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What does "non-forcible assimilation" mean? Lenin answers this question by stating: "Inseparably connected with the principle of complete equality is the guaranteeing of the rights of a national minority." The incorporation in the Constitution of a fundamental law which shall declare null and void all privileges whatever enjoyed by one nation and all limitations whatsoever of the rights of a national minority." (V. I. Lenin: Critical Remarks On the National Question, Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow 1981, p. 49).

Polemizing with the leaders of the Jewish social-democratic Bund who advocated national cultural autonomy, Lenin quotes statistics of the number of pupils in the schools of St. Petersburg in czarist days (1911), with 396 Jewish children of a total enrollment of 48,076, and he asks: Is it possible or necessary to establish a national program that will cover this diversity of relationships and conditions?"

In answering this question, Lenin speaks of a fundamental law that rendered null and void every measure that infringed the rights of a minority. "Every citizen would be able to demand the rescinding of orders that would, for example, prohibit the hiring at state expense, of teachers of the Jewish language. Jewish history, and so forth, or the provision of state-owned premises for teaching of Jewish, Armenian or Rumanian children, or even for one Georgian child. At all events, it is by no means impossible to satisfy all the reasonable and just wishes of the national minority, and nobody will say that the advocacy of equality is harmful." (Ibid., pp. 51-52).

This equality, as is well known, was introduced by Lenin after the October Revolution. When Lenin's approach was still in force, in the early 1930s, in the Ukraine alone, there were 765 Jewish schools with over 100,000 pupils, 3 teachers' seminaries, 16 technical schools, numerous Yiddish libraries and reading rooms, 3 Jewish state theatres, 10 Yiddish newspapers and periodicals and one Jewish scientific institute. A similar flourishing of Jewish culture took place in Byelorussia. In Moscow, there was the famous Jewish State theatre headed by Solomon Mikhoels, the Yiddish club "Komintern," a Jewish school in the suburb of Malakhova, the Yiddish daily "Eimesh" and the publishing house under that name and many other Jewish cultural institutions. In Moscow, Brisk, Birobidjan there existed Yiddish pedagogical institutes, university chairs, scientific establishments.

Just these few facts — and there are a great many more — will suffice to illustrate how the Leninist program of equality was put into practice. Then, towards the end of the 1930s there developed the Stalin cult and a suppression of Jewish culture began. Most Jewish schools were closed down, as were the Eimesh and other Yiddish publications. Yiddish book publishing still continued, and it is worth mentioning that while in 1913 under czarism, only 78 Yiddish titles were published, they numbered 339 (titles) in 1939.

After the war the Eimesh publishing house resumed activity, publishing 14 titles in 1945, 19 in 1946, 52 in 1947 and 60 titles in the first ten months of 1948 (in November all Jewish cultural institutions were clamped down).

The Moscow Jewish State Theatre too, was revived after the war and a Yiddish weekly, Eikinik, was published by the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee which had developed many Jewish activities in the field of Jewish culture and general Jewish affairs. All this was cut down when the cult brought down its heavy hand on the peoples of the USSR generally on the Jewish people in particular.

Since the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party Jewish culture was rehabilitated to a certain degree. There is the bimonthly Soviet Heimland with a circulation larger than the circulation of any of the Yiddish magazines even in the 1930s. There are a number of dramatic groups touring the country. Attendance at Jewish concerts reached the enormous figure of 300,000 in 1963. All this is very important and it corresponds with a Leninist approach to the national problem.

However, there is no Yiddish publishing house and no Yiddish books whatsoever were published in 1962 and 1963 (and thus far in 1964). There are no Jewish school facilities for teaching at state expense, of special teachers of the Jewish language, Jewish history and so forth, or the provision of state-owned premises for lecturers for Jewish children as required by Lenin.

Prof. Braginsky states that "only" some 20 per cent of the people of Jewish nationality in the USSR (declared Yiddish as their native tongue). Considering the line of forced assimilation practiced by the Stalin cult for over 20 years prior to the 1955 congress, considering the fact that part of the Jewish population which was not evacuated by the Soviet authorities during the war, or could not be evacuated (or did not want to leave their old homelands) and which was exterminated by the Nazis was overwhelmingly of the older generation (the younger people were quickly assimilated), while many hundreds of thousands of them were in transit or had left — considering this, the facts one is amazed at the percentage.

But what is a registered Yiddish school today to do when it teaches his child in a Jewish school in Soviet Russia courses, with no Jewish teachers? What, Lenin? Lenin's question should be asked, and he showed in 1917, how national culture is to be brought into practice. Now, a Leninist approach is to be able to speak of a "non-forcible assimilation" to quote Prof. Heim at.

In our next article, Prof. Braginsky will delve into the Yiddish language assimilation issues and the non-forcible assimilation. Eisen will quote Prof. Braginsky on how the Yiddish language is no longer a dead language to the young Jew in the Yiddish community, which is not Yiddish. This is overwhelming today. He approves the point that non-forcible assimilation does not equal forced assimilation. And this is overwhelming today.

This is something that I would like to emphasize. I think that there was a Yiddish community in the Soviet Russian in the days of the Czar. Local Jews had Yiddish books translated into Russian, although it is not Yiddish, Ukrainian, Ukrainian, or other nationalities. The non-forcible assimilation from the Yiddish community.

Since we mentioned the Yiddish community, one must say, in the American community, until the American community and municipal authorities provide the means for Yiddish courses.
people were quicker to evacuate while many hundreds of thousands of others, in the Red Army — considering these and other facts one is amazed at such a large percentage.

But what is a parent who registered Yiddish as his native tongue to do when he wants to teach his child Yiddish, with no Jewish schools or supplementary courses, with no Yiddish textbooks, whatever? Lenin stated what this question should be answered, and he showed the world, after 1917, that he was a great leader. Not until this Leninist approach is restored will one be able to speak of voluntary assimilation of Jews, to quote Prof. Braginsky.

In our next article we shall see how, according to Prof. Braginsky, the Yiddish language assimilation with national assimilation. Einstein, mentioned by Prof. Braginsky, did not know Yiddish. That is true. But he was a deeply national Jew, even nationalist to a certain degree. The Jewish community in the USA, which is, in its overwhelming majority, glaringly proves the point that language assimilation does not mean national assimilation.

This is something a Leninist should remember. Because of that there was a Jewish magazine in Russian in the 1930's, Tribuna. Soviet Jews who do not know Yiddish are now avid readers of Jewish books translated into Russian, even though it is true that Russians, Ukrainians and members of other nationalities read the translation from the Yiddish.

Since we mentioned the Jewish community in the USA one must say in passing, that until the American Federal, state and municipal governments will provide the means and facilities for Yiddish courses in the public and other schools, the means and facilities for the development of Yiddish culture will remain.

Of the total liquidation of the Stalin cult in relation to Jewish culture, he will now gain new momentum.

What should be one's attitude toward truly voluntary assimilation? What about Lenin's approach on this subject? And should assimilate whom? And is it possible when national cultures disappear, as they are bound to disappear, that there will be no more works in the original language to be translated? (For, how long can Jewish writers, for instance, continue to create in Yiddish when books in Yiddish are not published, when there are no newspapers, no schools?)

FOR many years Lenin conducted a struggle against the nationalist slogan of national culture autonomy, the Bund. As against this harmful slogan he put forth the program to satisfy all the reasonable and just wishes of the national minorities — and Yiddish-speaking Jews in particular — as quoted by me in the Morning Freiheit of May 17.

This program, outlined by Lenin in the autumn of 1913, deals with the subject of assimilation. We shall dwell on this subject later on. For the present, in addressing himself to the question of forced assimilation — something which Prof. I. Braginsky glosses over in his article in the May USSR — let us record the struggle of Lenin against assimilation.

In his essay "On the Right of Nations to Self-Determination," written in the spring of 1914, Lenin refers to the struggle led by Karl Marx in the First International both against the nationalism of Mazzini and the nihilism of the "Proudhon clique." In a letter to Frederick Engels, written June 20, 1906, Marx relates how, during a discussion at the Council of the International, he represented the French delegate who stated, "Youth in France came forward with the thesis that nationality and nation are obsolete prejudices."

The British delegates chuckled. Marx writes, when he drew attention to the fact that the French delegates who would abolish nations were using a language — French — which nine-tenths of the delegates did not understand. He also intimated Marx writes, that under cover of the theory of abolishing nationalities the French delegates expect the others "to be swallowed by the exemplary French nation."

During his polemics with Rosa Luxemburg on the national question, while recognizing many of her contributions to the revolution, Marx also exposed her harmful role of Kautsky on this question. In his "Left Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder," where he dealt both to leftist and vulgar reformists, Lenin stated:

"As long as national and state differences exist among peoples and countries — and these differences will continue to exist for a very long time, even after the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established on a worldwide scale — the unity of international tactics of the Communist working class movement of all countries demands not the elimination of variety, but the abolition of national differences (that is a foolish dream at the present moment), but such an application of the fundamental principles of Communism (Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat) as will correctly modify these principles in certain particulars, will properly apply them to national and national state differences." V. I. Lenin, Selected Work, International Publishers, New York, (vol. 10, p. 135).
THIS struggle, both against bourgeois nationalism and leftist dogmatism, was conducted by Stalin during the period when he adhered to the Leninist line and was fighting for this line. Thus in a speech he delivered at Moscow University on May 18, 1925 he stated:

"How are we to render the development of national culture, the development of schools and courses in the native languages, and the training of Communist cadres among local people, compatible with the building of socialism, with the building of a proletarian culture?"

"Is this not an irreconcilable contradiction? Of course not! We are building a proletarian culture. That is absolutely true. But it is also true that proletarian culture, which is socialist in content, assumes different forms and methods of expression among the various peoples that have been drawn into the work of socialist construction, depending on differences of language, customs, and so forth. Proletarian culture in content and national in form — such is the universal human culture towards which socialism is marching."

"Proletarian culture does not cancel national culture, but lends it content. National culture, on the other hand, does not cancel proletarian culture, but lends it form." (J. Stalin, Marxism and the National and Colonial Question, International Publishers, New York, pp. 209-210). In this same speech Stalin exposed "certain persons (Kautsky, for instance) who talk of the creation of a single universal language in the period of socialism and the dying away of all languages."

In his report to the 16th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (June 27, 1930), Stalin took issue with the "deviationists" who are using a "mask of internationalism," protecting themselves with the name of Lenin in order to hide "the most subtle and therefore the most dangerous form of Great-Russian nationalism."

"Lenin never said that national differences must disappear and national languages become fused into a single common language within the boundaries of a single state, before the victory of socialism on a world scale. Lenin, on the contrary, said something diametrically opposite, namely, that national and state differences among peoples and countries... will continue to exist for a very long time, even after the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established on a world scale." (Ibid p. 257).

DUE to this truly Leninist approach to the national question, Jewish culture, alongside the cultures of all nationalities, flourished in the Soviet Union, gaining enormous prestige for the land of socialism among all peoples abroad, including the Jewish people. Progressive Jews, fighters for socialism, pointed with pride to the Soviet Union as the land which truly solved the national question. Jewish culture — progressive culture of course, in the spirit of the Yiddish classicists, — can be built only under socialism, they maintained with full justification.

In our first article we quoted some figures on the development of Jewish culture in the USSR. On leafing through the book, "Jews in the USSR" (Yiddish, published by Mezhkhat and Emes, Moscow 1935) we were filled with the pride of the achievements of those days as well as some painful nostalgia...

We find that in 1933, only four Yiddish publishing houses in the USSR (there were more) published a book with a circulation of 2,609,700 copies. Of these there were 75 textbooks for Soviet Jewish schools, circulation 1,185,000 copies. (p. 169).

During the school year of 1933-1934, there were 143,815 pupils in the Jewish schools in the Ukraine, Byelorussia and other parts of the country, including Birobidzhan. There were 25 pedagogical and other Jewish technical Jewish sections at various universities, university chairs. There were 17 Jewish State theatres, many choruses, etc. Four large Yiddish dailies were in existence (Moscow, Minsk, Kiev, Birobidzhan, as well as a large number of other publications).

Professor Brunginsky is at variance with the facts when in his utter simplification of the national problem — he makes it appear that as a result of the October Revolution, Yid- dish began to disappear. He states "The natural course of cultural development of the Jewish population of the Soviet Union, a development which had already begun before the Revolution and was accelerated after 1917, lead to assimilation." Compare at least the number of books published by our Yiddish publishing houses in 1933 with the publication of only 93 titles in 1913. And, of course, there were no Jewish State theatres and other institutions in 1913. After the October Revolution, there began an amazing upward development of Jewish culture.

Only after the Cult set in, during the trials of 1936, followed by the "frightful year" of 1937, when the line of forceful assimilation began, as pointed out in our first article, did Jewish cultural institutions receive their first blow.

Jewish schools and other institutions were abolished, newspapers closed down (the Birobil- djan Shem began appearing 6 times a week in 2 pages and it still appearing so). Book publishing still continued, with 339 title appearing in 1939. Jewish cultural institutions, too, continued to exist, although reduced to 10 by 1939; there were also a few real schools (L. Singer: "The Renewed People," Emes Publishing, Moscow 1941, p. 109). After the war there was some revival, as indicated in my first article, developing in an upward line until the end of 1948 when everything was brutally crushed. (The Moscow Jewish Theatre was closed in the summer of 1949).

But here some well-meaning people will say: "Very well, you may be correct. But no matter how it happened, things have changed! You cannot turn the clock back!"

Without dwelling on the "morality" of such argument, which accepts the results of a criminal policy, one can say: Yes, things have changed. And if by that one means that there are fewer Jews using the Yiddish language, then, there are still close to half a million Jews in the USSR who registered Yiddish as their mother tongue in the census of 1959. Let them enjoy the same rights accorded to similar groups of other nationalities, including nationalities that are not concentrated in one territory!

One could dwell at some length on this point, quoting facts and figures, making analogies. But... things have truly changed in quite a different way! Some changes were brought about by fascism, others by the Second World War, when six million Jews were murdered — because they were Jews, murdered without any distinction.
Even before the war, during the rise of Nazism, Georgi Dimitrov raised a cry against national nihilism. He pointed out how Lenin, while fighting resolutely against bourgeois nationalism, wrote in 1914, his "National-Pride of the Great Russians." Reminding us how, during the historic trial at Leipzig, he defended the Bulgarian people, Dimitrov stated:

"Proletarian internationalism must, so to speak, "acclimatize itself" in each country in order to sink deep roots in its native land" (G. Dimitrov: "The United Front," pp. 79-80).

During the rise of Nazism national consciousness among the Jewish people was heightened. Then came Auschwitz... Treblinka... Maidanek... Babi Yar... Ponary... and many, many other death factories, places of the most horrible slaughter... Among the six million Jews murdered by the Nazis, there were one million Jewish children, slaughtered in a most unbelievably barbaric manner, burned alive... Does it not occur to Prof. Braginsky that this has really brought about profound changes among the Jewish people; that it is not to continue with the line of forced assimilation of insensitivity to the deeply felt sentiments of the Jewish people, he will only bring about the very thing he is supposedly fighting - bourgeois nationalism?

This insensitivity to the suffering of the Jewish people during the war was a by-product of the shameful book, "Judaism Without Embellishment." This insensitivity led to attacks on that pride of Soviet literature, Evgeni Evtushenko, for his poem "Babi Yar," a poem published in the organ of the Union of Soviet Writers, Literaturnaya Gazeta - all honor to this Writers' Union and its organ!

Professor Braginsky may not be so sensitive to this subject - and that is his right. He may not be expressing the anniversary of the uprising of the Warsaw Ghetto, observed by countless numbers of Jews (and non-Jews, too) throughout the world - and that is his right, too. But he is certainly not expressing the sentiments of the Jewish masses. Anyone accepting him as representing the Jewish masses would be making a serious mistake.

The May issue of Look magazine carried an article sensationally captioned: "The Vanishing Jew," by Thomas B. Morgan. From the standpoint of business this seemed to have been a good contribution; that issue of Look was gobbled up by the reading public, mainly by Jews. As a serious analysis, however, it was utterly worthless.

Mr. Morgan based his premise on some figures showing an increase in Jewish-Gentile intermarriages. Since American Jews do not go in for large families and therefore, according to Mr. Morgan, do not "reproduce" themselves, the day will come when the American Jew will "vanish."

While admitting intermarriage presents a problem, Jewish leaders nevertheless had little difficulty in blasting Mr. Morgan superimposed on the American Jew's "vanishing.

Mr. Morgan's type of "prediction" is nothing new. In 1908, the writer and dramatist Israel Zangwill prophesied the well-known theory of the "Melting Pot" predicting 56 years ago - the disappearance of all nationalities and national groups in the USA. He was followed by Karl Kautsky who in 1908 wrote "Are Jews a Race," written in 1914, predicted the disappearance of the Jewish nationalities everywhere, basing himself on immigration figures of Jews into the USA. Here, in the USA, he stated (50 years ago) "the process of the dissolution of the native Jewry is proceeding at full speed" (p. 154). He maintained (p. 241) that when Jewish immigration into the USA will end and the second generation will no longer understand Yiddish, will not live in compact Jewish neighborhoods and religion will become a matter of indifference to them, "the last barrier to their assimilation will be removed" (K. Kautsky: Are Jews A Race, International Publishers, New York 1926).

Consider present day realities this sounds ludicrous. Around 80 percent of the Jewish community of over five and a half million in the USA are American-born second, third and even fourth generation Jews. But this community was not so highly organized around Jewish activities. "B'nai B'rith" with about 450,000 members, Haddassah with over 300,000, or the Zionist movement or American Jewish organizations, are not as few as the Yiddish-speaking elements who are alert to national Jewish interests but are opposed to nationalism.

Again, language integration does not mean national assimilation! Many people, however, are still making the mistake of confusing the two distinctly different developments. In an article in the May issue of the magazine USST (published by the Soviet Embassy in Washington) is making the same mistake.

Does it follow that there is no assimilation at all? Of course there is. There are forces in Jewish society, as well as in Christian society, that bring about, for different reasons, assimilation depending on many factors, but the nationality as a whole continues to exist. In the USA, for example, the Jewish nationality has not been assimilated, although many Jews have assimilated. Those who have assimilated have done so because they have chosen to do so, not because they were forced to do so.

Some maintain that Jews have kept and are keeping together due to persecution, anti-Semitism. Undoubtedly this is a powerful factor. Anti-Semitism, anti-semitic trends and discrimination, anti-Jewish persecution tend to unite the Jewish people. Persecution of Jews in any country, particularly major ones, affects Jews everywhere. The Dreyfus case in France in the '90s had an effect on Jews throughout the world. And so with the persecution and pogroms in czarist Russia, in Eastern Europe generally, not to mention the extermination of a third of the Jewish people by the Hitlerite beasts during the Second World War. All these developments fostered nationalistic movements (Zionism came into being during the Dreyfus uproar), but among proletarian-internationalist Jewish elements, too, national consciousness was heightened due to these causes.

Generations of persecutions, of pogroms, of ritual blood libels, have made Jews everywhere sensitive to persecution or "just" anti-semitism anywhere. Again, the experience of the Jewish people during the Second World War, with its Auschwitz and Babi Yar must be borne in mind.

Any one surprised at the "exaggerated" shock and resentment over the despicable, anti-Semitic book "Judaism Without Embellishment" must have forgot the whole story.
Jews on alert. But one must not overlook other factors contributing to national consciousness and adherence. There is the history of the Jewish people, Jewish culture (in Yiddish, Hebrew, and other languages), tradition, customs or just national pride and other factors. So are families among Jews of various countries. Religion has played a powerful role in the past and is still a factor among many Jews.

With all this, certain elements among the Jewish people, even if relatively insignificant, may assimilate (and if these are progressive elements they make it easier for nationalist elements to hold sway over considerable Jewish masses). But it is not only idle to talk of the “vanishing” of the Jewish people, or of the disappearance because of the effect of the “melting pot,” or because of the diminished use of Yiddish—it is also harmful. The theories of Zangwill and Kautsky resulted in petty bourgeoise, anarchistic, or leftist-nationalist notions regarding the Jewish question and the national question generally. I am afraid the approach of Professor Braginsky suffers from this confusion.

Prof. Braginsky, to support his approach, may refer to Lenin who wrote in his polemics with the leader of the Jewish social democratic Bund charged them with their “fear” of assimilation. But Lenin was dealing with a trend, not a policy. There is a big difference here! When assimilation became a line they policy, one is apt to use a “little bit” of force in order to promote this policy, as was happening during ther Cult days in the USSR. But Lenin was quite stern on this subject; he kept warning against forced assimilation and his guards policy be put forth in the same essay, in his polemics with the Bund leaders, the program of equality, as quoted in my first article (Morning Freiheit, May 17). In the very same essay he declared in no uncertain terms: “Whoever does not recognize, and does not change, the equality of nations and languages, does not fight against all national oppression or inequality, it is not a Marxist, it is not even a democrat” (V.I. Lenin: Critical Remarks On The National Question, Moscow 1951, p. 24).

Nothing could be clearer than that! And this is policy.

In that same essay, written in 1913, while speaking favorably of the trends of assimilation, Lenin also referred favorably to the attitude of Kautsky, quoting-as Kautsky did-figures of Jewish and other immigrants into the USA. However, during the first war, in his polemics with Rosa Luxemburg on the national question-particularly in his book Left Wing Communism, Lenin was mainly fighting against left-dogmatism on this question, as we have seen (Morning Freiheit, May 31), hardly mentioning the subject of assimilation. What is most important is the policy of full equality, which resulted in the flowering of the culture of the nationalities, including the Jewish nationalities; it was introduced by him and prosecuted after the October Revolution with utmost severity, without weakening his struggle against bourgeois nationalism, against local nationalism as well as Great Russian chauvinism.

In this connection it will be important to recall “Lenin’s Letters On The National Question,” written towards the end of 1922 and published for the first time after the 20th Congress of the CPSU in the theoretical organ of the party, Kommunist (1956, No. 9). In these letters Lenin severely criticized the approach of Stalin and others on the subject of relations between the various Soviet Republics and among and towards the nationalities in the Caucasus. Lenin stated: “Internationalism on the part of the oppressing or the so-called GREAT nation (although great only in its violence, great only in the sense of brutality) must consist not only in observing the formal equality of nations, but also in such inequalities as will make up on the part of the oppressed nation, the big nation, for the inequality which in fact arises in life. Whoever does not understand this does not really understand the proletarian attitude to the national question.

...It is necessary to lay down the strictest rules regarding the use of national languages in republiques of different nationalities belonging to the union, and to enforce this rule with special thoroughness. There is no doubt that on the pretext of the unity of railway services, the pretext of fiscal unity and so on, we will have under the present apolitical mass of evil practices of a Russian-chauvinist character.” (The Letters appeared in English translation in the English section of the Morning Freiheit, on Dec. 30, 1936 and January 6 and 20, 1937.)

In 1956, after the Cult of Stalin was exposed, quite a good deal was written on how Lenin’s tenants on the national question were violated during the Cult period. The magazine Voprosi Istori (Problems of History), in the issue of March of that year devoted its first and leading article to this question and to Lenin’s fight against Stalin in the Caucasian situation. The editorial pointed out how Lenin fought against “great-power chauvinism and local nationalism”; how in his struggle against the Russian reactionaries and bourgeois parties he fought anti-semitism, pointing out that “anti-semitism is deeply hated by the proletariat.”