

Ioan Ratiu, "The Milner-Fabian Conspiracy", 2012

Chapter 1. Socialism or the transition from democracy to dictatorship

[Download the book in PDF or Epub format](#)

Socialism is a system of total state control, which in turn is controlled by a small clique representing vested international interests.

Content

- [Introduction](#)
- [Socialism, Karl Marx and the art of subversion](#)
- [Socialism and Dictatorship](#)
- [Socialism and Genocide](#)
- [Socialism and International Finance](#)
- [The feigned "death" of Marxism and its miraculous "resurrection"](#)
- [Socialism and Global Government](#)
- [Socialism and the UN](#)
- [Socialism and the EU](#)
- [Socialism and the destruction of the Nation-state](#)
- [Socialism and Islamization](#)
- [Notes](#)
- [References](#)

Introduction

Socialism is believed by some to be a thing of the past and so it ought to be. The only reason why this is not the case is that Socialism is the chosen political creed of the international financial interests which rule the world. This ensures that Socialism is not a thing of the past but of the present and, most likely, of the future.

Understanding Socialism, therefore,

- 1) enables us to understand recent history,
- 2) become aware of the present situation
- 3) and, above all, know what kind of future awaits us.

Socialism's various branches such as Marxism-Leninism (a.k.a. Communism), Social Democracy, Fabianism, etc., have been the driving force behind many negative social, political, economic and cultural changes which have taken place in Europe and the world since the early 1900s. This has to do with the fact that Socialism itself has historical roots in negative developments in the Western world's political systems.

Briefly, these may be described as a shift from monarchy to liberal democracy and from the latter to Socialist dictatorship. In other words, a shift from right to left, where "the Right" stands for the forces of Conservatism and Tradition and "the Left" for the forces of self-serving Change and Revolution (i.e., Destructive Upheaval).

"Right" and "Left"

The political and philosophical terms "right" and "left" originated in the political systems of Western Europe, notably revolutionary France, where conservative supporters of the monarchy in the National Assembly were seated to the right of the presiding official, whereas supporters of the revolution were

seated to his left. This practice was historically correct: sitting at the right hand of a ruler had long indicated a position of honour and authority attached to the ruler's representatives.

The Bible describes Christ as sitting at the right hand of God. The word "right" had always been associated with that which is upright, straight, correct, as opposed to that which is not so. Thus, "right" represents the right view and the right conduct which through the experience of generations has become the established order by adhering to which human society prospers and thrives.

Hence

- Greek word "**orthos**", "right", "correct" and orthodoxy, "right belief";
- Latin **ritus**, "custom", "ritual";
- German **Recht**, "law", "right";
- English **righteous** (right-wise), "morally right", "virtuous", "law-abiding";
- Russian "pravyy" (right) has a common root with the words "correct", "fair" and "truth" [* my note].

In contrast to this, we find Latin sinister, "left", from which French and English sinister, "malignant", "wicked", "evil"(cf. Matt. 25:33-41).

The right order of things or Righteousness, that is, truth, order and justice, is not the invention of modern liberal democrats. As far as recorded history goes, righteousness has been associated with the monarchy which has traditionally been entrusted with establishing and upholding righteousness for the good of society. Ancient Egyptian texts state that the deity has set up the king on earth that he may speak justice to the people, defend righteousness and fight evil (Assmann, 1975).

Similar references to kings as upholders of righteousness may be found in the Bible (Ps. 2:6-7; Eze. 45:9) and other religious and philosophical texts. It is not for nothing that the sages of the ancient world, including Plato, advocated a society ruled by wise kings (incidentally, Plato's work on the subject was titled Politeia, "Constitution" or "Just Government", not "Republic" as conveniently mistranslated by Roman republican Cicero and later liberal academics).

Monarchy versus pseudo-republic and pseudo-democracy

While Kingdom and, in particular, "Kingdom of God" is a traditional Christian concept, Republic is not. The concept of King is instantly recognizable as firmly rooted in Christian and even pre-Christian European tradition (note 1, p. 50). By contrast, "president" evokes the image of a person who chairs a business meeting such as (in England) the President of the Board of Trade. As we shall have occasion to see, the business world is precisely where both republican anti-monarchism and Socialism come from.

True, in the Left-dominated intellectual climate of today, the monarchy has come to be associated with ostentation and "undemocratic" practices. But we find that even in republican systems, including in Communist states, rulers reside in palatial homes and live a life of luxury.

As for the claim that monarchy is defined by undemocratic practices, this is based on the erroneous definition of democracy as direct rule by the people. On this definition, we find that no such system exists anywhere in the Western world.

In contrast, if democracy is defined as rule according to the will and in the interests of the people, we find that this definition applies to traditional monarchy (including Plato's "philosopher-kings" who were to rule with the approval and in the interests, of the community; cf. Laws 680e, etc.).

Indeed, to the extent that the monarchy serves to uphold the principles of righteousness for the good of society as indicated above, it is the supreme example of democratic institution. This is confirmed by the fact that the decline of the monarchy has coincided with the decline of traditional society and the concept

of righteousness, of what is right and what is wrong, on which true monarchy and true democracy are based.

Three types of transition from monarchy to socialist dictatorship

Although this decline has been hailed by some as "progress", the evidence is that the replacement of the monarchy with republicanism and "liberal democracy" sooner or later culminates in Socialist dictatorship.

This, of course, is not to say that all nations must embrace monarchism. Every nation has the right to choose its own political system -and there is no doubt that republics can function as proper democratic societies in the right circumstances. But republicans should be aware that their system may not ultimately prove to be the better one or deliver the promised boon. Meanwhile, suffice it to note that the transition from monarchy to Socialist dictatorship is a historical fact that no one can deny.

This transition may be classified into three basic types according to the tactics of its architects: **Type 1** – overt; **Type 2** – imperceptible; and **Type 3** – covert.

The most obvious examples of **Type 1** are Russia, Germany and Austria which all passed from monarchy to Socialist republic in 1917, 1918 and 1919, respectively.

Type 2 is exemplified by America which developed from royal colony to liberal capitalist and from the latter to quasi-Socialist state under presidents Clinton and Obama. In this type, the transition has been so gradual as to be imperceptible to the general public (though not, of course, to historians and other critical observers). Thus, despite appearances, America is no exception.

The best example for **Type 3** is Britain where the monarch has remained head of state, but from 1945 the country has alternately been run by Fabian Socialists (Labour) and "Conservatives" (Tories) increasingly pursuing Fabian Socialist policies.

In all these (and other) examples, the State has acquired more and more powers while democracy, that is, rule according to the will and interests of the people, not to mention rule by the people, has been constantly eroded and suppressed.

What becomes evident is that the loss of the concept of righteousness is directly related to loss of democracy and freedom: the promised all providing Nanny State (in the British sense of welfare state) invariably transforms itself into an all-controlling, repressive Socialist Big Brother State.

Thus, **modern history may be defined as a transition from Monarchy to Socialism, from righteousness to unrighteousness and from democracy to dictatorship.** According to Karl Marx and likeminded 21st century "progressives", this shift from right to left is the inevitable outcome of the course of history.

The present study refutes this view, showing that this development is in fact the result of systematic machinations on the part of certain self-serving financial and political interests. To claim that it is "inevitable" amounts to believing in the supremacy of selfishness, injustice and evil.

Socialism, Karl Marx and the art of subversion

Socialism is falsely projected by its sponsors, followers and supporters as a benign system aiming to raise the living standard of all citizens through equal access to resources, etc. In reality, it is a subversive system aiming to destroy the existing order and seize power as part of its agenda of world domination.

In addition, Socialism has often achieved the opposite of what it had promised, as exemplified by Stalinism in Soviet Russia, Maoism in China, etc., where after decades of State-imposed Socialism the ruling regimes

went bankrupt and were forced to import food from capitalist countries like the USA in order to feed their starving populations.

Finally, Socialism has been responsible for some of the most serious crimes in history. Apart from systematic political and religious repression, it has resulted in the death of millions of innocent people.

To be sure, most Socialists are well-meaning, ordinary citizens who are unaware of the true nature and history of the system they support. This is because all the information available to them comes from Socialist-dominated or – influenced sources. However, it is not necessary for all of a system's followers, supporters and sympathizers to be malignant in order for the system itself to be so.

As we shall presently demonstrate, Socialism is not only a malignant system but a fraudulent one. The facts speak for themselves.

Karl Marx

The most influential Socialist ideologist, Karl Marx (1818-1883), was a German-born adventurer with an obsession for secret societies and revolutionary intrigue who sought to subvert for his own ends not only the establishment, but also the revolutionary movements he joined.

It is no coincidence that the French socialist Pierre-Joseph Proudhon called Marx the "**tapeworm of socialism**" (Hauptmann, vol. 2, p. 200).

Following a failed attempt to foment revolution in Germany, Marx fled to France and then to Belgium where he became the head of the illegal revolutionary organization, the Brussels Communist League. In February 1848, using an inheritance from his father, he funded arms purchases for another (failed) revolution there, for which he was arrested and deported (Jenny Marx in Schiltrumpf, pp. 57-8; Wheen, pp. 126-7).

About this time, Marx came to believe that terror was a necessary part of revolutionary strategy (Galvert, p. 138). Later that year, back in Germany, he wrote: "there exists only one means of shortening, simplifying, and centralizing the death agony of the old order of society and the bloody birth-throes of the new, only one means -Revolutionary Terrorism" ("The Victory of the Counter-Revolution in Vienna", NRZ, 7 Nov. 1848, quoted by Kautsky in Terrorism and Communism, Kerridge's translation, pp. 49-50, see note, pp. 48-9, below).

In February 1849 Marx was put on trial for incitement to armed rebellion, only to be acquitted by a sympathetic jury. As a result, the authorities were left with no choice but to recommend him for deportation as a non-German citizen (he had earlier renounced his citizenship) along with other members of the editorial staff of his revolutionary paper. The police on his heels, Marx fled to Paris and then to London where he remained until his death in 1883.

Unrepentant, Marx continued to believe that Capitalism was doomed and Socialism destined to replace it. In 1850, Marx and his financial sponsor and co-conspirator Friedrich Engels (1820 1895), issued a secret circular letter calling for "decisive, terroristic action against the reaction" in Germany ("Address of the Central Committee to the Communist League", March 1850, MECW, vol. 10, p. 277; Marxists Internet Archive (MIA), www.marxists.org).

The activities of the [Communist League](#), founded by Marx and Engels in London in 1847, led to the trial of its members in Cologne and the subsequent dissolution of the organization in 1852.

In 1864, Marx took part in the founding of the London International Workingmen's Association, known as the [First International](#) (IWMA), and soon became its leader, being elected to the General Council (IWMA, the "First International").

Socialist revolution as a reign of terror

Between 18 March and 28 May 1871, a group of Socialist revolutionaries, some of whom were followers of Marx and members of his IWMA, seized the French capital and established an authoritarian regime which committed various atrocities such as executing scores of hostages, including the Archbishop of Paris.

This regime came to be known as the "[Paris Commune](#)" and it became a model for Marxist revolutionary ideology (Marx, *The Civil War in France*, MECW, vol. 22, p. 540; cf. Postscript by Engels, 18 Mar. 1891).

The exact role played by Marx and his collaborators in the uprising is not entirely clear. However, in April 1871, Marx associated himself with the Paris Commune by writing that it was the "most glorious deed" of their Party since the June 1848 insurrection in Paris (Letter to Dr. Kugelmann, 12-17 Apr. 1871, MECW, vol. 44, p. 131, emphasis added).

He later declared that the Commune will be forever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society ("*Third Address to the General Council of the International*", 30 May 1871, *The Civil War in France*, MECW, vol. 22, p. 230).

Marx's views drew criticism even from his own organization (IWMA) and he became known as "the Red Terror Doctor" (Letter to F. A. Sorge, 27 Sept. 1877, MECW, vol. 45, pp. 277-8; Berlin, pp. 1889).

On his part, Engels in 1872 defined revolution as a **reign of terror**, stating that it was "the act whereby one part of the population imposes its will upon the other part by means of rifles, bayonets and cannon" and that the victorious party had to maintain this rule by means of "the terror which its arms inspire in the reactionaries".

While approving of the Paris Commune, Engels criticized it for not using terror freely enough ("*On Authority*", published Dec. 1874, MIA).

Apologists for Marxism typically attempt to shift the goalposts by claiming, for example, that since the Commune was controlled by Marx and Engels' Blanquist and Proudhonist rivals, "our Party" could only have been meant in a broad sense (Walicki, p. 326). But this is beside the point.

The real point at issue, which must be beyond dispute, is that Marx and Engels described the Commune in terms indicative of their approval and admiration. Whether it was their party in a narrower sense or not, it was a movement to which they admittedly belonged and whose actions they openly endorsed.

Towards the end of his life, having failed to start a successful Socialist revolution in Western Europe, Marx turned his attention to Russia (even learning the language), declaring that this time the revolution will begin in the East (Letter to F. A. Sorge).

Marxism was later introduced into Russia by Marx's disciples Georgii Plekhanov, Vladimir Lenin and Leon Trotsky. Lenin and his Bolshevik gang readily embraced terrorism both while in the underground and after they seized power in the Communist Revolution of October 1917 (Law, pp. 76-7).

Bloodthirsty followers of Marx

Following in the footsteps of Marx and Engels, Lenin berated the Paris Commune for "excessive magnanimity", quoted Marx and Engels to justify his own support for dictatorship and revolutionary terrorism (*The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, MIA; cf. Walicki, pp. 326 ff.); created a secret police ([CHEKA](#)) as an instrument of state terror (ET, p. 72); and started the infamous campaign known as the "Red Terror" (Pipes, 1996, pp. 55-6), in which he ordered the internment of farmers, priests and "other doubtful elements" in concentration camps and public executions (Telegram to the Penza authorities, 9 Aug. 1918, Legget, p. 179; Telegram to the Penza authorities, 11 Aug. 1918, Pipes 1996, p. 50; Courtois, p. 73).

As noted by George Legget, political concentration camps ("[gulags](#)") used to isolate and suppress political opponents originated in Soviet Russia (Legget, p. 179).

Similarly, Lenin's deputy Trotsky wrote *Terrorism and Communism* (1920), in which he openly boasted that his party were never concerned with the "prattle about the 'sacredness of human life'"; that the revolutionary class should attain its ends by all methods at its disposal, including terrorism; and that **to reject terror was to reject Socialism**.

Another leading figure in Lenin's Socialist regime was Nikolai Bukharin who claimed that terror was a permanent principle of socialist organization (Kolakowski, p. 811). In his turn, CHEKA head Felix Dzerzhinsky said in an interview published in the official *Novaia Zhizn* (14 July 1918), "We stand for organized terror -this should be frankly admitted."

Meanwhile, China's Moscow-backed Mao Zedong declared in 1927 that it was necessary to bring about a reign of terror all over the country (Schram, vol. 2, p. 435; Chang & Halliday, p. 43).

Marxist-Leninist-Maoist terrorism later spawned a wide range of terrorist movements from the German Baader Meinhof Gang which was controlled by East Germany's Marxist intelligence chief Markus Wolf -and the Italian Red Brigades to the Peruvian Shining Path and many others.

Marxist Irish Republican Army

Even movements generally deemed "nationalist" have frequently been either initiated or subsequently taken over, by Marxists and other Socialists. Irish Nationalism, which was diverted for Socialist purposes at an early stage, is a case in point. Socialist Republican elements like [Irish Republican Army](#) (IRA) leader James Connolly had already infiltrated the movement in the early 1900s (English, pp. 100 ff.).

In the 1930s, the IRA which had emerged during the 1916 Easter Uprising, embraced Socialism (Law, p. 233), while carefully preserving the appearance of a nationalist movement.

In the 1970s, while denying being Marxist or Communist, the [Provisional IRA](#) (PIRA) committed itself to a Socialist Ireland. PIRA's political wing, the Provisional Sinn Fein, described itself as a movement "totally committed to revolution right across the board from top to bottom" (Janke, pp. 98, 103).

Former PIRA leader Gerry Adams proudly proclaimed that the Republicans' aim was to establish a Socialist State ("Northern Ireland: It is Clearly a War Situation", *Time*, 19 Nov. 1979; cf. "Belfast Militant Is Elected Head Of Sinn Fein", *New York Times*, 13 Nov. 1983).

It should be noted that the expression "top to bottom" reveals **an important feature of all socialist movements: their undemocratic character** and their desire to impose their will on the unsuspecting masses.

The Irish, Basque and Kurdish cases are just some of the many examples of national independence movements being cynically hijacked and converted into instruments of international Socialism whose ultimate aim is to abolish the nation-state. This, of course, is not unconnected with the fact that the Right has all but given up on national interests and has surrendered the initiative to the Left.

The predictable result is that instead of having sovereign nations, mankind is inexorably moving towards a Socialist world state.

Socialism and Dictatorship

Dictator Marx

By most accounts, Marx was an overbearing and authoritarian character who did not tolerate opposition or dissent in any form. According to police reports, his dominant characteristic was a boundless ambition and desire for domination (Lovell, p. 25).

Michael Bakunin, Marx's colleague and rival in the IWMA, described him as a "fanatical authoritarian" who "will not stop at the basest intrigue if, in his opinion, it will serve to increase his position, his influence and his power" (Berlin, p. 80). Even Marx's employer, Gustav von Mevissen, referred to him as "domineering" (Wheen, p. 38).

His strategy was simple: his behaviour meant that his prospective collaborators either turned away in disgust or allowed themselves to succumb to his bullying. As there were always some who would choose the latter, this ensured him a small but loyal following.

Marx's dictatorial ambitions were matched only by his violent ideology based on "class struggle", "revolution" and, in particular, the "dictatorship of the proletariat". He interpreted Capitalism as the "dictatorship" of the middle class (which he derogatorily called "bourgeoisie") over the working class (which he called "proletariat").

His aim was to reverse the roles of the two classes through armed revolution and establish a dictatorship of the working class over all other classes. Indeed, Marx claimed that the "dictatorship of the proletariat" was the inevitable result of class struggle and revolution (Letter to J. Weydemeyer, 5 March 1852, MECW, vol. 39, pp. 62, 65).

Allegedly, this dictatorship would lead to a new era of Communism - a utopian "classless society" based on common ownership.

Marxist apologists falsely claim that Marx never endorsed dictatorship by any individual and that he did not promote organizations "in which his will would be primary" (Lovell, pp. 25-6).

Marx may not have overtly endorsed dictatorship by any individual, but he was certainly involved in the creation of the Communist Correspondence Committee, the Communist League, the Brussels German Workers' Association, the Brussels Democratic Association and the London-based First International, all of which aimed to place themselves at the head of the revolutionary movement and in all of which he strove to acquire a leading position for himself.

It is evident from Marx's own statements that he judged the merit of all Socialist organizations solely by the degree to which he could control them (Berlin, p. 193).

As evident from the Communist Manifesto itself, Marx intended the Communist Party (of which he was a leading figure) to take the lead in a revolution (cf. Priestland, p. 40). Clearly, a successful revolution carried out by any of these organizations would have resulted in a dictatorship run by such an organization, e.g., the First International (IWMA), over whose General Council Marx admittedly had (in his own words) "decisive intellectual influence" (Lovell, p. 29).

In fact, Marx did not merely "influence" the IWMA but, as its general secretary, was its official leader. This would have placed Marx in a position very close to that of a dictator.

Engels himself was no less dictatorially-minded (Berlin, p. 193). While Marx preferred to scheme from behind the scenes, at the most financing the purchase of arms for Socialist revolutionaries in Brussels or calling for "class war against the bourgeoisie" in Vienna (Rappart, pp. 230-1), Engels – who went by the sobriquet the "General" – took active part in armed insurrection with the clear intention of converting Germany's Democratic-Constitutional revolution into a Socialist-Republican coup and imposing his own minority (or personal) agenda (Rappart, p. 342).

There can be little doubt that Marx and Engels' compulsive rebelliousness against established authority coupled with the drive to impose their own authority on the world were rooted in their hatred of their fathers as well as their desire to eliminate and replace them, which they consciously or subconsciously

projected on others. In Marx's case, this was considerably aggravated by violent moods and mental imbalance (Shuster, 2008).

The editor and columnist Stuart Jeffries of Britain's left-wing Guardian believes that there is no direct link between the Communist Manifesto and the gulags (Jeffries, 2012). It may be the case that neither Marx nor Engels can be held legally responsible for the crimes of later Socialist regimes, given that they died long before those regimes were established. But their advocacy of revolution and repression of opposition to it makes them intellectually and, above all, morally responsible. Their teachings certainly were a causal factor in the actions of their disciples (Lovell, pp. 15, 192).

Like all political demagogues, Marx advocated different policies at different times, sometimes preaching an evolutionary Socialism, based on the theory that Capitalism would evolve into Socialism over time and sometimes a revolutionary Socialism, based on conspiracy and terrorism (Bernstein, p. 152; Kolakowski, p. 437). This made it inevitable that some among his disciples (the Social Democrats) would embrace one policy and others (the Marxist-Leninists) the other.

As evident from Marx's 1850 Address to the Communist League, he believed in revolution by a small, self-appointed clique who would seize power and hold on to it as the executive committee of the masses in whose name they claimed to act. This doctrine was taken up by [Alexander Helfand](#) (alias Parvus) and put into practice by Lenin and Trotsky in 1917 (Berlin, p. 138). The concepts of "class struggle", "revolution" and "dictatorship of the proletariat" popularized by Marx and Engels became central to later Marxist thinking.

Marxism is always realized as a dictatorship of the party elite

Lenin went to great lengths in using Marx and Engels' teachings to extract support for his own theories of dictatorship (Walicki, Lovell). He insisted that Socialist dictatorship was not bound even by its own laws, writing that the secret police (CHEKA, forerunner of the KGB) should instruct the courts on what sentences should be passed (Lovell, pp. 174-5).

Trying people in accordance with Party guidelines later became established routine in the Soviet Union (Radzinsky, p. 251) and was faithfully emulated by its Socialist satellites from China to Eastern Europe. This, of course, was based on Marx's dismissive comments on the rule of law as "obsolete verbal rubbish". In Marx's view, the law in Socialist society was not to be above political considerations ("Critique of the Gotha Programme", 1875, MESW, vol. 3, pp. 1330; M/A).

Lenin taught that Socialist revolutionaries must be "merciless" and "ruthless" (Walicki, p. 271). As he put it, the proletarian dictatorship had to be "cruel, stem, bloody and painful" (LCW, vol. 29, p. 355). As the black leather-clad CHEKA (originally "The All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for Combating CounterRevolution and Sabotage") was the official instrument of State terror established to crush all opposition (ET, p. 72), it requires no great mental effort to grasp what Socialist "dictatorship of the proletariat" meant in practice, regardless of what it might have meant in theory.

But it is not the case that Marxist doctrines were merely employed by power-obsessed fanatics like Lenin and Stalin to legitimize their totalitarian practices. As pointed out by R. G. Wesson and others, authoritarianism is inherent in Marxism (Lovell, p. 11). Among the reasons why this is so is the central Marxist concept of "classless society" itself.

The absurd socio-economic theories of Marxism

Classlessness presupposes a society in which all citizens have the same occupation and the same income. It implies that all are portioned out an equal share regardless of the intelligence, skills, physical effort or time they put into their work. Not only is such an arrangement morally wrong, leading to the kind of morally bankrupt society as seen in the former Communist Bloc, but it is practically impossible. It can only be attempted (never accomplished) through coercion.

Marx himself admits that due to the inherent inequality of individuals (one being stronger or weaker than another, etc.) even a system where each receives an equal quantity of products in return for an equal quantity of labour leads to inequality, resulting in a situation in which "one will in fact receive more than another, one will be richer than another, and so on". In fact, Marx completely dismisses ideas like "equal right" and "fair distribution" as "obsolete verbal rubbish" – just as he dismisses the rule of law. Having dodged the question, he characteristically "settles" the matter by claiming that in a "higher phase of Communism" the rule will be "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!" ("Critique of the Gotha Programme", 1875, MESW, vol. 3, pp. 13-30, Marx's exclamation mark).

Like all other key questions, the issue as to who will decide what each person's ability and needs are, is conveniently left unanswered by "scientific" Marxism and for very obvious reasons, too: it would be the Communist Party, Marx's own organization, who will have control over these and other matters.

As the Communist Manifesto declares, all capital and means of production were to be concentrated in the hands of the State. As representative and executive power of the State, the Communist Party (Marx and Engels' own clique), would have been the dispensing authority. As is well known, this was the case of Soviet Russia and other Communist regimes in the 20th century.

Yet to admit this much would have amounted to admitting that Socialism is not only a dictatorial but a totalitarian system. Hence Lenin (paraphrasing Marx) dodges the question by claiming that only someone "with the hard-heartedness of a Shylock" would stoop so low as to calculate the exact quantities given or received.

Incredibly, Lenin insists that such a "narrow horizon" will be left behind and that there will be "no need" for such calculations as each will "take freely according to his needs". Even more incredibly, Lenin in the same breath says that until the arrival of the "higher phase" of Communism, the Socialist State will demand the strictest control of the quantities of labour and consumption.

In a fit of Orwellian doublethink or schizophrenia by now typical of Marxist thinkers, what had been dismissed only a few sentences before as "the hard-heartedness of a Shylock" was now admitted to be official policy of the Socialist State! He concludes that asking such questions is a display of "bourgeois stupidity" (The State and Revolution, 1917, LCW, vol. 25; MIA).

If in 1917, the first year of the Revolution, the intrepid enquirer was called a "bourgeois idiot", after 1918 and the creation of the secret police (CHEKA), expressing doubts about the infallible wisdom of the Party meant being branded "bourgeois enemy", "class enemy", "enemy of the people" or "enemy of the Revolution" and being sent to the concentration camps or shot (Applebaum, p. 111). This may have silenced opposition, but it changed nothing about the absurdity of Marxist teachings.

Equally absurd was Marx's concept of "market-less society" which, again, can only be attempted by force. As the Soviets themselves came to realize, no advanced society can exist without exchange of goods. The notion of producing goods and then freely distributing them or letting everybody help themselves "according to their needs" is a fantasy bordering on the pathological that could only have sprung from the overexerted minds of amateur philosophers like Marx and third-rate lawyers like Lenin.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a cunning cover for the dictatorship of the party elite

The same applies to Marx's doctrine of "proletarian dictatorship". It is obvious that a whole class cannot be involved in government. Governing would have to be entrusted to a select few and this would result in the rule of a handful over the majority.

If it is claimed that such a system would nevertheless be democratic because it serves the interests of the majority, the answer is that the majority at the time of Marx consisted in fact of farmers, artisans, traders, etc., not "proletarians", i.e., urban (industrial) workers. This was especially true of Russia where Marx wanted to export his system in his last living years. Lenin himself admitted that Communist Russia in 1920

was not a workers' state but a workers' and peasants' state "with a bureaucratic twist to it" ("The Trade Unions, The Present Situation and Trotsky's Mistakes", 30 Dec. 1920, LCW, vol. 32, p. 24).

In fact, Russia never became a "workers' state" even after eight decades of Socialism. The same is true of China which remains a technocratic dictatorship over the proletariat where the farming majority is brutally suppressed.

Even if we allow for a society where the majority actually are urban workers, the claim that the governing elite represents the workers' interests cannot be tested in a system which admits of no other representatives. Moreover, **those chosen to govern would cease to be workers by virtue of their new, non-proletarian occupation, and would become a new class of governors.** Far from being classless, such a system would create a new class as in fact it did in Russia and other Communist states.

Again, Lenin's standard reply to those who questioned Socialist dictatorship was to brand them as "fools", "idiots" and "politically ignorant" persons who were not to be allowed anywhere near a meeting ("Achievements and Difficulties of the Soviet Government", March-April 1919, LCW, vol. 29, pp. 71-2).

The fact is that, like other Marxist absurdities such as "classless", "market-less", "stateless" society, the "dictatorship of the proletariat" is a practical impossibility which can only be attempted through coercion by a fanatical and self-serving clique who knows itself to be in the minority (and in the wrong) and has no other means of imposing its agenda but lies and brute force.

It demonstrates that Marxism is as authoritarian and dictatorial as its inventor and it exposes Socialism's true aim, namely to create a new governing class and take over political power on behalf of a self-serving elite.

Indeed, middle-class Marxists from Marx to Lenin insisted on a "proletarian dictatorship"

(a) because unlike farmers who had no interest in state-ownership of land (and whom Marx therefore dismissed as "a sack of potatoes"), industrial workers had nothing to lose and

(b) because they knew that, ultimately, they themselves would be in charge, not the workers.

Like their successors, Marx and Engels had no intention to place themselves under anyone's authority, even less to join the ranks of the working classes. Far from being a working man, Marx himself employed a private secretary and a female servant.

Marx is a utopian, Marxism is a utopia

Professor Walicki concedes that Marx "was possibly the most extreme utopian" because he advocated common ownership, abolition of market exchange, etc., without supporting his views by "any scientific arguments whatsoever" (Walicki, p. 151).

That Marx was a utopian fantasist ought to be beyond dispute. After all, he had started his career as a utopian. In 1845, he wrote that in Communism "nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity" so that it would be possible for everybody "to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticize after dinner." (The German Ideology, 1845, MECW, vol. 5, p. 47; MIA).

Marx is a fraud, Marxism is a fraudulent project

Equally beyond dispute must be that a system which is unsupported by scientific argument is not a scientific system. But Marx was not only a utopian, but one who falsely claimed to be a "scientist". It is clear that Marx, who held a degree in philosophy, was perfectly capable of rational and logical reasoning.

Therefore, he must have been aware of the fact that his theories did not hold water and could not be supported by scientific (or even philosophical and logical) arguments. This is why, despite falsely describing his opinion based system as "scientific", he never explained key concepts like "dictatorship of the proletariat", choosing instead relentless and savage critique of others (including Socialist rivals) as a device for covering up his own fallacies or lies.

A typical Marxian tactic was to read during the day and impose his half-digested (and sometimes plain false) knowledge on his interlocutors -often during nightlong drinking bouts.

An excellent expose of Marx as a clever, power-obsessed charlatan is provided by Gustav Techow, a Prussian officer who, as a Republican and chief of the general staff of the Palatinate Revolutionary Army, was a potential ally of Marx's Communists (Wheen, p. 240).

Marx's fraudulent behaviour is obvious from other evidence showing, for example, that he plagiarized his Communist Manifesto from a work titled Principles of Socialism: Manifesto of Democracy in the Nineteenth Century, written five years earlier by a certain Victor Considerant (Sutton, 1995, pp. 38-40). This was no isolated incident. Passing off material lifted from others as own work was a characteristic Marxian habit (Davies, p. 837). Even his newspaper articles were in large part written by Engels.

On balance, the inescapable conclusion is that Marx was a fraud. And if Marx was a fraud Marxism, too, was a fraudulent project. Indeed, given its far-reaching social, economic and political implications, Marxism may be regarded as the intellectual fraud of the 19th century, if not of history.

Marxism is a fraudulent project not only because it claims to be "scientific" when patently it is not, but also because its predictions about a "better" society under Marxist rule have been refuted by events. The Marxist prediction that Socialist revolution will lead to an ideal Communist society has turned out to be a false prophecy.

Faced with its own internal inconsistencies and contradictions as well as hard facts, **Marxism has become like a faith-based messianic religion – with Marx and his successors as central figures – that promises salvation on earth** (Bauer, 1976, p. 176; Davies, p. 837). But while the ideal society promised by messianic religion (e.g., a peaceful and happy society governed by righteousness like the kingdom of God in Christian tradition) may conceivably become reality, especially in the hereafter, the utopian society promised by Marxism on earth is positively a society that never comes.

As Francis Wheen (p. 307) has shown, the best way to expose the real Marx is by quoting his Capital, that Bible of "scientific" Socialism which tells a lot about Marx's views on Capitalism but scarcely anything on what he meant by Socialism's promised land of "stateless", "classless", "market-less", "moneyless" society.

For example, Marx wrote on the "relative form of value":

"As a use-value, the linen is something palpably different from the coat; as value, it is identical with the coat, and therefore looks like the coat. Thus the linen acquires a value-form different from its natural form. Its existence as a value is manifested in its equality with the coat, just as the sheep-like nature of the Christian is shown in his resemblance to the Lamb of God..." (Capital, vol. 1, pp. 142-3; MIA).

Apologists for Marx have claimed that he was being humorous. That may be so. But (quite apart from the fact that this was supposed to be a serious, "scientific" work) as Marx himself was forced to acknowledge, his Capital was received with silence. There was a very good reason for this.

That Capitalism was not perfect was common knowledge (no man-made system is). What is remarkable -and devastatingly revealing – is that Marx's three volume magnum opus, which had taken half a lifetime to compose, was silent on what was to replace the Capitalist system it criticized.

Even socialists acknowledged Marx's delusions

More importantly, Socialists of all shades at first defended Marx, only to be forced by the hard facts to acknowledge his astounding fallacies. One of the smarter and more colourful figures among them, Bernard Shaw, published a series of brilliant articles and letters in which he exposed Marx's fallacies of "surplus value" and "class war".

Shaw concluded that people understood their own affairs much better than Marx did, and the simple division of society into two classes had "as little relation to actual social facts as Marx's value theory had to actual market prices" (G. B. S., "The Class War", Clarion, 30 Sept. 1904, quoted in Henderson, p. 167).

Indeed, Marx may have been a knowledgeable man, but he was not a scientist. Nor, as noted by Walicki, did he bother to support his theories with scientific arguments or evidence. For example, he failed to produce evidence to support his central claim that history was in fact the history of struggles among classes and not struggles among individuals. His method was not that of the scientist but that of the political agitator who uses a mixture of fact and fiction to gain the support of an ignorant and gullible public. His theory of class struggle only served to set one class against another as a device for individuals like Marx to acquire power for themselves (Techow in Wheen, p. 240). (See also note 2, p. 50.)

Unmoved, fellow fraudsters and diehard fanatics like Lenin and Stalin, who were in the pay of international financiers (Sutton, 1974), perpetuated Marx's great deception regardless. Lenin's own theorizing on Marxist lines and constant shifting from one meaning of terms like "state", "dictatorship" and "democracy" to others clearly expose his intention to deceive (Lovell, p. 170).

Objectors were labeled "bourgeois enemies", a blanket word equivalent to modern "Nazi", deployed to silence opposition whenever the authorities ran out of arguments and were close to being exposed tragically, a daily occurrence.

Communist regimes, of course, were Marxist dictatorships where "bourgeois" dissenters were routinely sent to the torture chamber, the concentration camp or the execution cell. The situation was slightly different in the West where opposition was more difficult to suppress.

At first, as Shaw had discovered, nobody in the Socialist movement knew anything about economics (Henderson, p. 159), which explains why Marx invariably took refuge in economic theories which he used as his weapon of choice to bully his opponents into submission. But this soon changed after Shaw's critical articles and letters.

Leading German Socialist Eduard Bernstein, who had established close links to Shaw and other Fabian leaders during his exile in London, published *The Preconditions of Socialism*, a critique of Marxian theories, in 1899. By 1919, another leading Marxist theorist, Karl Kautsky, came to admit that class dictatorship was pure nonsense and led to state terror as it did in Russia under Lenin (Terrorism and Communism).

Western European socialists are the same Marxists, only with different tactics

Unsurprisingly, Western European Socialists were forced to dismiss Marx's doctrine of class struggle, violent revolution and proletarian dictatorship. Unfortunately, they did not reject Marxism or Socialism.

Following Engels, Bernstein and Shaw, they took the path of "slow propaganda work and parliamentary activity" to achieve their nefarious goal. There were, of course, exceptions: Karl Liebknecht, the son of Marx's co-conspirator and intimate friend Wilhelm Liebknecht, did attempt a coup during the 1919 Spartacist Uprising in Berlin.

But even for those who swapped the Marxian hare of revolution for the Fabian tortoise of evolution, the objective remained the same: the conversion of the world to Socialism.

In the Social Democratic traditions of Western Europe, Socialism has been adept at establishing and maintaining an iron grip on society by more subtle and less bloody, yet equally efficient and ultimately dictatorial, means. Sweden's Social Democratic Party ruled without interruption from the 1930s to the 70s. Similarly, Norway's Labour Party has been in power for most of the post-war period.

While some may wish to see this as the result of genuine democratic procedures, it hardly could have been achieved without constant and systematic propaganda, media control, manipulation of public opinion and other tactics routinely deployed by anti-democratic forces (some of these tactics are described in Ch. 2, [The Fabian Conspiracy](#)).

History shows a clear tendency for Socialism to eliminate opposition and move towards one-party rule and dictatorship. A system which indoctrinates people from an early age to blindly obey it and to think, speak and act in ways that are convenient to itself is no less of a dictatorship than one which relies exclusively on armed forces and secret police to suppress opposition.

Controlling information and suppressing the truth about the origins and nature of Socialism, the fraudulent character of its founders and its connections with international finance (see below) are unmistakable marks of dictatorship. Nor is it clear how importing millions of foreign workers and driving wages down and living costs up can be in the interests of local workers whom Socialism allegedly represents.

As in the case of Britain's Fabian Socialist Labour Party who looked up to Communist Russia as a social and economic model well into the 1960s, i.e., for over forty years (Callaghan, pp. 198200), the anti-democratic agenda of Western European Social Democracy is exposed by its covert or overt support for bloody dictatorships like those of Soviet Russia and Maoist China.

A typical example was the Norwegian socialist [Trygve Lie](#), a close associate of Lenin's Communist International (Comintern), who became Secretary-General of the UN with Soviet support (Griffin, pp. 110 ff.).

Moreover, as in Leninist Russia, dissenters in Socialist dominated society are routinely labelled "stupid", "ignorant", "backward" or "reactionary", excluded from democratic processes and targeted by violent "anti-fascist", "anti-racist", "ant Capitalist" groups and other far-left proxies of the establishment.

In the final analysis, **Socialism does not create a free society but one that is totally controlled by the State which is in turn controlled by a small clique representing vested international interests.**

Socialism and Genocide

As already noted, the other key feature of Marxism was the belief in class struggle. In the Communist Manifesto (1848), Marx wrote that "the history of all societies is the history of class struggles".

The ideology of Socialist Genocide

Marx claimed that revolution involved two mutually exclusive social classes, the class of "emancipation" and the class of "subjugation". While the class of "emancipation" (i.e., the Socialist revolutionary class) was projected as representing the whole of society, the other class was proscribed as "the embodiment of the general social obstacles and impediments" within society ("Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right", Introduction, 1844).

The revolutionary class was to be "emancipated" and the reactionary class the "obstacle" to be eliminated. This implicitly defined revolution as the liberation of society from one class, providing the basis for the **Marxist belief in the extermination of a whole class** as a precondition of successful revolution.

In addition, early Socialists beginning with Marx and Engels were social Darwinists who believed that the

existing human race had to be replaced by a "superior", Socialist type of man. In his *Class Struggles in France* (1850), Marx compared his generation to the Biblical Jews led by Moses through the wilderness, claiming that it had to perish in order to give way to those who were fit for a new Socialist world order (p. 114).

As according to the Bible large numbers were killed during the Exodus, the genocidal implications are quite clear.

Likewise, in 1849, Engels in the "Neue Rheinische Zeitung" (NRZ) wrote that all reactionary (i.e., non-Socialist) peoples were destined to perish in the next revolutionary world war, presumably at the hands of Socialist revolutionaries like himself ("The Magyar Struggle", 13 Jan. 1849, MECW, vol. 8, p. 227; MIA).

Under Lenin and his Russian Communist Party, totalitarianism founded on state terror and genocide as state policy became two of the 20th century's defining ideas (Will, 1996). Lenin based his theory of mass extermination on Marx and Engels' twin concepts of dictatorship of the proletariat and class struggle.

He proclaimed revolutionary violence to be the "fundamental feature" of proletarian dictatorship. He further defined revolutionary violence as violence "of one class against another" and added that **the object of revolutionary violence of the working class ("proletariat") against the middle class ("bourgeoisie") was the latter's destruction** (The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, 1918).

Already at the beginning of the [Red Terror](#) campaign, Lenin's regime called for mass extermination and genocide. In 1918, [Grigory Zinoviev](#), member of the Central Committee and leading ideologue of the Communist Party said:

"To dispose of our enemies, we will have to create our own socialist terror. For this we will have to train 90 million of the 100 million Russians and have them all on our side. We have nothing to say to the other 10 million; we'll have to get rid of them" (Severnaya Kommuna, no. 109, 19 Sept. 1918, p. 2; cf. Leggett, p. 114 and Courtois, pp. 756).

In the same year, Russia's Socialist leadership published the following statement in its paper *Krasnaya Gazeta*:

"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 ... let there be floods of the blood of the bourgeois, more blood, as much as possible" (cf. Leggett, p. 108).

In November 1918, CHEKA chief Martin Latsis gave instructions to his henchmen to exterminate the "bourgeoisie" as a class (Courtois, p. 8).

Lenin's deputy Trotsky himself in his *Terrorism and Communism* (1920) wrote: "The historical tenacity of the bourgeoisie is colossal ... We are forced to tear off this class and chop it away. The Red Terror is a weapon used against a class that, despite being doomed to destruction, does not want to perish."

It becomes evident from these statements that **the Soviet leadership advocated the physical extermination of Russia's entire middle class, amounting to about ten million people.**

[*] My note.

By exterminating the middle class—the most educated, creative, and active part of society—revolutionary socialists essentially decapitated society. Their sly rhetoric about class struggle concealed two pragmatic goals:

1. To create an intellectually helpless society, willing to obediently accept their demagoguery;
2. To take the place of the destroyed middle class.

This scenario was repeated in all countries where revolutionary socialists came to power.

Fabian socialists pursue the same goals, but use more "humane" methods: restricting civil rights and economic freedom, reducing the quality of education, and replacing the European population with people from Asia and Africa.

End of my note.

Socialist genocide in Russia

While it is impossible (due to lack of adequate data) to know the extent to which the extenuation of the middle class was carried out under Lenin and Trotsky, it is beyond dispute that large-scale extenuation was begun under them and successfully implemented under Stalin, who came to power following Lenin's demise in 1924.

Indeed, one of the defining features of Stalin's rule – known as the "[Great Terror](#)" – was the systematic killing of millions of people (many of them farmers) through executions, imprisonment, slave-labour, beatings, torture, malnutrition and starvation (Conquest, 1991).

While the Tsarist government had executed 3,932 persons for political crimes in nearly a century (between 1825 and 1910), Stalin's Socialist regime executed 681,692 persons for "anti-Soviet activities" in 1937-38 (one year) alone (Pipes, 2001, p. 66).

Censuses show that the population of the Soviet Union decreased by 9 to 10 million persons in just seven years (between 1932 and 1939) (Nave, p. 180; Pipes 2001, p. 67). The total number of victims of Russia's Socialist regime has been estimated at between 20 million (Conquest, 1991) and 62 million (Rummel, 1990 www.hawaii.edu).

Socialist genocide in China

In China, in 1950 (soon after seizing power) Mao Zedong launched his own campaign of mass killings by ordering "massive arrests, massive killings". In 1955 he devised a Five-Year Plan for mass arrests and killings (Chang & Halliday, pp. 337, 411).

In 1956, Mao sought to surpass the extermination policies of Europe's Socialist regimes, declaring that the basic problem with some Eastern European countries was that they didn't eliminate all those counter-revolutionaries (Chang & Halliday, p. 434).

Not surprisingly, the total number of victims of China's Socialist regime under Mao has been estimated to be over 70 million (Chang & Halliday, 2005; Rummel, 2005).

Socialist genocide in Western Europe

Meanwhile, Western Europe (including Britain) was being taken over by a "non-violent", gradualist form of Socialism that was to prove as deadly as its Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Maoist cousins. Among its first victims were between five and six million Germans who perished as a result of deportation, mistreatment and starvation at the hands of Allied authorities between 1944 and 1950 (de Zayas, p. 111; Bacque, pp. 119, 204; Dietrich, pp. 107-8, 140).

The chief architect of the plan resulting in this deliberate genocide was US Treasury Secretary [Henry Morgenthau, Jr.](#), a supporter of the [League for Industrial Democracy](#) (LID), the London Fabians' "provincial society" (Martin, p. 237). But the American's eager collaborators included Communist Russians and Fabian Socialist Britons.

As shown in the following chapters, the Morgenthau Plan for Germany is being followed up by the ethnic cleansing (or what some have called "bloodless genocide") of Europe's indigenous population by stealth and under the cover of a spurious ideology of "racial diversity", through state-imposed, gradual mass immigration from non-European countries.

Thanks to Europe's political elites, there has been unprecedented immigration from the Indian subcontinent (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh) into Britain; from North Africa into France; from Turkey into Germany, etc. Needless to say, over time this can only result in the complete replacement of Europe's indigenous population with non-Europeans. Thus, while earlier generations perished in the name of racial

purity, entire nations must now disappear for the sake of "racial diversity".

Socialism and International Finance

It must be noted at this point that Socialism could not have achieved the position of global dominance it has enjoyed for decades without some form of collaboration on the part of Capitalist forces. Indeed, contrary to the popular perception that Socialism and Capitalism do not mix, Socialists and Capitalists have collaborated in many different ways, especially at top level (Sutton, 1995, p. 33).

The origins of Marxism itself can be traced to a group of Liberal industrialists and bankers, i.e., Capitalists, based in Cologne. Situated in industrialized Rhineland which was part of the North German Kingdom of Prussia, Cologne had earlier been under French Republican occupation and had become a Liberal stronghold.

In 1841, this group, which included the textile magnate (later industrialist and banker) [Gustav von Mevissen](#) and the banker [Ludolf Camphausen](#), set up the "Liberal" paper [Rheinische Zeitung](#) (NDB, vol. 17, pp. 277-8).

All the key figures involved in the emergence of Marxism, [Moses Hess](#), Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, were closely connected with the Rheinische Zeitung and the Liberal Capitalist financial interests behind it.

Hess, a wealthy publicist, seems to have been an early Communist ringleader who arranged the financing of the Rheinische Zeitung and converted Engels to Communism (Berlin, p. 55; Hunt, p. 77). In his turn, Engels himself who, like von Mevissen, had links to British business interests, was a textile magnate and member of the Manchester Royal Exchange (Hunt, p. 1; see also Ch. 2, [The Fabian Conspiracy](#)). Engels also became Marx's lifelong collaborator and financial backer.

It was in the same circles that Marx became acquainted with Communism.

Why would Liberal Capitalists support anti-Capitalist Socialism?

The short answer is that, as a minority, Liberals needed allies against the established order.

The longer answer is that Liberals had a number of goals in common with the Socialists. Liberalism had its roots in 1600s' England and 1700s' France where it had started as a left-wing movement aiming to restrict the powers of the Conservative monarchy, aristocracy and clergy and obtain greater economic freedom for the emerging Capitalist middle class.

By the 1830s, while some German Liberals (Constitutionalists) would have been content with a constitutional monarchy, others wanted to eliminate the Conservative monarchy and aristocracy altogether and substitute themselves as the ruling class.

The deceiving character of Liberal Capitalism is evident from the fact that it was Capitalism itself, not the monarchy, who was responsible for many social and economic ills such as poverty and unemployment among considerable sections of society. Industrial Capitalism, in particular, was responsible for the introduction of mechanized production (e.g., in the textile industry) and the resulting loss of livelihood to many workers.

Capitalism was the creation of merchants and later, bankers and industrialists, not of the monarchy. While officially the monarchy held the political and military power, the Capitalist classes (the bankers and the industrialists) controlled the economy. Politics was dominated by Capitalist economics, not by Monarchism.

The monarchy itself, originally based on agriculture and trade, had become heavily dependent on Capitalist bankers.

This situation was correctly understood by the majority of people. For example, impoverished German weavers in 1844 stormed the local cotton mills -in protest against Capitalist industrialization -not the royal palace in Berlin (Hunt, p. 125). Marx himself in the Communist Manifesto, Capital and elsewhere clearly linked the development of industry and commerce, i.e., Capitalism, with the deteriorating situation of the working class (see also "Inaugural Address and Provisional Rules of the International Working Men's Association", 21-27 Oct. 1864).

Clearly, blaming social and economic problems on the monarchy amounted to shooting at the wrong target. True, it may be argued that the monarchy had failed in its fundamental duty to protect the land and its people against harmful developments and allowed itself to be overwhelmed by events. But, if so, its crime was one of omission not of commission, the active agents – and principal culprits – being the predatory Capitalist bankers and industrialists.

Yet it was precisely these elements who cynically aimed to use the monarchy as a scapegoat for the problems created by Capitalism in order to grab even more power for themselves. Marx and Engels, of course, fully agreed: they claimed that Capitalism was a "progression" from "Feudalism" and an essential step towards Socialism (Kolakowski, p. 250).

Thus the abolition of the monarchy and the establishment of Liberal Capitalist rule coincided with the aims of the Radical Democrats and their Social Democratic bedfellows.

What is conveniently overlooked by "democracy-loving" apologists for Socialism is that Marx and Engels in their Manifesto state that the farmers, artisans and lower middle classes (i.e., the majority) were "conservative", "reactionary" and seeking to "turn back the wheel of history". Industrial workers themselves, Socialism's supposed "revolutionary" class, were "smashing machinery", "setting factories ablaze" and "seeking to restore the vanished status of the workman of the Middle Ages" (Communist Manifesto, MECW, vol. 6, p. 492).

If the oppressed classes wanted to return to a medieval, pre-Capitalist and pre-industrial form of society, then whose interests was a Socialist revolution serving, if not those of the Liberal Capitalist industrialists and bankers who wanted to expand and monopolize industry and finance for their own purpose?

In addition, the upper reaches of Liberal Capitalism aimed to go beyond their domination of the national economy and gain control over all of the world's economies and political systems through control over the world's finances. This coincided with the Socialist aim of abolishing national frontiers, creating an international society and establishing a World State.

In fact, this aim had its origins in the same Liberal Capitalist circles who were now collaborating with the Socialists against the monarchy. This explains why "Liberal" international financiers have frequently supported totalitarian regimes (not only Socialist ones) in many parts of the world, as shown by Quigley (1966), Sutton (1974) and others.

On their part, the Socialist minority, too, needed the Liberals as allies. Socialists like Marx and Engels aimed to bring about a Liberal-Democratic revolution as a preliminary step towards Socialism (Hunt, pp. 161-2).

The March Revolution of 1848 forced the Prussian King Frederick William IV to form a new government headed by the Liberal banker Camphausen, who became the first commoner to hold that post. Camphausen's government saw itself as an instrument for implementing the transition from absolute to constitutional monarchy (NDB, vol. 3, p. 114).

With the Conservative monarchy on the retreat and the Liberal Capitalists on the ascendance, all the Socialists now had to do was to keep pushing the movement to the left until Socialism prevailed.

In a clear illustration of their mode of operation, in June 1848, Marx and Engels who had set up a wide network of Communist League cells, resumed the publication of their paper (which had been closed down by the authorities in 1843).

Called Neue Rheinische Zeitung (New Rhenish Newspaper), the NRZ was staffed by Communist League members under Marx's leadership. In September that year, Marx and Engels who evidently had expected Camphausen to establish a Liberal dictatorship and "smash up" the existing order, berated him for not having done so ("The Crisis and the Counter-Revolution", NRZ, 13 Sept. 1848, MECW, vol. 7, p. 431).

The Socialists' cunning plan: "A Revolution within a Revolution"

The Prussian Crown, at the time, was able to suppress such plans. But Marx and Engels carried on regardless with their revolutionary scheming. Their intentions are known from their secret circular letter to the Communist League of March 1850, in which they describe their position in unambiguous terms:

1) **The Socialist revolutionaries were to cooperate with the Liberal Democrats for the purpose of overthrowing the Conservative rulers** and oppose them "wherever they wished to secure their own position".

2) **From the very moment of victory over the Conservatives, the Socialists' efforts were to be directed against their former Liberal Democratic allies.** The Communist League was to establish revolutionary governments alongside the new official governments (in various parts of Germany and other countries) and work both "openly and secretly" against the latter.

To enable Socialists to oppose the Liberal Democratic government "forcefully and threateningly", the whole revolutionary working class (in fact, a small minority) was to be armed with "musket, rifles, cannon and ammunition" ("Address of the Central Committee to the Communist League", March 1850, MESW, vol. 1, pp. 175-85; MEW, vol. 7, pp. 244-257).

As pointed out by Kolakowski (p. 437), the Address was Blanquist in spirit, following as it did the conspiratorial line of communard [Auguste Blanqui](#) who joined the Communist League that year and who advocated revolution by a small group who would seize power and establish a dictatorship which would impose a new order.

However, the Address was not only Blanquist. As Bernstein notes, it was entirely in line with Marx and Engels' very own Communist Manifesto and other writings which they had published in 1848 (Bernstein, p. 152). It clearly shows that Marx and Engels planned a revolutionary coup by a tiny non-proletarian clique.

Moreover, it exposes a very elaborate, international scheme to stage a revolution within a revolution:

- **in the first phase**, a Liberal Democratic Revolution was to eliminate the Conservative Monarchist government and install a Liberal Democratic one;
- **in the second phase**, a parallel Socialist Revolution was to remove the Liberal Democrats and bring the Socialists to power.

It goes almost without saying that this would have paved the way for Marx and Engels' own Communist League to install itself as the new Communist government.

What becomes evident is that Marx was quite capable of highly deceptive behaviour. This was wholly in line with his character. Marx's fellow journalist Karl Heinzen described him (with full justification) as "a liar and an intriguer" and Bakunin called him "perfidious and sly" (Wheeler, pp. 42, 64).

Particularly revealing is Marx and Engels' public appeal to NRZ readers not to stage a putsch in Cologne ("To the Workers of Cologne", NRZ, 19 May 1949), while calling for armed insurrection and "decisive terrorist action" in secret circulars like the one of March 1850.

On balance, this reinforces our conclusion that:

1. **Marx and Engels were fraudulent characters acting not on behalf of the people** (the majority of whom clearly did not want a Socialist revolution) but on behalf of themselves and other vested interests.
2. It also exposes **Socialism as a parasitic system imposed on the masses from the outside** – as admitted by Socialist leaders from Bernard Shaw to Lenin (Lenin, *What is To Be Done?*; Walicki, p. 294) – which is precisely why Marx and his clique never succeeded in winning the support of the majority.

The German authorities, of course, were no fools. In May 1849, they closed down Marx and Engels' paper and not long after smashed the Communist League's Cologne section, with some of its members being put on trial and jailed while others scattered far and wide. As a result of this, the League was disbanded in 1852.

However, the authorities could not ultimately prevail against the forces of international Socialism and their Liberal Capitalist backers. In the 1860s, Marx and Engels' co-conspirators Wilhelm Liebknecht and August Bebel were able to set up a Socialist party which in the following decades was to play a key role in the gradual conversion of Germany into a Socialist state.

London becomes the center of a pan-European revolutionary conspiracy

Meanwhile, the League's principal leaders, Marx and Engels, were safe in England where they were out of the reach of the German government and where they continued to pull the strings through a network of Socialist organizations.

Of particular interest is that by 1850 this Europe-wide revolutionary conspiracy was orchestrated from London. The Communist League had various centers across Germany, as well as in Switzerland, France and Hungary. But, as stated by Marx and Engels themselves, the London section or "district" was not only the strongest in the League, but also its main financial backer, single-handedly bankrolling the whole League ("Address of the Central Committee to the Communist League", June 1850, MEW, vol. 7, p. 311).

In light of the fact that Marxism had been close to Liberal circles from inception, it cannot be mere coincidence that the Communist League's strongest section was in London, the world's capital of Liberalism. Similarly, we find that on the other side of the Atlantic America's financial centre, New York, became a stronghold of Liberalism and Marxism and, perhaps inevitably, a source of finance for the Communist League's leadership.

Indeed, between 1851 and 1861 Marx was in the pay of the leftist New York Tribune, which published Marx's articles (which were reprinted in other papers around the world). The Tribune's owner and editor were collaborators of [Clinton Roosevelt](#), a radical Democrat member of the Morgan-associated Roosevelt Clan (Sutton, 1995, p. 45). In addition, it was to New York that Marx transferred the headquarters of his International Working Men's Association (IWMA) in 1872.

England, of course, had its own Socialist-oriented movements such as Chartism and the "Manchester School" from which Marx's Communism admittedly drew inspiration. But it was Marx's better-organized and, given Engels' links to the textile industry, better-connected movement that knew how to impose itself and secure a leading role for itself.

Following the break-up of the Communist League, Marx used the London-based IWMA, of which he became general secretary, to pursue his subversive schemes. Following the failure of the 1871 Paris Commune, the International lingered on for a few years and was eventually dissolved.

However, in 1881, it was decided to reconstitute the organization and the [Second International](#) was formed in 1889. Like its predecessor, the Second International was the coordinating body for international Socialism and was linked to characters like Helfand and Lenin who later were involved in the Russian Revolution.

In 1951 the organisation was revived as the [Socialist International](#) and placed under the control of the London [Fabian Society](#).

The British Labour Party as a subversive force of the Socialist International

There can be no doubt that Marx's International also originated the idea leading to the creation of that other subversive outfit, the British Labour Party (Berlin, p. 190). In 1893, Engels became honorary president of the Second International and, in the same year, [Keir Hardie](#), who had taken part in the founding of the Second International, set up the [Independent Labour Party](#) (ILP) with himself as chairman and leader.

The creation of the Labour Party may have been instigated by Engels himself who was berating Britain's Socialists for relying on the Liberal Party instead of following the German example and setting up their own Socialist party.

In 1900, Keir Hardie and other Socialists associated with Engels' Second International founded the Labour Representation Committee (LRC), which was renamed "The [Labour Party](#)" in 1906.

The aim of the ILP and the Labour Party was the abolition of private property and establishment of state-control over the means of production. Needless to say, this was identical to the aim of Marx and Engels' Communist League as stated in its Manifesto.

In Russia, this aim was promoted by Lenin's Social Democratic Labour (later Communist) Party and similar "Labour" parties run by middle-class elements were founded in Europe and elsewhere.

The Socialists' close proximity to Liberal Capitalism is illustrated by the fact that in the 1880s, that is, before the founding of a separate Labour Party, they stood in parliamentary elections as Liberals. Similarly, the Fabian Society had been set up for the purpose of implementing Socialism through the [Liberal Party](#), which represented Capitalist interests.

But what is particularly significant is the fact that Marx's principal preoccupation in his Capital seems to be not the abolition of Capitalism but the establishment of a planned and efficient method of production in which large-scale labour was to be subordinated to a directing authority (Priestland, p. 38).

Marx's False Revolution

Already in the Communist Manifesto, Marx had praised Capitalism for creating "massive and colossal productive forces" and for centralizing production by replacing the "patriarchal workshop" with large factories where masses of labourers were organized like soldiers (MECW, vol. 6, pp. 488, 491; cf. Priestland, p. 29).

State-controlled mass production bears no resemblance whatsoever to Marx's earlier utopian aim of restoring freedom and dignity to workers. On the contrary, it sounds very much like State Capitalism, as later practised in repressive societies like Communist Russia and China.

Having identified industrialization and mass production as responsible for the alienation and dehumanization of the workers, the logical solution would have been to restrict or abolish such developments altogether. Instead, what Marx was implicitly advocating was the expansion of industrialization and mass production and their elevation to official policy of the future Socialist State! This was entirely predictable. Marx's Socialist revolution was, after all, the product of a textile manufacturer and a utopian philosopher (or fantasist). Indeed, a true revolution, that is, a revolution desired by the majority, would have been a return to traditional values and methods of production.

In other words, a restoration of the rule of righteousness as opposed to the dictatorship of vested interests. This was the original meaning of the word "revolution" (from revolve, tum about, hence return to an original state or point of departure, e.g., the revolution of heaven in astronomy) and it was originally applied in this sense to the restoration of the English monarchy in 1660. Even in "revolutionary" France, the majority as late as 1871 favoured a restoration of the monarchy.

In contrast, Marx's Socialist project was a false revolution which merely continued, reinforced and accelerated the industrial revolution of Liberal Capitalism (the root-cause of it all), complete with the dispossession of rural communities and their transfer en masse to the city where they swelled the ranks of the army of industrial workers, as well as those of gullible converts to Socialism.

Far from restoring the rule of righteousness, this false revolution pushed mankind further and further away from the land, from tradition and from themselves into the arms of unprincipled dictators leading them into slavery even while promising "liberty".

Unsurprisingly, we find that Marx's Liberal Capitalist obsession with military-style, large-scale, state-controlled labour was shared by his successors Lenin, Stalin and Mao.

Lenin, who just a few months earlier had declared that only those "with the hardheartedness of a Shylock" would calculate the quantities of labour and products given or received, began in 1918 to impose the strictest accounting and control of production and distribution, imposing very tight labour discipline or, in his own words, "iron rule".

Lenin, who in 1917 had claimed that in Socialism labour would be so productive that each worker will "voluntarily work according to his abilities" (State and Revolution), now declared that only "everyday labour discipline" could lead to a Socialist system. He now called for "iron discipline while at work, with unquestioning obedience (Lenin's emphasis) to the will of the Soviet leader" (i.e., himself) stressing the need for the "steady advance of the iron battalions of the proletariat" ("The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government", Mar. – Apr. 1918, LCW, vol. 27, pp. 235-77).

Socialism is State Capitalism

Already in September 1917, Lenin had declared that State Capitalism was "a step towards socialism". In April 1918, he reiterated his claim, announcing that "state capitalism is something centralised, calculated, controlled and socialised, and that is exactly what we lack ... **if in a small space of time we could achieve state capitalism in Russia, that would be a victory**" ("Session of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee", 29 Apr. 1918, LCW, vol. 27, pp. 279-313).

Far from restoring freedom and dignity to workers, the entire population was to be transformed into servants of the state and organized into a giant "state syndicate" controlled by Lenin and his clique and run on Capitalist lines.

In a telling move unmasking the true face of Socialism, Lenin introduced the Liberal Capitalist methods of mass production designed by Frederick Taylor and Henry Ford to extract the maximum output from the workers for the benefit of large-scale industrialists, which were in vogue at the time in Liberal Capitalist America.

Taylor had written that "In the past, Man has been first. In the future the system must be first," which perfectly fitted the Communists' own philosophy. Taylor had also influenced Henry Ford, of Ford Motor Company. In addition to being a large-scale Capitalist manufacturer, Ford was a pro-Bolshevik with links to the American League to Aid and Cooperate with Russia, a Wall Street outfit whose Progressive vice-president Frederick C. Howe had authored Confessions of a Monopolist (1906) in which he proposed methods by which monopolists could control society (Sutton, 1974, pp. 19, 154).

The bitter irony (or farcicality) of all this was that the Soviet regime intended to show its alleged superiority over Capitalism by introducing Capitalist methods. Soviet Russia, of course, was too dysfunctional to even remotely implement either Taylorist or Fordist methods of production (or, for that matter, anything else apart from State terror and oppression) but it is beyond any doubt that the intention was there and that "Taylorization" and "Fordization" became part of the Soviet vocabulary along with more orthodox Marxist terminology.

Another unexpected result of the Communist revolution was that by the early 1920s Capitalist monopolists like Ford could look forward to doing some brisk business with the new Socialist regime (White, pp. 139, 163-4 ff.).

While Britain's Labour Party was demanding government loans to the Soviet Union, the country was flooded with imported Fordson tractors, followed by Ford cars and trucks mass-produced there under licence. The regime's fascination with large-scale, Capitalist style projects funded by Western banks continued well into the 1980s (see p. 199).

Thus, Socialism failed to overcome the fatal handicap of dependence on Capitalist technology, Capitalist methods of production and, above all, Capitalist credit, which **exposed it as a form of Capitalism**. Indeed, **the State Capitalism advocated by Lenin and applied today in Communist China is indisputably a form of Capitalism, albeit one where planning and control by a self-interested elite is carried to unparalleled extremes.**

The connections between comprehensive state planning and certain business interests have been noted by many authors. Professor P. T. Bauer has observed that comprehensive planning shields business enterprises from competition (Bauer, 1976, p. 92).

As there is no evidence that such planning has raised general living standards anywhere, the enduring insistence on such methods can only be explained by a desire to control production and the resulting financial and political power, a desire shared equally by Socialists and Capitalist monopolists.

Obsession with planning and control as a manifestation of mental disorder

But Bauer also notes that comprehensive planning "can act as a substitute for lost values" (Bauer, 1976, p. 94). This is an interesting point which supports our contention that modern developments like planned mass production of goods -advocated by both Liberal Capitalism and Socialism -are symptoms of the wider pathology caused by the loss of traditional values.

It is a medical fact that disorders in a person's psychological structure or nervous system result in abnormal behaviour which can include compulsive, repetitive actions and an obsession with planning and control.

Thus, the compulsive preoccupation with large-scale industrial production and state planning and control may be regarded as a substitute gratification for the unfulfilled need for traditional moral and spiritual values which were progressively suppressed in modern Western society.

Even before the Russian revolution, this was exemplified by Britain's Fabian Socialists, an association of culturally and spiritually uprooted individuals who rejected a society based on traditional values and aimed to replace it with one which was well-organized, efficient and controlled by themselves.

Psychological disorder is often accompanied by a marked desire in the affected person to hide the symptoms. Indeed, in addition to financial and ideological links, another key factor shared by Socialists and monopolistic elements among the upper reaches of Liberal Capitalism was the tactic of pretending that their exclusive objective was the "public good".

Both Socialists and their "Liberal Capitalist" backers claimed, and continue to claim, that their aim is to establish social and economic "equality", "justice", "progress", "peace" or whatever happens to be the fad of the day. Monopolistic industrialists and financiers' belief (or delusion) that their activities were in the interests of the "public benefit" goes back to the Carnegie, Astor and Morgan groups of the 1870s (Corey, p. 80) and before.

In Britain, these interests and their tactics came to be represented by Liberal elite groups (see John Passmore Edwards' monthly magazine *The Public Good*) and their successors like the Liberal Milner Group and the Socialist Fabian Society. Both camps surrounded themselves with a smokescreen of endowments like the Rhodes Trust and the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations through which they were able to influence or control public figures from academics to politicians, while purporting that it was all for the "public good".

While this dissimulation may have been involuntary or unconscious in some Liberals and Socialists (even well-intentioned individuals may at times unwittingly engage in deceptive behaviour), there can be little doubt that it must have been conscious and deliberate in others. At any rate, like Lenin, they all aimed to reduce the masses to obedient and efficient servants of the new ruling elites (Crowley, pp. 115, 133).

Strategic alliance of Socialists and International Capital

While Marx and Engels failed to establish Socialism in their lifetime, their conspiracy was carried on by their co-conspirators and disciples including Liebknecht, Behel, Bernstein and Kautsky, in Germany; Jules Guesde, in France; H. M. Hyndman, in England; Helfand, Lenin and Trotsky in Russia, etc.

Like Marx and Engels, these elements were closely linked to international financial interests with whom they collaborated in the cause of world revolution.

Liberal Capitalist financiers were responsible for

- financing Japan's 1904-05 war against Russia (Encyclopaedia Judaica, vol. 14, p. 961; Ferguson, 2000, vol. 2. p. 396);
- spreading revolutionary propaganda in Russia ("Pacifists Pester Till Mayor Calls Them Traitors", *New York Times*, 24 Mar. 1917);
- backing the overthrow of the Tsarist government and the seizure of power by Socialist-Revolutionary elements (Sutton, 1974, pp. 40-1, 59);
- and for helping Russia's Communist regime to survive following the 1917 Revolution (ibid, pp. 19 ff.) – hence the establishment in 1918 of the American League to Aid and Cooperate with Russia by liberal Wall Street Capitalists.

Similarly, the Anglo-Soviet Trade Agreement of 1921 was engineered by the government of Liberal Capitalist Lloyd George, while diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia were established in 1924 under Fabian Socialist Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald. Both Lloyd George and MacDonald had close links to the Liberal Capitalist Milner Group (Quigley, 1981, pp. 229, 231).

The same international interests who instigated the Russian Revolution also called for a revolution in Germany. The November Revolution of 1918 in Germany resulted in the abolition of the German monarchy and establishment of a Socialist government, while the large industrialists and bankers continued operating unhindered from behind the scenes.

International bankers with Milner Group connections, from Montagu Norman of the Bank of England to Thomas Lamont of J. P. Morgan & Co., were keen on advancing credit to Germany's new Socialist State (Quigley, 1981, p. 235).

In Austria, too, with the abolition of the monarchy, the country became a republic in 1919. In the following year, the Liberal Socialist director of the Austrian National Bank, Michael Hainisch, became President of the Austrian Republic.

Thus, **Socialism stands exposed as a convenient instrument by which Liberal Capitalist bankers and industrialists removed monarchies from power and imposed themselves as the new (covert or overt) rulers.**

It is evident that monopolistic, Liberal Capitalist financial interests were at the apex of this world-revolutionary movement, followed by an extensive network of Liberal and Socialist organizations. Among these, Liberal parties (including Britain's Liberal Party), the [Milner Group](#), the [Fabian Society](#), various Marxist groups and their Anglo-American associates, played key roles.

While Liberal Capitalists were providing the financial backing and influenced the economy in ways that were conducive to first Liberal and then Socialist revolution, the other groups were responsible for the preparatory political and social groundwork through permeation, indoctrination, agitation and organization. In some cases, as in 1917 Russia, they carried out armed coups.

In the light of these facts, it becomes clear that the Russo-Japanese War and World War I were just a smokescreen deployed by international financial interests to instigate revolution and impose Socialist regimes that would enable them to implement their agendas. This is confirmed among other things by the International Socialist Congress of Basel, 1912, which even before the start of the war had resolved that Socialists should "with all their powers utilize the economic and political crisis created by the war to arouse the people and thereby to hasten the downfall of capitalist rule" (Extraordinary International Socialist Congress Basel, November 24-25, 1912, Berlin, 1912, HI, vol. 22, p. 149).

This had well-documented historical precedents like the Franco-Prussian War which had been used by subversive elements connected with Marx and Engels' First International to instigate the Paris Commune of 1871.

The use of wars and other (e.g., financial and economic) crises for the purpose of subverting the existing order and moving closer towards world government has remained a key tactic utilized by these groups to this day. The global financial crisis which began in 2007-08 and the installation of Marxist inspired left-wing activist Barack Obama as President of the United States is a case in point (see pp. 394 ff.).

The same interests have also enabled Communist-controlled China to become a dominant economic power at the expense of Western countries. In short, this **alliance between Liberal Capitalism and its offshoot, Socialism, is the key to the correct understanding of the events that have shaped the modern world.**

The real issue has never been "Feudalism", the "Monarchy" or the fictitious "class antagonism"; it has been and remains monopolistic Capitalism and totalitarian Socialism. Thanks to the treacherous policies of monopolistic "Liberal Capitalists" who control the world's finances, Socialism is alive and well and on the march towards world domination and dictatorship.

The feigned "death" of Marxism and its miraculous "resurrection"

The much-publicized abandonment of Socialist ideology and "embrace of Capitalism" following the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc in the late 1980s has been little more than a temporary measure by ex-Communist regimes to save themselves and their economies from total collapse.

Despite Russia's Communist Party being outlawed in 1991, the country is run by an administration that has been dragging its feet on restoring the monarchy (which for many Russians would represent a break with the Communist past and return to normalcy) and former Communists with links to the International Left are never far from power; China remains firmly under Communist Party control; and many

"ex-Communist" leaders continue to hold positions of power and influence in Eastern Europe's new democracies which instead of truly abandoning Socialism are reinventing themselves along the lines of Western European "Democratic Socialism" a.k.a. "Social Democracy".

As proudly trumpeted by Stuart Jeffries, "Marxism is on the rise again". Indeed, Marxism is enjoying a well-orchestrated comeback: Marx, Lenin and Stalin are once more the heroes of colleges and university campuses; Russian hats with Soviet insignia and T-shirts with "СССР" ("USSR") and "Che Guevara" logos are making Bolshevik chic fashionable again on the streets of London; the Fabian Socialist [London School of Economics](#) (LSE) advertises itself as the ideal political mentor to young people, etc.

According to Wheen, Marx's Communist Manifesto is "still a bestseller" in London book stores (Wheen, p. 124). Jeffries notes with barely contained excitement that sales of Das Kapital "have soared ever since 2008" (Jeffries, 2012). Wheen and Jeffries may have overlooked many a bookseller's leftist propensities or, for that matter, that British cities like London have been Socialist fiefdoms ever since the days of Bernard Shaw and Sidney Webb.

In addition, British cities and, in particular, London, are also financial centres. All the key ingredients of Socialism from finance to Marxist ideology and from government/local authorities to universities (to which we may add migrants) are to be found in urban centres. And this is precisely why Socialism in London and other centres of international finance has never really been on the decline.

Though Socialists may tell us that they are rebelling against financial institutions like those that are at home in London and New York (Jeffries, 2012), the fact is that these very institutions are the primary movers behind World Socialism. This is the true explanation for Socialism's vampire-like longevity as well as its recent revival.

International bankers finance Socialism

Unlike the propagandists in the Guardian — a newspaper published by Rothschild associates Paul Meiners and Anthony Saltz — it's obvious to any objective observer that the financiers who support global socialism are simultaneously funding an "uprising" against themselves. The [Occupy Wall Street](#) movement, funded by billionaire financier and Rothschild associate George Soros is a classic illustration.

The purpose of this tactic is to mislead the opposition and to trick the political system into introducing further banking control and centralization, a key demand of Marx and Engels' Communist Manifesto. Thus, while smaller, honest banks are struggling, offending global giants like Rothschild, Lazard, JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup and Goldman Sachs, are growing and their links to each other and to the ruling elites are becoming ever closer and stronger.

Socialists rebelling against banks should be asked to explain **the similarity (or identity) of Marxist objectives to that of big bankers relentlessly pushing for concentration of finance in the hands of a few.** Above all, they should explain the close collaboration between their leaders and the leaders of international finance, for example:

- Lord Rothschild, of N. M. Rothschild & Sons, personally funded and served as president of the LSE, an institution set up by Fabian leaders to teach economics on socialist lines, to which the Rothschilds have retained close links ever since as have the Rockefellers and other leading bankers;
- leading Western banks provided, secretly or overtly, billions of dollars a year to Soviet Russia's Socialist regime;
- the Rockefeller-dominated International Monetary Fund (IMF) bankrolled Britain's Labour governments in the 1940s and 60s (Martin, pp. 77, 109);

- in the 1970s, Fabian Socialist and LSE graduate David Rockefeller became a director of the New York Federal Reserve Bank (the bank which dominates America's banking system), while LSE graduate and Soros associate Paul Volcker became its president and later chairman of the Federal Reserve itself (Sutton, 1995, p 109);
- the Socialist Lord John Eatwell, former adviser to Labour leader Neil Kinnock and fellow Socialist Lord Patrick Carter, adviser to Labour's BlairBrown regime, became senior advisers to the global private equity firm Warburg Pincus;
- leading Fabian Socialist Lord Mandelson, is not only the architect of Britain's New Labour, but also a close friend of the Rothschilds and other international plutocrats, as well as senior adviser to the global investment bank Lazard Ltd., which has a history of generous support for leading Socialists around the globe, including US President Barack Obama;
- Mandelson's disciple Tony Blair was a member of the World Economic Forum's (a Rockefeller-dominated organization) Global Leaders of Tomorrow group even before becoming Prime Minister and joined the J.P. Morgan International Council (part of the Rockefellers' JPMorgan Chase) after leaving office;
- LSE graduate and Rothschild associate George Soros, has been bankrolling globalization and Socialist causes for decades, etc.

The question, in other words, is, **why are Socialists rebelling against bankers who are either Socialists or are being advised by Socialists and who, moreover, are bankrolling Socialism?** The obvious answer is that either they are hypocrites (which must be true of some of them) or they are allowing themselves to be led by the nose by their own leaders (which is true of most of them).

Socialism and Global Government

One key element of Socialism that has remained unchanged since Karl Marx is internationalism and the resultant drive for world government. While various degrees of internationalism have been promoted by other systems, it has been a core value of Socialism.

Already in his 1848 Communist Manifesto, Marx expressed his belief that solidarity between the workers of all countries was more important than solidarity between the citizens of one country. Marx also recognized that the emergence of global markets had turned Capitalism into a global system. Yet instead of challenging the global economy that supported Capitalism, **Marx advocated the replacement of global Capitalism with global Socialism!**

As noted above, Socialist organizations promoting internationalism have been created from the time of Karl Marx. Marx himself had been a leading figure in the International Working Men's Association (the "[First International](#)" founded in London in 1864). As wars tended to disrupt the construction of International Socialism, Socialist efforts in this direction had to be resumed after each major war.

- Following the Franco-Prussian War, a [Second International](#) was formed in Paris in 1889.
- After WWI, another [Communist International](#) was formed by Lenin (in 1919).
- After WWII a [Socialist International](#) (a continuation of the Second) was formed by Britain's Fabian Society (in 1951).

At its first Congress at Frankfurt, the Socialist International (SI) declared that "**national sovereignty must be transcended**" ("[Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism](#)", Declaration of the Socialist International adopted at its First Congress held in Frankfurt on Main on 30 June-3 July 1951).

At the 2-4 June 1962 Oslo Conference, the SI made its position even more clear, resolving that

"The ultimate objective of the parties of the Socialist International is nothing less than world government. As a first step towards it, they seek to strengthen the United Nations... Membership of the United Nations must be made universal." (["The World Today: The Socialist Perspective"](#), Declaration of the Socialist International endorsed at the Council Conference held in Oslo on 2-4 June 1962; www.socialistinternational.org).

As Socialism expanded its reach at national, regional and global level, it was able to advance its internationalist agenda through the creation of

- the League of Nations (LON, 1919),
- the Soviet Union or Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR, 1922),
- the United Nations (UN, 1945),
- the British Commonwealth (1946)
- and the European Economic Community (EEC, 1957).

While they could not have been taken without Capitalist collaboration, the main driving force behind these steps has been Socialism, this being the dominant ideology at the time in the Soviet Union, Europe, China and, through "Liberal Socialism", in the USA.

At any rate, it is evident that the developments the world has witnessed since the rise of Socialism in the 20th century are nothing but phases in the process of transition from global Capitalism to global Socialism leading to Socialist-dominated global government and dictatorship.

Socialism and the UN

The League of Nations (LON) and its successor, the United Nations (UN), have been the principal schemes through which international Socialism and its "Liberal Capitalist" bedfellows have implemented their plans of world domination.

The United Nations which was created at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference of August -October 1944, was a Socialist organization backed by international financial interests such as the Rockefellers. Its main (permanent) founding members were:

- Socialist-dominated Britain,
- Socialist (Marxist-Leninist) Russia,
- Liberal Socialist USA (under Democrat and [New-Deal](#) author Roosevelt),
- Socialist France (under Charles de Gaulle's coalition government of Communists, Socialists and Christian Democrats)
- and National Socialist China (under "Red General" Chiang Kai-shek).

Despite, or perhaps because of, its Liberal Capitalist backing, the UN was run by Socialists from inception.

The post of UN President was occupied by Socialists beginning with the appointment in 1946 of leading Belgian Socialist [Paul-Henri Spaak](#).

The post of UN Secretary-General was also occupied by Socialists:

- [Trygve Lie](#), a leading figure in the Norwegian Labour Party (1946-52);
- [Dag Hammarskjöld](#), former Foreign Secretary in Sweden's Socialist government, outspoken Socialist and supporter of Maoist China (1953-56);
- [U Thant](#), former functionary in Burma's Socialist government and openly pro-Soviet and proChina (1961-71), etc. (Griffin, pp. 110, 114, 117-8)

Other key posts in the UN were also given to Socialists. For example, the post of Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs (assistant to the General-Secretary) between 1946 and 1992 (almost half a century) was held by Soviet Russians -with the exception of 1954-57 when it was held by Socialist Yugoslavia (Griffin, pp. 85-6).

Given its Liberal Capitalist-Socialist background, it is not surprising to see that the UN promoted Soviet-type state-sponsored industrialization and industrial manufacturing in underdeveloped countries, for example, through initiatives like the [UN Conference on Trade and Development](#) (UNCTAD), launched in the early 1960s.

Socialism and the EU

The idea of a united Europe originated in Socialist circles with links to Liberal Capitalism. Marx and Engels' co-conspirator Moses Hess advocated a federation of England, France and Germany in the 1840s. At about the same time, the French writer and statesman Victor Hugo campaigned for a "United States of Europe". Its Liberal Capitalist origins are confirmed by Engels himself who described Hugo's project as "bourgeois" (Letter to A. Behel, 18-28 March 1875, MECW, vol. 42, p. 61).

Unsurprisingly (given its Liberal Capitalist backers), the Socialist camp represented by Wilhelm Liebknecht (1888), Karl Kautsky (1911), Vladimir Lenin (1914), Arthur Ponsonby (1915), Leon Trotsky (1929) and others, all parroted the Liberal Capitalist slogan by calling for a "United States of Europe". It goes without saying that they all meant a Socialist USE.

Among the most vigorous promoters of the idea were the Austrian Socialist Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi and France's Socialist Prime Minister [Aristide Briand](#). A leading figure in the French Section of the Second International, Briand became Foreign Minister in 1925 and declared his ambition to establish a "United States of Europe".

In 1929, Briand made a speech to the then 27 European members of the League of Nations in which he proposed a federal union. In 1930 he presented to the League a "Memorandum from the French Government on the Organization of a Regime of European federal Union" (Britannica, vol. 18, p. 712).

In 1931, Sir [Arthur Salter](#), a former Fabian Society member who later served as head of the economic and financial section of the League of Nations Secretariat, published a collection of papers entitled The United States of Europe in which he explored the building of a federal Europe, declaring that "the United States of Europe must be a political reality" (Booker & North, pp. 16-7).

The structure of the new supranational entity described by Salter was later used by his collaborator [Jean Monnet](#) as a model for the [European Coal and Steel Community](#) (ECSC) created through the April 1951 Treaty of Paris (Booker & North, p. 58).

In 1955, Monnet founded the [Action Committee for the United States of Europe](#) (Booker and North, p. 70) which became one of the driving forces behind the initiatives leading to the 1957 Treaty of Rome and the creation of the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1958, the European Community (EC) in 1967, and finally, the European Union (EU).

Like the UN, the EU was run by Socialists from the time of the first President of the Common Assembly of the ECSC (which later became the European Parliament), Paul-Henri Spaak and has remained dominated by Socialists such as Roy Jenkins, Jacques Delors, Romano Prodi, Javier Solana, Lord Mandelson, Baroness Ashton and many others.

Following the dissolution of the Eastern Bloc (the Soviet Union and its satellites), many former members of East European Communist parties were appointed to key posts in the EU hierarchy. Although former

Marxist-Leninist and Maoist regimes have ostensibly abandoned their Socialist ideology, in reality they have done little more than join the rest of the world most of which is Democratic (or Liberal) Socialist for all practical purposes.

If anything, the new collaboration between "ex-Socialist" and current Social Democratic or Liberal Socialist regimes has brought the prospect of global government closer than ever before.

Socialism and the destruction of the Nation-state

It may be argued that all international economic cooperation tends to lead to global economy and global society ruled by global government. However, classical Capitalist (e.g., British Liberal) internationalism revolves (at least in theory) around cooperation between sovereign nation-states within a framework of international law.

By contrast, Socialist internationalism entails the dissolution of the nation. Therefore, **internationalism as advocated by Socialism presupposes the abolition of sovereign nation-states and transfer of government to regional and global bodies such as the EU and UN**. Here, again, Socialist aims coincide with those of the Liberal (in fact, illiberal) Capitalist elite mentioned above.

It is generally accepted that a nation's identity is defined by territorial, ethnic, cultural and religious boundaries. All these boundaries were deliberately and systematically blurred by the alliance of socialists and liberal capitalists:

- **The territorial boundaries** of Britain and other European nations have been constantly eroded through growing national integration into regional and global systems like the EU and UN.
- **Ethnic boundaries** have been eroded through State-imposed mass immigration.
- **Cultural boundaries** have been eroded through the introduction and promotion of foreign cultures or "multiculturalism".
- **Religious boundaries** have been eroded through the introduction and promotion of foreign religions or "multireligionism".

It goes without saying that a nation ceases to exist according as the erosion of its defining boundaries advances. Socialism and its Liberal Capitalist collaborators have been the main driving force behind this process.

For example, Lenin wrote: "We do not support 'national culture' but international culture ... We are against national culture as one of the slogans of bourgeois nationalism. We are in favour of the international culture of a fully democratic and socialist proletariat" ("Draft platform for the Fourth Congress of Social Democrats of the Latvian area", May 1913, MIA).

In Britain, the Labour Party passed the 1948 [British Nationality Act](#) which allowed all inhabitants of the British Empire to enter, live and work in the UK without restriction.

[Concept of multiculturalism](#) was introduced by Labour Home Secretary (later President of the European Commission) [Roy Jenkins](#) in 1966 when the Labour Party changed its policy from assimilation of immigrants to state promoted "cultural diversity" (Joppke, p. 19)

And [mass immigration](#) deliberately intended to make Britain more multicultural was secretly promoted by Tony Blair's "[New Labour](#)" regime ("Labour wanted mass immigration to make UK more multicultural, says former adviser", Daily Telegraph, 5 May 2011).

As we shall have occasion to see, similar policies have been pursued by left-wing interests elsewhere in Europe and America.

Socialism and Islamization

Islamization is the transformation of non-Islamic into Islam dominated society. While this is not the express aim of Socialism, Socialist collaboration with Islam is undeniable and must be regarded as having to do with Socialism's aim of creating global government which, by definition, must include Islamic nations. More specifically, Socialism regards Christianity as "reactionary" and Islam, as the arch-opponent of Christianity, as "revolutionary".

Already in the early days of Lenin's Socialist Revolution, there had been a clear official trend to gain favour with Muslim dominated Central Asian populations by pandering to the idea that Muslims were victims of Christian "oppression". The regime's collaboration with Islam even went so far as to allow the use of Sharia courts (Crouch, 2006).

Outside the Soviet Union, Socialist groups infiltrated Arab Muslim countries in the first half of the 20th century. Following the 1956 Suez crisis, the Soviet Union established close links with pro-Socialist Arab regimes, particularly those of Egypt and Syria, and in the early 1960s began to support the Palestinian cause and supply the PLO and other Palestinian terrorist organizations with weapons. In the Arab-Israeli War of 1973, the Soviet Union sided with the Arabs, supplying them with military equipment.

However, Western Europe's Socialists went even further, with British Fabian Socialists like [Denis Healey](#) taking a leading role. Having inspired the nationalization of Western-controlled oil industries in Muslim countries, resulting in higher oil prices and increased income and power for oil-producing Islamic regimes, they proceeded to open Europe up to Islamic influence.

In November 1973, the Socialist-dominated European Economic Community (EEC) issued a declaration initiating a [Euro-Arab Dialogue](#) (EAD) with the objective of strengthening the ties between European countries and the Arab world.

In July 1974, an official meeting at ministerial level between Europeans and Arabs was convened to discuss the organization of the EAD and the European Parliamentary Association for Euro-Arab Cooperation was founded to improve political, economic and cultural cooperation between Europe and the Arab world (Ye'or, pp. 52, 54).

A key role in these discussions was played by French President [Georges Pompidou](#) and German Chancellor and Socialist leader [Willy Brandt](#). Brandt later became President of the Socialist International (the successor to Marx's own International).

Since its accession to the EEC in 1986, Spain – a nation formerly occupied by Muslim Arabs -has become a key player in the Euro-Arab project. In 1995, the [Euro-Mediterranean Partnership](#) (EMP) was created on the initiative of Spain's Socialist Government represented by Foreign Minister [Javier Solana](#) (Barcelona Conference 1995 [eeas.europa.eu](#)).

Other initiatives instigated by Solana, Spain's Socialist President Jose Luis Zapatero and their collaborators have led to the creation of

- the [Anna Lindh Foundation](#) for Dialogue between Cultures (ALF),
- the Alliance of Civilizations (AoC),
- the [Euro-Mediterranean Parliamentary Assembly](#) (EMPA)

- and, above all, the [Union for the Mediterranean](#) (UfM), which aims **to incorporate all North African and Middle Eastern countries into Europe by 2030** (Lannon & Martfn, pp. 15-16, 21; Bicchi et al., 2011).

Notes

1. "King of kings", "God the King", "King of the gods", are titles of God in both Christian and pre-Christian, Classical tradition (KJV, 1 Tim. 6: 15; LXX Ps. 48:2(47).2; Hom. Od. 4.691; Hes. Th. 886; Pi. O. 7.34; Emp. 128.2). See also "Thy kingdom come" in the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:5-13).

2. Righteous or just society is based on harmony between occupation based estates or classes such as (originally) clergy, nobility, craftsmen and farmers. When this balance is disturbed, as occurred with the rise to prominence of self-seeking merchants, financiers, bankers and industrialists, the task before the genuine revolutionary is to restore the original harmony.

Marx had no interest in doing this because, as observed by Techow, he aimed to seize power for himself by driving the aristocracy from government with the help of the working class. It follows that Marx's chief concern was not the welfare of working men but the acquisition of personal power.

As the following chapters show, concern for the working class stands exposed as an elaborate yet ultimately fraudulent power-seeking, divide-and-rule strategy which Socialist leaders have used for their own agendas ever since.

References

- Applebaum, Anne, *Gulag: A History of the Soviet Camps*, London, 2004.
- Assmann, Jan, *Aegyptische Hymnen und Gebete*, Zurich, 1975, no. 20, II. 31-37, quoted in Assmann, J., *The Mind of Egypt: History and Meaning in the Time of the Pharaohs*, New York, NY, 2002, p. 187.
- Bacque, James, *Crimes and Mercies: The Fate of German Civilians Under Allied Occupation 1944-1950*, London, 1997.
- Bauer, Peter Thomas, *Dissent on Development*, London, 1976.
- Berlin, Isaiah, *Karl Marx*, Oxford, 1978.
- Bernstein, Eduard, *The Preconditions of Socialism*, 1899, English translation Cambridge, 2002.
- Bicchi, Federica and others, *Mediterranean Politics*, vol. 16, issue 1, March 2011, reproduced in F. Bicchi & R. Gillespie, eds., *The Union for the Mediterranean*, Abingdon, Oxon, 2012.
- Booker, Christopher & North, Richard, *The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union*, London, 2003. *New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 29 vols., Chicago, IL, 2002.
- Callaghan, John, *The Labour Party and Foreign Policy: A History*, Abingdon, Oxon, 2007.
- Chang, Jung & Halliday, Jon, *Mao: The Unknown Story*, New York, NY, 2005.
- Conquest, Robert, *The Great Terror: A Reassessment*, Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Corey, Lewis, *The House of Morgan: A Social Biography of the Masters of Money*, New York, NY, 1930.
- Courtois, Stephane et al., *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression*, Engl. translation, Cambridge, MA and London, 1999.
- Crenshaw, M. & Pimlott, J., eds., *International Encyclopedia of Terrorism (JET)*, London, 1998.
- Crouch, Dave, "The Bolsheviks and Islam", *International Socialism Journal*, Issue 110, 6 Apr. 2006.
- Crowley, Brian Lee, *The Self, the Individual and the Community: Liberalism in the Political Thought of F. A. Hayek and Sidney and Beatrice Webb*, Oxford, 1987. For the Socialist belief in the individual's duty to submit to the will of the state, see also Ramsay MacDonald's *Socialism and Government* (1909).
- Davies, Norman, *Europe: A History*, New York, NY, 1996.
- De Zayas, Alfred-Maurice, *A Terrible Revenge: The Ethnic Cleansing of the East European Germans, 1944-1950*, New York, NY, 1946.
- Dietrich, John, *The Morgenthau Plan: Soviet Influence on American Postwar Policy*, New York, NY, 2002.
- Engels, F., "On Authority", *Almanacco Repubblicano*, Dec. 1874. English translation in *Marx-Engels Reader*, New York, NY, 2nd ed., 1978, pp. 730-3; *Marxists Internet Archive*, www.marxists.org English, Richard, *Irish Freedom: The History of Nationalism in Ireland*, London, 2006.
- Ferguson, Niall, *The House of Rothschild*, 2 vols., New York, NY, 2000.
- Garlvert, Peter, "Theories of Terror in Urban Insurrection", *JET*, pp. 137-144.
- Griffin, Edward G., *The Faithful Master: A Second Look at the United Nations*, Belmont, MA, 1964.
- Henderson, Archibald, *George Bernard Shaw: His Life And Works, A Critical Biography*, Cincinnati, OH, 1911.
- Habtmann, Pierre, ed., *Carnets de P. -1. Proudhon*, 4 vols., Paris, 1960
- Histoire de la Ile Internationale (HI)*, Documents Generaux, 23 vols., reprint Geneva, undated.
- Hunt, Tristram, *The Frock-Coated Communist: The Life and Times of the Original Champagne Socialist*, London, 2010.

Janke, Peter, *Guerrilla and Terrorist Organizations: A World Directory And Bibliography*, Brighton, 1983.

Jeffries, Stuart, "Why Marxism is on the rise again", *Guardian*, 4 Jul. 2012.

Joppke, Christian, *Immigration and the Nation-State: The United States, Germany and Great Britain*, New York, NY, 1999.

Encyclopaedia Judaica, 16 vols., Jerusalem, 1971.

Kautsky, Karl, "War and Peace", *Justice*, 29 Apr. 1911.

Kautsky, Karl, *Terrorism and Communism: A Contribution to the Natural History of Revolution*, 1919, translated by W. H. Kerridge, London, 1920.

Kerridge correctly renders the German "Terrorismus" as "terrorism". For a variant translation of this passage see note under K. Marx.

Kolakowski, Leszek, *Main Currents of Marxism*, English edn. New York and London, 1978.

Lannon, Erwan & Martin, Ivan, *Report on the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership Status & Progress 2009*, Barcelona, 2009.

Leggett, George, *The Cheka: Lenin's Political Police*, Oxford, 1981.

Lenin, V. I., *Collected Works (LCW)*, 45 vols., Moscow, 1960-70.

Lenin, V. I., "Draft platform for the Fourth Congress of Social Democrats of the Latvian area", May 1913, *Lenin Collected Works (LCW)*, vol. 19, p. 116; MIA, www.marxists.org

Lenin, V. I., "The War and Russian Social-Democracy", Sept. 1914, *LCW*, vol. 21, pp. 25-34.

Lenin, V. I., *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, 1918, *LCW*, vol. 28, pp. 104-112; MIA, www.marxists.org

Law, Randall D., *Terrorism: A History*, Cambridge, 2009.

Lovell, David W., *From Marx to Lenin*, New York, NY, 2009.

Marx, Jenny, "Short Sketch of an Eventful Life", 1865, *Reminiscences of Marx and Engels*, Moscow (undated); "Kurze Urnisse eines bewegten Lebens", 1865, *Mohr und General. Erinnerungen an Marx und Engels*, 4th edn., Berlin, 1982, pp. 184-213; also in Schiltrumpf, pp. 55-76.

Marx, K. & Engels, F., *Werke (MEW)* [in German], 43 vols., Berlin, 1956-1990.

Marx, K. & Engels, F., *Collected Works (MECW)* [English], 50 vols., London, 1975-2004.

Marx, K. & Engels, F., *Selected Works (MESW)* [English], 3 vols., Moscow, 1969.

Marx, K., "The Victory of the Counter-Revolution in Vienna" (*Sieg der Kontrerevolution zu Wien*), *NRZ*, No. 136, 7 Nov. 1848, *MEW*, vol. 5, 455-7 www.dearchiv.de.

Note: The official (Soviet Communist) English translation reads, "there is only one way in which the murderous death agonies of the old society and the bloody birth throes of the new society can be shonened, simplified and concentrated, and that way is revolutionary terror," Marx & Engels, *Articles from the Neue Rheinische Zeitung 1848-49*, translated from the German by S. Ryazanskaya, Moscow, 1972, 2^d printing 1977, p. 150; *MECW*, London, 1977, vol. 7, p. 503; MIA, www.marxists.org. This English version has "terror" instead of the original "terrorism" (German, *Terrorismus*) and has been used by Marxist apologists to falsely claim that Marx did not advocate terrorism. In fact, Marx's advocacy of terrorism is confirmed with approval by Trotsky in his *Terrorism and Communism* and must be beyond dispute.

Marx, K., *Class Struggles in France, 1850*, New York, NY, 1964, reprint 1997; *MESW*, vol. 1, pp. 186-299; MIA, www.marxists.org

Marx, K., "Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right" [Towards a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right], Introduction, 1844, H. J. Stenning, trans., *Selected Essays*, Freeport, NY, 1926; "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law", Introduction, *MECW*, vol. 3, p. 4; "Zur Kritik der Hegelschen Rechtsphilosophie", Einleitung, Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels, *Werke (MEW)*, Berlin, vol. 1, 1976, pp. 378-391.

Marx, K. *Capital*, *MECW*, vols. 35, 36, 37; *Capital*, 3 vols., New York, NY, 1967.

Neue Deutsche Biographie (NDB), 24 vols., Berlin, 1953-2010.

Nove, Alec, *An Economic History of the Soviet Union*, London, 1988.

Pargeter, Alison, *The New Frontiers of Jihad: Radical Islam in Europe*, London, 2008.

Pipes, Richard, ed., *The Unknown Lenin: From the Secret Archive*, New Haven and London, 1996.

Pipes, Richard, *Communism: A Brief History*, London, 2001.

Ponsonby, Arthur, "The Case for a United Europe", *Labour Leader*, Apr. 1915.

Priestland, David, *The Red Flag: Communism and the Making of the Modern World*, London, 2009.

Quigley, Carroll, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time*, New York, 1966, 3rd printing, GSG & Associates, San Pedro, CA, 1998.

Quigley, Carroll, *The Anglo-American Establishment: From Rhodes to Cliveden*, GSG & Associates, San Pedro, CA, 1981.

Radzinsky, Edvard, *Stalin*, 1988, English translation London, 1996.

Rapport, Mike, *1848: Year of Revolution*, London, 2008.

Rummel, Rudolph, *Lethal Politics: Soviet Genocide and Mass Murder Since 1917*, New Brunswick, NJ, 1990; www.hawaii.edu

Rummel, Rudolph, "Reevaluating China's democide to be 73,000,000", 20 Nov. 2005.

Schram, Stuart, ed., *Mao's Road to Power: Revolutionary Writings 1912-1949*, New York, NY, 1994.

Schiltrumpf, JOrn, *Jenny Marx oder: Die Suche nach dem aufrechten Gang*, Berlin, 2008.

Shuster, Sam, "The nature and consequence of Karl Marx's skin disease", *British Journal of Dermatology*, vol. 158, issue 1, Jan. 2008, pp. 1-3.

Sutton, Antony C., *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, first published in New York, 1974, reprinted in Forest Row, East Sussex, 2011.

Sutton, Antony C., *The Federal Reserve Conspiracy*, first published in 1995, reprinted in Carson City, NV, 2005.

Trotsky, Leon, *Terrorism and Communism, A Reply to Karl Kautsky*, 1920, English translation New York, NY, 1922.

Walicki, Andrzej, *Marxism and the Leap to the Kingdom of Freedom*, Stanford, CA, 1995.

Wheen, Francis, *Karl Marx*, London, 1999.

White, Christine A., *British and American Commercial Relations with Soviet Russia, 1918-1924*, Chapel Hill, NC, 1992.

Will, George F., "Man of The Century, Alas", Newsweek, 16 Sept. 1996.

Ye'or, Bat, Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis, Madison, NJ, 2006.