

(Originally published in *Comment* [Montclair State College, NJ], vol. 3, nos. 3-4 (Spring, 1984), pp. 24-29)

A Lethal Form Of Lying : Notes on Anti-Semitism and Cold War Scholarship

**Grover Furr
English Department, Montclair State College**

The claims of the American business, governmental, and educational elites to be firmly opposed to anti-Semitism are often accepted at face value. This is a grave error. Like other forms of racism, anti-Semitism remains a useful tool with which the U.S. elites attempt to manipulate the population.

During the Iranian hostage crisis of 1979-81, for example, blatant anti-Iranian racism was encouraged in the mass media and by elite institutions. In New Jersey alone Iranian bus drivers were fired in Jersey City and an Iranian-born high school senior was prevented from delivering the valedictory address at a Jersey shore high school because of teacher protests that her national origin made her unworthy.

Acts of racist violence against Iranians were, in essence, endorsed through uncritical portrayal in the news broadcasts of the major networks. The editor of the *Columbia Journalism Review*, a major liberal intellectual journal, was fired simply for allowing into print an article that tried to explain Iranian hostility to the United States. President Jimmy Carter waited almost a month before voicing perfunctory criticism of violent acts against Iranians in the U.S. This should be understood in the same way as similar denunciations of racism from the Soviet ruling stratum.

Along with anti-communism, racism is the major technique used to arouse mass support for the ruling elite's imperialist foreign policy. Despite pious professions to the contrary, a little scrutiny reveals that anti-Semitism too remains an important arrow in the elite's quiver of demagogic techniques. The U.S. educational elite contribute to anti-Semitism by, among other things, covering up the anti-Semitism of major U.S. allies.

Anti-Semitism In The Polish *Solidarity* Union

In an article in the June 2, 1983 issue of *The New York Review of Books*, Professor Abraham Brumberg acknowledged the existence of anti-Semitism in the "*Solidarity*" union.

A small group of *Solidarity* members in Warsaw, calling themselves 'genuine Poles,' conducted a vigorous campaign against 'aliens' (i.e. Jews) who had wormed their way into the union's highest councils, especially its board of advisors. And in the late summer of 1981 Marian Jurczyk, the head of the Szczecin *Solidarity* chapter, openly speculated in one of his speeches about the preponderance of "zydki" ("kikes") in the country's ruling elite.

Brumberg then implies that the *Solidarity* union handled this racism properly:

Marian Jurczyk was denounced by Walesa and censured by the editors of the union's *Solidarity Weekly*.

This claim is false. Walesa did not mention Jurczyk by name in any known interview. In the only one reported in the Western press in which he mentioned anti-Semitism in the *Solidarity* union, given the day before martial law was imposed, Walesa simply denied that anti-Semitism was a problem in *Solidarity* at all (see *The Washington Post*, Jan. 9, 1982) -- this despite the long history of anti-Semitism in Poland!

As for the "censure" by "the editors of the union's '*Solidarity Weekly*'" of Jurczyk's speech: according to *Solidarity Weekly* (*Tygodnik Solidarnosci*) of November 13, 1981, the following occurred at a meeting of the National Commission of *Solidarity* on November 3-4, 1981:

The chairman of the discussion read a letter which the presidium had received from the Secretary of the Editorial Board of *Solidarity Weekly*, Krzysztof Wyszowski: "...M. Jurczyk stated that 3/4 of the Polish authorities are Jews, who are enemies of our state. I would like to draw the attention of the Commission the fact that public racist statement by a high-ranking and popular union officer burdens the whole Union... It is a grave blow to the good name of the Union..." M. Jurczyk communicated his response considerably later, in the afternoon. He said: "I will not deny any responsibility. I respect all peoples, independently even of the color of their skin. I said that 3/4 of them are Jews, but I did not say that the Jews were guilty. Now I can say nothing more." A. Slownik concluded the Jurczyk affair by stating that it should end with this answer.

This is no "censure" at all. Jurczyk retracted nothing, and discussion was simply ended.

But there is more. For the Commission knew that Jurczyk was lying when he claimed he had not said the Jews were "guilty." The transcript of Jurczyk's remarks, made on October 25 at a furniture factory in Trzebatow (a city in Szczecin province, in the north of Poland) was carried in the newspaper *Glos Wybrzeza* (Voice of the Seacoast) in the November 4, 1981 issue. In that transcript, taken from a tape recording, Jurczyk says:

Yes -- they [*nasi panowie*, "our bosses"; Jurczyk is speaking of the authorities] are three-fourths Jews, betrayers, as I said, of our fatherland. And this must be changed...

Finally, the same Krzysztof Wyszowski whose letter to the National Commission Brumberg takes as a "censure" wrote an article in the November 28, 1981 issue of *Solidarity Weekly* in which he blames the Polish authorities for using the "Jurczyk affair" to try to split *Solidarity*:

Those who can serve as a lever for the split are known. At the present time it is chiefly Jurczyk and Gwiazda. Jurczyk repeated nonsense that he heard from obliging deceitful advisors... P.S. When Passent [writer for the Polish government newspaper *Polityka* and critic of *Solidarity*] rebuked Marian Jurczyk, who spoke evil about Jews and that "the Soviet Union is our false friend", Lulinski [commentator for the Polish Communist Party's newspaper *Trybuna Ludu*] rebukes Jan Josef Lipski [KOR member and top *Solidarity* advisor] for his fine reference to "Polish megalomania and xenophobia", where he defends the Jews.

In other words, Wyszowski says Jurczyk's racism is just "stupid" and he is being "used" by those who would split the union. But Wyszowski's own letter to the *Solidarity* National Commission had only complained of the damage done by Jurczyk's remarks. And the Commission, as we have seen, neither criticized Jurczyk nor took any action when Jurczyk refused even to retract his remarks.

Jurczyk was a member of the *Solidarity* National Commission and candidate (against Walesa) for President at the September-October 1981 Gdansk Convention. What union or other organization in the United States, for example, would have permitted such an outspoken anti-Semite to remain in high national office, even if just for appearance's sake? Yet Jurczyk's statement was quickly "forgotten."

More: in the November 10, 1983 issue of the *New York Review of Books*, Adam Michnik, liberal member of KOR still imprisoned in Poland, complains "what kind of amnesty is it" if it leaves Jurczyk in prison? (For further discussion of the fascist nature of *Solidarity*, see my essay "The AFT, the CIA, and *Solidarnosc*" in the Spring, 1982 issue of *Comment*).

The *New York Review of Books* left out of its biographical blurb on Brumberg the fact that he was formerly the editor of the State Department journal *Problems of Communism*. Brumberg, like other "experts on anti-Semitism," are far more interested in helping the racist U.S. elite against their essentially similar Soviet counterparts than in fighting racism. This is why supposed "fighters against anti-Semitism" like Brumberg, and the journals that cover for them like the *New York Review of Books*, make light the racism of anti-Soviet fascists while attacking the pro-Soviet fascists' racism. When given a choice between being anti-racist and fronting for the pro-US. racists in the Cold War, Brumberg and his ilk apologize for racism every time.

Anti-Semitic Character Of The 'Heroic' Hungarian Revolt Of 1956

The American intellectual elite have tried to cover up the fascist, anti-semitic nature of the Hungarian revolt against the pro-Soviet regime in 1956. On the whole they have been successful. The "Freedom Fighters" of Hungary are often praised as though they were morally superior to the Soviet stooges they battled. The facts reveal otherwise.

In 1957 Professor Richard Stephenson of the Rutgers Sociology Dept. intensively studied several dozen Hungarian émigrés and “freedom fighters” who had escaped during the revolt. Others were interviewed by the Columbia University Oral History Project. The results showed that “to a significant extent the refugees interviewed after the uprising were anti-Jewish” (David Irving, *Uprising*, London 1983). In the words of Rutgers sociologist Jay Schulman, “The Communist leaders were perceived as Jews by almost 100 percent of the people we have seen.” According to a Hungarian Jewish émigré, “The people connected their miseries with the Jews...The people saw only the twenty Jews who were among a hundred [Hungarian] Communist Party members, not the other eighty.”

The “heroic” Cardinal Mindszenty, Primate of Hungary, was at least as outspokenly anti-semitic as his Polish counterparts Cardinals Hlond and Wyszynski. According to a U.S. intelligence report of November 1945 Mindszenty had been famous for his anti-semitic views as Bishop of Veszprem, and for failing to protest at the deportation of the Hungarian Jews in 1944.

Anti-communist historians usually “explain” this widespread anti-Semitism as being a result of the fact that many of the leaders of Hungarian Communism were Jews. This is racist nonsense, a good example of “blaming the victim.” The Hungarian ruling classes and the Catholic Church had made anti-Semitism a part of Hungarian culture for centuries. The German Nazis at once blamed Jews for communism (communism was but a part of the “international Jewish conspiracy”) and for capitalism (Jews had “acquisitive instincts” and stole business from “honest Germans”).

The same had been true in Poland. Like Poland, pre-war Hungary was a fascist, Nazi-like dictatorship in which anti-Semitism, along with other forms of racism against minorities (e.g. Rumanians in Hungary, Ukrainians in Poland) was institutionalized. During the 1930's and '40's the Communist movement opposed anti-Semitism more strongly than any other political force (including the Zionist movement; see below). As Menachem Begin wrote in 1951,

the Soviet Government fought anti-Semitism with characteristic pertinacity...The truth is that the Soviet Government is anti-anti-semitic.

Naturally many Jews were attracted to the communist movement. Many others welcomed the Red Army after the war and joined the various communist parties. Many of the leaders of the communist movement in Hungary as elsewhere were of Jewish origin. This fact neither explains nor excuses the anti-semitic character of the anti-communists, any more than Hitler's racism was “justified” by the fact that there were many prominent Jews in Weimar Germany.

Little is written about the anti-Semitism of the *Solidarity* union in Poland or of the Hungarian “freedom fighters” by Western historians. Small wonder that most intellectuals believe these movements are fundamentally different in nature from the Soviet regime. Apparently this is part of the apparatus of deception intended to prove

that the anti-Soviet forces of the world are morally superior to the pro-Soviet regimes and so worthy of support.

Anti-Semitism In The Zionist Movement

To anyone familiar with the history of the US elites the efforts of American historiography to hide the racism of anti-Soviet and pro-US forces should not be surprising. But that the Zionist movement itself has historically been as anti-Semitic, in essential ways, as any fascist will shock many, so well has this fact been concealed by "scholarship."

I recall the sense of amazement I felt when I learned of the involvement of the Zionist movement in helping SS Colonel Adolf Eichmann ship 500,000 Hungarian Jews to the death camps. Despite universal condemnation in the "respectable" press of Ben Hecht's book *Perfidy*, and later, of Hannah Arendt's *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, the truth could not be entirely squelched. Recently even *The Jerusalem Post* publicized the fact that Yitzhak Shamir, successor to Begin as Israeli prime minister, was involved in seeking "an alliance with the official representatives of Nazi Germany during World War II and the Holocaust" (Int. ed., Sept. 18-24, 1983). Liberal representatives of Zionism are increasingly concerned with what Professor Y. Leibovitz, editor of the *Encyclopaedia Hebraica*, last year called "Judeo-Nazism"; witness the publicity given to Amos Oz's recently published book, *In the Land of Israel*.

But that mainstream Zionism has historically promoted views of Jews identical to those of the most vicious anti-Semites -- this will be met with shocked disbelief in most quarters. Yet a book published this year documents it with convincing thoroughness.

Lenni Brenner, author of *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators* (Lawrence Hill, 1983) is apparently a Trotskyist of some kind. His own analysis of the evidence is often faulty. But the evidence itself is damning. Some of his citations from the Zionist press:

It used to be fashionable for Zionist speakers (including the writer) to declare from the platform that 'To be a good Zionist one must be somewhat of an anti-Semite ...' (Chaim Greenberg, editor of the labor Zionist *Jewish Frontier*, 1942) [\[link to citation\]](#)

The Jew is a caricature of a normal, natural human being, both physically and spiritually. As an individual in society he revolts and throws off the harness of social obligations, knows nor order nor discipline. (*Hashomer Hatzair*, journal of a Zionist youth group, December 1936) [\[link to citation\]](#)

The fact is undeniable that the Jews collectively are unhealthy and neurotic. (*Jewish Call*, 1935) [\[link to citation\]](#)

Brenner cites more briefly many other statements by Zionist leaders and writers. An example:

For Micah Yosef Berdichevsky the Jews were "not a nation, not a people, not human." To Yosef Chaim Brenner they were nothing more than "Gypsies, filthy dogs, inhuman, wounded, dogs." To A.D. Gordon his people were no better than "parasites, people fundamentally useless." (Brenner. p. 23) [\[link to citation\]](#)

Such statements are as racist from the pen of Jewish writers as they would be from non-Jews.

These and many other citations in Brenner's remarkable book show that the roots of "Judeo-Nazism" and Zionist anti-Semitism go back to the beginnings of the Zionist movement. Amos Oz's book examines the resentment of Sephardic Jews against the racist treatment afforded them by the Israeli elite, overwhelmingly of European origin.

The lesson is clear. The elite groups in American society "attack" anti-Semitism not wherever it appears. but only where it suits cold-war strategies. Thus Soviet anti-Semitism is loudly denounced. while that of the Hungarian, Polish, and Zionist forces is hushed up because they are useful allies in the cold war against the Soviets.

Does the publicity given to Brenner's book, or Oz's, or David Irving's recent work, denote an increased dedication on the part of elite publishing houses and journals to exposing anti-Semitism where it has hitherto been all but hidden? I fear the opposite is true. It rather coincides with increasing tensions between the Israeli ruling elite and that of the United States. These tensions can only increase, leading to a sharp break between Israel and the U.S. in the future.

At that time (and, in preparation for it. well before then) anti- Semitism will again be openly promoted to "justify" the turn of U.S. foreign policy towards the (equally racist) Arab states. As in the Iranian hostage crisis the U.S. elite will use racism to crush opposition, this time from Jewish groups to the shift in foreign policy. Those who, for whatever reason, belittle, ignore, or apologize for the racism of the U.S. or Zionist elites are unwittingly helping to set the stage for a renewed anti-Semitic program. Only unyielding, multiracial opposition to all forms of racism and the business, governmental, and intellectual elites who benefit from it constitutes genuine opposition to racism.