

## Yankee Steve's Column

for the Week of May 28, 2009

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

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

##### The Big Apple and Jewish Socialism

There was a time when it was thought that the headquarters of the KGB had been relocated to the Jewish sections of Brooklyn, New York.

Brooklyn was awash with Communists from about the 1930s. Jewish Brooklyn did in fact become the epicenter of Communism for all of North America. The term "Red Diaper Babies" originates in Brooklyn. Communist mothers were intent on bringing up their children to be Communists. Speaking Yiddish or Russian or Brooklynese they told their children to follow the Russian example and observe May 1st as a holiday to be set aside for workers.

These same mothers boldly displayed red flags from their baby carriages. They hated America because America had gotten rich on Capitalism, and apparently they were not rich. Communism thrives on jealousy. One political commentator, of Jewish descent, says that their children were shipped off every summer to the Pocono Mountains for indoctrination. He adds a chilling comment when he says that these very same children now control the media and that many of them preside in our courts. Columnist Joseph R. Stromberg agrees with this assessment. He adds that the left-leaning anti-war activists of the 1960s who brought radicalism to the campuses had their origin in Brooklyn. He wrote, "**The Red Diaper babies were a pivotal factor in the now-receding Sixties. [They] grew up in an insular, self-protective, and besieged culture in which everything was politicized and one's life choices had to do with finding the best way of assisting the triumph of communism in the United States.**"

##### Not the Jews, but Nihilism

The Russian revolution and the birth of Soviet Communism cannot be blamed on the Jews. If anything, the Jews wanted out of Russia where they had experienced more than one pogrom. Who then is responsible for the Russian revolution and the triumph of Socialism in that country?

**The Russian revolution and Socialism came along at a time when philosophical nihilism had been turned into a religion of sorts.**

Nikolai Berdyaev [1874-1948] was there at the time. He tells us that Socialism came into its own in Russia because the **philosophy of nihilism, in which it is believed that there is no truth at all, at least not in a final or absolute sense.**

Nihilists were willing to act like those who martyred in the Roman Coliseum if by doing that it would bring about the emancipation of their fellow countrymen, serfs, and the poor peasants, but without the prospect of an eternal reward. Need I say it? They were not at all like the nihilists of today who are commonly referred to as “limousine liberals.” These nihilists were willing to do more than talk. Berdyaev says,

Russian nihilism denied God, the soul, the spirit, ideas, standards, and the highest values. And none the less nihilism must be recognized as a religious phenomenon. It grew up on the soil of [Eastern] Orthodoxy; it could appear only in a soul which was cast in an Orthodox mold. It is Orthodox asceticism turned inside out, and asceticism without Grace. At the base of Russian nihilism, when grasped in its purity and depth, lies the Orthodox rejection of the world, its sense of the truth that “the whole world lieth in wickedness,” the acknowledgement of the sinfulness of all riches and luxury, of all creative profusion in art and in thought . . . Nihilism considers as sinful luxury not only art, metaphysics, and spiritual values, but religion also. All its strength must be devoted to the emancipation of earthly man, the emancipation of the laboring people from their excessive suffering, to establish conditions of a happy life, to the destruction of superstition, and prejudice, conventional standards and lofty ideas, which enslave man and hinder his happiness. That is the one thing needful, all else is of the Devil . . . More remarkable than anything is the fact that Russians, when nihilism had shaped them, readily sacrificed themselves and went to penal servitude and the gallows. [Berdyaev, N., *The Origin of Russian Communism*, University of Michigan Press, 1962, p. 45, 47]

### **Thinking Out Loud**

I sometimes wonder if Jews become Socialists for reasons that do not appeal to most Gentiles. Jews live under a cloud of guilt and suspicion. This is to be expected when you are unjustly persecuted and throughout history driven from one place to another. During the opening stages of the Reformation, Jews living in Rome were made to wear a star on their persons because it was believed that they favored the Reformers. They also had to live in the same ghetto.

A person thinks to himself, “Maybe I should hate myself because this would not be happening if it were not for a good reason, or maybe I should hate myself for reasons I cannot explain. Immediately such individuals begin to think that the Jews, who were supposed to have given the world a Messiah (a peacemaker and prince who would enlighten the nations and lead them beside still waters), should adopt Socialism. Socialism becomes a substitute. Socialism allows Jews to think that their mission to the world can now be fulfilled. In that way the Messiah becomes a movement and not a God-man.

It is all about destiny. Now the Jews will be able to emancipate the suffering from their prison. Everyone will have; there will be no have-nots. Everyone will live in peace (Jews like that one in particular because they are typically non-violent) and everyone will sit under his own vine. Socialism when made the law of the land will go on to right all wrongs.

We must never forget that Socialism is first and foremost eschatology. The Jew reasons, would also this begin in Genesis and not end in paradise? Some dream of a one world government.

## The Jews and Secularism

Two names stand out from the past when it comes to Socialism: Karl Marx [1811-83] and the dean of Socialism Joseph Dietzgen [1828-88] who like Marx was a Jew. Both were unwilling to embrace their Jewish-ness. The son of a rabbi, Marx learned a great deal about Socialism from Dietzgen whom he considered to be Socialism's philosopher and from the Zionist Moses Hess [1812-75].

Well why does anyone fall for Socialism? It's the packaging. The Jews of the post-enlightenment era had grown secular, and make no mistake about it Socialism is utterly secular.

Socialists pretend that they are in advance of the times. It is a forgone conclusion that if you do not accept their philosophy then you are suffering from a mental deficit. Dietzgen went further; he got personal. Accept Socialism or we will say that you are "without ethics." A different kind of ethic one that he believed was winding its way through the world made Dietzgen bold. Get with the program, he said, or you will not have our respect.

This new ethic, the ethic of Communism, does not need religion. Dietzgen put his finger right on what happens when we embrace Socialism. We will become secular. When becoming secular we will leave behind any hope of finding out truth through supernatural means. That will only divide us from each other. Socialism is the secular man's religion.

Dietzgen represented secularism in its purest form.

No divine oracle, no inner voice or pure deduction from the brain shall teach us moral truth or any other truth. That ideological way leads only to an insipid hankering after a supernatural, unchanging and unchangeable truth. A clear scientific result can only be won by induction; it is always based on experimental and verifiable facts; in our present case, on the established fact, *that men need and serve each other* . . . That what is right to one person is equitable to another one is as certain as that men need one another. With the growth of the necessity for mutual service among men, their association becomes more extensive and intensive, their intercourse more considerate, and their morality attains to a higher and truer standard. Social-democracy is thus quite aware that man is limited by the nature of things. But having recognized the general, or the so-called true essence of morality, we refuse to be mystified by those who want to palm off a particular phenomenon or form for the general essence of morality. Whether people marry or live in free-love, whether private property is sacred or wicked, whether revenge is permitted or prohibited, are customs which may be qualified as moral or immoral in the same measure as they promote or hinder human progress. And with social-democrats, human evolution is no mere ideological drivel or spiritual perfection for which there is no material test and which is therefore exposed to the wildest interpretations.

With us, human progress means, as often stated, the growing control of man over nature to serve his needs. In view of that great purpose, religion, art, science and morality are

simply helpmates. I repeat: the narrower or wider, the looser or closer state of social aggregation changes the law of morality. *The higher or lower grade of morality is measured by the degree of social interdependence.* Yet, the mere knowledge of the moral law is not sufficient to be able to make use of it in practice; the general conditions must be ripe for it. Theoretically we may easily grasp the highest degree of morality; in practice, however, things go through their *historical stages*. The customs of the barbarians must pass before we attain to higher ones. Where people live by hunting and fishing, there the sense of brotherhood of man cannot be as developed as where the proletarians of all countries are striving for unity. [Ibid, *emphasis added*]

Dietzgen said that we can theorize about interdependence but “. . . **the general conditions must be ripe for it.**” As things would go, fortune was on his side. Thanking his lucky stars he discovered that he was born at the right time. He looked around and saw that the general conditions were ripe for the New World Order, and that being the case he should guide his contemporaries. At long last, after centuries of preparation, the proletariat can seize power. Capitalism was about to breathe its last. How interesting, Socialists are like those quack Enthusiasts and builders of cults who think that all that took place before they arrived was preparatory to their coming. Socialism is the atheist’s eschatology.

Dietzgen wants us to know that the new ethic has already come into its own and that it was being distilled throughout the world because its time has finally come. A process of evolution has been at work. The world is now ready for an ethic that is summed up in one word – INTERDEPENDENCE - or what seems to have been a favorite word not only with Dietzgen but with theologian Reinhold Niebuhr and his protégé Senator Bobby Kennedy. As a matter of fact Jack Kennedy went so far as to use the word in a Fourth of July speech. The president presented a gathering of Americans with an idea about the way the world should be run, it was summed up in one word, “interdependence.”

Niebuhr found an admirer in Bobby Kennedy. If he were to take ten books to the moon Niebuhr’s *Children of Light and Children of Darkness* would have to be one of them. Six times in one chapter Niebuhr talks about the need for interdependence and why it should become the political ethic of the New World Order.

Niebuhr delights in the possibility of a single government running the world. There must be no exceptions. However, he disparages, as Socialists will do, the idea that nation states will not favor this idea because it means that they will have to suffer the loss of their national sovereignty. Niebuhr has no illusions about how difficult it will be for the children of light, who because they are enlightened, will promote international interdependence.

Niebuhr, who taught at Union Seminary in New York, which has remained a stronghold for Socialism and leftist causes, ridicules any government based on a constitution. That kind of government, he thinks, is such a bourgeois thing. Constitutional governments rely heavily on will power and the readiness of its citizens to stand by a written constitution, but this will not prove sufficient motivation if and when men do away with various national sovereignties. We will need something more, but what is more powerful than a constitution or a social contract like the one America has which is rooted in the covenants of the Bible?

According to Niebuhr, a one-world government will need God. His direct intervention will keep the whole thing together. But didn't God get the heave-ho from Dietzgen? Wasn't it Dietzgen who said that our ethic must be based on the way we had been prepared for certain changes? How did God get back into the equation? It's simple. Niebuhr just put Him back and he did this even though the book of Genesis condemns the idea of a united world, and even though Dietzgen effectively argued that Socialism must be secular, and that a one-world government cannot be a religious entity. So what happened? Niebuhr simply waved his hand and said that a child of light will act in accordance with what he thought was the right way, and he thought that we should live in a united world.

Niebuhr does not question the idea that a one-world government might be a bad idea. He seems to take it for granted that those who are the children of light would want such a thing because in his eyes it is a good thing. In other words if he likes the idea then it is a good idea. The pomposity of the man is striking.

Finally, Niebuhr does not want us to have any illusions about how difficult it will be to establish a constitutional government so that a constitution could provide us with the guidance we need in the future.

Most plans for a constitutional world order, presented by the children of light, assume that it would be a fairly easy achievement for nations to abridge their sovereignty in favor of a new international authority. They think in terms of a possible world constitutional convention which would set up authority and would then call upon the nations to subordinate their interests to this new sovereignty. This hope is a projection of the "social contract" theory of government, characteristic of bourgeois thought, to the scale of the world community. [Niebuhr, R., *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness*, Scribner's, New York, p. 169]

In other words not only will Americans lose their national sovereignty, they will also lose any hope of a bond being established between a government and its people, which is what a constitutional form of government is based on, i.e., a covenant.

While discussing the possibility of the nations coming together, Niebuhr, in a somewhat roundabout way, finally explains why we need to and why we can make one nation out of many. He thinks that modern technology has increased the possibility of interdependence because of the way it has shrunk the world. In other words a small world should be a united world.

Recently President Obama talked about how small the world had become because of technological advances, and that this meant that we should all become more dependent on one another. **Did he really mean interdependent?** Maybe he has been reading Niebuhr. Why not, his pastor for 20 years, Rev. Jeremiah Wright did.

According to Niebuhr the barriers to a one-world government have NOW been removed, which means that no one is far away from anyone else anymore. As a matter of fact my distant neighbor is just around the corner. This would indicate would it not, that a United World is

possible? Particularity, he thinks had its day, but now we can come together. Technology and modern science have successfully shrunk the world. We are so close now we may even do away with competition.

Economist Friedrich Hayek wrote, “Of the various arguments employed to demonstrate the inevitability of [central] planning, the one most frequently heard is that technological changes have made competition impossible . . . This belief derives mainly from the Marxist doctrine of the ‘concentration of industry’ although, like many Marxist ideas, it is now found in many circles which have received it at third or fourth hand and do not know whence it derives.”

## **Conclusion**

Socialists would like us to think that they should run the nation, and even the world. Jews who know better deserve our support. Here is a partial list.

Milton Friedman, author and economist [deceased]

Ludwig von Mises, author and economist [deceased]

Barry Farber, dean of talk radio

Jonah Goldberg, author and columnist

David Horowitz, author and educator

Rabbi Daniel Lapin, founder and president of Toward Tradition and talk show host

Dr. Mark Levin, author and talk radio host

Michael Medved, author and movie critic

Dennis Prager, talk show host

Dr. Michael Savage, author and talk radio host

Ben Stein, economist, author, and movie producer, etc.

Ever yours,

Yankee Steve Cakouros  
oldlineconservative.com