

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 26, 1953

FIVE CENTS

FIVE THEORIES ON THE ROOTS OF STALINIST ANTI-SEMITISM

... pages 4-5

Those 'Fighting Liberals' in Congress

... page 2

Snags for British Imperialism

... page 3

'Salaries' for Students?

... see Youth and Student Column, page 8

BEHIND RUSSIA'S NEW ANTI-SEMITISM ARE THE REAL ASSASSINS

By ABE STEIN

The arrest of six Jewish physicians in Moscow (along with three of their non-Jewish colleagues) on the fantastic charges of having caused the deaths of Politburo members Andrei Zhdanov and Alexander Sherbakov and of further plotting the death of a group of Russia's highest ranking military leaders brings to a climax an anti-Semitic campaign in Russia that began in the fall of 1948.

The denunciation of the physicians as agents of international Jewish organizations linked with Israeli and American-British imperialism follows the pattern of the recent Prague trials and leaves not the slightest doubt as to Stalin's intentions.

To make doubly sure that no one can possibly misunderstand, Stalin chose the alleged victims of the "Jewish cosmopolitans" with care. Zhdanov, who died in 1948, the champion of Great-Russian chauvinism, was the initiator and most vicious prosecutor of the post-war campaign against "cosmopolitanism." Sherbakov, who died in 1945, vice-commissar of defense and commissar of the Political Administration of the army, was an outspoken anti-Semite.

And in choosing outstanding members of the military hierarchy as prospective victims of the "Jewish agents of American-British imperialism," Stalin is evidently trying to link the official doctrine of "imperialist encircle-

(Continued on page 6)

Stalinist 'Art' 1929-1953



This cartoon is not from the Nazi Der Stürmer. It is a poster in East Germany today, put up by the Stalinist party, representing Hoegner, the social-democratic minister of the interior in Bavaria, who has cracked down on both neo-Nazi and Communist Party agitation.



This cartoon is not from Gerald L. K. Smith's Cross and Flag, but from the Stalinist organ Freiheit (New York) for Sept. 19, 1929, printed at a time of pogroms in Palestine organized under the Grand Mufti. The caption and the message are anti-Zionist, but even in 1929 "anti-Zionism" led to caricatures of hooked noses. . . .

The Two Camps of Hypocrisy

With no difficulty at all, American leaders and the American press have joined the outcry against the Stalinist anti-Jewish drive with expressions of appalled indignation. Behind the witchhunt against the Jews in Stalinland they see with equal ease the attempts of a reactionary regime to martyrize a whole people.

It is wonderful insight that they display—when the criminals are on the other side of the Iron Curtain and also happen to be the leaders of that imperialism which is challenging America's own "right" to dominate the world.

When, however, the (still undiscovered) disloyalty of a possible few Nisei on the West Coast was expected in 1941, these defenders of civilized methods against Stalinist barbarism rushed to put a whole national minority behind barbed wire.

The new president of the United States says we must "show the world the indignation all America feels at the outrages perpetrated by the Soviets against the sacred principles of our civilization."

This outraged general, however, simply considered it clever politics to hobnob with the Southern leaders of White Supremacy, for whom the sacred principles of our civilization require that a whole people, with colored skins, be kept in economic, social and political inferiority.

The outgoing president of the United States says that "We Americans cannot condemn these procedures [the Prague trial] too forcefully. The persecution of political, racial or religious minority groups is contrary to everything we stand for and believe in."

Yet—even aside from the fact that this is one of the countries where a systematic racist Jim Crow system is institutionalized—this is the president who has set up "subversive" lists, loyalty boards, Smith Act trials and FBI inquisitions for nothing else than "the persecution

of political . . . minority groups," and not only the Stalinists at that.

When, in the midst of the headlines about the "Jewish doctors' plot" invented by the Kremlin, a Democratic Party congressman, Rep. Walter, stood up in Congress to slander the "professional Jews" who, he claimed, are behind the protests against the racist McCarran Immigration Law, there was no unanimous outpouring of indignation and horror, in the name of the sacred principles of civilization, against this 100-per-cent American Jew-baiter.

It is true that the United States is still far from the monstrosities perpetrated by the totalitarian regime in Moscow. No thanks for that to the reactionaries who control a wing of the Republicans and to the Southern racists and their Northern allies who are more firmly entrenched than ever in the Democratic Party. But when shocked Europeans and Asians—from right to left—express their feelings about the racist and political witch-hunts which are part of American life, our "patriots" resent these "misunderstandings" and express dark suspicions about the moral fiber of our benighted critics.

That much has to be said about the hypocrisy of these indignant leading citizens, who were only too willing to glorify and whitewash the leaders of the Kremlin when the latter were noble allies in the Second World War and not open imperialist rivals.

We can say this. The Stalinists cannot.

The line of the Daily Worker these days is one prolonged cry of "You're another!" If they cannot explain away the Jew-baiting by their own puppet-masters, they can savagely attack a Rep. Walter. Their sacred principle is that one good hypocrisy deserves another.

The simple truth these days can be spoken only by those who are not tied to the interests of either American imperialism or Russian totalitarianism.

LABOR ACTION FORUM

on

'OPERATION X' — THE NEW STALINIST ANTI-SEMITISM

Speaker:

ABE STEIN

Thursday, January 29
8:30 p.m.

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, New York

Donation: 25 cents

Detroit Teachers Resist Witchhunt

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Jan. 18—As a result of a vigorous protest by the Detroit Federation of Teachers (AFL), there was considerable back-tracking on the part of Detroit's newspapers in building up another witchhunt atmosphere here last week, based on fantastic assertions by the U. S. Senate Internal Security Committee.

Even the Senate committee maintained a discreet silence after the Detroit teachers, burned up at the vicious and totally irresponsible statements, fired a counterblast.

This situation developed last Monday when Detroit's daily press came out with huge banner headlines about 100 to 200 "Reds" teaching in Detroit's schools. The sensational stories that followed were based on a special report of the Senate committee released that day.

Any two-year-old child, not to speak of any senator, should have known that on the very face of it, such a situation was a political impossibility. In their greatest heyday the Stalinists never had that kind of organization in Detroit's school system. As a matter of fact, last spring the House Committee on Un-American Activities uncovered exactly one Stalinist among all of Detroit's 9,000 school teachers, and the committee had a complete roster of all Stalinist names in Michigan furnished by Mrs. Baldwin, a paid FBI agent in the Communist Party.

Apparently these obvious facts penetrated even the skulls of Detroit editorial writers, and combined with bitter protests by many individual teachers, the newspapers began to retreat. Two of them, the Detroit Free Press and the Detroit News, went so far as to print editorials warning against wild charges and defending the "loyalty" of the teachers.

HIT AT DODD

This did not satisfy the teachers union, however, and it issued a sharp statement, which the newspapers were forced to print prominently. The statement says in part:

"Statements in the press that there are 100 or more Communists in the Detroit school system are false. The congressional sub-committee admittedly bases its charges on one ex-Communist's testimony.

"Superintendent Dondineau and all who know the Detroit school system emphatically deny the charge.

"The press is at fault in accepting the charges of an unreliable witness like Bella Dodd, of the notorious New York Teachers Union (expelled as a red front by the American Federation of Teachers and later by the CIO) against the testimony of Superintendent Dondineau that there are no Communist activities afoot in the Detroit schools and no evidence of Communist infiltration.

"Superintendent Dondineau has said that a five-year study has disclosed there are not more than a half dozen under suspicion of Communist activities among 12,000 school employees.

"A man of Superintendent Dondineau's integrity, who has been in the service of Detroit schools for more than 30 years, should not be doubted.

"The Detroit Federation of Teachers also knows the Detroit school system inside and out and has a clear record of militant opposition to Communism.

"Our prediction is that the pending senatorial investigation will uphold the superintendent's findings and clear Detroit teachers of the charge now maligning them in the headlines.

"Let the Senate Internal sub-committee prove its charges, based apparently on the sensational testimony of Dr. Bella Dodd, an ex-Communist regarded

by her associates as a highly unreliable witness.

"Mrs. Dodd testified that in 1943 there were 1,500 Communist members who were teaching, 1,000 of them in New York City. Cells of three or more, she said, existed in a dozen universities. Without confirmation, such testimony should be disregarded as out-of-date and suspect."

CHARGE SMEAR

After explaining the difference between the AFL teachers union and the union once led by Mrs. Dodd, the statement continues.

"Bella Dodd's report of Communist activities in such a notorious Communist front as she led should not be permitted to smear Detroit teachers.

"The press does have a responsibility that it has entirely disregarded for not accepting a congressional committee's report about its local school system until it has thoroughly investigated the facts.

"The newspaper headlines have instead stimulated suspicion, distrust and disrespect of teachers. And these teachers give their lives in unselfish devotion to Detroit's school children. It has also undermined the parent and children's confidence in their teachers.

"Parents can trust their children's teachers in spite of scare headlines. Our Superintendent Dondineau vouches for them, and he is a man of greatest vigilance and unquestioned integrity."

When United Auto Workers (CIO) members read this statement, they can contrast it with the disgraceful silence of the UAW leadership last year during the week that the House Committee on Un-American Activities whipped up a lynch hysteria.

The teachers union was, of course, mainly intent on counteracting the scareheads, whose result would be to loose wild witch-hunting in the school field. In the climate of Detroit's anti-red "hysteria, it has a salutary effect, even though the union has not taken a pro-civil-liberties stand on the right of Stalinists to teach.

DETROIT, Jan. 18—Carl Stellato, president of Ford Local 600, United Auto Workers (CIO), announced today that all 197 members of the General Council, governing body of this huge local, had signed union loyalty pledges that they have no "Communist, fascist or subversive" connections. The 197 included 14 members of the council against whom charges of "Communist connections" had been made last spring during the House committee hearings.

Stellato said that a week ago he had urged the entire council to stand up and be counted on the Communist issue. This is his move to prepare answers to the expected blast, at the forthcoming UAW convention by the Reuther leadership, against the leadership of Ford Local 600.

LONDON LETTER

Snags for British Imperialism

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Jan. 13—This week we report on two centers in Africa where the imperialism of the British Tories' government has been running into difficulties.

Whether one calls him a demagogue, a bonapartist or a tyrant, General Naguib of Egypt is a clever fellow. Before he came to power King Farouk had attempted to divert the attention of his people from their internal troubles by pointing to the effects of British imperialist policy. First he raised the issue of British troops in the Suez Canal Zone; then he turned his attention to the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan and unabashedly pronounced himself king of Egypt and the Sudan.

The Sudanese themselves have shown that they are interested in greater autonomy, up to independence, from both Cairo and London.

The British government has some clever fellows in its diplomatic service too. They decided that the most fruitful policy for them was to stay in the Canal Zone, enlarge the arms bases and meet any attempt at expulsion with force.

NAGUIB SWITCHES

In the Sudan, however, the British government, being less corrupt than the Egyptian, had received a certain measure of support, as against the Egyptians, from a section of the Sudanese politicians. London therefore decided to forestall Farouk's annexation of this territory by offering them a "democratic" parliament; the only condition would be the retention of a British governor-general with special powers, allegedly accorded him to protect the interests of the less politically articulate Southern Sudanese.

When Naguib came to power he temporarily ceased harrying

the British in the Canal Zone. He was too busy settling matters at home; furthermore, the British were very obligingly providing him with modern arms, including jet aircraft. While this flow of arms continued, Naguib considered it wise to show good will; he entered into a series of negotiations with Sir Ralph Stevenson, the British ambassador, on the future of the Sudan. This week Anthony Eden, suddenly got a shock.

Negotiations for the future of the Sudan were almost complete when Naguib's special envoy, Colonel Salem, announced that he had come to an agreement with the Sudanese political parties, of which one of the most important was the Socialist Republican Party. They had exchanged support for the British plan for support of the Egyptian proposal, which gave their prospective assembly wider powers and the governor-general less.

When the British ambassador called on Naguib to express his distaste for negotiations behind his back, the prime minister was unable to see him. He was at that moment addressing 15,000 students at Fuad the First University; they were holding a demonstration in solidarity with four students who were killed fighting the British in the Canal Zone exactly one year ago. The burden of Naguib's speech can be summed up in his words, "We will not permit any foreign soldier to stay among us. Only over our dead bodies. . . ."

IN KENYA

From another black spot of British imperialism came a significant development. I have pointed out before, in LABOR ACTION, that the most reactionary pressure for a hard policy in Kenya comes from the local European population. This had been

one of the most serious problems of the British Labor government too.

Today the situation in Kenya offers an excellent example of this difficult fact. The local Europeans, led by Michael Blundell, have complained that the action taken by Sir Evelyn Baring, the governor-general, was "too liberal" toward the Kikuyu tribe and the Mau Mau movement.

Now Sir Evelyn Baring is a Conservative, an imperialist and a cricket player. But even in terms of his own tradition, which is far from "liberal," he is not ready to go as far as the local Europeans demand—perhaps because, as a sportsman, he feels that some semblance of just government must be retained.

ON THE BONFIRE

The local Europeans, sitting on a bonfire of their own making, have started an agitation for his removal and for independence for Kenya—indeed, that is, not for the native population but for themselves. In other words, they want to be in a position to follow in the footsteps of the Malan government of South Africa without interference from "unrealistic" Whitehall. Government by the Colonial Office has failed; they say.

Blundell called for five measures at a meeting representing the local Europeans in Kenya: (1) Bring more Europeans into the government; (2) appoint a single person in charge of "security"; (3) give district commissioners summary authority to mete out punishment to Mau Mau suspects; (4) hand over a carte blanche to armed patrols to fire at suspects; (5) banish Kikuyu suspects from the towns.

As far as they are concerned, clearly, the UN Declaration of Human Rights is "For Whites Only."

Philly NAACP Shows the Way Toward Effective Negro Struggle

By JOE ARNOLD

PHILA., Jan. 10—For the third straight year the Philadelphia branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People swore in its progressive administration. This is the group that showed the entire NAACP and the rest of the country how to fight Stalinism successfully on a democratic and militant basis.

For years the Stalinists had complete control of the Philadelphia NAACP and had steadily torn down the branch. From a membership of 15,000 it dwindled to a mere 2000. The tortuous turnings and twistings of the Communist Party line had reduced the organization to impotence. The labor movement was alienated, the masses of the Negro people distrusted it. The branch

owed the National Office over \$2000 in dues. There was talk of lifting the charter and bureaucratically setting up a new branch.

It was then that a group of militants including socialists, trade-unionists and liberals set up a bloc that within a year educated the membership and brought new leaders up from within the ranks.

In the most effective and democratic fashion this group defeated the Stalinists and ousted them from the leadership of the branch. The defeat was so decisive from a political and programmatic point of view that to this day the Stalinists have not recovered from the blow; they now rarely show up to meetings.

GATHERU CASE

Today the Philadelphia NAACP is a healthy vital branch. It has over 6,000 members. It meets regularly every month. It has an active executive committee and an energetic executive secretary. It participates in the day-to-day struggles of the Negro people against Jim Crow on the job, in the shop, theatre or restaurant. It has won outstanding victories in all these fields in the last few years. Last year it broke the Jim Crow pattern at the giant Philco plant, also in the Philadelphia Navy Yard and in housing projects.

It is alert to international issues. It is supporting the committee to defend Raul GATHERU, the Lincoln University student from Kenya. The British Colonial Office is trying to get the U. S. government to deport him so that it can clap him into a concentration camp.

The Philadelphia NAACP has pointed out that the UN has based

its opposition to the Korean armistice on the principle that no one must be forcibly repatriated to suffer for political and other reasons. The Philadelphia NAACP feels that this applies to Gatheru. He too should not be turned over to a government that will inter him for political reasons. The branch is following this matter with keen interest and all other phases of the African nationalist movements and the struggles of the African peoples for independence.

While pointing out all these good qualities of the local branch, it should be noted that there are some weaknesses. Outstanding is a tendency to shrink from mass action on important matters. Proposals for mass meetings, door-to-door leaflet distribution, neighborhood meetings, etc., are very cautiously received. Progress is being made in the direction of breaking down such hesitations. Once this is done the Philadelphia NAACP will make enormous strides toward becoming a mass fighting organization of the Negro people in the city.

'THE NEW INTERNATIONAL'

is the leading Marxist magazine in the United States, internationally recognized as among the foremost organs of Marxist thought and political analysis in the world.

SEND 35 CENTS FOR THE CURRENT ISSUE

OR SUBSCRIBE AT \$2.00 A YEAR

New International, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

Subscribers — Attention!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the wrapper.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

17-4

RENEW NOW!

If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

Those 'Fighting' Democratic Liberals in Congress . . .

By GEN HALL

As the 83rd Congress meets, the pattern of American politics in the coming months is becoming discernible. Republicans hold narrow majorities in both Houses but the Senate lineup and the issues already debated reveal what simple arithmetic conceals: A powerfully strengthened reactionary bloc with Taft in control of the Senate majority and Southern Democrats in control of its minority.

The inevitable rightward tone of legislative deliberations cannot be justified as reflecting the "will of the majority" expressed in 1952. Those who voted for Eisenhower were not clamoring for a reversion to Republican conservatism; they chose the only method available in their eyes for protesting the inadequacies of the Democratic administration. American politics remains cramped into the Democratic-Republican party system, hampering the emergence of a truly progressive-labor wing.

The first days of the new Congress demonstrate this brute fact in dramatic form. The recent CIO convention warned that genuine liberals must be ready to "stand up and be counted." Labor is outside Congress; the Democratic liberals are inside; and inside Congress they appear disoriented and demoralized in their new role as an "opposition."

Everyone likes to be "constructive"; but the insistence of the liberal coalition that it intends to serve as a "constructive opposition" to Eisenhower expresses not a statesmanlike nobility but a wavering uncertainty. Months before the elections they darkly predicted imminent catastrophe if the Republicans won. Now it appears that the gains won by labor in the early days of the New Deal are not to be obliterated with explosives but worn away with abrasives.

For many years the legal and legislative position of labor was undermined, while a "Fair Dealer" sat in Washington and liberals in Congress went along with the tide! Since no abrupt and obvious change seems likely to emanate from the new administration, the liberals are thrown off balance.

"A good many Democrats are having difficulty distinguishing the Eisenhower administration as a 'foe,'" writes one New York Times correspondent.

LOST BEARINGS

Some labor leaders were so overwhelmed by the appointment of an AFL man as secretary of labor that they momentarily lost their bearings. They had become accustomed to getting so little from "their own" administration that they are grateful for little things. Once they protested their role as "captives" on war boards appointed by Truman; now they congratulate Eisenhower's cabinet prisoner.

Government portfolios from cabinet ministers down are to be staffed with authentic and obvious big businessmen. Charles E. Wilson, most prominent and symbolic of all, divests himself of all formal jobs with General Motors as a token of impartiality and merely continues to hold \$2,500,000 worth of stock in the company. This case is so crude that even the Senate gags. As government is handed to a cabinet of millionaires and one plumber, we hear hardly a murmur of protest from labor leaders and liberal congressmen. The labor movement displayed greater indignation in 1944 when the re-elected Roosevelt made similar appointments and the unions aggressively demanded to know "Who won the elections?"

A first questioning voice is heard from Local 688 of the Teamsters Union (AFL): "The extreme anti-labor attitude of . . . cabinet appointments makes us keep our fingers crossed." A closer examination of labor's attitude

would show that the union leaders are not really misled by their own wishful thinking; they express illusions about Eisenhower merely for temporary lack of any more consoling policy.

As though to correct their misunderstanding, Eisenhower holds out the hand of good will and cooperation to Senator Byrd, a leading Southern Democrat who broke with Stevenson and helped carry Virginia for Eisenhower. Byrd was offered the post of secretary of the treasury; when he turned the job down, Eisenhower appointed T. Coleman Andrews, another pro-Eisenhower Virginia Democrat "highly recommended" by Byrd. And William S. White writes in the *Times*: "there is a general supposition that the new president and the old senator (Taft) are not likely to stand very far apart on any major domestic matter."

THE LIBERALS BUCKLE

While Taft men dominate the Senate committees, the reactionary Southern wing emerges with increased power inside the Democratic caucus. And this power they will use, as in the past, in alliance with the Taft Republicans. The liberal coalition which dominated the Democratic Party convention discovers that in the Senate its party is the anti-union, anti-Negro, anti-liberal Southern Democracy.

Domination of the Senate Democratic caucus is in the hands of Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia, recognized spokesman and leader of the Southern bloc. Formal leadership rests with Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas, chosen floor leader by the caucus. Johnson is reputed to sit between the ultra-conservative bloc and the timid liberals as a middle-of-the-road buffer; his choice as minority leader was undoubtedly considered a "compromise." His election was unanimous.

In accepting this choice without protest, Democratic liberals give us a sample of what is to come; in this case, presumably, they accepted Johnson to avoid Russell. They begin their 1953 career as crusaders for liberalism by endorsing a man who on principle stands against civil-rights legislation and opposes curbs on the filibuster.

"Senator Johnson," reports Cabell Phillips for the *Times*, "is safely a 'Russell man' whenever the chips go down between the Northern and Southern wings of the party."

In return for their obliging capitulation, they are granted representation as a helpless minority on the party steering committee and policy committee.

Two issues tested the mettle of the Senate liberals: the filibuster and the assignment of Wayne Morse to a committee seat. They opened up on the Senate floor with a foredoomed procedural motion aimed against the filibuster, last ditch defense of reactionary Southerners against civil rights. They could muster only fifteen votes from Democrats and six from Republicans.

The CIO had put this measure in first place in its own legislative program; Walter Reuther sent letters to every senator urging support of the move. Although the liberals had reconciled them-

selves to defeat, they hailed their own maneuvers as a public manifestation of their fighting intention to keep alive the program of the Fair Deal.

Their brave demonstration, however, has its peculiarly disappointing aspects. The liberal Democrats made no effort to fight for their line within their own party. The Senate Democratic caucus treated the measure with utter contempt: it was not even discussed, much less defended, at its conferences. And, of course, Floor Leader Johnson voted to kill the measure.

If on the filibuster the liberal Democrats acted with gingerly concern for inner-party relations—but at least acted—on the Morse issue they fell apart.

Morse had broken with the Republican Party to support Stevenson and is now listed on the Senate rolls as an "independent." The question then arose: "Is he or is he not entitled to his old seat on the Senate Armed Services Committee?"

Morse's candidacy was rejected by a vote of 81-7. Five, and only five, Democratic senators voted with him. O fighting liberals! O courageous men! O tribunes of the people!

To repeat: the CIO calls upon liberals to stand up and be counted. Don't bother to use the Census Bureau; just count 'em, men.

Newspaperman Reveals Chiang's Repression of Labor in Formosa

The foreign correspondent of the Chicago *Sun-Times*, Frederick Kuh, gives a picture of Formosa under Chiang Kai-shek, now that he "has learned some lessons from his China disaster and forgotten others." The lesson he learned, says Kuh (January 9), is the need for some land reform for the peasants. But otherwise—

"All power on this 14,000-square-mile island refuge is centered in his hands. He is the leader of what they call Free China. But freedom, except for the small ruling group, is as hard to find here as in Communist China."

"No political opposition is tolerated. During the three weeks up to mid-December some 80 alleged Communist agents or saboteurs were executed, bringing the total executions during 1952 to about 160. The whole apparatus of government—executive, judicial—presents the familiar collection of yesmen."

"A relatively bright spot is the land reforms introduced on Formosa. But the Chinese Nationalist government's policy toward the 300,000 industrial workers on this island is sinister. . . ."

"Two U. S. officials of the Mutual Security Agency have just finished a three-month study of labor conditions on Formosa. Their report presents an ugly picture."

"Child labor is common in most industries and often on the land. Small children are loading and pushing carts of ore underground in the copper and gold mines."

They work in textile mills. To the limit of their strength they help harvest crops. Less than one child in 10 on Formosa attends school beyond the grades.

"Labor has almost no rights. There are no trade unions in the accepted sense. So-called labor organizations, claiming about 130,000 members, are government controlled. Wages are too miserable to permit workers to pay enough dues to finance the 'unions,' so the government subsidizes them."

"The government supervises the election of 'union' officials and oversees their activities. No collective bargaining agreements exist."

"The government has introduced some labor insurance for accidents, death benefits, disability and maternity—but not for sickness or unemployment."

"Strikes are forbidden by law. Last year, however, squalid conditions drove workers in the salt fields to riot. U. S. investigators found these men were being paid one Formosan dollar (about 3/4 of one U. S. cent) for producing one ton of salt. But retail price of that product was 666 Formosan dollars (over \$4)."

"The American investigators concluded the government is enforcing a low wage policy. Wages, they learned, have been frozen for three years, while in the first nine months of 1951 prices rose 39.5 per cent. Workers' living standards have sunk out of sight."

Wilson Balks at Turning His Back On GM—or on 2½ Million Dollars

by LARRY O'CONNOR

A bit of a "scandal" has marred the inauguration of the first Republican administration in twenty years. The term "scandal" is put in quotation marks, because this is one of the most genteel-type scandals which the country has faced in many a moon.

What makes it genteel is that two and one half million dollars owned by one solitary individual is involved. Even in these days when government expenditures are counted in the tens of billions, such a sum of money, when owned by a single individual, cannot help but make him and his doings most respectable.

The man, of course, is Charles E. Wilson, lately head of General Motors Corporation and now designated secretary of defense in Eisenhower's cabinet. It turns out that although Wilson resigned his post with GM, he could see no reason to sell his \$2½ million dollars worth of stock in that company.

Further, it seems that he has another \$600,000 coming to him from GM over the next four years in bonuses. In exchange for getting these bonuses, he has given GM his word that during the period in which they are paid he will do nothing to harm the interests of the corporation.

Neither the newspapers nor congressmen would find all this worthy of comment if it were not for the fact that in the job for which Wilson has been proposed he will be in a position to substantially affect the profit position of GM. That corporation has more orders from the government than any other. Further, it has recently submitted a request to the War Department for a higher profit margin on its contracts.

This request was undoubtedly prepared while Wilson was still head of GM. It will be acted upon by the new secretary of defense, whoever he may be. And the decision will quite materially affect the dividends to be paid on GM stock in the future.

If you had two and a half million bucks tied up in GM stocks, wouldn't you be interested in help-

ing to make that decision?

When Wilson and the other gentlemen who will head the various sections of the War Department appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee they all took different stands on what they would do with their private holdings and connections in view of their new jobs. Of all of them, Wilson acted most impatient with, and contemptuous of, the committee's questioning. That is only fitting, it would seem, since he has more money than the rest of them.

When asked if he would participate in making policy which affects GM, he replied that of course he would, as he knows more about GM than anyone else. At another point in the hearing he said that "What is good for General Motors is good for the country."

NEW BROOM, EH?

There can be no doubt about it: the man is honest and forthright in the presentation of his considered opinions. He has not yet learned the language of diplomacy, a language designed to conceal thoughts rather than express them. That is why his statements are the only "refreshing" thing we have heard from an Eisenhower man since those early days of the campaign when the boss himself admitted that he knew little about anything.

In fact, they are quite as forthright as any U. S. Chamber of Commerce or National Association of Manufacturers pamphlet which starts and ends with the slogan "What Helps Business Helps You."

Charlie Wilson is such a fine fellow, and so well understood by his fellow businessmen who are running the government, that no one has really been upset too much by the revelation of his stock holdings. It seems that there is a law against a government official retaining an interest in firms with which he has to deal in his official capacity. Suggestions are now flying thick and fast from the most respectable quarters on how this law can be evaded, ignored or amended.

The suggestion has been made that perhaps Wilson should sell

his stock. But then everyone is appalled at the thought of forcing this public-spirited man to take a tax loss of about half a million dollars in such a transaction. The latest suggestion, as we go to press, has been to amend the tax laws for Mr. Wilson's convenience and profit.

Actually the "predicament" in which the Republicans (and Wilson) find themselves in this matter is chiefly of interest because it offers such a striking illustration of who really runs the government. Even if Wilson and all the others like him were to sell every share and bond they have in private industry, and invest the whole of their private fortunes in government securities, the situation would be the same. They all believe to the marrow of their bones that "what is good for big business is good for the country." And that is the way they will try to run things.

In its stately editorial on the "problem," the *New York Times* said: "To sum up, we believe that Mr. Wilson would find it intolerable to deal as a public official with a great corporation in which he continued to have a financial interest." Mr. Wilson has already answered that one adequately himself. But there is a report that even before he had left the Senate Committee hearing room the wisecrack was in circulation: "Did he say he would not turn his back on General Motors?" Who really thinks that he will?

To date the papers do not reveal any strong reaction from the ranks of the Democrats in Congress. Those of them who have spoken for publication seem to be as anxious as their Republican colleagues to find some way for poor Wilson to hurdle the inconvenient obstacle in his path.

Where are the outcries from the defenders of the people's interests? Where is the righteous indignation from the Friends of the Common Man? In fact, the question cannot be avoided: Where is the forthright, hard-hitting press release from the president of the United Auto Workers and the CIO? We are waiting, but not hopefully.

Five Theories on the Sources of

By HAL DRAPER

The new virulent outcropping of Stalinist anti-Semitism has everywhere raised the question "Why?" It surely is not enough to take the abstract attitude that a reactionary government is bound to assume the forms of every other reactionary government that ever existed. It is well known, for example, that anti-Semitism did not appear as a feature of Italian Fascism until the Hitlerites imported and imposed it, since it was not one of the barbarisms unleashed by Mussolini, and in any case it is necessary to inquire how anti-Semitism serves the needs of the specific Stalinist tyranny.

The proposed answers, or theories about the motive drives of Stalinist anti-Semitism, can be divided into two groups. Familiarly enough, the first group attempts to derive the mainsprings of the phenomenon not from the Stalinist system but from "Bolshevism."

This is scarcely surprising, since there are sufficient ax-grinders whose wisdom about Stalinism consists only of the notion that it is a "logical" continuation of Lenin's ideas. Since Stalinism is "inherent" in Leninism, the germs of the new Stalinist anti-Semitism must be discoverable in Lenin too, and the phenomenon must be given an ancestry going back to the first day of the Russian Revolution.

The fact that it cannot be found, and that only its reverse can be found, is but a small obstacle, once you become a real expert in deriving Stalinism from the Bolshevism of the October Revolution. But what we are interested in right now is not the mendacity and stupidity of the attempt.

The interesting thing is how this Stalinism-flows-from-Bolshevism school finds itself echoing the very rationalizations of the Stalinists themselves.

1

THE STALINIST LINE IN REVERSE GEAR

We have three cases in point in the current press discussion on the roots of Stalinist anti-Semitism.

We find that, in effect, in trying to prove that this barbarism of the Kremlin is the legitimate offspring of the Russian Revolution, they succeed in providing the only assists for the Stalinists to be found outside the Stalinist press itself.

The first case is from an article in that staunch fortress of rabid anti-Communism, the *New Leader*. The article is by M. Z. Frank, who is listed as a "frequent contributor."

To introduce it properly, we need only recall that the official Stalinist rationale for the purge of Jews now going on in Russia and the satellites is that it is not directed against Jews as such but only against the Zionists, i.e., "Jewish bourgeois nationalists."

Now the whole point about the present outcry against Stalinist anti-Semitism is to prove that this claim is a lie. Thus even the most ignorant journalistic hacks of the press, who are not the "experts on Communism" that the *New Leader's* staff purport to be, have concerned themselves to underline the obvious fact that the prominent Jewish Stalinist victims of the purge have been bitter enemies of Zionism and Jewish nationalism of any sort.

There are, on the other side, innumerable Stalinist dupes, in this country as elsewhere, who are at this very moment in the throes of trying to convince themselves that it is indeed Zionism and Zionists that are the butts of the drive in Stalinland.

But this *New Leader* expert has to trace the new Stalinist purge back to something in "Bolshevism." That's his job. And so, believe it or not, he comes up with the ready-made ancestry which Stalinist propaganda provides for him!

"Official Soviet anti-Semitism, though new, does not date from the Prague purge," he writes. This is quite true; what does it date from? He continues right on with the following: "Communist opposition to Zionism is so old that it may be said to antedate the Soviet regime. It has its roots in the initial opposition of the socialist movement to all forms of organized effort at national expression and, in particular, to Jewish nationalism. This policy was gradually modified, and Labor or Socialist Zionism was honored by being recognized at international democratic socialist gatherings. But in Communist Russia, antagonism to Zionism became more, not less, virulent."

And he later winds up: "Soviet policy has evolved from anti-Zionism in 1917 to anti-Semitism in 1952 in typical zigzag fashion."

Now this M. Z. Frank is a Zionist, and our readers may be acquainted with the penchant of some Zionists for equating anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism out-of-hand. That antedates the Soviet regime too. But thereby our Zionist proves a little too much. For it would seem that the "seeds" of anti-Semitism are to be found not only in "Bolshevism" but in all socialist anti-Zionism—and the larger part of the world socialist movement has always been anti-Zionist, whether or not it "honored" the Zionists by "recognizing" them at its meetings. (This is aside from the ignorant or lying statement that "the socialist movement" was ever in "initial opposition . . . to all forms of organized effort at national expression.")

For this expert, then, if Stalinism evolved from Leninism, it is also true that anti-Semitism "evolved" from

anti-Zionism; and he thereby succeeds in slandering not only Bolshevism (a slander which the pages of the *New Leader* always accept tolerantly) but also slandering socialism, and, with a massive shotgun effect, also giving color to the line of propaganda of the Kremlin.

And this is inevitable, for to throw Lenin's cloak over the figure of Stalin is the very task which Moscow's henchmen set for themselves.

The second case is from an equally irreproachable bulwark against Communism, the *New York Times*. Its editorial on "Communist Anti-Semitism" (Jan. 18) gets equally fundamental about the motives. As confused American Stalinists read the *Daily Worker's* rationalizations with more or less disturbance of mind and heart, they can be bucked up to read in the *Times* that what is really at issue is . . . the Communist antagonism to "religious faith."

"The Communist basis for anti-Semitism has its roots in the character of the Communist dogma itself," says the *Times*, and this is exactly what the *Daily Worker* reader is trying hard to believe. "The Jewish faith is an expression of moral and religious loyalty. So is every other religious faith. Communist dogma permits only one loyalty and therefore identified religionists, of every faith, are its enemies. . . ."

"It may be observed that the superficial reason for the present use of anti-Semitism by Moscow is to woo the Arab world and to revive a fanaticism in East Germany. These are temporary considerations. Beyond them is the hard fact that Soviet Communism has long since ceased to be a body of economic and political theory. It is a war on civilization, and religion is a part of the enemy to which the Communists are implacably opposed."

Is it true, then, that Slansky and his fellow Stalinist bureaucrats, as well as the East German, Hungarian and other satellite functionaries who are about to be liquidated, and also the Kremlin doctors who have been accused of a murder plot—these are in reality "identified religionists" and it is therefore that they can no longer be tolerated by "Communist dogma"? The *Times'* news columns are enough to show that this "profound" explanation by its heavy thinkers is as fantastic as the framed-up accusations themselves.

Again, we leave aside, as garden-variety stupidity, the tracing of anti-Semitism to its roots in "Communist dogma" at the same time that we are told that "Soviet Communism has long since ceased to be a body of economic and political theory," a state of affairs which would seem to exclude any dogma. This sort of nonsense can be found in the American press on any day of the year; what fascinates us is that, searching for profound roots precisely in those "dogmas" which Stalinism has abandoned, the *Times* comes up with the same type of theory that the propaganda of the Stalinists puts forward as its justification.

The third case is further from home but it is too precious to overlook. It is from a pamphlet entitled *Communism and the "Jews"* published in France, by Gédéon Hagamov, and now reprinted in a French periodical which specializes in anti-Stalinist documentation, *Information et Riposte* (Dec. 16-31 issue).

"Lenin held racism in horror and on this subject he made himself clear in very explicit terms, many times repeated. And so people generally, but wrongly, admit that Bolshevism and anti-Semitism are incompatible. In reality, it was in the nature of things that—by the general expropriation, by the economic leveling, and above all by the destruction of trade and handicrafts—the Bolshevik revolution delivered an initial blow to Judaism, without premeditating this blow. . . ."

This is how our French defender of Judaism begins his account of Stalin's ancestry. We must not imagine that this business begins with the Prague trials or even the Russian denunciations of "cosmopolitanism"—ah no, we must trace things back to the roots—and though the anti-Jewish blow may not have been intended in 1917, it was the very abolition of capitalism which was the (objectively) anti-Semitic devil in the first place. . . .

Thus our fervent enemy of anti-Semitism, industriously tracing Stalinist crimes back to the Russian Revolution, identifies the JEWS AS A PEOPLE with the traders and shopkeepers who suffered from the revolution!

If he had found something like this in the Prague trial, he would have had little doubt about its slanderously anti-Semitic character. He needn't look to the Prague transcript; he can find it in Hitler or Coughlin or Gerald L. K. Smith, or their French equivalents. It escapes his notice because he is so busy being "fundamental." . . .

So it is with our Stalinism-flows-from-Bolshevism school. We find smears against the socialist movement, we find an assist for the *Daily Worker's* scribes, we find even unwitting slanders against the Jews themselves, but we find no light at all on the mainsprings of Stalinist anti-Semitism.

2

THE JEWS AS SCAPEGOATS

Turning to the more serious thinking which has been done on the problem, we have to consider those hypotheses about the roots of Stalinist anti-Semitism which at least have the merit of starting with the Stalinist reality, the present regime in Moscow, and not with the Russia of the October Revolution which was overthrown and destroyed by the Stalinist counter-revolution.

Four motivations have been widely proposed to account for the present Stalinist drive. I tend to favor one of them, as I shall discuss, but in any case it is not necessary to insist that the other three are irrelevant.

There is a big element of speculation at the best, but I would begin by proposing a distinction between two questions.

There are, I think, some important things to be said about the sources of Stalinist anti-Semitism which bear upon its preconditions, but which do not by themselves add up to a sufficient explanation of the current forms of Stalinist anti-Semitism.

For example, this is certainly the case in connection with the question of Stalin's personal tendencies toward anti-Semitism. Here we are not dealing with the fanciful derivation of policies from a "Bolshevism" from which Stalin long ago separated himself in blood; we are dealing with the same man. And certainly one of the preconditions for the flowering of anti-Semitism as Stalinist reaction has deepened is the fact that this man has a record of his own.

We refer, for example, to the incident in 1907 when Stalin made a report on the Social-Democratic congress in London, published in Baku, in which he slyly observed that the majority of the Menshevik group was composed of Jews while the "great majority" of the Bolshevik group was composed of Russians, and took occasion to add that "one of the Bolsheviks (Alexinsky, it seems) remarked jokingly that the Mensheviks are a Jewish group, the Bolsheviks a true Russian group, and that it would not be a bad idea to make a pogrom inside the party."

If, perhaps, it was a joke for Alexinsky, assuming he said it at all, the inclusion of such a "joke" in a report was possible only for Stalin. Though it is true that we have heard more "anti-Semitic" jokes than that banded around over coffee in Jewish circles, this passage stands out (not only in hindsight) like a sore thumb in the climate of Russian socialism and Bolshevism in pogrom-ridden Russia.

Trotsky has written about the very cautious anti-Semitic overtones in the fight of the Stalin group against the Left Opposition, in the years when the new bureaucratic regime was first establishing its power in the party. With affected reproof, at one point, Stalin cautioned his followers against making use of the fact that the revolutionary opposition was led by Jews (Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev) and that its ranks were full of Jews, thereby backhandedly calling attention to a situation that was not without benefit for him.

But this does not by any means account for the anti-Jewish drive. It only means that we are not dealing with a man whose personal sentiments stood in the way of such a development.

Another precondition is the eternal need of the regime for scapegoats, victims to be sacrificed on the altar of popular discontent. This has been a motive force of anti-Semitism—and most especially, of the fostering of anti-Semitism from the top—which is of much more ancient lineage than Stalinism itself. Of the four current theories which we mentioned as being widespread, this first is understandably the most popular.

It is an especially ominous development, however, for the Stalinist power. Other scapegoats have from time to time been thrown to the wolves—"Trotskyist wreckers" in the big purge trials of the '30s, "Titoist" conspirators since 1948, "spies" and "Western agents" and what not—to provide the masses with personal devils to account for the failure of the regime to satisfy their standard of living and for the continuing totalitarian straitjacket under the monstrous "socialism" which has been "achieved."

In all of these cases the need of the bureaucracy for scapegoats has been a sign of its underlying rottenness, but why now the Jews? To be sure, they make very good scapegoats, as both Hitler and the tsars of Holy Russia found in their time, but precisely for this reason it is a well-rutted tradition that Stalin now falls into, and one with immediate appalling significance for every remaining Stalinist who has any illusions left about the nature of the Russian regime.

For some sections of the peoples under Stalin, inflamed by popular anti-Semitism, it may be strong medicine, but the therapeutic dose which the Kremlin is now administering bids fair to exact a substantial toll in terms of support from less corrupted elements in Stalinism's entourage abroad.

3

THE FOREIGN-POLICY FACTOR

We would present the second theory also under the head of a precondition. This puts the emphasis on Moscow's foreign policy: the Stalinist regime is using the anti-Jewish trials and purges to bid for the support of the neo-Nazis and unreconstructed anti-Semites of Germany and for the support of the Arab peoples against Israel.

That the Kremlin has this aim is not in question. For sometime now it has ostentatiously bid for the support of the German Nazis by its open policy in East Germany of rehabilitating and wooing former Nazis, putting a big welcome sign on the doormat for them, integrating them into the regime. For some time now, after its earlier flirtation with the Israelis, including its vote to set up the Israeli state, it has been turning toward the Arabs with a harder anti-Israel policy. In terms of practical foreign politics, this would seem to be enough. Why add also a costly policy of blatant anti-Semitism?

Let us put it this way: the present anti-Jewish drive is possible for Moscow since it has made its turn on Israel and toward the German Nazi elements. The foreign-policy element is a precondition, not a determining cause; and we can add that if a by-product of the current campaign is more enthusiastic support from the reactionary strata that are being wooed, this is not without previous calculation.

The New Anti-Semitism in Russia

4

THE RATIONALE OF RUSSIAN ANTI-SEMITISM

The third theory to be considered adds a further filip of attractiveness, for Stalin, with regard to the use of the Jews as scapegoats. The term scapegoat implies an innocent victim chosen for sacrifice simply because he is handy. For Stalin there is excellent reason to believe that the Jews are not "innocent" victims.

For the Jews are "rootless cosmopolitans," as the Stalinists have been yelling during the past few years, in the anti-Semitic manifestations which preceded the present outburst. And all that this means is that they cannot be so easily bludgeoned and blinded into the fanatical *Russian chauvinism* which it is the persistent aim of the regime to inculcate into its people.

The idea of a whole national, racial or religious group which is inherently disloyal is not simply an invention of the Kremlin. It becomes even "rational"—as Hitler's anti-Semitism never did—in terms of Stalinism's social aims.

We are considering a regime which devotes thousands of man-hours of agitation, and reams of paper, to convince its people that *Russians* invented everything from the shoelace to the game of baseball; which considers everything un-Russian as an alien and dangerous element; which looks on linguistics as a front in its imperialist struggle; which considers the slightest contact with the Outside, or contact with someone who has had contact with the Outside, as prima-facie evidence of the taint of disloyalty; which brooks the existence of no loyalty whatsoever other than loyalty to the bureaucratic state; which looks even on the family tie, which naturally exists outside the state, as a danger to its existence, wherefore it has long expended vast energies to propagate the patriotic merit of the child who denounces his father to the GPU or of the wife who denounces her husband. . . .

It is necessary to recall this picture, of a totalitarian power grinding in on itself, because it is only on the background of such an unprecedented society that the first "rational" basis for anti-Semitism has come into existence.

It is a "rational" basis (that is, one based on real, practical reasons of state) which, however, points not only to anti-Semitism but to anti-every other type of grouping which is inherently independent of a state which allows nothing whatsoever to be independent of it. It provided just as "rational" a reason for the liquidation of other nationalities *in toto* living within the borders of the USSR, such as the Volga Germans' republic, which by its very nature had a species of tie with the West.

The accusation of "cosmopolitanism" against the Jews has its kernel of Stalinist-type sense. Here is how "cosmopolitan" was defined in the '30s by the Little Soviet Encyclopedia (1931 edition, vol. 4, page 262) and by a Soviet Dictionary in 1935:

"COSMOPOLITAN: a person who looks on the whole world as his fatherland and does not consider himself as belonging to a particular nationality."

But in 1949 a Moscow dictionary of foreign terms had the new line:

"COSMOPOLITAN: a person lacking in patriotic feeling, detached from the interests of his fatherland, alien to his own people, and behaving disdainfully with regard to its culture. . . . Under present conditions, cosmopolitanism is a reactionary ideology of American imperialism. . . ."

And so American imperialism is given the great compliment (falsely enough) of being the attractive pole for what was still recognized in the '30s as the internationalist outlook. And in the post-war years the Jews were paid the great compliment of being especially singled out as the ethnic embodiment of such an outlook.

Not without truth here. Not because Jews are "inherently" more internationalist-minded as a people (as the contemporary development of Israeli chauvinism goes to show, by the way) but because their conditions of life and historical traditions make them more intractable to the Russian chauvinism which is the heart of Stalinist ideology.

In a society where, in all seriousness, official journals can campaign against tying shoelaces in a certain "Western bourgeois" fashion, there is a people scattered through the population whose language is a Western dialect, who have more relatives living in the West than probably any other section of the population, who (many of them, Zionists or not by ideology) have another country with which they have a special feeling of kinship (Israel).

In the Prague trial one of the continuing themes about the Jewish defendants was their close ties with the West. Jews are represented as fitting into the needs of the mythical "conspiratorial center" because of their greater knowledge of the West. It is, of course, the accumulative repetition of the theme which is important, but a typical example is the testimony of defendant Loeb:

"I began to work along these lines during my London exile with the direct support of the Economic Commission, whose members were also Jewish bourgeois nationalists, under Frejka's leadership. At our last meeting before returning to the liberated homeland, I agreed with Frejka that under the pretext of needing persons with a knowledge of the West, we would continue to keep up the circle around the Economic Commission and in fact enlarge it with further 'Londoners' whom we would place in key economic positions with a view to realizing our concept of shackling Czechoslovak economy to the capitalist West. . . ."

In this sense, then, a specifically anti-Jewish drive, a terrorization of Jews as such—anti-Semitism, therefore, even if it is a new type of anti-Semitism—becomes

a "rational" form of defense of a tyrannical state, and not merely the insensate hatred, or mere scapegoatism, which it was under Nazism. As it is always useful to remember, Stalin is not a political hysteric like Hitler.

So much, then, for the third theory on the sources of the present Stalinist anti-Semitic campaign. It is possible to consider that here we have a consideration which is not merely a *precondition* or a by-product but a motivating force, and one which stems straight from the continuing inner needs of the Stalinist totalitarianism itself.

But precisely because it is a continuing need, it is legitimate to ask: Why this outburst NOW? And are there really enough dangerously "cosmopolitan" Jews in Russia to justify the losses which a display of anti-Semitism will cost in terms of support abroad?

5

THE ZHDANOV-MEN AND THE BUREAUCRATIC STRUGGLE

Here we can come to the fourth theory which, in one form, may perhaps explain why the affair has been triggered off now.

It is with good reason that many close observers of the Stalinist bureaucratic state, in this case as before, turned for an explanation to an element we have not yet mentioned: the ever-present struggle within the hierarchy of the dictatorship for positions of power. So we did also (in LABOR ACTION for last Sept. 1) in discussing the reasons behind the convocation of the recent party congress of the CPSU.

But how is it involved here? It has been easy for commentators to point to the obvious fact that the long finger of fate is pointing at Lavrenti Beria, as Stalin's press thunders away at the inexcusable negligence of the state-security organs (GPU-NKVD-MVD-MGB), which are under Beria's control, in failing to prevent the "Jewish doctors' plot" which has been dreamed up for the occasion. It is easy to come to the conclusion that the anti-Semitic campaign is an instrument of factional policy (say, Malenkov vs. Beria, as has been suggested).

The difficulty is that, while this might require that a "plot" be framed up and then "unearthed" in order to cook Beria's goose, why an anti-Semitic frame-up? Which is, of course, the question we started with, and the mere explanation that there is some struggle for power going on at the top does not bear upon it, by itself.

There is, however, a further suggestion which has the advantage of making excellent sense and pulling various threads together within its framework, although it is naturally speculative. As put forward by Max Shachtman, it is a question of getting rid of Zhdanov's men in the apparatus and, most especially, in the apparatuses of the satellite bureaucracies.

The background for this can be given in the same terms which we used to discuss the Russian party congress on September 1, when, with the announcement that Malenkov would make the main report at the congress, it was clear that some kind of resolution had taken place in the struggle of the ruling masters for Stalin's succession:

"The coming congress may also be used as the sounding board for a new turn in policy, but it is not being called as sounding board for a policy but to rally the apparatus behind the victors in a bureaucratic struggle, victors who may also stand for a new orientation or line.

"There is another element involved in the internecine struggles of the bureaucratic cliques, which may have played an even greater role than policy questions and which also involved other policy questions itself. It must not be forgotten in this connection that this bureaucracy which rules Russia has, since 1945, come into possession of a new empire, of new satellite lands—and therefore of overlordship with respect to new and subordinate bureaucratic apparatuses in those lands.

"With the expansion of the Stalinist empire, the arena on which rival bureaucratic factions had to maneuver became not only the machinery of the CPSU itself, though that is still primary, but also the *gauleiter* CPs of the satellites. In the dog-eat-dog struggle for power, prestige and position that goes on at the top of the Stalinist apparatus, the new subfuehrers in Eastern Europe had to choose up sides.

"Here we have a sidelight also on one factor in the purges that have gone on continually in Eastern Europe. Is Zapotocky of Czechoslovakia a 'Malenkov man'? Was Slansky, who tumbled into the abyss, a 'Beria man'? Was Ana Pauker of Rumania a protégé of Molotov? The specific connections for these individuals may be otherwise; that is not the point. The victorious clique in the leadership of the CPSU also had to consolidate its position in the satellite Stalinist machines, get their men into the driver's seat, rally the apparatus there."

The satellite apparatuses which are being purged—some remaining, some still to go—are the post-war creations of Zhdanov, under whose wing the Cominform was set up. The suggestion is that Malenkov, out to consolidate his position, is in the process of ousting the creatures of Zhdanov-Beria in order to replace them with his own reliable myrmidons.

Why the anti-Semitic accompaniments of the drive? On the above basis, a real connection becomes apparent. For the Jews in Russia may not be a great enough danger to the regime to warrant a drive of the present scope; and the Jews in the populations of the satellite countries may not be such a danger; but the following is true: that the number of Jews in the bureaucratic apparatuses of the satellites, as set up by Zhdanov, have up to recently been considerable enough to account for the developments.

This aspect is well known. The leadership of the Hungarian regime is largely Jewish (as the *Daily Worker* points out nowadays, though with fingers crossed). The number of Jews at the top of the Polish regime is large. In the Prague trial we saw the number of Czech Jews (from Slansky down) who figured. In Rumania there is (or was) Ana Pauker and her entourage. Only in Bulgaria is this element inconsiderable.

The plenitude of Jews in the Zhdanov-Cominform machines was not due to Zhdanov's philo-Semitism, of course. When the countries were taken over by Russia, there were very few native Stalinist forces available for the big task of staffing the branch-office bureaucracies. As is well known, the Russians (Zhdanov) had to use what they had on hand, most particularly the decaying habitués of the Hotel Metropole in Moscow, émigrés long detached from the native land; and above all, insofar as possible, no "nationalists." (We might even say . . . cosmopolitans.) From these individuals imported on the gun carriages of the Russian army, arose the disproportionate number of Stalinists of Jewish extraction in the ensuing regimes.

This is what makes an anti-Jewish drive useful as a catch-all for the purpose of making a clean sweep of the bureaucracies which now have to be replaced by cadres loyal to the victors in the Kremlin.

More accurately, this can be viewed as one strand in the web of a monstrous new development which bids fair to ramify out in directions perhaps unforeseen by its own creators, which tends to take on a logic and force of its own; not all of its manifestations are necessarily to be considered as the outcome of a planned maneuver. Not even the masters of the bureaucracy can plan their own fate.

THE GUILTY ARE ON TOP

We have been discussing the sources of the specifically Stalinist anti-Semitism—that is, anti-Semitism from the top. What is called "popular anti-Semitism"—that is, whatever anti-Semitic sentiments remain or have arisen among the people themselves—is another subject, even more moot. David J. Dallin, for example, expresses the following view:

"In any discussion of Soviet anti-Semitism, the reader should be warned against one superficially plausible, but actually false and dangerous, theory. The Jews were cruelly persecuted in tsarist Russia, and now here is the same pattern repeating itself under the Soviets. Doesn't it follow, one is tempted to ask, that anti-Semitism in Russia is anchored in the people's very soul, and there is therefore no future for the unhappy Jewish minority regardless of the political system?

"There are no facts to support this contention and many to refute it. Moreover, it has the effect, in a sense, of exonerating the Kremlin by making it appear as a servant of the people and its anti-Jewish policy as a reflection of the popular will. In reality, anti-Semitic movements in Russia have always been primarily politically inspired and only to a small degree the product of popular feeling. This is the case today just as it was before the Revolution. . . ." (In an article in the *New Leader* for Jan. 5, alongside the M. Z. Frank article referred to above, but quite different from Frank's blatherings.)

One thing is certain: given the present stimuli being applied from on top, it will be risky to try to separate out any "popular anti-Semitism" from the pogrom spirit of the rulers. The latter have given the green light to every modern barbarism, and now also to anti-Semitism. Nothing could be clearer, as an instruction to the ranks, than the words put in the mouth of Slansky in the Prague trial to announce that, from now on, a fight against anti-Semitism is prima-facie evidence of "Zionist Jewish bourgeois nationalism."

For Slansky said, in a passage which is the most revelatory of all:

"I deliberately shielded them [the bourgeois Zionists] by perverting the campaign against so-called anti-Semitism. By proposing that a big campaign be waged against anti-Semitism, by magnifying the danger of anti-Semitism, and by proposing various measures against anti-Semitism—such as the writing of articles, the publication of pamphlets, the holding of lectures, and so forth—I criminally prevented the waging of a campaign against Zionism. . . ."

Who now, in Czechoslovakia, will dare to engage in "the writing of articles, the publication of pamphlets, the holding of lectures" against anti-Semitism, now that such activity by itself has been cited as proof of "criminal" propensities? To clinch the point, Slansky's script continued:

"I deliberately shielded Zionism by publicly speaking out against the people who pointed to the hostile activities of Zionists and by describing these people as anti-Semites—just as did my collaborators—so that these people were in the end prosecuted and persecuted and sometimes even excluded from the party, as happened to certain members of the Central Secretariat. I thus created an atmosphere in which people were afraid—even prominent officials in the state apparatus—to oppose Zionism and Zionist organizations."

So certain members of the Czech leadership were expelled as "anti-Semites," according to the present story! We can imagine whose clique it is that Slansky is now being used to rehabilitate. But above all, what Slansky's words mean is that the dictatorship has "thus created an atmosphere in which people will be afraid" to oppose anti-Semitism.

Under such conditions there can be little point to developing notions about the inherent anti-Semitism of the "Russian soul," not to speak of the Ukrainians, etc. The criminals are in the Kremlin, not among the people they oppress.

BEHIND RUSSIA'S NEW ANTI-SEMITISM

(Continued from page 1)

ment" and the war danger to existing anti-Semitic prejudices.

While the background must be sought in the post-war history of Russia, we should also remember what preceded the war. In 1936 Stalin responded to Hitler's march into the Rhineland by simultaneously preparing the great show trials and proclaiming "the most democratic constitution in the world." If the first action was designed to rid Stalin of any threats to his own power in case of war, the second was intended to win the support of "democratic" opinion in the Western countries for his regime and for a military alliance. Having decided in 1939 that an alliance with the Western powers was impossible, Stalin dropped his liberal People's Front mask and signed the pact with Hitler. A shocked world heard Stalin's cynical hirelings declare that "Fascism is a matter of taste."

But current Stalinist anti-Semitism is not a matter of taste. It has become official policy.

Growth of Anti-Semitism In the Russian Empire

An official cloak of silence covers the post-war flare-up of anti-Semitism among some parts of the Russian masses. It appeared not only in the Ukraine, its traditional seat, where it was most virulent, but in Byelorussia and the Great-Russian republic as well.

It is important to note that as a result of the war anti-Semitism spread to the interior areas of the country where it had never existed before. It sprang up in such areas as Kazakhstan, Western Siberia and Central Asia.

While the Stalinist regime has never lifted the veil on what happened, we have the accounts of eye-witnesses, letters and depositions of former citizens, particularly army men. We now know that immediately after liberation, Jews were received with open animosity by sections of the Ukrainians. Those attempting to regain their homes and possessions were subject to physical attack. In general, Jews returning home never received more than a small portion of their property.

In Kharkov Jews did not dare venture out into the streets at night. In Kiev during the same period a pogrom took place in which 16 Jews were killed. The official answer to Jewish complaints was that the population had been infected by the Germans and that anti-Semitism could only be uprooted gradually (Bulletin of the Joint Rescue Committee of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, March 1945).

Echo of Hitlerism

The spread of anti-Semitism to the interior areas of Russia was the product in large part of the evacuation of central government institutions to these areas during the war. Dr. Jerzy Gliksman, the Polish socialist who observed conditions in Central Asia, has this to say: "Another group of Russian Jews, belonging predominantly to the bureaucratic class and having financial means, aroused the hostility of the local population by sending prices up on the free market, which were very high to begin with." (Jerzy Gliksman, *Jewish Exiles in Soviet Russia*, 1939-43.)

The Hitlerite propaganda against the "Bolshevik Jews" found its echo even here. Though the Jews represented but a minute section of the privileged group, the hostility of the provincial populations against the bureaucratic intruders from the urban centers was directed at the former as the easiest and safest target.

The widespread reports of anti-Semitism among the rank and file of the army during the war must also be taken into account. Army soldiers and officers of Jewish origin have given abundant testimony of the resentment

at the front against civilians in general and Jews in particular. The latter were considered "draft dodgers" and "profiteers."

Many Jewish ex-officers have reported that they changed their names during the war not because they feared capture by the Germans but because of the hostility of the rank and file of the Russian army. (Rachel Erlich, *Summary Report on 18 Intensive Interviews with Jewish DPs from Poland and the Soviet Union*, October 1948.) The prejudice of the returning soldiers must have been a potent factor in reinforcing the anti-Semitic feelings that already existed among the civilian population in many parts of the country.

Anti-Semitic Bureaucrats

To the anti-Semitism among the masses must be added the poisonous anti-Jewish feelings which run strong in the ranks of the bureaucracy from the top down. A particularly striking example of the anti-Semitic bureaucrat on the highest level of the apparatus is the late Alexander Sherbakov—one of the alleged victims of the Jewish doctors. Besides heading political work in the army, Sherbakov was also a member of the Politburo and secretary of the Moscow provincial and city committees of the Communist Party. There is no evidence that he incurred Stalin's displeasure because of his prejudices.

Another leading army figure reported to have expressed anti-Jewish feelings is General Vassily I. Chuikov, now commander-in-chief of Russian troops in Germany. A report published in the *Christian Science Monitor* on February 14, 1952 and based on the statements of ex-Russian officers and soldiers, declares that Chuikov began a purge of Jews in the Russian occupation army in Germany in 1946. However, it is unlikely that Chuikov would carry out a purge except by order of or permission from Moscow.

The former Hungarian minister, Nicolas Nyaradi, gives an illuminating picture of the anti-Semitism which is rampant in the highest Kremlin circles. Both in his recently published book *My Ringside Seat in Moscow* and in magazine articles, Nyaradi declares that he continuously heard Jews referred to by the derogatory term *zhid*, although a law against racial defamation exists. When Kaftanov, the Russian minister of education was about to introduce Nyaradi to Ilya Ehrenburg, he told him: "You know, he is a *zhid*, but in spite of that he is a prominent Communist and a good Soviet patriot."

The Regime Goes Along

Anti-Semitism is not confined to the top layers of the bureaucracy, but spreads outward and down to the provincial levels. We have referred to anti-Jewish feeling in the Ukraine—but it is a feeling that is found among the Ukrainian bureaucracy as well.

A deposition made by a Ukrainian Jew to the Rescue Committee of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, who left the Ukraine in 1944, states: "The Ukrainian authorities are greatly anti-Semitic. . . . When the Commercial Academy moved from Kharkov to Kiev several Jewish professors applied for permission to go there; but their applications were rejected. They addressed themselves to the chairman of the Ukrainian Soviet but received no response."

The response of the Stalin regime to the post-war outbreak of anti-Semitism was . . . silence. An indirect index to the official line can be arrived at by comparing the proportion of Jews in the Russian all-union legislature—the Soviet of Nationalities and the Soviet of the Union—in 1946 with the comparable figures for 1937.

In 1937 a total of 47 Jews were elected to both chambers of the Supreme Soviet. The proportion of Jews in both was a little over 4 per cent. But in 1947 there were not more than five Jews among the 601 members of the Soviet of the Union, less than 1 per cent, as against 32 Jews among 569 representatives, 5.6 per cent in 1937. Comparable figures are not given for the Soviet of Nationalities in 1946. However, the situation is mirrored in the place which the Jews find in the list of nationalities. In 1937 the Jewish people were listed in 11th place; in 1946 they were in 26th place among the very smallest nationalities.

The Post-War Danger

What is the explanation for the policy of silence and concession on the question of anti-Semitism during the years from 1945 to 1948? In general the explanation lies primarily in the difficult situation of the Kremlin.

The primary task was to reconstruct and set in motion the great bureaucratic machine that had been disrupted and weakened by the war. The drive to restore "discipline" in the factories and collectives was the chief task. Immediately before the regime lay the problem of "de-Westernizing" the army and those civilians who had come in contact with the West and its higher standard of living; of squeezing the "unreliables" out of the war-inflated party and Komsomol.

Stalin understood only too well the dangers inherent in encouraging anti-Semitism at a time when the state apparatus was shaky. It represented a perverted form of protest against the bureaucracy that could have had dangerous repercussions if set off.

In the Ukraine there existed a specific reason for

not moving against anti-Semitism. As late as December 30, 1947 the Russian authorities admitted the existence of armed national bands in the Ukraine. Some of these underground groups (not the main group, the UPA) were reactionary and anti-Semitic in character and had taken part in the extermination of Jews. In a speech before the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, Politburo member Khrushchev discussed the question of amnesty for these anti-Semitic elements.

'Criminal' Demonstrations

In the autumn of 1948, Moscow was the stage for two of the most extraordinary mass demonstrations that have ever taken place during Stalin's reign.

Thousands upon thousands of Jews gathered in and around the Moscow synagogue on Rosh Hashonah, the Jewish New Year, to greet Mrs. Goldie Myerson, who had arrived in Russia to open an Israel legation. Joseph Newman, the N. Y. *Herald Tribune* correspondent in Moscow at the time, has described the scenes in eloquent and moving terms.

According to Newman, the demonstration was repeated a week later on Yom Kippur, the solemn Jewish holy day of atonement.

The sentiments expressed by the Jews in these demonstrations were unmistakable—they showed disaffection with Stalin's Russia and a looking-toward the new state of Israel. A continuous flow of Jews passed through the temporary headquarters of the Israel legation requesting information about emigration.

Stalin was quick to take action. A group of Jews were rounded up and imprisoned as the organizers of the demonstrations. The Russian security police raided and liquidated the only two Yiddish-language printing plants in Moscow—the newspaper *Einheit* and *Emess*. Simultaneously, Stalin liquidated the offices of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, an organization Stalin had set up during the war to enlist the support of Jews in the Western world for sympathy with Russia.

(In passing, it is important to note that one of the six Jewish doctors now under arrest is the brother-in-law of the late Solomon Mikhoels, the noted actor, who served as the chairman of the JAC. According to the newspaper reports, Dr. Vovsi, the physician in question, has "confessed" that he "received a directive on the destruction of leading cadres of the USSR . . . from the 'Joint' through a doctor in Moscow, Shmeliovich, and the well-known Jewish bourgeois-nationalist Mikhoels." Stalin's hand is evident in the arrangement of the confession.)

The Israeli legation was declared out of bounds for Russian citizens and the desire to emigrate to Israel declared a crime and an act of disloyalty.

Beginning of the Drive

It is from this period that the virulent campaign against Zionism and "rootless cosmopolitanism" dates, and the campaign begun to drive the Jews out of Russian life. Needless to say, the onslaught was inaugurated with a virulent attack on Zionism by the journalistic prostitute Ilya Ehrenburg, with an article that appeared in *Pravda* on October 21, 1948. The general ideological campaign to "de-Westernize" Russian intellectuals was redirected in part and aimed at the Jews.

From this period dates the open anti-Semitic attacks on the Jews that appeared in the official press. Some of the material was so shameless and vicious that the Russian censor refused to allow foreign correspondents to transmit certain articles in part or whole. It is from this time that the practice of revealing the Jewish names of writers first appeared in the press.

The official assault against the Jews has not been restricted to the field of ideology. Slowly but inevitably they are being squeezed out of the administrative and political machine that governs the country. Jews are being purged out of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Foreign Trade, the army, the Ministry of Education, and if the case of the Jewish doctors is a reliable sign, the Jews will soon be purged out of the medical and other professions.

There are reports, which have been neither confirmed nor denied, that Stalin is taking even more serious measures against the Jews in Russia. There is a persistent report that the Jewish Autonomous Province of Biro-Bidjan has been liquidated. Accounts have appeared in the Israeli press affirming that mass deportations of Jews from the Western Ukraine took place during 1949-1950.

One element in the inspiration for Stalin's drive against the Jews, which has culminated in the frame-up of the Jewish doctors, is all too clear. By identifying themselves with Israel, by expressing their desire to emigrate to Israel, Russian Jews have committed an unforgivable crime against the state. They shattered the myth of the monolithic "workers' paradise" and the undying fealty which all Soviet citizens render freely to "the leader of progressive mankind," Stalin.

Episode in the Ukraine

For this crime Stalin has declared them "enemies" of the state and declared them outside the pale of his society. The fate which Stalin visited upon the Kalmucks

Read about Independent Socialism

in the special pamphlet-issues
published by LABOR ACTION

THE PRINCIPLES AND PROGRAM OF INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

THE FAIR DEAL: A SOCIALIST CRITICISM

10 cents each

Order from:

Labor Action, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

STAND THE REAL ASSASSINS

and Chechen-Ingush peoples now looms before the Jews. One should not discount Stalin's vindictiveness. Long ago Trotsky observed that Stalin is dominated to an unusual degree by the desire to revenge real and fancied insults to his person.

Just a short time after the Prague trial ended, an extraordinary event occurred in the Ukraine. Three Jewish officials were arrested and dragged before a special military tribunal (in peacetime) and after a brief trial condemned to death and shot as "speculators."

The timing of this trial, the locale in which it was staged, and the charges against the accused give it more than ordinary significance. Again the criminal hand of Stalin is at work—for all the circumstances surrounding the trial point to one conclusion only: Stalin is seeking to excite the basest passions of some sections of the Ukrainian people. Given the existence of anti-Semitism in other sections of Russia, the effects of Stalin's criminal behavior in this instance cannot be limited to one area.

Great-Russian Chauvinism

Why is Stalin pursuing his anti-Semitic course in such an open and brutal fashion? One theory is that Stalin is seeking to terrorize world Jewry—particularly in the United States and Israel. Perhaps. But world Jewry has been denouncing his actions since they began in late 1948. For a time, the campaign against the Jews lost its raw virulence as a result of the outcries of Jews throughout the world. If Stalin is returning to the attack it is not because he hopes to subdue and terrorize Jewish opinion.

The theory of the scapegoat has been invoked to explain anti-Semitism in Russia as well as in the satellites. The profound dissatisfaction of the masses is one of the facts of life which must be accepted. But one must go a step further.

Is not anti-Semitism the accompaniment of Great-Russian chauvinism?

Official attacks on "bourgeois-nationalism" have raked the various republics with a steady stream of fire over the last few years. The campaign reached a new high in 1951 when major purges of the party and state administration took place in at least seven of the republics—with the Ukraine, of course, heading the list. Among the republics that suffered almost complete change of leadership were: Byelorussia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Moldavia, Kirghizia, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan.

In each case a close study of the conflict reveals more than ideological conflict. Behind the "bourgeois national deviation" is concealed the determined resistance of the masses in the various republics to the impossible economic squeeze arbitrarily ordered by the Kremlin.

The Great-Russian chauvinism so assiduously practised by the Georgian, Stalin, has its dangers. The gulf between the regime and the masses of the nationalities may grow too deep and wide. Is Stalin seeking to counterbalance the centrifugal forces inherent in the doctrine of Great-Russian chauvinism by using anti-Semitism as a force to dissipate in part the hostile attitudes of the various nationalities and identify them with the regime?

Until recently, the dogma of inevitable imperialist attack served as such a centripetal counterweight. But if, as Stalin recently proclaimed, the imperialist attack on the Soviet Union is improbable, then a substitute to bind the masses to the regime must be found. Anti-Semitism answers that need in the most reactionary form possible.

II

The Assassins Are In the Kremlin

Does the attack on the Jews exhaust the content of the show trials which are soon to take place? If we know Stalin, if we refer back to the trials of '36, '37 and '38, the answer must be no.

Freud has taught the world that the figures we see in dreams are charged with multiple significance. And like the true nightmares that they are, Stalin's show trials have always settled more than one account for this master of intrigue.

In the third and last trial of '38, Rykov, Bukharin, Krestinsky, Rakovsky and Yagoda were charged with being "Trotsky's agents," and as such of conspiring with Germany, Japan, England and Poland to invade Russia, assassinate Stalin and other Kremlin leaders in order to dismember the country and restore capitalism. On the prisoner's bench with these prominent figures, three physicians sat, charged with having poisoned Gorki and his son; also Menzhinski, who had preceded Yagoda as head of the secret police, and Valerian Kuibyshev, Politburo member and one of Stalin's inner circle.

The amalgam is worth noting. Together with leading old Bolsheviks, men who had shaped the history of the Bolshevik party and the revolution, Stalin places his creature Yagoda. In addition, there appear the inex-

pliable figures of the three physicians who had no political importance whatsoever.

Also worth noting is the conjunction of imperialist powers whom Trotsky and his alleged agents were charged with serving. In 1936 the chief charge against Zinoviev and Kamenev and the fourteen other defendants had been their complicity in the slaying of Kirov and a plot to murder Stalin. In 1937 the charges against Radek, Sokolnikov, Pyatakov, Serebryakov and Muralov were widened to include the accusation of having come to an agreement with Hitler and the German capitalists. In addition "Trotsky and his agents" have also made a compact with Japan. But in 1938 the number of imperialist powers widens to four—England and Poland are now involved.

The Case of Ordjonikidze

Time has unraveled the mystery of the amalgam. In 1936 and '37 Stalin desperately sought a pact with the Western powers against Hitler—therefore the appearance of Germany and Japan as the imperialist enemies. But by '38 Stalin had begun to feel out the possibilities of a pact with Hitler. This explains the inclusion of England and Poland on the list of imperialist enemies.

But Stalin was settling more than one score with the '38 trial. Yagoda and the three physicians had to be disposed of because they knew too much . . . about the death of Gorki and Sergei Ordjonikidze, Stalin's close collaborator in the struggle for power.

In the July-August 1952 issue of the Russian émigré magazine *Na Rubezhe* there appears an illuminating article by Mrs. N. Magus, former medical assistant to Dr. Pletnev, one of the doctors charged with killing Gorki and Kuibyshev. In this article Mrs. Magus describes the manner in which Stalin had Ordjonikidze murdered.

According to Mrs. Magus, Dr. Pletnev, one of the Kremlin physicians, was forbidden by Stalin to treat Ordjonikidze even though the latter suffered from a serious heart condition. Instead a member of Stalin's personal staff (Yezhov) was assigned to the task of administering Ordjonikidze's medicine—which, as Pletnev knew, was poison.

One night Pletnev was summoned by Ordjonikidze's wife for emergency treatment. At first Dr. Pletnev had even refused to answer the phone, knowing who it was. He had Mrs. Magus pick up the phone and tell Ordjonikidze's wife he was not there—but the latter was hysterical with fright. Finally Pletnev yielded to her entreaties and asked Mrs. Magus to accompany him.

When they arrived at Ordjonikidze's apartment, they found him lying in a disheveled, half-dressed condition on the floor. His wife explained that the heart attack had been brought on by a fit of anger. Ordjonikidze was too weak to rise from the floor and had to be lifted to a couch. Just as Dr. Pletnev was about to examine him, Stalin's personal secretary, Poskrebyshv, entered the room. He ordered Dr. Pletnev, his assistant and the sick man's wife to leave the room.

After a brief period Poskrebyshv emerged and declared that Ordjonikidze had fallen asleep. Mrs. Magus left the Kremlin in an agitated mood, but Dr. Pletnev did not leave with her. At the gate he was summoned back to the Kremlin.

As he explained to Mrs. Magus the next day, it was none other than Stalin who had wanted to see him. Stalin had been very courteous and pleasant with the old physician and had wanted to know all about Ordjonikidze's condition. Dr. Pletnev exclaimed at this point: "He is preparing something evil."

The next day the Moscow papers carried the story of Ordjonikidze's death and Mrs. Magus asked Dr. Pletnev (who had signed the death certificate) what had happened. The old man was brief: Stalin had slowly been poisoning Ordjonikidze and Poskrebyshv had finished the job by strangling him. The murder was committed while Dr. Pletnev, his assistant and the sick man's wife had stood outside the door. Such was Dr. Pletnev's opinion.

MORE

on this subject —

Back issues of LABOR ACTION contain a number of informative articles on the growth of anti-Semitism in Russia and the satellite states.

Most recently these include:

"Anti-Semitism as a Major Stalinist Policy"—Dec. 15, 1952.

"The Slansky Case"—Jan. 14, 1952.

In addition, the development of the drive against "cosmopolitanism" was documented in a number of articles in 1949, available from LABOR ACTION's business office.

The Case of Frunze

Ordjonikidze was not the first of Stalin's victims to die while under his "special" medical care. In 1927 the gifted Russian writer Boris Pilnyak caused a sensation with his story *Story of the Unextinguished Moon*. (Stalin immediately had the book confiscated and Pilnyak fell from official favor.) The sensational nature of the story resided in the fact that it was a fictional account of the mysterious death of Marshal Frunze, Trotsky's successor as commissar of war, on the operating table.

Frunze suffered from stomach ulcers, but his physician advised against an operation; Frunze's heart could not withstand the effects of the anesthetic. On the basis of his doctor's diagnosis, Frunze refused to risk an operation. Thereupon Stalin chose a physician who would and did advise an operation. The Politburo confirmed the order; Frunze died on the operating table.

In the case of Marshal Frunze, his death deprived Kamenev and Zinoviev of a weighty ally in the struggle with Stalin which had already taken shape. Behind Frunze stood the army.

Did Stalin, as Trotsky suspected, poison Lenin as the latter approached an open break with him? It would be in complete accord with his psychology and method of removing a dangerous opponent. Lenin's recovery threatened Stalin with abject ruin and disgrace; his death assured Stalin of a free hand in his struggle for power.

The Case of Gorki

There is no question that Stalin ordered Yagoda to poison Gorki. Gorki's discontent, his world reputation, his extensive correspondence with the great political and literary figures of the Western world, represented a danger for Stalin. One word of public protest from Gorki and the fantastic frameups Stalin was preparing would have been irreparably compromised.

It would have been impossible for Stalin to put Gorki on trial—he was too well known and admired in the outside world. Another means of eliminating him had to be found before the trials began. At the '38 trial, Gorki's secretary testified that Yagoda had told him: It is necessary to lessen Gorki's activity; he is in the way of the "big chiefs."

The mediocrity Yagoda, whom Stalin had elevated to the eminence of a marshal of the army, had only one chief—Stalin. It is sufficient to indicate the timing of Gorki's death: he died before the opening of the Zinoviev-Kamenev trial in 1936.

In temperament and party position there is a striking similarity between Ordjonikidze and Zhdanov. Both were men of strong character with violent tempers; both held important positions in the bureaucratic apparatus; both in their time had been bosses of the Leningrad party apparatus. And what is most important—both were capable of disagreeing with Stalin and conducting a struggle against him in the Politburo. In Ordjonikidze's case, we know he tried to block the wholesale liquidation of the Old Guard, and paid with his life for daring to disagree.

Mystery surrounds the death of Zhdanov. But there is a striking similarity as well between the circumstances surrounding his death and that of Ordjonikidze. Both suffered from heart trouble. In both instances the doctors who signed their death certificates are brought to trial on framed-up charges.

What significance is there in the fact that one of the doctors now under arrest certified that the doctors involved in the '38 trial had poisoned Gorki and Kuibyshev? Is Stalin trying to shut the mouth of one of the last witnesses to his murder of Gorki and Ordjonikidze . . . and Zhdanov?

The above are some of the questions bearing most directly on the sinister forces behind the new anti-Jewish drive in the Russian empire. The question can by no means be exhausted in this manner. As we indicated, Stalinist anti-Semitism is not an independent phenomenon within the context of Russian bureaucratic society. Full discussion—even full speculation—would have to deal also with the most important questions of the course of the Stalinist regime. These are matters to which LABOR ACTION will have to come back.

A basic pamphlet—

"SOCIALISM: THE HOPE OF HUMANITY"

by Max Shachtman

Read it!

10 cents

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Youth and Student Corner

The ISL Program In Brief

Salaries for Students: A Campaign of the French Student Movement

The question of regular financial aid to students has become one of general interest ever since the GI "Bill of Rights" made it possible for tens and even hundreds of thousands of veterans to attend college. More recently the idea of government-subsidized scholarships has been realized for a few students in the graduate-education programs of the army, the navy, the Public Health Service and, of course, the Atomic Energy Commission.

In other countries the logical extension of this idea has been raised in the form of proposals for uniform support to all students. Usually this proposal is made where admission to universities is limited to successful examinees. In France a long fight for such a proposal has been led by the National Union of French Students (UNEF), which is organizationally and politically analogous to our own National Student Association but far more socialistically oriented.

That is why we feel it is of particular interest to reprint the following explanation of the French student movement's proposal, contained in an interview with Jean Sarvonat, former president of the UNEF. It appeared originally in the periodical L'Etudiant de France and was reprinted in the European Student Mirror.

Sarvonat explains his views on what the French call a *présalaire*, a student salary.—Ed.

way, that at the time these lines will be published the project will still not have been made effective.

I can only repeat it time and again that students are no demagogues. They will agree to wait for weeks, nay months even, if but they have had feasible demonstrations of the authorities' goodwill.

DANGERS?

Q: I think there should at last be an end to propagating the myth that the execution of the study-subsidies scheme would involve certain dangers. Could you tell us something about this question?

SARVONAT: It has always been a custom when reforms were impending, to label them either dangerous or scandalous. We have been told, first of all, that study subsidies would carry with them a danger to the students' freedom, for, it was said, if the state was to grant subsidies to students, it would also be entitled to direct them to certain areas of study, according to demand. To this we may reply that we have proposed legal means to be instituted in order to ward off any danger of this kind. Those who advance such arguments should at least know that in our administrative and constitutional system, universities are largely independent in this field. Funds that will be jointly administered by students and graduates are to distribute the money, and this fact is to promote harmony within univer-

sities but not, as it is alleged, create antagonisms. An actual attack on students' freedom, however, is to be seen in the present situation which, by evoking a certain degree of fatalism in our society, so influences the orientation of youth as to make it almost impossible for them to follow their own inclinations. An attack on freedom is also constituted by the fact that owing to the lack of an adequate and generous social education system, many youths cannot reach positions where they might employ their abilities to the benefit of the nation.

PROMISES

Q: UNEF's present information campaigns have aroused the attention of part of the public. As matters now stand, does UNEF intend to launch another campaign, or is it going to employ other means to achieve the execution of the system of study subsidies?

SARVONAT: For two years we have doubled our efforts to acquaint the public with certain significant issues, and we are convinced that it is on this information work that our chances depend. For it is important to clear away prejudice and other barriers.

It is as important, however, to realize that public opinion on a certain cause will forever be lagging behind the opinions of those advocating that cause. But the most efficient way, of course, would be—and here I am returning to what I said before—to connect the "study subsidies"-truck to the "educational reform"-train. Authorities must be convinced that the youth of our country, confronted as it is with greater difficulties than ever before, expects something more than promises and improvised speeches. The minister, M. André Marie, at the Montpellier Congress replied to the enquiries of a great number of participants that he was against promising anything that would not be kept, as this would bring about only bitterness and disappointments. He should remember his own words.

QUESTION: In the context of total developments we are facing today, the problem of the so-called *présalaire* stands out as a separate issue. Has this project of granting regular study subsidies to students, which might transform them into young intellectual workers, been developed far enough already, so that it might be approved of by the National Assembly and by the nation itself?

SARVONAT: This project of study subsidies, which has come into the limelight of public interest during recent years, was first discussed by UNEF in 1924. . . .

Two objections have been advanced against our scheme, one of them of a fundamental nature and the other of a financial nature. I should need several pages of this paper were I to describe those fundamental objections; regarding the financial aspect, we feel we may not stand by as silent spectators when cuts are made in the budget of the Ministry of Education at the same time that Parliament appropriates thousands of millions required for our scheme. As a matter of fact, the question of study subsidies may not be solved separately and out of its context, since it does belong in the vast complex of a reform of our educational system.

IT CAN BE DONE

Q: But don't you think this very fact might retard your claims' being made a reality?

SARVONAT: We are no children—as many seem still to be supposing—and we are quite aware of the far-reaching effects of our endeavor. To put such a project down on paper alone needs weeks, and its being put into effect might start, at the earliest, several years hence. It is for this reason that we have never demanded an educational reform to be carried out at once and in its entirety, nor have we ever called for study subsidies to be introduced immediately and without this previous reform.

We are convinced that, if authorities are conscious of their responsibilities, and for once willing to enter on new ways, a gradual reform of the educational system and a provisional execution of the study-subsidies scheme, in the framework of transitory regulations, that is, would be highly reasonable. All this would be possible provided the authori-

ties are willing, and it is this very aspect of the matter which is causing us some concern. The minister, M. André Marie, declared at the Montpellier Congress in April of this year that he was going within two months to put before the Council of National Education the project of an educational reform. As yet, however, nothing new has happened with regard to this matter and we cannot allow ourselves forever to be satisfied with evasive answers and promises. It had taken the whole of one year to prepare the "Langevin-Valon Plan," and I don't quite see how the minister is going to keep to his announced deadline, even if drawing on top-rank agencies for his information. I might as well bet, by the

Chicago Anti-Franco Comm. Calls Rally Against Terror

CHICAGO, Jan. 20 — "Franco Terrorism Must Be Stopped" will be the theme of a protest rally addressed by six prominent liberal and labor leaders Wednesday evening, February 4, at Roosevelt College, 430 South Michigan Ave.

Sponsored by the Chicago Committee to Defend Labor Victims of Franco, the meeting will focus attention upon the plight of Spanish labor leaders awaiting execution by the fascist dictatorship after trials behind locked doors and the mass arrests of hundreds of democratic unionists. The committee calls for defense of the victims of dictatorship on BOTH sides of the Iron Curtain.

Norman Thomas, chairman of the New York City Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims, will be the main speaker of the evening. Other speakers are: Harold Cranefield, general counsel of the International Union, UAW-CIO; Patrick Gorman, International Secretary-Treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL); Abraham Plotkin, Midwest Organizer, ILGWU (AFL); Jacob Siegel, chairman, Jewish Labor Committee; Ed Marciniak, editor of *Work*, organ of the Catholic Labor Alliance. Chairman of the meeting will be Francis Heisler, Chicago labor and civil-liberties lawyer.

Calling attention to the harshly anti-democratic character of the Franco regime, presently negotiating for military and economic aid from the United States to bolster its sagging authority, the committee presents evidence that accused persons most often face trial on charges of striking; attempting to form free labor unions, which are banned as "illegal associations"; and attempting to publish their own free press. Such charges automatically constitute "sedition" in totalitarian Spain, just as they do in Stalin's Russia. Frequently the "trials" are military court-martials, where in the accused literally have no rights of self-defense whatever, with no formal charges being presented against them.

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 \$1.00
 1 year at \$2.00

NAME
(please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE APT.

STATE

Payment enclosed.
 Bill me.

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE
114 W. 14th St.
New York 11, N. Y.

I want more information about the Socialist Youth League.
 I want to join the Socialist Youth League.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....

SCHOOL (IF STUDENT).....

INTERESTED? Get Acquainted —

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE
114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.
 I want to join the ISL.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY ZONE.....

STATE TEL.....

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 17, No. 4 January 26, 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, 1879.

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.