

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MARCH 2, 1953

FIVE CENTS

NEW BLOWS AGAINST THE JEWS

HUNGARY: Role of the Ex-Nazi Stalinists

UKRAINE: A New Amalgam in the Making

RUSSIA: The Case of V. S. Grossman

... page 6

'White Supremacy' in South Africa: Dictatorship Over the Whites Too

... page 3

Washington and the 'Creeping War' It's a Blind Alley, America!

By GORDON HASKELL

The Republican administration continues in its "activist" policy of psychological warfare—against its allies, the American people, and itself. During the past week its big coup has been the heralded "repudiation" of the "secret understandings" reached at Yalta and Potsdam by the major victors of World War II.

President Eisenhower had announced in his State of the Union message that he would ask both Houses of Congress to pass a resolution stating that the government "recognizes no kind of commitment contained in secret understandings of the past with foreign governments which permit... enslavement." This was widely interpreted to mean that the resolution would spell out, in detail and concretely, certain sections of the agreements at Yalta and Potsdam which divided the world into spheres of influence between the Stalinist and capitalist powers, and repudiate them formally.

It is quite clear that many leading Republi-

cans had given a literal interpretation to the plank in their party platform adopted last year which read:

"The government of the United States, under Republican leadership, will repudiate all commitments contained in secret understandings such as those of Yalta which aid Communist enslavement. It will make clear, on the highest authority of the president and the Congress, that United States policy, as one of its peaceful purposes, looks happily forward to the genuine independence of those captive peoples."

Payoff on Election Demagoguery

As soon as Eisenhower had made his State of the Union speech, allied governments began to inquire just what was intended. After all, the British government had participated in all agreements made at Yalta, and the French government had been drawn into negotiations for settling the post-war deals as part of the Foreign Ministers' Council. The secret sections of the Yalta agreement dealt chiefly with concessions to be made to Stalin in the East in return for his promise to enter the war against Japan as soon as Germany had been defeated. The sections of the Yalta agreement which gave Russia control over the present satellite countries was not a secret at that time, yet it is evident that if "repudiation" is to have any meaning it is precisely the fate of these countries which is primarily involved.

When the text of the proposed resolution was

sent up to Congress on February 20, it became clear that the president was proposing nothing more than a condemnation of Russia for not keeping her part of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements. This is the part which had reference to the setting up of independent, democratic states in the countries liberated from the Nazis.

This is not a "repudiation" of any agreements. It is simply a statement in most general and vague terms that the United States is against Russia's subjugation and Stalinization of other countries, something which is hardly news to the world.

(Continued on page 7)

What's New? Militarism...

"I am sometimes asked what is the greatest change in American life that I have noticed in the nearly 28 years that I have known America. And my answer is always the same: not the talkies, not social security, not the rise of the unions but the militarization of the country... the rise in size, power and conspicuousness of the armed forces is the single most important change.

"All this, of course, has taken place since 1940, when the American armed forces numbered around 300,000. Now they number well over 3,000,000, both in time of peace. And the tenfold increase is really one of these changes from quantity into quality that Hegelians and Marxists talk about."

Such is the judgment of Prof. D. W. Brogan, author of a number of books and frequent writer on America for the *Manchester Guardian*, in the issue of that noted British newspaper for February 12.

Not that Prof. Brogan is so anti-militarist himself. He puts the sole blame on "Messrs. Hitler and Stalin" for compelling America to militarize itself, in somewhat the same way that some used to explain Mussolini by blaming the "Communists" for forcing Italian capitalism to go fascist.

And Brogan indeed adds: "Much of this [American] dislike of the brass seems to me unjust; it is a result of refusing to notice that armies have to be like that, that discipline must often be irrational, that mere obedience is a necessary quality in a soldier, that, as the wise German saying has it, a totally reasonable army would run away."

An apologia for militarism like this is worth noting.

Bevan's Organ Says:

'THIS IS NOT OUR WAR!'

So reads the headline in the *London Tribune*, referring to the new China and Formosa policy of the Eisenhower administration and the danger of expanded warfare which it sees in these policies.

In a front-page article on February 6, the *Bevanite organ of British Labor's left wing* warns further: "The most elementary duty of any British government worth the name is to make it clear that Britain will have nothing whatever to do with the assistance of Chiang's war. He is no ally of the British people and never will be accepted as such."

The Eisenhower decision, it adds, "is an open declaration by the new American president of his desire to resurrect Chiang Kai-shek and carry the war to the Chinese mainland."

It says: "the manner in which this change of policy has been made inflicts humiliation on America's allies and reveals a frightening contempt for their opinions." And: "the dangers of an enlargement of the war have undoubtedly been increased. Forces equipped by the Americans and assisted by the American fleet may become involved in a renewal of the Chinese civil war."

The General and The Senator: 'No Solution'

By WALTER JASON

A vivid incident occurred last week at the end of a secret hearing for testimony by General Omar Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before a Senate committee, according to *Newsweek* magazine. It illustrates the dilemmas posed to U. S. policy by the problem of Korea and Stalinism.

General Bradley spoke patiently and at great length to show the fatal weaknesses in the end-the-war-quick theories which are so popular among Washington politicians and a large segment of the American public.

These plain facts exasperated the senators to the point where Senator Ferguson of Michigan snapped, "General, you don't have a solution."

General Bradley quietly replied, "No, senator, YOU don't have a solution!"

And that exchange put the whole situation in the proverbial nut-shell.

THE WRONG WAR

There is no known satisfactory solution given present American foreign policy, dominated as it is by the contradictory currents of the American political scene, which may be described as MacArthurism on the one hand and a passive (if not open) resistance to a continuation of an unpopular war on the other hand.

The trial balloons of the Eisenhower administration backfired throughout the world, as Arthur Krock of the *New York Times* wrote this past week in a carefully guarded analysis of the effect of the Eisenhower decision to "free the Seventh Fleet."

(Turn to last page)

ACTU Discovers Menace Of 'Deweyism' in the UAW

By BEN HALL

The Association of Catholic Trade-Unionists zealously pursues its monthly effort to purify the United Auto Workers from the menace of liberalism. Its publications remonstrate with Reuther for tolerating "socialists," "secular liberals," "laborites," and what not. Each issue of its Michigan organ, the *Wage Earner*, leaps off the press to track down some new culprit clearly guilty of the all-pervasive conspiracy to smuggle in intellectual enlightenment.

Last month, it rushed to the protection of Scandinavian workers from the infiltration of alien American socialism. It "exposed" the UAW representation on a CIO delegation to visit the Scandinavian labor movement, discovering that three of its members were socialists.

DEWEY 'EXPOSED'

Why this should cause any eyebrow to be lifted it never made clear, but at any rate it wanted to know who was paying their way, who had chosen them. Perhaps some undercover atheists were hot at work. But the fiery bolt from heaven turned out to be nothing but an odoriferous puff. The people in question had paid their own way in good American cash acceptable in any Bingo game and they, like all other applicants for the trip, had been accepted as a matter of course.

This month's episode in the struggle for mental stupefaction uncovers a new dangerous foe: Deweyism. "Would the average

union guy accept the philosophy of John Dewey if he knew it for what it was?" asks the Reverend Karl Hubble, chaplain of the Detroit ACTU. "Or, more important, would he want its promotion to be subsidized by part of his union dues?"

The provocation? It seems (according to Hubble) that the Educational Department of the Michigan CIO is "pushing" *Problems of Man*, a collection of essays by John Dewey. Indeed a crime; and he wants to know how "the unionist who treasures a religious faith" can allow the spread of "Deweyisms" that refer to traditional religious beliefs as "the fruit of early emotional fancies which by the accidents of history had become embodied in scriptures and incorporated in the structure of the creeds that were to be accepted if the individual soul was to be saved."

And if this is a not horrifying enough quotation, others are reprinted including: "The end of man's life is the complete realization of human personality . . . in the here and now."

AIM OF ACTU

No one can quibble with Hubble's incontestable right to disagree with Dewey or to attack his views with vigor. But his aim is far different; he seeks not primarily to refute the ideas that he opposes but to suppress their distribution.

If union officials are not intimidated by his written appeal to traditional superstitions he hopes to highpressure them by empty threats. "It may be fashionable for

the frustrated visionary to deprecate the union politician who is more interested in the practical objectives on the 'bread and butter front' but it is well to remember that in a democratic union, the votes are still counted."

Why he refers somewhat obscurely to the "bread and butter front" remains puzzling; perhaps it is just a hint to his followers suggesting that they vote for conservative men against Reutherites. In any case he is not discussing "bread and butter" in this article but pie in the sky. His concern here, is not for what enters the worker's belly but for what is allowed to go into his mind; he obviously seeks the domination of union intellectual life by the clergy.

In the UAW, like most ordinarily liberal unions, cross-currents of all beliefs, religious, non-religious and anti-religious, flow without creating difficulties or crises. This the ACTU cannot tolerate. Individuals and groups maintain a general belief in contradictory and mutually exclusive elements of different "philosophies," usually without being aware of the fact that opposing lines of thought live side by side in a sort of democracy of their own mind. Conflicting claims of science and religion both gain a hearing with a good-natured tolerance that expresses a basically healthy democratic atmosphere.

But that is not good enough for ACTU. What conflicts with its outlook is to be repressed. How vexing and frustrating that it has no power to establish a Prohibitory Index for the UAW! But it tries. . . .

British Tories Recognize A Reality in Egypt

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Feb. 17—The Anglo-Egyptian treaty signed, General Naguib shook hands with Her Britannic Majesty's ambassador, patted him on the back, embraced him, and said; "Now we can prepare for negotiations for the evacuation of Suez."

The Conservatives were completely taken by surprise. Some backbenchers wanted Eden to resign. They were furious that he had thrown away Sudan without so much as a fight.

But Eden knew that Naguib meant business, and after being outmaneuvered by Major Saleh, he had to regain the initiative. As soon as Naguib conceded Egyptian suzerainty, the British compromised to the extent that the governor-general need have no special powers, as the Constitution would protect the Southern Sudanese, who are less politically articulate, and about whom the British government was apparently so concerned. The two parties to the agreement decided on a formula, "Self-determination first, then self-government."

INTERPRETATIONS

The British and Egyptian troops are to be withdrawn, and a legislative assembly set up. On the day of the signing of the agreement, the Labor Party gave its lukewarm support. In London, Sir Ralph Ashton, Conservative MP for the City, protested at giving freedom to a people only 1 per cent literate (this figure was shown to be applicable only to the Southern Sudan). In Khartoum, there were enormous demonstrations in support of the agreement. Everything went fine until the

Egyptian government started interpreting the agreement. It said that it understood that Sudan's complete freedom implied no ties with Britain. Eden in Parliament interpreted it otherwise. While there was no obligation upon the Sudan to join the Commonwealth, in his opinion complete freedom was not incompatible with this affiliation.

It seems likely that, although hard words will confuse both interpretations the treaty will be executed despite the legal minutiae.

REDISCOVER BEVIN

Seeing that the Sudan issue was almost settled negotiations began for evacuation of the Canal Zong. I myself was surprised at the degree of realism shown by Tory newspapers. Understanding that Naguib has every intention of expelling them, the British imperialists have completely reoriented their line.

They have rediscovered the late Ernest Bevin's deposition in 1947 that the British government's intention was withdrawal anyway. They are now saying that their previous reticence was due to their distrust of Farouk's regime; they had doubted his ability to protect and maintain the area.

Apropos of this problem, the Labor Party forced a debate on the supply of arms to the Middle East. Hugh Dalton, who has just returned from Israel, pointed out for the Opposition that supply of jet aircraft could only unbalance the delicate situation there. It could only lead to an arms race between countries which should be using their resources for raising their standards of living. Many Opposition speakers thought that at a time when Egypt wanted Britain to withdraw from Suez, it was being supplied with the wherewithal to enforce its demands.

The Tories were evidently discomfited. They pointed out that only 12 jet aircraft had been supplied to Egypt, that it was to Britain's economic advantage to sell them, that there were treaty obligations to do so, etc. Labor forced a vote on this question and was defeated by 27 votes in an almost full House.

Radio broadcasts from Israel this week have reflected increased uneasiness. There have been many border incidents with Jordan, the Russians have obviously gone over to supporting the Arab bloc, and now the British continue to supply jets and modern armaments to all her neighbors.

moment—and that is what concerns us right here, right now—Bevanism is still ideologically in the camp of Western imperialism. And though it may oppose and resist any attempts of the Eisenhower administration to spread the war, it will not, and cannot, establish for itself the necessary fundamental socialist opposition to imperialist wars.

Bevanism has not reached the stage of repudiating the Korean intervention. Bevan still stands foursquare on the actions of the United Nations in Korea. It would be foolish to blind oneself to this fact. It is important for British socialists to make clear the attitude of Marxism to the Western camp in times of peace (or cold war).

[The continuation of this London Letter, in which Comrade Vaughan raises some discussion questions, appears on page 4, Ed.]

You're Invited

to speak your mind in the letter column of LA. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views.

Keep them to 500 words.

LONDON LETTER

Bevan in India Voices Asia's Hope of '3rd Bloc'

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Feb. 17—Aneurin Bevan has considerably strengthened his position by his successful visit to India. On Monday he addressed a joint session of both houses of parliament in New Delhi, attended by Prime Minister Nehru.

Russia, he said, suffers from rigidity and the United States from instability; both suffer from fear and are so powerful that they think wisdom unnecessary. The weak need wisdom most, and it is from the weaker nations that most sense has come of late. He continued:

"I believe that not only for you but for mankind it is necessary that there should be a realignment of the forces of the world; that there should emerge a third bloc of nations holding the world balance of power and compelling the two giants to listen to what they have to say.

"The voice of India in the councils of the nations has recently been of the utmost importance. Though her advice has not always been accepted, do not make the mistake of supposing that it has not had its influence. Though perhaps a change of policy may come from another nation, the initiative in changing the direction of forces can often come from nations like India leading others in the United Nations."

ATLEE SUSPECT

Undoubtedly Bevan's bold declaration to the Indian houses of parliament has raised the importance of "Bevanism" on the international plane. Atlee's visit to India, and his participation in the deliberations of the Asian Socialist Conference in Rangoon only a few weeks ago, could not

add anything to the stature of "Atleeism" by the very nature of its policy, or lack of it.

The Asian socialists were suspicious of this "Western-type socialism" which had justified General Templer's uprooting of Chinese villages and which had turned a blind eye to the ruthless exploitation of the Malayan and Chinese rubber-plantation workers. They could not sympathize with the type of "socialism" which allied itself definitively with the camp of the British Tory exploiters, the Dutch colonialists and the French imperialists. They could not see where or even how the newly emerging nationalisms of Asia and Africa could fit into the Western camp, despite a healthy skepticism of the Kremlin's "peace" camp.

But Bevan's participation was an entirely different matter. Bevan put into eloquent phrase the inarticulate feelings not only of the British Labor Party but also the yearnings of the Asian and African peoples for political and economic freedom.

NOT ONLY LABOR

Atlee's tours had raised justifiable suspicions in the hearts and minds of Asian socialists. Bevan's powerful and unequivocal appeal for an independent camp embracing the Asian nationalisms as well as the European labor movement did not, however, fall on deaf ears. This is the language, "distinct from that of capitalism and Stalinism," which finds an echo in all corners of the world.

Parallel with the Bevanism of the organized labor and trade-union movement goes the "Bevanism" of the European bourgeoisie. This tendency is becoming increasingly strong with the advent of a Republican administration in the United States bent on what it calls a more "positive" and "comprehensive" policy, as evidenced by its new line on Formosa.

When Aneurin Bevan said that he was speaking for "Britain" in expressing the grave disquiet all circles felt here with the appointment of John Foster Dulles as secretary of state, there was more than a particle of truth in his statement. For it is not only the Labor Party which is anxious about Formosa, about the talk of "repudiation" of the Yalta and Teheran agreements; the Conservative Party itself is more than usually worried.

PUSHING BEHIND

True, the anxieties stem from a different class basis. True, the Tories are thinking of trade and profits, while the Labor ranks are thinking of the Chinese revolution; they ask: What has Chiang Kai-shek to offer in place of Mao's dictatorship? But the anxieties are common to all circles of opinion, nevertheless. Already the Labor Party's front benches have given vent to the strong feeling in the country, consequent on the new reactionary twists imparted to the previous policies of the Truman administration.

Closely cross-questioned in the Commons yesterday, Foreign Minister Anthony Eden gave full support to the statement made by Arthur Henderson (former Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs in the Labor government) that "the British government does not agree with the unilateral repudiation of any international agreements which were voluntarily and validly entered into." This was in reference to the Taft statements on the repudiation of the Yalta and Teheran agreements.

And on the vexed Formosa issue, Eden said firmly: "There is no doubt in my mind—or in the U. S. government's—that this [British] government feels it has a right to consultation in advance on any major decision which would affect war policy."

It would be naive to assume

that the Labor Party front benches were not putting into bolder and more plain words the privately expressed opinions of the government benches. At the same time, the Labor front bench is setting the pace and putting the none-too-impressive Tory government on the defensive.

More important still, the Tory government and the Labor front bench are forced, despite themselves, to toll-end the Bevanite currents of opinion. Many recent statements on arms policy, on foreign policy (particularly with reference to Britain's relations with America) by Tory speakers and right-wing Labor spokesmen can be paralleled in Bevan's former or present speeches in the House of Commons, in his writings and in the pamphlets of his colleagues.

BEVAN AND WAR

This brings us to the vital problem which besets the Labor left wing—the war question; or, to be more hopeful, the war-or-peace question. Although the danger of localized wars (as in Korea and Indo-China) breaking out into a global struggle is not close at the present time, the existence of civil war, cold war or localized war since the end of the Second World War does pose, every minute of the day, life-and-death questions for socialism in general, and for the Labor rank and file in particular.

It is a fact that Bevanism is still far from a coherent, comprehensive, all-sided socialist position not only as regards domestic policy, but perhaps more important still, far from an inwardly consistent socialist foreign policy. Of course, many excellent sentiments about the need for a Third Camp are forthcoming, and only a cynic would deny that all these sentiments will have some influence when the Labor Party is raised to power on a Bevanite program.

But the truth is that, at the

NO PEOPLE THAT OPPRESSES ANOTHER CAN ITSELF BE FREE

'White Supremacy' in South Africa Means: Dictatorship Over the Whites Too

By L. G. SMITH

White South Africa took a long step into the shadows of totalitarian rule when the lower house of its Parliament voted overwhelmingly for a "public safety bill" which gives the government dictatorial powers whenever it declares that an emergency exists. Although the press reports do not indicate how the tiny Labor Party members voted on this bill, the two major parties lined up shoulder to shoulder to back it, in the name of "white supremacy" in South Africa.

The background of this bill is significant not only for South Africa, but for the whole of that vast continent. It is a background of brutal exploitation and suppression of the vast majority of the people who have darker skins (Negroes, Indians and people of mixed origin) by a small minority of people of Dutch and British ancestry. This rule took on its most oppressive form in recent times when the Nationalist Party headed by Malan came to power after the war, and instituted its infamous "Apartheid" program of total segregation and degradation of the non-whites.

Much to the surprise of the ruling race, the subjugated peoples refused to take this program lying down. Led by the African National Congress and the Indian National Congress, a vast movement of peaceful resistance to the Apartheid laws developed. Up till December 16, 1952 some 8,057 people had been arrested in 37 centers of South Africa for deliberate defiance of the laws.

To date, the movement has remained completely peaceful. Several "riots" which have broken out in South Africa during the past year were not connected with the movement, and bear marks of having been deliberately provoked, fanned, and then brutally suppressed by the police.

Fatal Disease

The non-whites in South Africa are disfranchised. Some of them have the right to participate in the election of three white people to represent the three-quarters of the population which is non-white in the Parliament. Non-whites have virtually no rights; they have only restrictions and obligations. In the circumstances, they have no democratic machinery available to them for the redress of their grievances, let alone for an assertion of political strength. Thus they are driven to seek extra-legal means of defending themselves. So far these means have been entirely peaceful, apparently guided by the philosophy of Gandhi:

The government's new law is directed toward depriving them of such peaceful means of resistance, or at least of making the penalties extraordinarily severe (including prison sentences, fines, and whippings). And in the process of denying to the non-whites those means of protest and resistance which have been more or less open to them in the past, the white minority is well on the way to depriving *itself* of its own democratic rights.

The debates in the South African Parliament over the "national safety bill" show the workings of the fatal disease which is destroying all vestiges of freedom in the country. Under this law, once the government has declared that an emergency exists, all guarantees of civil liberties, property rights, and the right to trial by the courts cease to exist. As far as is known, the opposition failed to push through any of the limiting amendments which it had demanded early in the debates. At every turn it was silenced by its own adherence to the idea of white domination in South Africa.

When the "whipping post" bill was first presented to Parliament, the opposition United Party (which has its largest following among the English-speaking section of the white popu-

lation) decided to concur "in principle" with the government's demand for stronger powers with which to meet the "threat" of non-white resistance, while opposing the particular measures proposed by the government. But they soon collapsed under the government's ideological pressure. In reporting the debate in the House of Assembly on the bill, Albion Ross of the *New York Times* wrote on February 11:

"The government benches accused the Labor and United Parties of wanting equal rights for all men. The great fundamentals of the democratic faith were hurled at opposition speakers as accusations, and again and again the opposition members denied in effect that they believed in human equality and reaffirmed, under a barrage of scornful interruptions from the government benches, that they believed in domination of the natives by the white minority.

"Harry Lawrence, interior minister when the United Party ruled, declared that domination would not work, but he was forced to retreat. He then asked rhetorically whether Mr. Swart [Malan's minister of "justice"] believed that domination could last forever.

"J. G. Strydom, minister of land and an absolute apostle of white supremacy, who may be Dr. Malan's successor, replied: 'What else? What is the alternative to white supremacy?'"

Dictatorship for All

It was in this atmosphere that Labor member Lewis Lovell rose to issue a solemn warning to the House:

"If we want [white] domination, we must take all that goes with it, and that is complete dictatorship for all of us. We cannot continue in this country to be a free European people. We cannot be free men ourselves if we want to enslave the rest of the population. Is democracy so vile, so worthless that we should throw it away because the minister of justice has difficulty with native agitators? What this amounts to is a permanent police state for South Africa."

Truer words have seldom been spoken. The mentality of the ruling party was further revealed when, in the same debate, Minister of Justice Swart raised the threat of press censorship. He said that reports had been sent abroad which make the name of South Africa "stink," and hinted that press censorship is the only answer. This is the psychology of a group which knows it is doomed, and is lashing about itself in blind fury.

Their racial policy arouses revulsion in all decent people the world over. Their answer: censor the news of the policy. Their policy of Apartheid arouses its victims to demonstrate and protest. Their answer: declare martial law, abrogate all civil liberties, plunge the country into darkness in order to put down the "rebellious" masses. Every measure they take dooms them in the long run.

The "Opposition"

The policy of white supremacy is bound to produce an explosion in Africa. It is significant that the Malan government is using the Mau Mau terrorist movement in Kenya as its chief "argument" in pushing through its repressive legislation. Although to date there has been no armed resistance, either terrorist or open, by the disarmed non-whites of South Africa, it is evident that the possibility that such may develop worries the white-supremacists more than the existing movement of peaceful resistance.

But why is there no sizable group among the whites which recognizes the suicidal course of the Malan government and is prepared to resist it with determination? In the past the United Party has given lip service to the desirability of granting some degree of opportunity to at least a small section of the non-white population to rise above the level of hunted or corralled beasts of burden. And then there is the "Torch Com-

mando," made up of veterans who have opposed some of Malan's most dictatorial moves in the past, which appears to have been the last of the major groups to bow its neck before the "whipping post" bill. Why have they become Malan's partners in this morbid drama?

The answer is that the United Party is most closely connected with the big mining and industrial interests which are primarily concerned with keeping the Negroes as a vast source of pitifully cheap labor. They are fearful that the winds of political self-consciousness which are blowing among the peoples of Africa will lead to an assertion of human rights in the economic field. They have long succeeded in preventing any union organization among the Negroes, and they know that this would become much more difficult if these were to gain some degree of political rights.

The Face of Fascism

But there is another answer which goes beyond even the vital question of economic self-interest. This is that, however uneasy the United Party and the Torch Commando may be about the implications of the Nationalists' policies of furious repression, they cannot escape from its logic as long as they are committed to the *theory and policy* of white supremacy. For the impossible task of maintaining the privileged position of 2,500,000 whites in South Africa over the 8,000,000 non-whites *requires* force once the latter have begun to struggle.

Vast numbers of cheaply paid and partially enslaved workers are necessary for the continued extraction of vast wealth with a minimum of capital investment which is the pattern in South Africa. Suppression of the non-whites is necessary if they are to continue to do all the hard manual labor in the country.

Only a complete change in the economic and social relations of the country can now make it possible for the whites to remain there in a peaceful and democratic relationship with the non-white majority. And thus it is not an accident that in resisting any idea of such a change the Nationalist Party not only proposes to increase the repressive measures against the non-whites, but also increasingly assumes the ideological and political trappings of a fascist movement.

Too Much in Common

In retreating shamefully before Malan, the liberals in South Africa also behave like liberals have usually behaved in the face of powerful reactionary or fascist movements. The yielding of the United Party and the Torch Commando is all too reminiscent of the liberals' "struggle" against Hitler when he was on the road to power, and of our own liberal Democrats in the last Congress who "resisted" the McCarran Internal Security Act by adding to it the concentration-camp provisions. The point is that in both cases the liberals found that they had too much in common with their enemies to be able to offer the kind of determined resistance which the circumstances required.

In South Africa there have been a few whites who have joined the struggle of the non-white majority against the repressive laws of the government. They have recognized that in the interest of the *white* people of South Africa, and in the interest of humanity as a whole the victory of the non-white resistance is the only progressive solution to the problem.

There can be no question that in the long run this movement will triumph, either in its present form or in some other. But the historic fate of South Africa may very well depend on how quickly large numbers of whites in that country act on the recognition that they can be free men only to the extent that they fight for the freedom of *all* the people.

YOU and SCIENCE

WHAT THE SCIENCE WORLD CAN EXPECT FROM THE GOP

By CARL DARTON

Like everyone else socially conscious scientists have been looking to Washington and attempting to determine what the change of administration may mean to them.

Twenty years ago discussions of science and politics were much less important. Today we immediately think of atomic-weapon research and control, government domination of research as affecting peaceful applied science versus its military application, visa procedure and travel restrictions on scientists, loyalty issues, utilization and conservation of technical and scientific manpower, and UNESCO, to list most of the main issues. All of these are factors in the American science-politics coordinates.

Before we take a look ahead it is well to analyze the state of American science at the year's end. In this we can turn for aid to the article "Dangers Confronting American Science" by Melba Phillips, in the October 24, 1952 issue of *Science*. This review is not the product of a single author but reflects extended discussion on the subject within the American Association of Scientific Workers.

This paper points out that science has won public acceptance in the past for what it has achieved in the technology of war as well as for its medical discoveries in such fields as antibiotics and hormones. Science is supported by the government today for what it has done rather than for what it can do. With the increasing emphasis on the military, government is perverting the basic goals of science, its humanitarian purpose of improving the material conditions of life and the acquisition of knowledge for its own sake. Thus, in place of what could be the great achievement of science in this period, the technological development of vast backward areas of the earth is replaced by the support of military research involving mostly atomic energy and its missile application.

Within science itself, continues the AASW report, there is the trend toward bigness, the construction of large showy equipment such as the calculating machine, the synchrotron and cyclotron, to the neglect of the individual factor in research. As a result scientific manpower is now largely devoted to projects which bring quick results, particularly in the military field. This overshadows fundamental long-range basic research which is the guarantee of the future growth of science.

CONDITIONS FOR PROGRESS

Coupled with this application of science to immediate, often perverted needs, is the decline in scientific freedom itself. Harassment of the scientist in travel, personal security and morale, and restrictions on the time-honored freedom of publication and communication, are now, unfortunately, established features of American science.

The conditions of scientific operations today has resulted in the decay of the moral fiber of the scientist with the deterioration of his traditional code of ethics and professional conduct. This lack of individual feeling of social responsibility which accompanies general social decadence has not left the scientist unscathed. Even physicians are being urged to violate the classical code of medical ethics and become informers of the FBI.

The AASW article states that there are certain conditions for the advancement of science which permit no compromise. These are:

"(1) Scientific work must be in the public domain, freely published, taught, and criticized.

"(2) Scientists must not be hedged about with restrictions on personal freedom.

"(3) Science must be supported as a public responsibility for the public welfare, whether immediate or ultimate, and not for primarily military ends."

From this review we can see that the conditions for living and working for the scientist are not fundamentally different from that of all workers, "professional" or otherwise.

With this background we can again turn to the question of what can be expected from Washington or science policy. Eisenhower's statements have been even less specific on science matters than other subjects. But with the knowledge of the type of men in Washington some general statements on trends can be expected. The appointment of Dr. Conant as high commissioner to Germany and the use of Vannevar Bush behind the scenes indicates that some use of the best upper-class scientific thinking will be made.

On specific issues atomic energy is uppermost. No change in the extraordinary expenditures for the hydrogen bomb can be expected.

The developments in atomic-energy research have reached a stage where its exploitation for industrial energy sources may be profitable to private industry. When industry makes up its mind to go ahead, as it apparently has, the businessmen who make up the Eisenhower organization will arrange the necessary laws to expedite the transfer of authority (including the "secrets") to permit this exploitation.

ATOMIC "TEAPOT DOME"?

As ever, industry has favored "socialization" of costly research too extensive for itself, but is willing to display the necessary "private initiative" when profits are in the offing.

Already large corporations like Dow Chemical and Detroit Edison have initiated moves to take over. The House and Senate Joint Committees on Atomic Energy is expected to hold hearings on plans for private industry to harness atomic power. Gordon Dean, who has just resigned as chairman of the AEC, has recommended "declassification" of secret information so that it will be available for industry. A "Teapot Dome" of atomic energy may be in the cards.

On the home atomic-defense front there are indications that the Republicans will attempt to decentralize control in order to reduce federal costs and by some means try to shake the apathy of the public on civil defense.

To counterbalance the overwhelming unbalance of science toward producing quick military results there will be increased agitation among scientists for funds for the National Science Foundation—this in order to increase the emphasis on long-range basic research. There may even be a movement for a cabinet "secretary of science." With the Eisenhower plan of balancing the budget not very much money can be expected for "impractical" theoretical research, however.

With congressman falling over each other to participate in the investigation of "subversiveness," a hard year ahead can be expected for all intellectuals, including free-thinking scientists. Substantial modification of the McCarran Act to permit freedom of travel for scientists appears doubtful. With the increased witchhunting in the UN, scientists in UNESCO can expect even less aid from the U. S. in the technical development of the hunger areas of the world.

Developments in 1953 are likely to bring home to scientists as well as all workers the futility of politics within the confines of the two-party system. The big question is how far politics will tend to break toward the development of a labor party. Until such a party develops, scientists as well as all workers will have little opportunity to really express their political aspirations.

A DISCUSSION

Some Questions of War Policy

In the following addendum to his London Letter in this issue (see page 2) Comrade Vaughan raises some discussion questions, on which we append a comment.—Ed.

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

It is important for British socialists to make clear the attitude of Marxism to the Western camp, not only in the event of war, but also the attitude of Marxism to the Western camp in times of peace (or cold war).

This means a concrete application of the principled basis of all socialist opposition to war and war preparations: that the class struggle must be pursued in peace and war, independently of its military consequences for the bourgeoisie. And this in turn assumes that the greatest flexibility would have to be entertained in the event of the non-Stalinist world being locked in combat with the Stalinist world.

In Yugoslavia, say, the attitude of the socialist would be markedly different from that of the attitude of a socialist in an imperialist or exploiting country. Although condemning the imperialist war as a whole, the struggle of the Yugoslav Titoists against Russian Stalinism would merit his full material support (apart from the obvious political criticisms).

Again, a Bevanite Labor Britain trailing on the left of the Western camp would merit a different and less "sectarian" approach than a Franco Spain.

Similarly in the Stalinist camp, it is conceivable that some colonial countries would identify themselves with this camp, if membership or participation in the Western camp meant a return to the imperialist-colonial status quo immediately. In this case, no socialist could remain indifferent to the outcome of the military struggle between the colonial power and its would-be oppressor.

The key thing is the principle, the socialist principle. Almost as important is the meaning of the full application of the principle.

COMMENT

We think this passage requires a comment since at the best we find it quite unclear; possibly it tends to convey a thought which Comrade Vaughan did not intend. Certainly "the key thing is the principle, the socialist principle," as Comrade Vaughan well says, and we are not at all sure what socialist principles are in his mind behind the three "applications" referred to above. While obviously his few sentences point to questions of socialist anti-war policy which merit lengthy discussion, we confine this comment (likewise) to pointing to some considerations which appear to be scanted by his remarks.

(1) *Yugoslavia*: As far as LABOR ACTION'S point of view is concerned, we have more than once made clear that we are for defending Yugoslav national independence against Russian attack, in any case where this is the real issue of armed (or "cold") conflict. For this see the ISL resolution on the subject in LABOR ACTION of June 18, 1951.

But this is not the question that raises the difficulty. Comrade Vaughan seems plainly to be considering the likelihood of a Moscow-Yugoslavia conflict as part of, and merged in, a general world war between the two war blocs now formed. On this we have made our own viewpoint also quite plain. No one's position on a general world war can be determined by the Yugoslav element in it, which will be quite subordinated to the over-all character of the global conflict.

But Vaughan, it appears to us, is raising the question of a special and different attitude, in the midst of a general world war, to one of the allies in the Western bloc, Yugoslavia: an attitude of socialist-defensism in this corner

of the war. We would refer Comrade Vaughan, at this point, to "the principle, the socialist principle" which the internationalist socialists applied in 1914 to a virtually identical case: the case of Serbia (and also Belgium).

They argued, in our opinion irrefutably, that although Serbia had indeed been fighting for its national independence against Austria and although it was attacked by Austria, and although this taken by itself would mean that socialists were dutybound to defend the Serbian independence struggle, all this had become merely the local episode around which the general world war broke out, that it was an element subordinated to the general imperialist war, and that socialists could not be "Serbian" defensists without giving support to the imperialist bloc of which little Serbia became an integral part, etc.

It is not merely a question of Marxist "precedent" here; this is precisely the reality which looms for the Yugoslav element in a third world war. With one qualification: unless Comrade Vaughan looks on Yugoslavia as a "workers' state" which will be involved in a "mixed war." Now we know that Comrade Vaughan has expressed disagreements with our views on Titoism in our columns (Sept. 22, 1952) and he was indeed invited to further explain his views; but we do not understand that he makes this claim for Tito's regime.

We note only in passing that Comrade Vaughan implies that Tito's Yugoslavia is not "an imperialist or exploiting country." It is certainly not an exploiter of any colonies, since it has none. Our press has elsewhere discussed Tito's imperialistic efforts in the Balkans (on his own scale) before his regime was thrown completely on the defensive, before the aggressive might of Moscow. But what is relevant, precisely in the light of key socialist principles, is not whether Tito has colonies to exploit, but whether his is an exploitive social regime. We think we have shown in detail that it is, and this is obviously part of the question which is raised at least by implication in Comrade Vaughan's comments.

(2) A "Bevanite Labor Britain": Comrade Vaughan speaks of "a different and less 'sectarian' approach [to it] than to Franco Spain."

(a) In war as in peace Marxists cannot but take a "different" attitude toward a government led by a working-class party than toward a government under a capitalist (let alone a fascist-capitalist!) party government. The reader will understand, we think, that "less 'sectarian'" is a very loose and misleading term in this connection and we will do best to overlook it.

(b) But this is true also of a non-"Bevanite" Labor Britain, unless by a "Bevanite Labor" government Vaughan is thinking of a Labor government which follows a genuinely socialist, internationalist, democratic and anti-imperialist course in domestic and foreign policy—which does not seem to be the case.

(c) Plainly, the \$64 question is: just how "different" an attitude, and different with respect to what questions? We venture to say that not much has been said, and not much can be discussed, until this is concretized as a point of view. For example, there may be some who think that Marxists should support Britain in an imperialist war provided only that it is governed by a Labor, or "Bevanite-Labor," cabinet. We would, of course, not agree ourselves.

(3) *Colonial countries which jump into or get sucked into the Stalinist war camp out of antagonism to Western imperialism*:—Again, a "different attitude" toward such peoples than toward the Western imperialist oppressors or for that matter toward the Stalinist imperialists who swallow up such misguided

(Continued on page 5)



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 17, No. 9

March 2, 1953

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address: Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL

Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from the New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, out February 25:

The Wonderful World of Books, edited by Alfred Stefferud, 319 pages, 35 cents. *We Fished All Night*, by Willard Motley, 600 pages (Signet Double Volume), 50 cents. *When Boyhood Dreams Come True*, by James T. Farrell, 256 pages, 25 cents. *The Unwanted*, by Dante Arfelli, 176 pages, 25 cents. *Doubtful Valley*, by George Garland, 168 pages, 25 cents. *You and Your Heart* (revised), by H. M. Marvin et al. 192 pages, 25 cents. *Act of Passion*, by Georges Simenon, 144 pages, 25 cents. *Night at the Vulcan*, by Ngaio Marsh, 176 pages, 25 cents. *Moiwa*, by Julian Green, 160 pages, 25 cents.

On the Roots of Stalin's Anti-Semitism

THE SOURCE IS NOT FOREIGN POLICY BUT FEAR OF THE JEWS' "UNRELIABILITY" IN FACE OF WAR

By AL FINDLEY

The continuous and almost daily blows by the Stalinist bureaucracy against the Jews have left few doubts in the minds of most people that Stalinism has embarked on an official anti-Jewish policy, but illusions die hard among all of us—including this writer, who has been writing about Stalinist anti-Semitism for a number of years.

The idea that Russia is a land of racial and national equality, so assiduously propagated by the official Moscow line, takes its toll even now that the facts speak clearly to the contrary. This is seen in the explanations given for Stalinist anti-Semitism.

In exploring the reasons for Stalinist anti-Semitism, many see it as something not integral to the policy of the present regime but as a "tool" of bureaucratic factional struggle or as an instrument of expansionist politics in the Near East, among the Arabs. Many Jewish writers explain it by the desire of Stalin to "denationalize" the Jews and forcibly assimilate them, in line with Stalin's theory that the Jews are not a nation.

While no one can deny that the struggle of bureaucratic cliques for control and power is a factor, the evidence points out that much more is involved. If the purges and the anti-Semitism were limited to the Jews in the ranks of the bureaucracy, one might be able to accept that theory more easily.

"JUDENREIN" POLICY

The idea suffers, however, from important defects. In all previous fights for power there were Jews, like others, on different sides of the struggle. In the present anti-Semitic campaign it is directed against all Jews. In addition, the victims have been those Jews in positions in the satellite countries who could be counted on to be the most loyal to whatever faction triumphed in Moscow. They had little support in the countries they ruled and were dependent on Moscow.

This also disposes of the theory that the purge is directed against those elements in the CP hierarchy that had a "Western" orientation. This theory is little more than an application of the anti-Semitic incidents in Stalin's fight against Trotsky and the Left Opposition. But it is now no longer a question of isolated incidents but of a continuous and increasing governmental policy.

The tendency has been the same whether it was under Zhdanov or Malenkov, whether it was under Beria or Molotov, who held the favorite spot. Since 1939 there has

War Policy—

(Continued from page 4)

lonial regimes? Yes, "different," etc. Also again: but do we become supporters in war of such colonial countries which "identify themselves" with the Stalinist war camp? That would be an enormous error.

Independence movements in India and other Asian countries, in the last war, became collaborators of the Japanese imperialists out of their hatred of the British oppressors; we understood their anti-imperialist motives or at least those of the followers they misled; but Marxists cannot fail to combat energetically such a policy, in our opinion. It is suicide, political and otherwise.

We would express the opinion that Comrade Vaughan has not thought through the statements he makes so briefly. Our own comments are intended only to suggest what we think has to be thought through, since further discussion would have to make perhaps unwarranted assumptions about the ideas he is expressing. Ed.

been an upward spiral of increased governmental (not popular) anti-Semitism, reaching its present peak in the Slansky case and the case of the Moscow doctors.

Another, and probably the most important, objection to these theories is that the exclusion policy is not directed only against Jews in the ranks of the bureaucracy, high or low, but is directed against all layers of Jews regardless of their social and economic position. The expulsion of Jews from many border provinces like Bukovina (which has been made almost entirely Judenrein as the Nazis used to say), the Ukraine and White Russia, proves that it is not a bureaucratic question but a basic attitude toward all Jews.

WHAT'S GAINED?

In considering the theory of "denationalization" and "wooing the Arabs," we must ask the decisive question: What advantage will accrue to the Kremlin from such a policy? Why should the Kremlin be willing to risk the incalculable loss of prestige and influence that the end of the legend of Russian racial and national equality would bring in its wake?

The "denationalization" of the Jews could be carried out by the "quiet" or "cold" methods used to date. The closing of schools, the complete suppression of the Jewish press and culture, and the destruction of all forms of Jewish organization was begun in the late '30s and was completed in Russia in 1949. The same task could have been accomplished in the satellite countries without incurring the terrific losses entailed by an anti-Semitic campaign.

The theory of "denationalization" doesn't hold especially when we consider that it is directed most viciously at precisely the most assimilated elements among the Jews and at those who all their lives fought the idea that the Jews are a "nation," as have the Jewish Stalinists.

ARABS' REACTION

The same objections are true in considering Stalinist anti-Semitism as a tool to capture the Near East and win the support of the Arabs or of the Arab extremists. The Russian war bloc had many more convenient tools at hand to win their support without losing much support from other sources.

The Stalinists, for instance, could have championed the return of the Arab refugees to Israel. This might even have increased world sympathy for them and gained Arab support. The Stalinists could have demanded that Israel return the territory it now has that was allotted to the Arabs in the partition plan. They would not have reversed their position and come out against the internationalization of Jerusalem.

The reaction among the Arabs to Stalinist anti-Semitism has not been a favorable one. The Arabs have been arguing that Israel is not needed any more as a "haven" for the persecuted, that the Zionists have been encouraging immigration in order to expand. The open anti-Semitism of the Eastern power bloc has strengthened the Israeli argument for the necessity of aiding Israel, and world opinion, which was in the process of forgetting Israel, once more became focused on the country.

The Arabs were so worried by this fact that a number of Arab nations presented a memorandum to the U. S. not to increase aid to Israel as a result of Stalinist anti-Semitism. The only actions that the Arabs applauded were those directed specifically against Israel, like the breaking of diplomatic relations, and not those directed against the Jews in the Stalinist countries. Of course, the Stalinists will try to squeeze out any little advantage that their present policy gains them among

the Arabs but this is not the reason for their present policy.

What then is the reason for Stalinist anti-Semitism? The basic reasons are two, in my opinion. The first is an internal one, inherent in the structure of Stalinist society, and the second lies in the sphere of international relations.

Stalinist anti-Semitism is not a revival of tsarist anti-Semitism but a new and special phenomenon. Under tsarism anti-Semitism was principally a rural phenomenon limited to the Jewish Pale. Under Stalin it has become an urban phenomenon spread all over Russia and now over all the satellite countries.

The nationalization of industry and the five-year plans greatly expanded opportunities in industry and government. The Jews, who were an urban population with a much higher average educational level than other groups in backward Russia had an initial advantage over their competitors who yesterday were illiterate peasants. As a result, the ranks of Jewish salaried workers increased and they became highly conspicuous in the ranks of the lower-paid government employees, those nearest the people.

It was these officials who in their daily routine had to apply

the government policy of scarcity and near-starvation of the people. As a result they acquired the special hatred of the people. While this new hatred displaced the tsarist and church anti-Semitism, nevertheless it was built on the elements of it which survived openly or unconsciously.

On the one hand, then, we have the "outs," i.e., the people hating the regime and seeking outlets for their hatred. On the other hand there were large sections of the "ins" consisting of competing groups in the bureaucracy engaged in rivalry for bureaucratic and salaried posts with a savagery and barbarism that only life in a totalitarian bureaucratic society can engender. This struggle among the "ins" took a national line. All minority nationality groups lost their relative position in the Russian bureaucracy. The men of the Great-Russian nationality more and more dominated the entire setup.

CLUE IN FRANCE

The Jews suffered the most from this. By 1949 Jews were limited in the army and in engineering schools and completely excluded from the foreign office and foreign trade. The purge in the professions began with the campaign against "rootless,"

"homeless," "cosmopolitan traders" and "peddlers." With the accusation against the Moscow doctors, it enters a new phase.

But the development did not stop there. The Stalinist bureaucracy decided that Jews as such were at least partially "unpatriotic" and began the forced mass transfer of Jews from the Western frontier areas of Russia. Why did the Stalinist bureaucracy decide that the Jews were unreliable (from the point of view of the regime)?

A clue is to be found in the French Stalinist press — *L'Humanité* in 1946 and *Ce Soir* in 1953. On February 21, 1946 a writer for *L'Humanité*, Pierre Hervé, wrote that "it is natural that as a result of their situation the Jews should be becoming the offensive ideal of a certain overseas mercantilism . . . [this] detaches the French Jews from their interests as Frenchmen as a whole and renders them more susceptible to propaganda which might threaten our independence. I consider this a dangerous fact."

According to the Yiddish press, *Ce Soir*, a French CP paper, made similar remarks about all Jews only last week, pointing to Jewish Communists as potential renegades of whom the non-Jews should beware.

(Turn to last page)

ISL FUND DRIVE

We Need Those Funds Early—NOW!

By L. G. SMITH

In writing a piece on the Fund Drive it is always difficult to know just what note one should strike. Should one write, in a vein of official optimism, that all the members and friends of the Independent Socialist League, and all the loyal readers of LABOR ACTION, will assuredly come through in their accustomed magnificent style. Or should one seek to wrench the heart and thus open the pocketbook by referring to the exceptionally hard times with which socialists, and particularly those organized socialists who seek to publish their views and disseminate their ideas, are confronted?

Either of these modes are perhaps more appropriate to the later stages of the drive. At the moment, with barely two weeks of the drive behind us, we have reached 15 per cent of our goal. That is just about an average start. If it were not for the very good showing of New York, we would have cause for alarm. The efforts of our friends in Pittsburgh and Cleveland are also heartening, for the sums they have raised show a very strong determination on their part to respond to our plea to get the money in early in this drive.

As that is what we say in every Fund Drive, the appeal may appear hackneyed to our readers. Believe us, it is not. This year we need the money early as never before. We do not want to bore you with the minutiae of our administrative struggles with the hard facts of life, nor to paint for you glowing pictures of the projects which the early payment of your contributions will bring within our reach. But there are such struggles, and there are such projects, and our ability to cope with the former and to embark on the latter do not depend solely on our getting the whole of the \$11,800 by May 1, but in no small measure on our ability to get most of it, the vastly larger part of it, before March goes bleating away from us.

Most of you who are reading this have made up your minds that you are going to contribute to the Fund Drive, and how much you are going to give. The question is: Can you

make up your minds to part with it immediately, and with all of it? That's what we would like to urge upon you, just as earnestly as we can. Once you have actually got loose of the money, you can make your own plans without it getting in the way, even as a subconscious factor. And once we have it, we can make our plans also.

LABOR ACTION and the New International come to you through-

out the year. Their uninterrupted appearance is a repeated minor miracle of our age. And like all miracles, this one has a material base. That base is laid in the Fund Drive in which we are asking you to participate. We are confident that you will fulfill your duty, not to us, but to the publications which serve our common purpose. We ask, in addition, that you fulfill it now.

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Enclosed is \$.....as my contribution to the ISL 1953 Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE.....

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates)

Fund Drive Box Score

	Quota	Paid	Per Cent
TOTAL	\$11,500	1803.99	16
Pittsburgh	150	61	40
Streator	25	10	40
New York	4,000	1074.49	27
Cleveland	200	50	25
Detroit	500	100	20
Oakland	500	75	15
Los Angeles	600	80	13
Philadelphia	250	32	12.8
Chicago	1,800	180	10
SYL	1,250	96.50	8
General	1,075	45	4
Akron	50	0	0
Buñalo	650	0	0
Indiana	75	0	0
Newark	250	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0
Reading	50	0	0
Seattle	200	0	0
St. Louis	25	0	0

New Blows Against the Jews in Stalinland

Hungary: Role of the Ex-Nazis—Ukraine: A New Amalgam in the Making—Russia: The Case of V. S. Grossman

By ABE STEIN

The immediate reaction of Moscow to the bombing of the Soviet Legation in Tel Aviv two weeks ago—a break in diplomatic ties with Israel—confirmed the fears of most observers: the campaign against the Jews within the Stalinist empire will continue with unremitting ferocity. Overshadowing a steady stream of reports on anti-Semitic actions inside Stalinist Russia itself, was the report of a wide purge of Jewish state and party officials in Hungary.

According to unconfirmed news from Vienna, the Slansky pattern of trials and confessions will soon be staged in Hungary. A New York Times dispatch of February 22 reports that 30 leading Jewish Stalinists have been despoised by a group of Russian secret police who arrived in Budapest several weeks ago.

Among those reported purged are: Zoltan Vash, head of the Government Economic Council—suicide; Peter Gabor, chief of Hungary's secret police and director of the ill-famed police headquarters "Andrassy 60"—shot together with his wife, a private secretary in Premier Rakosi's office; Gen. Sandor Nogradi, deputy defense minister—arrested; Istvan Szirmai, chief of the Hungarian State Radio—arrested.

Among those also said to have been ousted are: Karly Kiss, former foreign minister; Arpad Hasi, former minister of the interior; Gyula Decsei, minister of justice; Erik Molnar, minister of foreign affairs.

The report declares that a large group of lesser Jewish officials have been arrested and that in certain cases they committed suicide. In the latter group are listed ten high officers of the political police.

The Hungarian Ex-Nazis

The conspicuous role of Jews in the topmost layers of the Stalinist apparatus in Hungary provides an ironic counterpoint to the fact that the entire state and party apparatus is filled from top to bottom with former Nazi collaborators and members of the Hungarian fascist (Arrow Cross) party.

Should these reports be confirmed and a "Slansky" trial be staged in Budapest, there is no doubt that the state prosecutor will be Gyula Alapi, who performed that function in the Mindszenty trial. In 1944, Alapi, then a provincial state prosecutor, joined the fascist Arrow Cross party. In 1945, Alapi safeguarded his neck and his career by joining the Communist Party.

The hanging judge will surely be Vimos Olty, president of the court in the Mindszenty, Vögler and Rajk trials. An official in the Ministry of Justice in 1941, Olty performed the task of confiscating the enterprises of Jews with uncommon vigor. During the war he joined the staff of the Hungarian-German Society and was sent to Munich on a scholarship for indoctrination in Nazi ideology. After the Russians marched in, Olty joined the Communist Party. During the Rajk trial he played up the anti-Semitic motif, asking each defendant his father's and grandfather's name—in order to discover possible Jewish origins. He forced Rajk, not a Jew but in fact an anti-Semite, to confess he had conspired with the Zionists.

If it is true that Vash, head of the Government Economic Council, has been ousted and committed suicide, then his most likely successor will be one of his deputies, Bela Nagi, who wrote a pro-Nazi pamphlet proving the inevitability of German victory during the war. Along with Nagi, another anti-Semite, fascist and former member of the Arrow Cross Party, who will be in line for advancement in the Economic Council, will be Tibor Fajth. Like the others, Fajth became a member of the Communist Party in 1945, and two years later was rewarded by the regime with the Gold Medal of Labor.

Perhaps the most typical representative of the fascist-Stalinist bureaucracy, which constitutes the solid core of the Stalinist regime in Hungary today, is the infamous Sendor Zold, a functionary in the Ministry of the Interior and a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. According to Dr. Bela Fabian, a member of the Hungarian National Council in exile, writing in the May 1951 issue of *Commentary*, Zold has a long history of anti-Semitism dating back to 1934. In November of that year, Zold was one of the leaders in an attack on Jewish students in the medical college located in the town of Debrecen. Later Zold became a Nazi.

When the fortunes of war brought victory to the Stalinists, he transferred his allegiance to the new power. In 1945 he became a councilor in the Ministry of the Interior and advanced thereafter to the post of under-secretary. After the fall from grace of Rajk (who had removed Zold from his post for being involved in a malodorous scandal that revolved around the extortion of money from the inmates of concentration camps), he returned to his former position. In the summer of 1950 he was appointed minister of interior only to be demoted again in the spring of 1951. Nevertheless he remains a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and an official of the Ministry of the Interior.

If for the moment the fate of the Jewish Stalinists remains in doubt, the tragic lot of Hungarian Jewry does not. Nowhere have Stalin's anti-Semitic policies so closely approached Hitler's methods of physical genocide, the literal annihilation of the Jews, as in Hungary. If Hitler destroyed 80 per cent of Hungary's 750,000 Jews in the Polish death camps, then Stalin is finishing the job of

wiping out the pitiful handful who survived. The ability of Hungarian Jewry to withstand further ravages of anti-Semitism is non-existent, for 20 per cent of those remaining were over 60 years of age and about 10 per cent were children, a third of them orphans.

Until 1950 the harassment suffered by the Jews in Hungary did not differ in great detail from the general pattern that had been unfolding in all the satellite countries. As in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Rumania, the Hungarian Jews were unable to recover any part of the property stolen from them by the Hungarian fascist regime and the Nazis.

In 1948 the government began a sharp attack on Jewish community and cultural organizations. The Stalinists intervened in the Jewish communal elections and forced the election of a "unified" ticket. The entire administration of the Jewish organizations was taken over by the Stalinists, with the single exception of the post of president, which remained filled by Stoeckler. By pointing to Stoeckler, the Stalinists could prove the Jewish community was free from interference. (On January 17 of this year, Stoeckler was arrested.)

In the middle of 1948 all Jewish schools were nationalized, which simply meant that Hungarian was henceforth to be the only language of instruction. In September the last Zionist newspaper was discontinued on the ground of a "paper shortage."

The real nightmare, however, came in the middle of 1950, when the first mass deportations began. The victims of this first wave of deportations were drawn from all classes and consisted of people who had been sentenced to prison terms exceeding two years, or who had been interned for indefinite terms. According to various observers, the number of these deportees ranged from 50,000 to 70,000. All these observers agree that there was an especially high proportion of Jews among them. These victims of Stalin's terror were shipped to transit camps in the Carpatho-Ukraine. Their final destination in Stalinist Russia remains unknown to this day.

The second wave of mass deportations, which devastated Hungary's former middle classes, began in 1951. According to one reporter, George Kent, writing in the *New Leader* of January 21, 1952, between May 21 and July 18, 1951 alone at least 25,000—a minimum estimate—were banished from Budapest and other cities to forced labor in the provinces or slave-labor camps in Stalinist Russia. The tragic implications this violent displacement of the urban population held for the Jews stem from the fact that approximately 80 per cent of Hungary's Jews—those who survived Hitler's death camps—live (or rather lived) in Budapest.

Furthermore, the majority of those Jews who had been able to return to some sort of livelihood were concentrated in middle-class occupations. Most competent observers agree that Jews comprised at least 20 per cent of the victims of these deportations, and that means ultimate death from slow starvation in the Hungarian countryside—for the government does not provide rations and the deportees are dependent on the good will of the peasants, who are already burdened by government requisitions and taxes. Or else they face the same fate in Stalin's Russian slave-labor camps.

Should the reports prove true and the Jewish Stalinists in Hungary be brought to trial soon, then the complete liquidation of Hungarian Jewry will be brought that much nearer. Not because Stalin's Jewish-born hirelings were more merciful than the former fascists who will take their place; but because it will be the signal for the resumption of the mass deportations. A shocked world opinion was able to force a temporary halt to these crimes against humanity in the fall of 1951. But it may be that no outburst can halt Stalin's present anti-Semitic course, which among other things, spells the death of Hungarian Jewry in the literal, physical sense of the word.

2

"Quacks" and Amalgams

It was inevitable that after the arrest of the Jewish doctors in Moscow special attention would be paid to driving Jews out of the ranks of the medical profession and research. Just this has been happening. On January 24, the Minsk newspaper *Soviet Bielyrussia* denounced seven Jewish doctors for malingering and absence from work. On January 27, the Health Ministry's newspaper *Medical Worker* accused a medical research worker, Dr. Myra Israllevna Chernayakova, of incompetence and criminal negligence.

In addition, the same issue of the newspaper "exposed" two Jews who had been allegedly passing themselves off as doctors. The first, Zaitzev, had risen to the relatively important post of chief of a hospital in the Chuvash Autonomous Republic. The second, Izrailit, had for many years been chief of a department in the health institutions run by a southern railroad. Both, according to *Medical Worker*, had passed themselves off as doctors without ever having received medical certificates.

On February 16 the attack on Jewish doctors was turned toward the Ukraine. On that date the Ukrainian *Pravda* denounced 20 Jewish doctors in the cities of Kiev and Nikolaev for deception, fraud, embezzlement and disloyalty to the government. To emphasize its point, Ukrainian *Pravda* printed the names of the accused in full.

In Kiev, Patzuk and Magaziner were described as "quacks" who had passed themselves off as doctors. In Nikolaev, Drs. Heller, Wasserman, Makarovskiy, Ravich and Litzman were charged with having defrauded the

state of more than 600,000 rubles. The names of some of the other doctors were: Rappaport, Cohen, Roitelman, Gendelman, Zaslavsky, Geshin, Cohen-Yasny, Levin, Sheftel, Olshanetsky and Erlikhman.

For every Jewish doctor or research worker who is publicly denounced and driven from his or her post, hundreds of others who are not the objects of public condemnation are obviously suffering the same fate. Deprived of the right to work at their professions in the main centers, they have only one recourse (if they are not arrested and forcibly sent to Siberia or Central Asia): "voluntary" exile to these same forbidding regions to find whatever employment they can.

One of the special features of the anti-Semitic purge is the emphasis being given to driving the Jews out of all posts in the Ukraine. The victimization of Jewish state and party officials has been particularly severe in this area. Jews have not only been publicly denounced and ousted from their jobs, they have been arrested and in some cases condemned to death by extraordinary military tribunals and promptly shot, as we reported in *LABOR ACTION* for January 26.

The concentration of anti-Semitic actions in the Ukraine is somewhat of a paradox. From all information available, the role of Jews in all phases of Ukrainian life declined sharply after the war in accordance with official policy. Besides offering the Jews up as a scapegoat to the Ukrainian masses, the special attention being paid to the Ukraine may signify something else: the threat of another broad purge of the Ukrainian party and state apparatus. Not only are the Jews purged, but in each case a responsible party official, non-Jewish, and his ministry are unsparingly criticized. For example, in the case of the 20 Jewish doctors mentioned above, Ukrainian Minister of Health Shupik was attacked by Ukrainian *Pravda* for "careless, unprincipled administration."

Again, on January 18 the Ukrainian Communist Party's Central Committee issued an edict ordering the end of "all political carelessness and slackness." In the same week, the Ukrainian *Pravda* raked every ministry in the Ukrainian government over the coals and linked the arrest of the 9 Moscow doctors with the "drive against commercial fraud" and the "general campaign for state and party discipline."

A new amalgam is apparently in the making, for at a convention of the Ukrainian Young Communist League in Kiev, its secretary, G. G. Shevel, lumped Ukrainian nationalism and Jewish bourgeois nationalism together as identical crimes. This means that when heads begin to roll, the accusations against the present jobholders in the state and party apparatus will take the following form: The accused will be found guilty of "being a Ukrainian nationalist in disguise who knowingly permitted his Jewish confederates to worm their way into important posts where they could do the dirty work of American imperialism."

3

The Case of Grossman

Of special interest is the attack on the famous wartime correspondent and novelist Vassily Semenovitch Grossman. On February 11, *Pravda* attacked Grossman's new novel *For the Right Cause*, an account of the battle of Stalingrad, for failing to give a true picture of how "typical" Russian soldiers and civilians conducted themselves in this critical period. Communist, the official organ of the party's Central Committee, "deepened" the attack with the charge that Grossman was guilty of "Pythagorism." Two weeks later, the *Literary Gazette*, organ of the Union of Soviet Writers, the group which had published Grossman's novel in the first place and praised it highly, advised the author to recant if he wished to write about World War II.

As is usual, one will not find the real reasons for Grossman's fall from favor in the official charges. The charge of "Pythagorism" remains both obscure and absurd until one discovers that right after the war the Union of Soviet Writers published a play Grossman had written earlier called *If One Is to Believe the Pythagoreans*. The play has very little bearing on Pythagorean philosophy but does contain the moral that a good liberal of pre-revolutionary days who swears by Pythagoras (self-sacrifice, devotion to a cause) is better than a bad Bolshevik who values his material well-being above everything else. In a word, "Pythagorism" represents a not-too-obscure attack on the luxurious and grossly ostentatious habits of the Stalinist bureaucracy. This is Grossman's first crime.

What about the main charge against Grossman—that he does not give a true picture of the "typical" Russian soldier and civilian in the early and critical period of the war? First of all, the charge must be translated into its real terms—that Grossman "underestimates" the role of the party and its representatives in this period. While we have not yet had an opportunity to read the book under attack, *For the Right Cause*, the charge seems manufactured. For if we turn back to Grossman's wartime writings, we find that Grossman, more than other writer, stuck very closely to the official line in giving predominance to the role of the party at a time when the party and the Kremlin stood on very shaky grounds.

Grossman's book *The People Immortal*, published in 1943, deals chiefly with "official" types. Unlike Fadayev and other writers, Grossman never came under attack for having "underestimated" the "heroic" deeds of the party and was not compelled like these writers to revise

(Turn to last page)

It's a Blind Alley, America — —

(Continued from page 1)

If there were any doubt about it, both Secretary of State Dulles and some of the leading Republicans in Congress have done their utmost to dispel it, from opposite directions and motives. In reply to the alarmed questions from allied governments, Dulles has stated that "since the declaration does not involve any actual repudiation of any legally effective agreements, it does not affect the legal rights of any other partners in the matter."

It may be some comfort to Stalin to know that the United States does not question his "legal rights" in Eastern Europe, even though it deprecates the moral license with which he has exercised them.

On the other side, leading Republicans in Congress have attacked the wording of the proposed resolution as too vague and not going far enough. They had built up a picture of dark dealings at Yalta in which Roosevelt, guided by Alger Hiss, had secretly delivered whole nations to Stalin without getting anything worthwhile in return. In painting this picture and implying that a Republican administration would find a way to turn it upside down in a jiffy, they were more concerned with its effect on domestic vote-getting than with the realities of world politics even from the viewpoint of American capitalism.

Capitalism's Alternatives

Despite the grumbings of these Republicans, it appears that the resolution will be passed pretty much in its present form, or not at all. The Democrats in Congress are quite willing to vote for a resolution which points the finger at Stalin rather than at Roosevelt and denounces the former for violating agreements made between them. They would take an altogether different view of a resolution which implied that their administration had been guilty of wrongdoing.

And as the purpose of the whole thing is to get agreement in words and to present the world with a picture of an American government in which both parties are solidly united on policy (and incidentally, to make it appear to the voters in the next election that the Republicans have fulfilled a campaign promise) the resolution will have to satisfy the Democrats as well as the Republicans.

But what is the point of the whole business as seen from the Republican corner? Are they really only interested in getting some high-sounding words on paper, or is there much more behind it? Is this just another "Formosa" escapade, which starts with an ear-shattering bang and then trickles off into involved and self-contradictory explanations with very little else to give it substance?

Despite the apparent dedication of the present government to a maximum of bluster in everything it undertakes, it is probable that this "repudiation" indicates a general orientation of the government in foreign policy. It is this orientation which was discussed at length in LABOR ACTION during the past electoral campaign under the general heading of "containment or liberation" (see particularly the issue of September 8, 1952).

The hard facts are these:

The second world war ended in a division of the world between the Stalinist and capitalist camps. This division was the real war aim of both the United States and Russia in the last war.

Of course, each would have liked to restrict the other to as small a portion of the earth's surface as possible. It is also quite likely that Stalin saw the issue much more clearly than Roosevelt at the time the war was being fought. The American president was far from sophisticated in his understanding of Stalinism, and seems to have taken it for granted that a restoration of capitalist economic systems, with regimes politically acceptable to Stalin, was the most the master of all the Russias would dare to attempt.

At any rate, that is the way the war ended. But such was the weakening of Western imperialism in the war that the whole of Asia was in turmoil. The Stalinists were able to take advantage of this situation, primarily in China and Indo-China where they were confronted with the utterly corrupt government of Chiang Kai-shek and with France's adamant attempt to re-establish her rule in her Asian empire.

In Western Europe's shattered economy capitalism was able to maintain itself only by the skin of its teeth and the Marshall Plan, while in Eastern Europe Stalinist regimes were placed in power through ill-concealed military and police methods.

From that moment on, capitalism was faced with two alternatives: to stabilize the present division of the world for as long a "peaceful" period as possible, or to redivide the world by force of arms.

Dulles' Orientation

Truman's policy of "containment" was directed toward the former objective. This was made clear in Greece, and it was in support of this policy that he marched American troops into Korea. The maximum that such a policy could hope to attain would be such a preponderance of force that Stalin would agree to settle down within his present sphere for an indefinite period, and to stop pushing wherever the political situation seems to offer him a temporary opportunity. Under such a "world settlement" both major powers would hope that some internal collapse of the other, or the rise of some presently unknown factor, would give them the opportunity to change the "settlement" at a later date.

The other alternative is to seek to change the present balance by whatever aggressive moves, short of all-out war, come to hand. In the form in which it is closest to John Foster Dulles' heart, it involves schemes to "foment revolution" behind the Iron Curtain combined with demonstrations of military strength and the willingness to use it, wherever an opportunity offers. It is only in such a context that it makes any kind of sense to proclaim, as an official government policy, that the disintegration of Stalin's empire by all means is the objective of the American government.

It should be noted that the Russian government has never announced that its policy is to liberate the colonies of the Western powers, or to bring Stalinist "liberation" to the whole world. From the standpoint of its own (non-capitalist) exploitive aims, it condemns capitalist colonialism, it denounces capitalism as a social and economic system and predicts its collapse. But the Stalinists are intelligent enough to realize that their whole demagogic "peace" policy would be doomed to failure if their government were to say that it will not rest until the colonies are free and the world Stalinized. To the millions who can be fooled by a propaganda of "anti-imperialism" and "peace" such an announcement would mean that sooner or later the Kremlin is determined to wage war for its objectives. That is exactly the way in which the peoples of the world are reacting to the foreign policy of the American government.

The major point which must be understood is that the Stalinists actually have the means with which to carry out their policy for a redivision of the world by measures short of world war, while the American government does not. Throughout the world they have powerful popular movements under their control or subject to their influence. The steam behind these movements is generated by the colonial system and by the decline of capitalism. Where these movements are held in check, this is accomplished either through force of arms, or through the existence of other movements, also essentially anti-capitalist in nature.

From Formosa to Indo-China

The American government has no comparable weapon with which to undermine Stalin's strength. Secretary of State Dulles may be convinced by his brother Allan (a former official in the OSS and now head of Central Intelligence) that he can build such movements behind the Iron Curtain, but this is a dream as far as the American capitalist government is concerned. To the peoples of the world the United States stands as the supporter of the present capitalist system, or where it no longer exists, of its restoration.

As long as this remains the actual state of affairs, talk about "fomenting revolution" will remain nothing but talk. The practice of the "liberation" policy remains in the realm of building armies and preparing for war.

This is as clearly true of the "Formosa" policy as of the "repudiation" of the consequences of the last war. Formosa has no serious political weight in the world struggle, unless it be the kind of weight a millstone has when hung on a man's neck.

That is why the eyes of Washington are turning toward projects for blockading China's coast, and toward vastly increased support for the French armies in Indo-China as the real content of the "Formosa" policy.

The blockade idea may be shelved because of the protests of Britain and other American allies who fear both its economic and its military effects. But the French, at least, would welcome increased military aid in Indo-China, and in view of their own problems in Malaya, it is not likely that the British Tories would put too many obstacles in the way of expanded military activity there.

In preparing the American people for a possible change in the nature of the government's support to France in Indo-China, the newspapers here are putting heavy emphasis on the "increased independence" which France has been willing to grant her puppets in Indo-China in recent months.

The fact remains that France is willing to grant any-

thing that is forced out of her except actual independence for the peoples of this peninsula. If she had been willing to grant that in 1946 the present war would not be in progress, and there is no reason to believe Stalinism would have conquered the country any more than it has conquered Burma or Indonesia, which were able to win their independence and set up their own governments after the war. It was only in the process of the long, wearying anti-imperialist struggle that the Stalinists were able to gain undisputed control of the Viet-Minh movement for national liberation.

Tattered Banners

Thus if the United States enters the war in Indo-China with its own troops, or with a major program of training Indo-Chinese troops to do "their own" fighting, the nature of the intervention will be the same. Except in the name of liberation, either social or political, no mass movement can be built in Asia whether it be in military or political form. Armies of semi-mercenaries can be raised, and they can even be trained to fight with some degree of efficiency. But their effectiveness will remain military, not political in nature.

At the moment, the new policies of the administration remain in the realm of sound and fury—but they do not signify nothing. They show an orientation which can only hasten World War III. To the extent that they tend to dismay and antagonize the shaky allies of the American government, they even work inexorably toward a war in which the people of the United States will even have to bear the brunt of the fighting, with a minimum of aid from others.

And the Democrats are incapable of offering serious opposition. Their policy of "containment" had ended in a blind alley both in Korea and elsewhere. They could show no serious gains against Stalinism from it, and only prospects of a continual series of retreats or futile battles. They have no appealing alternative to offer.

The reason for this lies at the very heart of the political situation in America. Both parties are by their nature committed to a global preservation and extension of capitalism (which they call "democracy"). The shining banners to which they hope to rally the peoples of the world look to the latter like the tattered symbols of their own degradation.

We Need a Fundamental Change

A genuinely progressive policy for the defeat of Stalinism, and for the turning-back of the war danger which emanates from the line of Washington as well as Moscow, is offered only by a fundamentally different policy. In this country it could be offered only by a new political movement which is NOT bound to capitalism, which can really come before the peoples as the champions of a consistently DEMOCRATIC FOREIGN POLICY, which can really appeal to them and mobilize them for the defense of a "free world," and not for the defense of the old world of capitalist imperialism which takes this name in vain.

There is no easy and cheap way out of the blind alley into which the Truman-bipartisan-Republican line led, and in which the Eisenhower administration is thrashing about. It is not the Yalta-Teheran-Potsdam imperialist deal by itself which is the villain of the piece. It is not military threats—or more futilely, the threat of military threats—which can counter the political weapons that the rival (Russian) would-be masters of the world have at their disposal and are able to use.

We, Independent Socialists, believe that only a workers' government which has cut itself loose from the interests of American capitalism, will be able to extricate itself from this blind alley and offer the world a Third Alternative to the war road being followed by capitalism and Stalinism. But we ourselves offer this Third Camp goal as no ultimatic dogma to those who still think that liberal or even conservative politicians can be induced to change their spots or their policies.

We say only: build a new labor political movement which really does oppose the anti-democratic, militaristic and imperialist "aspects" of U. S. foreign policy and find out for yourselves, by prosecuting an unremitting and bold fight, whether these "aspects" can be cured short of a fundamental transformation of the whole society.

Bank Robber as Sociologist

In *I, Willie Sutton* by Quentin Reynolds, the notorious bank robber explains why banks get robbed:

"I felt I knew a great deal about bank employees. To begin with, most of them are horribly underpaid. Bank employees are never organized. They do not enjoy the privileges of collective bargaining. Very few banks pay overtime; at best, they give their employees dinner money. Each bank has a board of directors, and usually one of these men has relatives working in the bank. They are the ones who get the better jobs and who find advancement easiest. The ordinary bank employee doesn't feel any great loyalty toward the bank that hires him. If the bank is robbed, he knows no one individual really suffers. He knows that a dozen insurance companies as impersonal as the bank divide the loss among them. Bank guards are usually ex-cops who have reached the age of retirement. Such a man is hardly inclined to risk his life in defense of property that doesn't belong to him. These are all factors which the intelligent law-breaker takes into consideration."

New York

SYL Book Bazaar

Come and fill out your library with our bargains

POLITICS, FICTION, SCIENCE, etc. at give-away prices!

Friday, March 20 from 8:30 p.m. on

LABOR ACTION HALL 114 West 14 Street, New York City

(Don't forget to bring any of your own books that you want to contribute to the sale.)

The General and the Senator — —

(Continued from page 1)

Recently, Homer Bigart, one of the ablest war correspondents of today, wrote from Korea that the field commanders favored an offensive against the Chinese Stalinist forces as a method of forcing a decisive decision.

General Van Fleet, upon retirement, openly urged such a policy, until the world and national reaction became so sharp that he retreated under the usual cover of being misunderstood, etc.

The theory of a naval blockade likewise found itself punctured by the reaction of the Western countries and a cold-blooded analysis of its actual military effect. Hanson W. Baldwin's writings in the *New York Times* served to bring some sense into the discussion of this question.

For whatever proposal is made, the conclusion comes back to the basic strategic estimate that the Joint Chiefs of Staff made in the brilliantly succinct statement of General Bradley, "This is the wrong war at the wrong place at the wrong time and with the wrong enemy."

Putting it even more clearly, the strategic advantage in the East is with Stalinist Russia. This is the unpalatable fact that no American politician in high places has dared say openly, for all segments of Republican and Democratic party officials backed the policy that set the stage for this untenable position.

It is within the framework of this strategic picture that each proposal for a solution to the war in Korea backfires, and gives the Stalinist demagogues more ammunition in the struggle for the support of the masses of the globe who want peace.

BULLITT LINE

Excluded from any consideration on their part is a genuine political counter-offensive based on the strategic withdrawal of American troops from Korea. Senator McCarthy alone is powerful enough in American politics to forbid any such public discussion in Congress and 'most anywhere else.

In a world fearful of war and hungry for peace, the discussion

in Washington and the American press simply serves to feed the Stalinist propaganda machine. A classic example is the article by William C. Bullitt, former U. S. Ambassador to Russia and France, which appears in the current issue of *Reader's Digest*, which has a circulation abroad and at home of 17,000,000 copies.

Bullitt says: "In order to win the Korean war, we shall certainly have to bomb some cities and railroads in South Manchuria and we may have to bomb other Chinese cities and bridges." That certainly makes for fine and reassuring reading to a jittery Europe and a suspicious India, to mention two important areas.

"What will happen if we do? Will the Soviet Union make war on us?" Bullitt asks. Since Stalin didn't during the skirmish between the East and the West in Greece, he thinks not. But China is no Greece. The stakes are far greater. Besides, why would Stalin have to declare war? Why not a continuation of the war in the wrong place at the wrong time with the wrong enemy? The strategic

advantage and flexibility rest with Stalinist Russia.

The desperate situation today is illustrated by the fantastic hopes rested on none other than Chiang Kai-shek and his essentially mercenary forces, who lack everything required for a serious military blow against Mao Tse-tung's China, as American military leaders with their experiences on establishing a second front in Europe know only too well.

Nor is this crisis assisted by the popularization in America of the slogan, "Let the Asiatics Fight the Asiatics."

'CREEPING WAR'

All these difficulties flow from three basic factors, which are not likely to be changed in the coming period: (1) A fundamental inability to understand the nature of Stalinism, which becomes harder, incidentally, as the witchhunt atmosphere in America precludes serious public discussion. (2) Lack of grasp of the military problems involved in a war with Stalinism, which makes the more astute military men like General Bradley suspicious in the public eye (Senator Taft, for example, long ago announced his public lack of confidence in the Joint Chiefs). (3) The unattractive nature of capitalism to the masses of the world, or conversely, the blind faith of American capitalism in itself and its inability to understand that it is the last bastion of an old society, not the herald of a new and fresh world capitalism.

In the face of this world situation, the American ruling class has no choice but abdication or a continuation of its blind follies. It will not abdicate. Rather, a policy of more military force against Stalinism, as the only answer it has to the world crisis, is indicated.

Thus a policy of creeping war, expanding inevitably, and posing the life-and-death question of all-out World War III, becomes the essence of U. S. foreign policy.

Its European reflection will be a ruthless and intensive drive for a European army at any cost, and an expansion of the use of military force of all varieties in the Asian conflicts from Indo-China to Korea.

On Stalinist Anti-Semitism — —

(Continued from page 5)

The rulers of Russia have seen that their "classless society" has given rise to a group that is caught in the middle between the demands of the tops and the resentment of the people, and that cannot be integrated completely into their totalitarian system. Combining this with their cultural heritage and revolutionary traditions "it is natural as a result of their condition" for the Jews, still victims of racial hatred, to look for or toward doctrines of international and social equality.

This is true whether or not in fact there has been a strong development in that direction. The totalitarian dictators have decided that they are "more susceptible" and that is enough to doom them. They fear that social conditions will again cause the Jews, as in tsarist time, to become revolutionaries.

LOOKING TO WAR

The bureaucracy, in its paranoid fashion, reasons that this group, which is trod upon and mistreated, burns with a desire for revenge and waits impatiently for an opportunity to betray it to the enemy. Hence its characteristic reaction—death, imprisonment and exile for these "potential traitors."

Having decided that the Jews as Jews, i.e., as a whole, are unreliable, it strikes hardest at those in high governmental economic and cultural positions, then at those in sensitive jobs and border areas.

In the satellite countries this tendency was retarded or rather reversed for a time because of the fact that Stalin had no other human material with which to rule these countries; and the Jews were allowed to become the "fall guys" since for historical reasons they make the best scapegoats. It took them but a few years to develop some substitutes for its quislings and now the Jews are

sent away.

Time is getting short as the Third World War looms: The luxuries they had to allow themselves in the post-war years won't do now.

Preparation for World War III is the other major reason for the "open" features of Stalinist anti-Semitism.

The new bureaucratic anti-Semitism goes hand in hand with the post-war development of chauvinism and a fantastic xenophobia as the dominant ideology in Russia. This inculcation of super-chauvinism is in preparation for World War III.

The struggle against the West will not be, and in Russia cannot be, marshaled under the banner of social revolution. The Russian masses have little illusions on this score. Hence the effort to repeat the technique employed during World War II but this time on a vaster and unprecedented scale.

SYMBOLS OF WEST

A key feature and basic need of totalitarian propaganda is to find internal symbols and representatives of whatever enemy the masses are being aroused against. As long as Stalinism could evoke social and class forces during the '20s and early '30s; the internal "enemies" were vestigial representatives of, or those who could serve as symbols of, the overthrown capitalist and feudal classes. The new nationalist course requires new internal symbols of the foreign, Western, enemy who can be pilloried and against whom the hatred of the masses can be directed.

As symbols of the West, no people in Russia is as eminently fitted as the Jewish people, the bulk of whom live in the West, in the U. S. and other countries within the Anglo-American orbit. Hence, the frequency of the plausible charge in the continuing campaign against "cosmopolitanism" in Russia that

Jews have too many ties with and too much sympathy for the Western world, are lacking in Russian patriotism.

A typical criticism is the remark made by the general secretary of the Byelo-Russian CP on February 17, 1949: "Only one theater in the Byelo-Russian Republics—a Jewish one—puts on unpatriotic plays in which life in America is praised." Hence also the central charge against the Jewish "cosmopolitans" that they "are devoid of the natural feeling of Soviet national pride" and their cosmopolitanism "is advantageous now to world reaction, to the instigators of a new war." (Simonev, in *Pravda*, February 27, 1949.)

The passage of time unfortunately brings nearer the beginning of World War III. It is this consideration, in my opinion, that is the real answer to the question of "Why now the anti-Jewish drive?"

New Blows at Jews — —

(Continued from page 6)

his work. If Grossman carefully toed the mark at a time when the vigilance of the Kremlin was greatly weakened, why should he deviate now when the Kremlin clique is more firmly in the saddle than it ever was? The answer is that Grossman's crime has not been mentioned.

Grossman's "crime" is in being a Jew and having written about certain war-time experiences from the viewpoint of a Jew.

In late 1943 Grossman visited the liberated Ukrainian provinces east of the Dnieper and began to write a series of articles for the Yiddish Moscow newspaper *Einigkeit* which bore the title "The Ukraine Without Jews." Grossman drew the following desolate picture:

"I covered this country on foot and by car from the Northern Donets to the Dnieper, from Voroshilovgrad in the Donets Basin to Chernigov on the Desna River. I went down to the Dnieper and looked from afar at Kiev—and I met but one Jew in all that time. He was Lieutenant Kapershtein, who had been caught in an enemy encirclement in the Yagotin district in September, 1941." The effect of these simple but powerful lines was to destroy the Stalinist propaganda myth that the Kremlin had "saved the Jews from Hitler."

Grossman's accounts of the annihilation of Russian and Polish Jewry in the Ukraine appeared in only two issues of *Einigkeit*, that of November 25 and December 2, 1943. The series was

abruptly discontinued although further installments had been promised. The facts contained in these two articles never appeared elsewhere in the Russian press. They were not published in the army newspaper *Red Star* to which Grossman was accredited as a correspondent. Nor did they appear in Grossman's volume of war dispatches and stories issued in Russian in 1945.

"COURT JEWS"

However, despite Grossman's "crimes" he will probably not disappear as yet from the literary scene. The fact that he has been offered the opportunity of recanting indicates this. Grossman is an undeniably talented writer, with the added prestige of having been "discovered" by Maxim Gorki in the early '30s. Stalin still needs his "court Jews" to refute the charges of anti-Semitism.

It is no accident, for instance, that shortly before the arrest of the Jewish doctors in Moscow, Ilya Ehrenburg, Stalin's literary hireling, received a Stalin Peace Prize, or that Lev Mekhlis, former minister of state control, who had been in retirement for several years, has received an official funeral out of all proportion to his real role.

Grossman can fit into the same category—if he recants. What is being demanded of him now is a public demonstration of loyalty to the regime, that is, open acceptance of Stalin's anti-Semitic line as well as of the implied rebuke for having dared lapse even momentarily into "Jewishness."

The ISL Program In Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and the ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

For information about
The ISL,
write to

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

The Handy Way To Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription:
 NEW RENEWAL
 6 months at \$7.00
 1 year at \$2.00

NAME
(please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE APT.

STATE

Payment enclosed.
 Bill me.

Labor Action FORUM • New York

Next Thursday, March 5 at 8:30 p.m.

Problems of Socialist Anti-War Policy

by
Hal Draper
Editor, *Labor Action*

Last in a series

III—WAR AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Discussing problems of anti-war policy
in the light of the new elements of World War 3.

LABOR ACTION HALL
114 West 14 Street, New York City