

Goćkowski, Janusz / Marmuszewski, Stanisław

Socialist Science in Fight Against Zionism : Ethnocentric Arguments in Support of the Party Science

Organon 26 27, 199-219

1997 1998

Artykuł umieszczony jest w kolekcji cyfrowej Bazhum, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych tworzonej przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego.

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie ze środków specjalnych MNiSW dzięki Wydziałowi Historycznemu Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.



Janusz Goćkowski, Stanisław Marmuszewski (Poland)

SOCIALIST SCIENCE IN FIGHT AGAINST ZIONISM: ETHNOCENTRIC ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THE PARTY SCIENCE

The Trotsky make the revolutions, the Bronsteins pay the bills.
Rabbi of Moscow to Leo Trotsky (1918)

Stalin spotted Zionist plotters everywhere. In his view, every Jew, Party member or not, was a plotter. Moreover, every Russian Party member was a plotter if they were married to Jewish women.

Abdurrahman Avtorkhanov, *Zagadka śmierci Stalina* (The mystery of Stalin's death) (1976)

To members of the Puławy faction, those of the Natolin faction were brutes; to the Natolin faction, members of the Puławy faction were Jews. Both descriptions say a great deal about the ideological consciousness and depth of both sides' socialist beliefs.

Witold Jedlicki, *Klub Krzywego Koła* (The Crooked Circle Club) (1963)

1. Bolshevik purge of Jewish elements

A. Koba and his successors

Stalin, whom his closest associated referred to as Koba, was the first to launch and approve anti-Jewish practices, turning that eventually to an element of Bolshevik cadre and nationalist policy. Jews, real and imagined, were eliminated in a systematic and consistent manner from of Party and state executive bodies. At first, they were sidelined or thrown out beyond the pale of real socialism. Later, with the advent of the „acre revolution” (1935 to 1940) and in the years leading up to „the second Yezhovshchizna” (1946–1953) elimination usually meant killings. Progress in the construction

of socialism in one country was accompanied by growing chauvinism and xenophobia. Koba went by the rule, „We will plow up the country and pull out the weeds!” In Koba’s view, Jews presented classic cases of „weeds,” and that included „Trotskyites” and „Zinovievists,” „cosmopolitans” and „Zionists,” „swindlers” and saboteurs,” „spies” and „poisoners.” The de-judeization of Soviet life during the Great Patience¹ was to do with using Jews to carry out any kind of bad act stemming from Stalinist policy. The moment a Jew stopped being useful they deserved to be killed in the cellars of the security service (VChK) or to be sent for a certain death to Kolyma. What happened to Karl Radek or Genrikh Yagoda were good cases in point illustrating the rule that a Jew whose time of being useful to Stalin was over had to be finished. An anti-Jewish „ethnic purge,” directed and supervised by Koba, was carried out inside the Bolshevik party, in the Socialist International, and in Soviet institutions, especially in the state bureaucracy. After World War II, „new shock troops” appeared: the people’s democracies. There, too, in the course of building socialism and in response to „the growing class struggle,” a hunting for Jews as „pests” began. The November 1952 Prague trial of „Jewish gang” led by Slansky (Zalcman) is a good case in point.

Few Jews actually fled from the „realm of scientific Communism,” and if they did then only when their feet were burning. Valter Kryvitski, Aleksandr Orlov, Genrikh Lushkov were just a few names to mention in this connection. A vast majority of Jews tried, more or less successfully, to be useful to Stalin doing their best and displaying a good deal of ardent devotion. Their game for adaptation was essentially a game for survival. They were active builders of the Stalinist order, yet in most cases they ended up as „inputs” in Stalin’s „mincer.” They did not stand out in that respect as Jews, but they certainly performed tasks, with cleverness and commitment, which later enabled Koba to present them as villains deserving the contempt and repugnance the masses of Soviet people felt towards the Jews. Jews who held important positions in the Bolshevik party could not as an ethnic group demonstrate either solidarity or self-preserving resourcefulness or deftness against the Stalinist genocide. Bolshevism allowed them to free themselves from their Jewish separateness, which they experienced as unpleasant and unfavourable in Tsarist times. However, very shortly they began to be seen and treated as „alien” in the process of „building socialism in one country.” As front-runners in the army of those putting into practice Leninist lies and crimes they continued to do what they used to do before, namely actively engaging in the realization of Stalinist lies and crimes. They uprooted themselves from their Jewishness, from society, humanity etc. The world of the Bolshevik party VKP(B) became their only world. In that world it was being officially announced more and more often that at Koba’s decision they were transformed from stokers to fuel. The same tactic of „stak-

ing for survival” contributing to Stalinist lies and crimes was also applied by Jews – activists of Communist parties in the people’s democracies.

The „ethnic purge” of Jewish elements that began under Stalin’s rule lasted until the formal demise of the Bolshevik party and the Soviet Union. Stalin’s successors at the top of the Party, went on with the de-judeization stopping short of any planned or systematic extermination. Instead, they continued a policy of a planned diminution of Jews by depriving them of their right to cultural identity. Stalin almost completely eliminated Jews from the „leading cadres.” That purge was completed by Koba’s successors. Stalin tried to kill as many Jews as possible because he regarded them as „enemies of the people” and „pests.” His successors tried to erase Jewishness as a phenomenon from the cultural map of Soviet society. Denunciation was accompanied by repression. Many Jews were placed in camps and asylums. There were also those executed: for things of which they were accused to public prosecutors and especially for being who they were.

Under Koba’s successors, Soviet anti-Jewish productions flourished. News reports and press articles, propaganda pamphlets and documentary films, philosophic treatises and specialist literature, fiction and paintings were churned out continuously and in quantity against Jews, the enemies of Soviet people and the Soviet state.

B. De-judeization the Polish way

A majority of the „leading cadres” of the Communist Party of Poland (KPP), a section of the Comintern, were killed during the „cadre revolution” (1935–1940). The Polish people’s democracy was taken over – on Stalin’s orders – by individuals from the third, fourth or fifth rows of Communist Party activists. Marching under the banner of the Polish Workers Party (PPR) they began to Sovietize Polish life. They resorted to lies, exploitation and murder. They used collaborators and opportunists, crooks and criminals. They had Soviet protection and supervision. Many of them were Jews – uprooted, like their Soviet colleagues, from Jewishness, Polishness, society, humanity. They were criminals in the service of Stalin – playing their „game for adaptation” with the heads of those for whom they could score points in the files of cadres of the Stalinist empire. And as criminals acting under Soviet control and supervision, they cooperated with individuals of „Aryan” descent: Róžański with Humer, Zambrowski with Kliszko, Berman with Gomułka, Minc with Nowak, Szyr with Jaroszewicz.

Some of them were caught in the wheels of the Stalinist „mincer.” They were not the only ones: there was Anna Pauker in Romania; Sling, Geminder and Andre Simone in Czechoslovakia (apart from the above-mentioned Slansky); or Rajk in Hungary. At a time of „pulling out weeds” from the soil of the People’s democracy, they were all in danger of following in the footsteps of their older colleagues, those killed during the „cadre revolution”

(Unszlicht, Redens, Ryng, Reicher). A few exceptions apart, they managed to survive. As guests of the Polish section of the VChK they were treated in a similar manner as their jailed Gentile comrades. They were treated badly by Gentile and Jewish secret police functionaries alike. In the wake of the 19th Congress of the Bolshevik party they were threatened with mass extermination. The trial of Slansky's „gang” and an article called „Vile Spies and Murderers Clad as Professors-Doctors” (*Pravda* of January 13, 1953) by Koba himself exposed a „Jewsection”² among the „leading cadres” of the Polish United Workers Party (PZPR), implying those people could soon share the fate of sentenced and executed „agents of the spy terrorist organization «Joint».”

De-judeization the Polish way began already during Stalin's lifetime. The denunciation of the „rightist and nationalist deviation,” the Party's disavowal of Gomułka's and Spsychalski's line, was not enough. A Jew fighting against „nationalists” and „rightists” in close cooperation with „Gentiles” such as Bierut, Zawadzki, Nowak or Józwiak could not be sure of safe conduct for themselves for even or for long. Agranov and Frynovski („stars” of the NKVD at the time of the „cadre revolution”) saw for themselves that the only thing Koba cared about were exigencies of the day. In the course of the „game for survival” some non-Gentile comrades were sent to VChK prisons, as others were sidelined.

In the early days of Khrushchev in power, a little de-judeization campaign was launched – without executions. Many „Gentiles” took over positions previously occupied by their colleagues from the „Jewsection.” On the other hand, many remarkable cadre reshuffles were made in connection with the 1956 changes inside the Communist Party. Many activists of Jewish descent had to leave on account of their participation in crimes and lies of the Bierut team. Some were even brought to trial. Their trials, however, were pure manipulations. The pattern of trials of Fejgin, Rózański or Romkowski, all dignitaries of the Ministry of Public Security (1957) was repeated during the 1985 trials of Father Popiełuszko's murderers in Toruń. The pattern was set by trials of Yagoda and Yezhov who were criminals and scapegoats at the same time.

At the time of Gomułka, a creeping de-judeization got under way. At first it embraced the „leading cadres” in the Party, the police and the armed forces. Then, especially in 1968, the „ethnic purge” was extended to embrace other walks of society (industry, diplomacy, science, the press). The „ethnic purge” gave new people considerable promotion or important posts. That de-judeization was carried out jointly by people from the Natolin group, the „Partisans,” the „technocrats,” and the „boss's men” (Gomułka's team). They were helped by some members of the Puławy group keen, in their „game for survival,” to be dubbed „first-class chameleons and Party time-servers.” So, the purge of Jews from the „leading cadres” of the PZPR and

People's Poland was carried out by the Polish section of international Bolshevism, in keeping with the usual Soviet practice and the tradition of Soviet-style nationalism.

De-judeization the Polish way continued when interests of the Communist power elite were endangered and when it was generally known that anti-Jewish activity was the chief issue of the day in the Moscow headquarters. It was also connected with the power game inside the Party and the rivalry for top posts in government and industry. The de-judeization hoisted new people into the „leading cadres” – new generations of „activists and functionaries,” people who regarded anti-Semitism (in keeping with Koba's line) as an element of Communist „patriotism” and Soviet „internationalism.” It was characteristic of the Polish-style de-judeization that getting rid of Jews from the „leading cadres” was a sign of nationalism („the Polish road to socialism”) which was subordinated to satellite loyalty towards the Moscow headquarters. It was similar to the Vichy of Petain and Laval.

2. The course of events in People's Poland

The year 1968 was certainly one of the worst years of Bolshevik rule in Poland. The Communist elite around Gomułka saw the end of the year compromised by the de-judeization of the Party, state and cultural institutions (especially scientific institutions). They also were at loggerheads with those of the intelligentsia who were not anti-Communist and tried to reconcile „European humanism” with a benevolent attitude towards leftist concepts of the system. The events in Poland, which began with Gomułka's hysterical and fawnlike reaction to the Israeli victory in the Six Days War, came to an end with the fifth Congress of the Polish section of international Bolshevism (November 1968). The things that happened then cannot be reduced to an „anti-Jewish action” or a „campaign against the intelligentsia” or to an „internal Party strife.” The situation, as now seen, had several levels and aspects. Perhaps five different threads of event should be distinguished.

1) New edition of „Brutes” versus „Jews.” The year 1968 was a period of accelerated de-judeization of public institutions in People's Poland. A „homogeneous front” of de-judeization activists consisted of individuals of different orientations and political provenience: members of different Party factions and cliques, employees of different government sectors. Kruczek and Szydłak, Kępa and Kozdra, Moczar and Szlachcic, Jaruzelski and Korczyński, Werblan and Walichnowski, Kąkol and Gontarz, Dobrosielski and Szewczyk – those were only a few of a long list of proponents of de-judeization line designed to ensure ethnic and ideological purity in the „socialist fatherland.” This first thread can be called one of „two-paired games.” A „game for the posts and desks left by Jewish colleagues” went alongside

with a „game for the steering wheel abandoned by Gomułka and his team.” The few true supporters Gomułka had were alienated from the „leading cadres.” That could be observed very closely during the December 1970 palace coup. As early as in 1968, factionists working their way up considered Gomułka an obstacle. On the other hand, Gomułka’s men were unable to guard their leader’s palace of power. The impact of a „new wave,” people of the Polish Youth Union generation; intrigues and plots of „the Partisans” (Moczar’s faction); and of „the Technocrats” (Gierek’s men), discontent among Party activists and state functionaries, who dreamt of socialism through a mixture of populism with nationalism, and of moving up in the official pecking order; aspirations of young men keen to get hold of top posts and disappointed with their slow vertical mobility under Gomułka’s „little stabilisation”; all these streams flowed into one river that eventually drowned the political and personal system of Gomułka’s rule. Both paired games, of course, were watched with a great deal of sympathy (and even patronised) by the „modernists” (not to be confused with the „liberals”) in the Moscow headquarters. Gomułka lost whatever sympathy he commanded in the Kremlin too, and not only in offices of the Party of Polish section of the VChK but in the headquarters of the „Polish People’s Army” as well. Attacks in both games, two versions of the power gamble inside the Communist „inner Party,”³ were directed by the rule that „power is won with the use of power,” and the principle of „everyone being against the ruler and the scapegoat.” The talk here of paired games is justified by the circumstance that the fight against the Jews was at the same time a fight against Gomułka. Gomułka was to be made face a choice between giving his blessing to accelerated de-judeization, that is, to a „bloodless cadre revolution,” which would have made him dependent on leaders of the purge that was carried out under a banner of de-judeization; or declaring himself to be against the „National Socialist” uprising of the cadres and the activists, thus becoming a defender of an „alien and hostile” element and so condemning himself to deposition or forced abdication. In either case, the attackers were to set the tone, style and line of the Party’s policy. It was from among them that a new team of Communist rulers of Poland was to emerge.

2) Restoring a full range of supreme authority. The events of 1968 were remembered for more than the Power game insider the Party. The most interesting development perhaps in the eyes of sociologists of culture (especially sociologists of science) was perhaps a struggle to restore overall and total control of science and art, that is, control of culture in its classic Bolshevik version. The „leading cadres” (both the attacking anti-Semites and the defending Gomułka supporters) were keen to stamp out any freedom the Polish intelligentsia managed to win for themselves in the domain of creative thought in 1956. The year 1968 saw a Polish edition of Zhdanov’s and Suslov’s line on the offensive. Ever since they appeared on the stage,

Gomułka's team (supported by people of different factions, cliques and gangs inside the Party) had treated those freedoms as something fundamentally opposed to the nature of „real socialism.” It tried to liquidate them almost from the first days after the eighth session of the leaders of the Polish section of international Bolshevism (October 1956). All „moons” of domestic culture were to shine with light reflected from the „Sun,” the Party. The Politburo's supreme authority was to be conclusive to intellectuals and artists, for all the people belonging to the intelligentsia.

3) The Sinai and the Prague events: the „storm troops” pass their test. The events of 1968 were one way of demonstrating to the Moscow headquarters that the Polish section of international Bolshevism were able to think and act in a spirit of „Leninist internationalism.” Thus, the de-judeization was a peculiar case of participating in the struggle of „the camp of peace and socialism” (its leading warriors were three Arab countries incorporated in the orbit of global Soviet policy against „Israeli agents of world imperialism”). Fighting the Zionists in Poland was the Gomułka regime's contribution to the war against international Jewry, a war in which the fighters for progress and peace lost the Six Days War. The other test the „leading cadres” of the Gomułka regime had to pass was their attitudes towards the situation in Czechoslovakia. The „Prague Spring” was brought to an end in August 1968 with the application of the „Brezhnev doctrine.” Some of the champions of the Prague Spring were not exactly „Gentiles.” That fact was emphasized by outstanding „patriots-internationalists” contributing to the „normalization,” like Husak, Bilak, Svestka or Indra. The ethnic and ideological purity of the „Polish storm troop” was to be ensured by immunizing them against the united hostile forces of Jews from Poland with Jews from Bohemia. There was more at stake, really, namely the defence of the integrity and unity of the „socialist camp.” Gomułka and his successor, Gierek, along with others from the team running the Polish section of international Bolshevism supported Brezhnev, Suslov, Kosygin, and cooperated with Ulbricht against the „Czechoslovak revisionism.” Later, troops of the Polish People's Army under the command of Jaruzelski and Siwicki took part in the pacification of Czechoslovakia international Bolshevism launched under the banners of the Warsaw Pact. So, pacification was not limited to Poland, but also a hand was lent to pacify the lands of the Czechs and the Slovaks.

4) Workers with the Party: „Great patience” Gomułka's way. Anti-Zionist mass meetings and considerable support the working class gave the Party apparachiks in March 1968 were facts. Lashing out at the intelligentsia, Jews, students, the Gomułka regime converted Party activists and state functionaries to an army of fighters for ethnic and ideological purity in the „socialist fatherland.” In order to complete the liquidation of what was left from the limited freedom of creation and expression the regime charged some dubious

characters with the job of pacifying the domain of culture. At the same time, however, the regime called for support to the working world (especially blue collar workers) as they gave Gomułka their vote of confidence in the autumn of 1956. The response was, by and large, positive. Workers who backed the evictions of 1968 knew they could safely show their glee at seeing one of the pillars of ruling Bolshevism destroyed by another pillar of the same provenience. People were likewise happy seeing the „cadre revolution” taking place in the Soviet Union. Stalin was busy killing off most of his mal-factors: Postyshev, Tukhachevski, Yagoda, Yezhov, Krylenka. Moreover, it should be pointed out that the regime reared society (at school, in the media, at Party training course, through works produced by „ideologically correct” Party academics) in a spirit of xenophobia. People were told to be hostile towards Germans and Ukrainians, towards Americans and Chinese, Czechs and Romanians. Israel was presented as a neo-fascist state, Zionism as an aggressive brand of racism much like Nazism. Indeed, one is tempted to ask, why would Poles be immune to anti-Jewish propaganda if recollections of ill practices of Berman or Rożański, Minc and Szyr, Werfel and Borejsza were fresh in their minds? The working class never stood up against the practices of 1968 as Gomułka’s regime had not taught workers by then that they were little more than low-paid labour. Their illusions are not really surprising, consider their being exposed to a combined effort of educational activities of the Party functionaries’ „ideological front” with those of „heretics-revisionists.” That particular education lowered workers’ consciousness. Earlier, on what came to be dubbed the „biack Poznań Thursday” (June 1956), the workers taught the Communists a lesson. An anti-Communist uprising in Poznań, which quickly became an armed insurgency for freedom (without Communist control) and bread (without Communist planning) was the last demonstration of dogged resistance led by individuals who came from right-wing organizations, the Freedom and Independence Movement (WiN) and the National Armed Forces (NSZ). The insurgent Poznań workers in June 1956 were closer to anti-Communist underground fighters of the years following World War II than to Kuroń and Modzelewski, authors of the vaunted „Open Letter to the Party.” From October 1956, Polish workers had been taught patriotism was consistent with „the Polish road to socialism.” Writings by „revisionists” and „eminent personalities” from the Catholic group ZNAK supply plenty of evidence. They expressed their disgust with individuals like Kufel or Witaszewski, yet they certainly felt closer to Morawski, Schaff, Żółkiewski or Matwin, than to Józef Mackiewicz. The success of the propaganda stunt scored by the directors of the „accelerated de-judeization” can be explained by the fact that Communists taught ethnocentrism and xenophobia (praising Polish society’s supposed monoethnic nature), while Jews were presented as Zionists accused – and not without reason – of being Bierut’s supporters and living in luxury ordinary working

people could never even imagine. The manipulation was that Gomułka's regime shielded from responsibility the top criminals of the Bierut gang (Berman, Minc, Radkiewicz, Zambrowski, Mazur, Nowak, Ochab), ignored deeds of Bierut's „Gentile” men, concealed criminal acts committed by Gomułka, Spsychalski, Zawadzki, Kliszko or Moczar, while at the same time lashing out at those who were against Gomułka's policy of building socialism the Polish way in close cooperation with and under the aegis of the Moscow headquarters. The 1968 events were a sociotechnical stunt by the Party elite which can be described as an action „with the support of workers – against the intelligentsia, in order to put down the working class afterwards.”

5) Suppressing the „trouble-makers,” rebuking the „reactionaries.” The manipulation produced a situation in which „the arrogant” were persuaded (by beating, imprisonment, relegation from college) that resistance and protests to demonstrate opposition simply did not pay off. Students (and trouble-makers of any kind) were brainwashed into believing that the „working masses” took the side of the „people's power” and that this power could and was keen to enforce calm by any means. At the same time, „reactionaries” (right-wing people opposing Communist rule as such) were told the methods Gomułka used in 1944–48 during the years of fighting for the victory of people's democracy could well be employed again.

3. For Polish and socialist science

Accelerated de-judeization went side by side with an accelerated takeover by ignoramuses who set up dictatorial power in science and academic institutions. Stalinists (those who served the „bad power” whereas the one now installed was good) were one object of attack; „cosmopolitans” (people to whom Polish life, interests and aspirations were remote and who perceived science as a specific and separate international form of knowledge and cognition rather than as part of a „national-internationalist” state. „Revisionists” (people wanting to adjust Marxism-Leninism to rules and requirements of science in the proper sense) were another butt of attacks. So were „reactionaries,” i.e., people thinking of Marxism-Leninism as one in many world outlooks and one not particularly promising from the scientific point of view nor one easily conforming to rules governing the world as such. Along with that, castigating words were hurled at „wannabe politicians with academic titles” for doing things any Bolshevik scholar would feel was an obligation towards the Party. That was connected with presenting Gomułka's pacification as a fight against „pseudo-science” and „nihilism” towards the Polish cultural tradition. Party activists and functionaries of repressive institutions came forward as advocates of science that was to be nationalist and socialist

at the same time. Guided by such intention they cleared the Polish academic scene from „cosmopolitans” and „revisionists,” „mediocrities” and „doctrinaires.” In the course of the pacification they paid tribute to the tradition of Polish science. Yet in reality, they paid homage to Roman Ingarden while promoting Marian Dobrosielski. It should be added that getting rid of „Zionist pseudo-scientists” entailed the bringing out and promotion of a great many obedient mediocrities. The batch production of so-called „March assistant professors” and the toppling of university autonomy were mutually complementary developments. Characters dubbed „Volksdozents” supplemented „objective officers” (individuals watching academic institutions on behalf of the political police).

The year 1968 in Poland saw an attempt of a „big leap” to push science strongly in a desired direction. Science was to be subordinated to the jurisdiction and orders of the superior authority of the Party bureaucracy. Ethnocentric arguments, boiling down to anti-Jewish demagoguery, were put forward in the course of that game. The Polish section of international Bolshevism resolved to resort to xenophobia (as Hitler’s and Stalin’s propaganda did before) in a campaign designed to dock scholars of their intellectual independence and universities of their autonomy. The Communists announced that Jews were enemies of the people and of socialism and assumed the anti-Jewish formula was very helpful in pacifying the academic circles and their natural autonomy.

3a. Gomulka’s reconquista in the humanities

What was going on in the spring of 1968 in Polish humanities cannot fail to be seen as a major event in an on-going effort, which took off practically at the very beginning of Gomulka’s take-over of the Communist party helm in socialist Poland, and which was aimed at restoring Party apparatchiks to a position of supremacy and control, and Marxism-Leninism (tailored to its 20th CPSU Congress version, which Lenin and Stalin themselves repeatedly practised) to a monopoly position. Gomulka’s fight to prevent the onset of a „second stage” (embarking on genuine democracy and authentic national sovereignty) was combined with a struggle against „revisionism” inside the Party (views the leaders held to be strategically or tactically wrong; whether or not such views looked like „nonconformist” or publicity stunts for rewards in the West seemed no major issue to Gomulka’s inquisitors, for the important thing was to stamp out anything that did not square with the ruling group’s knowledge and ideas in the humanities).

In the earliest stage after Gomulka group’s got themselves in the saddle (October 1956 to June 1964), the busiest of all helpers in grabbing back anything human scientists had managed to snatch away were Communist

Party activists of what before Gomułka's jump to the very top flight – right after the following Bierut's death but especially after the Poznań workers' June 1956 protest action – used to be called the „Puławy faction.” Witold Jedlicki has discussed their role in shrinking the scope of intellectual liberties in his book on the Warsaw Crooked Circle Club (*Klub Krzywego Koła*), a study a sociologist and historian of ideas cannot but find interesting. Adam Schaff is a particularly remarkable case. He began as a Stalinist watchdog over the domain of philosophy and author of bizarre sorties into gnosiology and historiosophy; to get actively involved in restoring humanities to normalcy (especially sociology, for he saw himself as an authority telling sociologists what they should do). Lastly it turned out the Party no longer trusted Adam Schaff, so they staged a brain-washing session for him in the *Nowe Drogi* Party monthly in 1966, to proceed to sacking him from the Party Central Committee in the autumn of 1968. That, by the way, did not deter him much later from supporting and applauding the group of Jaruzelski and Kiszczak. What is particularly interesting in Jedlicki's book is Schaff's part in police action to destroy the Crooked Circle Club, a discussion forum of intellectuals active in the humanities who took advantage of freedom of expression to the extent allowed by the new „post-October” order, which quickly turned out to be another version of real-world Leninism.

The emphasis on the exceptional nature of the Gomułka group preached and did in the spring of 1968 to the humanities and those active in them is amazing. The only really new thing was the open hostility towards Jews, now called, Stalinist-style, Zionists. Everything else was just a continuation of that. Gomułka speaking in Warsaw's Congress Hall on March 19, 1968, and in November in the same year to a congress of the Polish section of international Leninism, attacked the humanities and the people in it in the same vein as he spoke to the Party Central Committee in May 1957 and again in July 1963, and also what was heard from Zenon Kliszko, the controller-general of cultural life in socialist Poland, you could say the chief ideologue of the Gomułka group, at a Central Committee meeting in June 1967. In all those propositions one got presentations of the idea to curb the influence of „bourgeois ideology” and „revisionism” in the humanities and to ensure a dominant position to Marxism-Leninism and Party supremacy in that area.

The pacification of the humanities by Party apparatchiks, the political police, Party journalists and Party henchmen in the academic milieu, which also got the support of some real scientists, was geared to a gamble to ensure Party supremacy and control in the humanities. It was also, as observed before, part of a small „cadre revolution” in the „internal Party.” The neo-Stalinist „pogromists” pretensions to be fighting to preserve the Polish character of research work or to be fighting Zionism were a Communist variety of „explanations of the public” (Goebbels' favourite term of things Nazi propaganda had for the masses).

The Party action the Polish humanities in 1968 can safely be described as a new edition of the Zhdanov-Suslov line in the Polish style. The selective nature of repression was dictated by (a) the academic milieu's wide-spread conformist disposition (the claim by many Polish humanist scientists to have taken advantage of their *ius resistendi* is a nice legend); (b) the problem the hard core around Gomułka had in keeping up their dominant position in Party leadership bodies; (c) plans to pacify first the working-class and subsequently to take to handle, powerfully and definitively, the humanities (had the homicide action by Gomułka, Kliszko, Kociołek, Korczyński and others in December 1970 succeeded in putting down the counter-revolution, the humanities in Poland would soon have experienced what Comrade Wiesław [Gomułka], the co-organiser of pacification and mass killings in 1944–48, was capable of doing). In 1968, a number of individuals were picked (certainly not all of those the Interior Ministry's „Jewish Section” had collected) to give the general public a lesson. Those picked were individuals who were „nonconformist” or insufficiently „principled” in their attitudes while at the same time being vocal as intellectuals rather than as ordinary specialists in such or other discipline of human sciences, and also whose academic authority could contribute to spreading inappropriate ideas in a wider range of humanities. Also lashed out at were individuals who could hardly be seen to have an active role in „revisionism”, such as the aesthetician Stefan Morawski or the gnosologist Waclaw Mejbaum. Mejbaum, years later, demonstrated his devotion to Stalinism and hostility towards independent humanist ideas, in what he produced as a column writer. He acted this way at the time the Communist Party was putting down the Solidarity movement.

The story of four people associated with the monthly *Studia Socjologiczne* is very interesting indeed to a student of the Party's action against the humanities in 1968. Zygmunt Bauman and Maria Hirszowicz were fired from their jobs at Warsaw University with no offer to work elsewhere in their trade. They were forced to leave Poland, and eventually the two established themselves as sociologists in the West. Janusz Reykowski and Jerzy J. Wiatr stayed on in Poland, always siding with the group that was at the helm of the Party at the time. Later they were faithful supporters for the group running the country at the time of „martial law,” the group around Jaruzelski and Kiszcak. Another four people were the philosophers Leszek Kołakowski and Bronisław Baczko, who were fired from Warsaw University (but not from their jobs at the Polish Academy of Sciences), and Krzysztof Pomian and Helena Eilstein, who also lost their jobs at Warsaw University. The four philosophers were blackened as the „eye of darkness” in philosophy that was Polish and socialist at the same time. The defamation campaign against them pushed them to leave Poland.

Five arguments were put forward against the persecuted humanists: (1) that they thought nothing of Marxism and socialism; ((2) they thought noth-

ing of the people's tradition and needs; (3) in their work they drew from bourgeois ideas and concepts and spread „revisionist tuberculosis” in the academic milieu; (4) they fought actively on the ideological front in Stalinist times; (5) their academic achievement was meagre. This last argument is really delicious, if one recalls the academic achievement of the persecuted and banished, but also of most of the mud-throwing Party ideologues many of whom acted under a guise of being academics.

In 1968, picking up what was started long before, the Communist Party took actions to launch something like a „campaign to improve its style of work” (a Maoist purge hitting those among the Party rank and file who held wrong ideas) and something like a „great proletarian cultural revolution” (Maoist-style destruction of what in China did not fit the Great Helmsman's doctrine and tactics).

The March 1968 events should also perhaps be considered in its cultural perspective. Party columnists (secret police officers and informers, lecturers and correspondents) wrote extensively on culture, especially Polish culture. Gomułka's men bravely defended it against Leszek Kołakowski and Stefan Cardinal Wyszyński, always apprehending that culture as Soviet in substance and Polish in form. This is not surprising at all, if you recall that Gomułka himself was a secret holder of a Soviet Communist Party card. Who got boosted in the hierarchy? Who was entrusted with the defamation job? Who set the tone in the new humanities whose object was nationalistic and socialistic pacification? Answers to these questions justify the contention about that being a „dictatorship of halfwits.” After all it was not only the dregs or nitwits, or „garbage” of academia and the press that joined the rat race of de-Judeization of science and the exorcising of the evil spirit of „bourgeois” and „revisionist” ideas from science. Apart from Professor Henryk Jabłoński, the man who signed orders sacking people from jobs yet who holds Polish Academy of Sciences ordinary member status to this day, special mention should be made of Professor Józef Chałasiński, who published (while serving as editor of the monthly) a special issue of *Przegląd Socjologiczny* (Review of Sociology) which was a chronicle of repression and defamation as well as a song of praise for such practices at the same time.

Two individuals deserve special mention in connection with the 1968 campaign: Andrzej Werblan and Tadeusz Walichnowski. Werblan hated whatever smacked of normalcy in research work of human sciences, but later he made himself a political science professor in the style of Soviet „red professors.” The other headed a nationalities section (including the „Jewish section) at the political police headquarters in socialist Poland and he authored anti-Jewish writings and later an employee of the sector of science with academic distinctions. Two other fighters on the front of was for a new national and socialist human science: Jan Szewczyk, who argued that the

fight against Zionism tallied with a bringing back to fashion Ingarden's phenomenology, and Kazimierz Kąkol, who combined his nomination to assistant professor as a reward for his defamatory activities with publicising the idea of a new kind of science in Party and police journals. The list of active fighters of that war would not be complete without the unforgettable Professor Zygmunt Rybicki, first Pro-Rector and subsequently Rector of Warsaw University, who was the toughest ally of the troopers beating students in 1968, while in 1977, as befitted a new style law professor, destroyed a law sociology team led by Adam Podgórecki.

The fight against Kołakowski and Baczko as men of pre-October 1956 times is a curious incident considering the prominence of the long-standing and resilient Soviet-minded academic Jarosław Ładosz, who wrote in the Party daily *Trybuna Ludu* that it was only thanks to the March 1968 purges the freedom of expression had been restored to Marxists. Several intertwined chains of personal ties can be distinguished in 1968. The chain: Gomułka – Kliszko – Kociołek – Kępa, went side by side with the chain: Gomułka – Moczar – Olszowski – Szlachcic – Kępa.

The year 1968 was also taken advantage of to teach a lesson those who thought they were untouchable in their Party member status. The firing of Professors Schaff and Żółkiewski from the Party Central Committee made it clear that no one was safe in the fight for power. 1968 further was a year of lashing out at individuals, who later became ardent advocates of Party dictatorship in human science. Waclaw Mejbaum and Jan Kurowicki are two outstanding cases.

It was also a time in which the Gomułka group began its descent into the abyss, yet also a time of escalation of actions Soviet activists prided themselves of: from March 1968 (racism and destroying the humanities) through August 1968 (the armed intervention in Czechoslovakia) to DEcember 1970 (the truly Soviet-style homicide in Poland's Baltic coast cities). That road: from purging the armed forces from Zionists, through the launching of troops into Czechoslovakia, up to the command of armed forces in December 1970, was the road of General Jaruzelski, whom a former U.S. Defence Secretary called a „Soviet General in a Polish uniform.”

Let us also recall the words of Party leader Jan Szydlak from a hate demo against the enemies of the Party in science: „Take this Kołakowski, this moral nought!” Soon after that Szydlak got himself boosted to the post of Central Committee Secretary in charge of ideological education in and outside the Party, who, as a Party decision-maker, also interfered in the affairs of human science. In 1968, new individuals appeared on the stage, new brilliant careers and steep promotions began, yet the old patterns, methods and dogmas remained.

4. Gomułka's reconquista in human sciences

What human sciences in Poland were subjected to in the spring of 1968 can certainly be called and interpreted as a landmark event in Gomułka's never-faltering drive to subordinate human sciences to the supremacy and control of Party elements along with a monopoly of corrected Marxism-Leninism (corrected, incidentally, in the style of the 20th Congress of the Communist party of the USSR, which was the same style as the one Lenin and later Stalin repeatedly resorted to). Gomułka sought to prevent a „second stage” (embarking on a road of authentic democracy and authentic sovereignty) from ever happening. That „second stage” was associated inside the Party with „revisionism,” the shorthand for any views that ran counter to the Party leaders' strategy and tactic; whether such views were proof of „audacity” or a game for publicity and rewards from the West was of little avail to Gomułka's inquisitors; the important thing was to put down what intellectually was at odds with the ruling people's order of knowledge and cognition in human science.

In the first stage of Gomułka's rule (October 1956 to June 1964), active fighters seeking to recapture what scholars in human science had gained for themselves were activists of the Communist Party who before Gomułka's ascension to power – during the time following Bierut's death but especially after the Poznań workers' insurgency – belonged to the „Pulavian” faction. Their special contribution to reducing the field of intellectual freedom was presented by Witold Jedlicki in his book on what was called Angled Circle Club, a book of great importance to sociologists and historians of science. A very telling story is told by the case of Adam Schaff, at first a Stalinist supervisor of the domain of philosophy and protagonist of curious sorties into the realm of gnosiology and theory of history, later active in holding back efforts to restore human science to normal standards (especially of sociology, for he deemed himself fit to instruct sociologists what and how they should conduct their research work), till at long last it turned out the Party did not trust Adam Schaff and staged a brainwashing session for him in the editorial offices of *Nowe Drogi*, the official Party monthly in 1966, to expel him from the Central Committee in 1968, which later did not stop him from supporting and praising the Jaruzelski and Kiszczak team. The most remarkable thing in Jedlicki's book is his presentation of Schaff's own role in the police harrassment of the Angled Circle Club, a forum of humanist debates seen as utilizing freedom of expression within the „post-October” (1956) order that soon turned out to be a new version of real Leninism.

It is surprising to read in the book what Gomułka's team actually said and did to human science and scholars in the spring of 1968. The only new element was the open declaration of hostility towards Jews, who were dubbed, in typical Stalinist style, Zionists. Everything else was a continuation

of previous practices. Gomułka speaking in Warsaw's Congress Hall on March 19, 1968, and again in November that year to a congress of the Polish section of international Leninism, attacked human science and scholars in a fashion that was very reminiscent of what he told the Party's Central Committee in May 1957 and again in July 1963, and what Zenon Kliszko, the chief supervisor of culture in People's Poland and probably Gomułka's chief ideologue, repeated before the Central Committee in June 1967. Each of those propositions presented the idea of curbing possible effects of „bourgeois ideology” and „revisionism” in human science and efforts to install Marxism-Leninism as the reigning ideology and the Party as the supervisor of human science.

The pacification of human science launched by the apparatchiks, the political police, Party journalists and Party activists in research institutions, and backed by some real scientists, was a game for Party supremacy and control in the world of science, for the restoration of Marxist-Leninist monopoly in human sciences. It was also, as said before, part of a small „cadre revolution” in the „inner Party.” The pretensions the neo-Stalinist pogromshchiki brought up to demonstrate their alleged commitment to a fight for Polish tradition or the fight against Zionism was just a Communist version of „explanations for the general public” (a favourite phrase of Goebbels' to denote things broadcast by Nazi propaganda).

The 1968 Party campaign in Polish human science can be described as a new edition of Zhdanovism the Polish way. The repressions were applied selectively, for three reasons: 1) the academic community was generally very conformist in their attitudes (it is a refreshing experience to hear of the mass of Polish research staff to be allegedly opposed to the official line then); 2) Gomułka's closest coworkers had trouble keeping their position inside the Party elite; and 3) there were plans to pacify, first the working class, but later to deal with thoroughly and systematically with academics in the human sciences too (had the genocide action launched by Gomułka, Kliszko, Kociołek and others in December 1970 succeeded in stamping out the counter-revolution, Polish human science would soon have experienced what Comrade Wiesław, a co-organizer of the 1944–1948 pacification and massive murders, was capable of doing). In 1968, a number of individuals were hand-picked (certainly not all those whose dossiers the Internal Affairs Ministry's „Jewish Section” had collected), and not only those columnists like Kałol, Kur, Gontarz, Machejek or others described as Zionists, to teach the general public a lesson. Those individuals were those who combined „nonconformity” or insufficient „integrity” with a high frequency of standing out as intellectuals rather than ordinary specialists in such or other discipline and whose scientific standing could make it easier for them to advertise unwanted ideas in the community of human science. The attacks were also launched on individuals who could not possibly be charged with active involvement

in spreading „revisionist” ideas, namely Stefan Morawski the aesthetician or Waław Mejbbaum the gnosiologist. Mejbbaum many years later demonstrated with his writings that he stood close to Stalinism and to the campaign of fighting independent humanist thinking. That was how he presented himself during the years of the Communist party’s fight against the Solidarity movement.

Anyone interested in the history of the Party campaign against human science in 1968 may be amazed at the stories of four members of the *Studia Socjologiczne* quarterly expelled from the journal. Zygmunt Bauman and Maria Hirszowicz were dismissed from Warsaw University and banned from finding jobs in their professions, thus forcing them out of Poland to trying to settle in the West as professional sociologists. Janusz Reykowski and Jerzy J. Wiatr remained in Poland, always joining the faction that was at the Communist party helm at the moment. Later they became faithful servants to the group that launched „martial law” in Poland, the group around Jaruzelski and Kiszczak. Or look at what happened to four philosophers: Leszek Kołakowski and Bronisław Baczko, who were docked of their posts at Warsaw University (though not at the Polish Academy of Sciences), and Krzysztof Pomian and Helena Eilstein, who were dropped from Warsaw University. Those philosophers were described as „the heart of darkness” in Polish philosophy and in socialist philosophy at the same time. The defamation campaign forced them to leave Poland.

Five arguments were adduced against the persecuted humanist scholars: 1) they thought nothing of Marxism or socialism; 2) the people’s tradition or wants had no meaning to them; 3) they promoted bourgeois ideas and concepts and sought to spread destructive „revisionist tenets” inside the Party; 4) they were all active in the ideological front in Stalinist times; and 5) as scholars, they were poor achievers. The last-named possibility reads funny not only in view of the real scholarly records of the persecuted and the expellees but also in regard to the skills and achievements of the vast majority of the defaming Party ideologues many of whom came forward in the guise of scholars.

In 1968, the Communist Party followed in its own footsteps of previous practices launching something like a „campaign to repair the style of work” (a Maoist purge of those elements in the Party with the wrong ideas) and something like a „great proletarian cultural revolution” (a Maoist destruction of what did not fit in the Great Helmsman’s doctrine or tactics).

March 1968 must also be studied in its cultural aspect. Party columnists, after all (policemen and informers, assistant professors and correspondents), wrote at length about culture, especially Polish culture. Gomułka’s cadres defended that culture bravely against Leszek Kołakowski or Cardinal Wyszyński, always conceiving of that culture as Soviet in substance and Polish in form. That is hardly surprising if you consider that Comrade Wiesław himself

(Gomułka) was a secret member of the VKP)B) all along. Who were being promoted, who were given the job of defamation, who sang the tone in the new human science which pacified the others nationalistically as well as socialistically? Answers to those questions lead one to the conclusion that it is perfectly fair to speak of a „dictatorship of the ignorant” also referring to the Party’s policy towards science. After all, the de-judeization of science and the adjurations of demons of „bourgeois science” or „revisionism” from science or the media were done not only by creeps and dimwits alone. Even leaving aside cases such as that of Professor Henryk Jabłoński who put his signature under decisions to sack people from their posts yet enjoys his status of ordinary member of the Polish Academy of Sciences to this day, one should recall the case of Professor Józef Chałasiński who, as editor of *Przegląd Socjologiczny*, released an issue of the journal which was both a chronicle of the struggle for Polish-cum-socialist science of the time and a praise of such practices.

Speaking of the harvest of 1968, two names of particular merit must be mentioned: Andrzej Werblan and Tadeusz Walichnowski. The former of the two was opposed to anything the scholarly community considered to be self-evident truths, and later he established himself as professor of political science in the Soviet style of „red academia.” The latter of the two headed an ethnic affairs section (including the „Jewish section”) in the headquarters of the Polish political police, produced anti-Jewish articles, and later established himself as a researcher with academic distinctions. Two more fighters on the front of struggle for a new nationalistic and socialist human science. One was Jan Szewczyk, who argued that the fight against Zionism was perfectly in tune with efforts to do justice to Ingarden’s phenomenology. The other was Kazimierz Kąkol, who combined his appointment as assistant professor in reward for his contribution to the defamation campaign with the promotion of a new type science in Party and police journals. To round up that group of activists of the fight, one should mention the Professor Zygmunt Rybicki, the unforgettable Deputy Rector and later Rector of Warsaw University, who was the most faithful ally of the gangs that beat up students in March 1968, and who broke up Adam Podgórecki’s sociology of law team in a fashion befitting the new-style professor of law.

The fight against Kołakowski and Baczko as men representing the pre-October 1956 period appears in a funny light when cast against the fact that a person like Jarosław Ładosz, who wrote in the Party daily *Trybuna Ludu* that it was only the March 1968 expulsions that gave Marxists freedom of expression, and long-standing resilient scholar of Soviet mentality was able to stalk proudly on the stage during the time of pacification. The year 1968 saw several strands of personal sequences unfolding side by side and intertwining with one another. Thus the sequence Gomułka – Kliszko – Kociołek – Kępa was joint with the sequence Gomułka – Moczar – Olszowski – Szlachcic – Kępa.

The year 1968 was also thought of as a time of bringing to reason those believing their positions in the Party were stable. The expulsion of Professors Schaff or Żółkiewski showed that no one could really be safe as long as the fight for power was under way. That year also saw the Party bashing some of those who subsequently got to be ardent preachers of the dictatorship of the Party in human science. Waclaw Mejbaum and Jan Kurowicki are two cases in point.

One more point: the period under discussion here saw the beginning of the end of Gomułka's team. Yet at the same time it saw the deeds Soviet prided themselves on escalate. The road led from March 1968 (with its inherent racism and destruction of human science) through August 1968 (armed intervention in Czechoslovakia) to December 1970 (truly Bolshevik genocide in Poland's coastal cities). It was that road, incidentally, from purging the armed forces from Zionists through dispatching troops to Czechoslovakia to commanding the armed forces in December 1970, that was taken general Jaruzelski, whom a former U.S. Defence Secretary described as „a Soviet general in a Polish uniform.”

5. The advantage of being a Jew as an enemy of the people and socialism. The fact that Jews were picked was not necessarily proof of ethnocentric emotions. Anti-Jewish actions should be interpreted as a sociotechnical ploy. Facts were manipulated to inculcate negative stereotypes and irrational resentment. Those actively engaged in the de-judeization campaign viewed Jews as „objective enemies.” Always and everywhere the Jew was seen to be causing harm to the Polish people and fighting socialism. The Jew was an „international Jew” (with no motherland of his own), a „cliquish Jew” (plotting against everyone), a „dishonest Jew” (collecting riches at the expense of ordinary people). Also, the Jew was seen as a Zionist, ready to ally himself with every „monster” and „demon” in order to rule over souls and appropriate treasures. What he presented as science was a lie. His methods of work amounted to Talmudism and deception.

The Jew made excellent stuff for an objective enemy as he can be recognized by his anthropological features. First of all, he is a polymorphous enemy of anything that is good and important to the national culture of socialist society. He is a „Zionist” as well as a „cosmopolitan,” and he feigns to be a Pole. He is a „Stalinist” and a „Trotskyite,” later a „revisionist,” and he pretends to be an advocate of socialism. Committed as he is to „ethnic cliquishness,” the Jew pretends to be a disinterested scholar. He advertises „Jewish rubbish” while preaching a cult of „good work” and high standards of academic and artistic creation. De-judeization made it possible to show in what way patriotism (faithfulness to People's Poland) differed from nationalism („Zionist” loyalty to Israel), or internationalism (solidarity with Moscow headquarters) from cosmopolitanism (links to centres of Anglo-American imperialism, neo-Nazi expansionism, but above all the Jewish

desertion of international friendship for a cult of gold and intimate ties to financial circles).

The fight for the de-judeization of Polish culture was a game for integrating the nation under the leadership of the Polish section of international Bolshevism. It was also an attempt to make science subservient and utilitarian under the rule of the Party bureaucracy. It was, lastly, an attempt to unmask those who were to blame for difficulties and problems impeding the „Polish road to socialism.” The de-judeization was designed to present the Party subordinated to the Moscow headquarters as a „Polish party,” a Party that was socialist and nationalistic at the same time, a Party that was honest in its endeavours to introduce socialism the Polish way and one that was authentically homogeneous.

The above is meant as a contribution to research concerning the replacement of elites in what was „real Leninism.” It is further a contribution to the study of Bolshevism as a „method in the game for power and consolidation of power,” which resorted to officially condemned techniques such as xenophobia (especially its anti-Jewish brand) or terrorism. This contribution also concerns the „operational code” Communists used in their attempts to gain complete and daily supremacy of „Partocracy” in the culture of cognition and creation.

Bibliography

1. A. Avtorkhanov, *Zagadka śmierci Stalina. Spisek Berii* (The mystery of Stalin's death. Beria's plot), London, 1989.
2. W. Bieńkowski, *Socjologia klęski* (A sociology of defeat), Paris, 1971.
3. H. Carrère d'Encausse, *Le Grand Défi. Bolsheviki et nations. 1917–1930*, Paris, 1987.
4. R. Conquest, *The Great Terror*, London, 1971.
5. M. Djilas, *Conversations with Stalin*, London, 1967.
6. A. Drawicz, *A/kos czyli szkoła podłości* (A/kos, or a school of villainry), in: *Łysenko i kosmopolici*, Warsaw, 1989.
7. J. Eisler, *Marzec 1968* (March 1968), Warsaw, 1991.
8. R. Girard, *Le bouc émissaire*, Paris, 1982.
9. M. Głowiński, *Marcowe gadanie. Komentarze do słów 1966–1971* (March talking. Comments on words, 1966–1971), Warsaw, 1991.
10. W. Jedlicki, *Klub Krzywego Koła* (The Angled Circle Club), Paris, 1963.
11. P. Johnson, *A History of the Jews*, London, 1987.
12. J. Karpiński, *Taternictwo nizinne* (Lowland mountaineering), Paris, 1988.
13. *Marzec '68*, special issue of the monthly *Krytyka*, Warsaw, 1989.
14. J. Z. Muller, *Komunizm, antysemityzm i Żydzi* (Communism, anti-Semitism and the Yews), in: *Konfrontacje*, No. 12, Warsaw, 1990.
15. J. Rapoport, *Na rubieżach dwóch epok. Delo vrachei 1953 goda* (At the turning-point of two epochs. The case of the doctors 1953, Moscow, 1988.
16. G. Watson, *Were the intellectuals duped?*, London, 1983.

Notes

¹ „Great Patience,” an expression Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn used to describe the practice of picking different groups and social circles one by one for humiliation and oppression.

² „Jewsection” was a special Jewish section in the Party with a job of separating „Jewish comrades” in order to win Jews over to the Party line. In his de-judeization of Party and state Stalin made use of the particular situation of Jews-Bolesheviks, as in a campaign against „enemies of the general line” he passed from „persuasion and discussion” to „beating and grubbing up.” H. Carrère d’Encausse wrote about „Jew-sections.”

³ „Inner Party,” George Orwell’s expression describing people who constitute the Party elite, are pulling the strings, and have a commanding status.