

the Cominform. These items were all "little sins" in themselves. Added up, over the months they amounted, I think, to a rather "big sin," a sin of omission (as shown above) as well as of commission. Underlying all the good works there was a picture of the USA as the land of huge, vulgar wealth, and of abject poverty; of sex, lack of culture, and plenty of cash—and so on. It is clever picture-editing, I suppose, to show Red Army soldiers in Potsdam (German HQ of the NKVD) fondling their baby carriages and, a few issues later, show American GIs fondling their looted Leica cameras. That is all very innocent fun if published in New York; it takes on a very different meaning in Munich. I repeat, therefore, that *Heute* was an extremely "blunt . . . democratic weapon."

2. I do not believe Mr. Norden to be a Communist, and I did not say he was. I said he had been a member of several organizations, including the ALP. Rep. Dondero who, as I indicated in my article, made these allegations, also stated that Mr. Norden had been (a) Chairman of the City-Wide Tenants' Council (apparently a CP front); (b) member of the Consumers National Federation (apparently CP dominated); (c) member, Board of Directors, N.Y. Conference for Inalienable Rights (apparently a CP front); (d) translator of books by Czech Communist F. C. Weiskopf and *National Guardian* contributor Max Werner; (e) member of apparently CP dominated Unions. None of these facts is in any way conclusive in itself. Added up, they represent a pattern which, it was my thesis, should have made Mr. Norden unfit to edit the principal US picture-propaganda organ in Germany. AMG did not think so, and that prompted my article. I have no axe to grind against Mr. Norden personally. His appointment simply happened to be an outstanding example of a mistaken policy.

Mr. Norden recalls his Army loyalty checks, but seems to have forgotten that the Navy discharged him in 1942 after two weeks of service because, according to its Bureau of Personnel, Mr. Norden "had, while in New York City, close and active association with and in behalf of groups considered to have interests inimical to those of the United States." I don't believe the Navy ever discharged a man for slum clearance.

## A Correction:

Sir:

Several weeks ago. Mr. Sam Warhaftig, an official of Military Government in Germany, was returned to this country under suspicion of disloyalty, and, presumably, for a hearing in Washington. Since my article in the last issue of *POLITICS* indirectly referred to certain events within Mr. Warhaftig's sphere of activities (without mentioning Mr. Warhaftig's name), I met with him a few days ago. As a result of our conversation I feel that I should correct and clarify several statements in my article:

1. Mr. Warhaftig's position in MG was not as important as I had thought. He was merely a member, and later the head of the Elections and Political Parties Branch.

2. Mr. Warhaftig states that he not only did not select, but actually disapproved of Venedey and Mueller, and that Venedey in turn disapproved of him. He further states that, while he did persuade other Germans to serve in the Hesse Government, neither Venedey nor Mueller needed persuasion.

3. Mr. Warhaftig indicates that only part of the German Police of Hesse was under the direction of the Ministry of the Interior: The Gendarmerie, including State Troopers and Border Guards; and that it was, further, supervised not by his Branch of MG, but by the Public Safety Branch.

4. Mr. Warhaftig admits that there existed innumerable rumors and polemics against him among certain groups of Germans, but that democratic, anti-Stalinist Germans and Americans saw in him a trustworthy friend. He documented this statement with impressive proof.

5. Mr. Warhaftig knows that he has been under a loyalty investigation for over two years. He once saw eight specific charges against him, seven of which seemed far-fetched to me as he recalled them. The eighth concerned his friendship with a prominent German Communist, a relationship which seemed to me to

show an astonishingly naive attitude in a man holding an important MG post.

My feeling after my talk with Mr. Warhaftig was that I was mistaken in believing that he had a part in the pro-Stalinist MG decisions which I described. But while I was impressed by his self-avowed good intentions, I found it upsetting to know that a man with Mr. Warhaftig's political insouciance was fighting the democratic fight for us in Germany.

New York City, Feb. 12, 1949

PETER BLAKE

*Editor's Footnote: Since Mr. Blake wrote the above—a copy of which he made available to the Army Loyalty Board—the Board has suspended Mr. Warhaftig without pay; he is preparing an appeal, at his own expense. I may add (1) I agree with Mr. Blake's political estimate of Mr. Warhaftig, but (2) the Army Loyalty Board's procedure was stupid and unjust: not one definite name or fact was cited in the charges, nor did the defendant have a chance to confront his accusers. Nothing, so far, has been proved one way or the other by this absurd and outrageous mock trial; it can benefit only the Communists.*

## Is There a Pacifist Dilemma?

Sir:

In the first part of his "dilemma" statement in the last issue of *POLITICS*, the editor seems to me to confuse considerations relating to Stalinist versus democratic ideologies and values, and considerations relating to the power struggle between Russia and the United States. The result is to give a misleading picture of the role of the USA in the power struggle and needlessly to give plausibility to the idea that war against Russia might after all be the lesser evil.

Stalinism, we are told, is the chief enemy. If this means that the values of the Judeo-Christian, democratic way of life are to be preferred to and maintained against the values in Stalinist totalitarianism, that is a correct statement and its importance can hardly be exaggerated. But even in this field it must be noted that the practice does not—fortunately—fully accord with the theory in Russia, where life does not represent unrelieved evil; and that in the Western world the practice unfortunately falls far short of the profession. Furthermore, war is the one way in which democratic and humane, or Christian, values cannot possibly be preserved.

To go on from there to say that "in the many conflicts between USA and USSR since 1945" it is the former that enlists one's preference, seems to me a non-sequitur and utterly misleading. Here we are dealing with the mores of Russia and U.S. in the power struggle and the basic fact is that they are two sides of the same coin. Neither would exist or behave in anything like its present form without the other. Over against Russian behavior in Eastern Europe, conflicts in the U.N. and so on, you can attack the American use of the atomic bomb in completely inexcusable and irresponsible fashion, the equally inexcusable and irresponsible stockpiling of such weapons, the adventure in Greece and Turkey, the taking over of the Atlantic, Pacific, Mediterranean and way stations as American lakes, the refusal to establish trusteeship in the Pacific islands, and so on. To say that one or other is, on this level, the main enemy is to utter an irrelevancy. Here the war-making, conscripting, power-state is the enemy. The fatal thing is to direct the attention of people in either nation to the militarism of the other. Each people must address itself to the destruction of its own militarism. As Lenin taught, the results which may flow therefrom will not all be pleasant but they will be verily "the lesser evil."

This leads to my only other observation. The only chance there is for averting World War III and/or the spread of totalitarianism over the world is to give the Russian people a chance to complete their revolution which in its inception was of course aimed at achieving the prophetic vision of a class-less and warless world. Negatively, it is impossible for that revolution to be accomplished under the continued threat of war and capitalist expansionism from without. This strengthens the counter-revolution. Only a non-violent people's movement which consists of people who refuse to be dupes or slaves of their own national militarism and expansionism can successfully appeal to the Rus-

sian people to refuse any longer to be the dupes and slaves of Stalinist militarism.

The editor incorrectly phrases his dilemma when he speaks of violence and non-violence both seeming impractical. He himself makes it clear that violence and war are both evil and impractical, whereas non-violence is right and necessary. The "dilemma" then is not a speculative one or one which can be resolved by argument or research. It has to be resolved by and in action. The building of the non-violent revolutionary movement must begin. And in such a dilemma the only ones who can walk at all are those who are willing to walk by faith and not by sight.

A. J. MUSTE

### A Reply by the Editor:

Dearlly as I should like to be persuaded by the above, I cannot quite manage it. Maybe it is because I am not willing to walk by faith and not by sight. Such faith as I have been able to preserve is based entirely on my brain working on the evidence supplied by my senses; the religious vision which guides A. J. Muste's steps is, in me, blind.

The bulk of his letter fortunately, contains sight, not faith, arguments. They are, briefly, that while the *values* professed by the Western bourgeois democracies are admittedly superior to those professed by Soviet Russia, the actual *practices*, both at home and abroad, are not importantly different. If this is true, then clearly there is no reason to prefer the West to the East, since neither he nor I are foolish enough to be impressed by mere protestations of virtue when they are contradicted by actions. But precisely the point at issue is whether there is or is not an important qualitative difference (from our mutual point of view as radicals) between the *actual* social institutions and the *actual* foreign policies of USA and those of USSR. In my article, and in "USA v. USSR" in the preceding issue, I tried to show that there really IS such a difference, by contrasting the two social and political systems, in their actual functioning and not at all just in their ideologies. I regret that Muste has not tried to marshal this kind of evidence in support of his contrary view: that the differences are *not* of such importance. If he or some one else can do this, then the dilemma is resolved: two ethically symmetrical power-systems confront each other; we don't have to worry about which will prevail; and we can wholeheartedly and single-mindedly concentrate on "the building of the non-violent revolutionary movement." But if there IS an important qualitative difference between the two antagonists, then the dilemma is unresolved. I agree wholly with Muste that a third world war would probably mean the end of all we both hold dear, that the Russian people must make their own revolution against the Kremlin, and that war would have the same effect as it did on the German people: it would bind them all the closer to their oppressors. In fact, I said all these things in the article under discussion. In fact, it is precisely because these things are true, and because walking-by-faith pacifists like Muste are unable or unwilling to demonstrate that the two conflicting social systems are really "two sides of the same coin," that we sight-walkers are in the dilemma we are in.

Finally: Muste thinks I "confuse considerations relating to Stalinist versus democratic ideologies, and considerations relating to the power struggle between Russia and the United States." But, as his letter shows, what he is really objecting to is not a *confusion* of these two kinds of considerations but rather a *relation* of them. I fear that Muste's religiosity leads him to make an unhealthy separation between values and action. If I am right in believing that the *realization in action* of democratic values goes much farther in the West than in the East, then a corresponding difference in power politics must, and in fact does, follow.

### WHAT PAPER D'YA READ? OR: WHO'S HIDING WHAT?

... Miss Bjurstroem won the title, "Miss Sweden of 1948," in her country's annual beauty contest. She was disqualified at Paris last summer in a contest to select "Miss Europe" because she had concealed the fact of her marriage. ("N.Y. Herald-Tribune" Feb. 13)

... Betty Bjurstroem was chosen "Miss Sweden" last year, only to be disqualified later from the "Miss Europe" contest because she was wearing falsies. ("N.Y. Daily News," Feb. 13)

## Here & Now

a department dedicated to the possible

### A Modern Schweik

*Editor's Note: A reader sends in the following letter, from a German friend of his who during the war showed that even Hitler's army was not impervious to Schweikism. We print it here as a reminder that (a) the Nazi system was not so monolithic as its architects would have liked it to be; and (b) cunning and evasion are always at the service of the dissenting individual confronted by the warmaking State, whether German or American. "By the way," adds our correspondent, "my friend Ernst some years earlier got himself released from a concentration camp by cutting his wrist so expertly that everybody thought he was going to die; actually, there was lots of blood but no danger at all to life and limb!"*

*We do not give Ernst's last name because he is now in the Soviet zone, and may soon again have to do his stuff.*

In 1940 I was called to the draftboard (Wehrmusterung) for the first time. I told the chief physician that I had been suffering from epileptic fits since my 15th year. He asked me to produce documents to prove this, but I behaved like somebody who doesn't need written proofs. When they called me the fourth time, they themselves had written to my physician. Well, the man had written something that was neither fish nor fowl. But in the meantime I had gotten a job as a worker in a propeller factory. In September 1944 they got me after all and I was finally drafted. I was assigned to the airforce and played the "good soldier." Only I couldn't shoot, simply couldn't. When I fired my first blank cartridge I was so scared that I dropped my gun. The startled sergeant ordered two soldiers to escort me on a walk to calm me down. The same thing happened during sharpshooting practice. The sergeant had left it to me whether I wanted to come along or not. I insisted that I wanted to try it again. Even the lieutenant in person took an interest in my case, yet it was all in vain. I almost wept for shame and the lieutenant did his best to console me. After this, I was sent to the carpenter shop. All of a sudden I heard a machinegun fire a few shots in the shed next to ours. I immediately dropped under the bench. The sergeant heard of this accident. From then on, whenever there was going to be some explosion, I received orders to go into the airraid shelter before the explosions started. The foreman was told that he must remind me of this so that I shouldn't forget.

Sergeants and other noncoms didn't hate me at all, they just knew that they couldn't use me. There was no order which I didn't execute in a completely wrong manner. They all tried their luck with me, but with no success. There are certain things which are not supposed to ever happen to a soldier; the dog tag, the paybook and the rifle, for example, are never supposed to be lost. I lost all of them and this within one single week. To make up for the loss, I went into the sergeants' office with a huge bunch of safety pins and told him that I had found them. The next day during the roll call he duly announced the find to the assembled men. I very timidly raised my hand