["Critical Remarks on the National Question," published in 1913 and available in English in a pamphlet published by the Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow—*Eds.*], Lenin said: "There are two nations in every modern nation—we will say to the social-nationalists. There are two national cultures in every national culture. There is the Great-Russian culture of the Purishkeviches, Guchovs and Struves—but there is also the Great-Russian culture that

is characterized by the names of Chernyshevsky and Plekhanov. There are the *same two* cultures among the Ukrainians, as well as in Germany, France, England, among the Jews, etc."

It is evident from this quotation that Lenin did not have a concept of one, undifferentiated Russian, Ukrainian or Jewish national culture. He conceived of national culture as being socially differentiated. In another place in this same article, Lenin writes:

"Take a concrete example. Can a Great-Russian Marxist accept the slogan Great-Russian national culture? No. Such a man should be placed among the nationalists and not among the Marxists. Our task is to fight the dominant, Black-Hundred and bourgeois national culture of the Great-Russians and to develop, exclusively in the international spirit, and in the closest alliance with the workers of other countries, those rudiments that exist also in our history of the democratic and working-class movement. To fight your own Great-Russian landlords and bourgeoisie, to fight their 'culture' in the name of internationalism, and while fighting, to 'adapt' yourself to the peculiar characteristics of the Purishkeviches and Struves—such is your task, and not to advocate, not to tolerate the slogan national culture.

"The same applies to the most oppressed and persecuted nation, the Jewish. Jewish national culture is the slogan of the rabbis and the bourgeois, the slogan of our enemies. But there are other elements in Jewish culture and the entire history of the Jews. Of the ten and a half million Jews throughout the world, a little over half live in Galicia and Russia, backward and semi-barbarous countries, which forcibly keep the Jews in position of a caste. The other half live in the civilized world and there the Jews are not segregated in a caste. There, the great, world-progressive features of Jewish culture have clearly made themselves felt: its internationalism, its responsiveness to the advanced movement of the epoch (the percentage of Jews in the democratic and proletarian movements is everywhere higher than the percentage of Jews in the population as a whole)."

As we see, Lenin's concept of national culture is profound and many-sided. He saw it as socially differentiated. He saw its reactionary content *and* its progressive content. He saw these *two* aspects also in Jewish national culture. He saw its reactionary side—the culture of the rabbis and the bourgeoisie. But he saw its second side, the progressive, the internationalist, its response to the democratic and socialist ideas of the age.

WHAT SENSE, THEREFORE, WAS THERE IN TAKING ONE ASPECT OF LENIN'S concept of national culture—the reactionary aspect—and thus leave

the reader of the *Encyclopedia* under the impression that this was Lenin's evaluation of Jewish national culture as a whole? Is this not a distortion of Lenin's profound and widely encompassing idea of a national culture? What would happen, for instance, if one took the liberty of presenting from Lenin's many-sided evaluation of *Russian* national culture only one sentence which deals with its reactionary content? Would this not be the most terrible distortion of Lenin's thoughts on Russian national culture? Would this not be an insult to that Great-Russian national culture which is represented by Chernyshevsky and Plekhanov? What connection would this kind of interpretation have with encyclopedic information and interpretation?

The authors and editors of the *Encyclopedia* article know Lenin's theory of national culture, they know its social aspects. They know Lenin's writings on this question. Yet they irresponsibly tore the above sentence out of context and thereby terribly distorted it, especially since the quoted sentence brings no clarity whatsoever to the question of Lenin's struggle against Bundist separatism.

Why did they do it? What impelled them to do it?

No matter what the answer to this question may be, one thing is certain. This kind of encyclopedic information, such a manner of quoting and interpreting, is a far cry from that scientific conscientiousness which should animate people who have undertaken to provide encyclopedic information. This methodology is far from scientific objectivity in the Marxist sense of the word. It is rather an attempt to fit a subject matter to political expediency, whose purpose was to establish that Jewish national culture is a reactionary phenomenon.

In another place, the *Encyclopedia* writers say: "After the Socialist October Revolution, the restrictions on Jews were liquidated, as they were on other oppressed national minorities. In 1934 the Jewish Autonomous Region was established. The working-class Jews were given access to trades and professions; they actively participated in the building of Communism. In this way the Leninist-Stalinist national policy of equal rights and friendship among peoples resulted in the fact that there is no 'Jewish Question' in the Soviet Union."

The authors point out that after the October Revolution all restrictions on Jews were abolished; that the Jews had access to all trades and professions. But can we reduce the accomplishments of the October Revolution in regard to national minorities merely to the equalization of rights? The abolition of the restrictions on Jews, giving them entry into economic life, had already been proclaimed by

the French bourgeois revolution. And these rights are enjoyed, more or less, by the Jews in all the bourgeois states of the West.

Of course, the October Revolution abolished all tsarist restrictions on Jews, as well as on other national minorities. Certainly the civil equality in the Soviet Union is incomparably broader and more fundamental than in most advanced bourgeois states. But the October Revolution was not content with this. The October Revolution went much further than the most consistent and fully realized bourgeois democratic revolution. The October Revolution did not stop at civil equality, as the authors of the article would have us believe. The basic characteristic of the Leninist nationality policy, which distinguishes it from bourgeois equality, which was proclaimed by the October Revolution and was put into the foundation of the practical activity of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet government, and which was distorted by the Stalinist practice—this characteristic is the full *national* equality of all the peoples who inhabit the Soviet Union.

Not only the abolition of the tsarist restrictions, not only free access to all pursuits and professions did the Jewish population of Russia receive from the October Revolution. This revolution and the Soviet government, putting into practice the Leninist national policy, gave the Jewish population *full national equality*.

Full national equality meant not only the absolute equalization of the rights of every national minority or group, regardless of size, with all nations, larger or smaller, who inhabited Russia, in the sense of creating for them all political, moral and financial possibilities and conditions at the expense of the government, so that they might, like all other nations, fulfill their national needs; that they might create a national culture of progressive content; that they might, as far as possible, develop and contribute to the building of the socialist culture in the Soviet Union.

Lenin used to emphasize that national equality should even be interpreted in the sense of a certain privilege for some national minorities in order to compensate for the crimes which tsarist rule had committed against them.

Until the October Revolution, such rights had not been proclaimed or granted by any revolution. No government except the Soviet government gave, or could give, such rights. Only the dictatorship of the proletariat could do this.

Did the Jewish population in the Soviet Union achieve national equality? Yes! In the greatest measure and with the broadest scope! Did this find expression in the *Encyclopedia* article? No! Unfortu-

nately, this aspect, the basic aspect, of the achievement of equal status for the Jewish national minority did not find expression.

In the excerpt just cited from the *Encyclopedia*, one observes a large gap. The authors tell us what the October Revolution gave the Jewish population. Suddenly they skip to the year 1934 and the establishment of Biro-Bidjan. But the question arises: well, what happened to the Jewish national minority in the Soviet Union during those 17 years from 1917 to 1934? What happened to the more than three million Jews who lived throughout the length and breadth of the Soviet Union during those 17 years of Soviet life? How did the national equality which the October Revolution gave to the Jews for the first time in history find expression? What did the Jewish population achieve and create during that time? What is its national contribution to the rise and development of the multi-national Soviet socialist culture?

Why did the authors and editors of the *Encyclopedia* not tell us about this? Why did they not inform the reader about the hundreds of Jewish schools, pedagogical institutes, newspapers, magazines; about the thriving Yiddish literature and its creators, about the serious works of literature and criticism? Why isn't there even a short review, if not of the history of Jewish literature in various countries, then at least of the history of Jewish literature in Russia, the Ukraine, White Russia, Lithuania, where during the 19th century scores of Jewish writers—Maskilim [Enlighteners], democrats, socialists—worked and were listened to? Perhaps all this was a national culture of the rabbis and the bourgeoisie? Or didn't they have anything to write about?

They failed to write about this, not because they had *nothing* to write about, but because they had a *great deal*. There was and there still is a good deal to tell about a great body of democratic and socialist culture which was destroyed. The authors of the *Encyclopedia* article sensed this and wanted to make it more palatable by pointing to Biro-Bidjan. But in the atmosphere of distorted policy toward the Soviet Jewish national culture there could be no talk about a proper development of Biro-Bidjan either. The Jewish Autonomous Region therefore shared the fate of the Soviet Jewish national culture and remained only a name.

One final point: the reader will remember that the *Encyclopedia* writers say that as a result of the October Revolution all tsarist restrictions relating to Jews were abolished and that the Jews were given access to all economic pursuits and that they are participating in the socialist construction of the country. And they conclude that in the Soviet Union there is no "Jewish Question." This conclusion

is only a half-truth. Insofar as the Jewish population in Russia was granted equal civil rights with all other citizens, there is no "Jewish Question" in the Soviet Union.

But, as stated above, Lenin's policy can not be reduced to civil equality and nothing more, as the authors try to make out. Correctly understood, Leninist national policy is a higher level of equality (proletarian and international) which is expressed in *national* equality. But to the extent that the correct policy was distorted, to the extent that the Jewish population of the Soviet Union remained without a means to fulfill its national needs, to that extent I tend to accept the opinion that an unsolved question exists in that area.

I believe, however, that the *Encyclopedia* article belongs to a period that is past. The 20th Congress, on the basis of a criticism of the past, has indicated the measures which should be taken to re-establish the Leninist criteria. The resolution of the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party says: "In its national policy, the Party has always proceeded from the Leninist principle that socialism, far from removing national distinctions and specific features, ensures the all-round development and efflorescence of the economies and cultures of all nations and nationalities. In future, too, the Party must attentively heed these specific features in all its practical activities."

We hope and believe that the editors of the *Encyclopedia* will take into account the observations of the 20th Congress and will introduce the necessary changes in the articles on "Jews" in order to raise them to the proper level of scientific accuracy.

July and August, 1957