

Yankee Steve's Column

for the Week of May 14, 2009

Series on Communism/Socialism among Blacks, Jews, and Anglo-Saxons in America

Part Two: Communism/Socialism among Jews in America, Section One

In the first part of this series it would have been easy to recognize that we feel certain sympathy for the plight of blacks in America, although that is changing rapidly, as indeed it should.

The black man was brought to America against his will. This indignity, accompanied as it was by pain, suffering, and many times death, was followed by an even greater insult. The black man was placed in the care of Socialists who taught that he could not care for himself, which is to say that he needed the government. In other words he had not truly been emancipated.

White liberals relied on blacks to help them by convincing blacks that Socialism is concerned about the average man and that this wasn't a power grab. The head of the NAACP, W. E. B. Du Bois, went so far as to say that Joseph Stalin was deeply concerned about the average man.

Joseph Stalin was a great man; few other men of the 20th century approach his stature. He was simple, calm and courageous. He seldom lost his poise; pondered his problems slowly, made his decisions clearly and firmly; never yielded to ostentation nor coyly refrained from holding his rightful place with dignity. He was the son of a serf but stood calmly before the great without hesitation or nerves. But also - and this was the highest proof of his greatness - he knew the common man, felt his problems, followed his fate. [The National Guardian, March 16, 1953]

If the black man is going to have to suffer the likes of men like Du Bois he will never fully realize that from the first day in which he set foot on a slave ship his problem has been government. It was government that allowed slavers to threaten the members of the First Continental Congress declaring that they would not assist in the formation of a more perfect union [1787] if slavery was abolished.

We simply must realize that government has never been the solution to our problems, and that it has on numerous occasions been the problem itself.

In this section it my intention to show sympathy to the Jews because they, like the blacks of America, fell prey to the notion that governments provide the solution for our troubles. A number of Jews sided with the revolutionaries in old Russia. Their leader was not a Jew but a Russian, Vladimir Lenin.

The Russian revolution began as a civil war. On the one side were the Socialists on the other the Czarists. The Czarists had shown themselves to be anti-Semites. However, if by siding with

the revolution the Jews thought that they would be able to preserve their unique place in the world, they were in for a surprise. Communism does not care for distinctions of any kind.

As far as the Communists were concerned the Jews of Russia, who lived through and in many ways aided the Russian revolution, [especially from February to October of 1917] would have to assimilate. To hold on to the idea that they were a nation within a nation ran contrary to the spirit of Communism. The Communist leadership, especially Stalin, stated that the Jews could not be a nation chiefly because they had no territory of their own.

This explains why the Russians, when they were under the leadership of the Communists, resisted the birth of the state of Israel. They were certain that it would lead to migration.

Communists are always one-worlders. They want to form one race from many. They would like to assimilate America with the rest of the world if that world becomes Socialist. Senator Pat McCarran [D-NV] [1876-1954] always tried to communicate the idea that America had a culture all its own, and one that the world needed, and therefore we should not be assimilated into the world but should stand away from it.

Senator McCarran joined Representative Francis Walter in June of 1952 so together they could instigate the passing of the McCarran-Walter Act which was meant to impose more rigid restrictions on entry quotas to the United States. McCarran was convinced that if we open our borders indiscriminately that America would not be able to assimilate into its culture all those who immigrate. He said,

I believe that this nation is the last hope of Western civilization and if this oasis of the world shall be overrun, perverted, contaminated or destroyed, then the last flickering light of humanity will be extinguished. I take no issue with those who would praise the contributions which have been made to our society by people of many races, of varied creeds and colors. America is indeed a joining together of many streams which go to form a mighty river which we call the American way.

However, we have in the United States today hard-core, indigestible blocs which have not become integrated into the American way of life, but which, on the contrary are its deadly enemies. Today, as never before, untold millions are storming our gates for admission and those gates are cracking under the strain. The solution of the problems of Europe and Asia will not come through a transplanting of those problems en masse to the United States. . . . I do not intend to become prophetic, but if the enemies of this legislation succeed in riddling it to pieces, or in amending it beyond recognition, they will have contributed more to promote this nation's downfall than any other group since we achieved our independence.

In a very real sense the problem we are facing in America is similar to what the Jews faced in Soviet Russia and elsewhere in the world. The Jews had to face the problem of whether or not they should be assimilated into society, and so much so that they would lose their identity.

The Jews asked themselves, should I be a part of something that ignores who or what I am? In other words will we continue in America to engraft onto our body politic the ideology of Socialism, which under the guise of respecting all cultures does not permit any culture but its own? Multiculturalists tell us that they respect all cultures when in fact they only accept one culture, the culture that says no culture is really important.

Lenin

After reading *Capital* by Marx [1889] Lenin became a convert, but not just any convert. From the time of his conversion to Marxism, Lenin thought that the world should be divided into two classes, comrades, and those whom he referred to as “them.” The Socialist or if you like the liberal looks at the world through a lens ground in the workshop of Vladimir Lenin. There are “us” and “them.” The liberal has no place in his or her world for a conservative.

Those who were turned into Communists agreed with Lenin - the ills of society are to be traced to the private sector or to private investing or Capitalism. This prompts a question. How could Lenin sell Russia on such an idea when it is known that Capitalism was virtually unknown in Russia at the time? Capitalism in Russia was in its nascent stage; Russians were just emerging from feudalism. All Lenin had to do was place the blame somewhere, on those who looked like Capitalists. In other words he wanted a revolution and he intended to get one. It was revolution for its own sake. Lenin was aided in his efforts by Russians and Russian Jews. Has anything changed since then?

A Hard Look

It has been said that a politically conservative Jew is an oxymoron. Is this true? I fear that it is. The Jewish lobby that favors the left is indeed powerful.

The majority of American Jews have signed on to the Socialist agenda, a carry-over of their wanderings in Europe and Russia. This has been so apparent that a number of anti-Semites have said that Jews invented Socialism as we know it and that the Russian revolution should be blamed on them. While we do not blame the Jews for modern Socialism we have to wonder why they have a proclivity for it.

Jews are among the most liberal members of the U.S. Congress. Barry Goldwater [R-AZ] was an exception to the rule. Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania called himself a Republican but no one really believed him. It is a given, if a Jew is elected to Congress he or she will more than likely be a Socialist or white liberal. As a matter of fact, the most conspicuous liberals in the government, apart from Ted Kennedy and Barack Obama are themselves Jews: Sen. Diane Feinstein [D-CA], Sen. Barbara Boxer [D-CA], Rep. Henry Waxman [D-CA], and Sen. Charles Schumer [D-NY]. The same holds true for the Supreme Court. No Jew appointed to the high court has been a conservative. Felix Frankfurter [1939-62] was an Austrian-born Jew who defended the honor of known Communists.

In his autobiography John Stewart Mill, British political economist, acknowledged those to whom he was intellectually indebted. If Henry Waxman is ever forced to do that, Karl Marx will have to receive top billing. Waxman has to be a real source of embarrassment to Jews, especially those Jews who know that **cap and trade** is going to provide Marxists with a way of seizing the reins of industry. Some of Waxman's ideas have passed from the inane to the insane. Apart from the fact that he is an enemy of free speech and the right of the people to assemble for political reasons, Waxman has now teamed up with Rep. Ed Markey of Massachusetts, a rabid fire-breathing Marxist. An article in the *Wall Street Journal* says that these two devotees of Prussian Socialism have now put together a 648-page tome suggesting that an unrestrained government be given free reign, and that it be allowed to tax anything and everything - Jacuzzi, phone, showerhead, television, car, moped or anything at all, if it can be shown that it contributes carbons (that stuff that grows plants) into the atmosphere.

Once upon a time the people of the Diaspora were seduced by the empty and meaningless promises of Socialism. Since that time it has not been easy for them to part with it. These same Jews on coming to America brought their Socialism with them. It was apparent that many of them were determined to turn America into a Socialist state in spite of the fact that during the 19th century the American worker was elevated on seven different occasions, and that he was the best paid worker in the world.

As you might expect Jews taught their own children to follow in their footsteps. This is why Jonah Goldberg, a conservative columnist and best-selling Jewish author from New York, has said that he was something of a political oddity in the Jewish community in which he was reared.

Jews are unwilling to sit on the sidelines. Jewish activism has contributed in no small way to the selling of Socialism. This is so obvious that those non-Jews assume that a Jew will vote to the left. Ben Stein says that in Hollywood there are only six Jews that could be called conservative.

Jews have looked beyond America. The Jewish state, which rose like a phoenix from the ashes of the Second World War [1948], has in fact remained what it was intended to be, a Socialist entity, and it has been able to do so because of the political and financial backing of American Jewry.

Jewish Socialists like Waxman likely take delight in the state of Israel, but not as we do because it provides Jews with a homeland, but because it is a Socialist state. No doubt he would like to do in America what has already been done in Israel. Waxman fits the definition of a fanatic.

The fact that the state of Israel continues from year to year to be dependent on foreign aid can only be explained by the fact that Socialism does not work. Socialist countries are heavily weighted in the direction of their entitlement programs. Consequently, they have less for defense than they do in fact need. In that respect the Israelis are just like many of the countries that make up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which sends its bills to Washington, DC. This means that hard working Americans are asked to shoulder the costs of the European and Israeli defense budgets so that they can devote their own monies to social programs. America

which has gotten rich through Capitalism is being asked to carry the burden of Socialism with which it competes. Need I tell you that this problem will not be cured in the near future? Israel has increased its social welfare system. Presently it is drowning in entitlement programs and all because we are willing to indirectly finance these programs.

Just Who Is a Jew?

Some of the Jews who vote liberal remind me of author Howard Zinn whose loyalties appear to be divided. In an attempt to defeat Hitler, Zinn flew with a bomber squadron during the European campaign which means that he served his country. At the same time Zinn objected to our having gone into Vietnam in order to put an end to Communist rule which was even more brutal than Fascism.

In order to discredit the government for engaging Communism head-on Zinn equates the American policy of containment (through which America would put a stop to Communism wherever it could around the world) with hypocrisy.

Zinn suggests that our motives for opposing the Communists are at best questionable. Ostensibly we went into Vietnam in order to help the Vietnamese people. Zinn pooh-poohs this. For if we were really concerned about human rights in Vietnam we would first clean up our own act at home, especially in the Jim Crow South. The assumption is that if there is wrong-doing anywhere in America then we have no right to war with those whose world plan does not allow for the existence of democracies like our own.

It is apparent that Zinn is not a thinker, but you don't have to be when you are hurling invectives from the left. Liberals will follow you wherever you lead them because you have appealed to their emotions and not particularly to their logic. America has resisted Communism and the Comintern (which later became known as the Communist International and which was determined to subvert every government not devoted to Communism) because it feels threatened by a movement that was bent on world domination. Didn't you understand that Mr. Zinn? Or is America always the bad guy?

Zinn thought that if there were racists in the South, and people were denied their rights in our country, then America was not really concerned about liberating the Vietnamese from the Bolsheviks so that in the future, we could protect our national existence. Is he suggesting that America wanted Vietnam's rice or some such thing?

Socialists are terribly inconsistent. **Precious little is needed for them to cry foul when people on the right wage war.** However, the silence from that same quarter becomes deafening when leftist governments skin people alive and chew on their entrails.

Zinn writes in praise of the Socialist Eugene Debs [1855-1926] who discovered Communism while spending time in prison for having opposed the draft, an action which any conservative would say was his right. You will remember that Debs ran for president on the Socialist ticket. However, it was Marx's *Capital* that became the instrument that opened his eyes to the idea that Capitalism or private ownership was too evil to be tolerated.

Why mention this? When Zinn praises Debs for being a Socialist it is apparent that he speaks for a number of Jews in America. They don't want Communism, which they equate with Stalinism, but they want Socialism which they equate with economic equality. Maybe that is why Zinn's book, *A People's History of the United States*, is nothing more than a Socialist tract, and not by any means a valuable tool for serious research, and yet it became a best-seller. The Jews of America have bought into Socialism. Zinn is one of their pied pipers. He has put forward the idea that the Socialism of Eugene Debs in no way is related to the barbarism of Stalin and the Communists, and that Socialism by itself does not carry within it the germ of despotism.

In other words the well-intentioned Socialism of Debs and the horrors of the Stalin era have nothing in common. It's the old story and one that we have heard many times; Socialism does not carry within it the seeds of authoritarianism and cruelty. I am sure that most Jews in America, who think and act like Socialists, would agree with that sentiment. However it is not backed up by the facts. Was Stalin the only Socialist who went awry? What about Pol Pot genocide of Cambodia or Lenin and Khrushchev who dipped their arms in blood up to the elbows? Is it mere coincidence that Socialists are as cruel as Nazis?

Fidel Castro and Che Guevara (a favorite with Obama and Hollywood liberals), are they not Socialists? At this very moment there are people rotting in jails in Fidel's Cuba. One could prepare at a moment's notice a long list of Socialists who soaked the road that leads to their utopia in blood. Bryan Crozier, an authority on Communism, concluded that **Socialism has been responsible for 143, 000,000 deaths, and that does not include the atrocities of the Nazis who by the way were Socialists.**

Friedrich A. Hayek wrote about this. The great economist who lived during perilous times says not everyone was fooled and that people were becoming apprehensive about the fundamental nature of Socialism. Hayek refers us to a Jew, Max Eastman, who saw the light.

While "progressives" in England and elsewhere were still deluding themselves that communism and fascism represented opposite poles, more and more people began to ask themselves whether these new tyrannies were not the outcome of the same tendencies. Even communists must have been somewhat shaken by such testimonies as that of Max Eastman, Lenin's old friend, who found himself compelled to admit that "instead of being better, Stalinism is worse than fascism, more ruthless, barbarous, unjust, immoral, anti-democratic, unredeemed by any hope of scruple," and that it is "better described as superfascist;" and when we find the same author recognizing that Stalinism is socialism . . . his conclusion clearly achieves wider significance. [Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*, University of Chicago Press, 1944, p. 29]

Hayek is worthy of another quote, "It is rarely remembered now that socialism in its beginnings was frankly authoritarian." [Ibid, p. 24]

What is in the root will show up in the branches. The authoritarian spirit is inextricable from Socialism in the bud and the flower. Socialism must therefore resist what resists it, renounce what does not honor it, and even brutally to set to one side all that would dare to oppose it.

By saying that most Jews think like Zinn I am suggesting that the Jews who are known for being intelligent are being led along by their feelings. That is what Socialism does. It says that it has the answer to misery. The Jews like that kind of thing because they are not prone to violence.

I am happy to report that a number of Jews in America abandoned Communism around the time that they discovered the truth about Stalin. What is sad is that many Jews remained on the left because they have not made the connection between Socialism and sadism, or if they have they have been willing to excuse their indolence on the grounds that if there is to be gain there must be pain.

Ever yours,

Yankee Steve Cakouros
oldlineconservative.com