

They're All

ANTI-COMMUNISTS

By HAROLD LORD VARNEY



Now

IT WAS salty old Jim Watson of Indiana who used to say, "If you can't beat 'em, jine 'em."

Jim has long since gone to his reward but his dictum is still a political canon. Its most assiduous present practitioners are the ex-Communists.

Nowadays, seasoned anti-Communists who were fighting Stalinism before Roosevelt recognized the Soviets are becoming strangers in their own household. The whole anti-Communist movement is in a fair way of being taken over — lock, stock and barrel — by determined men and women, some of whom, only yesterday, were the prize exhibits of the nation's most notorious Communist fronts.

Ex-Communists and fellow travelers staff most of the newer and more heavily financed anti-Red movements which have mushroomed up since the beginning of the Cold War. They pontificate daily as "Communist experts," in

the columns of the leading newspapers. They are grinding out libraries of anti-Communist exposé books, most of which are snatched up eagerly by respected publishers. They are on the radio and TV. They are so omnipotent that some of them are even preparing purge lists to exclude from the anti-Communist fellowship the old anti-Stalinites who made the mistake of fighting Communism too soon.

All of which might be cause for rejoicing if we could be certain that all these eleventh-hour converts had actually got the Communism out of their systems. Unhappily, there is no such assurance. On the contrary, there are mounting indications that some, at least, of the new recruits to orthodoxy are slippery opportunists who are merely following the expedient trends. They have had no genuine change of heart.

This is not to say that the influx of the ex-Communists and the ex-Communist sympathizers into the

anti-Communist line-up has not been an electrifying development. The contribution which some of these ex-Leftists have made is tremendous. It was the Eugene Lyonses and the Max Eastmans who first tore the mask off the myth of a humanitarian Russia. It was Ben Gitlow who revealed to us the sordid meanness of life inside the Communist Party. It was J. B. Matthews who picked up the floundering Committee on Un-American Activities and transformed it into a pitiless instrument of truth. It was Whittaker Chambers and Louis F. Budenz and Elizabeth T. Bentley who lifted the whole case against the Communists from the fog-bank of rumor into documented, inescapable proof. Without the aid of such courageous witnesses, the anti-Communist movement would still be in the impotence of guesswork.

BUT not all who chatter about their anti-Communism have been so helpful.

Among the publications which I read regularly is a newspaper which bubbles with "anti-Communist" protestations — the New York *Post*. Undoubtedly, its "anti-Communist" pose fools many whose knowledge of Communism does not antedate the Marshall Plan. For older readers, however, the claim is bewildering.

The featured writers of the *Post* are a curious company of unreconstructed Left Wingers who formerly

went overboard for all the Russia-first extravagances of the war period, and who have suddenly blossomed forth as "anti-Communists" without passing through any intermediate stage of recantation.

Top editor of the *Post* is James Wechsler, about whom the kindest thing that could be said is that he resigned from the Young Communist League in 1937, where he was known under the party name of Arthur Lawson. But he continued to fellow-travel with the Communists in various front organizations until a few years ago, when it became obviously inexpedient to continue. (As late as 1940, he was one of 17 "Liberal Leaders" who signed a letter to the American Civil Liberties Union protesting against its exclusion of Communists from the offices of the Union.)

By-lined UN correspondent for the *Post* is Joseph P. Lash, ex-head of the Communist American Students' Union and the American Youth Congress, who was denied an appointment in Naval Intelligence during the war because of his Communist affiliations. Chief columnist is Max Lerner, most articulate exponent of the Russia-first line for over a decade, cited over and over again in government reports for pro-Communist activities and affiliations.

When the *Post* team gets through breast-beating over its own "anti-Communism," it goes to work on the slickest hatchet job against the

real anti-Communists that is now on exhibition: By a nonstop smear job on Senator Joe McCarthy, using every gutter trick to destroy the Senator's influence; by a no-holds-barred feud with Walter Winchell, which began only after the columnist launched an intensive campaign against the Soviet party line and its American followers; by an attempted smear job against Senator McCarran, built around the Nevada capers of a former employee of party-liner Vito Marcantonio; by constant derision of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; by a continuous needling of Chiang Kai-shek and his "corrupt" anti-Communist Chinese associates (these attacks have sunk to *pianissimo* in recent months); by a similar discrediting of President Syngman Rhee of Korea; by dropping the column of Dorothy Thompson when she began to call spades spades; by giving all the news breaks to Dean Acheson, Owen Lattimore, Bill Benton, Millard F. Tydings, and other monkey-wrench throwers in the current Washington investigations. (The *Post* delivered itself of the opinion that "all those who believe in freedom in this country are in the debt of Owen Lattimore.")

The loves of the *Post* are as revealing as the hates. The *Post* has its special orchids for the Americans for Democratic Action, Walter Reuther, the New York Liberal Party (the old Social Democratic Federation), the American Civil

Liberties Union, educators who defy loyalty oath acts, and for "civil rights" in its narrow, pressure-group version.

How much believable information on Communism the American public could extract from such an Alice-in-Wonderland editorial policy, it is difficult to state.

The *Post* is not cited as the only, or even the most glaring, offender against the truth. There are numerous other newspapers and magazines of national circulation which pay lip service to anti-Communism and which similarly mislead the people. They constitute a publicity phalanx which, wittingly or unwittingly, is today one of Stalin's prime assets in America.

It would be immature to assume that the hard-boiled controversialists who steer these publications don't know precisely what they are doing.

ANOTHER vehicle the confusionists use with deceptive skill is the widely publicized manifesto demanding soft treatment for Communists by the government. Such manifestoes are always issued in the name of "anti-Communism." And yet they invariably serve Stalinite ends in the particular situation in which they appear.

A case in point was the manifesto of 145 "anti-Communists" which appeared in the press on January 20, 1951 — the day after Senator McCarran announced the appointment of his subcommittee on public se-

curity. The manifesto started with a denouncement of Communists. It then proceeded to argue that the way Senator McCarthy fought the Communists (it did not mention his name but the inference was unmistakable) was the wrong approach and actually helped the Reds. It charged "star-chamber" tactics, and "distortion of the truth."

The comic relief in the incident was the names. Amid a sprinkling of *bona fide* anti-Communist names were such hoary veterans of fellow-traveler and Socialist movements as Alfred Baker Lewis, Roger N. Baldwin, Rex Stout, Reinhold Niebuhr, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Lewis Mumford, Sherwood Eddy, Evans Clark, and Dorothy Kenyon. These were the "gray-eyed people" who were laying down America's line to defeat Stalin's aggression.

AS THE Cold War with Russia sharpens throughout the world, nothing is more urgent than to reappraise the forces that are ostensibly on the anti-Communist side in the propaganda battle. Hitler was not the only power-dreamer who understood the value of the Fifth Column.

Long scrutiny of the tricks and dodges by which the bogus "anti-Communists" spread confusion reveals a number of constantly repeated behavior patterns by which we can recognize the type. An anti-Communist, through stupidity

or association, may fall into one or more of these attitudes, and still be a sincere anti-Stalinist. But when a self-styled "anti-Communist" exhibits them all, there can be little question of his masquerade.

LET us glance briefly at some of these patterns:

(1) The bogus "anti-Communists" are always fiercely anti-McCarthy and anti-McCarran. Their most poisonous diatribes are reserved for these upsetters of the Communist apple cart in Washington and the UN.

(2) When direct smears of "McCarthyism" fail, they always have a flank attack to fall back upon. This is the tricky argument that we must not employ McCarthyism because the Communists themselves want us to fight them that way.

Two of those who have recently used this gambit tellingly are Morris L. Ernst (in his "Report on the American Communist") and Herbert A. Philbrick. In Philbrick's case, the argument seems plausible because he was a member of the Communist Party until recently, and can assumedly testify from personal experience — although no possible way exists to check him. Of course, the argument is nonsense, but, as long as it throws doubt on the value of McCarthy and McCarran, it blunts the effectiveness of their investigations.

(3) They invariably raise the cry of "Russian propaganda." Nothing

has been such a damper upon a forthright American anti-Communist policy in recent years as this induced fear that we mustn't go too far, lest the Russians use our actions as fodder for their propaganda among the restless colonials, the colored races, and the satellites. This phobia has gripped the master minds of our Voice of America, who lecture us constantly on the necessity of following domestic policies which will look good in the propaganda battle with Moscow. The "pseudo-anti-Communist" is always an expert at plying this argument.

Nothing is so humiliating to American sovereignty as the suggestion that we cannot do as we please in our domestic policies lest the United Nations, or Britain, or Russian propaganda writers won't like it. By raising this bugaboo of "Russian propaganda," the bogus anti-Communists have succeeded in watering down American policies in repeated instances. They have persuaded us, for example, that we must pull our punches in China, in Korea, in Africa, and in the United Nations, to soothe foreign sensibilities. Against a realistic Russia, America is induced to fight frightened in every decisive trouble spot in the world.

(4) To obscure the target, they endeavor to keep alive the anti-fascist issue. In the face of a live Stalin, they are still beating the bones of a dead Hitler. There actually exists a "Society," headed by

a Columbia University professor, "To Prevent World War III," not by stopping Stalin but by enforcing a vengeful peace upon Germany. It may be of significance that the head of this organization — Professor Mark Van Doren — was also a sponsor of the March, 1949 Waldorf-Astoria "World Peace Conference," which the State Department announced was Communist-organized.

(5) They have always tearfully worried about the civil liberties of accused Communists. True, the civil liberties issue has worn rather thin since Mrs. Roosevelt wrote in her August 17, 1948 column that:

"Smearing good people like Laughlin Currie, Alger Hiss and others is, I think, unforgivable. Anyone knowing either Mr. Currie or Mr. Hiss, two people whom I happen to know fairly well, would not need any denial on their part to know that they were not Communists."

However, the self-styled "anti-Communists" are still shedding salt tears over the persecution of such worthies as Owen Lattimore, John Carter Vincent and Dr. Edward U. Condon.

When William W. Remington was first unmasked as a wartime member of the Soviet spy ring, the "anti-Communist" Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., chairman of the executive committee of the "anti-Communist" Americans for Democratic Action, became his indefatigable attorney, and extracted \$20,000 from the "anti-Communist" Robert Marshall

Civil Liberties Trust to finance the defense. The *New Yorker*, on May 21, 1949, published a 20-page article extolling the Remington defense as a victory for civil liberties. When Remington was found guilty of perjury recently, these exultant words were placed in rather absurd relief.

When the late Agnes Smedley was unmasked by General MacArthur's Tokyo office as a member of the Sorge Japanese Soviet spy ring, "anti-Communist" O. John Rogge, her attorney, stirred up such a storm of protest against the accusation on the radio and in the "anti-Communist" liberal press that a timid Army Public Information Division chief in Washington was induced to disavow the Tokyo statement. "Anti-Communist" Harold L. Ickes burst into print to declare that "no one who knows Miss Smedley would ever suspect that this courageous and intelligent American citizen has stooped so low as to be a spy for any country."

When Miss Smedley died in 1951, she willed her estate to General Chu Teh, chief of the Chinese Communist Army.

(6) They are usually supporters of world government, in some one of its proposed forms. Their particular enthusiasm is reserved for the "Point-4" program, and they would have the United States assume the responsibility for raising the living standards of the whole globe. "Anti-Communist" Henry A. Wallace was the original parent of this bright

share-the-wealth idea. In one of its later versions, "anti-Communist" Walter Reuther has proposed that the United States should bestow two trillion dollars abroad over the next century.

(7) They are virulently against General MacArthur, and they all rejoiced at the Truman-Acheson decision to recall him. MacArthur means to the crypto-anti-Communist a constant threat to Red China. To such "anti-Communists," it is better that the United States lose the Korean War, than that the hated Chiang Kai-shek return to the mainland.

(8) In Asian policy, their hopes are placed on India. Socialist Nehru, in their view, is a far-sighted statesman who "understands" the Russians, where we do not. Indian Ambassador Pannikar's double-faced maneuverings in Red China, both before and after the fall of the Chinese Nationalists, are eulogized. India's consistent stand against an anti-Communist bloc in South Asia is approved. The bogus "anti-Communist" is strong for more American aid for India, and less for the Philippines, Japan, Formosa and Thailand.

(9) Similarly, in Europe, he is anti-Spain, but he is trustfully pro-Tito.

These are some of the earmarks of the "anti-Communist" who is still keeping a tentative foot in the doorway of Stalinist approval.

However, there is another and

more certain way of identifying the half-hearted ex-Communist or ex-fellow traveler. This is by his attitude toward the current government anti-Communist effort.

The ex-Communist or ex-fellow traveler who is sincere in his re-orientation is willing to aid the government in such investigations as those of the Senate subcommittee on internal security, or the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or in the Department of Justice prosecutions. The ex-Communist who holds back from this manifest duty reveals the hollowness of his "anti-Communist" pretense.

ADMITTEDLY, it is not a happy experience, to a man of normal sensitivity, to be cast in the role of an informer. And yet this is a price which the ex-Communist must pay, if he is to be true to himself and to his nation.

Whittaker Chambers has said the definitive thing on this problem:

"If the ex-Communist truly believes that Communism is evil, if he truly means to struggle against it as an evil, and as the price of his once having accepted it, he must decide to become an informer; in that war which Communism insists on waging, and which therefore he cannot evade, he has one specific contribution to make — his special knowledge of the enemy. . . . For in the end, the choice for the ex-Communist is between shielding a small number of people who still actively further what he now sees to be evil,

or of helping to shield millions from that evil which threatens even their souls. Those who do not inform are still conniving at that evil."

We have had some striking cases of witnesses unwilling to bare their pasts in the hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations before the McCarran Committee.

Anyone who will plow through the wearisome pages of evasive, slippery, defiant testimony of an Edward C. Carter or an Owen Lattimore can have little doubt that these were men who had guilty knowledge which they were desperately trying to withhold from their government. In agreeable contrast with the Carter and Lattimore quibblings was the testimony of such men as Karl Wittfogel and Kenneth C. Colegrove before the same committee. Both Wittfogel and Colegrove had been equally mistaken with Lattimore about the Chinese Communists. The difference was that, having seen their error, they were eager to help their government throw the X-ray upon the subterranean causes of the ghastly China blunder. Carter and Lattimore were not.

And yet both Lattimore and Carter indignantly aver that they are "anti-Communists." They must be regarded as archetypes of the *sinister forces which were working, at the highest government levels, to stultify America's anti-Communist program.*

The ivory tower dweller may admire the fastidiousness of a Lil-

lian Hellman, who told the Committee on Un-American Activities that "I cannot and will not cut my conscience to fit this year's fashions." But a personal code which bars an American from aiding his government in time of peril is a luxury which no private citizen can afford. A nation of Miss Hellmans would inevitably go down before the dark forces which are abroad in the world today.

Imperfect as it is, America has no better yardstick for identifying the genuine anti-Communist than the yardstick which the American Legion and other patriotic organizations have approved — that the ex-Communist give his government the whole story of his career in Communism. Some masqueraders will slip through even this net. But the unwilling or half-truth witnesses will be screened out. Their refusal will stigmatize them for what they are, in the eyes of all fair-minded Americans.

AMERICA has gone far, in its crusade against subversives, since 1947 when Bert Andrews, of the New York *Herald Tribune*, received the Pulitzer Prize for ridiculing the loyalty probes in Washington as a "witch hunt." The time is past when those who raised the Communist issue could be sneeringly dismissed as "primitives" (a favorite epithet of Max Lerner), or smeared as potential "fascists." Today it is the pro-Communists who are on the

defensive, and who are fearsomely seeking the protective coloration of "anti-Communism."

And yet, some of the old confusionist spirit still survives in minds which should know better. An instance is the incredible recent editorial in the New York *Times* declaring that such a Johnnie-come-lately among organizations as the "Committee on the Present Danger" is prepared to take over the anti-Communist movement and give it a "respectability" which it has lacked "because of abuses by well-meaning zealots, more or less cynical demagogues, and those who make anti-Communism a profession."

The sheer impudence of such a statement may be realized when we recall that these "zealots" and the "professionals" are the ones who unmasked Alger Hiss, forced Service, Vincent, Clubb, Brunauer, Duran, Stone, Keeney, and Marzani out of the State Department, drove Remington and Lee from the Commerce Department, forced 48 Communist-minded officials out of the UN, exposed the Communist influence in Hollywood and on the New York stage, induced Phil Murray to purge the Communist unions out of the CIO, broke the grip of Communism on the New York schools, while accomplishing other chores of major importance in the last five years.

Contrariwise, there is grim humor in the fact that the Committee on the Present Danger is headed by

James B. Conant, who, as president of Harvard, kept 76 teachers on his faculty after they had been revealed as members or sponsors of organizations cited by the Department of Justice or the Committee on Un-American Activities as "Communist fronts."

Such leadership may be "respectable," but we shudder to think where it would take the anti-Communist cause.

Between the planned confusionism of the bogus "anti-Communists" and the babe-in-the-woods naïveté of the Dr. Conants and the other good people who have just discovered the Communist problem, America's battle against Stalinism will face many pitfalls in the coming years.

We are all anti-Communists now, but some of us have our fingers crossed.



» You are underrating the President (Lincoln). I grant that he lacks higher education and his manners are not in accord with European conceptions of the dignity of a chief magistrate. He is a well-developed child of nature and is not skilled in polite phrases and poses. But he is a man of profound feeling, correct and firm principles and incorruptible honesty. His motives are unquestionable, and he possesses to a remarkable degree the characteristic, God-given trait of this people, sound common sense. — *Carl Schurz*

» It ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfaction, to theirs; and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interests to his own. — *Edmund Burke*

» Of "Americanism" of the right sort we cannot have too much. Mere vamping and boasting become a nation as little as a man. But honest, outspoken pride and faith in our country are infinitely better and more to be respected than the cultivated reserve which sets it down as ill-bred and in bad taste ever to refer to our country except by way of deprecation, criticism, or general negation.

— *Henry Cabot Lodge*

DOWN *to* EARTH

By Alan Devoe

LADY, A HORSE



IN EVERY gravely troubled time in human history, every profound crisis of confusion, desperate men turn childish.

The "adult" layer of us — the thinking man, reflective man, insighted man — is only, as Henry Thoreau used to say, our "top-head." In time of tranquillity, the overrule and captancy of this top-head may be maintained with reasonable consistence. But underneath it there is the huge, dark, disorganized jumble of our pre-rational self: the self of blind instinct and blood-impulse, the self of childishness, of pre-childishness, even of pre-humanness, going back and back, deep and down, to the most ancient stirs and thrusts of mindless organic life. The reasoning and intellective "I" that presides as our psyche's organizing principle holds a difficult and uneasy tenure over a vast pack of eager infantilities, barely suppressed rages of instinct, leashed drives of animal urgency and hankerings of childish wish. In good times, we keep this

chaotic zoo under control. Holding (as it were) in one hand the whip of reason and in the other the chair of will, we direct and subdue our cageful of psychic creatures, and we may look upon them with a cool smile of mastership.

It is a thing of some effort and strain, at best, to keep always alertly holding the whip and tilting the chair at the ready. It becomes much harder if there are factors in our life to confuse us, to shake our self-confidence, to make us uneasy and unsure, possibly to hint to us that the whole stern performance is only a rather empty thing, scarcely worth doing. When such dismaying and unsettling factors as this become strong enough in the individual life of one of us, we may suddenly, in a frantic gesture, throw down the whip and the chair and in effect cry out: "Oh, what's the *use*. Let's just let the animals loose. Let's just let them take over." In a gesture of easeful surrender and release, the "I" withdraws; and now — the arena is in entire charge of a tiger of rage, a lion of weeping, a padding leopard