

# Zionism & Russia

8 Forum Lectures



**By Valdas Anelauskas**  
**Lecture 8**

**Zionism & Russia**  
**8 Pacifica Forum Lectures**  
**By**  
**Valdas Anelauskas**

**Contents**  
**Zionism and Russia – Lecture 8 of 8**  
**November 17, 2006**

Someone, quoted in that Register-Guard article (Jeff Wright, “Pacifica Lectures Decried as Anti-Semitic,” The Register-Guard, October 11, 2006, pp. A1, A9), described my previous lecture (about Red Terror) as “chilling” and I hope that it really was so. I wanted, I intended it to be not only chilling but horrifying — all those photos of corpses, victims of Red Terror, prisoners, executions, torture, dying children, and so on...

Isn't that odd that when we continually hear so much about “holocaust,” about Auschwitz, when Jewish community's organizations are using their political influence to have laws passed in a number of states requiring school kids to take mandatory courses about the “holocaust,” what happened in Kolyma or Vorkuta or Solovki is never even mentioned in American school? The excuse given for requiring students to study the “holocaust” is that it was “the greatest crime in history,” and we should know about it so that we won't repeat it. But then why shouldn't we learn also about the Great Terror in Russia, atrocities where millions of people were the victims, and so the lesson should be even more pertinent for everyone today?

You know, I'm not trying to be funny or sarcastic about this. We all know the answers to these questions, but I just want you to think about their significance. To them, Auschwitz is important because Jews died there, and Kolyma is not important, because their own Frenkels and Bermans and Rapoport were bosses there. They were no less than founding fathers

of Gulag! The Zionists keep rubbing our noses in Auschwitz, because they want us to feel guilty, they want us to feel that we owe the Jews something for letting it happen. The media rarely mention Gulag because Jews were the guilty ones there. Besides, today they make a lot of money by promoting the “holocaust.” As saying goes, “There is no business as good as Shoa business”... It’s certainly not going to help Zionists to divide the attention and the sympathy of the American public between Auschwitz and Gulag. And it’s certainly not going to help their effort to extort billions of dollars in “holocaust” reparations from Germany, from the Swiss, and from everyone else if they admitted their own guilt for Great Terror in Russia. Even more importantly, the “holocaust” story is used as sword and shield for IsraHell, that cancer tumor on Middle East.

The Zionist Jews are hiding behind that perpetual victim status and thus receiving much undeserved sympathy. The world knows of Anne Frank but do you know of all the Russian young girls killed under the leadership of Jewish Bolsheviks, starting with the Czar’s daughters? The Jews are the only group that has never had to answer for crimes against humanity nor make reparations. The world has yet to receive an apology much less an acknowledgement they (the Jewish Communists) led the largest campaign of genocide in 20th century!

On the occasion of his receiving the left-wing German Ludwig-Börne-Prize for outstanding performances in literature, the American-Jewish scholar George Steiner said in his thank-you speech: “In my opinion there can be no higher honour, no higher nobility, than to belong to a people who has never engaged in persecution. Since my childhood I have been proud not to have that arrogance. I belong to the highest race because it does not persecute others. We are the only ones; we never had the power to do so. Alleluia!” [*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 31 May 2003, German original is available on the Internet as George Steiner, „Wir alle sind Gäste des Lebens und der Wahrheit“,

<[http://www.niemandsland.koblenzerjugendtheater.de/brisant/george\\_st\\_einer.htm](http://www.niemandsland.koblenzerjugendtheater.de/brisant/george_st_einer.htm)> English translation from Wolfgang Strauss, “The End of the Legends,” *The Revisionist* 2(3) (2004), pp. 342-351, <[http://www.vho.org/tr/2004/3/Strauss342\\_351.html](http://www.vho.org/tr/2004/3/Strauss342_351.html)>]

Never persecuted others? Never held power? Really??? This is exactly what they call chutzpa! There is a joke that “chutzpa” means when someone kills his father and mother, then asks the court for mercy because he is an orphan...

“The Jewish commissar with the leather jacket and Mauser pistol, often speaking broken Russian, is the typical image of revolutionary power.” This statement comes from Sonya Margolina, who is proud to be “the daughter of a Jewish Bolshevik.” Margolina today lives in Berlin. Her book *Das Ende der Lügen: Russland und die Juden im 20. Jahrhundert*, from which I just cited, follows it with these words: “The tragedy of Jewry is that there was no political option to escape the vengeance for the historical sin of the Jews, namely, their enthusiastic cooperation with the Communist regime. The victory of the Soviet regime saved them for a while, but vengeance still lurked ahead.” [Sonja Margolina, *Das Ende der Lügen: Russland und die Juden im 20. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Siedler Verlag, 1992). English translation from Wolfgang Strauss, “The End of the Legends,” *The Revisionist* 2(3) (2004), pp. 342-351,

<http://www.vho.org/tr/2004/3/Strauss342-351.html>>.]

Even such celebrated Zionist historian as Richard Pipes (daddy of Daniel Pipes) links the “holocaust” ultimately to the perception that the Bolshevik revolution was dominated by Jews: “The Jewish Holocaust thus turned out to be one of the many unanticipated and unintended consequences of the Russian Revolution.” [Richard Pipes, *Russia under the Bolshevik Regime* (New York: Knopf, 1993), p. 258.]

So let’s go back now to Soviet Russia of the 1920’s and 1930’s.

As another celebrated historian, Paul Johnson, said: “More than anyone else, Trotsky symbolized the violence and daemonic power of Bolshevism and its determination to inflame the world. More than anyone, he was responsible for the popular identification of revolution with the Jews.” [Paul Johnson, *A History of the Jews* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), p. 451]

When Trotsky was addressing the delegates of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets on December 1, 1917, he warned that “in less than a month, this terror is going to take extremely violent forms, just as it did during the great French Revolution. Not only prison awaits our enemies, but the guillotine, that remarkable invention of the French Revolution which has the capacity to make a man a whole head shorter.” [Delo naroda, 3 December 1917, quoted in Stéphane Courtois, et al., *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), p. 59]

Trotsky was very (extremely!) enthusiastic about the reign of terror that swept Russia. He wrote in January of 1919: “Terror as the demonstration of the will and strength of the working class is historically justified...” [Izvestia, January 10, 1919.] During a speech at the International Communist Congress in Moscow the following March he said: “Blood and mercilessness must be our slogans.” [Quoted in David McCalden, “The Hidden Hand: Leon Trotsky,”

<<http://www.redwatch.net/trotsky.html>>] Later, to explain away the bloody slaughter of the rebellious Kronstadt sailors he wrote: “Idealists and pacifists always accused the Revolution of excesses. But the main point is that ‘excesses’ flow from the very nature of revolution which in itself is but an ‘excess’ of history.” [Quoted in Abbie Bakan, “Kronstadt and the Russian Revolution,” *Marxism*, No. 1, 2003,

<[http://www.web.net/sworker/Journal/m2003/17\\_Kronstadt.html](http://www.web.net/sworker/Journal/m2003/17_Kronstadt.html)>] Trotsky actually even wrote a book titled *The Defence of Terrorism* in which he said: “The man who recognizes the revolutionary historic importance of the very fact of the existence of the Soviet system must also sanction the Red Terror.” [Leon Trotsky, *The Defence of Terrorism* (London: Labour Publishing Company and George Allen & Unwin, 1920), p. 64]

This cold, calculating, and cynical cruelty, the logical result of an implacable class war pushed to its extreme, was shared by other Jewish Priests of Terror as well. Other luminaries in the Jewish-Bolshevik heavens took up the Trotsky’s refrain. Hirsch Apfelbaum (who entered the history books as Grigory Zinovev), one of the main Jewish Bolshevik leaders, declared in September 1918: “To dispose of our enemies, we will have to create our own socialist terror.” [Severnaya Kommuna, no. 109

(19 September 1918), p. 2, quoted *The Black Book of Communism*, p. 75]

He penned a charming article in the *Krasnaya Gazeta* (1 September 1918) under the rubric “Blood for Blood”:

“We will make our hearts cruel, hard and immovable, so that no mercy will enter them, and so that they will not quiver at the sight of a sea of enemy blood. We will let loose the floodgates of that sea. Without mercy, without sparing, we will kill our enemies in scores of hundreds. Let them be thousands; let them drown themselves in their own blood! Let there be floods of blood of the bourgeois — more blood! As much as possible!” [Quoted in “Red Terror”

<<http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/RUSterror.htm>>]

He then proclaimed the mass death sentence: “The bourgeoisie can kill some individuals, but we can murder whole classes of people.” [Quoted in Wolfgang Strauss, “The End of the Legends,” *The Revisionist* 2(3) (2004), pp. 342-351, <<http://www.vho.org/tr/2004/3/Strauss342-351.html>>] Apfelbaum wanted to send ten million Russians (ten out of each one hundred) to the smoldering ovens of the class war. His pronouncement of 17 September 1918 sounds almost unbelievable in its monstrosity; Apfelbaum-Zinoviev formulated this holocaust sentence: “From the population of a hundred million in Soviet Russia, we must win over ninety million to our side. We have nothing to say to the others. They have to be exterminated.” [Quoted in *The Black Book of Communism*, p. 76]

Eventually almost all the resistance to Bolshevik regime in Russia was crushed. Any further opposition was brutally suppressed by the Soviet secret police. The society which Bolsheviks began to build had to resort to unrestrained violence, in order to survive. As the highest principle of revolutionary development, the dictatorship trampled and subordinated everything to its own will. Trotsky did not merely inspire revolutionary terror, he was also the first to make it into a state institution.

Trotsky & Co. then turned attention toward fomenting similar Communist takeovers in other countries.

Jewish preponderance in communism was by that time evident also everywhere outside of Russia and first became absolutely obvious during the short-lived communist takeover of Hungary in the spring of 1919 led by the Jew, Béla Kun (a variant of Cohen).

While the Communist Party Congress was in session in March 1919, the formation of the Hungarian Soviet Republic was announced. The Congress erupted in ecstasy and asked Lenin to send its greetings to Budapest, which he gladly did: “Our Congress is convinced that the time is not far off when Communism will be victorious throughout the world. ... Long live the international Communist Republic!” [Dmitri Volkogonov, *Lenin: A New Biography* (New York: The Free Press, 1994), p. 395]

As notes Jewish scholar Howard Sachar, “for 135 days [in 1919], Hungary was ruled by a Communist dictatorship. Its party boss, Béla Kun, was a Jew. So were 31 of the 49 commissars in Kun’s regime.” [Howard M. Sachar, *Diaspora: An Inquiry into the Contemporary Jewish World* (New York: Harper and Row, 1985), p. 339] Historian Richard Pipes claims that 95% of Kuhn’s regime was composed of Jews. “The government of Béla Kun was composed almost entirely of Jews who held administrative offices,” says also *Encyclopedia Britannica*. [page 517, vol. 13, 1946.]

During the three month regime, the country was turned upside down in a reign of murder and terror. Soon a Terror Group of the Revolutionary Council of the Government was formed and quickly became known as “Lenin’s Boys.” Its leader was Tibor Szamuely, the most radical of all Hungary’s Jewish communists. Historians attribute some 80 of the 129 recorded deaths to “Lenin’s Boys,” but it is likely that the real number was at least several hundred. [The *Black Book of Communism*, p. 274] In an amazingly frank report, the *New International Year Book of 1919* (page 587) has summarized the situation:

One of the chief weaknesses in the new regime was antipathy to the Jews. In the country districts the feeling was widespread that the revolution had been a movement on the part of the Jews to seize the power for themselves,

and the remark was frequently heard that if the Jews of Budapest died of starvation, so much the better for the rest of the country.

And it was this factor which quickly brought about the regime's downfall, as the ordinary Hungarians detested Jewish dictatorship. Béla Kun was deposed and interned in a lunatic asylum. Eventually he was released and fled to Russia where he became chief of the secret police, the Cheka, in southern Russia, in Crimea. Béla Kun, notes Jewish scholar Louis Rapoport, "a Jew, [was] the cruel tyrant of the 1919 Communist revolution in Hungary and later Stalin's chief of terror in the Crimea." [Louis Rapoport, *Stalin's War against the Jews: The Doctors' Plot and the Soviet Solution* (New York: The Free Press, 1990), p. 56] There he distinguished himself by executing officers from Wrangel's army who had agreed to surrender if their lives would be spared. Szamuely attempted to flee to Austria but was arrested and committed suicide soon afterward. [The Black Book of Communism, p. 275]

While Kun and Szamuely terrorized Hungary, a Budapest lawyer, Ernst Bettelheim, had the approval and funding of the Comintern to set up an Austrian Communist Party. Bettelheim and his followers planned to seize control of the nerve centers of the government, while Kun sent the Red Hungarian army to the Austrian border (only two hours' march from Vienna), ready to invade to support their comrades. The night before the planned rising, on June 14, 1919, however, the Austrian police arrested all of Austrian Communist leadership; a march of 4000 Communists to free them broke under police fire. The Austrian revolution had been decapitated. This uprising by the Communist "Red Guard" was led by Egon Kisch, a Prague-born Jewish journalist. With the failure of the uprising he was imprisoned and then expelled from Austria. In later years he fought with the Spanish Republicans against Franco, and having emigrated first to New York and then to Mexico, returned after the Second World War to become president of the Prague Jewish community.

In Germany, the Jewish communists also tried to take over there in the chaos that followed the First World War. The Jewish Communist leaders in Russia were involved from the start. Trotsky dispatched a team of his most able revolutionaries lead by Karl Radek, one of the most powerful Jewish men in the Communist movement, to infiltrate Germany. Aided



by funds from the Soviet Ambassador Adolf Ioffe, the Spartacists, led by Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht, Leo Jogiches, and Clara Zetkin (all Jewish) attempted to overthrow the German government in 1919. Historian Paul Johnson writes about Rosa Luxemburg:

The most representative of them was Rosa Luxemburg. She came from Zamosc in Russian Poland and her historical background was impeccably Jewish. She was descended from rabbis going back to at least the twelfth century, and her mother, the daughter and sister of rabbis, quoted the Bible to her endlessly. [Johnson, *A History of the Jews*, p. 448]

Soon the revolt had been crushed and its leaders, Luxemburg and Liebknecht, had been captured and executed.

As if there had not been enough trouble in Germany already, a turbulent and bloody episode seized Munich, where a number of Jews were at the forefront of the attempt to impose Communist rule. This Communist-inspired coup in Bavaria had far greater success. It began with the seizure of power by a Jewish radical, Kurt Eisner, who proclaimed a socialist republic in Bavaria. The Jewishness of Kurt Eisner is described by historian John Toland in his famous book, *Adolf Hitler*:

In Munich another insurrection broke out on November 7. It was led by Kurt Eisner, a small elderly Jew wearing a black floppy hat which, large as it was, couldn't contain a shock of wild hair. Epically untidy, he was a living cartoon of the bomb-throwing Red. [John Toland, *Adolf Hitler* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.), p. 76.]

Then, upon his assassination, Eisner's government was replaced by another, again radical socialist one. Eisner was succeeded as Prime Minister of Bavaria by another, even more extreme Jewish revolutionary, Gustav Landauer. But he also was killed soon. With Eisner and Landauer dead, a third German Jew, Ernst Toiler, a neurotic young poet, emerged as a leader of the Bavarian revolution. A few ragtag revolutionaries took up arms and declared Bavaria as Soviet Republic. Erich Mühsam was yet another Jew in high position in the government. Erich Mühsam was the one who said about himself:

I am a Jew and will remain a Jew so long as I live. I never denied my Judaism and never even walked out of the religious community (because I would still remain a Jew and I am completely indifferent under which rubric I am entered in the state's register). I consider it neither an advantage nor a disadvantage to be a Jew; it simply belongs to my being like my red beard, my weight, or my inclinations. [Erich Mühsam, Briefe 1900-1934 2 Bde. (Darmstadt: Topos, 1984), vol. 2, pp. 422-3. English translation from Stephen Eric Bronner, "Persistent Memories of the German Revolution: The Jewish Activists of 1919," *New Politics*, vol. 5, no. 2 (new series), no. 18, Winter 1995, <<http://www.wpunj.edu/~newpol/issue18/bronner18.htm>>]

Later on, as troops loyal to the government in Berlin moved against Toller's forces, yet another revolutionary regime — the Second Bavarian Soviet Republic — was declared in Munich. Its leader was Eugen Leviné, a Russian-born Jew who announced in triumph that "the sun of world revolution has risen." As British journalist and historian John Cornwell describes it, "After a week or two of outlandish misrule, ... a reign of terror ensued under the red revolutionary trio of Max Levien, Eugen Leviné, and Tobias Axelrod to hasten the dictatorship of the proletariat. The new regime kidnapped 'middle-class' hostages, throwing them into Stadelheim Prison. They shut down schools, imposed censorship, and requisitioned peoples' homes and possessions." [John Cornwell, *Hitler's Pope: The Secret History of Pius XII* (New York: Viking, 1999), p. 74]

When Béla Kun established a "dictatorship of the proletariat" in Budapest, Hungary, it excited those Jewish communists in Germany who believed in a domino theory of revolution and who still believed that revolution must be imminent in Germany.

In Moscow, news from Munich was encouraging. The Bolshevik head of the Communist International, Grigory Zinoviev, believed that within a few months the communists would win in Germany. But Communist risings in Germany did not go nearly as far as Kun's in Hungary. In a matter of days, the German patriotic Free Corps defeated the revolutionaries and took power in Munich. The Munich Soviet was crushed, and a month later its leader Leviné was executed. Ernst Toller was captured also, but he escaped and lived to write plays. He became a

screenwriter in Hollywood, and in 1939 he hanged himself in New York. Of his Jewishness he had written, in words which many Jewish revolutionaries committed to a new world order could have echoed: “A Jewish mother bore me, Germany nursed me, Europe educated me, the earth is my homeland, the world my fatherland.” [Quoted in Martin Gilbert, *The Jews in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Schocken Books, 2001), p. 108]

The revolutionaries, in a desperate attempt to avert defeat, took hostages, most of them civilians. Adolf Hitler, still serving as a corporal in the Second Bavarian Infantry Regiment, was reportedly among those who managed to avoid being taken. Ten of the sixteen hostages were then killed. One of those in Munich at the time was the Papal Nuncio, Cardinal Pacelli, later Pope Pius XII, for whom the “bestial hostage murder” blackened the name of both Jews and Communists. And, as celebrated Jewish British historian Sir Martin Gilbert says, “Hitler, who might so easily have been a victim of the Red Terror, saw in the Jewish leadership of the revolution proof of the destructive, anti-patriotic nature of Jewry.” [Martin Gilbert, *The Jews in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Schocken Books, 2001), p. 107]

“There has been a tendency to circumvent or simply ignore the significant role of Jewish intellectuals in the German Communist Party, and thereby seriously neglect one of the genuine and objective reasons for increased anti-Semitism during and after World War I,” says Sarah Gordon in her book *Hitler, Germans and the “Jewish Question”*. And then she continues: “The prominence of Jews in the revolution and early Weimar Republic is indisputable, and this was a very serious contributing cause for increased anti-Semitism in post-war years. It is clear then that the stereotype of Jews as socialists and communists led many Germans to distrust the Jewish minority as a whole and to brand Jews as enemies of the German nation.” [Sarah Gordon, *Hitler, Germans and the “Jewish Question”* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984), p. 23.]

So communist revolution failed in Hungary, Austria, and Germany. It also failed in parts of the former Russian Empire itself: in Finland and the Baltic countries, including Lithuania, patriots defeated Communists and set up independent non-Communist governments. But, in independent

Lithuania, between two world wars, Jews were heavily (enormously!) overrepresented in underground subversive movement, in Soviet spy rings. It's known that at least two-thirds of members of underground Communist Party in Lithuania at that time (before WWII) were Jewish. When Soviets invaded Lithuania in 1940 and Red Army occupied it, and Lithuania was annexed, and became part of Soviet Union, of course all those Jewish communists were triumphant. Then, I remember I lived for many years on a street that had name of one of those Jewish communists and I was always embarrassed when someone asked me where I live and I had to say that I lived on Greifenberger Street...

Now let's back to Russia. The fullest expression of Trotsky's role always was, yes, in relation to the question of world revolution, a matter to which he devoted unprecedented effort.

A world revolution, however, needed a world instrument. Apart from the Russian Communist Party, radical subversive organizations in other countries were in a relatively embryonic stage. At the very moment when Béla Kun and his companions were attempting to set up a second Soviet state, Trotsky and Lenin decided to establish an international organization whose aim was to spread the revolution throughout the world. Communists from other countries were invited to assemble for a conference in Moscow in March 1919. They decided that "the international Communist conference would create the Third Communist International," known henceforth as Comintern. Seventeen delegates signed the manifesto, and set their task: to struggle for the world dictatorship of the proletariat. [Volkogonov, Lenin, p. 390] From its inception, this body became a cover and a tool of the Communist Party's activities in the international arena. The Communist International would control all of the world's communist movements.

Hopes of world revolution ran high. Lenin said that the "victory of the world communist revolution is assured." Their aims were to create a single world-wide Communist Party and to overthrow the "international bourgeoisie" by force to create "an international Soviet Republic."

Zinoviev was appointed a president of this central agency for spreading communist revolution in other countries. He claimed time and again that

the victory of Communist revolution in Europe was guaranteed, and that the Red Flag would soon be flying over all continents. He saw his primary task as helping to ferment armed uprisings wherever “the revolutionary situation was ripening.” [Volkogonov, Lenin, p. 391] Zinoviev said: “The eternal in the Russian revolution is the fact that it is the beginning of the world revolution.” [Quoted in Frederick Lewis Schuman, *American Policy Toward Russia Since 1917: A Study of Diplomatic History*, International Law and Public Opinion (New York: International Publishers, 1928), p. 231] Well, sounds just as American Rabbi Lewis Browne who said that “We intend to remake the Gentiles by doing what the communists are doing in Russia.” [Lewis Browne, *How Odd of God: An Introduction to the Jews* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934)]

While the German police and troops were rounding up scattered conspirators, Zinoviev was in Moscow, shouting from the platform: “Arm yourselves, German proletarians! Wherever you can get hold of a gun, take it! Form Soviets! Build a Red Army! Long live the proletarian revolution in Germany and the whole world!” And he was trying to convince the Politburo that “the leaven of world revolution” was already at work in the main capitalist countries. [Volkogonov, Lenin, p. 391]

The Central Committee, meanwhile, was preparing the program for new parties, formulating the “Twenty-one Conditions” for admission to Comintern, and sending trunkloads of gold and other valuables to Germany, Italy, Hungary and elsewhere in order to foment revolution. The Bolshevik leadership believed fanatically that, the torch of revolution having been lit in Russia, the ancient edifice of civilization would soon be engulfed in flames and burn to the ground like an old wooden barn. [Volkogonov, Lenin, p. 391]

On 6 March 1920, at a ceremony marking the first anniversary of the founding of Comintern, Lenin gave a “guarantee that the victory of the Communist revolution is inevitable ... and that it is not too far off.” The Bolsheviks planned not merely to control but also to create revolutionary situations through Comintern. For this purpose, from the very beginning, Lenin and Trotsky and Zinoviev had to shift the entire financial burden of the “international Communist Party” onto the shoulders of plundered, starving, half-stifled Soviet Russia. As early as 8 October 1918, the Central

Committee had created a Russian Communist Party Bureau for “foreign work”... All financial operations were conducted through the Bureau, under Zinoviev... Karl Radek was in charge of Bolshevik relations with foreign Communist delegations... [Volkogonov, Lenin, pp. 391-392]

Moscow was handing out money to foreign communists, millions of gold roubles, dollars, pounds, marks, lire, crowns and so on, all raised by selling off the tsarist gold reserves, the valuables looted from the churches and confiscated from the bourgeoisie. Jewish Bolshevik Osip Pyatnitsky was in charge of Comintern’s hard-currency chest. [Volkogonov, Lenin, p. 393]

In May 1919 the Politburo gave routine authorization for a collection of valuable jewelry to be made available to Comintern. The list of this jewelry runs to many pages and is valued in many millions of roubles, with items marked “for England,” “for Holland,” “for France,” and so on.” [Volkogonov, Lenin, p. 69] The total quantity of valuables collected is unknown, but the contents of one list of items collected up to 1 November 1922 provides an idea of the scale of operations: 1220 pounds of gold, 828,275 pounds of silver, 35,670 diamonds, 71,762 items of unspecified valuables, 536 pounds of gemstones, 3115 gold roubles, 19,155 silver roubles, 1902 “various precious objects.” It also says: “In addition to the church valuables listed above, 964 antique objects were collected and will be valued.” Once in Moscow, the boxes were sorted before dispatch to the State Repository: part of the loot was put at the immediate disposal of the Politburo for the Comintern fund. [Volkogonov, Lenin, p. 381]

The Bolsheviks were robbing the churches and using tsarist gold reserves, ostensibly to purchase grain from abroad, but in reality to finance revolution throughout the world and to force the creation of more and more new Communist Parties. The number of agents abroad to whom very large sums of money in local denominations were sent — virtually from the moment the Bolsheviks took power — is countless. For instance, on 20 April 1922 the Politburo accepted a forecast budget of 3,150,600 gold roubles for Comintern activities for the year. A week later, Zinoviev, a chairman of Comintern, tabled a paper on the budget, and the previous week’s forecast was revised upwards by a further reserve of 400,000 gold roubles as a first installment. Zinoviev explained that he needed 100,000

gold roubles at once “for agitation among the Japanese troops.” [Volkogonov, Lenin, p. 50] On the other hand, in November of 1921 the Politburo unanimously rejected an appeal from a special commission for the improvement of children’s rations. [Volkogonov, Lenin, p. 69]

While millions were dying of hunger and disease, the Politburo was lavishly disbursing tsarist gold to ignite revolution in other countries. The ruined countryside was incapable of feeding the population. Famine was beginning to break out in many provinces, and the workers in the towns were receiving a miserable ration of bread. Thirty-six million people were starving, thousands dying every day, and yet on 7 December 1922 the Politburo took the decision to export almost a million tones of grain. As famous Russian philosopher Nikolay Berdyaev put it: “There is something other-worldly in the Bolsheviks, something alien. That is what makes them terrifying.” [Nikolay Berdyaev, *Iovoe Srednevekovye* (Berlin, 1924), p. 89, quoted in Volkogonov, Lenin, p. 345] The country was starving, and yet the government was selling vast quantities of grain abroad!

The Bolsheviks hung onto power only by the use of relentless terror, driven by the urge to carry the civil war as fast as possible to other countries. It was their firm conviction that their supporters abroad would only come to power by the use of force and terror. In the Manifesto of the Second Comintern Congress, this was clearly stated: “The Communist International cannot admit those organizations which, while including the dictatorship of the proletariat in their programmes, continue a policy plainly aimed at the peaceful resolution of the historic crisis.” [Volkogonov, Lenin, p. 397]

While the Second Comintern Congress was in session in the summer of 1920, the Bolsheviks launched a military campaign to take Poland. Zinoviev had arranged for a vast political map of the world to be hung on the stage of the Bolshoi Theatre, where “the world party of the socialist revolution” was in session. Every morning the delegates watched as little red flags were moved to show the progress of the Reds, while Zinoviev gave an excited commentary, promising that their next Congress would take place in Berlin, then in Paris, then London... His words were drowned in a storm of applause. [Volkogonov, Lenin, p. 281]

On 30 of August, 1918, Lenin was speaking at a Moscow factory. As Lenin left the building and before he entered his car, some woman called out to him.

When Lenin turned towards her, she fired three shots. One passed through Lenin's coat, the other two hit him in the left shoulder and left lung.

The woman was Jewish and her name was Faina Yefimovna Kaplan (also known as Fanny Kaplan and as Dora Kaplan or Feiga Chaimovna Roytblat Kaplan). She was a member of the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries.

Lenin was taken back to his living quarters at the Kremlin. He feared there might be other plotters planning to kill him and refused to leave the security of the Kremlin to seek medical attention. Doctors were brought in to treat him but were unable to remove the bullets outside of a hospital. But despite the severity of his injuries, Lenin survived. However, Lenin's health never fully recovered from the attack and it is believed the shooting contributed to the strokes that incapacitated and later killed him.

Kaplan was taken into custody and interrogated by the Cheka. She made the following statement: "My name is Fanya Kaplan. Today I shot at Lenin. I did it on my own. I will not say whom I obtained my revolver. I will give no details. I had resolved to kill Lenin long ago. I consider him a traitor to the Revolution." ["Fanny Kaplan"  
<[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fanya\\_Kaplan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fanya_Kaplan)>]

But in recent years the actual role of Kaplan in assassination has been questioned. In particular, it is suggested that she was on secondary payroles and after the arrest she took the guilt upon herself.

But the "Kaplan attempt" gave the Bolsheviks the excuse they wanted to launch massive, overwhelming state terror. Five hundred hostages were shot in reprisal in Petrograd alone by order of Zinoviev, the head of the local soviet. On September 5, the commissars officially legalized the Red Terror.

Then, at the Party Conference in April of 1922, Lenin suggested that a new post of General Secretary should be created. Lenin's choice for the



post was Joseph Stalin, who in the past had always loyally supported his policies. Stalin's main opponents for the future leadership of the party failed to see the importance of this position and actually supported his nomination. They initially saw the post of General Secretary as being no more than "Lenin's mouthpiece."

Soon after Stalin's appointment as General Secretary, Lenin went into hospital to have a bullet removed from his body that had been there since Kaplan's assassination attempt. It was hoped that this operation would restore his health. This was not to be; soon afterwards, a blood vessel broke in Lenin's brain. This left him paralysed all down his right side and for a time he was unable to speak. As "Lenin's mouthpiece," Joseph Stalin had suddenly become extremely important.

On January 21, 1924, Lenin died from causes variously described as a heart attack, brain hemorrhage, and even syphilis.

The cult of Lenin became a fusion of political and religious ritual. The Politburo decided to embalm his body and place it in a sarcophagus inside a mausoleum for public viewing. The mausoleum, a cube-like structure of gleaming red granite, was built on Red Square abutting onto the Kremlin wall. Here, the most prominent party, military and government leaders would stand to view parades passing by on the anniversary of the October Revolution, May Day and other special occasions.

Images of Lenin's stern visage soon appeared everywhere throughout the Soviet Union in stone and metal, on canvas, and in print. Lenin Corners, analogous to the icon corners of Russian Orthodox Church, became a fixture of nearly every Soviet institution, and Lenin's name graced thousands of collective and state farms, libraries, newspapers, streets and cities. Among the cities was the birthplace of the October Revolution which assumed the name of Leningrad on January 26, 1924.

On 1 January 1990 in the Soviet Union there were more than 653 million copies of Lenin's writings in 125 languages — perhaps the only area of abundance achieved by Communist effort. [Volkogonov, Lenin, p. xxx] His comrades immediately began fighting amongst themselves to see who was to become his successor. The struggle to succeed Lenin which

commenced even before his death in January 1924 rocked the Communist Party to its foundations and had immense consequences to its — and the Soviet Union's — future.

The question of Lenin's will, or, put more precisely, of who would be the second person in the Party and the state, arose while Lenin was still alive. The name that always came after Lenin's was that of Lev Trotsky. On 24 December 1922 Lenin described Trotsky as “the most capable man in the present Central Committee” and “the outstanding leader of the present Central Committee.” [Volkogonov, Lenin, p. 249]

After the Revolution, Lenin and Trotsky had the relationship of equals, but when Lenin became ill in 1922, his relations with other leaders strengthened at Trotsky's expense. Trotsky visited him less than Stalin. On the other hand, Trotsky, who talked to Lenin's physicians, seems to have realized sooner than many that Lenin was not going to be able to return to his full functions as Chairman of the Government. And he was convinced in his heart that Lenin could pass the leader's baton to no one but him. [Volkogonov, Lenin, p. 256]

Beside Trotsky, Lenin's closest allies were Lev Kamenev and Grigori Zinoviev. They, and they alone, formed the “leadership nucleus” and had also every reason to expect to inherit the mantle of leadership from Lenin. The man closest to the “troika” of Trotsky–Zinoviev–Kamenev was Grigori Sokolnikov (Brilliant), who in words of Arkady Vaksberg was “the most outstanding Bolshevik leader after Trotsky,” a member of the Central Committee, and at one time a candidate member of the Politburo. Stalin hated him passionately, and with cause. It was Sokolnikov who in 1926 would demand from the tribune of a Party congress Stalin's removal as General Secretary. All four men whom Stalin perceived as his rivals in the struggle for power were Jewish. [Arkady Vaksberg, *Stalin against the Jews* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994), pp. 18-19]

Kamenev once told Trotsky (his brother-in-law) that “It will be enough for you and Zinoviev to appear together on the platform in order to reconquer the whole party.” [Isaac Deutscher, *Stalin: A Political Biography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 308]

Well, it didn't work out that way. Stalin proved to be a more ruthless and/or shrewd leader in the struggle for power. He managed to play all these Jews off against each other. He outmanoeuvred Zinoviev, Kamenev, Trotsky, Sokolnikov, Radek, and all the rest, and eventually came out on top.

It undoubtedly was to his advantage during this power struggle that the Russian people detested the Jews, from centuries of bitter experience with them. (At least some of the popular opposition to the Communists in Russia was fueled by hatred of Jews. There were explicitly anti-Semitic posters showing an ugly Jewish Trotsky.)

Well, it's important to know that Trotsky was feared even by other Jewish Bolsheviks, who banded against him.

After Lenin's stroke incapacitated him in 1922, as the most famous Trotskyist historian Isaac Deutscher says, "a triumvirate, composed of Stalin, Zinoviev, and Kamenev, formed itself within the Politburo ... Between them, the three men virtually controlled the whole [Communist] party and, through it, the Government ... Zinoviev was, in addition, the President of the Communist International." [Deutscher, Stalin, p. 255] This "Troika" as it was known was formed to keep Trotsky from the succession.

Though Zinoviev and Kamenev feared Trotsky as too militant and extreme, they shared his belief in permanent revolution, which Stalin did not. Russia had been in almost continuous turmoil for twenty years and had suffered revolutions and counter-revolutions, war, invasions and a pitiless and drawn-out civil war. There were limits to which the endurance of a people could be stretched. The Russians wanted to bury their dead and resume what they could of normal life.

Stalin understood this. Therefore, Stalin unleashed a new weapon, which Trotsky probably had not considered him capable of producing. Stalin set forth a theoretical position of his own from which he could challenge Trotsky and his theory of "permanent worldwide revolution." In Problems of Leninism, published in 1924, Stalin proclaimed his theory of "socialism in one country" — putting the safety of the Soviet Union's own economic

development first, above any international policy of revolution. Stalin's advocacy of "socialism in one country" proved a politically effective weapon against Trotsky who seemed by contrast to lack faith in the self-sufficiency of the Soviet Union.

In the middle of the 1920s the division in the Bolshevik Party already looked ominously like those in the Jacobin party. There was the Left opposition led by Trotsky, with ultraradical groups such as the Workers' Opposition in the background; the Right Opposition, led by Bukharin and Rykov; and the Centre, with Stalin at its head.

"The weaker the trio {the triumvirate which succeeded Lenin: Kamenev, Zinoviev and Stalin} felt in matters of principle, the more they feared me — because they wanted to get rid of me — and the tighter they had to bolt all the screws and nuts in the state and party system. Much later, in 1925, Bukharin said to me, in answer to my criticism of the party oppression: 'We have no democracy because we are afraid of you.'" [Leon Trotsky, *My Life* (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1975), p. 508]

During a lull in the intra-party fighting in the spring of 1926, Zinoviev, Kamenev and their supporters in the New Opposition gravitated closer to Trotsky's supporters and the two groups soon formed an alliance, which also incorporated some smaller opposition groups within the Communist Party. The alliance became known as the United Opposition.

Amidst intrigue and power struggles, by 1927 Kamenev and Zinoviev also "at last threw in their lot with Trotsky." [Deutscher, *Stalin*, p. 307] Then, in October 1927, Trotsky and Zinoviev were expelled from the Central Committee.

When in November of 1927 the United Opposition tried to organize independent demonstrations commemorating the 10th anniversary of the Bolshevik seizure of power, the demonstrators were dispersed by force and Trotsky and Zinoviev were expelled from the Communist Party on November 12. Their leading supporters, from Kamenev down, were expelled in December 1927 by the 15th Party Congress, which paved the way for mass expulsions of rank and file oppositionists as well as internal exile of opposition leaders in early 1928.

When the 15th Party Congress made Opposition views incompatible with membership in the Communist Party, Zinoviev, Kamenev and their supporters capitulated and renounced their alliance with the Left Opposition. Trotsky and most of his followers, on the other hand, refused to surrender and stayed the course.

In the struggle for power that followed Lenin's death, Stalin eventually emerged victorious over his rivals, eventually succeeding in putting to death nearly every one of the most prominent early Bolsheviks leaders — including Trotsky, Zinoviev, Radek, and Kamenev. With the passage of time, and particularly after 1928, the Jewish role in the top leadership of the Soviet state and its Communist party diminished markedly. Via the purges of the 1930s, Stalin overthrew Jewish Bolshevism and installed a Russian version. It is frequently argued that Stalin's rise to power marked the end of the Jewish phase of communism. In support of this, it is pointed out that while such Jews as Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Martynov, Zasluch, Deutsch, Parvus, Axelrod, Radek, Uritsky, Sverdlov, Dan, Lieber, Martov, and others were prominent in the early history of the revolution, these have almost without exception been executed or exiled. Now, it's about time to say at least something about Stalin himself. There is no need to describe the impact that Joseph Stalin exercised on Russia. He was, no doubt, among the most enigmatic figures of the twentieth century. However, his influence was by no means innovative. What was later called Stalinism was artificially and intentionally separated from Communism, and even set off against it. First of all, by Trotsky and his followers.

Some authors have suggested that Stalin was himself a Jew. Known facts do not bear this out. There are people actually claiming Josef Stalin was Jewish just because his real name, Dzhugashvili, sounds like "Jew," in English. But that is nonsense! In the Georgian language "shvili" means son of, as in John-son. But then some also say that "Dzhuga" means Jew. Therefore Dzhugashvili means "son of a Jew" (something like Jewison). No, the actual word for "Jew" in Georgian is "ebraeli" and the more colloquially used "uriya"... Word "dzhuga" means "flock" or "steel" dependent on the originating cultural meaning.

Stalin (or Joseph Vissarionovich Dzhugashvili) was born in the mountain

village of Gori, situated in the province of Georgia, in 1879. His father, Vissarion Dzhugashvili, was a peasant from the neighboring town of Dido-Lilo — his mother was Katevan (or Ekaterina) Geladze, whose forebears were serfs in the village of Gambareuli. Not too much is known about Stalin's father. He was for a time a cobbler, and he seems to have worked as a day laborer in a shoe factory in Adelkhanov. He is said to have been a heavy drinker. Stalin's mother was a devoutly religious woman who took in washing to feed her family, and her life's ambition was to see her son become a priest. Young Joseph attended the elementary school in Gori — a four year course — and in 1894 he obtained a free scholarship to the Tiflis Theological Seminary which provided free clothing, books, and food in addition to his tuition. Four years later he was expelled, after which he applied himself to revolutionary activity. Actually, Stalin's family were not Georgian, as is popularly thought, but they were in fact Georgian-speaking Ossetians. In the Caucasus, that means a great deal. The Ossetians have been in Georgia and the Caucasus for a long time.

Numbering approximately a quarter of a million in Stalin's youth, the Ossetians were a people of Iranian-Japhetic origin, who later mixed with the conquering Scythians, an ancient Persian-related people known for their worship of fire (to many minds, Stalin would come to epitomize the Scythian spirit). Most of the Ossetians made their home in the 15,000-foot-high icefields in the middle of the Great Caucasus, where, according to the legend, the Titan Prometheus stole fire from heaven and was chained to a rock by the Olympian gods while vultures tore at his liver. Karl Marx would refer to the central and northern Caucasus, where the Ossetians lived, as the "knees" of the Russian empire. The fire-worshipping tribe, living among the knife-edged massifs where yellow-eyed tigers roamed, called their capital Dzauzhikau, ages later to be renamed Ordzhonikidze after one of Stalin's associates. Most Ossetians spoke a dialect called Iron and lived in a district of the same name-poetically fitting for an area where the Iron Age began, and for the region's most famous son, who chose the name Stalin, meaning Man of Steel. The name Iron is derived from "Iran," according to Ossetians. The Christianized Ossetians were the only Caucasian people who consistently welcomed Great Russian hegemony, possibly providing a clue to Joseph Dzhugashvili's (Stalin's) passionate desire to assimilate? The mature Stalin sometimes thought of himself as

an Asiatic and was never able to shake off his thick Georgian accent, but he completely identified with the Russian majority. In this respect he can be likened to the Corsican Napoleon, who came to personify France, or to Hitler, the Austrian Führer of Germany.

The Gulag is commonly associated with the name of Stalin, but the true father of the Bolshevik mass terror was, no doubt, Trotsky. He did not merely inspire revolutionary terror, he was the one to make it into a state institution. The vast majority of those people who are now said to have been made the victims during the period of the “Stalinist repressions” were in fact victimized actually in the earlier period, that is to say in the first decade after the revolution and civil war.

Up until 1937–1938, the Soviet Union was ruled by an apparatus in which Zionists had a tremendous preponderance. It was only after 1938 that the real leadership of the country passed to Stalin and his government apparatus. Everything that had been done in the provinces before then was done also in Stalin’s name, of course. This applies particularly to the introduction of collective farming. The excessive steps taken in dispossessing the better-off Russian farmers, and the massive repressions against the peasants, were the work of the pro-Zionist state machinery, which was in fact glad of the opportunity to work once again on the genetic stock of the Russian people and cause it to deteriorate. And, again, let’s not forget individuals as Kaganovich.

These were the operations of the Soviet system which, by reason of its nature, often produced very, very negative results. Apart from people who were really pro-Zionist, a tremendous number of people were also repressed who were innocent. Certain factors contributed to this. Firstly, the instructions were not clear: who was the enemy? Secondly, both the central and the local authorities wished to achieve distinction. Over fulfilling the government’s plans was so fashionable in the Soviet Union, and so too was fulfilling them at any price.

And Zionism was conducting its direct operations here. The Zionists understood Stalin’s objective and decided, when being removed from their positions of influence, to harm Russia as much as possible. Every true Zionist who had been arrested gave the names of many people, mostly

innocent. The Zionists alleged that these people had been involved in organizing and carrying out the counter-revolutionary activities, espionage, and other operations, which were being conducted by the Zionists themselves. These people, suffering the physical effects of interrogation — a method of operation introduced by the Zionists — took the guilt upon themselves, in this way signing their own death warrants. Now, why did the Zionists allow Stalin in, and why did they not eliminate him at the very outset or at a later date? Well, because he deceived them! They thought he was one of theirs. At the beginning of his career as Secretary General of the Party, Stalin surrounded himself with Zionists. As I just said, there was triumvirate of Stalin, Zinoviev, and Kamenev. Until about 1937 it was not obvious at all that Stalin's chief goal was to liquidate Zionist power in the Soviet Union. Even after 1937, Stalin gave the impression of having no claims upon the Zionists: Lazar Kaganovich, whose very name made him a convenient cover for Stalin against any accusations of anti-Semitism, was one of Stalin's closest aides and outlived him by many years.

In 1994, Jewish author Arkady Vaksberg (who himself, as far as I know, still lives in Russia) wrote a book entitled *Stalin against the Jews*. Its fundamental thesis is that Stalin was a fanatical anti-Semite. (Louis Rapoport's book *Stalin's War Against the Jews* reflects the same theme.) Yes, as early as 1902, Stalin, for example, stressed the Jewishness of the Mensheviks in very abusive words, claiming that all Jews were cowards. [Mikhail Agursky, *The Third Rome: National Bolshevism in the USSR* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1987), p. 110] While before the revolution it was emotional factors that pressed on Stalin, after the revolution more prosaic and concrete factors came into play. The vicious power struggle was organically coloured in ethnic hues. As Vaksberg says, "Every (not almost every, but literally every) one of Stalin's serious rivals in that struggle was Jewish." [Vaksberg, *Stalin against the Jews*, p. 18]

On the third anniversary of the October Revolution there was published a colourful album, which opened with a photomontage of a gallery of the founders of the revolution — Lenin surrounded by his closest comrades. To the right of Lenin is Zinoviev, to the left, Trotsky. There are sixty-one men in the photographs, but Stalin is not among them. We can imagine



his frustration and anger. And of the pictured Bolsheviks, more than a third, twenty-two, are Jews. And the picture, moreover, does not include Kaganovich, Pyatnitsky, Goloshchekin, and many others who were part of the ruling circle, and whose presence on that album page would have raised the percentage of Jews even higher. [Vaksberg, Stalin against the Jews, p. 20]

“I learned quite suddenly,” recalled his former secretary, Boris Bazhanov, “that Stalin was an anti-Semite.” [Vaksberg, Stalin against the Jews, p. 27] “He never liked Jews,” Stalin’s daughter Svetlana would write in her memoirs, “though he wasn’t as blatant about expressing his hatred for them in those days [the mid-1930s] as he was after the war.” [Svetlana Alliluyeva, Twenty Letters to a Friend (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), p. 159.] As Khrushchev put it: “Suddenly after the war, Stalin was seized by a fit of anti-Semitism.” [Louis Rapoport, Stalin’s War against the Jews, p. 77] At Yalta in 1945 Stalin told U.S. President Roosevelt that Jews were “profiteers and parasites.” [Rapoport, Stalin’s War against the Jews, p. 77]

Stalin, no doubt, disliked Jews, but he never acted simply to gratify his likes and dislikes. Could someone as cunning as Stalin fail to understand that his official anti-Semitism would create a wave of hostility against the USSR in the West, and above all in the United States?

The fact that Stalin was surrounded (at least till 1937–1938) by Jews everywhere in positions of high power is described by Vaksberg as “camouflage” for the Soviet leader’s hatred of Jews. [Vaksberg, Stalin against the Jews, p. 27] This is exactly what I said just a couple of minutes ago. Vaksberg describes Stalin as a singularly rabid, irrational Jew-hater even while stating that “the people who surrounded Stalin and who had rendered him service in the twenties and thirties were mostly Jews” [Vaksberg, Stalin against the Jews, p. 35] and conceding that Jews especially close to Stalin like Emelyan Yaroslavsky (Mines Gubelman), Moisey Gubelman, Lev Mekhlis (“Stalin’s right hand man”), [Vaksberg, Stalin against the Jews, p. 23] Lazar Kaganovich and Isaac Mintz all survived Stalin’s declared “anti-Zionist” purges.

Arkady Vaksberg wanders: “Why did Stalin, as an anti-Semite have two Jewish secretaries — Lev Mekhlis and Grigori Kanner?” [Vaksberg, *Stalin against the Jews*, p. 27] As historian Donald Rayfield says, “Stalin’s least-known but most vicious scorpion was Lev Mekhlis who helped Rozalia Zemliachka-Zalkind murder captured White officers in the Crimea.” [Donald Rayfield, *Stalin and His Hangmen: An Authoritative Portrait of a Tyrant and Those Who Served Him* (New York: Viking, 2004), p. 384] “The Commissar of State Control then was the vile and vicious Lev Mekhlis,” describes him Arkady Vaksberg. [Vaksberg, *Stalin against the Jews*, p. 129] “Lev Mekhlis,” notes Louis Rapoport, “would become Stalin’s secretary and one of the most despised men in Soviet history. [Rapoport, *Stalin’s War against the Jews*, p. 30]

Well, Lev Zakharovich Mekhlis was the son of a Jewish office worker in Odessa. He was an impassioned Bolshevik who had imprisoned his own father and testified against him before a secret police tribunal. He became the main perpetrator of the purges which wiped out the Soviet officer corps. [Adam B. Ulam, *Stalin: The Man and His Era* (Beacon Press, 1987), p. 447.] He was instrumental in the execution of 15,000 Red Army officers. [Rapoport, *Stalin’s War against the Jews*, p. 200]

Why too, we might add in turning Vaksberg’s facts to different theses, whenever Stalin went on a vacation, did Lazar Kaganovich, a Jew, take over running the government? [Vaksberg, *Stalin against the Jews*, p. 51] And why, we might add, if Stalin was so all-encompassingly hateful of Jews, did he entrust his life to a Jewish bodyguard, Matyas Rakoszy? [Vaksberg, *Stalin against the Jews*, p. 40] (Another Jewish bodyguard, son of a rabbi, and “protégé of Nikita Khrushchev,” was Alexander Contract, who started out in the NKVD — later the KGB. Contract even saved the life of future Israeli prime minister Menachem Begin). [Thomas O’Dwyer, “The Rabbi’s Son at Stalin’s Side,” *The Jerusalem Post*, July 6, 1998.]

Moreover, all prominent non-Jewish Communist Party officials (and close associates of Stalin’s social circle), Kalinin, Bukharin, Molotov, Voroshilov, Andreyev, Poskrebyshev, and Rykov, all had Jewish wives. Stalin’s own daughter Svetlana had an affair with Jewish screenwriter

Alexei Kapler; she later married Grigory Morozov (Moroz), also Jewish. [Vaksberg, Stalin against the Jews, p. 138; Rapoport, Stalin's War against the Jews, p. 208] Stalin's first son Yakov had Jewish wife. The fact that Stalin reportedly did not approve is routinely explained by Jewish scholars as anti-Semitism.

The purging of Zionists in the Party and State apparatus began as early as 1929. At first secret methods, rather than open measures such as arrest and trial, were employed. From that time onwards, Stalin found himself in a situation where he might, albeit at a later stage, be declared a political criminal. The methods by which he worked were, as I have said, borrowed from his Zionist opponents: when in Rome, do as the Romans do. Those methods went far beyond the limits of what is done in civilized countries. But he deliberately practised such methods. He saw no possibility of liquidating Zionism in Russia by any other means, and this was later to cost him the loss of his reputation. Secret methods of eliminating one's opponents were too costly, but from 1931 onwards they became considerably less expensive: Zionists, pro-Zionists, and those who were caught in the trap of Zionism, began to be proclaimed as members of the opposition and as counterrevolutionaries. Work began on arresting them, giving them a trial for the sake of appearances, and liquidating them.

The fact that many Jews died during these purges is beyond question. Among them, to give just few examples, were such really innocent people as famous poet Osip Mandelshtam and theatrical director Vsevolod Meyerhold. Now, as always in these lectures let's consult our very Jewish professor Yuri Slezkine from Berkeley and see what he has to say, in his recent book *The Jewish Century*:

Members of the political elite suffered disproportionately during the Great Terror. Because Jews were disproportionately represented within the political elite, they were prominent among the victims. [Yuri Slezkine, *The Jewish Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004), p. 272]

As one can judge from the national composition of the oppositionists arrested after the 15th Party Congress, the majority of them were indeed Jews, although we are speaking only about the strongest activists. In the

Ural political prison at the beginning of the 1930s, 43 percent of the Trotskyites were Jews. [Agursky, *The Third Rome*, p. 335] Again from Slezkine:

Most Soviet Jews were not directly affected by the Great Terror, and of those who were, most suffered as members of the political elite. [Slezkine, *The Jewish Century*, p. 275]

The Jews, who were not numerous among nonelite victims, were underrepresented in the Great Terror as a whole. In 1937-38, about 1 percent of all Soviet Jews were arrested for political crimes, as compared to 16 percent of all Poles and 30 percent of all Latvians. By early 1939, the proportion of Jews in the Gulag was about 15.7 percent lower than their share of the total Soviet population. The reason for this was the fact that the Jews were not targeted as an ethnic group. None of those arrested during the Great Terror of 1937-38 was arrested as a Jew. The secret police did put together several Jewish-specific cases, but they were all politically (not ethnically) defined. [Slezkine, *The Jewish Century*, p. 273]

Indeed, Jews were the only large Soviet nationality ... that was not targeted for a purge during the Great Terror. [Slezkine, *The Jewish Century*, p. 274]

In August 1936, the first Moscow show trial of the so-called “Trotskyite-Zinovievite Terrorist Center” was staged in front of an international audience. During the trial, Zinoviev, Kamenev and 14 other accused, most of them prominent Old Bolsheviks, confessed to having plotted with Trotsky to kill Stalin and other members of the Soviet leadership. The court found everybody guilty and sentenced the defendants to death, Trotsky in absentia. The second show trial of Karl Radek, Grigory Sokolnikov, Yuri Pyatakov and 14 others took place in January 1937, with even more alleged conspiracies and crimes linked to Trotsky.

There is a fairly well substantiated story about the final minutes of Lenin’s and Trotsky’s closest comrades, who formed the leading circle of the revolution.

After the assassination of Leningrad Party chief, Sergei Kirov, on 1 December 1934, both Zinoviev and Kamenev were arrested. Kamenev tried to dissociate himself from Zinoviev, hoping in this way to mitigate his lot. Zinoviev meanwhile tearfully begged for mercy in letters to Stalin. At their trial in August 1936, the “Bolshevik twins” had agreed to confess to all the fantastic charges, in exchange for Stalin’s promise to spare their lives.

In his letters to Stalin from prison, Zinoviev sank to the lowest depths of humiliation: “I am at the point where I sit for long periods and stare at your portrait in the newspapers and those of other members of the Politburo thinking: my dear ones, look into my heart and surely you will see that I’m no longer your enemy, that I am yours, body and soul...” He signed his letters, “With all my soul, I am now yours, G. Zinoviev.”

Scorpion was eating scorpion, the system was remorselessly consuming its creators...

According to accounts of Zinoviev’s execution, he had collapsed in fear and hysteria, screeching at the top of his high-pitched voice as he was dragged into a killing cell in the Lubyanka prison, where an NKVD lieutenant shot him in the head. [Rapoport, *Stalin’s War against the Jews*, p. 50] Zinoviev literally licked the boots of his executioners minutes before his death. Then he raised his hands to the heavens, and shouted, “Shema Yisrael Adonai Eloheinu Adonai Ehad!” (“Hear O Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is One!”) This is the first line of “Shema” (from Devarim–Deuteronomy 6:4), a central affirmation of faith in Judaism; among Orthodox Jews, it is traditionally the final utterance of a person before death. [Vaksberg, *Stalin against the Jews*, p. 42]

Well, this was the same Apfelbaum-Zinoviev who, as I already quoted, said:

“We will make our hearts cruel, hard and immovable, so that no mercy will enter them, and so that they will not quiver at the sight of a sea of enemy blood. We will let loose the floodgates of that sea. Without mercy, without sparing, we will kill our enemies in scores of hundreds. Let them

be thousands; let them drown themselves in their own blood! Let there be floods of blood of the bourgeois — more blood! As much as possible!”

He was the one who said: “The bourgeoisie can kill some individuals, but we can murder whole classes of people.” He was the one whose pronouncement of 17 September 1918 sounds almost unbelievable in its monstrosity: “From the population of a hundred million in Soviet Russia, we must win over ninety million to our side. We have nothing to say to the others. They have to be exterminated.”

Now Stalin took care of him and his ilk.

But how about Trotsky himself? Well, as Donald Rayfield put it, “Trotsky’s arrogance undid him.” [Rayfield, *Stalin and His Hangmen*, p. 134]

Trotsky first was exiled to Alma Ata on January 31, 1928. Soon, in February 1929, he was expelled from the Soviet Union. His first station in exile was the Turkish island of Prinkipo off the Istanbul coast, where he stayed four years. There were many former White Army officers in Istanbul, which put Trotsky’s life in danger, but a number of Trotsky’s European supporters volunteered to serve as bodyguards and assured his safety. In 1933 Trotsky was offered asylum in France. But he was not even allowed to visit Paris. In 1935 it was implied to him that he was no longer welcome in France. After weighing alternatives, he moved to Norway, where he got permission to enter the country. After two years, allegedly under influence from the Soviet Union, he was put under house arrest. After consultations with Norwegian officials, his transfer to Mexico on a freighter was arranged.

Trotsky and a handful of close collaborators arrived in Mexico in January 1937. The administration of General Lázaro Cárdenas was the only government in the world that would grant Trotsky asylum. Trotsky went to live in a suburb of Mexico City, in a house lent by his friend and political supporter, Diego Rivera, a well-known Mexican painter. Trotsky was allowed to come to Mexico, after Diego Rivera had used his influence to make this possible. But after sexual indiscretions with his host’s wife Frida (also famous artist) Trotsky eventually quarreled with Rivera and in 1939

moved into his own residence in Coyoacán, a neighborhood in Mexico City.

Stalin would bitterly regret having allowed Trotsky to leave the Soviet Union in 1929, and he set the NKVD — successor of the Cheka and OGPU — the task of eliminating his sworn enemy almost as soon as Trotsky was outside Soviet jurisdiction. Stalin's assassination team pursued Trotsky, but for many years failed to hit the fatal mark.

In the middle of the night on 24 May, 1940, came the first direct assault on Trotsky's life. A group of armed raiders forced their way into Trotsky's house, raked the bedrooms with machine-gun fire, and set off incendiaries evidently intended to destroy Trotsky's archives and cause the maximum possible damage. Trotsky narrowly escaped death by lying on the floor beneath the bed. This assassination attempt was carried out under the leadership Mexican painter David Alfaro Siqueiros.

Then, that same year, on August 20th, another assassination succeeded. Ramon Mercader had become one of Trotsky's trusted helpers, and one night he drove an ice axe into Trotsky's head. Mexican authorities sentenced Mercader to 20 years in prison. The Soviet Union awarded him with the title of Hero of the Soviet Union and awarded Mercader's mother the Order of Lenin.

The story of Trotsky's murder is too well known to bear repeating it now in greater detail. What is important for us is the fact that the leaders in this successful operation were both Jews, both major figures in the NKVD (when the NKVD introduced the rank of general, they both got it) — Naum Eitingon and Grigory Rabinovich, who received the highest decorations of the USSR for achieving the most important of Stalin's aims. [Vaksberg, Stalin against the Jews, pp. 96-97]

At Stalin's behest, Trotsky's image was photographically removed from certain significant group pictures that documented the early history of communist Russia. Other rivals and traitors, perceived or real, likewise were literally blotted out of Russian history books after being blotted bodily from the face of the earth. In effect, they "died twice."

The situation in the Soviet Union changed considerably after the purges of 1937 and 1938. But even then Stalin was unable to state openly that those whom he opposed were of course not “counter-revolutionaries”, “spies”, “saboteurs”, “conspirators”, or the like, but were rather Zionists pursuing their methods and objectives, and were quite simply enemies of the Russian people. He was still compelled to resort to false accusations in order to rid the peoples of Russia of a very great danger and save them from their most vicious enemies.

He could not announce his struggle against the Zionists, because he would have been proclaimed (internationally) anti-Semite, and so on. On the other hand, Stalin’s domestic authority would have been mightily undermined if he had announced publicly that he had been compelled to resort to deceit. He also hoped that the remaining Jewish communists had understood everything and would continue to serve the country and not work towards the goals of Zion. But it seems to me that this was a mistake. (Even such a furious battler against Zionism as Stalin did not, even to the very end, understand the Zionists’ nature: Zionism is indestructible as long as there are Zionists.)

It is also not impossible that Stalin wished to announce the whole truth to the people immediately after completely liquidating Zionism in the Soviet Union. I don’t know. He managed to do neither the one nor the other, but nevertheless undoubtedly dealt Zionism in Russia a most powerful blow. As even Jewish writer Mikhail Agursky says, the Russian population praised Stalin for “moving the party from the Jewish tracks.” [Agursky, *The Third Rome*, p. 324] A Jewish joke compared Stalin and Moses: Moses took the Jews out of Egypt, and Stalin took them out of the Central Party Committee. And so on. A leading Jewish politician, Boris Brutskus, expelled from Russia in 1922, wrote in 1926: “Russian life has plunged stormily into a river-bed that has nothing to do with the ways outlined in Marx’s teachings. From this moment, the star of Jewish Bolsheviks has been setting.” Brutskus, like Gorky and others, put the responsibility for the anti-Semitism on the Jewish Bolsheviks themselves. “Jewish Bolsheviks,” he said, “have abundantly sown the most malicious seeds of anti-Semitism.” [Quoted in Agursky, *The Third Rome*, p. 324] The most extreme Zionist of the time, Vladimir Jabotinsky, called the new political development in the Soviet leadership a mobilization of Russian



nationalism. “Many people,” he said, “have forecast for a long time that the moment would come when Bolshevism ... will start its liberation from its — in the broad sense of this word — Jewish section.” [Quoted in Agursky, *The Third Rome*, p. 324]

Stalin took up the cause of “socialism in one country” not simply as a cudgel to oppose the Jewish revolutionaries who followed Trotsky’s internationalist preachings, but because he was in essence, yes, a Russian nationalist. [Rapoport, *Stalin’s War against the Jews*, pp. 38-39] “When Stalin destroyed the so-called Left Opposition in the 1920s, he let it be known that the opposition was led by Jews, and that the struggle was between Russian socialism and aliens,” says Louis Rapoport. [Rapoport, *Stalin’s War against the Jews*, p. 38] The political defeat of that Jewish Zionist “section” was widely regarded as a Russian victory par excellence. A Russian professor who left Russia in 1927 explained: “Do you know what Stalin’s victory over the opposition means? This is the victory of the majority of the Russian population over international communism — in the face of the Comintern. Without the support of this majority Stalin would never have won.” [Quoted in Agursky, *The Third Rome*, pp. 335-336]

The elimination of Jews from the Soviet communist leadership was actually widely welcomed abroad. As Jewish scholar Mikhail Agursky wrote, “The Soviet system was widely regarded as essentially Jewish dominated, and the majority of Western politicians regarded Stalin’s victory as a very positive Soviet isolationist development.” [Agursky, *The Third Rome*, p. 339] But what’s most interesting is that Stalin’s victory was especially welcomed by the so-called “left-wing” Nazis in Germany. It was said, for example, that Stalin, that “silent and active Russian, moved the center of gravity from the idea of internationalism to the Russian national idea. ... This does not mean that Stalin is not a revolutionary, but he is a Russian revolutionary and not an international one.” Ernst Reventlow, Gregor Strasser, Otto Strasser, Joseph Goebbels, and others in Germany were jubilant at this view. Otto Strasser even came to the conclusion that Stalin’s real objective was to finish the revolution and liquidate communism. [Agursky, *The Third Rome*, pp. 339-340]

However, Hitler did not think so. He was persuaded that the Jews still constituted the backbone of Soviet state power and that the Russians could not run their country without them. For him, the end of Jewish domination would mean the end of the Russian state. [Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (Boston, 1943), p. 655.] Hitler paid dearly for this view. The differences in principle between Hitler's national-socialism and Stalin's socialism can be reduced to Hitler's declaration: "My socialism is not the class struggle, but order." However, Stalin's socialism converged with Hitler's in that it too became national. [Rayfield, *Stalin and His Hangmen*, p. 253]

Stalin cautiously supported Lenin while repeatedly expressing his strictly nationalistic view of the Russian revolution and so he was condemned by the Trotskyists. Stalin had made communism too nationalistic — a "national communism," in fact. Stalinist "national communism" of this kind is often called National Bolshevism as well. By the way, later, wartime Russian propaganda never referred to the Nazis as "national socialists". The communists testifying at the International Military Tribunal always referred to the Nazis and the Wehrmacht as Hitlerians or fascists.

But about the war we are going to talk next time.

Let's now move to the concluding part of our lecture.

Trotsky and his followers originally hoped for the triumph of the communism on a global scale. Their views were defined by a notion of permanent revolution that would transcend nations and constantly expand to envelop the globe. Although Trotsky himself had a rather fateful encounter with an ice pick in 1940, Trotskyists today continue his fight. These days however many Trotskyists prefer to call themselves "neoconservatives."

The ideas now known as "neoconservative" began boiling in the minds of a group of Jewish American Trotskyists in the 1930s and 1940s. This group "morphed into anti-communist liberalism between the 1950s and 1970s," writes author and journalist Michael Lind in the London-based *Jew Statesman* magazine, "and finally into a kind of militaristic and imperial right" that we see today. [Michael Lind, "How Neoconservatives

Conquered Washington – and Launched a War,” April 10, 2003, <<http://www.antiwar.com/orig/lind1.html>>] They are now the strategists who pushed for war in Iraq.

In one of the first in-depth studies written about neo-conservatism in the 1970s, *The Neoconservatives: The Men Who Are Changing America's Politics* (1978), Peter Steinfels observed that it is impossible to understand the neoconservatives without understanding their history. Leon Hadar, a former UN bureau chief for the *Jerusalem Post*, laid out the now widely accepted view in an article in the *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*:

Among the major figures in the [neo-conservative] movement were former Trotskyites who studied in the '30s and '40s at the then “poor man's Harvard,” the City College of New York, a centre for socialist activism. They included Irving Kristol, who in the 1950s launched an anti-Soviet CIA front, the International Congress for Cultural Freedom; Norman Podhoretz, the editor of the American Jewish Committee's monthly magazine *Commentary*, which he turned into a major neoconservative outlet; Podhoretz's wife, Midge Decter, the chairperson of the now-defunct Committee on the Free World; sociologists Nathan Glazer and Daniel Bell; and Democratic Party pamphleteer Ben Wattenberg. [Leon Hadar, “The ‘Neocons’: From the Cold War to the ‘Global Intifada’,” *WRMEA*, April 1991, <<http://www.washington-report.org/backissues/0491/9104027.htm>>.]

And, as historian Alan Wald detailed in his probably the most authoritative work on the impact of Trotskyism on the so-called “New York Intellectuals,” *The New York Intellectuals: The Rise and Decline of the Anti-Stalinist Left from the 1930's to the 1980's* (1987), many of the others who also today belong to neo-conservatives also did indeed pass through the different shades of Trotskyism available in the 1930s and 1940's. From its different generations, one can list: Elliot Cohen, Sidney Hook, Herbert Solow, Meyer Schapiro, Irving Howe, Saul Bellow, Harold Rosenberg, and Clement Greenberg. All are Jewish.

This is why among neocons today there is, as Michael Lind put it, “a distinct Trotskyist political culture, which shows its residual influence

even on individuals who renounced Trotskyism or who were never Trotskyists but inherited this political culture from their parents or older mentors.” [Michael Lind, “I Was Smeared,” June 30, 2003, <<http://hnn.us/articles/printfriendly/1530.html>>]

The Trotskyist pedigree of neoconservatism is no secret; the original neocon, founder of this political movement, Irving Kristol (who is daddy to Bill Kristol of Weekly Standard and also Foundation of New American Century), acknowledged it with relish. In 1995, this ober-neocon candidly stated: “I regard myself to have been a young Trotskyite and I have not a single bitter memory.” [Quoted in Daniel McCarthy, “Springtime for Trotsky,” November 6, 2001, <<http://www.lewrockwell.com/dmccarthy/dmccarthy23.html>>]

You can see in that statement his willingness to identify with Trotsky. Irving Kristol, a former Trotskyist and later one of the few original founders of neo-conservative movement, describes proudly his early views in his *Memoirs of a Trotskyist*. As a student in the 1930's and early 1940's, Kristol was a proud member of the Young People's Socialist League, a radical Trotskyist group that hoped for a permanent revolution that would envelop the globe. “Joining a radical movement when one is young is very much like falling in love when one is young,” Irving Kristol wrote. “The girl may turn out to be rotten, but the experience of love is so valuable, it can never be entirely undone by the ultimate disenchantment.” [Irving Kristol, *Neo-conservatism: The Autobiography of an Idea* (New York: The Free Press, 1995), p. 470. Also available on the Internet at <[http://www.pbs.org/arguing/nyintellectuals\\_kristol\\_2.html](http://www.pbs.org/arguing/nyintellectuals_kristol_2.html)>]

In his autobiographical *Reflections of a Neoconservative*, he describes his early views as a “romantic passion” in which society was guided by an “intellectual and moral elite.” “It would never have occurred to us to denounce anything as ‘elitist’,” Irving Kristol wrote, describing his Trotskyist upbringing. “The elite was us — the ‘happy few’ who had been chosen by History to guide our fellow creatures toward a secular redemption.” [Kristol, *Neo-conservatism*, p. 471.]

That this is the organizational and intellectual pre-history of the neoconservatives is pretty much beyond dispute. “The origins of their

ideology on the left are apparent,” says Michael Lind. “The fact that most of the younger neocons were never on the left is irrelevant; they are the intellectual (and, in the case of William Kristol and John Podhoretz, the literal) heirs of older ex-leftists. ... The concept of the ‘global democratic revolution’ has its origins in the Trotskyist Fourth International’s vision of permanent revolution.” [Michael Lind, “A Tragedy of Errors,” *The Nation*, February 23, 2004,

<<http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?i=20040223&s=lind>>]

All twentieth century Jewish intellectual and political movements stem from the deep involvement of Jews with the left. However, beginning in the late 1920's, when the followers of Leon Trotsky broke off from the mainstream communist movement, the Jewish left has not been unified. By all accounts the major figure linking Trotsky and the neo-conservative movement is Max Shachtman, a Jew born in Poland in 1904 but brought to the U.S. as an infant. If we want to discover the Marxist and especially Trotskyist antecedents of neo-conservatism, then we certainly must investigate the career of Max Shachtman, one of the founders of American Trotskyism whose personal and political odyssey illustrates how the ideology and leadership of today’s War Party evolved, not from the Right, but from the far Left.

Like other leftists during the 1920s, Shachtman was enthusiastic about the Soviet Union, writing in 1923 that it was “a brilliant red light in the darkness of capitalist gloom.” [Quoted in Peter Drucker, *Max Shachtman and His Left: A Socialist’s Odyssey through the “American Century”* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International, 1994), p. 25.]

To a much greater extent than the U.S. Communist Party, which was much larger and was committed to following the Soviet line, the Trotskyists survived as a small group centered around charismatic leaders like Shachtman, who paid homage to the famous Trotsky, who lurked in the background as an exile from the USSR living in Mexico. In the Jewish milieu of the movement, Shachtman was much admired as a speaker because of his ability in debate and in polemics. Max Shachtman was a tremendously charismatic figure, a pyrotechnic speaker. He became the quintessential rabbinical guru — the leader of a close, psychologically intense group: “He would hug them and kiss [his followers]. He would

pinch both their cheeks, hard, in a habit that some felt blended sadism and affection.” The Trotskyist movement had a Jewish milieu as Shachtman attracted young Jewish disciples — the familiar rabbi/disciple model of Jewish intellectual movements: “Youngsters around Shachtman made little effort to hide their New York background or intellectual skills and tastes. Years later they could still hear Shachtman’s voice in one another’s speeches.” [Drucker, Max Shachtman and His Left, p. 43]

Then Max Shachtman became a Cold Warrior and social democrat in the late 1940's, while his erstwhile Trotskyist allies in the Fourth International were bent on continuing their isolation in separate factions on the left. By the 1950's he stopped calling himself a Trotskyist. [Drucker, Max Shachtman and His Left, p. 219] In the 1960's “he suggested more openly than ever before that U.S. power could be used to promote democracy in the third world” — a view that aligns him with later neo-conservatives. [Drucker, Max Shachtman and His Left, p. 179]

In his book *The neo-conservative Mind* (1993) Garry Dorrien argues also for the centrality of James Burnham (who wasn't Jewish), who in the 1930's was, indeed, a leading intellectual and leader of the American Trotskyists, as an ideological precursor of the neo-conservatives. One of Dorrien's main contentions is that through Burnham and later Irving Kristol, neo-conservatism retained the “rhetorical methods” and “chief concepts” of Trotskyism. [Gary Dorrien, *The neo-conservative Mind* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993), pp. 381, 36.] I did myself quite a bit of research on Burnham, but because of shortage of time now I can't go into too many details here. So let's focus better on Irving Kristol and others, who are still alive and dangerous today.

Irving Kristol was a Trotskyist, eventually winding up as a member of the Shachtman group, as were several other prominent the so-called “New York intellectuals” who followed Shachtman on his rightward course — sometimes lagging behind, sometimes skipping ahead — and finally crossing over to the right, in the cold war era, to make up the intellectual core of the War Party today. Kristol joined Shachtman's Trotskyist Workers' Party in 1940. He belonged to a small intra-party faction known as the “Shermanites” which was led by future sociologist

Philip Selznick. [Alan M. Wald, *The New York Intellectuals: The Rise and Decline of the Anti-Stalinist Left from the 1930's to the 1980's* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press), p. 350.]

For quite some time I couldn't understand what there was a difference between "Shermanites" and "Shachtmanites"... Well, "Sherman" was actually the Party name of Philip Selznick (born Philip Shachter). (Jewish, of course.) He became a young Trotskyist around 1937 and joined Shachtman's Workers Party when it split from the Socialist Workers party in 1940. Selznick immediately organized a faction known as the "Shermanites." Supporters of the Shermanites included Gertrude Himmelfarb, Seymour Martin Lipset, Marvin Meyers, Martin Diamond, Herbert Garfinkel, Jeremiah Kaplan, and Irving Kristol — all of whom later became well known as neo-conservatives.

Moreover, as Srdja Trifkovic, writing in the on-line version of *Chronicles* magazine, says that second generation of today's neo-conservatives, "including Joshua Muravchik, and Carl Gershman, also came to neo-conservatism through the Socialist Party at a time when it was Trotskyite in outlook and politics." [Srdja Trifkovic, "Neo-conservatism, Where Trotsky Meets Stalin And Hitler", *Chronicles Extra*, July 23, 2003, <<http://www.chroniclesmagazine.org/News/Trifkovic/NewsST072303.html>>.]

Joshua Muravchik and Carl Gershman played key roles in the Socialist Party and later on in Social Democrats USA, during the 1960's and 1970's. Justin Raimondo writes in [Anti-War.com](http://www.antiwar.com), that "it was Shachtman's particular schismatic brand of Trotskyism, as advocated by the 'Yipsels', as Comrade Muravchik and his fellow young commies called themselves, that over time was transmuted into a militant push for global 'democracy'." [Justin Raimondo, "Smoking Gun", [Antiwar.com](http://www.antiwar.com), May 9, 2003, <<http://www.antiwar.com/justin/j050903.html>>]

Well, intellectual nomads by their very nature, they are as comfortable with one ism as with another. "The transition from whatever it was the neo-conservatives formerly purported to believe to whatever it is they now purport to believe was no more wrenching a spiritual odyssey for them than a trip from Pinsk to Prague would be for an Eastern European

peddler,” wrote the late Sam Francis in his article about the neocons, “The Real Cabal.” [Chronicles, September 2003, <http://www.chroniclesmagazine.org/Chronicles/September2003/0903Francis.html>]

But even as their world-view changed in response to the failure of communist ideals, their Trotskyist mindset stayed consistent. These ex-Trots simply reinvented themselves. As Justin Raimondo says, “For in spite of their many costume changes — from the red and pink hues of Trotskyism and Social Democracy, to the gray flannel button down conservatism — there has always been one constant: a passion for war.” [Justin Raimondo, “Iraq – First Stop on the Road to Empire,” October 11, 2002, <<http://www.antiwar.com/justin/j101102.html>>] Leon Trotsky advocated war and mass murder as do today’s neocons. In the 1920’s and 1930’s, it was a class war. When Irving Kristol and his band of apostate Trotskyists inveighed against the Stalinists in the 1930s, socialism in one country, they declared, was impossibility: the Revolution had to be exported to Europe, and throughout the world, at gunpoint. In the Soviet Union, they believed, a bureaucratic caste had arisen that was content to rest on Lenin’s (and even more so Trotsky’s) laurels and reap the benefits of their privileged position, instead of doing their duty and going out and spreading the Revolution far and wide.

Growing gradually more disillusioned over the years, and more fixated on hatred of their old enemies, the Stalinists, these embittered Jewish ex-radicals moved into the right wing of the old Socialist Party, and wound up supporting the Cold War and Vietnam War, and all other wars of American Imperialism.

In the context of the Cold War, these refugees from the left continued with their hopes for a global revolution, but instead of the socialist revolution, they joined forces that advocate the triumph of American capitalism, which they all unequivocally equate with democracy. They were united by their aversion to the moral relativism, and their new ideology came to be marked by a Cold War fury, a new permanent global revolution in which America is unquestioningly moral and right. The use of military might to conquer the world in the name of America was the modern



manifestation of the Trotskyist ideal. This belief in geopolitical manifest destiny has only grown stronger with time.

“Neo-conservatism in the realm of foreign policy is merely Trotskyism-turned-inside-out — a militant internationalism fuelled by U.S. taxpayer dollars and backed up by the mightiest military the world has ever seen,” says Justin Raimondo. [Justin Raimondo, “Neocons in Denial,” April 30, 2003, <<http://www.antiwar.com/justin/j043003.html>>]

As early as 1963 Richard Hofstadter commented on the progression of many ex-Communists from the paranoid left to the paranoid right, clinging all the while to the fundamentally Manichean psychology that underlies both. Four decades later the dominant strain of neo-conservatism is declared, as Srdja Trifkovic says, to be a mixture of geopolitical militarism and “inverted socialist internationalism.” [Srdja Trifkovic, “Neoconservatism, Where Trotsky Meets Stalin and Hitler,” *Chronicles*, July 23, 2003, <<http://www.chroniclesmagazine.org/News/Trifkovic/NewsST072303.html>>]

In his book review of John Ehrman’s *The Rise of Neoconservatism*, entitled “Trotskyism to Anachronism: The Neo-conservative Revolution” that appeared in *Foreign Affairs* in 1995, John B. Judis, writing specifically on the neo-conservative view of foreign policy, maintains that “Neo-conservatism was a kind of inverted Trotskyism, which sought to ‘export democracy’, in Muravchik’s words, in the same way that Trotsky originally envisaged exporting socialism”, and that, “[the] Neo-conservatives who went through the Trotskyist and socialist movements came to see foreign policy as a crusade, the goal of which was first global socialism, then social democracy, and finally democratic capitalism. They never saw foreign policy in terms of national interest or balance of power.” Behind this lay the fact that, “What both the older and younger neoconservatives absorbed from their [Trotskyist] past was an idealistic concept of internationalism.” [John B. Judis, “Trotskyism to Anachronism: The Neoconservative Revolution”, *Foreign Affairs*, July/August, 1995, <<http://www.foreignaffairs.org/19950701fareviewessay5058/john-b-judis/trotskyism-to-anachronism-the-neoconservative-revolution.html>>.]

But the neo-conservative mindset is apocalyptic, rather than utopian (which characterizes the Trotskyite Left). The replacement of the Soviet threat with the more amorphous “terrorism” now reflects the doomsday revolutionary mentality that can never rest. New missions and new wars will have to be engineered, and pretexts manufactured... [Srdja Trifkovic, “Neo-conservatism, Where Trotsky Meets Stalin and Hitler,” Chronicles, July 23, 2003, <<http://www.chroniclesmagazine.org/News/Trifkovic/NewsST072303.html>>]

One of those neocons, Michael Ledeen, wrote that “creative destruction” is America’s eternal mission, both at home and abroad, and the reason America’s “enemies” hate it: “They cannot feel secure so long as we are there, for our very existence — our existence, not our politics — threatens their legitimacy. They must attack us in order to survive, just as we must destroy them to advance our historic mission.” [Quoted in Srdja Trifkovic, “Neo-conservatism, Where Trotsky Meets Stalin and Hitler,” Chronicles, July 23, 2003, <<http://www.chroniclesmagazine.org/News/Trifkovic/NewsST072303.html>>]

From permanent revolution to permanent conquest! Their Trotskyist mindset, shorn of its Soviet roots, morphed easily into a “permanent revolution” on behalf of an American rather than a socialist world order. [Justin Raimondo, “Neocons in Denial,” April 30, 2003, <<http://www.antiwar.com/justin/j043003.html>>]

It’s just a coincidence that, in year 2003, George W. Bush gave a speech announcing that the U.S. was leading a “global democratic revolution” on the eve of Leon Trotsky’s birthday, but it is one that neatly illustrates the militant revolutionism at the core of American foreign policy.

“While there can be no doubt that [another Leo] Leo Strauss, is the Godfather of the Neocons, it can also be said that Leon Trotsky is their Grandfather.” [B. A. Livingstone, “Neocon Imperialism; or Apocalypse Now?” December 3, 2003,

[http://www.chemtrailpatrol.com/cpr\\_neocon\\_imperialism\\_or\\_apocalypse\\_now.htm](http://www.chemtrailpatrol.com/cpr_neocon_imperialism_or_apocalypse_now.htm)]

It's also worth noting again that the neo-conservative preoccupation with exporting "democracy" abroad through war and mercantilism reflects the original split between Trotsky and Stalin. Trotsky argued that there could not be "socialism in one country" but rather that the revolution had to be truly international. Trotsky's theory is, as I said today many times, called "Permanent Revolution". This was the central idea in the difference between Stalin and Trotsky in the early stages of the Soviet Union. Whereas Stalin wanted to focus the attention of the people in the re-building of Russia, Trotsky looked to keep the revolution alive taking the fight to the capitalists in the west. Trotsky's proposed "permanent revolution" was a revolution that must never cease. Trotsky rationalized that the revolution driven by its own inertia would spread and prevail over all its enemies, from the capitalism of the west or what he called, "enemies of the people" to all global enemies. If the revolution failed to be kept alive, it would simply perish.

This is exactly neocons' philosophy at its core, a core mission to "transform" U.S. foreign policy to exert a "permanent" global hegemony even if it brings "revolutionary change" just like dear old grand dad, Leon Trotsky. In Wall Street Journal article, neo-conservative scholar Michael Ledeen spoke on the justification of a U.S. attack on Iraq. "We are the one truly revolutionary country on Earth," he declared, and that would be "the reason we will successfully transform the lives ... of millions in the Middle East." [Michael A. Ledeen, "The War on Terror Won't End in Baghdad," Wall Street Journal, September 1, 2002] In another article by Michael Ledeen, entitled "Creative Destruction: How to Wage a Revolutionary War," the main argument was that it was "time once again to export the democratic revolution" as the best way to defeat the terrorists. [Michael Ledeen, "Creative Destruction", National Review Online, Sept. 20, 2001,

<http://www.nationalreview.com/contributors/ledeen092001.shtml>]

Words cannot be more clear, neocons, like Trotsky, seek a permanent revolution.

Having given up the idea of revolutionary socialism for the more practical project of global “democracy,” this troublesome sect of neoconservatives, not so affectionately known as “neo-cons” (or rather “zio-cons”), is at last having its moment in the sun.

Michael Lind in a much quoted article in the New Statesman from April of 2003 wrote that, “neoconservative defence intellectuals ... call their revolutionary ideology ‘Wilsonianism’ (after President Woodrow Wilson), but it is really Trotsky’s theory of the permanent revolution mingled with the far-right Likud strain of Zionism”. [Michael Lind, “The Weird Men Behind George W. Bush’s War”, New Statesman, April 7, 2003, <<http://www.newamerica.net/index.cfm?pg=article&pubID=1189>>]

Even before Lind, the charge had already been made by famous Paris-based columnist William Pfaff, who had written in the International Herald Tribune in December of 2002 that, “The Bush administration’s determination to deal with its problems through military means ... seems a rightist version of Trotsky’s ‘permanent revolution’, destroying existing institutions and structures in the millenarian expectation that all this violence will come to an end in a better and happier world.” [William Pfaff, “Al Qaeda vs. the White House”, International Herald Tribune, December 28, 2002]

In another article, Pfaff says that neoconservatives, “are influenced by the Trotskyist version of Marxist millenarianism that was the intellectual seedbed of the neoconservative movement.” [William Pfaff, “The Philosophers of Chaos Reap a Whirlwind”, International Herald Tribune, August 23, 2003]

Neo-conservatives in the U.S. Defence Department are surreptitiously implementing Trotsky’s theory of permanent revolution from the White House. The application of Trotsky’s concept of Permanent Revolution means that the United States is engaging in an “endless war.”

Seymour Hersh, speaking at the American Civil Liberties Union conference on July 7, 2004, gave a pretty good definition of today’s neo-cons: “In a sense I would say Paul Wolfowitz is the greatest Trotskyite of our times. He believes in permanent revolution. And in the Middle East,

to begin with, needless to say.” [Quoted in Justin Raimondo, “The Cult of Power: From Leon Trotsky to Paul Wolfowitz, July 14, 2004, <<http://www.antiwar.com/justin/?articleid=3027>>] The real story, as Hersh clearly realizes, is that Paul Wolfowitz is perhaps the greatest Trotskyist not only of our time but of all time. Certainly greater than Trotsky himself, the founder of the Red Army and prophet of world revolution who wound up in some rundown Mexican backwater with an icepick sticking out of his head. Trotsky’s “Fourth International,” stillborn, lived in Stalin’s shadow for all of its brief half-life, but in that time managed to generate a tendency that would eventually culminate in another sort of world revolution — and yet, on second thought, not all that different. [Justin Raimondo, “The Cult of Power: From Leon Trotsky to Paul Wolfowitz, July 14, 2004, <<http://www.antiwar.com/justin/?articleid=3027>>]

Worthy of note is that while ex-Stalinists tended to denounce their Communist roots vehemently, neoconservatives like Kristol and others remain at least wistfully fond of Trotsky. [Gerhard Rempel, "Stalin vs. Trotsky," <<http://mars.wnec.edu/~grempe/courses/stalin/lectures/StalinTrot.html>>] As Jeet Heer has reported in the National Post, citing neocon writer and “ex”-Trotskyist Stephen Schwartz:

To this day, Schwartz speaks of Trotsky affectionately as “the old man” and “L.D.” (initials from Trotsky’s birth name, Lev Davidovich Bronstein). “To a great extent, I still consider myself to be [one of the] disciples of L.D,” he admits, and he observes that in certain Washington circles, the ghost of Trotsky still hovers around. At a party in February celebrating a new book about Iraq, Schwartz exchanged banter with Wolfowitz about Trotsky, the Moscow Trials and Max Shachtman.

“I’ve talked to Wolfowitz about all of this,” Schwartz notes. “We had this discussion about Shachtman. He knows all that stuff, but was never part of it. He’s definitely aware.” The yoking together of Paul Wolfowitz and Leon Trotsky sounds odd, but a long and tortuous history explains the link between the Bolshevik left and the Republican right. [Quoted in Justin Raimondo, “The Cult of Power: From Leon Trotsky to Paul Wolfowitz, July 14, 2004, <<http://www.antiwar.com/justin/?articleid=3027>>]

Stephen Schwartz spent his formative years in a Spanish Trotskyist group. Trotsky was, no doubt, a successful military leader, and Stephen Schwartz finds support for the idea of pre-emptive war in the old Bolshevik's writings. "Nobody who is a Trotskyist can really be a pacifist," Schwartz notes. "Trotskyism is a militaristic disposition. When you are Trotskyist, we don't refer to him as a great literary critic, we refer to him as the founder of the Red Army." ["Trotsky's Ghost Wandering the White House," National Post, June 07, 2003, <[http://www.prisonplanet.com/trotskys\\_ghost\\_wandering\\_the\\_white\\_house.htm](http://www.prisonplanet.com/trotskys_ghost_wandering_the_white_house.htm)>]

Stephen Schwartz has claimed there is an anti-Semitic motive behind association of Jewish neocons and Jewish Trotskyists: "The U.S. neofascists who have thrown this accusation around use the term 'Trotskyist' the same way they use the term 'neoconservative': as a euphemism for 'Jew'," he said. [Stephen Schwartz, "Trotskycons?: Past and Present, National Review, June 11, 2003,

<<http://www.nationalreview.com/comment/comment-schwartz061103.asp>>]

Somewhere in the bowels of hell Leon Trotsky must be smiling.

These 8 lectures were retrieved from the following website:  
<http://www.efn.org/~valdas/pacifica.html>

## End of Lecture 8



# **Contact us for details of audio tapes and articles by:-**

**Dr. Wesley A. Swift**

**Rev. Dr. Bertrand Comparet**

**Rev. William Gale**

**Captain K. R. McKilliam**

**Pastor Don Campbell**



# **THE NEW CHRISTIAN CRUSADE CHURCH**

## **CALLING THE PEOPLE OF BRITAIN**

**At last the bible makes sense!**

**At last we know its meaning.**

## **Its the book of the RACE**

