

ALERT

Vol. IV, No. 20/April 16, 1980/ Robert Gordon - Pres./Davida Manon-Editor

The Union of Councils for Soviet Jews

TWO NEW PRISONERS SENTENCED

Vladimir Korniev of Odessa was recently sentenced to one year's imprisonment on charges of "parasitism". In another case, Ivan Oleinik of Kiev was sentenced to one year in a labor camp on charges of "hooliganism." Detained for the first time on March 13th, it was expected he would be given the 15 day sentence meted out to his wife, Elena and brothers-in-law on past occasions. These sentences are further indications of the recent severe crack-down on refuseniks in the Ukraine.

TOURISTS AND REFUSENIKS HARASSED

American tourists in the Soviet Union have been caught up in the recent rise in Soviet anti-Semitism (see N.Y. Times article reprinted on page 10). It was reported by CBS on April 11th, that Jewish tourists from the US were attacked in Kiev, Odessa and a central Asian city. We have also heard from two students who were searched both upon entering and leaving the Soviet Union. The two were separated, questioned and denied the right to call the US consulate. A claim may be made against the Soviet government for confiscating their personal property.

Searches of refusenik homes in several cities have also been reported. In Riga, Alexander Maryasin, Yakov Arieiev and two others whose names are not known, were subjected to search and interrogation. In Leningrad Aba Taratuta's apartment was searched by nine KGB men for 3 hours. Claiming they were seeking "unusual anti-Soviet material," they took books not printed in the USSR, the Taratuta's typewriter, cassettes, letters and their address book. They even took apart the washing machine! Aba Taratuta, who was also subjected to a two hour interrogation, asks for letters from all their correspondents, as they no longer have any addresses. Write to Aba and Ida Taratuta at: Pr. Kosmonovtov 27 Kv.1, apt. 71, Leningrad, RSFSR, USSR.

GUBERMAN APPEALS HIS SENTENCE

Igor Guberman, recently convicted without evidence on charges of theft, is scheduled for a hearing of his appeal on April 23rd. Until that time he is being held in Volokolomsk Prison which is situated about fifty miles from Moscow. His friend, Lev Izrin, was sentenced to two years in a labor camp for refusing to incriminate Guberman.

AMNER ZAVUROV RELEASED

Zavurov, a former resident of Uzbekistan, was recently released at the end of his sentence of three years for trumped-up charges of parasitism and hooliganism. Originally the recipient of an exit visa in August 1975, along with his brother Amnon, Amner had his exit visa confiscated the day before their departure. Because he refused to desist from further attempts at emigration, he was imprisoned in December 1976. In January 1977, he received a three year sentence which recently ended.

Now that he is out of prison, Soviet authorities must be urged to give Amner back his exit permit. Send letters to Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin, Soviet Embassy, 1125 16th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, reminding him that Amner Zavurov has served his sentence and now deserves to be allowed to emigrate.

THE TRAGEDY OF ISAAC ZLOTVER

On April 7, 1980, long-term refusenik Isaac Zlotver died in Sverdlovsk after a long bout with cancer. His wife Dina died of cancer in 1977. They never saw their grandchild in Israel. (Continued on next page)



Many people strove in vain to help Zlotver obtain his emigration visa and join his children in Israel.

In May 1979 Representative Blanchard wrote the head of OVIR in Sverdlovsk:

Mr. Zlotver will reach 60 years of age at the end of May. He suffers from cancer and only wishes to have the opportunity to live out the rest of his life with his family. His wife, who has already died of cancer, never had that opportunity...

Surely in this instance, simple humanitarian understanding is basis enough to allow Mr. Zlotver to leave the Soviet Union now.

In June 1979, Representative Fenwick stated:

In the name of humanity, in the spirit and according to the letter of the Helsinki Pact, I urge Soviet officials to grant compassionate consideration of this truly pathetic case.

The Soviet Union disregarded all pleas and a sick and lonely old man was not granted his final wish.

SHCHARANSKY AND MENDELEVICH IN LABOR CAMPS

Anatoly Shcharansky and Yosif Mendelevich have been transferred to two different camps in the Perm region. Though there is some relief that the men have survived the dreaded transport, the camps they are in give new cause for concern. They are reportedly extremely anti-Semitic. In Shcharansky's camp Jews are not allowed to meet. Even two Jews standing together is considered dangerous. The central postal address for both men is: Uchr. 5110/1 VS, Moscow, RSFSR, USSR.

TROUBLE BREWING FOR YELISTRATOV

A report from Siberia indicates that Soviet authorities are putting together a case against Victor Yelistratov. Victor is especially disliked by the KGB because he is openly involved with both Jewish and Christian dissidents. Soviet authorities have been particularly harsh toward those who foster communication between different strands of opposition to their regime. This was apparently a factor in the arrest of such activists as Yuri Orlov and Anatoly Shcharansky, and is now being used against Yelistratov.

Our source in Siberia was questioned extensively about Tatiana Velikanova, a human-rights activist now in pre-trial detention, Bishop Goretoi, an imprisoned Christian dissident and Yelistratov. The interrogator indicated that there would be a trial involving all three in late summer.

The prosecution is apparently following the approach used in the Guberman case, tying a Jewish activist to other dissidents in the hope of discrediting all of them.

SOVIET CATCH 22 SHATTERS A DREAM OF PASSOVER IN ISRAEL by Walter Wisniewski

Moscow (UPI) - Andrew Reznitsky and his wife, Nadezhda Zakharova, Tuesday celebrated Passover, the traditional religious holiday commemorating the Jews' deliverance from slavery, almost bereft of hope that they can realize their dream of emigrating to Israel.

Less than three weeks ago Andrew and Nadezhda were at Sheremetyevo Airport preparing to leave for a new life in Israel. Now they are almost penniless, jobless and homeless, without any official documents.

They no longer have a permit to leave the Soviet Union, nor do they possess permission to stay in Moscow, or anywhere else. Miss Zakharova is seven months of the way through a difficult pregnancy - she has had three miscarriages in the past - but Moscow clinics will no longer offer her any medical aid, since she and her husband surrendered their citizenship as part of the emigration process.

Since they have neither the official papers to leave nor the necessary documents to stay, Reznitsky and his wife are caught in one of the paradoxical riddles that permeate Soviet

bureaucracy, a real-life catch 22. Most of all they want to leave, but there seems to be no way out.

Reznitsky and his wife have exactly \$277 left. Soviet visa authorities have told them they cannot retrieve their emigration permits until they pay 8,000 rubles - more than \$12,000 at official exchange rates.

Miss Zakharova (she uses her maiden name) says she and Andrew are the victims of a "horrible experiment" to discourage Soviet Jews from emigrating. "This is a new step in the policy against the Jewish people, trying to draw everything out of them," she said. "All other Jewish families are trembling with fear."

Western monitors of Soviet Jewry have noted scarcely any reduction in the tide of emigration from the Soviet Union to Israel, running at a rate of up to 60,000 people each year.* But they have recently reported a rise in anti-Semitic incidents.

The plight of Reznitsky and his wife is unusual because it represents a split within a family - the 8,000 rubles is the amount Miss Zakharova's eldest sister says she is owed for all the presents she gave Nadezhda during her lifetime. But in this one-word-against-another dispute, the authorities have taken the claim of the older sister as fact, and disregarded Nadezhda's protests because, as a would-be emigre, she is a "betrayers of the motherland."

Soviet citizens are allowed to make financial claims against anyone emigrating from the USSR, but those claims normally must be decided in court. Miss Zakharova sought legal aid from the Soviet courts, and while she found one jurist who agreed the verdict without trial of OVIR, the visa office, was unfair, he declined to act, "because nobody tells OVIR what to do."

The claim against Miss Zakharova surfaced less than 24 hours before her departure, which had been scheduled for March 14. She and her husband were yanked out of a line waiting for customs inspection at Shermetyevo and told to report at once to OVIR. There officials asked to inspect the couple's visas and announced they would not be returned until Miss Zakharova, who is 27, satisfied her debt to her sister, Valentina Shcherbina, 45, who lives in the distant Siberian city of Norilsk.

"Eight thousand rubles, to us that is a fantastic sum, like a million dollars," Miss Zakharova said. "When I was working, (she was asked to resign her job as an intourist translator after she applied to emigrate in early 1979) I earned only 90 rubles a month (\$136.80). That's 8 years salary".

The young woman said she certainly had received gifts from Valentina "on all the usual occasions," but beyond two small gold rings, there was nothing of significant value. She does not harbor ill-will toward her sister, who has a high-paying engineering job in Siberia, but believes some overly zealous apparatchik suggested the financial claim.

(Mrs. Shcherbina returned to Norilsk, a closed city, after delivering the 8,000 ruble claim to OVIR. Repeated attempts to interview her by telephone were unsuccessful.)

Miss Zakharova's tall, dark-haired husband, who is 37, sat quietly by her side as she told about their plight, and why they decided to risk further official disfavor by making an open appeal for help.

Reznitsky also lost his job - he was an artist, working on the design of commercial establishments and exhibitions - when the couple filed for permission to emigrate.

Since they were called back from the airport last month, they have been accepting aid from friends. Their landlady has evicted the couple and they now have a bed only on a day-to-day basis. Miss Zakharova said the state visa office will not relent. "Now we have no documents, no visas, no passports, no jobs, no place to live and nobody wants to know us."

* Editor's Note: This statement is incorrect. Last year emigrants numbered a little over 50,000. this year's figures are down 30%.



Prime Minister Menachem Begin
Robert Gordon, President UCSJ



Lynn Singer, Vice President UCSJ, Adele
& Joel Sandberg, Vice President UCSJ,
Prime Minister Menachem Begin

UNION OF COUNCILS FOR SOVIET JEWS SPONSORS INTERNATIONAL MEETING IN ISRAEL

Soviet Jewry activists from 5 countries gathered in Israel from March 20th to 25th for an international meeting on the current problems facing Soviet Jews. The meeting was sponsored by the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews, The Israel Public Council for Soviet Jewry, with the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry, The 35's (Women's Campaign for Soviet Jewry, England and Canada) and the French Committee of 15.

One of the highlights of the seminar was a Sabbath afternoon meeting in the home of Prime Minister Menachem Begin. There Robert Gordon, president of the UCSJ, urged the Prime Minister to do everything in his power to help Soviet Jews and especially, to improve the Israeli government's handling of the handling of the large Soviet Jewish exodus.

The following is a summary of the sessions of the conference:

I THE MEETING AT THE KNESSET

The first session was a rather heated meeting at the Knesset with Member of the Knesset Roni Milo, chairman of the Committee on Aliya and Absorption. When asked by a UCSJ activist why the Israeli government would not pass on basic information about refuseniks, Mr. Milo acknowledged that the activist groups need information in order to be effective, and promised to work to improve relations between the Israel "Special Office" and the groups from abroad.

There was less agreement on other issues. Roni Milo defended the Israeli policy of fighting to deny aid for Soviet Jews who do not go to Israel. This was the first of many such comments from Israelis. The unanimity with which Israelis spoke against "noshrim" (drop-outs) surprised many of the participants from abroad. Possibly the Israelis were equally surprised at the degree of support for freedom of choice for Soviet emigrants expressed by the foreign activists.

II THE CULTURAL MOVEMENT

Several Soviet Jews spoke on the crucial issue of aiding the movement to disseminate Jewish culture among the Jews of the Soviet Union. Prof. Benjamin Fein defined Jewish cultural survival as a key problem and requested that the West share with Soviet Jews its wealth of Jewish cultural materials. He stressed that the leaders of the movement want cultural materials sent openly, as it is legal according to the Helsinki Accords. (Editor's note: Given the rate of Soviet compliance, the main result of such a campaign may be documentation of Soviet non-delivery of these items. This information, however, will be useful for presentation in Madrid.) As the Accords state that signators will facilitate the cultural education of national minorities, the cultural movement is also struggling for the legalization of Jewish education in the USSR.

Prof. Fein showed the group a series of tape cassettes produced by "Tarbut" on Jewish culture which may be sent or brought legally into the Soviet Union. These cassettes are now available from the UCSJ.

More on Jewish culture was presented by Dan Roginsky of the Association for the Dissemination of the Hebrew Language. He spoke of the renaissance of the Hebrew language in the Soviet Union which, he pointed out, preceded the emigration movement. The desire to speak the "mother tongue" is strong among certain Soviet Jews and the need for tapes and books is great.

Alla Rusinek was the third Soviet Jew to speak on the need to bring in cultural materials. She showed the group copies of Israel Today, a monthly publication in Russian. She stressed that the large format was used to emphasize that this is a legal publication, not one that has to be smuggled into the Soviet Union. She is also working on the preparation of materials for children. (The materials from the sessions on Jewish culture are available from the UCSJ office).

III SOVIET JEWISH SCIENTISTS IN ISRAEL

Dr. Shmuel Adler spoke to the conference about the resettlement of scientists in Israel. He was able to give the participants a positive picture of the situation of the immigrants after the difficult first years of adjustment to a new society. The figures were quite encouraging. After 3 years, 75% of the immigrant scientists report that they are in a profession similar to that in which they worked in the USSR. The same proportion report that they are satisfied with their housing. Seventy percent report general satisfaction with their lives in Israel and 90% plan to remain in Israel. (Of the group studied, only 6-8% had left Israel within 3 years of their arrival.)

Dr. Adler reported that the most serious problem for new arrivals is housing. The government has various programs to ease the situation, including rent subsidies and low-interest mortgages, but the housing shortage will remain a problem for some time to come.

In 1973 the Center for the Absorption of Scientists was founded. One of its projects was to find jobs for refusenik scientists so that when they finally received permission to emigrate, jobs would be waiting for them. Though this is a small scale project, five refusenik scientists have already arrived in Israel and taken up their jobs.



Rifka Drori(sister of POC Yosif Mendel-
evich), Glen Richter, SSSJ



Michael Sherbourne, London UCSJ,
Elana Friedman(sister of Ida Nudel)

IV THE MOVEMENT IN THE USSR AND ISRAEL

Ruth Bar-On, the Director of Information of the Israel Public Council for Soviet Jewry, presented an overview of the Soviet Jewry movement, with the bright and dark sides. The figures she presented for 1979 showed both aspects. Last year 180,000 Soviet Jews requested 'vizovs' (invitations to immigrate to Israel) representing a vast swelling of the desire to

escape the Soviet prison. The current number of "Prisoners of Zion" is the lowest that it has been in years. However, the movement in the Soviet Union is weak and fearful today, the number of activists dwindling and their morale low. The main activities today are cultural, not political, as in more hopeful times. Israel expects only 30,000 to emigrate from the Soviet Union this year as opposed to the more than 50,000 who came out last year.

In Israel there have been many developments in the movement over the past decade. In 1970, when the country became aware of the Soviet Jewish renaissance, there was great euphoria. This was followed in 1973 by disillusionment when the country began to deal with the reality of the Soviet Jewish immigration - not heroes, but real people. Today, Ms. Bar-On said, Israelis are more receptive to Soviet Jews. As evidence, she cited a number of developments: increased emphasis on Soviet Jews in Israeli education; a Russian language letter writing project called "Keshet Am Yisrael"; the formation of various activist groups, such as Shomer Achi Anochi, I-WIN (Israeli Women for Ida Nudel) and youth movements; and pressure groups of Soviet Jews who are now beginning to reach positions of importance in Israeli society.

In the question and answer period that followed, two concerns were raised: First, activists from France were especially disturbed by the limited definition of "Prisoner of Zion" used by the Israelis. They felt that a broader classification of Prisoner of Conscience should be used when determining who deserves a campaign of support. A second concern was that the definition of refusenik was too narrow for the current situation. A new category must be developed for those who are unable even to submit their applications because of various Soviet restrictions.

V RECENT ARRIVALS FROM THE SOVIET UNION

Among the recent arrivals from the Soviet Union who spoke at the conference, Lev Ulanovsky spoke most forcefully. He told of the discouragement felt by the long-term refuseniks of Moscow, only two of whom had received permission in the last year.

The rising anti-Semitism also had him worried. Ulanovsky claimed that anti-Semites feel that they have a free reign in Soviet society today. The very word "Jew" has become a dirty word in the Soviet Union. Given this dangerous situation, it is imperative that Soviet Jews be helped to get out as quickly as possible.

VI DAVID SHIPLER ON SOVIET DISSIDENT MOVEMENTS

A speech by David Shipler was termed "the most informative lecture ever given at any Soviet Jewry meeting". As a NY Times correspondent formerly stationed in Moscow and currently working in Israel, Shipler is in an excellent position to comment on Soviet Jews and their place among dissident movements in the Soviet Union.

He presented a picture of many diverse dissenting elements in the USSR, which in the period after the signing of the Helsinki Accords, began to coordinate as Helsinki Monitors. Shipler described the excitement and optimism of that period, as the leading dissidents learned to work with the Western press to make their demands known.

The picture of Soviet dissent since the crackdown which started in the fall of 1976, was much more sobering. Two of the factors which led to the Soviet attack against the dissidents were (1) the authorities' fears of the communications network which had developed within the USSR among the dissidents, and (2) the spread of dissent into Eastern Europe.

Shipler attributed the rise in the number of Jewish emigrants to Soviet perception that detente - which to them meant arms limitation and trade with the West - was succeeding. The US, on the other hand, feels that a reduction of tensions in the Third World is an essential part of detente. According to Shipler, this lack of understanding of each other's goals led to the demise of detente and the drop in emigration.

VII MEETINGS WITH SOVIET JEWS

The emotional highpoints of the conference were meetings with Soviet Jews. There were joyous moments - when activists met former prisoners of conscience and refuseniks - people

now busy rebuilding their lives in Israel. Even the absence of one old friend - Silva Zalmanson - was a cause for joy. Her brother, former POC Israel Zalmanson, told the group that she was home in Tel Aviv taking care of her newborn daughter.

The former prisoners, at a gala reception hosted by the IPC, spoke movingly of the need to keep working on behalf of those still in prison and those former prisoners still refused permission to leave the Soviet Union.

The joy of the reunions at the reception can best be told by the photos shown below.



Aviva Gendin (wife of Lev Gendin)
Lynn Singer, Vice President UCSJ



Pam Cohen, Chicago ASJ, Parents of Lev Shapiro

VIII MEETINGS WITH FAMILIES OF CURRENT REFUSENIKS AND PRISONERS

Emotional moments of a different sort came at the meetings with separated families. Parents asked for help getting their children out of the Soviet Union, children asked that their parents be rescued. Brothers and sisters asked for help for their siblings. Some appeals brought tears to the eyes of activists who had been working on a particular case. (Now it was a person with a face - not just another case).

Reports of the situations of separated families will appear in the ALERT in coming weeks. Next week's Alert will also feature a report on an international meeting of Soviet Jewry activists recently held in London, as well as some highlights of UCSJ visits to institutes founded by Soviet immigrants in Israel.



Former POC's: Hillel Butman , Israel Zalmanson, Boris Penson, Leib Khnokh



Sister and brother-in-law of V. Slepak, Ilya Kaplan (Kishinev), Enid Wurtman, Israel Public Council

Soviet Outcasts Meet Western Scientists

By ANTHONY AUSTIN

THE NEW YORK TIMES, TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1980

SOME 30 Soviet scientists who lost their research positions after applying to emigrate to Israel crammed into a small apartment living room yesterday to hear from a group of visiting Western colleagues about recent scientific developments in their fields.

Viktor Brailovsky, a cybernetics specialist and Jewish activist who has been without a job and under police harassment since 1972, welcomed the foreign visitors to his home, saying: "Your support during these years has enabled us to survive as scientists."

It was the Fourth International Conference on Collective Phenomena, Moscow's unauthorized, officially persecuted but virtually institutionalized "refusenik seminar." It constituted the Western scientific community's gesture of solidarity with those Soviet Jewish scientists who have been refused both exit visas and a chance to continue their scientific work.

"The authorities seem to have a real problem," said Mr. Brailovsky's wife, Irina, a specialist in applied mathematics. "They don't like to see Western scientists giving this kind of support to us wretched refuseniks. Yet right now they would give their eye teeth to meet with these scientists themselves, to counteract the cutoff in scientific exchange. Strange as it may sound, you might say that the only Soviet-Western scientific contact going on right now is taking place right here in this room."

The fourth conference is marked by the same sense of valuable scientific exchange as its predecessors. In a room 18 feet by 10 feet, with all excess furniture moved out, the conferees sit on borrowed chairs or on piles of back copies of the *Physical Review* of the American Physical Society or stand crowded in the doorway.

As in 1974, 1977 and 1978, some leading Western physicists, mathematicians and other scientists filtered into Moscow, singly and in small parties, to present their papers and to learn what the Soviet outcasts have been able to produce despite professional isolation.

The Soviet Government appears to be ambivalent about this year's conference, as Mr. Brailovsky related at the opening of the conference.

On April 10, he said, he was arrested by plainclothesmen who broke down his apartment door when his wife was slow to answer the doorbell. He was questioned at a police station as a suspect in a case alleged to involve "defamation of the Soviet state" by the samizdat (self-published) journal "Jews in the U.S.S.R.," of which he is chief editor. The crime he was ques-

tioned about carries a maximum penalty of three years in prison.

"But this, I am sure, was only a pretext," Mr. Brailovsky said. "The real purpose became clear when I was warned against having the conference in my apartment."

Yet when the investigator, after a long interval, returned to the detention room, his words and manner suggested to Mr. Brailovsky that he had received new orders from above. Mr. Brailovsky asked if the authorities wanted him to "eject" the Western scientists who would be arriving at his apartment three days later. The investigator replied with some alacrity that there was no need to do that. He added that Mr. Brailovsky was being released, only stipulating that he remain in Moscow.

Six distinguished American scientists who had been invited by the Russian organizers of the conference to report on the latest advances in computers, DNA, viruses and related fields were denied entry visas.

They were Max Gottesman and Maxine Singer of the National Institutes of Health, John McCarthy of Stanford University, Patrick Winston of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Daniel McCracken, president of the Association for Computing Machinery, and Alan Nixon, a former president of the American Chemical Society.

All six, it was learned, had applied for visas for the stated purpose of attending the Moscow seminar. But four American scientists who applied to go as tourists got their visas and were among the 24 Western scientists present for the April 13-15 conference.

These four were Joel L. Lebowitz, director of the Center for Mathematics Science at Rutgers University and past president of the New York Academy of Sciences; James S. Langer, a physicist with Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, and Rolfe Herber of the chemistry department at Rutgers University.

There seemed to be some inconsistency about who was allowed in, for William Glaberson, a Rutgers physicist who had also applied for a tourist visa, was rejected. This may have been because he had attended the 1978 conference, but so had Mr. Lebowitz and Mr. Langer, two Norwegian scientists who were issued visas even though they had named the seminar as the reason for their trip. The other Westerners were nine from France, five from Britain, three from Sweden and one from Mexico.

Some of the Soviet scientists ascribed the inconsistency on who was admitted to official uncertainty as to how to deal with the whole phenomenon, particularly this year, when the Soviet scien-

tific establishment is distressed over the post-Afghanistan breach with the Western scientific community and would like to avoid giving Western scientists additional offense.

Mr. Brailovsky was not the only refusenik subject to harassment before the conference began. Yuri Golfand, a member of the organizing committee and a physicist who is best known for his original work in symmetry principles and the theory of gravitation, had his apartment searched on April 10; much scientific and other material was confiscated. Another refusenik, Abram Kagan, was prevented from leaving Leningrad to attend the conference.

The seminar idea grew out of the weekly Sunday seminars that the refuseniks have been holding among themselves since 1972. Scores of Jewish scientists who had requested and been refused permission to emigrate to Israel found themselves dismissed from their jobs or demoted to minor nonresearch positions. They needed to get together to compare notes and to fight despair as they struggled to keep alive as scientists by working in their homes, without proper equipment or material.

By the summer of 1979, more than 200 Western scientists had either attended one of the international conferences or had taken part in the Sunday seminars.

The benefit appears to have been mutual. The refuseniks and dissidents were saved from a feeling of being abandoned, and were given an opportunity of measuring their lonely work against what was being done abroad. The Westerners found the discussions highly stimulating. The Nobel Prize winner Arno Penzias said one of the seminars was his best audience ever.

The attendance at the fourth conference is the biggest yet, with a broad range of papers, including one by the exiled academician Andrei D. Sakharov, a theoretical work on the origin of the universe, sent from his exile in Gorky and read in English translation by a member of the organizing committee, the mathematician Naum Melman, and one by Yuri Orlov, who was sentenced to seven years in a labor camp in May of 1978 for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda."

As the participants arrived at the Brailovsky apartment, the K.G.B. men who had prowled about the driveways during the earlier conferences were either absent or subtler in their surveillance, and there was no sign of the communications van that listened to the proceedings with directional microphones in 1977 and 1978. Nor has anyone been arrested, as the leaders were in 1974.

HIAS bogeyman

Zvi Gitelman argues that the key to cutting the number of drop-outs lies in making Israel a truly attractive country and by raising the level of Jewish consciousness among Soviet Jews.

THE SUBJECT of Soviet emigré drop-outs has been dealt with so often that one might have expected the facts to be widely known and the issue to be discussed with some objectivity. Unfortunately, Sarah Honig disappointed that expectation in her article, "On the Drop-Out Trail," in last week's *Post*, where she helped to perpetuate the Israeli image of HIAS as a bogeyman.

She quoted one of the Jewish Agency's emissaries in Rome as saying that the emigrés had already decided not to go to Israel. Research by the Ministry of Immigrant Absorption, among others, supports the belief that this decision had already been made in the Soviet Union.

What sense does it make, then, to talk about HIAS "snatching olim from Israel"? These people never intended to come to this country. They merely used the only way open to them, an Israeli invitation, to get out of the USSR, for Soviet authorities allow only about 500 Jews a year to go straight to the U.S. And if one raises the moral issue of dissimulation — one can reply that this is a legal fiction, known to all parties concerned, and hence tacitly agreed to.

Would anyone argue that European Jews who used Central American papers to escape the Holocaust, or those Hungarian Jews who became "Swedish subjects" through the efforts of Raoul Wallenberg, were acting immorally? True, Soviet Jews are in no immediate danger of physical annihilation, but the only way they can leave a country in which there is no future for Judaism, or even for assimilated Jews, is to accept an invitation to Israel.

This renders the term *noshrim* — drop-outs — not only loaded but inaccurate. The notion of HIAS

"snatching olim" is contradicted by the contrasting pictures drawn by Ms. Honig: while those bound for Israel "disappear behind an electronically-operated steel door...without being allowed as much as a peek at Vienna," the others move about freely in Rome.

When one realizes that those bound for Israel are never seen by anyone from HIAS or the JDC, while those who are heading elsewhere are interviewed first by Jewish Agency officials in Vienna, and then are exposed to Israeli films, books, and language training in Rome, it certainly strikes one that, rather than HIAS persuading anyone to go to America, it is the representatives of Israel who have all the chances in the world to convince people — quite rightly in my opinion — to come to Israel.

Finally, I am puzzled as to why this country would want so many *n'er-do-wells* as are described in Israeli articles about the emigrés (Ms. Honig heard "rumours of...protection rings, crime, prostitution and gang wars among the emigrants"). There is no doubt that such types are found among the emigrants, though I am not prepared to say in what proportion. But are they to be brought here for rehabilitation in Israel's superior moral climate?

HUNGARIAN, Polish, Iranian and other Jews who have been assisted by HIAS in the last 20 years might differ from Ms. Honig's judgment that it is "an anachronism that has outlived its usefulness." (The only Jewish immigrants to America it has not aided are the 300,000 from Israel.).....

On the practical side, we must recognize the clash between the principle of freedom of choice, so sacred to the liberal circles to which most American Jews belong,

and the traditional paternalistic Israeli attitude toward immigrants (and citizens). It will do no good to appeal to the "well-meaning...but misinformed community members" to cut off aid to the emigrés, because it goes against their values and beliefs.

FINALLY, one must deal with the hoary myth, repeated by Ms. Honig, that "if the trend continues unchecked, the drop-outs may endanger, or severely limit, Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union. The number of exit permits has already gone down drastically."

Neither Ms. Honig nor the mysterious "*aliya* circles" can cite a single Soviet source to support this. More importantly, how do they explain the fact that in 1977, 1978 and 1979, years in which more than half the emigrés did not go to Israel, there was a rise in Soviet-Jewish emigration? In 1979, about 50,000 Jews, more than ever before, left the USSR.

True, in recent months there has been a decline in exit permits. But since changes in the volume of emigration have always reflected the state of American-Soviet relations, it is not the trends in *neshira* and *aliya*, but the Afghanistan crisis that is the relevant factor.

There is no reason for anyone to settle in Israel other than a strong Jewish and Zionist commitment. Most Jews left in the USSR today have neither, the committed ones having left as soon as the gates were opened. To force uncommitted Jews to come here — and cutting off aid means, in practice, just that — is short-sighted, immoral, impractical, and self-defeating. Only by making this a truly attractive country, and by raising the level of Jewish consciousness among Soviet Jews, can Israel hope to have people choosing to live here.

The author is professor of political science at the University of Michigan. A specialist in Soviet affairs, he is currently a guest professor at Tel Aviv University. (This article is extracted from one which appeared in the daily edition of The Jerusalem Post.)

COMMUNITY EVENTS SPUR SOVIET JEWRY FREEDOM DINNER

A Bi-county effort is under way in Nassau-Suffolk to insure the success of the First Annual Freedom Dinner for Soviet Jewry, which will take place March 8 at the Sands in Atlantic Beach.

Starting in early Fall, a series of dinner planning meetings were held, and the plight of Soviet Jewry was brought to the attention of Long Island leaders in the fields of banking, industry, labor, politics and religion.

Mrs Lynn Singer, President of the Long Island committee for Soviet Jewry, and State Senator Norman Levy, Chairman of the Dinner, have been focusing attention on, "Why holding a 'Human Rights' event for Soviet Jews on Long Island is of extreme urgency at this moment in history." As the world situation becomes more fraught with danger and the cold war looms larger on the

horizon, those Soviet Jews who have put their lives on the line by actively participating in the freedom movement in Russia must not be forgotten. The Soviets must not be allowed to deny freedom of emigration to Russian Jews.

"The senses of Americans have been dulled by constant media propaganda stating the numbers of Jews allowed to leave the USSR has increased," commented Norman Levy, speaking before a gathering of country club presidents at the Seawane Country Club. "The truth is, that even though the numbers of Jews allowed to leave has increased, more Jews were being denied permission to emigrate and there are more refusenik families being denied permission. We have accurate information showing that the Soviets have separated families, allowing mothers and children to emigrate, while refusing

permission to the husbands, or giving parents exit visas and not allowing their children to leave."

Lynn Singer, speaking at a meeting of Long Island bankers and industrial leaders, pointed out the facts in the Shcharansky, Nudel and Slepak cases. "Anatoly Shcharansky," she said, "Is very ill in a Soviet prison, has not been allowed proper medical treatment, and is denied the minimal care given to the most vicious criminal in a free society. Ida Nudel and Vladimir Slepik are serving sentences in exile in Siberia, having committed no crime. Only their desire to emigrate to Israel and their exposure to American tourists, put their lives in jeopardy and snatched them from the lives they led as refuseniks. They are now living as exiled prisoners, away from family and friends under the most unhealthy and unsanitary conditions in the furthestmost regions of the USSR." Mrs Singer added that, "In order for the Long Island Committee to continue its work on behalf of Shcharansky, Nudel and Slepak, and all the refuseniks, and to fight the latest threat of a cold war with the USSR, the Freedom Dinner must be supported fully by Long Islanders to insure its success."

U.S. Says Soviet Harasses Tourists

By ANTHONY AUSTIN

Special to The New York Times

MOSCOW, April 11 — The United States Embassy said today that it was protesting to the Soviet authorities against incidents during the last two weeks in which American tourists were harassed by Soviet customs officials and assaulted by unidentified Soviet groups.

Though the embassy declined to go into details, it was learned that the assaults took place in Kiev, Odessa and a city in Central Asia and involved six American men, all Jews, some of whom had brought religious articles for Soviet Jews in those cities.

The embassy also disclosed it had protested to the Soviet Government against a recent increase in "harassing surveillance" of American diplomats attached to the consulate in Leningrad.

There has been no formal reply to the American protests, informed sources said, and the intensified surveillance in Leningrad is continuing.

Link to Olympics Discerned

While Western diplomats could not be sure what this hardening Soviet attitude portended, the tourist incidents were thought to be linked to the approach of the Olympic Games.

Soviet officials have been calling in the controlled press for greater vigilance against foreigners who will be arriving under the guise of Olympic tourists in order to spread ideologically harmful material. It may be that the authorities have decided to stop American Jewish visitors from bringing in religious objects for Soviet Jews, a practice that is understood to have been going on for some time. The incidents cited by the embassy may have been intended as a warning to American Jews who plan to be here during the Olympic season.

The embassy statement said: "There have been several incidents over the past two weeks involving confiscation of materials and harassment of U.S. tourists by Soviet customs officials. There have also been three separate cases of assaults on U.S. tourists by groups of unidentified Soviet assailants. Protests regarding these incidents are being lodged with Soviet authorities."

In each case, it was learned, the Americans were accosted, pushed about and roughed up by groups of toughs while walking in the street. One of the groups pretended to be drunk, the sources said.

THE NEW YORK TIMES,

SATURDAY, APRIL 12, 1980

No Serious Injuries

The Americans sustained bruises and other injuries but nothing serious enough to require medical attention. In two cases, the sources said, the Americans were carrying Hebrew prayer books, sheet music and other religious articles not obtainable in the Soviet Union.

Some of the same tourists were involved in the customs incidents, in which, it was said, the luggage of American Jews arriving in Moscow was searched with "unnecessary severity" going far beyond normal customs procedures. One American woman, it was reported, was subjected to a body search by a female official.

In Leningrad, where American consular officials are as accustomed to "normal" surveillance as American Embassy officials in Moscow, Soviet security-police tactics have suddenly become more manifest. For instance, a source reported, an American diplomat driving in his car will find a Soviet car uncomfortably close behind, or a man out walking will find security men walking next to him.

Union of Councils for Soviet Jews

24 Crescent St., Suite 3A, Waltham, Ma 02154

April 16, 1980

INSIDE TODAY'S ALERT

- * International conference of Soviet Jewry activists meets in Israel. Page 4.
- * Refuseniks host International Science Conference in Moscow. Page 8.
- * More on the subject of "drop-outs". Page 9.
- ** STOP PRESS ** Semyon Gluzman is very ill, according to his wife (ulcer suspected).
- ** URGENT REQUEST ** Please send documentation of Soviet non-delivery of mail to Washington Committee for Soviet Jewry.

First-Class Mail

U.S. POSTAGE

PAID

WALTHAM MA

PERMIT NO 57814