The extermination of the overwhelming majority of Polish Jews in the Holocaust by the Germans in occupied Poland did not end anti-Semitism in Poland. Jewish emigration from Poland increased following the Kielce pogrom in 1946. It is difficult to dispute in general the conclusion that the demoralization and inhumanity experienced during the war, the transfer of some Jewish property, and the relentless Nazi racial propaganda took its toll, leaving many psychological scars on postwar Polish society.

The Żydokomuna (Jew-Communism) myth gained especially powerful resonance with the subsequent forced establishment of communist rule in Poland. The Polish version of this stereotype has its genesis in the interwar period. And anti-Semitism in Poland has more ancient historical antecedents.

Stalin’s wartime and postwar nationalities and cadres policy, at least as applied to the Polish case, tended to prefer those who had taken Soviet citizenship and Soviet party membership as well as ‘comrades of Jewish origins’ to many important posts. Stalin did more than promote ethnic particularism among the nationalities under his control. He became an effective and ruthless manipulator of the nationality of party cadres in the Soviet party, the foreign parties of the Comintern, and later most of the ruling communist parties of Soviet-East Europe. The peculiarities and zigzags of Soviet nationality policy, which had a direct impact on cadre policies throughout the Soviet bloc, was not merely exported to the communist states of Eastern Europe. It had become an integral part of the mindset of many East European communists long before they had seized power of their respective states.

Poland had been “enemy number 1” in the 1920’s and Stalin ensured Poles remained his enemies. Khrushchev later spoke to Poland’s leading communists about Stalin’s personal distrust of Poles, including Polish communists. In a secret speech Khrushchev gave extemporaneously at the 6th plenum of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers’ Party (PUWP) on 20 March 1956 in Warsaw, where he had attended the funeral of Boleslaw Bierut -- Poland’s Stalinist party boss died in Moscow on 12 March -- the new Soviet leader explained: “You should understand. I have a lot of Polish friends. And [Stalin] made me a Pole. Stalin asked me:
“What’s your last name?” I said: “Khrushchev.” [Stalin:] “Your last name ends like a Polish one with [one line blacked out in text] ski.” I said: “Who knows. I lived for a long time as Khrushchev, and now its-ski.” Comrades, I was standing near Yezhov, and Stalin said: “Yezhov said it.” Yezhov replied: “I didn’t.” [Stalin:] “How is it you didn’t say it? When you were drunk, you said it to Malenkov.” Malenkov passes by. Stalin says: “Did Yezhov tell you that Khrushchev’s Polish?” He says: “No.” You see, they’ll say, why is Khrushchev denying. First of all, I’m a Russian, I’m not denying. Second, what kind of crime is it if I had been Polish? What kind of crime?5

Khrushchev thus emphasized that being Polish would no longer be a hindrance to promotion to the top ranks of the PUWP apparatus, although he later tried to conceal the whole matter in his memoirs: “In 1956 Comrade Bierut died. I did not attend the plenum because we didn't want the Soviet Union to be accused of interference in the internal affairs of the Polish Communist party.”6 It should come as no surprise that traditional anti-Jewish prejudice was reinforced in Stalinist Poland or that a new stereotype of the Jewish and communist danger flourished.7

Between 1944-47, the Red Army and its Polish allies on the Eastern Front, especially the units under the command of Soviet security forces, subdued all other Polish and national (such as Ukrainian, Lithuanian, German) military and paramilitary formations that fell into their sphere of operations. Polish-speaking communists, particularly the political and counter-espionage officers of these various Soviet controlled units, emerged from the Great Patriotic War to become leading actors in the preparations for the coming Stalinist revolution in postwar Poland. Non-communist forces in Nazi-occupied Poland were often organized to resist the Germans, each other, and later Soviet power, along ethnic lines or political divisions that enunciated a position on the numerous nationality questions that preoccupied their leaders in the region.

The multi-national component of some formations, even units under German command, was considerable. It was logical that the Polish Peoples’ Army (PPA), founded in the USSR, was also the most consciously multi-national institution in Peoples’ Poland.8 What made it remarkable was that Stalin encouraged it after World War II. It is difficult to assess when the Polish Jews who had volunteered to serve or remain in the postwar communist security forces began to realize, however, what Soviet Jews had realized earlier, that under Stalin, as Arkady Vaksberg put it: “if someone named Rabinovich was in charge of a mass execution, he was perceived not
simply as a Cheka boss but as a Jew, while if someone named Abramovich was in charge of a mass epidemic countermeasure, he was perceived not as a Jew but as a good doctor.”

Bierut too had a preference for Soviet military and security advisors as well as Polish Jews, especially in conspicuous positions inside the party-state apparatus. In the remarkable interviews Teresa Toranska conducted with Jakub Berman, during the Solidarity years, the second most powerful leader in Stalinist Poland acknowledged: “Bierut supervised everything, and on every issue he had the final say. If there were any noticeable differences of opinion, they concerned only the minor matters, not the key issues. Perhaps I shouldn’t say this, because naturally I wouldn’t want to put any blame on Bierut, who displayed exceeding kindness towards me and to whom I owe much...In our Troika [Hilary] Minc dealt with economic affairs, while I was assigned culture, education, institutions of higher education, the Polish Academy of Sciences, propaganda, foreign policy, ideology and supervising the security forces.”

The first shock to this highly regulated Soviet operated cadre system came after Stalin’s death in March 1953 and the fall of Beria in June that same year. Although the fall of Beria and his subsequent execution in December did not end Stalinist repression in Poland, which continued until mid-1954, the ensuing power struggle in the Kremlin had immediate impact in Warsaw. Poland’s Jewish communists, particularly those who served as investigative officers in the vast security apparatus, quickly emerged as the major culprits for the so-called “period of errors and distortions.” Thus, negating the personal moral burden for the crimes committed at the time by many other individuals, including Poles and Russians. The gross oversimplification and assault on memory concerning responsibility as well as the scale and nature of the crimes committed by communists in Poland during the Stalin years cannot go unchallenged. And while Poland’s communists had been highly selective in their choice of Jewish scapegoats after Stalin’s death, if only because other Jews in the party and security apparatus could not be excluded from participating in the whole process, and the desire of the leadership to keep a tight grip on the scope of the ensuing investigations, there is further evidence to suggest that Poland’s communists had grown accustomed to placing the burden of their own failures to gain sufficient legitimacy among the Polish population during the entire communist period on the shoulders of Jews in the party.
In attempting to explain the sources of Poland’s postwar crises in light of the Solidarity experience of 1980-81, a report prepared by a PUWP commission in 1983 emphasized the pivotal role played by the 1948 intra party struggle. The authors of the 1983 report concluded that the defeat of Władysław Gomułka and the so-called “rightist-nationalist deviation” by Bierut and his allies in 1948 was a disaster for the party. The party ideologues continued to insist that Poland’s communist future might have been different, if not brighter, had Gomułka remained the party leader after 1948. The Kubiak commission, like others before 1983, largely blamed Bierut and his Stalinist followers for lost opportunities. The role of Jewish communists was not mentioned in the Kubiak Report, in the context of 1983 — after the Solidarity experience — hardly surprising, but there can be little doubt that the popular perception in Poland of the 1948 leadership crisis often focuses on the Jewish group in the security apparatus that conducted the operations to defeat the nationalists.

But there is still something missing from a more comprehensive explanation of why the PUWP leadership kept falling prey to anti-Semitic dogmas. It was not enough for Poland’s communists to shift blame for Stalinism on Jews in the security apparatus. “They” were ultimately viewed as anti-socialist and anti-Polish “elements.” The road from “Party member” of “Jewish nationality” to, “under investigation,” “rude” or “fanatical,” “Trotskyist sympathizer” or “Zionist agitator,” who “speaks Yiddish with friends,” some of whom had “emigrated from Palestine” and, “without Polish citizenship” and “without qualifications,” were “offered Senior level intelligence posts,” and finally, “traitor” or “fifth columnist” had to be forged. That labor was largely left to Stalinist counterintelligence officers. And if they hated the colleague in question for personal reasons or ethnic hatred, it made the work easier. As communists, a “comrade under investigation has a dangerous bourgeois background” or “comes from a rich prewar Jewish family” was always the first place to start. In any case, often the targets of these investigations had long records of security experience.

New evidence from the Polish archives suggests that further study of postwar anti-Semitism in Poland, as well as how Polish communist ideologues and guardians of national security investigated Stalinist crimes in Poland, must include greater emphasis on the international component.
Soviet efforts in support of their foreign policy objectives drove ideological debates that placed Zionism and the Kremlin’s version of American imperialism on the same level — “enemy number 1.” This had much impact not only on East-West relations but on the perceptions of individuals engaged in ideological and state security work. And while relations between the USSR and Israel and Poland and Israel, when assessed throughout the Cold War period, did have their cordial moments, a significant residue of distrust was always present. It is the role played by national security institutions, such as the leadership of Poland’s foreign intelligence and counterintelligence organs, that has yet to receive considered analysis.

As a case study, this paper focuses on two important dynamics in the evolution of postwar Polish anti-Semitism. First, it broadly examines why postwar Polish revolutionary socialism tended to reject internationalism and instead gravitated toward narrow ethnic nationalism. Second, it examines more specifically the role of Jewish defectors from Poland’s leading national security institutions who “escaped to freedom,” as the popular Western saying put it at the time. The main focus of this study is on one individual: Lieutenant Colonel Jozef Swiatlo, deputy director of the 10th Department of the Ministry of Public Security (MPS). The first important defector from the Soviet controlled Polish security apparatus to the CIA.

II

“If scholars and journalists do not know what intelligence agencies have done, can they be said to have done anything? More practically, if scholars and journalists do not tell citizens what intelligence agencies have done for them in the past, why should the citizens expect intelligence agencies to be useful in the future?” The above questions were posed by Earnest R. May at a CIA symposium on teaching intelligence.17

Recent research has already concluded that KGB documents from the former Soviet archives need to be treated with a good deal of caution, notwithstanding their obvious fascination.18 There is a need to recall the tendency among intelligence and security bureaucrats in any country, if only to show results, to exaggerate reports to leaders. In addition to remembering the lack of systematic access to all intelligence archives of the leading states engaged in the Cold War — in Poland these archives remain closed — those who evaluate documents that become available must temper their enthusiasm with an appreciation that evidence may have been
destroyed, distorted or fabricated. Much more research is needed before a balanced and informed evaluation of intelligence and counterintelligence services during the Cold War can be attained.

Vladimir Zubok concluded further that it goes without saying that documents relating to the foreign intelligence services of former Soviet bloc states often contain references to events and individuals that remain uncorroborated. Such materials need to be carefully cross-referenced with other evidence before their accuracy and significance can be confidently gauged. And much of it requires collation with relevant materials in the archives of other intelligence services, especially the USA and the former USSR. Systematic analysis of these documents by specialists in the history of intelligence is particularly important.

Throughout the tense period under review, 1953-54, Soviet bloc security and intelligence services were an integral part of international and domestic policy and powerful instruments of propaganda between the ideological blocs and among various internal proponents of alternative policies. Security and intelligence services engaged in the Cold War helped to shape the international and domestic political atmosphere that engendered them and allowed them to consume a significant part of their respective national budgets. In 1953, Poland had approximately one MPS official per 800 residents. When other national security organs are included to the 1953 total the calculation rises dramatically to one per eighty residents. If Soviet bloc security and intelligence services were “early-warning” forces that conducted reconnaissance, non-military, and paramilitary operations to influence the situation in the enemy’s camp, they were state organs that no less shaped institutional and popular perceptions of the enemy.

In my view, the essence of those times was best portrayed by British novelist John le Carre. His novel, The Spy Who Came In From the Cold, published in 1963, may have come closest in capturing the tension among officers engaged in foreign intelligence and counterintelligence activities. Set against a backdrop of pervasive gloom and betrayal, including the personal animosity between an ex-Nazi and East German intelligence officer, who turns out to be a British double agent, and his deputy in the East German service, a Jew, who becomes the target of the British operation, the most striking part of le Carre’s novel is not that both sides employed unsavory methods to accomplish their tasks. Intelligence officers were motivated by bitter hatred, which manifested itself not just between rival services, but also among officers within the same service. And ethnic hatred played its part.
Almost ten years of constructing and consolidating the party-state institutions of the Polish Peoples’ Republic (PPR), modeled on the Soviet Union, between 1944 and 1954, provided the elite of the Polish Workers’ Party (PWP) and its PUWP successor, established in late 1948, with ample opportunity to learn firsthand how to conduct Stalinist party purges. Jozef Swiatlo had received his professional education (such as it was) and significant on-job-training as a security functionary at the hands of highly experienced Chekists. When he later reexamined the Stalinist purges of East European communists between 1948-53, in his sensational 1954 radio broadcasts to Poland, it was with clarity and sophistication. Swiatlo argued that “ideological differences in the party occur in the sense that some faithful and devoted agents of Moscow have no difficulty in accepting changes in tactics since they reconciled themselves long ago with the principle that the so-called party line is nothing else but the interests and will of Moscow.” In addition, “so-called rightist or leftist deviations occur when some comrades do not differentiate between party tactics and the real political line. Tactics change, depending on circumstances, political conditions at a given time, and Moscow’s needs. But the real party line always remains the same. Those who understand changed tactics as a new political line have to take the consequences later.”

The PUWP faced yet another cycle of purges shortly after Stalin’s death. This time, however, fears of renewed repression among the elite of the Polish party as well as those of the international communist movement took place during a real Soviet leadership transition crisis. When Gomulka, the PWP General Secretary at the time, was accused in 1948 (and later arrested), together with a group of other wartime PWP leaders, of being a Polish nationalist, or what Stalinist ideologues later more broadly labeled the “rightist-nationalist deviation,” the new ruling group of the PUWP was dominated by individuals who had spent the war in the Soviet Union and it included a number of Polish Jews. The prominence of Jews was highlighted not so much by their numerical over representation among the elite of the various party and state institutions, limited in any case as a future pool of potential cadres, but the secrecy surrounding the actual numbers and the effort at the time to find and promote reliable cadres of Poles. Such conditions fed wild popular speculations about the actual number of Jews in the PUWP and the security organs that persist until today.
Jews in early postwar Poland could not have made up more than some 1% of the total population. Of the 23 persons who sat on the PUWP Politburo between 1945-57, Berman (12 December 1945 to 3 May 1956), Minc (1945 to 10 October 1956), and Roman Zambrowski (1945-63) were Jews. The figures on Jews among the upper echelons of the MPS, from 1944-56, including the provincial and county security chiefs (except that in these cases they tended to move from province to province or county to county), remained rather stable. The minister of public security and his two deputies were there for at least ten years. Of the 447 MPS personnel that could be called “high ministry officials” at that time, 131 were Jews or just over 29% of the total. Some 21% of the 447 functionaries had belonged to the prewar Communist Party of Poland (CPP) or its branches. Just over 35% of the 131 Jews in the MPS leadership had belonged to the CPP. A 1953 report on Jews inside the Ministry of Foreign Affairs concluded that 5 of the 8 department directors were Jews and “for the 12 available deputy director posts we have nominated only 4, of which 3 are Jews, of the 28 division managers 18 are Jews.”

There was also the contrast with the obvious absence of German communists in the PUWP and the relatively modest figures for Ukrainian communists at almost every level of the party. The overall situation was exacerbated by similar struggles between local communists and so-called Muscovites, where ethnic origins also played a role, in other Soviet bloc states.

The so-called struggle against the “rightist-nationalists” did not mean that Polish Jews (or Soviet Jews) who served as party cadres in Poland were ever safe from the purge process during the Stalinist period. The much longer and relentless struggle against the “Trotskyist” and later “cosmopolitan” and “Zionist” deviations were related and in turn were related to the “Titoist” and “rightist-nationalist” deviations. Jewish communists faced danger during Moscow’s violent 1952 campaign against Czechoslovak party boss Rudolf Slansky and others, and again in 1953, when the Kremlin announced an alleged doctors’ plot to kill Stalin, all of which had an impact on the Polish party at the time. During the period under review, Jews openly became suspect in the Kremlin and the Soviet security apparatus in particular.

Poland’s military counterintelligence branch, the Chief Directorate of Information (CDI), directed by Soviet officers between 1950-53, officially targeted “Jewish Nationalism” and Polish Jews in the PPA as “potential enemies of the state” from August 1950. That particular order was not rescinded until August 1955. They also renewed efforts against “Trotskyists” from April 1953. Former Soviet spymaster Pavel Sudoplatov later suggested that “Stalin’s use of anti-
Semitism, antinationalism, and anti-bourgeois cosmopolitanism for his usual political juggling had
turned into license for leaders who harbored old hatreds against Jews...Unfortunately, it was a
legacy that remained and flourished after his death.”

III

The proliferation of Politburo commissions after 1948 effectively concentrated power in
the hands of a small group of PUWP leaders. The Public Security Commission was a permanent
body. It was established on 24 February 1949 by the Central Committee (CC) Secretariat. The
CC Secretariat was responsible for the nomenklatura system in the party and made direct
appointments down to the level of departmental deputy director in the security organs, including
the heads of the personnel departments down to the provincial levels. Security Commission
members included: Bierut, Berman, Stanislaw Radkiewicz, Roman Romkowski, Mieczyslaw
Mietkowski, Konrad Swietlik, and the head of the basic party organization in the MPS at the
time. The Commission controlled the entire process of the most important investigations and
took overall responsibility for the security and intelligence apparatus. Bierut chaired all sessions of
the Commission, occasionally took part in conferences at the MPS, and took decisions about
general organizational matters concerning the security apparatus at Politburo meetings.

Soviet advisors participated in Security Commission meetings, put forward orders, had
complete access to all materials gathered by Poland’s security organs, and coordinated their
activities with Soviet security organs throughout the bloc. An Advisors Aparat, opened in 1945,
with Soviet officers attached to the MPS and its provincial bureaus, ensured a one-way channel of
communications between the MPS and Moscow. In 1953, there were a total of some 30 advisors
at the ministry and about 25-30 at the provincial levels. The Senior Advisor or Senior Soviet in
Poland (after Serov) were as follows: N.N. Selivanovskii (27 April 1945 to 1946), S.M. Davidov
(1946 to 17 March 1950), M.S. Bezborodov (17 March 1950 to 10 April 1953), N.K. Kovalchuk
(10 April to 20 July 1953), S.N. Lialin (20 July 1953 to September 1954), and G.S.
Ievdokimenko (September 1954 to April 1959). Moreover, Bierut talked directly to Moscow
(often by telephone) about security matters, especially on organization and personnel matters
following Swiatlo’s defection.
In March 1950, a decision was taken to establish the Secretariat of the Organization Bureau. Membership in this body included Bierut and three Politburo candidate members: Franciszek Mazur, Zenon Nowak, and Edward Ochab, who were to divest themselves of all other party duties and devote their attention to the work assigned by the new institution. At the same time, Mazur, Nowak, and Ochab became full Politburo members and CC Secretaries. Mazur added membership in the restructured CC Secretariat to his growing list of leadership duties, where he joined six other Politburo members: Bierut, Berman, Jozef Cyrankiewicz, Minc, Zambrowski, and Aleksander Zawadzki. Bierut and Mazur emerged as the only two among the leadership that held membership in all five ruling institutions of the party between 1950-54: the Politburo, Secretariat of the Politburo, CC Secretariat, Organization Bureau, and the Secretariat of the Organization Bureau.

No later then 1952, Mazur – a Ukrainian -- took charge of the MPS and Citizen’s Militia among the “foursome” in the Secretariat of the Organization Bureau. In March (formally established in September) 1951, a Special Sector responsible for cadre policies and activities of primary party organizations within the security apparatus was created and attached to the CC Organization Department. In December 1952, operations of the Special Sector were transferred to the CC Administration Department. Bierut and Berman continued to retain overall control of security members and their role has generally been well documented, but Mazur’s role as a leading figure in foreign policy matters and the Special Sector has only recently been fully appreciated.

In October 1948, General Radkiewicz set up a special operations unit, which became known as “General Romkowski’s special apparatus.” The unit finally evolved to become the notorious 10th Department of the MPS, formally established on 30 November 1951 to “defend the workers’ movement” from enemies inside the party. The initiative gave Radkiewicz sweeping police powers against even the most senior party members. The new directorate carried out its own investigations, operated special prisons, and kept their own archive and card index system. In the meantime, the struggle against a “conspiracy within the armed forces” had begun. This ensured close collaboration (and competition) between the MPS and Soviet-directed CDI, the military counterintelligence apparatus. A group of new security functionaries and party cadres were introduced to the MPS in preparation for the upcoming purges. Colonel Fejgin, CDI deputy chief between August 1945 and May 1950, took responsibility for the struggle against the
“Gomulkovshchina” in the fall of 1949. Fejgin served as head of Romkowski’s Special Bureau and later as director of the 10th Department. One of Fejgin’s two deputies was Jozef Swiatlo.

IV

Who was Jozef Swiatlo? The precise answer to that question is still hidden in the Polish, Russian, and American archives and continues to be inaccessible to scholars and journalists. It is no less difficult to assess how important Swiatlo’s defection was for the CIA at the time since none of the serious scholarship and journalism on US intelligence history covers the subject. The one book dedicated to the orchestrate the East European purges of 1948-53. William Shawcross, in his review of Operation Splinter Factor, concluded that the book “reads like the dedicated and ingenious work of a man who had been told in confidence a fascinating, if bourbon-soaked, yarn and who has tried with all his might to entice the facts — enlarging some, diminishing some, ignoring some — towards confirming it.”

Flora Lewis wrote the following about Swiatlo in 1965: “He was a man with the ineradicable spot of blood on his hands; he personally had been a torture master. His nickname was the ‘Butcher’. When the United States agreed to give him asylum it was in the knowledge that he would have to be protected for the rest of his life because the number of his victims and relatives of victims sworn to exact retribution was so great.” However, she added: “It was police bully Jozef Swiatlo who, with the power of words instead of his usual instruments, rattled the chains so hard they began to break.”

At the time, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles pursued a policy of liberation by peaceful means. He was determined not to frustrate legitimate aspirations for freedom from Soviet dominance. Stalinist Poland was a prime target of US foreign intelligence and counterintelligence operations. President Eisenhower appointed Allen Dulles to the post of CIA director on 26 February 1953. The new US administration was determined to put the Soviets on the defensive in the bloc primarily through propaganda and psychological warfare means.

Swiatlo was born in 1915 near Tarnopol (Ternopil’) to a “poor Jewish family.” He was then called Fleichfarb. Swiatlo was a member of the Zionist organization “Gordonia” before joining the Union of Communist Youth in the Cracow area and, from 1936, he was active in the trade union movement. In a handwritten autobiographical account of his life, Swiatlo wrote that he took part in the September 1939 campaign with the 6th Division and taken prisoner by the Red
Army on 20 September. He was sent to work in the Soviet Union until 1941 and later worked as a tailor, until joining the communist founded 1st (Tadeusz Kosciuszko) Division in May 1941.

In subsequent RFE broadcasts, Swiatlo said he was arrested by the NKVD and sent to a labor camp but transferred to a labor battalion after the 1942 amnesty before joining the Polish forces under Soviet command. Upon completing training as a political officer he took part in the Lenino battle as assistant battalion commander for political affairs. After Lenino he was deputy commander of a communications battalion and then an instructor for political affairs in the Independent Motorized Artillery Division until entering Prague. Swiatlo was involved in organizing state administration in liberated areas. Recruited for security work by Konrad Swietlik, who had been deputy chief of political affairs at the 1st Division and later an MPS vice-minister, Swiatlo had been recommended by Romkowski, whom he had known before the war.

On 17 January 1945, he was to take up the post of deputy director of an Operations Group in Warsaw, but appears in fact to have been put at the disposition of General Serov. He completed this mission in May, which included participation in, among other things, the arrest of 16 commanders of the Polish Home Army as well as the arrests of two leading commanders of the Peasant Movement. Swiatlo then returned to the MPS and from December 1945 worked as the deputy chief of the provincial security office in Olsztyn and later in Cracow. From 1 October 1948, he was promoted to headquarters and joined “Romkowski’s special apparatus” and later the 10th Department as deputy director.

He gained a reputation with the security and counterintelligence apparatus as a highly effective officer with extremely strong support from Moscow. Swiatlo carried out the arrests of Gomulka (12 August 1951) and Marshal Michal Rola-Zymierski (14 March 1953), Poland’s defense minister until 1949 and a long time Soviet agent. Swiatlo also arrested, among others, Poland’s Roman Catholic Primate, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, on 26 September 1953. He had carried out an interrogation of Noel Field on 27 August 1949 in Budapest and was involved in the arrest and subsequent interrogation of Noel’s brother, Herman, a US citizen, who went to Warsaw in 1949 to look for Noel, but was secretly detained at the airport and kept in a 10th Department prison for five years, until Swiatlo broke the story.

After Gomulka was arrested (along with his wife), he was only superficially interrogated and never tortured. His interrogator, Swiatlo, claimed that Bierut lacked the “courage to cope with him.” Swiatlo may have deliberately misled his audience, and the Polish archives are
unclear as to why Gomulka was not forced to “confess” to being an “agent of American imperialism” and put on public trial.

At the US Congressional Hearings before the Select Committee on Communist Aggression in December 1954, Swiatlo gave the following account of the 10th Department:

Department 10 dealt with the members of the party, from the political bureau, the highest authority, to the lowest cells of the party.

There were four basic units in Department 10. The first one took care of all rightists, nationalists, and Trotskyite movements. The chief of that Department was myself.

The second unit took care of all members and officials of the party who had had any connection with the West in any capacity.

The third unit was charged with uncovering informers and agents who had been sent to Poland after 1939.

The fourth unit was the investigation unit. Department 10 was the only department in the Ministry of Public Security which had its own investigation apparatus.

The next unit, physical security, took care of the physical security of the party. Again Department 10 was the only department which had its own prisons.

The secretariat took care of all documentation of the archives, and so forth, of the Department.

The inspectorate, as you see here [pointing to a chart], controlled all regional branches of Department 10 throughout the country.

In every district of Poland, there was a branch of Department 10, with all those units I have just described.

So, as you see, gentlemen, our Department 10 protected the Communist Party in Poland from every point of view.

A Polish prosecutor investigating officers in the 10th Department after the Swiatlo defection received the following background on the structure of the directorate: Fejgin reported to Romkowski. The first deputy director was Swiatlo, the second was Henryk Piasecki. The 10th Department was divided into four sections: Section One was responsible for the Trotskyists and the rightist deviation problems. Section Two was responsible for the struggle against penetration by foreign intelligence in the Party. Section Three was responsible for problems stemming from provocation’s during the interwar and occupation periods, especially the PWP and its wartime military wing the Peoples’ Guard, as well as collaboration with the Gestapo. Section Four was
the investigations branch of the 10th Department, which conducted investigations for the other three sections.\textsuperscript{47}

V

On 3 December 1953, Fejgin and Swiatlo (using the cover name Jozef Mirecki) traveled by train from Warsaw to Berlin. They met with officials from the GDR Ministry of State Security on the following day. During a trip through the city that found them in the Western sector, on 5 December, Swiatlo quietly slipped away from Fejgin and mysteriously disappeared.

There are a number of conflicting versions of the Fejgin-Swiatlo Berlin operation of December 1953. In Swiatlo’s version, as released by Radio Free Europe (RFE), Berman sanctioned the operation and gave the order directly to Swiatlo to locate Wanda Bronska\textsuperscript{48} in Berlin with the aid of the East Germans and “have done with her.”\textsuperscript{49} It was during a second shopping trip, the first to the French sector a day earlier was used by Swiatlo to plan his defection, that Swiatlo took advantage of Fejgin’s lack of vigilance. His RFE broadcasts had pointed to a direct relationship between himself, the Berlin operation being conducted by the 10th Department -- to locate and eliminate Polish Trotskyists -- and Berman. Others implicated directly in this operation were Bierut and Radkiewicz, of course, but Romkowski and Fejgin were Swiatlo’s immediate superiors. An aware outside observer at the time would not have had difficulty coming to the conclusion that in Swiatlo’s version, the security forces were hunting down, among others, Polish Trotskyists.

Fejgin’s versions changed as events unfolded, naturally. Initially, he convinced himself that Swiatlo had been kidnapped by enemy intelligence services. This was a sensible, if also a self-serving conclusion. The 10th Directorate was charged with conducting top secret counterintelligence operations that targeted the PUWP elite and former officers of the interwar Polish political police, including the interwar internal affairs ministry, the security departments, their provincial headquarters, and intelligence and counterintelligence officers. Fejgin’s directorate, in 1952 alone, had made 507 arrests.\textsuperscript{50} Fejgin understood the potential repercussions of Swiatlo’s disappearance. Selected Jews in the MPS had already become targets of internal investigations several months earlier.
The Senior Soviet in Warsaw at the time was Serafim Nikolayevich Lialin, who served from July 1953 to September 1954. He returned to Moscow shortly after Swiatlo’s RFE broadcasts. Lialin was associated with Khrushchev and began security work after holding the post of Secretary of the Tula oblast Committee (1944-51). He retired as a Lieutenant General and KGB chief of the Moscow oblast in June 1971.\(^{51}\) The ambassador to Poland was Georgii Mikhailovich Popov, very closely connected to Khrushchev, who served in Warsaw in 1953-54.

It might be remembered that Stalin made important personnel changes in December 1949. Khrushchev, first secretary of the Ukrainian Republic, was transferred to the post of first secretary of the Moscow City and Regional Party Committees, replacing G.M. Popov.\(^{52}\) As a full Politburo member and a Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) CC Secretary with regional responsibilities, Khrushchev became a direct competitor of Beria and Malenkov. Stalin also removed Viktor Abakumov from his post as chief of the Ministry of State Security (MGB) and had him arrested in June 1951. Vsevolod Merkulov of the Ministry of Internal Security (MVD) and M.D. Riumin, Abakumov’s deputy — according to Amy Knight — conspired together by informing Stalin “that Abakumov had known about a Jewish bourgeois nationalist plot, linked to American spies, and had for some reason kept it a secret,”\(^{53}\) including murdering a physician arrested in 1951 who was the source of this information. The removal of Abakumov worked to Khrushchev’s advantage, rather than Beria and his supporters. The new MGB chief appointed by Stalin was Semen Ignat’ev, an associate of Zhdanov from Byelorussia. Ignat’ev brought in a series of new men, all of whom were close Khrushchev associates.\(^{54}\)

Furthermore, anti-Semitism began to play a larger role in shaping Stalin’s mind set at the time. Jewish communists had already been the major target of the purges in the Soviet Union as well as Eastern Europe from 1949, although in Poland the priority appears to have been Gomulka’s group and other Poles with connections to the interwar Polish state. The Slansky process had begun in November 1951. The arrest of Slansky appears to have troubled a number of the leading communists in Poland. The charges against Slansky and the other Czechoslovak communists included allegations of illicit arms dealings with Israel, “cosmopolitanism” and “Zionism”.\(^{55}\) Abakumov had laid the groundwork for the Slansky trial, but it was now left to Ignat’ev and Khrushchev’s men to carry out the largely anti-Jewish plot.\(^{56}\)
Polish archives have revealed a five-page document on the Slansky process which discusses Polish matters taken up at the show trial and how they relate to Gomulka. The conclusion of the report was prepared by Colonel Jerzy Siedlecki, director of the MPS Bureau of Functionaries Affairs, and Edmund Pszczolkowski, member of the Organization Bureau. Dated 1 December 1952, the authors were critical of the trial on a number of grounds, including the excessive focus on “Jewish nationalism at the beginning stages of the process” by the Prague prosecutors and the “lack” of focus on “Slovak nationalism” and “Czech nationalism”. It is still too early to assess in detail what Bierut expected to gain from the Slansky trial, but the signs were becoming obvious that the Polish party might be forced to follow their Soviet masters. And if the Soviets were leaning towards an “anti-Zionist” purge, how would this impact on the Gomulka matter and the MPS. Bierut must have understood that everything would eventually land at the feet of Berman. This may help to explain why Bierut was so slow in preparing a case against Gomulka, who had, after all, already in 1948, expressed his concern directly to Stalin about the over representation of Jewish comrades in the Polish party.

The response offered by Gomulka to Stalin in 1948 concerning his own removal from the party leadership was to follow Gomulka until his return in October 1956. It may also have saved him from early prosecution and certain death. In a long letter to Stalin, dated 14 December 1948, written after his 9 December meeting with Stalin, Molotov and Beria, Gomulka gave four reasons why he could not work with the new leadership in Warsaw. It is the third reason that is most relevant to our discussion. Gomulka: “All members of the Politburo know my position with regard to the personnel policy of the party in relation to the Jewish comrades...but the major fault for the unfolding of the current state of affairs falls above all on the Jewish comrades.” In short, Gomulka insisted that Poland’s cadre policies were incorrect because the Jewish comrades in the leadership insisted on over staffing the senior levels of the party-state apparatus with other Jews. He added that this situation created hostility among the working class and that the party would suffer if it did not change policies to reflect the new realities. Gomulka insisted that it is in this spirit that Stalin should interpret his position and that it was the nationalities question and the cadre selection problem that in fact poisoned the atmosphere in the PUWP Central Committee.

Gomulka’s 1948 letter to Stalin helps to explain why so many of the reformers in the party tried to block Gomulka’s return to the leadership, until the Poznan revolt of June 1956 forced all factions in the party leadership to reconsider their disputes and focus instead on the Soviet
advisors as the main reason for social and political instability in Poland at the time. This same letter was held up to Gomulka by Mikoyan during their heated exchange at the Belvedere Palace, during the Soviet-Polish confrontation on 20-21 October, prompting Mikoyan to remark: “That now he [Gomulka] will be pulled to the top by the Jews and then again [emphasis added] they will drop him.”

Moreover, in a self-criticism submitted on 5 May 1956 to the Politburo, Berman defended his own odious past but also noted that the Soviets had for a while been planning to purge activists of Jewish origin. He wrote: “In 1953, together with the Soviet advisors, Comrade [ambassador] Popov prepared a special and thorough study of former Trotskyists in the party. The 10th Department then furnished very wide-ranging plans [read: purges] on this subject. On the recommendation of Comrade [Bierut] I became familiar with these plans and voiced my opinion that they be markedly constricted. In any case, the plans were not realized.”

Stefan Staszewski, the Warsaw party boss in 1956, and a very close associate of Zambrowski, told Toranska in his interview: “Popov, in an official demarche, demanded the dismissal of Staszewski, [Artur] Starewicz, [Leon] Kasman and about two other comrades. They had got back on their old anti-Semitic course, and we were Jews. Bierut said to me outright: it pains me, but it’s not our decision.”

In the Spring of 1953, in the midst of the Kremlin power struggle against Beria, and before Swiatlo defected, the PUWP Central Commission for Party Control (CCPC) in Warsaw received and decided to investigate two separate charges brought by individuals released from Polish prison at the end of July against Colonel Jozef Rozanski, director of the MPS Investigative Department. According to Swiatlo, who was the first to provide details of this investigation via RFE to Poland, the charges against Rozanski stated that he had physically and verbally abused his accusers while they were under arrest and that he was a sadist. Rozanski’s Soviet advisor had been a Colonel Jurij Nikolaszkin. He told Rozanski that in case of some change in course by the party leadership, always the first in line to go “under the knife” are investigative officers.

MPS functionaries discovered from Swiatlo that Rozanski’s longtime colleague, “Luna” or Julia Brystigier, a CCPC member, took special interest in the investigation. An historian and writer (under the pseudonym Julia Preiss), Brystigier was also a leading communist activist. Swiatlo said “she began her career in Lwow from the moment the Soviet army crossed in 1939” and “Luna had all the right contacts and acquaintances. Immediately after the Bolshevik armies
crossed Lwow, in 1939, Brystigier, began to inform and make admissions in such a vulgar fashion that she even jeopardized many party comrades, because she let them know. From that moment, begin the sharp battles between her and Rozanski.”

Brystigier was one of the most powerful individuals inside the MPS. She had directed the 5th Department (investigations and operations against all political and social organizations, including the Church) from the beginning and she frequently participated in MPS party meetings. Brystigier joined the CPP in 1930 and was later an activist in the Union of Polish Patriots (UPP). She took special interest in the Rozanski investigation. According to Swiatlo: “through her lovers Berman and Minc, she added her own three cents against Rozanski. She even gained [the support of] the deputy chair of the Control Commission, Luba Jankowska, and herself moved very hard against Rozanski in the Commission.” Rozanski was eventually dismissed from office on 5 March 1954 and subsequently arrested. The initial targets were Jewish investigative officers, but not the operations officers.

VI

On 21 December, Fejgin officially reported to Romkowski that Swiatlo had been the victim of a kidnapping plot. Fejgin was officially dismissed from the MPS on 1 January 1954. Radkiewicz called a special commission to investigate Swiatlo’s past in mid-January. The report concluded, largely based on interviews with those who knew Swiatlo best, that the kidnapping scenario was plausible. Romkowski also suggested that Swiatlo would “withstand scrutiny.” However, with Swiatlo in the hands of a Western intelligence service, operations of the 10th Department had to be suspended. The actual elimination of Fejgin’s directorate came on 9 June 1954. Swiatlo remained on the MPS payroll, remarkable as it may seem. His wife and two small children continued to receive a pension.

CIA counterintelligence decided to take full advantage of their well informed defector and on 28 September 1954 the US Attorney General announced to the press and media that Swiatlo was in the United States and had been granted political asylum. At the time Swiatlo was the most senior MPS functionary to defect in its ten year history. More important, Swiatlo began to broadcast his sensational revelations on the day Warsaw and Moscow receive the news. Swiatlo was dismissed from the MPS on 30 September. Shortly afterwards, a special MPS bulletin announced: “After communicating to the activists in the Ministry about the matter of the
provocateur Swiatlo, a large number of employees from different units and their families began to listen to the enemy radio broadcasts and sharing information.  RFE saturated the airwaves with some 140 broadcasts by Swiatlo as well as 30 special programs.

Swiatlo’s defection seriously compromised the Bierut group. His RFE broadcasts were not merely serialized but subsequently air dropped by special balloons over Poland. An original illegal Swiatlo pamphlet can be found in the Polish archives. “Operation Spotlight” was run by the National Committee for a Free Europe (NCFE), which was dedicated to the liberation of Eastern Europe and ran RFE. The NCFE was guided by C.D. Jackson, Special Assistant for Cold War Affairs to President Eisenhower, and a great fan of psychological warfare. The hostile debate inside Poland’s powerful security apparatus following Swiatlo’s defection quickly spread to all party institutions at the central level. All the intelligence, counterintelligence, and public security institutions of Peoples’ Poland were compromised. The defection engendered party debates on the role of the ruling elite during the Stalin years. Eventually the 10th Department was eliminated. In line with the Soviet model, Poland’s security organs were reorganized and the MPS was replaced by the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA) and the Public Security Committee (PSC).

An immediate casualty of the defection appears to have been the CDI chief and Soviet officer, Colonel Dymitr Wozniesienski. Appointed to the post in May 1950, Wozniesienski reported directly to Bierut and to Poland’s defense minister, Marshal Konstanty Rokossowski, who had remained a Soviet citizen after taking the post in 1949. Wozniesienski ceased to be CDI chief on 12 December 1953. It is still difficult to assess to what degree his return to the Soviet Union was a result of the Beria affair rather than the Swiatlo defection. The CDI deputy at the time, Lieutenant Colonel Antoni Skulbaszewski, also a Soviet officer, was not recalled from Poland until May 1954. The secrecy that continues to surround Wozniesienski’s demise underlines the sensitivity of the matter. The impact of Swiatlo’s defection on the Soviet foreign intelligence and counterintelligence directorates cannot be denied. Most Soviet advisors inside and outside Poland’s military and civilian security organs had to be considered compromised. Beria’s fall had a decisive impact on many party and security functionaries in the Soviet bloc. Furthermore, a pattern began to emerge. Soviet advisors in Poland were officially protected from public accusations — for the sake of unity with Moscow at a time of international crisis — that they too had been responsible for Stalinism. In response or as a result, persistent critics
rediscovered Great Russian Chauvinism or what others in the international communist movement also called Great Power Chauvinism.

At the PUWP Politburo meetings held between 2 and 5 May 1956, to discuss Berman’s dismissal from the party, Premier Cyrankiewicz argued that the 10th Department was founded by the Soviets and operated in their interest. Rokossowski interjected and blamed Berman and other Jews for the failures of the security organs. Mazur naturally agreed with Rokossowski and took no responsibility for security or cadre matters. Aleksander Zawadzki, Khrushchev’s favorite among the PUWP leaders, added: “All leadership positions Berman filled with Jewish comrades and not with only good old comrades...How can one explain this? I looked at Berman’s profile, Jewish intellectual from a bourgeois family, he did not develop in revolutionary situations. All together this paints a picture that is very unclear.”

Jim Marchio has noted: “Assessing discontent behind the Iron Curtain became a virtual cottage industry for the US intelligence community during the early Cold War.” And “NSC [National Security Council] and CIA staff studies in July 1956 on the East European satellites concluded that ‘there is no evidence that Moscow’s ability to control them has been fundamentally affected by anything that has happened since the death of Stalin’.” US policy makers may have set unrealistic goals and failed to appreciate the limits of their policies and particularly of intelligence on “resistance” in the Soviet bloc. However, if another aim of “Operation Spotlight” was to expose the mechanics behind the purges against the nationalists in 1948 or other sensitive matters, and the broadcasts were directed not only at the Polish public but also security functionaries and party activists -- the Free Europe Committee pamphlet in the Polish archives includes a call for officers of the security apparatus to defect -- then the operation may have exceeded its target.

Swiatlo’s RFE broadcasts had a remarkable following among communists and security functionaries. Swiatlo further brought to the surface many old wounds in the party that dated back to wartime intrigues. The defection alone damaged the security organs in Poland but the public exposure of taboo disputes through radio broadcasts appears to have played a greater role in the steady rise of tension inside the party than had been previously believed. Future debates about de-Stalinization in Poland would always focus on the role of national minorities and Soviet-appointed cadres in Poland’s party and state institutions.
The May 1968 report from the special commission appointed by the Chief Political Directorate of the Polish Army, cited earlier, notes: “Only after 1953, in conjunction with the assumption of leadership posts in the 2nd Directorate [of the General Staff or foreign military intelligence] by Soviet officers do important changes take place in the cadre policies of that institution. A period had begun of intensive preparations and initiation for a period of attention to officers of Polish nationality.”75 For instance: “From 1953, for military attache work, those directed are primarily officers of Polish nationality,” except in Washington and Belgrade.76

VII

In subsequent declarations to Polish investigators, Fejgin argued that Zambrowski, not Berman, arranged the Berlin matter, with the aid of the Yugoslavs. Fejgin, not Swiatlo, was given the order. Among other things, and without Swiatlo’s knowledge, Fejgin met privately with the GDR’s Walter Ulbricht, who gave him a letter to deliver to the Yugoslavs. Fejgin now argued that Swiatlo had planned his defection earlier, although he defended himself by adding that his vigilance in keeping Swiatlo ignorant of the Ulbricht meeting prevented that information from reaching the CIA. Their collective mission was to investigate Bronska’s RFE connections and not to “silence” her. Romkowski had forced Fejgin to take Swiatlo with him. And Fejgin denied they had been shopping while in Berlin.

After Swiatlo made his escape from Fejgin, he went to the US Military Police and surrendered his sidearm to the Americans. On 6 December, Swiatlo was taken by air to Frankfurt and on 23 December to Washington. The CIA established Jozef Mirecki’s true identity as Jozef Swiatlo by preparing a list of persons, in the West, that Swiatlo, as a security officer, had interrogated in Poland. They found Boleslaw Biega, who told US investigators that Swiatlo had taken his silver cigarette case with the inscription “From Baba” engraved, and a gold watch. It appears that Swiatlo had both items with him at the time. Swiatlo spent the next ten months undergoing extensive questioning by CIA counterintelligence and other interested US national security agencies. It has been reported that US intelligence put together some fifty lengthy reports from Swiatlo’s interrogations. Poland’s Stalinists destroyed much of the archives that had belonged to the 10th Department. The largest collection of archival materials on that directorate are therefore held in Washington and Moscow.
Romkowski took responsibility for the defection in the end. But he did so with a declaration that smacks of a plea arrangement: “From 1952, in different circumstances, Swiatlo, both to me and Fejgin, displayed ever stronger Jewish nationalism with regard to the settlement of accounts on certain personnel advances in our country and in other peoples’ democracies. In particular, this kind of outpouring surfaced again during the Slansky process.”

The investigations by Poland’s Stalinists led to a massive cover-up. And while non-violent purges continued, especially in the security apparatus, only a handful of people was targeted for full investigation and legal proceedings. After Rozanski’s arrest in 1954, on 13 July 1955, Jozef Dusza, Jerzy Kaskiewicz, Jerzy Kedziora, Jan Mislurski and Jan Kieras were arrested. This was a tiny list that did not include, of course, any of the truly important Stalinists functionaries. Only Rozanski stood out but all insiders knew that he was by no means the only guilty person among the long list of party functionaries with an odious past in the vast apparatus and, frankly, not even one of the major players. Nevertheless, Rozanski’s name became synonymous with Polish Stalinism.

In 1956, as demands for more accountability increased, the best that Poland’s communists could offer was the heads of two senior MPS functionaries already completely discredited by the Swiatlo defection. Romkowski and Fejgin were arrested in April. On 31 December, new investigations against Rozanski, Romkowski, and Fejgin were conducted. Eleven days later Romkowski and Rozanski were sentenced to fifteen years imprisonment, Fejgin received twelve years. Upon appeal in 1958 Rozanski’s sentence was reduced by one year. All three received a reprieve and were released on the same day: 3 October 1964.

Rozanski, Romkowski, Fejgin were a Stalinist troika no more or no less guilty than other high party officials that ran the security organs, and certainly not the most important, who became the PUWP’s official Jewish scapegoats for Stalinism. The net widened, if nominally, after 1956, but the quality and the pattern of the investigations into the so-called “period of errors and distortions” remained the same.

VIII

Swiatlo was now attacked as a traitor. But his revelations -- even if some were rejected as highly suspicious -- emboldened the critics of the Bierut group inside the party and led to a period of considerable social activism against Poland’s Stalinist system. As unity in the PUWP Central
Committee and the central party apparatus began to dissolve, also in response to the intensity of the ensuing power struggle inside the Kremlin, the influence of the Bierut group dramatically weakened, especially in Moscow. Albania’s Enver Hoxha characterized Bierut as a senior “communist-statesman” and valuable partner. Bierut always had a low opinion of Khrushchev as leader of the international communist movement. Zambrowski later wrote: “From 1948-52, influence on Bierut’s policies were directly exerted, sometimes through Malenkov or Molotov, by Stalin. From 1953-56, Khrushchev’s influence on Bierut was never as strong as that of Stalin...Bierut simply refused to accept Khrushchev as the definitive leader after Stalin’s death” and “upon meeting Khrushchev...Bierut did not consider Khrushchev’s authority to be greater than that of the other leaders in the Soviet Presidium, such as Molotov, Malenkov or Mikoyan.”

The Bierut group did not recover from the significant and often abrupt personnel shifts and structural changes to the institutions of Stalinist rule that accelerated after the 2nd congress of the PUWP in March 1954, where the “new course” was adopted. The internal and external pressure for a purge directed against some of Poland’s ruling elite markedly increased, while debates about de-Stalinization in the Polish party almost always gravitated toward the question of responsibility for the “period of errors and distortions.” The Swiatlo affair wounded the Bierut group but the rise of Khrushchev, at the expense of Molotov, especially following Khrushchev’s visit with Tito in 1955, isolated Poland’s Stalinists. Stalin’s enmity towards the Yugoslav communists had been an important ideological cornerstone used to justify the purge of Gomulka and his group in 1948.

Beria understood that Gomulka’s rehabilitation was a threat to him and his group. The sensational revelations about the motivation and the mechanics behind the purge of the Gomulka group, including Gomulka’s continued detention without trial, increasingly became a subject of debate at almost all PUWP meetings from November 1954. Bierut had been forced to release the former Polish leader on 13 December 1954.

The “thaw” or relaxation of terror that eventually followed Stalin’s death, but most of all the political drama that unfolded following the Poznan revolt of June 1956 and the Soviet-Polish confrontation of October 1956, had de-stabilized the regime and brought with it a new coalition inside the ruling PUWP. Gomulka’s return to the top post as First Secretary had temporarily united the major party factions, usually represented in earlier Polish historical and sociological
studies by two ubiquitous factions. These factions operated in opposition to each other less on programmatic grounds and more for control over the vast party-state nomenklatura system.

The self-described ‘liberals’ were often called Pulawy and included leading Jewish communist. Their enemies inside the party often called them Żydy (Jews), which was usually meant to be an ethnic slur and in time became a derogatory label against anyone who supported greater reform of the post-Stalin system or spoke out against anti-Semitism inside or outside the party in Poland. Their opposite was known as Natolin. They were usually labeled Chamy (Boors) and always enjoyed the support of the Soviet security, military, and diplomatic advisors that served in Warsaw as well as the leadership in Moscow. The latter never found it a disadvantage to exploit the ethnicity of their rivals and, most of all, always shifted the blame for Stalinist crimes on the “Jews.”

Those in the party who employed anti-Semitism tended to do so primarily because they had precious little else to offer the party rank-and-file in the provinces, except the promise of a quick promotion in the event of a mass purge of the central organs. Playing the nationality card was not altogether a failed tactic, at least in so far as those who played it were concerned. It fed the Żydokomuna myth and it served to embarrass their rivals in the party, whose only means of defense was to attack anti-Semitism as backward. The most important unintended repercussion of ‘Jew-baiting’ inside the party apparatus was that it brought to the fore the nationalities question in general and the nationality of PUWP cadres in particular, and therefore the future role of the Soviet advisors and other Soviet officials inside the vast party-state apparatus, all of whom were associated with Natolin. Among those party elites connected to security or intelligence work, the anti-Semitic overtones served a more immediate and sinister purpose. They found it bonded them further with many of their Soviet counterparts. From 1953, Soviet and Polish Jews openly became suspect in the Kremlin and the Soviet military and security apparatus in particular.

Gomulka’s deals with the faction leaders around Pulawy ensured that many of them continued to hold important posts inside the party and state administration. The losers, however, were not Natolin, which in any case included many of Gomulka’s earliest supporters. It was the Soviet advisors, especially those serving directly inside the Polish security, intelligence, and military establishments, that largely fell as a result of the cadre changes that took place following the return to the Soviet Union of Poland’s defense minister, Marshal Rokossowski, in November 1956. In time, renewed struggle for control of the nomenklatura system began to grow,
particularly as younger cadres came to the fore and Gomulka gained greater autonomy inside the Politburo. As Gomulka began to put his own people in key positions, those who claimed much of the credit for the initial reforms in the cultural and economic sectors, were attacked as “revisionists,” which too became associated with the “Jews.” This pattern of escalating Jewish scapegoating reached its zenith in 1967-68 following the Arab-Israeli War of June 1967, but it did not stop altogether; all of which is beyond the scope of this paper.\(^\text{84}\)
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