

YOUR KINDLE NOTES FOR:

How the British Invented Communism (And Blamed It on the Jews)

Richard Poe and Noor Bin Ladin

Last accessed on Saturday, May 18, 2024

126 Highlights | 0 Notes

Yellow highlight | Location: 108

> Perhaps most surprising is the strange alliance between Karl Marx and Scottish aristocrat David Urquhart, an arch-reactionary who sought a return to feudalism. What united both men, according to Richard, was their common disdain for the bourgeoisie. Both believed that the middle class constituted the greatest threat to a just and stable world order, and must be eliminated. Fast forward to the present. The destructive policies of the Great Reset leave little doubt that the middle class is still the target, and that the unlikely connivance of Marx and Urquhart is very much alive. Thus communism, feudalism, and globalism continue their secret and incestuous affair to this day, giving birth to their monstrous progeny: the implementation of feudalism 2.0. Another vital ambition shared between them is the dissolution of the nation state. Since its inception, communism has always pushed "internationalism," and discouraged love of country. "I will conclude by wishing that the age may speedily arrive when there will be for all men but one country," said Karl Schapper, an early associate of Marx, at an 1846 speech in London, two years before the Communist Manifesto was published. And, of course, Marx and Friedrich Engels would drive the point home in their seminal treatise, by declaring, "Proletarians of all countries, unite!"

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 127

> Richard suggests that the demise of Europe's ancient aristocracy may have been exaggerated, and that many of the same princely families that ruled Europe for centuries may still be calling the shots, behind the scenes. Richard further suggests—and this is the point of his book—that the old aristocracy, especially in England, has made a persistent and systematic effort, through its intelligence and state propaganda services, to blame Jews for many of its own crimes and misdeeds, including the instigation of the French and Russian Revolutions.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 172

> Many readers will be surprised to hear such words from Churchill. We have been conditioned to think of him as the archnemesis of Hitler and the Nazis, a role he took

on later in life. But, in 1920, Churchill's views—at least his public views—were hardly distinguishable from Hitler's. As Secretary of War, Churchill spoke with the full authority of the British government. His article faithfully echoed Britain's official propaganda of the time. In April, 1919, the British Foreign Office had issued a report called the "Russia No. 1 White Paper: A Collection of Reports on Bolshevism in Russia," also known as the "Bolshevik Atrocity Bluebook." It identified Jews as the driving force behind the Tsar's murder and the Bolshevik Revolution.3 The British press followed up with a coordinated, anti-Jewish propaganda campaign, expressly promoting the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, a document of dubious origin purporting to reveal a Jewish plot to enslave the world.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 227

Our story begins with Leon Trotsky. It was Trotsky who directed the Bolshevik coup of November 7, 1917, and Trotsky who led the Red Army to victory in the Russian Civil War. Without Trotsky, there would have been no Soviet Union. But Trotsky did not accomplish these feats on his own. He had help from the British government. Trotsky's longstanding ties to British intelligence have never been adequately explained.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 233

For reasons unknown, the British secret service came to Trotsky's rescue, ordering his release. The order came from William Wiseman, US station chief for Britain's foreign intelligence division, later known as MI6.13 Following Trotsky's release on April 29, 1917, he embarked for Russia and joined the Revolution. The rest is history.14 In Russia, British handlers kept Trotsky close. One of his handlers was Clare Sheridan, who happened to be Winston Churchill's first cousin. She was a sculptress who claimed to be a Bolshevik sympathizer. Sheridan sculpted Trotsky's portrait, and was rumored to be his lover.15 Reliable sources have identified Sheridan as a British spy.16 Trotsky was banished by Stalin in 1929, spending the rest of his life on the run. During the Moscow Treason Trials of 1936-1938, Trotsky was convicted, in absentia, of working for Britain's Secret Intelligence Service (SIS). The star witness against him was Soviet diplomat Christian Rakovsky, who testified that British intelligence had blackmailed him in London in 1924, using a forged letter, all allegedly with Trotsky's knowledge and approval. "I went to Moscow and talked to Trotsky [afterwards]," Rakovsky testified. "Trotsky said that the forged letter was only an excuse. He agreed that we were to work with the British Intelligence."17

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 253

Seen in this light, Churchill's anti-Jewish rant in the Illustrated Sunday Herald begins to look like play-acting, like the spinning of an elaborate yarn, a cover story. But covering for what? What was Churchill trying to hide, by blaming Jews—and Trotsky, in particular—for the Russian Revolution? You will not find the answer in conventional history books. The story has been erased. But, in 1920, memories were still fresh. Witnesses were speaking out. The British faced hard questions about their role in the Russian Revolution. They needed a scapegoat.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 288

His son Dmitri (the Princess's stepson) was also caught up in British plots. On December 30, 1916, Dmitri took part in the assassination of the "mad monk" Rasputin. For a hundred years, historians have told us this operation was led by Prince Felix Yusupov—a gay, cross-dressing socialite—but all evidence suggests that the real leader was Lieutenant Oswald Rayner, a British intelligence operative who had been Yusupov's close friend at Oxford. Rayner was present at the murder scene and is believed to have fired the fatal bullet into Rasputin's head, according to Andrew Cook's To Kill Rasputin (2006).23 According to Cook, a secret British communication confirmed the killing, stating, "our objective has clearly been achieved. Reaction to the demise of 'Dark Forces' has been well-received by all… Rayner is attending to loose ends." "Dark Forces" was British code for Rasputin and his cabal of "reactionary" followers at the Russian court.24 We can thus see that Princess Paley and her family had rendered many services to the British Crown, even to the point of deceiving their own Sovereign. Despite these services, the Princess and her family were betrayed and abandoned by the British, as indeed all of Russia was betrayed. Russian liberals like the Grand Duke Paul had been led to believe that Britain would help them establish an enlightened constitutional monarchy in Russia, run on democratic principles. Instead, Russia got five years of civil war, followed by 70 years of Communist rule. In the end, Princess Paley's husband and her only son were murdered by the Bolsheviks, her husband shot, her son Vladimir thrown down a coal shaft and crushed by logs and stones.25

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 310

Bolshevism, the Princess suggests, was just one more weapon deployed by the British to keep Russia weak. "Is it not to Great Britain that we owe the continuation of the Russian agony?" she asked. "Great Britain supports wittingly… the Government of the Soviets, so as not to allow the real Russia, the National Russia, to come to life again and raise itself up." All evidence suggests that Princess Paley was right. The Bolsheviks were indeed pawns in a British chess game.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 317

> Ever since Russia's first emergence as a world power during the 17th century, British statesmen had regarded the Slavic empire with suspicion. They foresaw that Russia might one day prove an obstacle to England's ambitions in the East. Britain's antagonism toward Russia persisted through World War I. In the Great War, Britain and Russia were technically allies, but the British believed they had more to gain if Russia lost than if she won. This is yet another dirty secret underlying many mysteries of the Russian Revolution. In 1915, the Russians were in full retreat, taking heavy losses. The Germans, Austrians, and Turks were advancing on three fronts. Germany offered Russia a separate peace. Tsar Nicholas was tempted to accept.27 The Allies could not permit that. So they made Tsar Nicholas an offer he couldn't refuse. In March, 1915, the Allies concluded a secret pact with the Tsar, promising to give him Constantinople and the Dardanelles, in the event of an Allied victory. The only condition was that Russia must stay in the war and fight to the bitter end.28 Russia accepted these terms. But subsequent events make clear that the British never intended to keep their promise. As Princess Paley noted, keeping Russia out of the Mediterranean was a centuries-old British policy. If Russia were allowed to take the Dardanelles now, her warships could challenge British control of the Suez Canal and the trade routes to the East. No British government in 1915 would have allowed that.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 332

> In her memoir, Princess Paley states that British Prime Minister Lloyd George, "on hearing of the fall of Tsarism in Russia, rubbed his hands together, saying, 'One of England's war-aims has been attained!'"29 The Princess does not name her source, and the quote is likely apocryphal. Nonetheless, the story reveals the suspicion many Russians felt regarding England's hidden motives. Some evidence suggests that British leaders really did hope and plan for the defeat of their Russian ally, from the very outset of the war. This was certainly the attitude of Lord Herbert Kitchener, who served as Secretary of War from August 5, 1914 to his death on June 5, 1916. In his 1989 book A Peace to End All Peace, US historian David Fromkin notes that Lord Kitchener viewed Russia as a permanent enemy, the only European power capable of challenging British supremacy in Asia. Fromkin writes: "In Kitchener's view, Germany was an enemy in Europe and Russia was an enemy in Asia: the paradox of the 1914 war in which Britain and Russia were allied was that by winning in Europe, Britain risked losing in Asia. The only completely satisfactory outcome of the war, from…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 354

> The British had long experience outwitting and outfoxing Russia. They called it the Great Game. British intelligence officer Arthur Conolly is said to have coined the term

“Great Game” in 1840, to describe the intricate, spy-vs.-spy maneuvers of British and Russian agents vying for advantage in the wastes of Central Asia, as Britain tried desperately to slow Russia’s advance toward India.31 However,…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 363

without the Sultan’s permission. Tsar Ivan IV—known as Ivan the Terrible—welcomed the British traders, at first, but became angry when they demanded a monopoly over Russian trade. For their impudence, Ivan…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 368

Catherine’s success set off alarm bells in London. The Russians now had seaports on the Black Sea, threatening British control of the Mediterranean. When the Black Sea fortress of Ochakov fell to Russian forces in 1788, the English threatened war, demanding that Catherine return the fortress to the Sultan. She refused. The British backed down, dropping their ultimatum, but vowed to stop further Russian expansion.33 Their strategy was to play off Muslim against Christian. For the next hundred years, the British propped up the faltering Ottoman Empire, as a counterweight, to keep Russia in check. Their plan was to keep Muslims and Christians locked in a permanent stalemate or “balance of power,…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 410

Throughout the 19th century, British strategists pondered how to keep Russia from taking Constantinople and the Dardanelle Straits. They called it the “Eastern Question.” Unfortunately for the British, their Turkish ally was growing weaker while the Russians grew stronger. The Ottoman Empire was in long-term decline. And so the British did a delicate dance, playing off Russian against Turk, Turk against Russian, as the occasion demanded, often switching sides with dizzying suddenness.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 414

Thus, when the Russians instigated a Greek rebellion against the Turks in 1821, the British betrayed their Turkish allies and sided with the Greeks. By this means, the British won the friendship of the new Greek state, and prevented Greece from becoming a Russian dependency.38 On the other hand, when the Russians attacked the Turks in 1853, the British sided with the Sultan. French and British armies invaded Russia, defeating her in the Crimean War of 1853-1856. The peace terms of the Crimean War

required Russia to demilitarize the Black Sea. An angry, humiliated Tsar Alexander II was forced to disperse his Black Sea Fleet and destroy his fortifications.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 433

During the so-called Great Eastern Crisis of 1875-1878, Christian populations rose up in revolt throughout the Ottoman Empire. The Turks suppressed these risings with startling cruelty, slaughtering Christians by the tens of thousands. In Bulgaria alone, as many as 100,000 Christians may have been killed. Europeans were outraged. At least, most of them were. Queen Victoria, however, defended the Turks. “It is not the question of upholding Turkey: it is the question of Russian or British supremacy in the world!” she explained in a letter to Disraeli on April 19, 1877.41 In Victoria’s view, the only thing that mattered was keeping the Russians out of Constantinople. If that meant abandoning eastern Christians to genocide, so be it. Russia, on the other hand, decided to rescue the beleaguered Christians, declaring war on the Ottomans on April 24, 1877. A Russian army invaded the Ottoman Empire, marching through Romania and Bulgaria (both under Turkish rule at the time) and advancing on Constantinople. Queen Victoria wanted the Russians stopped. As for the poor, suffering Christians, they were mostly Eastern Orthodox. Who cared about them anyway? “This mawkish sentimentality for people who hardly deserve the name of real Christians… is really incomprehensible,” Victoria wrote Disraeli on March 21, 1877.42 The eastern Christians were “quite as cruel as the Turks,” Victoria stated on June 27. “Russia is as barbarous and tyrannical as the Turks,” she added.43

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 452

On January 10, 1878, Victoria wrote Disraeli that she could not bear the shame of allowing England to “kiss the feet of the great barbarians [the Russians], the retarders of all liberty and civilisation that exists… Oh, if the Queen were a man, she would like to go and give those Russians, whose word one cannot believe, such a beating!”45 Only ten days later, Victoria got her wish. As the Russians reached the outskirts of Constantinople, the British finally intervened. They warned the Russians to halt, sending a fleet of warships through the Dardanelles to protect the Turkish capital. Fearful of the British fleet, the Russian army came to a halt at the village of San Stefano, on January 20, 1878, only seven miles from the center of Constantinople.46 This was the closest the Russians ever got to their dream of a New Byzantium.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 463

But the situation had changed. The Ottoman Empire was now at war with England. The Turks had made an alliance with Germany on August 2, 1914. In addition, Russia’s

situation had changed. The Russian army was showing unexpected weakness. In the first month of war, the Germans annihilated two Russian armies, killing as many as 120,000 men. The Germans offered Russia a separate peace, and the Russians were listening.47 Britain scrambled to help her faltering ally, frantic to keep Russia in the war. On January 1, 1915, Russian commander-in-chief Grand Duke Nicholas (a cousin of the Tsar) requested help from the British. The Turks were hitting the Russians hard in the Caucasus. The Grand Duke asked the British to attack the Ottomans in the West, to relieve pressure on Russian troops in the East.48 The British agreed. They had no choice. If they refused to help, the Russians would make a separate peace with the Central Powers. Thus began one of the strangest, most mysterious episodes of World War I—the Gallipoli Campaign.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 480

Over an eight-month period, more than 410,000 British and Commonwealth troops—including British, Irish, Australians, New Zealanders, and Indians—would land on the Gallipoli beaches. Nearly 47,000 would die. About 79,000 French troops also took part in the attack, of whom 9,798 were killed, bringing the total Allied dead to 56,707.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 494

Broadbent speculates that the purpose of the campaign may have been to provide an illusion that the Allies were speeding to Russia's rescue, when, in fact, they were not. The sheer scale and persistence of the alleged "bungling" are difficult to explain by incompetence alone, Broadbent argues, raising the question of deliberate self-sabotage. He writes:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 504

Let us assume, then, for the sake of argument, that Broadbent is right. Suppose the Allies deliberately sent nearly 57,000 men to their deaths, with no hope of victory. What was their motive? Broadbent points out that, had the Allies succeeded in taking Constantinople and the Straits, they would have been obliged to turn over these prizes to Russia, in accordance with a secret treaty of March 1915. The Allies would have done all the work, and the Russians reaped the rewards. "Russia alone, will, if the war is successful, gather the fruits of these operations," said a March 15, 1915 memorandum of the British Asquith government, quoted by Broadbent.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 509

In short, honoring the treaty would have done nothing for England. On the contrary, it would have harmed British interests by upending “nearly 200 years of British foreign policy which had opposed a Russian presence in the Mediterranean…” Broadbent notes. Rather than give the Straits to Russia, the British would have preferred to leave them in the hands of a “shrunken and compliant Ottoman state,” Broadbent opines. Such considerations might have led British commanders to conclude that it was better for the attack to fail. “In war thousands of lives are sacrificed for such grand strategies,” Broadbent notes.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 514

Plainly, the British would have preferred not to hand over Constantinople to the Russians. But how could they get out of it? Sabotaging the Gallipoli Campaign, in and of itself, would not have achieved this goal. The secret treaty—known as the Constantinople Agreement—was inescapable. As long as the Allies won the war, Russia would get her prize. The promise was binding, no matter who won at Gallipoli. Yet the British got off the hook anyway. What saved them was the Russian Revolution, says Broadbent. “[T]he agreement never had to be honoured ….,” he writes. “[T]he Bolshevik Government withdrew from the war and all Tzarist agreements including the Gallipoli treaty.” In short, the Bolsheviks saved the day, by unilaterally withdrawing their claim to Constantinople. This was a great stroke of luck for the British. But was it luck? Or was it planning? Broadbent suggests the latter.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 526

In answer, Broadbent poses a hypothetical question. He asks, “If there had been a victory at Gallipoli would there have been a Russian Revolution?” Probably not, says Broadbent. In his opinion, the capture of Constantinople, and its subsequent occupation by Russia, would have caused such an explosion of religious and patriotic fervor in Russia, as to make revolution impossible. Referring to Catherine the Great’s plan for a New Byzantium, Broadbent writes: “With the ultimate re-establishment of a new Byzantine Empire under the Tzar on the new Christian throne in ‘Tzaragrad’ on the Bosphorus, would the millions of Russian religious peasants, massively influenced by the victory, have flocked to support the Holy Tzar in the face of revolution, thus thwarting the Bolsheviks?” Broadbent thinks they might have. In that case, the Tsar might have remained on his throne. Such an outcome would have been contrary to British interests, Broadbent suggests.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 543

Broadbent's arguments are weighty. He compels us to consider whether Britain may have deliberately pulled her punches at Gallipoli precisely in order to deprive the Tsar of the one victory that might have saved his throne.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 546

If the March 1915 agreement was so inimical to British interests, why did Britain make such a treaty in the first place? Why did they offer Constantinople to Russia, if they didn't want Russia to have it?

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 549

The British did not offer Constantinople to the Russians for free. They asked something in return. Specifically, they demanded a large chunk of the newly-discovered Persian oil fields. The Russians agreed.51 In 1907, Russia and Britain had signed a treaty dividing Persia into two spheres of influence, with the Russians in the north, the British in the south, and a large neutral zone in between. Now, on the eve of the Gallipoli Campaign, the British suddenly asked that the neutral zone be added to the British sphere of influence, greatly enlarging Britain's share of Persia's oil-rich territory. Whatever else we may conclude about the Gallipoli Campaign, it appears to have been a bargaining chip in a high-stakes negotiation over Persian oil.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 562

In the end, the British got much more than the Persian neutral zone. The entire nation of Persia was effectively turned over to Britain, thanks to the unexpected generosity of Leon Trotsky, whose curious connections with British intelligence we have already noted.52 Following the Bolshevik coup of November 7, 1917, many perceived Lenin and Trotsky as equals, their regime a two-man junta. "[T]he Lenin-Trotsky combination is all-powerful," the Times of London reported on November 19, 1917.53 However, the day after the coup—on November 8—Trotsky accepted the position of Commissar for Foreign Affairs. This seemingly put him in a subordinate position to Lenin, but it also gave Trotsky tremendous power to alter the course of the war. Perhaps that was the point. On November 22—two weeks after assuming his new post—Trotsky did a curious thing. He suddenly announced that the Bolshevik government would repudiate all secret treaties and agreements made by previous Russian governments. Trotsky said the treaties had "lost all their obligatory force for the Russian workmen, soldiers, and peasants, who have taken the government into their own hands…"54 "We sweep all secret treaties into the dustbin," he said.55 By publishing and repudiating the treaties, Trotsky claimed he was rejecting "Tsarist imperialism."56 What he was actually doing was enriching the greatest imperial power on earth, Great Britain.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 577

> Among the treaties Trotsky repudiated was the secret Constantinople Agreement of March 18, 1915. He released the British unilaterally from their promise to hand over Constantinople and the Straits.57 Trotsky likewise repudiated Russia's extensive interests in Persia, including its oil rights, leaving everything for the British.58 In August, 1919, the British government took advantage of the Russian withdrawal by claiming all drilling rights in Persia. A British-owned firm called the Anglo-Persian Oil Company (APOC) thus acquired a de facto monopoly over Persian oil. This was a great windfall for the stockholders, especially the British government, which owned a controlling share. Less than two months before the start of World War I, Asquith's government had taken the unusual step of nationalizing APOC, purchasing a 51-percent share on June 17, 1914.59 The British government thus positioned itself, shrewdly and presciently, three years in advance, to take direct control of the staggering oil wealth which Trotsky now bestowed upon it. It may be worth noting that the Persian government never actually agreed to turn over drilling rights to APOC. However, their opinion no longer mattered in 1919.60 "Russian influence in Persia was reduced to nil and the British… made themselves masters in all of Persia," wrote US journalist Louis Fischer in his 1926 book Oil Imperialism.61 Trotsky's revolutionary rhetoric notwithstanding, these actions brought no benefit to the Russian people. They helped only the British. The Anglo-Persian Oil Company was now free to expand, since its chief rival, the Russian Empire, had suddenly vanished into thin air. In 1935, the fast-growing British oil giant changed its name to the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, then to British Petroleum in 1954. Backlash

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 613

> Great Britain had a weapon no one else had. They could make their enemies vanish into thin air. Upon a signal, governments would fall. Markets would crash. Armies would mutiny. Rioters would take to the streets. Such was the skill of Britain's clandestine services, that they often won wars without firing a shot, and often with no one even suspecting that a war had been fought.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 622

> The so-called "color revolutions" were portrayed in Western media as spontaneous uprisings. But they were far from spontaneous, as David Horowitz and I revealed in our 2006 book The Shadow Party. We exposed the role of George Soros and his Open Society Foundations in helping to fund and orchestrate many of these insurgencies.62 We noted that Soros worked hand-in-hand with a global network of government-

aligned front groups.63 Most importantly, we ascertained that color revolutions succeed not through the magical power of flowers and colored ribbons, but rather through years of preparatory work carried out covertly by trained operators. In The Shadow Party, we noted that post-Soviet color revolutions all seemed to follow a playbook written by the late Gene Sharp, an American political scientist who is often described, misleadingly, as a peace activist.64 In fact, Sharp was a psywar operative, with strong ties to both US and British intelligence. “Strategic

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 634

Sharp spent 30 years at the Center for International Affairs, nicknamed the “CIA at Harvard.”65 More importantly, he spent 10 years in England (1955 to 1965), working with the British peace movement and earning a Ph.D. from Oxford. Sharp’s iconic work, his 1973 book The Politics of Nonviolent Action happens to have been Sharp’s Oxford doctoral thesis.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 639

Sharp’s mentors in England included some of the top names in British military intelligence, including Basil Liddell Hart and Stephen King-Hall, both pioneers in the development of “strategic non-violence” as a weapon of war.66 It was they who taught Sharp to topple governments under the guise of “people’s revolutions.” The British have been cultivating this dark art for centuries.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 644

Sharp’s British mentors taught him that spontaneous uprisings cannot overthrow governments. The brute force of the state can easily suppress such disorders. Revolutions succeed only when the security forces themselves stand down and let it happen, as they did in France and Russia in 1789 and 1917 respectively. But why would the security forces stand down? Only one thing can cause this. Leaders in key positions must be compromised. David Horowitz and I wrote in The Shadow Party:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 656

we define a color revolution as a fake insurrection—that is, as a foreign-sponsored coup masquerading as a people’s uprising—then we must conclude that the French Revolution of 1789 and the Russian Revolution of 1917 seem to fit that description. In both cases, the uprisings began not in the streets, but in the drawing rooms of liberal aristocrats. In both cases, the hidden hand of British intelligence can be found

manipulating events behind the scenes. In both cases, “team colors” were used to identify the rebels, in a manner similar to today’s color revolutions—specifically, the tricolor cockade and “Phrygian” cap of the French Revolution, and the red flag and “Scythian” cap of the Bolsheviks. A

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 688

King Louis XVI was Britain’s number one enemy when the French Revolution broke out. He had earned Britain’s hatred by intervening in the American Revolution, forcing Britain to grant independence to the Thirteen Colonies. The British never forgave him. They devised a plan for Louis’s removal. They did not have to wait long for their revenge. The growing demand for liberal reform in France provided an opening. Inspired by America’s revolution, many in France hoped for a better world, in which rank and privilege would give way to liberty and equality. French liberals of that time tended to be Anglophilic. They looked to England as a beacon of liberty—as much as America—seeing both countries as products of a common tradition of English freedom.69 The British secret services took advantage of this good will. Intelligence operatives posing as English reformers infiltrated the French intelligentsia, pushing French dissidents toward violence, class warfare, and hatred of the Bourbon dynasty.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 710

According to Jefferson, these hired “incendiaries and anarchists” infiltrated the Revolution by “assuming exaggerated zeal for republican government,” then gained control of the legislature, “overwhelming by their majorities the honest & enlightened patriots…” These paid agents “intrigued themselves into the municipality of Paris,” said Jefferson, “controlled by terrorism the proceedings of the legislature…” and finally “murdered the king,” thus “demolishing liberty and government with it.” In the same letter, Jefferson accused Danton and Marat by name of being on the British payroll.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 714

The London Revolution Society Jefferson’s views find unexpected support from U.S. historian Micah Alpaugh, who has revealed the extensive influence British reformers exerted over the French revolutionaries. Unlike Jefferson, Alpaugh sees nothing nefarious in this influence, but nonetheless remarks on its surprising extent. In his 2014 paper, “The British Origins of the French Jacobins,” Alpaugh notes that France’s radical Jacobin clubs were consciously modeled after an existing British organization, the London Revolution Society (sometimes called the London Revolutionary Society).72 This was a group of English intellectuals who began meeting at the London Tavern in Bishopsgate in 1788, ostensibly to celebrate the 100-year anniversary of William III’s

Glorious Revolution. It soon became clear, however, that their true goal was to agitate for revolution in the present day. British

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 723

On November 25, 1789—four months after the storming of the Bastille—King Louis XVI was still on his throne, showing every willingness to work with the new National Assembly to form a constitutional monarchy. But this was not to be. Forces were hard at work in the shadows determined to unseat King Louis from his throne. That day, November 25, 1789, the president of the French National Assembly read aloud to the legislators a letter from the London radicals. The letter directly inspired the formation of the so-called Jacobin clubs, from which Danton, Marat, Robespierre, and the Reign of Terror would later emerge. The letter seemed innocent enough on the surface, calling on the French to disdain "National partialities" and join with their English brethren in a revolution that would make "the World free and happy." But deceptive agendas lay hidden between the lines. A

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 743

Deliberately or not, the so-called "English Jacobins" (as they came to be known) offered their French disciples a poisoned chalice of "cosmopolitanism, internationalism, and universalism" (Alpaugh's words), urging the French idealists to put aside the narrow interests of their own country, in favor of the broader interests of mankind.75

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 746

This was, in fact, a deception. Alpaugh may not see it this way, but the broader interests of mankind pushed by the "English Jacobins" turned out to be little more than a smokescreen for British imperial interests. The Jacobin Clubs gave rise to Marat, Danton, and Robespierre, ultimately leading to the Reign of Terror and the murder of King Louis XVI. They also gave rise to a new ideology which has come to be known as communism.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 752

Communism was born on the streets of revolutionary Paris. More than fifty years before Marx and Engels penned The Communist Manifesto, a faction of French radicals calling itself the Conspiracy of Equals was already preaching classless society, abolition of private property, and the need for revolutionary action. Led by "Gracchus" Babeuf—whose real name was François-Noël Babeuf—the Conspiracy of Equals tried

unsuccessfully to overthrow the so-called Directory, France's last revolutionary government, in 1796.76 Their conspiracy failed, and Babeuf was put to death. But his ideas live on. Marx and Engels called Babeuf the first modern communist.77 No record exists of Babeuf using the word communiste, though he sometimes called his followers "communautistes" (usually translated "communitarian").78 However, a contemporary of Babeuf, Nicolas Restif de la Bretonne, often used the word "communist" in his writings, beginning as early as 1785.79 Babeuf's prosecutors apparently believed that Restif was secretly in league with the Conspiracy of Equals, and some evidence suggests they may have been, according to James Billington, in his 1980 book Fire in the Minds of Men: Origins of the Revolutionary Faith.80

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 777

Thus, Babeuf's "crude" communism was already shaking up Paris more than 20 years before Marx was born. By March, 1840, the Communist movement in Paris was deemed sufficiently threatening that a German newspaper denounced it, saying, "The Communists have in view nothing less than a levelling of society—substituting for the presently-existing order of things the absurd, immoral and impossible utopia of a community of goods."83 When these words were written, the 21-year-old Karl Marx was studying classics and philosophy in Berlin. He had not yet shown a strong interest in radical or revolutionary politics.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 783

Babeuf's status as the founding father of communism cannot be disputed. It is therefore significant that Babeuf derived many of his ideas from British mentors, at least some of whom were British intelligence operatives. In that respect, Babeuf followed a path trod by many other French revolutionaries. One of Babeuf's mentors was James Rutledge, an Englishman living in Paris, who called himself a "citizen of the universe" and preached the abolition of private ownership.84 "Babeuf had known Rutledge even before the revolution," writes Billington in Fire in the Minds of Men (1980). Through Rutledge and his circle, Babeuf became acquainted with the Courrier de l'Europe, a French-language newspaper published in London and distributed in France. It promoted such radical doctrines as the overthrow of the French aristocracy and the establishment of a classless society. Babeuf became a regular correspondent of the paper in 1789.85

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 794

It appears to have been a British intelligence front. The newspaper's owner was London wine merchant Samuel Swinton, a former lieutenant in the Royal Navy who had, in the

past, performed sensitive diplomatic missions for Prime Minister Lord North. In a 1985 paper, French historian Hélène Maspero Clerc concluded that Swinton was a British secret agent, based upon her study of Swinton's correspondence with British Secretary of the Admiralty Philip Stephens.86 Thus the hidden hand of British intelligence can be found guiding and helping Babeuf—the first modern communist—from early in his career. The same can be said of another early communist, Karl Marx.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 805

Marx's case, the British influence was arguably stronger than it had been with Babeuf. For one thing, Marx had family connections to the British aristocracy. In 1843, he married Jenny von Westphalen. Her father was a Prussian baron, whose Scottish mother, Jeanie Wishart, descended from the Earls of Argyll.87

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 808

In 1847, Marx and Engels were commissioned by the London-based Communist League to write the Communist Manifesto. The tract was published first in London, in 1848.88 Expelled from Prussia, France, and Belgium for his subversive activities, Marx and his family took refuge in England in 1849. He lived in London for the rest of his life.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 812

Imperial Propagandist History is filled with men like Marx who supposedly pulled themselves up by their bootstraps, succeeding through ability alone. Yet, closer inspection often reveals that such "self-made" men relied upon influential relatives to open doors for them. Karl Marx was such a man. In February, 1854, Marx met Scottish nobleman David Urquhart (pronounced ERK-art)—apparently a distant relative of Marx's wife, through her Scottish grandmother.89 Urquhart was a British diplomat and sometime secret agent, who became a kind of 19th-century version of Lawrence of Arabia. After fighting in the Greek War of Independence, Urquhart served as a diplomat in Constantinople, where he became a close confidant of the Sultan. In 1834, Urquhart instigated a rebellion against Russia among the Circassian tribes of the Caucasus. The Circassians named him Daud Bey (Chief David). The name stuck, becoming famous throughout the Middle East.90 Urquhart had a fanatical hatred of Russia, so intense that he publicly accused Lord Palmerston, the Prime Minister, of being a paid Russian agent.91 Somewhat surprisingly, Marx joined Urquhart's cause, becoming one of the most prominent anti-Russian journalists of his day. Marx wrote blistering anti-Russian screeds for The New York Tribune—then the highest-circulation newspaper in the world—as well as for Urquhart's own publications in Britain.92 Marx went so far as to echo Urquhart's accusation that Lord Palmerston was secretly in league with the Russians.93

In his attacks on Russia, Marx wrote not as a revolutionary, but as a propagandist for British imperial interests. His tirades against Russia proved useful to the Empire during the Crimean War of 1853-1856.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 852

In his 1910 biography, Karl Marx: His Life and Work, John Spargo argues that, “Marx gladly cooperated with David Urquhart and his followers in their anti-Russian campaign, for he regarded Russia as the leading reactionary Power in the world, and never lost an opportunity of expressing his hatred of it.”95 Spargo thus tries to explain Marx’s anti-Russian work in terms of an ideological aversion to Russia’s “reactionary” politics, which is to say, Russia’s feudal condition during the 1850s, whereby the Tsar held absolute power, and the landowning nobility kept more than 20 million peasants in a state of serfdom. This interpretation does not pass muster, however. In all of Britain, there was no more “reactionary” voice than David Urquhart, who openly called for a restoration of the feudal system. In his 1845 book Wealth and Want, Urquhart argued that a serf under feudalism was better off than the paupers, miners, and factory workers of the present industrial age.96 “Serfdom, I assert, to have been a better condition than dependent labour…” Urquhart wrote. “The villain was not the slave of the lord, but… a freer man than any labourer to-day.” If Marx hated reaction, why then was he drawn to David Urquhart, whose “reactionary” views surely rivaled those of the most retrograde Russian landlord? John Spargo writes: “In David Urquhart he [Marx] found a kindred soul to whom he became greatly attached. … The influence which David Urquhart obtained over Marx was remarkable. Marx probably never relied upon the judgment of another man as he did upon that of Urquhart.”97 The alliance between Marx and Urquhart confronts us with a genuine mystery. If it is true that Marx found a “kindred soul” in Urquhart, then their views must have converged, in ways beyond the obvious. What exactly did these men have in common?

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 872

Ibelieve what bonded Marx and Urquhart was their mutual hatred of the middle class. This was the era of Young England, a movement of landed aristocrats calling for a return to the feudal system.98 While Urquhart is not normally mentioned in connection with the parliamentary faction calling itself Young England, he certainly shared its views. The Industrial Revolution had turned British society upside down, forcing men, women, and children of the lower classes to toil long hours in mines and factories under appalling conditions and for meager pay. The aristocrats of Young England blamed these abuses on the vulgar, money-grubbing culture of the middle class or bourgeoisie. Things had been better in the Middle Ages, the Young Englanders argued. In those days, benevolent landlords cared for their serfs, as lovingly as they

cared for their hounds and horses, never letting them go hungry or homeless. The problem of "pauperism" would vanish, said the Young Englanders, if the landowning gentry were put back in charge. The aristocrat's ancient sense of noblesse oblige would motivate blue-bloods to provide for the poor, just as they always had in the past.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 884

To prove their point, the aristocrats of Young England became reformers in the 1840s, agitating for a ten-hour work day and other policies to help the poor and working class. To achieve these ends, the Young Englanders allied themselves with communists and socialists, who hated…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 887

The Young England movement, "sought to extinguish the predominance of the middle-class bourgeoisie [emphasis added], and to recreate the political prestige of the aristocracy by resolutely proving its capacity to ameliorate the social, intellectual, and material condition of the peasantry and the labouring classes," states the 1902 Encyclopedia Britannica.100 The key phrase here is "extinguish the predominance of the middle-class bourgeoisie"—a goal the Young Englanders shared with their communist and socialist allies. Thus the Young England movement brought Tory aristocrats such as Lord John Manners and George Smythe…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 915

Like Marx, Digby saw the bourgeoisie as a disturbing new force in the world, breaking the old "natural alliance" between lord and serf, and sowing "disorder," "confusion" and "tempest." Marx may or may not have read Digby, but his view of the middle class is undeniably Digby-esque.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 926

Today, it is universally accepted that the old aristocracy is extinct. Whatever remnants of it may linger, hiding away in musty drawing rooms of places like Buckingham Palace, they are deemed to be powerless, unimportant, and financially insignificant. In their place, we are now asked to believe, self-made entrepreneurs such as Bill Gates and Elon Musk have become the richest, most powerful men on earth. In reality, we have no way of knowing who the wealthiest people are, as wealth is routinely hidden in offshore trusts, beneath layers of shell corporations, where it cannot be traced. There are, in fact, indications that—contrary to Marx's theory of bourgeois revolution—certain

aristocratic families not only managed to survive the Industrial Revolution with their wealth and power intact, but learned to thrive in the new system, living quietly, out of sight, and letting the bourgeoisie get all the limelight.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 933

More than 70 years after Marx and Engels pronounced the feudal aristocracy dead, the power of Britain's landed nobility emerged unexpectedly as a topic of heated debate in the US Senate. In 1919, the Senate was pondering the question of whether or not to ratify the Versailles Treaty, which would have required the US to join the League of Nations. Public opinion ran strongly against ratification, as most Americans—not unreasonably—feared the League of Nations would draw the US back into a dependent relationship with the British Empire. Daniel F. Cohalan, a justice of the New York Supreme Court, appeared before the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee on August 30, 1919, to argue against ratification. Born in New York, of Irish descent, Cohalan was active in the Irish Republican movement. He claimed to speak for America's 20 million citizens of Irish descent, which is to say, for one in five Americans alive at that time.105 "We believe we went to war for the purpose of ending autocracy…," Cohalan told the Foreign Affairs Committee.106 Yet the British Empire represented, "the most absolute, most arbitrary and most powerful autocracy the world has ever seen," he declared.107 "[T]he real ruling force is… the landed feudal aristocracy of England…" Cohalan's testimony on this point is worth quoting at length. He told the U.S. Senate: "The ordinary American… has not come to understand that the English democracy of which he hears and reads so much has little reality in fact, and that England continues to be governed by a handful of men, representing, with but few exceptions, the same small group of titled land-controlling families that have governed England since the days of Henry VIII, if not, in fact, much longer. … "The dominating figures in England to-day—those in actual power—are the Cecils and their relations. [emphasis added]. Lloyd-George or some other figure that has come to represent democracy… is put forward as the premier of governing authority. But the will that dominates, controls, and finally directs the policies and actions of England is that of the master spirit Cecil, no matter which member of that family or its connections it may happen to be. … "Englishmen like to say that King George reigns but does not rule. That is true. The real ruling force is that handful of aristocrats who represent the landed feudal aristocracy of England and who form the most absolute, most arbitrary and most powerful autocracy the world has ever seen."108 This is not the place to debate the question of who really runs things in this world, but Judge Cohalan's testimony at least reminds us that the obvious and familiar answers are not necessarily the right ones.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 963

Like his aristocratic mentor Urquhart, Marx had a tendency to romanticize the “idyllic” feudal past, and to vilify middle-class culture, in terms reminiscent of the Young Englanders. That is not to say that Marx approved of the feudal order. He clearly opposed it. Nonetheless, Marx plainly saw the bourgeois order as worse. Marx imagined the Middle Ages as offering, at the very least, some comforting illusion of a harmonious natural order, based on “patriarchal” relations, chivalry, and faith. The money-grubbing bourgeoisie, on the other hand, had stripped away…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 976

Digby himself could not have said it better.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 977

Most historians hold that the Young England movement petered out around 1849. Yet the spirit of Young England lived on, under different guises. It survived through the strange, symbiotic relationship between Urquhart and Marx. It lingered, through the 1880s, in the teachings of Oxford professor John Ruskin, and two of his young disciples, Arnold Toynbee and Alfred Milner.110 The Ruskinites embraced a philosophy that would one day come to be known as “liberal imperialism”—the notion that the best way to spread enlightened social policies across the world was by conquest and colonization, that is, through expansion of the British Empire. Milner would go on to become one of Britain’s leading statesmen. He served as colonial governor of southern Africa during the Boer Wars, and as War Secretary for Lloyd George during World War I. In 1920, the deposed premier of Russia, Alexander Kerensky, would call Milner the “wicked genius of Russia,” a reference to Milner’s controversial role in stirring up the Russian Revolution.111 But that’s getting ahead of our story.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 998

Milner began by acknowledging Marx’s core argument that the Industrial Revolution had intensified class conflict to the point that revolution was imminent. However, England could escape revolution if she acted wisely, said Milner. He said:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,003

And what were those remedies? “Socialist programmes,” said Toynbee.114 Toynbee argued that, of all countries, England was least likely to experience a revolution, because she had had the foresight to implement “socialist programmes” before it was too late. “Some of the things the Socialists of Germany and France are now working for,

we have had since 1834," Toynbee boasted. In this regard, Toynbee cited the New Poor Law of 1834, which had established workhouses for the poor, and the various Factory Acts, such as those of 1847 and 1848, which had established a 10-hour work day as well as other improvements in work conditions. Such measures, said Toynbee, had "saved England from revolution."

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,014

Milner and Toynbee both agreed that the best way to head off revolution was by meeting the revolutionaries halfway and giving them some form of socialism. Like the Young Englanders before them, Milner and Toynbee recognized a "natural alliance" between the upper and lower classes. It was the middle class, the bourgeoisie, that posed a problem. Milner pointed squarely to the middle class as the greatest threat to social stability. He condemned what he called, "the dominant principles of economics, the middle-class or bourgeois principles which have been invented by Capitalists to justify the Capitalistic system and to maintain it."116

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,025

However, Milner saw a new order on the horizon, one in which the "bourgeois or middle-class" values of "personal freedom" and "property" would no longer dominate men's thinking. "I don't deny that Communism may be the ultimate form of human society," Milner stated, though he allowed that "pure Communism" might be "impracticable" for the present age.118 Impractical or not, Milner had high praise for Karl Marx. In an 1882 lecture on the "German Socialists," Milner called Marx, "one of the most weighty, logical and learned of reasoners," adding, "Marx's great book Das Kapital is at once a monument of reasoning and a storehouse of facts."119 Strangely and fatefully, the same Alfred Milner who praised Marx in 1882 ended up, thirty-five years later, playing a major role in bringing the first Marxist state into being.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,036

In February, 1917, Lord Milner traveled to Petrograd to warn the Tsar that Russia was on the brink of revolution. To save the monarchy, the Tsar must lay down his traditional autocratic powers and institute democratic government, Milner told him.120 Nicholas refused. In fact, Milner's demand was unreasonable. To democratize Russia in the midst of war would have been folly. Britain had done exactly the opposite, creating a five-man War Cabinet in December, 1916, endowed with extraordinary powers which many called dictatorial. France too had radically streamlined its government decision-making for the war.121 Germany had turned over its government to what was, in effect, a two-man military junta, consisting of Field Marshall Paul von Hindenberg and General Erich

Ludendorff. If there was a good time for Russia to democratize, February 1917 was not it. Milner was giving Nicholas bad advice on purpose. He was trying to manipulate the Tsar into surrendering power to the Duma, knowing that the Duma's liberal leaders were all in the pockets of the British Embassy.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,047

Milner left Petrograd on February 27. Nine days later, the Revolution began.122 On March 8, 1917 a sudden cut in food rations triggered riots in Petrograd.123 The city garrison mutinied on March 12. The Tsar abdicated on March 15.124 This was the so-called February Revolution (given that name because the old Russian calendar ran 13 days late; Russians therefore dated the start of the food riots February 24 instead of March 8). To avoid confusion, all dates here will be in New Style, not Old Style. The February Revolution had been well-planned. It was a revolution from above, not below. When the soldiers mutinied, they did not rampage through the streets. They marched straight to the Tauride Palace, where the Duma met, to pledge their loyalty to Russia's new rulers. The London Daily Telegraph of March 17, 1917 reported: "On Tuesday [March 12] the movement rapidly spread to all the regiments of the garrison, and one by one they came marching up to the Duma to offer their services. … [T]hey listened to speeches from MM. Rodzianko, Miliukoff, and Kerenski, and then marched off amid cheering."125 Grand Duke Cyril Vladimirovich—first cousin to the Tsar, and third in line to the throne—also marched to the Duma that day, in his naval captain's uniform, leading the Marine Guard whom he…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,065

The February Revolution was, in effect, a palace coup, engineered by the Tsar's own relatives, working closely with the British Embassy. Maurice Paléologue, the French ambassador, called this aspect of the Revolution the "conspiracy of the Grand Dukes."128 British ambassador George Buchanan was directly involved in the machinations surrounding the Tsar's abdication. On March 14, Buchanan met with the Grand Duke Michael Alexandrovich,…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,119

The British press made no effort to conceal its glee over the Tsar's downfall. On the contrary, British journalists implied that the Tsar had gotten what he deserved, for failing to heed Lord Milner's warning. "Every effort was shattered by the obduracy of the Tsar," reported the London Guardian on March 16, 1917. "It is noteworthy that the outbreak [of the Revolution] followed promptly on Lord Milner's return from Russia, where his failure was generally understood to mean that nothing could be hoped from

the Tsar, and that the people must seek their own redemption."137 Of course, not everyone in Britain was pleased with Milner's Russian intervention. Laurence Ginnell, an Irish member of the House of Commons, spoke openly against it. On March 22, 1917, while the House of Commons composed a message of congratulation to the Russian Duma, Ginnell pointed out the hypocrisy of congratulating Russian rebels while hanging Irish ones. He sarcastically suggested the following wording for the message:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,145

The British press hastened to assure its readers that Russia's new Provisional Government would stay in the war. There would be no separate peace with Germany. Milyukov made this clear at a March 23 press conference. "We shall remain faithful to all past alliances ... " he said. "[I]t is Russia's duty to continue the struggle… for her own liberty, and for that of all Europe… Henceforward all rumours of a separate peace must vanish once and for all ... "142

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,178

The Brusilov offensive effectively ended Russia's experiment with democracy, as Ambassador Buchanan had predicted. Recall that, in his April 10 letter to Lord Milner, Buchanan admitted that he had "abandoned all hope of a successful Russian offensive…" and had predicted that Russian democracy would fail.146 I do not believe that the accuracy of Buchanan's predictions was due to clairvoyance, nor to any special talent or insight on his part. Buchanan knew what was coming because he was personally involved in making it happen. As a direct result of Buchanan's machinations, the Russian army was now in a state of full mutiny. From July 16-30, the streets of Petrograd were filled with armed, violent soldiers, sailors and workers, demanding an end to the war. This mutiny came to be known as the "July Days." Prince Lvov resigned as Prime Minister on July 20, replaced by Alexander Kerensky, a socialist.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,188

Kerensky accused the British of instigating the coup. Much evidence suggests he was right. On August 15, Buchanan wrote in his diary, "General Korniloff is the only man strong enough" to restore discipline in the army.148 On September 8, Buchanan wrote further, "I do not regard Kerensky as an ideal Prime Minister, and, in spite of the services which he has rendered in the past, he has almost played his part."149 The coup broke out on September 10. Kornilov sent General Krymov to Petrograd with a large force, on the pretext of putting down a Bolshevik uprising. Krymov's true mission, however, was to overthrow Kerensky. In his 1927 memoir, The Catastrophe, Kerensky

accused the British—and Lord Milner, in particular—of supporting the coup. Kerensky wrote:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,207

At this point, the strange figure of Leon Trotsky re-emerges. Trotsky had been arrested by Kerensky's Provisional Government in the aftermath of the "July Days" mutiny. However, on September 17—forty days after Kornilov's attempted coup—Kerensky decided to release Trotsky from prison. For the second time in five months, Trotsky had been set free just when the Revolution needed him.152 Upon his release, Trotsky took charge of the Bolshevik resistance. He was elected Chairman of the Petrograd Soviet on October 8. Two days later, on October 10, Trotsky led the Soviet in a vote for armed revolution. It was therefore no surprise when, on the night of November 6-7, 1917, Trotsky made his move, leading the Bolsheviks in a successful coup. Stalin acknowledged Trotsky's leading role in the coup, in a Pravda article of November 6, 1918. Stalin wrote:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,239

Prime Minister David Lloyd George never wanted to fight the Bolsheviks, according to British historian Martin Gilbert in his 1975 book, World in Torment: Winston S. Churchill 1917-1922.158 In Lloyd George's view, Britain's real fight in Russia was against the nationalists and monarchists.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,244

There were practical reasons for this policy. In 1917, high-ranking British statesmen were pursuing plans to carve up the Russian Empire into a patchwork of buffer states and to bring the oil-rich Caucasus under British control. Lord Milner even considered dividing up Russia's territories with Germany. The White Russian commanders, on the other hand, were nationalists. They would never agree to break up the Empire. Nor did they wish to bring back the liberal Duma which had started the revolution, in the first place. Most favored a temporary military dictatorship, followed by the eventual restoration of the Romanovs as constitutional monarchs.159 These policies were unacceptable to Lloyd George. Consequently, the White commanders and their British sponsors could never agree on essential war goals. What doomed the White armies, in the end, was their near-total dependence on Britain for funding, supplies, munitions, and military advisors. They could not make a move without permission from the British War Office.160 When the British finally cut off supplies and funding, the White armies were finished.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,254

> During the Russian Civil War, more than 200,000 foreign troops were deployed on Russian soil. These included 60,000 British troops, as well as various numbers of Americans, Japanese, French, Czechs, Serbs, Greeks, Italians, and others.161 Soviet propaganda promoted the myth for 70 years that the “imperialist” nations of the world had ganged up on Russia to crush the Bolshevik Revolution. But that was never their mission. Had the Allies wished to drive out the Bolsheviks, they could have done so easily. The British sent troops to Russia—and persuaded other countries to do so—not to fight Bolshevism, but to pursue other objectives. As long as Germany remained in the war, Britain’s first priority was to try to restore an eastern front, to fight the Germans. Secondly, the British sought to help separatist…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,264

> The Allies, in fact, did very little fighting in Russia, and not always against the Bolsheviks. When they helped the White armies, it was only in situations where White operations happened to coincide with other Allied objectives. Indeed, it is a little-known fact that the first Allied troops to land in Russia were a contingent of British Royal Marines who ended up fighting alongside the Red…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,268

> Murmansk was a vital Arctic seaport which had been Russia’s lifeline throughout the war. On March 1, 1918, Trotsky sent a telegram to the commander of the Murmansk Soviet, Alexei Mikhailovich Yuryev. The telegram stated (falsely) that peace talks with the Germans had “apparently broken off” and ordered Yuryev to “protect the Murmansk Railway.” Trotsky expressly ordered Yuryev to “accept any and all assistance from the Allied missions,” by which he meant military assistance.163 Trotsky thus ordered Yuryev to cooperate with the British fleet. Why did Trotsky send such an order? The official story is that Trotsky had somehow been misled into thinking the peace talks had fallen through, for which reason he feared an imminent German attack on Murmansk. But, as Commissar of Foreign Affairs, Trotsky was in charge of the peace talks, and surely knew they were nearing a successful completion.164 Trotsky’s claim that the peace talks had “broken off” was a false alarm. The real problem was the peace treaty itself. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk ceded vast Russian territories to Germany. A German occupation force would be moving in quickly to claim them. Large stores of British supplies and munitions were stored at Murmansk. The British did not want these falling into German hands, nor into the hands of any German allies, such as…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,284

> The British needed a pretext for occupying Murmansk. Trotsky provided it. But he did so discreetly. Rather than contacting the British directly, Trotsky used Commander Yuryev to make the request.166 Trotsky's telegram to Yuryev, instructing him to allow the British fleet to land, would later be used against Trotsky as evidence in his 1937 treason trial.167 The astonishing fact is that Trotsky singlehandedly legitimized Allied…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,350

> The last British troops withdrew from Russia in October 1919.184 The French and British governments cut off all aid to the White Russian forces on December 12, 1919, declaring they would no longer provide "assistance to the anti-Bolshevik elements in Russia, whether in the form of troops, war material or financial aid…"185 General Kolchak was betrayed and turned over to the Bolsheviks, shot before dawn on February 7, 1920—barely 24 hours before Churchill's article appeared in the Illustrated Sunday Herald.186 General Wrangel—the last White commander with a substantial army—evacuated Russia on November 14, 1920.187 Scattered bands of rebels continued fighting well into 1924, but with no chance of victory. Wrangel's withdrawal ended any hope of ousting the Bolsheviks. On March 16, 1921, the British signed an Anglo-Soviet Trade Agreement with the Bolsheviks. On March 21, 1921, the Bolshevik government adopted the so-called New Economic Policy (NEP) reintroducing limited capitalism into Russia, and inviting foreign investment. On February 1, 1924, Great Britain formally recognized the new Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. As with so many wars in our modern age, millions were left to wonder what it had really been about.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,414

> Why had the Germans done this? They claimed it was a military operation to destabilize Russia and hasten her surrender. On that level, the plan worked. Once installed, the Bolshevik government did its job, surrendering to Germany on March 3, 1918. In the process, the Bolsheviks gave up huge tracts of territory, including Finland, Poland, Ukraine, and the Baltic States. However, Germany's victory proved costly, as more than a million German troops were now needed to occupy the territories newly ceded by Russia. These troops were desperately needed on the Western Front, but instead found themselves bogged down in a disintegrating Russian Empire that was rapidly descending into civil war. Even worse, German troops fraternized with the Russians, becoming infected with their Bolshevik propaganda. This led to the German Revolution of 1918-1919, in which workers' and soldiers' councils sprang up all over Germany, modeled after those in Russia. The Kaiser was forced to abdicate and flee the country.

Communist militias took to the streets. Bolshevik leaders such as Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Radek arrived from Russia to help lead the revolt. Parts of Germany broke away, forming Soviet states. The rebellion was put down only through bloody action by the German army and by war veterans organized in militias.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,424

General Erich Ludendorff—who commanded German forces jointly with Field Marshall Paul von Hindernberg—admitted in his 1919 memoir that supporting the Bolsheviks had been a mistake. The Bolsheviks caused a domino effect that toppled both Russian and German governments. “By sending Lenin to Russia,” he wrote sheepishly, “our Government had moreover assumed a great responsibility. From a military point of view his journey was justified, for Russia had to be laid low. But our Government should have seen to it that we also were not involved in her fall.”193

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,429

Who was responsible for this mistake? Who persuaded the German government to back the Bolsheviks? In fact, the author of this plan was very likely a British agent. He was Alexander Helphand (better known by his alias Parvus), a Russian-born Jew with close connections to British intelligence. Born Israel Lazarevich Gelfand in what is now Belarus, Parvus left Russia at age 20, one step ahead of the secret police, who had marked him as a subversive. Parvus lived in Switzerland and Germany for some years, becoming a prominent figure among revolutionary exiles. He collaborated closely with Leon Trotsky, helping him formulate the doctrine of “permanent revolution.” Trotsky admired Parvus for his keen mind…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,437

Parvus achieved his dream of wealth by selling arms in the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913, acting as a sales agent for the German Krupp conglomerate and the British firm Vickers. Parvus’s partner in these endeavors was Basil Zaharoff (aka Basileos Zakarios), a Greek industrialist and high-level British agent who has been called the “guiding genius” of Vickers.195 Zaharoff helped build Vickers into a global powerhouse, acquiring for the British armament company the Maxim machine gun, the Nordenfeldt submarine, and other lucrative properties. He became the company’s top international salesman, a leading stockholder, and one of the wealthiest men in Europe. During World War I, Zaharoff was “an Allied agent working at the highest…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,455

> Tellingly, Parvus's greatest intelligence coup—tricking the Germans into supporting the Bolshevik Revolution—turned out to be a disaster for Germany, but a great help to Britain. Perhaps that was the plan. As Ludendorff later admitted, the subversive influences unleashed by the Bolshevik Revolution directly caused the German government to collapse in 1918 (with considerable help from British intelligence, which supported the German rebels).199 Thus, the Bolshevik triumph allowed Britain to achieve two objectives, ensuring that neither Germany nor Russia emerged victorious from the war. From the standpoint of cui bono (who benefits), the scales lean heavily toward the conclusion that Parvus was a British agent.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,482

> On January 7, 1915, Parvus met with Freiherr von Wangenheim, the German ambassador to Constantinople, telling him, "The interests of the German government are identical with those of the Russian revolutionaries." He convinced Wangenheim that Germany would never be secure unless the Tsar was overthrown and his empire split into many parts. Germany should therefore support separatist and revolutionary movements in Russia, Parvus argued.201 The next day, Wangenheim sent a telegram to his Foreign Ministry, reminding them that Parvus had performed "useful services" for Gernany in the past, and urging his superiors to consider Parvus's plan. Helphand accordingly met with diplomats at the German Foreign Ministry sometime in February. He followed up with a 20-page memorandum dated March 9, 1915, in which Parvus laid out a detailed plan for the destruction and dismemberment of the Russian Empire. The key to Parvus's plan was that Germany should give full support to Lenin and the Bolsheviks. The Germans agreed to this.202 "From the middle of March, 1915, Helphand became the leading advisor to the German government on revolutionary affairs in Russia," write Parvus biographers Zeman and Scharlau in The Merchant of Revolution (1965). "His assignment was to organize a united front of European socialism against the Tsarist regime, and to enable the socialist party organizations in Russia to promote their country's collapse, through defeatist propaganda, strikes, and sabotage."203

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,532

> In this, Churchill followed a well-trodden path. British intelligence operatives have been engaged, for more than 200 years, in a sustained effort to seed the historical record with doctored narratives alleging an alliance between Jewish and German occultists, organized in secret societies, and united for the common purpose of overthrowing Christian civilization. According to this theory, German Illuminati infiltrated Masonic lodges in France and Germany during the 18th century, infecting them with Satanic

doctrines (later portrayed as Jewish doctrines) which would ultimately evolve into communism. This is the “Judeo-Masonic” theory of communist origins, an idea which would later figure prominently in Nazi and Fascist ideology.207 The degree to which British intelligence services contributed to the formulation of this theory is a topic most historians have neglected.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,541

It was the City of London Tavern in Bishopsgate. There, the London Revolution Society —a hotbed of British intelligence activity—plotted the French Revolution and oversaw the creation of the famous Jacobin clubs. It was from these Jacobin Clubs that a radical network would arise that would ultimately bring forth the Reign of Terror and the first recognizably communist movement, led by French revolutionary Gracchus Babeuf, whose connections with Britain’s secret services we explored in Chapter 12. Secret societies played a role in the French Revolution, to be sure. Their role was central. But the allegation that those societies were mainly under German or German-Jewish influence—the Judeo-Masonic theory—appears to be a misdirection. Great Britain was the number one enemy of France, during this era, and all evidence suggests that British influence over the Jacobin Clubs—and on the Masonic lodges that supported them—was overwhelming and decisive. Whatever the original reason may have been for this misdirection, it had unfortunate results. The worldwide dissemination of the Judeo-Masonic theory by Winston Churchill in 1920—five years before Hitler wrote on that same subject in Mein Kampf—clearly contributed to the early formation of Nazi ideology, at a time when the fate of the German nation still hung in the balance, and the German people still had options for moving in different directions.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,567

good deal of circumstantial evidence suggests that Webster was a propaganda asset for the British government, and that her books were carefully contrived intelligence products. Webster’s father Robert Bevan was the head of Barclays Bank, making him one of the most powerful men in the British Empire.210 Her brother Edwyn Bevan was a high-ranking intelligence officer, specializing in propaganda. During World War I, he served in the small inner circle that ran Britain’s War Propaganda Bureau (known as Wellington House).211 After the war, Bevan joined the Political Intelligence Department of the Foreign Office.212 Given her family connections, it is not surprising that Webster’s work got a respectful reception from top publishers, newspaper editors, and cabinet-level ministers such as Winston Churchill. Her books—especially The French Revolution (1919), The World Revolution (1921), and Secret Societies and Subversive Movements (1924)—were extremely popular and helped bring the Judeo-Masonic conspiracy to a mainstream audience. Webster’s allegation of a centuries-old

conspiracy of Germans, Jews, Jesuits, and Freemasons provided a useful counter-narrative for concealing British complicity in the Russian Revolution and in the long series of subversive movements which preceded it. Webster's narrative had the added advantage of vilifying the Germans, a high priority for British propagandists at the time. That Webster accomplished her mission so capably is a testament not only to her talents, which were considerable, but to the patient groundwork laid by earlier writers on whom she relied. The story Webster told had been more than a century in the making, shaped and sculpted, through several generations, by the skilled hands of British intelligence operatives. Long before Webster was born, her predecessors had been hard at work perfecting this narrative, consciously designing it for the very purpose to which Webster now applied it.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,657

Much of what Barruel wrote was true. Secret societies, with ties to the occult, had indeed played a significant role in the French Revolution. Many of the revolutionaries were, in fact, Freemasons, and had used Masonic lodges as cover for their secret meetings. But that was only half the story. Barruel failed to mention the crucial role of Britain's secret services in instigating the French Revolution, and manipulating the secret societies which took part in it. Barruel's oversight was understandable. Like many French clerics, he had fled his native land to escape persecution, taking refuge in England. The British were his hosts and protectors. He was indebted to them. Moreover, as already mentioned, Barruel was largely dependent on British sources for his material. He also enjoyed the favor of powerful factions in Britain, whose patronage he could not afford to lose. For instance, Barruel's work was warmly endorsed by Edmund Burke, the British statesman and philosopher now known as the "father of conservatism." Burke's 1790 book, Reflections on the Revolution in France had preceded Barruel's exposé by seven years, and had presciently condemned the French revolutionaries as destroyers of civilization, at a time when most Englishmen still saw them as champions of liberty. Burke read Barruel's book and, in a letter to Barruel of May 1, 1797, not only praised the book, but strongly endorsed its specific allegation of Masonic conspiracy, stating:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,736

Barruel and Robison, with their respective books, had introduced the public to the Illuminati, and to the idea that Satanist followers of Adam Weishaupt had infiltrated Masonic lodges, using them as platforms to promote revolution. Significantly, however, neither book accused the Jews of any significant role in this conspiracy. The book that finally brought the World Jewish Conspiracy to a mass audience was penned—somewhat surprisingly—by Benjamin Disraeli, who would later become Britain's first (and only) Prime Minister of Jewish origin (though he converted to Anglicanism at age

12). Disraeli entered the House of Commons in 1837, and became a leader of the Young England movement, pushing for a restoration of the aristocracy's ancient feudal privileges, even though he was not himself an aristocrat. Many of Disraeli's allies in Young England doubted his sincerity, seeing him as an opportunist and social climber, seeking to ingratiate himself with the titled classes, and so he may have been.225 Seen in this light, Disraeli's greatest act of sycophancy may have been writing a novel titled Coningsby, published in 1844. The novel promoted the ideas of Young England. It also featured a character named Sidonia, based upon the legendary financier Lionel Rothschild. Disraeli describes Sidonia in these words:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,771

"Why did Benjamin Disraeli, who was Jewish, write a novel about a Jewish banking conspiracy?" asks Dr. Stanley Monteith in his 2000 book Brotherhood of Darkness. Monteith draws a surprising conclusion.228 He suggests that Disraeli's loyalty to the British Establishment outweighed his loyalty to his own Jewish people. Monteith suggests that Disraeli deliberately exposed Jews to vilification and suspicion, in order to serve what he deemed to be a higher master. Whoever that master may have been, he (or she) evidently had the power to reward Disraeli with the Prime Ministership of Great Britain and with an earldom. I find Monteith's argument plausible. Indeed, it is difficult for me to conceive of any other explanation for Disraeli's indiscreet boasts of Jewish power in his novel Coningsby. To say these boasts were ill-advised is an understatement. They marked a decisive turning point in the mood and tenor of anti-Jewish writings. They also gave a much-needed boost to Britain's covert propaganda campaign to deflect attention away from British involvement in the French Revolution, and to implicate Jews instead. As a direct result of Disraeli's intervention, the Illuminist-Masonic conspiracy of Barruel and Robison suddenly transformd into the Judeo-Masonic conspiracy of Simonini.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,800

When Webster wrote that Jews had "come forward into a blaze of light" with the founding of the First International in 1864, she was referring principally to Karl Marx, who became the leader of that organization, mysteriously raised up by helping hands behind the scenes. Originally called the International Workingmen's Association, the First International was founded (ostensibly) by British and French trade union leaders in London on September 28, 1864. Marx did not speak at the first meeting, yet he quickly became the acknowledged leader of the movement, a position he held until it dissolved in 1872. Marx's connection with the First International catapulted him to fame. In fulfillment of Disraeli's prophecy, a "Reformation" thus came out of Germany, led by a German Jew (albeit one who was raised Lutheran from age 7). There was something

strangely contrived about the whole affair. Like Benjamin Disraeli, Marx had always managed to make himself useful to the British establishment, and he was never more useful than in his role as leader of the First International. It was there that Marx performed the valuable service of putting a Jewish face on a movement—the communist movement—which had not been notably Jewish in the past.231

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,816

Officially called the International Workingmen's Association (IWA), the International was supposed to function as a union without borders, bringing all workers of all countries under a single authority. In reality, it was a British organization serving British interests. Pulling strings behind the scenes was a small circle of liberal aristocrats imbued with the philosophy of Young England, whose example they followed by supporting the labor movement while working behind the scenes to keep it on a tight leash. Aristocratic

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,821

One of these behind-the-scenes supporters was John Villiers Stuart Townshend, 5th Marquess Townshend, a British peer and Liberal Member of the House of Lords. When the International was formed, he moved it into offices at 18 Greek Street which already housed another organization, the Universal League for the Material Elevation of the Industrious Classes, founded and run by the Marquess. Most of the British members of the International's governing committee came from Townshend's Universal League, including George Odger, a London union leader who was widely touted as the driving force behind the International. In some respects, the International could be described as Townshend's Universal League wrapped in a new skin.233 When Marx received his invitation to take part in what would turn out to be the founding meeting of the International, he eagerly accepted, sensing that an important door had opened for him in the corridors of power. Marx biographer Rolf Hosfeld comments, "Though he had become accustomed to turning down such requests over the past ten years, Marx immediately agreed. This time, he informed Engels, he had the clear feeling that for the first time, real powers were in play…"234

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,832

Marx was right. "Real powers" were indeed in play. But they were not the powers of the revolutionary proletariat or even the British trade union movement. The International's precise relationship with the British Foreign Office is not clear, but there can be little question that the purpose of the new organization was to mobilize trade union support for British foreign policy objectives. Its initial assignment appears to have been to

neutralize growing support for Abraham Lincoln among British workers. On the surface, the British working man should have been expected to oppose Lincoln, out of his own economic interest. Lincoln's naval blockade of the South had cut off cotton supplies to British textile mills, causing massive unemployment. For that reason and others, the British government was pressing Lincoln hard to accept a peaceful separation of North and South.…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,841

The British government was in a delicate position. It had given its full and public support to the Confederacy. Indeed, Great Britain had helped instigate the Southern secession in the first place. Britain had long held a de facto monopoly on Southern cotton exports, 70 percent of which were purchased by Britain each year. The North had tried to replace England as the South's leading trade partner, by building its own cotton mills and imposing tariffs to block Southerners from trading with England. Britain took this as a threat to her vital interests. Her secret services went to work building a secessionist movement in the South. Most historians agree that the Southern secession movement began with a July 2, 1827 speech by one Thomas Cooper of South Carolina. As it happens, Cooper was a British intelligence asset, born in Westminster, England and educated at Oxford. He was sent to Paris in 1792, where he helped the radical Jacobins sieze power and launch the Reign of Terror. In 1794, Cooper emigrated to South Carolina, became a judge, and used his position of influence to agitate for secession. Cooper is merely one in a wider network of British agents who sowed division in America prior to the Civil War.235 When war finally broke out on April 12, 1861, England and her French ally Napoleon III tried to strong-arm Lincoln into accepting Southern independence. But Lincoln refused. France and England decided to take naval action to break the Union blockade and force Lincoln to the…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,856

Russian support for Lincoln had turned Britain's propaganda position upside down. Since 1807, the British had preened themselves as opponents of the slave trade, even while financing slavery in the American South. At the same time, the British had condemned Russia as a barbarous land which kept its people in serfdom. Now Alexander II had reversed all that. In 1861, he freed Russia's serfs. In the same year, Russia emerged as the only great power in Europe to support Lincoln in his fight against the Southern slave owners. The International Workingmen's Association (IWA) appears to have been launched, at least partly, as a propaganda operation to reclaim the moral high ground for Britain. In January, 1863, Polish rebels launched an uprising against Russia, with covert British support. Russia responded with a bloody crackdown. On cue,…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,871

> At the same time, the International, under Marx's leadership, became a rallying point for working-class supporters of Lincoln. Marx is credited with heroically defying the British government by supporting the North in America's Civil War. However, the true effect of Marx's "support" proved harmful to Lincoln, not helpful. Marx effectively coopted Lincoln's supporters, by drawing them into an organization—the International—which was actively engaged in undermining Lincoln's staunchest ally, the Tsar. Intentionally or not, Marx diluted and neutralized the energy of Lincoln's supporters, by manipulating them into a position where the only practical way to support Lincoln was to sign on with the International and support its anti-Russian agenda as well. Marx may or may not have understood the nature of this deception, but, as usual, he followed orders and played his part well.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,878

> Under Marx's leadership, the International kept up a constant drumbeat of anti-Russian agitation for years. Not unlike Trotsky, who constantly claimed to be acting on behalf of the proletariat while serving British interests, Marx was adept at inventing high-sounding excuses for his pro-British stances. At times, however, the illusion wore thin, and Marx's voice resounded with the unmistakable tones of British Foreign Office propaganda. For instance, in an 1867 speech to the International's General Council, Marx accused Russia of seeking "world domination" and demanded an independent Poland as a buffer against Russian aggression. "In the first place the policy of Russia is changeless … ," said Marx. "Its methods, its tactics, its manoeuvres may change, but the polar star of its policy – world domination – is a fixed star. … There is but one alternative for Europe. Either Asiatic barbarism, under Muscovite direction… or else it must re-establish Poland, thus putting twenty million heroes between itself and Asia and gaining a breathing spell for the accomplishment of its social regeneration."239 Marx was never so passionate as when he was denouncing Russia's alleged designs for "world domination." On the issue of workers' rights, however, the International proved listless and ineffective. Marx's 1912 biographer John Spargo admitted that the International's fearsome reputation was largely illusory, and that it mainly functioned as a publicity platform for building the myth of what he called "the terrible Marx." Spargo observed: "As

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,899

> When the Paris Commune was declared on March 18, 1871—a revolutionary government formed in the turmoil of France's defeat in the Franco-Prussian War—all

eyes turned to the “terrible Marx” and his International, who were believed to have instigated the uprising. In fact, Marx had opposed the insurrection from the beginning. The Germans had captured the Emperor Napoleon III on September 1, 1870, ending the French monarchy. A Provisional Government was declared, but France descended into chaos, with conservatives in the countryside demanding a new king while city dwellers—especially Parisians—sought a republic. On September 9, 1870, Marx wrote a declaration for the International, warning the workers of Paris that any attempt to overthrow the Provisional Government “would be a hopeless piece of folly.”242 Marx biographer Max Beer writes, “Marx then urged the French workers not to do anything foolish, not to set up a revolutionary Commune of Paris, but to make use of their republican liberties to create proletarian organisations and to save and discipline their forces for future tasks.” The Parisians ignored Marx and proclaimed the Paris Commune on March 18,1871.243 At that point, Marx had no choice but to embrace the Commune or risk irrelevance. But his private views differed from his public ones. In an 1881 letter to a friend, Marx wrote, “[The Commune] was merely the rising of a town under exceptional conditions, the majority of the Commune was in no sense socialist, nor could it be.”244 Marx biographer Spargo concurs, stating that the Commune was nothing more than “the revolt of a city of republicans against a nation of monarchists.”245 Notwithstanding his private cynicism regarding the Commune, Marx publicly played the role of revolutionary firebrand. The violence and vandalism of the Communards—who had senselessly set fire to many public buildings—horrified all of Europe. Marx’s apparent support of the Commune brought him and the International into disrepute.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,924

It was all posturing. The “terrible Marx” was an illusion. Marx did not, in fact, support the Commune. Nor did he suffer any serious persecution for pretending to support it. Marx’s pamphlet, The Civil War in France was an anti-climax. It became, according to Spargo, “the swan song of Marx and of the first International.”247 The following year, the International split into factions, its power broken. Yet Marx’s legacy lives on. Of what, then, does his legacy consist? As noted in Chapter 17, Marx received unexpected praise from the British establishment in 1882, the last year of his life. That year, Alfred Milner and Arnold Toynbee, two young Oxford graduates, delivered two separate—but strangely similar—lecture series, on the topic of socialism. Both called Marx a genius. Both declared that socialism was Britain’s secret weapon for heading off revolution. Both suggested that Marx was on the right track, but hinted that he may have gone too far, in his pursuit of communism. “[P]ure Communism” might be “impracticable” for the present age, said Milner.248 What then was Marx’s contribution? In their 1882 lectures, Toynbee and Milner both strongly implied that Marx’s true value to the British Empire may have lain precisely in his tendency to push things too far, to play the role of the “terrible Marx.” By raising the threat of bloody revolution, they implied, Marx had

frightened the bourgeoisie into accepting more moderate forms of socialism. And, as discussed in Chapter 17, the specific forms of socialism Toynbee and Milner approved were those which would protect, rather than threaten, the position of Britain's ancient aristocracy, in accordance with the agenda of Young England.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,946

Webster, in fact, argued that communism was a capitalist plot. She accused "super-capitalists" of deliberately creating Bolshevism as a strategy to line their pockets. Its purpose, she said, was to trick workers into giving up their rights and accepting a slave-like status, whereby their only choice was to "work or starve."249 The true purpose of Bolshevism, she wrote, was to allow "the industrial exploitation of Russia by the German and Jewish Company of super-Capitalists, whose real schemes were camouflaged under the guise of Communism…"250

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,961

Among those promoting the "super-capitalist" theory in the early '20s were such prominent opinion leaders as Wickham Steed, editor of The Times of London; H.A. Gwynne, editor of the London Morning Post, and Robert Wilton, who not only served as Petrograd correspondent for The Times but also as an agent of British military intelligence in Russia.251 The super-capitalist theory was also popular in France, where journalist André Chéradame wrote: "Bolshevism leads necessarily to the exploitation of Russia for the profit of a syndicate of super-capitalists of which the real leaders are Jews and Germans, that after the period of frightful licence which was necessary for the collapse of Russia, Russian workmen are now subjected to a régimé a hundred times more tyrannical than that of the Tzar."

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,970

Webster and her colleagues were not off the mark in suggesting that certain "super-capitalists" profited from Bolshevism. However, they neglected to point out that the most lucrative post-revolutionary deal, to date, had been struck by a British company, Anglo-Persian Oil (now known as British Petroleum), as described in Chapter 9. Quite possibly, the ruckus in the British press over "super-capitalist" exploitation may have been at least partly a case of projection, a classic propaganda ploy whereby you accuse your target of doing what you are actually doing. But Webster added a deeper dimension. She scrutinized the Bolshevik Revolution from an aristocratic perspective redolent of the Young England movement. Specifically, she argued that Bolshevism—and its evil twin "super-capitalism"—were products of bourgeois decadence, that is, products of a newly untrammeled middle class, no longer restrained by the nobler

impulses of the aristocracy. In Webster's eyes, the Red Terror in Russia simply proved, once more, that efforts to improve upon the feudal order only ended up making things worse. Was

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,002

Had he lived to read these words of Nesta Webster, Marx likely would have agreed with them. Marx did not spare his fellow Jews from the ideological condemnation he thought they deserved. In his 1844 pamphlet, "On the Jewish Question," Marx argues—very similarly to Nesta Webster—that "practical" Judaism is little more than "huckstering and money." To the extent that middle-class Christians of the industrial age had also become money-grubbers—that is, to the extent that "the practical Jewish spirit has become the practical spirit of the Christian nations"—Marx concluded that "the Christians have become Jews."256 Thus we have come full circle to the same, strange coincidence of interests that united Karl Marx and his aristocratic patron David Urquhart, the alliance between revolutionary and reactionary. Marx, Urquhart, and Webster all believed that the "abolition of feudalism" had created a soul-less, money-grubbing society, driven by what Webster called the "spirit of the Jew." From her vantage point in the early 20th century, Webster added the further observation that capitalism—unrestrained by the paternal impulses of the nobility—would lead inexorably to "super-capitalism" and its evil twin Bolshevism. Webster implies that the restoration of feudalism might cure those ills. She was not the first to consider this possibility. That was certainly the solution offered by the Young England movement of the 1840s, and by its spiritual descendants through the years. A good deal of evidence suggests that a similar agenda still smolders in the hearts and minds of certain global leaders today. We will consider the evidence for this in the remaining chapters of this book.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,078

We know for a fact that one of Rhodes's original supporters was the Crown Prince Edward—later King Edward VII—whose business with the Rhodes group was often conducted through a trusted intermediary, Reginald Balliol Brett, Lord Esher.271 We also know that the secretive network Rhodes founded got support from the aristocratic Cecil family. Readers may recall that "the Cecils and their relations" were accused of being the oligarchical power behind the British throne, in testimony before the U.S. Senate, during the Versailles Treaty hearings of 1919, as related in Chapter 16. It therefore seems reasonable to assume that Rhodes's agenda was approved at the highest levels of the British establishment.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,084

Following Rhodes's death in 1902, Alfred Milner took over his movement. This is the same Alfred Milner who would one day deliver Britain's final ultimatum to the Tsar, as described in Chapter 18. In keeping with Rhodes's vision, Milner set up secretive "Round Table" groups to propagandize for a worldwide federation of English-speaking countries.272 In each target country— including the US— a separate Round Table group was formed, which recruited local leaders to act as Judas goats, leading their fellow countrymen to the proverbial slaughter. In fact, the Round Table was leading people to a literal slaughter. War with Germany was expected. The Round Table sought commitments from each English-speaking colony to send troops when the time came. Australia, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa agreed.273 Rhodes's English-speaking federation proved to be a harder sell in the colonies. The colonies wanted independence, not union. So the Round Tablers proposed a compromise. They offered "Dominion" status or partial independence instead. Canada was to be the model. It had gained Dominion status in 1867. This meant Canada governed itself internally, while Britain ran its foreign policy. Canadians remained subjects of the Crown. The same deal was now offered to other English-speaking colonies.274

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,100

The United States presented a special challenge. We had been independent since 1776. Moreover, our relations with Britain had been stormy, marred by a bloody Revolution, the War of 1812, border disputes with Canada, numerous trade wars and British-led banking crises, as well as British meddling in our Civil War. Beginning in the 1890s, the British waged a public relations blitz called "The Great Rapprochement," promoting Anglo-American unity.276 Scottish-born steel magnate Andrew Carnegie called openly for a "British-American Union," in 1893. He expressly advocated America's return to the British Empire.277 British journalist William T. Stead argued in 1901 for an "English-speaking United States of the World."278 Stead was another Ruskinite, one of the three original founders of Rhodes' secret society in 1891. The other two founders were Rhodes himself and Lord Esher, who represented the Crown.279 The Burden of Empire Great Britain sought union with the United States not out of goodwill, but necessity. As early as 1883, Cambridge historian John R. Seeley suggested that the cost of defending Britain's colonies might outweigh the benefit. Seeley was one of John Ruskin's original disciples (albeit from the Cambridge branch, not the Oxford one). His views were very much in line with the other Ruskinites. In his 1883 book The Expansion of England, Seeley lamented the "great burden which is imposed by India" and suggested that "England would be better off now… had she remained standing, as a mere merchant, on the threshold of India, as she stands now on that of China."280

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,123

In his 1901 book The Americanization of the World, William T. Stead argued that England had only two choices. She must merge with America or be replaced by her.282 For committed imperialists like the Ruskinites, there was really no choice. Merging with the U.S. might save Britain's place in the world. But competing with the U.S. could only end in defeat.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,130

The U.S. was getting rich at Britain's expense, he complained. While the US profited from the Pax Britannica, Britain spent 60 percent more than America on its military, to keep the world safe for business.283 Something had to be done. It turned out that 23-year-old Cecil Rhodes had been right all along. The solution to Britain's problems lay in drawing the United States back into some kind of formal union with the British Empire.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,143

World War I pushed the world toward global government, giving rise to the League of Nations. This was by design. British design. Generations of schoolchildren have learned that Woodrow Wilson was the father of globalism. But Wilson's "ideals" were spoon-fed to him by British agents. On August 14, 1914—only 10 days after England declared war—novelist H.G. Wells wrote an article headlined, "The War That Will End War." "[T]his is now a war for peace ... " he declared. "It aims at a settlement that shall stop this sort of thing for ever."284 Wells released a book version of "The War That Will End War" in October 1914. He wrote, "If Liberals throughout the world ... will insist upon a World conference at the end of this conflict ... they may ... set up a Peace League that will control the globe."285 Wells did not invent the idea of a "Peace League." He was simply promoting official British policy. Wells was then a secret operative for Britain's War Propaganda Bureau (known as Wellington House).286 British Agents in the White House British leaders understood that their Peace League would never work without US support. For that reason, British intelligence made special efforts to penetrate the Wilson White House, which proved surprisingly easy. Wilson's closest advisor was "Colonel" Edward House, a Texan with strong family ties to England. During the Civil War, House's British-born father made a fortune as a blockade runner, smuggling cotton to England, then returning with British munitions to arm rebel troops.287 Young Edward House and his brothers attended English boarding schools, at the insistence of their father.288 While advising President Wilson, Colonel House worked closely with British spies, including Sir William Wiseman, the US station chief for Britain's foreign intelligence service. House, Wiseman, and Wilson became intimate friends, even vacationing together.289 This is the same William Wiseman who would later order Trotsky released from a Canadian internment camp so he could join the revolution in Russia, as described in Chapter 2. The idea for a "League of Nations" came from Sir

Edward Grey, Britain's Foreign Secretary. In a letter of September 22, 1915, Grey asked Colonel House if the President could be persuaded to propose a League of Nations and pretend it was his idea. Grey felt the proposal would be better received coming from a US president. Grey wrote: "To me, the great object… is to get security for the future against aggressive war. How much are the United States prepared to do in this direction? Would the President propose that there should be a League of Nations… I cannot say which Governments would be prepared to accept such a proposal, but I am sure the Government of the United States is the only Government that could make it with effect. …"290 Colonel House persuaded Wilson to do it. When the President later attended the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, Wiseman and House were close at hand, guiding his every move, along…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,185

On May 30, 1919, the Anglo-American Institute of International Affairs (AAIIA) was formed, with branches in New York and London. A formal structure now existed for harmonizing U.S. and U.K. policy at the highest level. However, the timing was bad. Anti-British feeling was rising in America. Many blamed England for dragging us into war. At the same time, English globalists were denouncing Americans as shirkers for failing to support the League of Nations. The US Senate had voted against joining on November 19, 1919. In view of these tensions, the Round Tablers decided to separate the New York and London branches in 1920, for appearances' sake. Upon separation, the London branch was renamed the British Institute of International Affairs (BIIA). In 1926, the BIIA received a royal charter and became the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), commonly known as Chatham House. Meanwhile, the New York branch became the Council on Foreign Relations in 1921. After separating from Chatham House, the CFR continued working closely with its British counterpart, under a strict code of secrecy called "Chatham House rules."296

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,195

The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) allowed British elites to exert a powerful influence over our foreign policy, effectively transforming the United States into a dominion of Great Britain, albeit secretly, out of sight of the public. Through the years, Washington insiders have come to refer to the CFR as the "real State Department."297 The establishment of the CFR was a great victory for the Round Table. But they were still far from their ultimate goal. The US Senate had delivered a harsh rebuff to the Round Tablers, by rejecting the League of Nations not once, but twice, on November 19, 1919, then again on March 19, 1920. This was a setback for British globalists, but they were patient and persistent. It took another World War— and the persuasive

talents of Winston Churchill— to finally draw the US into global government, via NATO and the UN.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,204

Churchill's vision of global government was oddly similar to that of Cecil Rhodes and the Round Table. Churchill called for a "world organisation" backed by a "special relationship" between English-speaking countries. On February 16, 1944, Churchill warned that, "unless Britain and the United States are joined in a Special Relationship … within the ambit of a world organisation—another destructive war will come to pass."298 Accordingly, the UN was founded on October 24, 1945. However, the UN was not enough. Cecil Rhodes and the Round Table had always maintained that the true power behind any global government must be a union of English-speaking peoples. British journalist and statesman Norman Angell had clarified this principle in 1942, insisting that the coming world government must be led by a "nucleus of authority"—specifically by "the West"—which in turn must be led by "the English-speaking world."299 Churchill repeated this plan in his "Iron Curtain" speech of March 5, 1946 at Westminster College (Missouri). Churchill warned that the UN had no "international armed force" or atomic bombs. The US must therefore join with Britain and other English-speaking countries in a…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,218

Churchill's words led to the 1949 NATO Treaty and the "Five Eyes" agreement, pooling intelligence efforts by the US, UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Step by step, we drew ever closer to the global superstate Orwell called Oceania. A self-described "Tory anarchist," Orwell hated Soviet Communism. If he wished, he could have written Nineteen Eighty-Four as a sort of British Red Dawn, with England groaning under Soviet occupation. But that was not Orwell's message.301 He was not warning of foreign invasion or infiltration. Orwell warned of a danger closer to home. He warned of British globalists and their plan…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,262

When Zimmern wrote, the United States had already refused to join the League of Nations twice. But, as a Round Tabler, Zimmern understood the power of patience. He knew that plans were already afoot to bring the Yanks around. And he knew that Great Britain would proceed with her plans for global government in any case. As Zimmern explained it, Great Britain was voluntarily giving up its global power. She had promised to grant self-rule to her colonies, as soon as they showed themselves ready for it. The British Navy would no longer serve as policeman for the world. Henceforth, the League

of Nations would provide a system “fitted to replace that which passed away for Britain in 1914,” Zimmern wrote.303 Behind these pretty words lurked a hard-nosed reality. British elites understood that the true purpose of the League of Nations was to expand British power, not diminish it. Some of the more idealistic US supporters of the League of Nations had discovered this while butting heads with their British counterparts. For instance, US socialist writer Charles Edward Russell, after dining with a group of prominent British newspaper editors, found that they were “obsessed with forming a permanent Anglo-American league to ‘control the world,” notes Susan Brewer in her 2019 book To Win the Peace.304 As previously noted in Chapter 30, British novelist and propaganda asset H.G. Wells had admitted in 1914 that the purpose of the proposed “Peace League” was to “control the globe.”305 He later wrote, “The British Empire… had to be the precursor of a world-state or nothing…”306

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,296

Lenin made six visits to London between 1902 and 1911.308 Indeed, virtually all the top Bolshevik leaders would visit London during those same years, including Trotsky and Stalin. What were they doing there? British researcher Alan Sarjeant—the same Alan Sarjeant whose 2021 study The Protocols Matrix I cited in Chapter 1—has amassed considerable evidence that Bolshevik leaders were groomed in London by a network of influential people connected to British intelligence. One of these was the aforementioned Philip Whitwell Wilson. In fact, Lenin actually stayed at Wilson’s home at 16 Percy Circus on his second visit to London. Russia’s 1905 Revolution was then in progress. Visiting Russian revolutionaries were closely watched by British authorities, who had a cooperative arrangement with the Okhrana, the Tsarist secret police. Despite Wilson’s position as a respected writer for the Daily News and a candidate for public office (he would be elected to the House of Commons the following year, as a Liberal MP), Wilson thought nothing of risking his career by harboring a notorious Russian revolutionary in his own home, under an assumed name, right under the nose of the police. Sarjeant writes: “Why

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,336

Milner named Toynbee Hall after his closest friend and classmate Arnold Toynbee, a young Oxford historian who had delivered, with Milner, two lecture series in 1882, on the topic of Karl Marx, socialism, and the importance of both to the preservation of the British Empire, as discussed in Chapter 17. Tragically, Toynbee died the following year, in 1883, at the young age of 30. Milner insisted on naming the new settlement house after his lost friend. It was not by chance, then, that Lenin found himself speaking at Toynbee Hall on June 17, 1902, during his first visit to London. It had become an icon of the Ruskinite movement. In keeping with Ruskin’s principles, Toynbee Hall featured

freewheeling debates where radicals and establishment figures could trade views as equals. In that spirit, Lenin engaged in a robust debate with Liberal MP John Morley on the topic of British foreign policy. Lenin asked him, “What is the use of your coming to the East End and talking about your foreign policy? Who there understands or cares about it?” Evidently, Lenin impressed his hosts. A few days later, he was invited back to Toynbee Hall for tea with Dean Robinson, who was both Toynbee Hall director and Dean of Oxford’s Balliol House. Lenin lectured Robinson on the need for violent revolution, declaring, “The Imperialist British Empire will dissolve.”312 Cecil Rhodes had died less than three months before, on March 26, 1902, leaving Milner in charge of his secret society. We do not know if Milner met with Lenin on his 1902 visit, but it does not seem out of the question, as Milner served on the governing board of Toynbee Hall, and was deeply involved in its affairs. Whether or not the two met, their destinies were interlocked. As described in Chapter 18, Milner traveled to Petrograd in February, 1917, as War Secretary, delivering to Tsar Nicholas II a final ultimatum, on behalf of the British government. Two weeks later, the Tsar was overthrown, and the way cleared for Lenin’s ascent to power.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,388

One of the enduring mysteries of the Cold War is why British intelligence behaved so carelessly in its dealings with the Soviets. Time after time, high-level British officials—including intelligence officers—were recruited by Soviet intelligence and allowed to operate for years as double agents for the Russians, with little or no interference from British authorities. The case of the Cambridge Five stands out, as none of the perpetrators were prosecuted, not even John Cairncross, who leaked atomic secrets to the Soviets.317 Three members of the spy ring defected to Moscow (Donald Maclean and Guy Burgess in 1953, and Kim Philby in 1963). Anthony Blunt and John Cairncross were both granted immunity from prosecution in 1964.318 The Cambridge Five turned over such massive quantities of secret documents to the Soviets that the Russians suspected they were being hoodwinked and given bad information. The Soviets were especially wary of Kim Philby, unable to comprehend how a person of known Communist sympathies and extensive involvement with Communist front groups could have risen to become a high-ranking officer of Britain’s Secret Intelligence Service (SIS).319 The ease with which Soviet intelligence operated among British elites during the Cold War is usually ascribed to British incompetence and apathy. A more plausible explanation is that the British simply had a different relationship with the Soviets than we Americans did. British spymasters appear to have deliberately allowed their people to cooperate with the Soviets, behind the Americans’ backs. By this means, they were able to play off Americans against Russians and Russians against Americans, in an endless game of “balance of power” that continues to this day.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,405

> Henry Kissinger played a significant role in helping execute Churchill's plan to play off the Americans against the Communists. Kissinger had been well-trained for this role by his Harvard mentor William Yandell Elliott (1896-1979), an American historian and political scientist who was one of the early leaders of the Round Table Movement. "Whatever I have achieved, I owe importantly to his inspiration," Kissinger later wrote of Elliott.320 In his 2012 book New World Order: A Strategy of Imperialism, Sean Stone reveals the surprising extent of Elliott's influence on Kissinger. As an Oxford graduate and one of the original US Round Table members, Elliott acted, for decades, as an agent of British influence in Washington. He was a behind-the-scenes kingmaker who advised six US presidents. Around 1951, Elliott recruited Kissinger into the newly-formed CIA.321 However, both men cultivated relationships with the British government that arguably conflicted with their loyalties as US intelligence officers.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,417

> Elliot's connection with the British establishment dated back to 1919-1923, when he earned his doctorate at Balliol College, Oxford. There he was recruited into Milner's Round Table Group. "[M]embers of the Round Table practically ran the college in the early 20th century," notes Stone. Elliott's Oxford mentor, Alexander Dunlop Lindsay, was a close friend of Round Table founder Alfred Milner.322 Through his work with the Round Table, Elliott developed close ties with British intelligence, going so…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,423

> At Harvard, Elliott taught Kissinger to see the world through British eyes. Many things about America displeased the Round Tablers. What they found most infuriating was America's independence, its ability to do as it liked, without regard for the wishes of foreign powers. The Round Tablers had never forgiven the US Senate for rejecting the League of Nations. Woodrow Wilson had promised the Round Table he would join the League, but the US Senate had overruled him. Clearly the Senate had too much power, the Round Tablers concluded. Elliott dutifully sought to remedy this problem. In 1935, he wrote…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,431

> Under Elliott's tutelage, Kissinger learned to put British interests ahead of America's. This was the heart and soul of the Round Table agenda, and Kissinger learned it well. He devoted his life to breaking US power, so we would have to accept British plans for global government. Kissinger was fated to be the hammer that would break America's

pride. On May 10, 1982, Kissinger spoke at the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA) in London, known as Chatham House. He was on home ground at the RIIA, an institution founded by Milner's Round Table and wholly devoted to its goals. Knowing he was among friends, Kissinger spoke with unusual candor about the special relationship between the US and UK,…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,442

The period of what Kissinger called his "White House incarnation" would have been 1973-1977, when he served as National Security Advisor (1969-1975) and Secretary of State (1973-1977) for Presidents Nixon and Ford. These were years of unprecedented crisis for America, including defeat in Vietnam and Nixon's forced resignation. Kissinger's admission that he "kept the British Foreign Office better informed and more closely engaged" than his own State Department during these perilous years raises questions of motive, loyalty, and judgment.…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,447

For most Americans, defeat in Vietnam was a bitter and senseless tragedy. Kissinger, however, seemed to view it in a positive light, as a necessary course correction for America. When Kissinger spoke of America's "rude awakening" in his 1982 speech at Chatham House,…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,457

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,467

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,473

Note: