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We publish below, as a complement to <https://elementsdeducationracial.wordpress.com/2022/03/20/yockey-et-la-russie/> , the introduction to Kerry Bolton's new edition of The Enemy of Europe (Centennial Edition Publishing, 2022), for its ability to put Yockey's thesis into context by recalling little-known or almost forgotten episodes of the political vicissitudes of post-war Germany. We will then try to clarify and evaluate Yokey's thesis, which Bolton sets out and defends in the two essays we have published about him. This critical study consists of three parts, the first of which we publish below.

World War II ended with Europe under the domination of two extra-European powers: the United States and Soviet Russia. Much of the far right in the post-war period viewed America as the lesser of two evils and sided with Washington in the Cold War, which had just broken out. In The Enemy of Europe , Francis Parker Yockey rejects this consensus and asserts on the contrary that the identity and the destiny of Europe are much more threatened by American domination than by Russian domination.

The Enemy of Europe (1948) was intended as the third volume of Imperium . In 1952 he revised his writings on Russia in the light of the "Prague Trials", which he analyzed in the essay he published that year, "What is Behind the Hanging of the Eleven Jews in Prague?" [1] For Yockey, it was clear that with the Prague trials, in which eleven of the fourteen defendants were Jews, the Soviet bloc had attacked Jewish interests [2].

Yockey argued that the United States was more Jewish-dominated and more implacably hostile to Europe than the USSR. It was therefore futile for Europeans to hope that the cultural distortion regime in place in Washington would be overthrown. According to Yockey, it was even unthinkable that a "nationalist revolution" would occur in the United States. As early as 1951 at least, Yockey sought to convince "the European elite" that America alone was Europe's enemy. He declared: “Let's not attack phantoms, let's attack the real enemy of Europe: America” [3].

Yockey's views were greatly misunderstood by the right, which could only see Russia as the existential enemy. Even Sir Oswald Mosley failed to understand the new world situation and saw the United States as a lesser evil, necessary to protect Western Europe from the ultimate horror of a Soviet invasion. Conversely, Otto Strasser adopted a point of view similar to that of Yockey, but it is unclear whether he was influenced in this by the latter's thought. “If Europe is not interfered with,” Strasser wrote, “Europe can and will deal with any threat from Russia – or anywhere else” [4].

Yockey published The Enemy of Europe in Germany in 1953. He simultaneously published a German translation, Der Feind Europas, in two hundred copies, which he intended to distribute to the leaders of the Reich Socialist Party (PSR) and to other other great German nationalists.

The Reich Socialist Party (PSR) was founded in 1949. The party won two seats in the Bundestag, after two deputies left their party to join its ranks. Major General Otto Remer, deputy leader of the party, was its most energetic militant. He was soon banished from Schleswig-Holstein and North Rhine-Westphalia, a stronghold of the PSR. The American occupation authorities noted the PSR's opposition to the Western alliance and its advocacy of a united Germany within a united Europe. In 1950, members of the PSR were barred from public service because the US State Department feared the party would democratically take power. PSR meetings were violently broken up by the police and the pro-PSR newspaper, Reichszeitung , was banned.

Remer accentuated his denunciation of the American occupation and the Western alliance while refraining from condemning the USSR and the German Democratic Republic (GDR), occupied by the Soviets. The US State Department took note of this and made this comment: "The party is suspected of being prepared to make a major compromise with Russia in order to unify Germany." »

When the United States opted for a policy of integrating Germany into the Western defense system, Remer launched a campaign whose slogan was: “ Ohne mich ! ("Don't count on me!"), which immediately aroused the reaction of war veterans, who were unhappy with the difficult situation they were experiencing in the western zone. Remer's campaign received support from all walks of life in German society, much to the dismay of the US government and media, which published sensationalized stories about a "Nazi-Communist alliance".

Remer went beyond his "neutralist" position and declared that, in the event of war, the Germans should not cover the retreat of the American army, if the Russians repulsed it. He claimed that he would "show the Russians the way to the Rhine" and that the members of the PSR, "posted like traffic cops, would spread their arms wide so that the Russians could find their way through Germany as quickly as possible. possible” [7]. On October 23, 1952, the PSR was banned after winning sixteen seats in the Lower Saxony state parliament and eight seats in the Bremen parliament.

In the United States, where [business executive in New York, figure in American far-right and fascist circles and friend of Yockey] H. Keith Thompson, with the help of Yockey, [8] was campaigning for Remer and the legal rights of the PSR, the FBI was interested in rumors of German nationalist Frederick Weiss's ties to Soviet agents and right-wingers in Germany. Weiss told the FBI that Yockey had left the United States for Germany in January 1953 and that he believed Yockey had gone to Germany to have The Enemy of Europe translated into German. In turn, the German secret service, K-16, seized and destroyed all copies of The Enemy of Europe. No copies of the English original survive and only a few copies of the German edition were distributed.

Yockey considered that the Asiatic horde of the eastern steppes had been able to occupy half of Germany only because of the shenanigans of the Americans and considered that Russia's world mission was destructive. In fact, his vision of Russia in Imperium reflects an atavistic anti-Slavism and even recalls the calls for the conquest of a Lebensraum in the East that had been made as early as the end of the 19th century. He further believed that the United States, carriers of the pathology of the Culture, had rotted the organism of the Culture spiritually, morally and culturally. Russian hegemony was only superficial and could be overthrown or subverted. In contrast, American hegemony was a cancer and had to be destroyed. Yockey's view of Russia was pragmatic and in keeping with the tradition of Realpolitik of the German elite of previous centuries. Spenglerian, Yockey was well aware of the prediction that the German philosopher had made in 1922 – the year of the Rapallo Treaty – that Russia would soon eliminate at home the import product that was Marxism and return to its own soul and that , therefore, Germany, because of its commercial, military and political interests, would be able to conclude an alliance with Russia against Versailles and the powers of the Entente [10].

American-Jewish Bolshevism versus Russian Bolshevism

Like Spengler, Yockey saw the Russian as a "barbarian", but not in a pejorative sense. By this he meant a "young" race that retains the vigor of adolescence. “The barbarian is rough and tough…he is neither legalistic nor intellectualized. He is the opposite of decadent. He is ruthless and does not shy away from destroying what others hold in high esteem,” writes Yockey in Der Feind .. Yockey asserted that Bolshevism, brought to Russia from the West largely by Jews, had changed in the Russian steppes. In contrast, Americans were simultaneously culturally primitive due to their indifference to Europe and "overcivilized" due to their preoccupation with "peace, comfort, and security." This apparent paradox shows that Yockey's thought was deeply influenced by German historicism. Misunderstood in English-speaking academia, for whom history is like a worm crawling down a path called "progress", German historicism establishes a dichotomy between Kultur and Zivilization, which reflect the inner (spiritual and moral) and outer (materialistic and technical) qualities of a Volk , respectively .

Both American and Russian Bolshevik ideologies were nevertheless obsessed with technique and production. Spengler had written extensively about the similarities of communism and capitalism in The Decline of the West , Prussian Socialism , The Hour of Decision , and elsewhere. Heidegger alluded to it in 1935: “Russia and America, from a metaphysical point of view, are both identical: they are seized with the same miserable frenzy for the unleashed technology and the seemingly limitless organization of the world. average man [11]. Aldous Huxley also understood this, whose Brave New World describes a synthesis of capitalism, Freudianism and communism.

However, for Europe, writes Yockey in Der Feind , “the following distinction is important: American-Jewish Bolshevism is the instinctive destruction of the West by primitive, anti-cultural ideas…by the imposition of cultural distortion and cultural backwardness. Russian Bolshevism seeks to destroy the West in the spirit of Pan-Slavic religiosity, that is, to Russify all of humanity. These are two antithetical messianic perspectives, yet not realized in history.

Yockey states in Der Feind : “Thus, American-Jewish Bolshevism poses a real spiritual threat to Europe. In all its aspects, Jewish-American Bolshevism strikes at a weak point in the European organism. The “Michel Element” [ Der Deutsche Michel is a personification of the German] – i.e. the enemy within – forms much of the ruling stratum of post-war Europe, reflection of "inner America", driven by the "purely animal American ideal" of comfort, security and conformity". If this quietude is disturbed, the bayonets can impose it again.

In Europe there is an "inner America" ​​which attracts the decadent elements of the West, but there is no "inner Russia". The Communist parties had soon ceased to serve Russia's interests and Moscow would have shown "political stupidity" by continuing to use Marxism as a means of exporting its influence, because Marxism had lost its value. When Russia turned against the Jews after World War II, the fate of every Communist party in the West was sealed, writes Yockey. In 1943, Stalin had dissolved the Comintern, which he considered a nest of traitors. Likewise, the graves of the leaders of the German Communist Party were dug in Russia and not in Hitler's Germany. The theoreticians critical of Hitler who lived in Germany found refuge not in the USSR but, thanks to the State Department and the Rockefeller Foundation, in the United States, where they took control of academia. These Judeo-Marxist destroyers were rejected as a whole by the USSR and the Soviet press condemned Herbert Marcuse at the time when he was presented as a great intellectual in the United States, where he inspired the riots that the New Left unleashed in Chicago in Prague (while the conservative right cried 'Soviet conspiracy').

The Prague trials definitively clarified Soviet relations with the Jews to the world, but the process had been ongoing since the Trotskyists had begun to be purged in 1928. Moreover, the significance of the USSR's rejection of the plans post-war Americans for the United Nations Organization and the so-called "internationalization" of atomic energy under the "Baruch Plan" did not escape Yockey, while it was not seized - and continues not to be – by rightists, mostly Anglophones, unable as they were – and still are – to emerge from their ideological quagmire. As a result, Yockey was attacked by Anglo-Nazis such as Arnold Leese.

The United States, for its part, recruited Mensheviks, Trotskyists and liberals to attack European culture with jazz and abstract expressionism in what is now called the “Cultural Cold War”. These were supposed to embody the benefits of American democracy, but the USSR condemned them as “rootless cosmopolitanism” and “internationalism”. This is how Yockey was able to speak of "American Bolshevism" and consider it more dangerous for Western culture-organism than "Russian Bolshevism." Today, supporters of the “American millennium” pride themselves on America's global “revolutionary mission” to destroy all vestiges of tradition through the irresistible lure of decadence.

When Sedova Trotsky, after breaking with the Fourth International, declared her allegiance to the United States during the Cold War and claimed that her late husband would have done the same, she showed the fundamentally Bolshevik character of the United States. Other Mensheviks, such as the esteemed Dr. Sidney Hook, sided with the American camp against the USSR and redefined American conservatism, so much so that when Dr. Christopher Lasch, after denying the Left in the early 1970s, looked for real "conservatism" in the United States, he found none. By the 1950s, Yockey had already grasped that "American conservatism" was a farce and a scam.

According to Yockey, the impact of a Russian occupation of (non-Slavic) Europe would be analogous to that of "barbarian" invasions of other civilizations, such as the Norse invasion of Egypt, the conquest of Babylon by the Kassites, the conquest of the Indus by the Aryans and the invasions of Rome by the Germans. Conquest did not destroy these cultures; on the contrary, the barbarians were absorbed by the culture-organism or were expelled from it. Furthermore, Yockey pointed out that the barbarian sometimes becomes the guardian of the values ​​of the culture of those he has conquered, especially when the latter are too weakened to maintain their own traditions, as happened during the long "dynastic cycles". in China [12]. The barbarian brings pure vigor and the prospect of cultural renewal rather than destruction,

The other possibility for an old civilization threatened by barbarian invasion is that the external enemy will push it to unite around its traditional ethos and thus be invigorated.

Yockey evokes these two possibilities in the event of an invasion of Europe by the Russians, while he considers that the United States represents not so much a military occupation as an invasion of the culture-organism by disease. Yockey refers, for example, to "Hollywood ethical syphilis."

Europe-Russia symbiosis

Yockey argued that Russia only occupied a tenth of (non-Slavic) Europe after World War II and that this occupation was only possible because of the machinations of the "Washington regime", machinations motivated by his pathological hatred of Europe. At that time, the New York-Washington regime still dreamed of associating the USSR with a world state through the United Nations and the Baruch Plan.

In the event of a Russian occupation of Europe, Yockey saw two possibilities: either endless uprisings until Russia grew weary and left, or the establishment of a relatively accommodating Russian regime that could be infiltrated. and, consequently, the “Europeanization” of Russia in a few decades, a “Europeanization” more significant than that which Petrinism had favored. This “would ultimately lead to the emergence of a new symbiosis: Europe-Russia. Its final form would be that of a European Imperium. It would respond to historical necessity rather than to the concept of Western Lebensraum .

We have here the clearest exposition that the slavophobe Yockey has given of his views on Russia.

Yockey also declared that, in the event of a Russian occupation of Europe, the first victims would be the local Communist parties, since those who were attracted to these parties could not be trusted. Stalin had already recognized this by dissolving the Cominternand eliminating foreign communists who had been naïve enough to seek refuge in the USSR. They were theoreticians of Marxism, when the real religion of Russia was not Marxism, but Russia. It has since been emphasized that Russian Bolshevism owed more to Alexander Herzen than to Marx, and one could also emphasize the anti-Russian character of Marx's own attitude, which influenced the development of Russian Bolshevism in Europe. away from what was seen as a rival German-Jewish current of socialism. Bolshevism was Russian messianism in another form.

According to Yockey, instead of destroying Europe, the Russian occupation would eliminate the “internal enemy”, the “Michel element” and “thus would liberate in Europe all the creative forces of the tyranny of the past”. The narrow statism would disappear with the traitors, who were kept in power by American bayonets: "The barbarian, whether he likes it or not, will complete the spiritual unification of Europe by removing the only intra-European obstacle to this unity. From the spiritual to the political there is only one step. If Russia were to try to incorporate Europe into its empire, it could only do so by making "significant concessions" to Europe, including autonomy as a unit. If she used brute force,

Yockey's accord with German geopolitical thought

Yockey was writing for a political elite, to inspire them to keep fighting at a time when Europe lay in ruins and many of the surviving political, military and cultural leaders were dispossessed and persecuted. The message was: Do not fight for the enemy of Europe, American-Jewish symbiosis, even if it means collaborating with a Russian occupation. This message was taken into account by many elements of the German right and explains the interest that the American authorities took in Yockey. Many Germans shared this opinion.

Yockey distributed Der Feind to the Germans just when the prospect of a rapprochement between Germany and Russia was making American ruling circles extremely paranoid. Yockey's perspective in Der Feind was part of the German tradition of Realpolitik and alliance with Russia: the alliance between Peter the Great and Frederick the Great in 1762; Bismarck 's Rückversicherungspolitik (reinsurance policy); [14] the Treaty of Rapallo; German-Soviet pact, which had been received with genuine enthusiasm in German military and diplomatic circles.

After Napoleon's defeat in 1812, General Johann David Ludwig von Yorck, commander of the Prussian corps of the Napoleonic army, negotiated a separate peace with the Russians in defiance of the will of the King of Prussia and of the Treaty of Paris, which committed Prussia to support France against Russia. This was the Tauroggen Neutrality Pact, which left a lasting impression on the German officer corps. It turns out that one of the many pseudonyms that Yockey used to escape military intelligence and the FBI during his travels from one country to another was (Franz) Ludwig Yorck.

Even ruling circles in Germany at this time wanted a united Europe, independent of the United States, which would have a collaborative attitude towards the USSR, which it was hoped would make major concessions. One of the leading German newspapers stated:

To emerge from its current isolation, it [the USSR] can, just as the Treaty of Rapallo did thirty years ago, make Germany a defensive buffer between East and West. From a politico-economic point of view, it could become a world power again by concluding long-term agreements with German industry and starting to trade with Germany again. Thus, Russia could regain its place in the world market [15].

If we Germans had the feeling that the other powers, overtly or tacitly, were trying to hinder […] the reunification of Germany, the (Western) treaties would quickly prove to have been built on quicksand… The fact that we are bound to the NATO pact does not prevent Europe, as soon as it is strong enough and the international situation has changed, from becoming independent of all parties one day. [16]

For its part, the newspaper Christ und Welt , aligned with Chancellor Adenauer's Christian Democratic Union, said:

Continental Europe would break the Atlantic Pact if the Soviets agreed to withdraw their forces behind the Pripyat swamp and leave not only the eastern area of ​​Germany, but also all of Eastern Europe, to join the European Union . A Western Europe, standing on its own feet and endowed with powerful forces of its own, will begin by developing its colonial empire in Africa. Such a Europe, whatever its links with America, will be able to carry out an independent policy, because it will have the force of a third power [17].

Father EJ Reichenberger[18] wrote in 1952 that the reunification of Germany “cannot be achieved without the consent of the Russians”. Moscow's primary objective

was not to spread communism in Germany, but to make Germany an ally. It's hard to see why Germany wouldn't align itself politically with Russia, especially after Western democracies agreed to ally with Russia. For Germany, the political question is therefore: with which side can Germany hope to make the best long-term deal?

He reminds German-American readers that the United States and the Allies have "seized German foreign assets, stolen German patents, and eliminated German competition in the world market." His vision of the world was also similar to that of Yockey and other European liberators: communism and Western democracy are variations of the same materialism which would be transcended by the German Weltanschauung [19].

The demand for neutrality in any conflict with Russia was the norm among Germans of all classes at a time when the United States was trying to rekindle the warrior spirit among the Germans, in case they were used as fodder for cannon. Just after the outbreak of war in Korea, the New York Herald Tribune reported from Germany:

The general impression abroad is that the German people would jump at the chance to put on their uniforms again and conduct new Blitzkriege. All the political and trade union leaders with whom our correspondent spoke in the main cities of West Germany declared that those who have this impression are greatly mistaken [20].

The Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung also published an article advocating a policy close to that recommended by Yockey and his comrades:

We need not draw the attention of experienced Kremlin men to the fact that a strong and unified Western Europe can defend its independence from all parties. Why wouldn't the Kremlin be interested in such independence?… If the world, which today is divided into two parts, could be reorganized into a number of powerful independent groups, it could prevent a terrible global conflagration. A flexible and prudent Russian policy could, for example, agree to a reunification of Germany in exchange for the independence of Europe, which could thus defend itself against all parties. In such a case, the reunification of Germany would become a guarantee of peace. The treaties currently signed will not constitute an obstacle to reunification, [21].

It is remarkable that in the appeals for reunification launched by various circles, Germany was seen as an integral part of a united Europe. The United States called for – even demanded – European unification, provided that a united Europe opposed the USSR. On the contrary, even in the minds of liberal Germans, a united Germany within a united Europe could only guarantee peace if it adopted a neutral, even cooperative attitude towards the USSR.

Russia's Conciliation Policy

Why were the Germans so optimistic about the possibility of a Russian-German agreement? On March 10, 1952, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko delivered the “Stalin Note” to German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and the Western occupying powers. James Cartnal puts it in context:

On March 10, 1952, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko sent the delegates of Germany's three Western powers a diplomatic note that included a draft peace treaty. The provisions described therein were radical. According to the Soviet note, Germany would be reunited, thus ending its aberrant division and allowing it to become an independent, democratic and peaceful state. Furthermore, all democratic parties and organizations in Germany would enjoy all public freedoms, including the right of assembly, speech and publication. The Soviet note also planned to grant civil and political rights to all German citizens, including all former members of the Wehrmacht and all former Nazis, except for those serving sentences for crimes against humanity. The draft Soviet peace treaty called for the withdrawal of all armed forces of the occupying powers, demanded the liquidation of all foreign operating bases in Germany, and barred a reunited Germany from joining any coalition or military alliance directed against any power having participated with its armed forces in the Second World War against Germany. The territories of Germany were defined, according to the Soviet diplomatic note, by the frontiers provided for by the provisions of the Potsdam Conference. In addition, the draft Soviet peace treaty allowed Germany to create the national armed forces (land,

The Soviets hoped to discuss the terms of peace with a united German state at a conference between four major powers. The conference envisaged by the Kremlin never took place. The Russian initiative only led to an exchange of diplomatic correspondence between the Soviet Union and the three Western occupying powers, which continued throughout the summer of 1952. This "battle of notes", as the British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, revealed that Soviets and Westerners had very different views on the need for free elections throughout Germany before any discussion of German reunification.

The "battle of the notes" left unanswered important questions that had been raised in the Soviet note of March 1952; the Soviets offered no specific limits on the remilitarization of Germany and gave no definition of what constituted a democratic, peaceful and independent state. By late summer 1952, Soviet attempts to resolve the German question had failed; Germany would remain divided and each side would anchor itself ever more firmly in its respective bloc over the next three and a half decades.[22]

Debates ensued over whether Stalin could be trusted. In the absence of a "Soviet threat", nothing could justify the subjugation of Europe to the Washington-New York regime, except a new change of policy and the revival of the legend of the "Prussian threat". Stalin was willing to meet most of Adenauer's demands, but Adenauer placed Germany's subordination to the United States ahead of a free and united Germany and Europe. Regarding the reaction to the "note from Stalin", Gromyko recalled that

the reaction of the Western powers was not enthusiastic. In Bonn, common sense completely abandoned Adenauer and his entourage, the Soviet proposals became an object of propaganda, and the question of the reunification of Germany disappeared into the fray.

No other postwar government made such a gross miscalculation. Undoubtedly, Adenauer lost a historic opportunity. Also, the Federal Republic was part of the anti-Soviet Western military bloc, while the USSR and Germany were still technically in a state of war. This did not end until January 25, 1955, by an order of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Adenauer's policy was a long succession of lost opportunities. In 1957 he rejected East Germany's proposal for a German confederation…[23].

Could Stalin really be trusted in this regard? It is likely so.

The USSR, having spilled human blood and indulged in every brutality in the part of Europe it occupied, put an end to its barbaric ravages, as the Morgenthau plan was put into effect. de facto, the United States still hoping that it would be possible to integrate the USSR as a partner in a new post-war order.

A significant example of the difference in attitude between the USSR and the United States towards Europe is the intervention of the former in favor of the Norwegian novelist Knut Hamsun who had always been popular in the Soviet Union. During the war, Hamsun had supported Hitler and the collaborationist Prime Minister Vidkun Quisling. A writer said:

At the end of 1945, the Soviet Foreign Minister, Molotov, informed his Norwegian colleague Trygve Lie that "it would be regrettable to see Norway condemn this great writer to the gallows". Molotov had made this statement with Stalin's agreement. It was after this intervention that the Norwegian government abandoned the plan to try Hamsun, contenting itself with inflicting on him a heavy fine which practically put him on the straw. The question remains open: would Norway have sentenced old Hamsun to the death penalty? The Norwegian collaborators were all given heavy sentences. The strong influence that the Soviet Union could exert in Scandinavia in the immediate post-war period was nonetheless feared [24].

The fact that the USSR offered Rudolf Hess to release him if he recognized the GDR is particularly symbolic. In 1952, the year of the "Stalin note", Lothar Bolz, GDR Vice-Minister-President Karl Hamann, together with Trade and Supply Minister Otto Grotewohl, met with Hess to find out if he was ready to play a leading role in a reunited and neutral Germany. German historian Werner Maser claims that Otto Grotewohl then told him about the meeting, on the understanding that it would not be mentioned until after Grotewohl's death.[25] Hess was taken out of Spandau to meet the leaders of the GDR at a time when the prison was under the judicial authority of the USSR. Maser relates that Stalin wished "to temper justice with pity in the German affair and to grant Hess an important role in the reconstruction and in the efforts for the reunification of Germany" [26]. If Hess declared that GDR policy was the same as the "socialism" he had always adhered to, he would be immediately released from Spandau and play a part in leading a reunited Germany. Hess rejected the offer, while “welcoming… the efforts of the GDR and the Soviet Union to preserve German patriotism and listening carefully to what his interlocutors had to say about the programs of the political parties mentioned…”. He nevertheless considered that accepting such an offer would have been a betrayal of Hitler's memory.

When the author indicates that Hess listened "attentively to what his interlocutors had to say about the programs of the political parties mentioned", he is referring to the creation of a nationalist party which was intended to be part of the government of the GDR.

During a meeting between Stalin and the leaders of the Socialist Unity Party ( Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands, or SED) held on January 31, 1947 in the Soviet zone, Stalin asked how many Germans in all the occupation zones were "fascist elements" and "what influence they retain [have] in the western zones" . Grotewohl replied that it was difficult to answer this question, but that he could provide Stalin with lists of former members of the National Socialist Party "holding leading positions in the Western Zones". Stalin had not posed this question with the ulterior motive of purging Germany of "fascists", but because he envisaged uniting the former members of the National Socialist party in a party which would promote nationalism and socialism in a Soviet Germany. He was also interested in the vote which could be that of the “fascist elements” in the event of a plebiscite on German unification. For Grotewohl, they were “all reactionaries”. Stalin's point of view was different. Would it be possible to organize the “fascists” under another name in the Soviet zone? He pointed out to the SED leaders that their policy of "exterminating the fascists" was no different from that of the Americans and told them: "Perhaps I should make this choice [to organize a nationalist party] in order to not push all former Nazis into the enemy camp” [28]. Would it be possible to organize the “fascists” under another name in the Soviet zone? He pointed out to the SED leaders that their policy of "exterminating the fascists" was no different from that of the Americans and told them: "Perhaps I should make this choice [to organize a nationalist party] in order to not push all former Nazis into the enemy camp” [28]. Would it be possible to organize the “fascists” under another name in the Soviet zone? He pointed out to the SED leaders that their policy of "exterminating the fascists" was no different from that of the Americans and told them: "Perhaps I should make this choice [to organize a nationalist party] in order to not push all former Nazis into the enemy camp” [28].

Grotewohl objected dogmatically that if the “fascists” were united in a party of their own, such an initiative would “not be understood by the working masses” of the western zones. Stalin replied that, by showing the "Nazis" in the western zones that their Soviet comrades were not eliminated, he would give them the positive impression that "they will not all be eliminated"; he further stated that he wanted to recruit "patriotic elements", especially among the "secondary figures of the former Nazi Party", to create a "fascist party". The creation of such a party would not be reactionary, because many “Nazis” were “from the people” [29].

Ulbricht found Stalin's idea plausible because, by emphasizing the socialist aspect of National Socialism, it could particularly appeal to young idealists. Stalin explained that he had no intention of integrating "fascist" elements into the SED, but that he wanted to encourage them to form their own party in alliance with the SED. In the Soviet-occupied area, former “Nazis” voted for conservative parties, fearing that the establishment of a Soviet state would lead to their liquidation. Stalin wanted to show them that their situation in a Soviet Germany would be different. Nor did he share the opinion of the German communist leaders that the "fascist elements" were all bourgeois. He stated that "we must rescue those who have not sold themselves" to the Western occupation and that "we must not forget that the elements who have remained faithful to Nazism are not only to be found in the bourgeois strata, but also among the working class and the small bourgeoisie”. The new party, which would be part of an SED-led “national front” coalition, would be called the “National Democrats” [30]. To the other objections that were raised Stalin replied that the "fascist elements" were no longer concerned with acquiring "living space" in the East. which would be part of a “national front” coalition led by the SED, would be called the “National-Democrats” [30]. To the other objections that were raised Stalin replied that the "fascist elements" were no longer concerned with acquiring "living space" in the East. which would be part of a “national front” coalition led by the SED, would be called the “National-Democrats” [30]. To the other objections that were raised Stalin replied that the "fascist elements" were no longer concerned with acquiring "living space" in the East.

In February 1948, the Soviet military administration ( Sowjetische Militäradministration in Deutschland , or SMAD) announced the end of denazification. In March 1948, the prosecution of the Germans for alleged "war crimes" was officially ended. The Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands (NDPD) was created the same month. The GDR, whose creation was proclaimed in 1949, was established by elections in the Soviet occupation zone after the USSR and the Western occupiers failed to agree on terms for elections in a reunified Germany .

After the creation of the NDPD, Stalin declared that the party would "erase the line of demarcation between non-Nazis and former Nazis". On March 22, a journal was launched to pave the way; it was the National-Zeitung, who announced that "while in other regions there is still an atmosphere of denazification, the eyes of the people are lighting up again in the eastern part. Simple party comrades should no longer be afraid and look fearfully around them as if they were outcasts”. The party was founded three days later under the presidency of Lothar Bolz. He held this position until 1972. A member of the German Communist Party in the pre-war period, Bolz was one of the few German Communist leaders to survive Stalin's uncertain hospitality towards Communist refugees. For much of this period, Bolz held various positions in the government of the GDR, including that of Minister of Foreign Affairs (1968-1978). The vice-president of the NDPD was Heinrich Hohmann; he had joined the National Socialist Party in 1933 and was also a co-founder of the League of German Officers, the original nucleus of the NDPD. The program of the NDPD was decidedly nationalist, as was that of the Socialist Reich Party, which was about to be outlawed in the Federal Republic:

America violated the Treaty of Potsdam and maliciously plunged us Germans into the greatest national distress in our history… But the American war can and must not take place! Germany must live! That is why we National Democrats make this demand: Americans to America. Germany to the Germans! The Federal Republic of Germany is a child of national betrayal… That is why we National Democrats formulate this demand: German unity above the government of national betrayal in Bonn, as the basis for peace , independence and prosperity for our entire German homeland .

The party had up to 230,000 members in 1953, and in the 1980s it still had 110,000. In 1948, 52 of its members were elected to the GDR parliament, the Volkskammer . To support his campaigns, he appealed to former members of the NSDAP and veterans of the army. In 1952, the appeal he launched was signed by 119 former officers of the Wehrmacht, the SS, the Hitler Youth, the League of German Girls (BDM) and the German Labor Front [33].

The origins of the NDPD go back even further, to the National Committee for a Free Germany, formed by German officers captured by the Soviets during World War II. Returning to the Soviet zone after the war, these officers took over the leadership of the NDPD and held high positions in the GDR for many years. For example, Colonel Wilhelm Adam, co-founder of the NDPD, was a veteran of both world wars. He had been a supporter of a nationalist policy since joining the Order of Young Germans in 1920. He had joined the NSDAP in 1923 and had taken part in the Munich Putsch. He had also been a member of the German People's Conservative Party (DVP) between 1926 and 1929. In 1933 he joined the Stahlhelm and the Sturmabteilung. Captured in 1943 in Stalingrad, Adam joined the National Committee for a Free Germany, and on his return to the Soviet zone in 1948 he became an adviser to the government of the state of Saxony. In 1952 he became colonel of the Kasernierte Volkspolizei (KVP), which later became the People's Army of the GDR. He was decorated in 1968 with the banner of labor and the title of major general in 1977. Many other people with similar backgrounds were honored by the GDR.

Conclusion

It was in this environment that Yockey evolved and that is why the American authorities were so interested in his activities. He and his German mentor in the United States, Frederick Weiss who published "assessments" of the world situation in a Spenglerian spirit, adopted a line which was in agreement with that of many of those who sought German liberation and unity. and European countries, the recognition of the United States as der Feind and the conclusion of an agreement with Russia to obtain concessions. This point of view had been propagated since 1948 in Argentina by the organization Der Weg, who represented what H. Keith Thompson told us was “the higher authority,” sensationally referred to as “Die Spinne” and “Odessa” by the global news media. But, beyond that, the idea had taken root among Germans of all stripes. Der Feind thus gave historical-philosophical depth to popular sentiments.

Otto Remer never denied his assertion that Germany and Europe should look to Russia. After continual legal harassment and a long exile in Spain, he returned to West Germany. In 1983 he founded the German Freedom Movement ( Die deutschen Freiheitsbewegung,or DDF), dedicated to the understanding between Russia and Germany. His manifesto, Le Manifeste Bismarck-Allemand, bears the subtitle "German-Russian Alliance Rapallo 1983", in the neutralist line of Remer's PSR three decades earlier. The manifesto, which echoes Yockey's ideas about the "cultural distortion regime" of Washington and New York, declares that "the American way of life is for us synonymous with the destruction of European culture" and that Germany "does not will not be used as the spearhead of NATO… We will not participate in a NATO war against Russia”.

Like Yockey's other writings, Der Feindhas not aged when it comes to its method of analysis. The world situation worsened with the collapse of the Soviet Empire. The Spartan way of life that was imposed in the Soviet Empire means that, today, the peoples of this region are the only white remnant that has not been contaminated by “the ethical syphilis of Hollywood”; hence the frenzy with which the “enemy of Europe” is trying to contaminate these regions – some states, like Hungary, are consciously resisting this “syphilis”. "The enemy of Europe" is now the global enemy (as Yockey foresaw in his last essay, "The world in flames" [34]), whose main weapon, as the American strategist rejoiced Ralph Peters, remains what Yockey called “cultural distortion”, backed by military force. Although some conditions have changed and the political fronts are different, the big political issues remain: the existential conflict between the United States and Russia; the role of Israel; the place of Europe and the West in this conflict; and the relationship between the West and the United States, which is presented as the "leader of the West" when it is nothing but the culprit of the distortion of culture, parasitism and the 'retardation.

Kerry Bolton (ed.), The Enemy of Europe , Centennial Edition Publishing, 2022, translated from English by BK, Introduction.

Let us first recall Yockey's thesis in its genesis: Europe has two enemies, one internal: the United States and their lackeys at the head of European countries; the other external: Russia.

Its internal enemy proves more dangerous for it than its external enemy because, while the latter threatens its existence in its material aspects, the former attacks the very spirit of Europe; it seeks, by waving the scarecrow of a Russian invasion of Europe, to unify it politically and economically and to standardize it culturally and mentally, in order to enslave it in all respects.

Its external enemy is all the less dangerous for it in that it has purged itself of its own internal enemy, namely Bolshevism, of which, on the other hand, the United States now bears; "cultural distortion" is basically synonymous with Bolshevism and ultimately Jewishness, since, to paraphrase Yockey, "Bolshevism is Jewish" (the paraphrase is justified by the fact that he applies the term " Bolshevism” to both the communist regime in Moscow and the capitalist regime in Washington). The only way for the layer of those who are repositories of European culture ( European culture-bearing stratum) to liberate Europe from the Bolshevik influence of the United States is therefore to make an alliance with Russia, debolshevised as it is. The unmistakable sign of this debolchevisation is constituted by the “anti-Semitic” turn that Stalin took on the occasion of the Prague Trials.

Has Russia Really Been Debolshevised? Has she freed herself from the grip of the ' Culture distorter ', the 'Culture bearer of disease', 'instinctively allied with all forms, theories, doctrines and practices of decadence in all areas of life", namely the Jew?

The answer to this question depends on whether or not the related thesis, explicit in Bolton, is solid that Russia and the United States are intrinsically enemies and not, as it were, two sides of the same pawn.

In 1887, Édouard Drumont wrote in Jewish France that “the Karl Marxes, the Lassalles, the principal nihilists, all the leaders of the Cosmopolitan Revolution are Jews”. In 1935, Léon de Poncins was spoiled for choice when writing “The Jews in Russian Bolshevism” (1).

Immediately after the October 1917 revolution, anti-Semitic leaflets began to swarm in Russia in reaction to the sudden worsening of the shortage and the consequent dizzying increase in prices. Gorky received one published by the Central Committee of the Union of Christian Socialists in Moscow and Petrograd. The leaflet, addressed to "workers, soldiers and peasants", carried the slogan "Anti-Semites of all countries, of all peoples and of all parties, unite!" ". He opposed "the Aryan race" to the Jews and urged all "Aryan" Russians to "purify themselves of all this Jewish vermin, which has so completely conquered our whole country, from the highest summits to the depths of the people". "Many think what a resident of Rovny, in the Volhynian government, writes: 'With us bread cost 5 roubles, and now it costs 15 roubles, it's all the fault of the Yids who have invaded all the offices'. The Bolsheviks attempt to organize a planned distribution of very insufficient supplies; they nationalize commerce from top to bottom. Private trade is prohibited. Anyone who engages in it is treated as a speculator. The Jewish trader is therefore considered a trafficker and a starver. The young Ukrainian communist Klounny explains the virulent anti-Semitism of the Ukrainian peasantry thus in a letter to the central committee: 'In the majority of cases, the village knows the Jewish merchant, who has exploited him in every way, especially in trade bread. While the villager fed the Jew with his produce, the Jew did nothing for him: the craftsman Jew served the bourgeoisie (nobility) and the petty bourgeoisie (milliners, cobblers, etc.) and the Ukrainian village almost never saw the Jewish proletariat. However, the peasant, not considering trade as work, considers all the Jews as not being workers. It is this vision which explains the irritation of the peasantry against 'the Yids commissars' and the popular phrase in Ukraine: 'Before, the Yids stole from us and now they want to settle on our backs' (2). On April 27, 1918, the Moscow Provincial Commissariat, after hearing the report of the commission it had appointed a few weeks earlier to study preventive measures against pogroms, decided to organize systematic propaganda against the anti-Semitism. On April 21, 1918, the Bolsheviks organized a big meeting against the pogroms at the Modern Circus in Petrograd. In July, Lenin drafted and co-signed a decree entitled “On the Eradication of Anti-Semitism” (3), which ends with the prescription to “outlaw those who participate in or call for pogroms”. According to the Bolshevik and former Menshevik Yuri Larin, "to outlaw active anti-Semites was to shoot them" (4). But, notes a special report of the United States Congress in 1954, “this executive order, issued as a directive during the Civil War, was not included in the official compendium of laws and governmental ordinances. And, in 1922, the first systematic penal code enacted by the Soviet government did not contain a special paragraph against anti-Semitism. The question was covered, in a general form, by a provision prohibiting 'agitation and propaganda arousing national enmity and dissension'; the penalty was a minimum of one year's imprisonment and, in time of war, if the offense was committed in particularly dangerous circumstances, death. A special law on crimes against the state, enacted in 1927, increased the minimum sentence to two years. But a Supreme Court decision in 1930 ruled that this paragraph was not applicable to 'attacks on individual members of national minorities as a result of personal disputes with such persons'. The law was strict, but it was rarely enforced.” if the offense was committed in particularly dangerous circumstances, death. A special law on crimes against the state, enacted in 1927, increased the minimum sentence to two years. But a Supreme Court decision in 1930 ruled that this paragraph was not applicable to 'attacks on individual members of national minorities as a result of personal disputes with such persons'. The law was strict, but it was rarely enforced.” if the offense was committed in particularly dangerous circumstances, death. A special law on crimes against the state, enacted in 1927, increased the minimum sentence to two years. But a Supreme Court decision in 1930 ruled that this paragraph was not applicable to 'attacks on individual members of national minorities as a result of personal disputes with such persons'. The law was strict, but it was rarely enforced.”

In March 1919, Lenin gave a “speech on the pogroms and the persecution of the Jews”, of which the following is an extract (5): “The propagation of hatred towards the Jews is called anti-Semitism. In the last days of the cursed Tsarist monarchy, she tried to turn the ignorant workers and peasants against the Jews. The Tsarist police, allied with landowners and capitalists, organized pogroms against the Jews. The hatred of the poor workers and the landowners and the capitalists was exercised against the Jews. And in other countries too we often see the capitalists fomenting hatred against the Jews in order to blind the workers, to divert their attention from the real enemy of the workers, capital. Hatred of Jews persists only in countries where the slavery of landowners and capitalists has created an abysmal ignorance among workers and peasants. Only the most ignorant and downtrodden people can believe the lies and slander that are spread about the Jews. It is a holdover from the old feudal era, when priests burned heretics at the stake, when peasants lived in slavery, and when the people were crushed and unable to express themselves. This old and feudal ignorance is disappearing; the eyes of the people are opened. It is a holdover from the old feudal era, when priests burned heretics at the stake, when peasants lived in slavery, and when the people were crushed and unable to express themselves. This old and feudal ignorance is disappearing; the eyes of the people are opened. It is a holdover from the old feudal era, when priests burned heretics at the stake, when peasants lived in slavery, and when the people were crushed and unable to express themselves. This old and feudal ignorance is disappearing; the eyes of the people are opened.

“It is not the Jews who are the enemies of the workers. The enemies of the workers are the capitalists of all countries. Among the Jews, there are workers, workers, this is even the case for most of them. They are our brothers, who, like us, are oppressed by capital; they are our comrades in the struggle for socialism. Among the Jews there are kulaks, exploiters and capitalists, as there are among the Russians and among people of all nations. The capitalists strive to sow and foment hatred between workers of different faiths, different nations and different races. Those who do not work are kept in power by the power and force of capital. Rich Jews, like rich Russians and rich people of all countries,

“Shame on the accursed tsarism which tortured and persecuted the Jews. Shame on those who foment hatred towards the Jews, who foment hatred towards other nations (6). »

In 1924, Gorky related what Lenin had told him about the pamphlet he had published in 1919 "On the Jews" (7) and in which he had written: "The Jews with the greatest energy served and serve the great cause of the Europeanization of our half-Asian country": "It must be said that during our conversations, Lenin repeatedly underlined the general importance of the Jews for the revolution, not only in Russia, but also in other countries, as well as the importance of putting an end as soon as possible, for the good of the revolution, to all these evils which afflict the Jewish working masses in a world governed by capitalism and religious institutions ( 8). "Lenin's reply reflected his general attitude towards ethnic questions, which was that communists of every ethnicity had to fight against the nationalist and religious prejudices and ideologies of their own ethnic origin” (9). The Jews were no exception.

As early as 1903, Lenin had criticized the idea of ​​a Jewish nation as "an absolutely false and reactionary Zionist idea in its essence"; “Jewish national culture, he added, is the watchword of the rabbis and the bourgeois, the watchword of our enemies” (10). Stalin took up Lenin's arguments. Neither with Lenin, nor with Trotsky, nor, at first, with Stalin, did anti-Zionism lead, to use the title of a book by Leon Poliakov, to anti-Semitism. Lenin and Stalin were in favor of assimilating the Jews to the Russian people. The nation being defined by Stalin, in a pamphlet ("Marxism and the National Question") that Lenin had asked him to write in 1913, as "a human community, stable, historically constituted, born on the basis of a community language, territory, of economic life and of psychic formation which translates into a community of culture", the Jews could and should naturally form part of the Russian nation. Anti-Zionism was therefore instituted as a dogma of communism and stubbornly defended both by Stalin and by Trotsky, for whom Zionism was a reactionary utopia (11).

Trotsky, who made no secret either that he was born and brought up in the Jewish religion, or that his origins had "no importance for him", to the point of declaring that he had "ceased to be a Jew for essential” the day he had become a Marxist and therefore an internationalist (12), never ceased to attack in general those of his congeners who, like the Bundists, gloried in their Jewishness and in particular the Zionists. The denial of his own Jewishness led him logically to the detestation, which he shared with Lenin and Stalin, of all nationalism. “The Bund exercised political influence between the February and October revolutions of 1917. Its leader, Mark Liber, was an active member of the coalition of socialists which dominated the soviets until the Bolsheviks took power. Jews were strongly represented in all revolutionary parties – Fëdor Dan and Yuli Martov were Menshevik leaders, while Abram Gots was among the leading Socialist-Revolutionaries. For a time it seemed that the Jewish question had ceased to be an issue in Russian politics,” except for Russian Jewish religious authorities; they “were worried about the number of Jews in the leadership of the revolutionary movement. They thought it might eventually backfire on Jews in general once old popular traditions of anti-Semitism were reasserted” (13). They sent a delegation to Trotsky in Petrograd to try to persuade him to break with the Bolsheviks. Trotsky sent them to graze, while not showing any of his own concern about it. “The anti-Soviet commander Alexei Kaledin galvanized his troops by declaring that the Bolshevik leaders were not Russians but Jews. And Lenin and Trotsky were at the top of his kill list. They embodied the communist order. An anonymous letter to the Soviet authorities asked: 'Have you gone blind and do not see who now rules Russia?…Trotsky, Sverdlov, Zinoviev and the others: they are all pure-blooded Jews who gave themselves Russian surnames to deceive the Russian people. Trotsky's name is Bronstein, Zinoviev is actually Liberman and so on. And it is you who prefer the Yid Bronstein (Trotsky) to the Orthodox Tsar'” (14). In an article published in Izvestiya in October 1919,

So would Russian cities have had 70 to 80 percent Jews?

He said no more about the Jewish question until he came into "open" conflict with Stalin in 1923. He then learned that activists were drawing attention to his Jewish origin and that anti-Semitic remarks were regularly made. made at meetings of party cells. Someone would have said: “The Yiddish are causing mayhem in the Politburo (16). Stalin closed his eyes to manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Party, which "helped him to defeat his rival" (17).

On January 12, 1931, Stalin gave the following answer to a question from the Jewish News Agency in the United States about the Soviet attitude towards anti-Semitism: "National and racial chauvinism is a remnant of misanthropic customs characteristics of the period of cannibalism. Anti-Semitism, an extreme form of racial chauvinism, is the most dangerous vestige of cannibalism. Anti-Semitism serves the exploiters; it is the lightning rod which deflects the blows struck by the workers against capitalism. Anti-Semitism is dangerous for workers because it is a false path that leads them astray and leads them into the jungle. Consequently, the communists, consistent internationalists, can only be the sworn, irreconcilable enemies of anti-Semitism. In the USSR anti-Semitism is punished with the greatest severity by law as a phenomenon deeply hostile to the Soviet system”. “Under Soviet law, active anti-Semites are liable to the death penalty (18),” he concludes, knowing full well that the laws in question were, as noted above, rarely enforced. In 1931, it had been seven years since, in spite of the note in which, shortly before his death, Lenin had advised the Party to beware of him, Stalin, an ally of Zinoviev and Kamenev, had succeeded him; two years earlier, he had succeeded in banishing Trotsky from the USSR after a long fierce struggle against him. He now had "free rein" to deal with the supporters of Lenin and those of Trotsky. “Under Soviet law, active anti-Semites are liable to the death penalty (18),” he concludes, knowing full well that the laws in question were, as noted above, rarely enforced. In 1931, it had been seven years since, in spite of the note in which, shortly before his death, Lenin had advised the Party to beware of him, Stalin, an ally of Zinoviev and Kamenev, had succeeded him; two years earlier, he had succeeded in banishing Trotsky from the USSR after a long fierce struggle against him. He now had "free rein" to deal with the supporters of Lenin and those of Trotsky. “Under Soviet law, active anti-Semites are liable to the death penalty (18),” he concludes, knowing full well that the laws in question were, as noted above, rarely enforced. In 1931, it had been seven years since, in spite of the note in which, shortly before his death, Lenin had advised the Party to beware of him, Stalin, an ally of Zinoviev and Kamenev, had succeeded him; two years earlier, he had succeeded in banishing Trotsky from the USSR after a long fierce struggle against him. He now had "free rein" to deal with the supporters of Lenin and those of Trotsky. it had been seven years since, in spite of the note in which, shortly before his death, Lenin had advised the Party to beware of him, Stalin, allied to Zinoviev and Kamenev, had succeeded him; two years earlier, he had succeeded in banishing Trotsky from the USSR after a long fierce struggle against him. He now had "free rein" to deal with the supporters of Lenin and those of Trotsky. it had been seven years since, in spite of the note in which, shortly before his death, Lenin had advised the Party to beware of him, Stalin, allied to Zinoviev and Kamenev, had succeeded him; two years earlier, he had succeeded in banishing Trotsky from the USSR after a long fierce struggle against him. He now had "free rein" to deal with the supporters of Lenin and those of Trotsky.

In December 1934, Kirov, the Party leader in Leningrad, was shot. The murder provided Stalin with the pretext to legally purge the Party. From 1936 to 1938, there were three trials, known as the “Bloc of Rightists and Trotskyists”. At the end of the first, in August 1936, Kamenev and Zinoviev, accused of belonging to the "Trotskyist-Zinovievist Terrorist Center", were sentenced to long prison terms for having "attempted to seize power at all costs" and, incidentally, for “complicity in murder”; at the end of the second, Sokolnikov was found guilty of having formed, together with 16 other "old Bolsheviks", a "reserve Trotskyist Anti-Soviet Center [...] in case the activity of the Trotskyist-Zinovievist Center was discovered by the organs of the soviet power”; he was shot in February 1937; Radek was one of the four defendants who escaped the death penalty. The third trial opened on March 2, 1938; the four main defendants were Bukharin, Rakovsky, Yagoda, Rykov (19). Many of the defendants, including those who have just been cited, were Jews, although they were not named as such in the indictments. The Congressional report quoted above indicates that “[t]he violent campaign against the 'traitors' was not presented officially from an anti-Jewish angle. But the campaign of anti-Semitic whispers was not deterred either. At the same time, secret Communist Party circulars ordered many branches of the civil service to no longer recruit persons of Jewish origin or to demote or dismiss those already in office. A numerus clausus was surreptitiously applied in the military and diplomatic academies. Each new 'election' led to a further drop in the percentage of men of Jewish origin elected in the various soviets. This process found its most eloquent expression when, in May 1939, Foreign Minister Maxim M. Litvinov was removed from office and replaced by Vyacheslav M. Molotov. A man of Jewish origin was not the most suitable person to negotiate the Stalin-Hitler pact”. Litvinov was removed from office and replaced by Vyacheslav M. Molotov. A man of Jewish origin was not the most suitable person to negotiate the Stalin-Hitler pact”. Litvinov was removed from office and replaced by Vyacheslav M. Molotov. A man of Jewish origin was not the most suitable person to negotiate the Stalin-Hitler pact”.

From this period dates the appearance in the USSR of what, in "Prisoners of the Red Pharaoh: political repressions against the Jews in the USSR in the last decade of Stalin's reign" (Arles, Solin-Actes Sud, 1997), for which he consulted about a hundred hitherto unpublished documents from archives, party organs, national security services and other structures of leadership and repression of the USSR, Gennady Kostyuchenko (20) calls a “ state anti-Semitism”. It had four axes: the liquidation of Jewish institutions and organizations (21), the persecution of the Jewish intellectual elite, the purges of certain state institutions, the reprisals against certain Jewish activists. “…Stalin regularly took advantage of anti-Semitic moods in society and the party to defeat his opponents in the struggle for power. Once transferred to the bureaucratic terrain, this way of proceeding acquired the status of a systematic policy carried out by the state. Its aim was the gradual elimination of 'Jewish influence' (more precisely the influence of Jews) on the socio-political and cultural life of society; and its preferred means were assimilation imposed from above and administrative and repressive measures, which grew steadily heavier over time” (22). Its aim was the gradual elimination of 'Jewish influence' (more precisely the influence of Jews) on the socio-political and cultural life of society; and its preferred means were assimilation imposed from above and administrative and repressive measures, which grew steadily heavier over time” (22). Its aim was the gradual elimination of 'Jewish influence' (more precisely the influence of Jews) on the socio-political and cultural life of society; and its preferred means were assimilation imposed from above and administrative and repressive measures, which grew steadily heavier over time” (22).

Barely restrained during the war (23), "state anti-Semitism" reached its peak in the 1950s. In October or November 1948, General Antonov, Jewish Chief of Staff of the Red Army, was replaced by General Shtemenko, a Gentile. Publication of the Yiddish newspaper Einigkeit, performances of the Moscow Yiddish Theater and a number of other Jewish institutional activities were suspended. The Jews of the USSR ceased to be recognized as a national minority, all this at a time when relations between the USSR and Israel were in good shape. The six leading Yiddish writers in the Soviet Union were arrested and disappeared without a trace. The cult that had formed around the memory of Simon Mikhoels, the famous actor and Jewish community leader who died earlier this year, was suddenly suppressed and his name was not mentioned officially until it appeared in the indictment of the famous trial of the white coats, seventeen officials of the main medical institutions in Moscow, most of whom were Jews ( 24). “In agreement with the majority of specialists, GV Kostyrčenko explains this [these] development[s] by a set of domestic and foreign political factors: the increased chauvinism of the national policy of the Soviet leaders; the exacerbation of Soviet-American tension and the hardening of the Cold War; the psychological degradation of old Stalin; his judgment of Zionism, of the State of Israel as 'the vanguard of US imperialism' and of Soviet Jews as a potential 'fifth column'” (25).

According to Maurizio Lattanzioni (26), these developments “should not, however, be attributed to Stalin's 'anti-Semitism', that is to say to a visceral aversion he allegedly harbored for the respect to the deep 'essence' of Jewishness and Jewish character traits. Nor did Stalin have the will to cut all the bridges that united the Soviet Union to the 'Western' plutocracy. Stalin's motivations are different: he simply wanted to liquidate a political and ideological tendency which had developed an interpretation of Marxian thought different from his own and had deduced from this interpretation models of management of Soviet power opposed to those advocated by Stalin himself. -same. This ideological dispute led to a clash between two rival factions of the CPSU. Stalin […] understood that Marxism could only survive if it was realized 'in one country'. Only the birth of a kind of 'national-communism' rooted in the deepest historical currents of Pan-Slavism, within the framework of an authoritarian, bureaucratic and centralizing conception of power and the State, could allow the advent of socialism in one country, that is to say, in our case, in the Soviet Union”. Trotsky himself repeatedly insisted that "Stalin, in his struggle with the opposition, [only exploit[ed] the anti-Semitic tendencies of the country" (27). Most scholars of the matter (28) still seem to agree today that although many victims of the Great Purge were Jews, they were not targeted as Jews,

“[S]talinian anti-Semitism takes up two themes of Nazi anti-Semitism: the 'pollution' that would constitute the more or less massive presence of Jews in the various fields of social life and the sea serpent of the world Jewish conspiracy to dominate the world. But these two themes remain lurking, like shameful stains, in secret internal circulars and in even more secret fabricated confessions, to which disgraced former police officers lend themselves to repeat whatever their colleagues in place dictate to them. There is more than one nuance here. Hitler's anti-Semitism is an organic development of Nazism; Stalinist anti-Semitism is contradictory to the origins of the Soviet system, born of a social revolution (liquidation of private ownership of the means of production and establishment of collective ownership) and political (overthrow of the old ruling class) and with its social foundations. The first asserts himself, the second hides, even keeps silent, camouflages and disguises himself, as if he were ashamed to show himself; he acts in the shadows” (29). In Russia there was no equivalent to the Nuremberg Laws, partly for the reason just given, partly for legal reasons. National Socialism, for its part, always acts in the open. there was no equivalent to the Nuremberg Laws, partly for the reason just given, partly for legal reasons. National Socialism, for its part, always acts in the open. there was no equivalent to the Nuremberg Laws, partly for the reason just given, partly for legal reasons. National Socialism, for its part, always acts in the open.

Stalin's anti-Jewish policy was continued after his death by the two men who had exerted the strongest influence on him: Malenkov and Beria (30). On March 4, 1953, the Komsomol´skaja pravda published an article entitled "Greater Revolutionary Vigilance", which denounced "the terrorist groups of doctors/saboteurs - agents of the Jewish organization and nationalist-bourgeois orientation Joint, at the pay from the foreign secret services" (31), but only a month after Stalin's death the radio broadcast the announcement by the Ministry of the Interior of the exoneration of all the doctors accused of having taken part in the conspiracy of the medical gowns white women and their restoration to their duties. Stalin had to die a second time.

In his memoirs, Khrushchev notes that Stalin often made “anti-Semitic” remarks “And, he recalls, we got used to it. We listened to them, but we didn't take them to heart and we didn't do anything about it” (32). It turns out, however, to have walked in the footsteps of its predecessor, although, if we are allowed the expression, in slippers (33). “He learned from Stalin to subtly use 'popular anti-Semitism' to implement policies (34). Incidentally, the death penalty for economic crimes such as embezzlement, theft, corruption and the black market was introduced in 1961 by the Soviet, which made the USSR the country with the most draconian legislation and by far for this type of crime in peacetime. “Of the hundred or so people executed for economic crimes in 1961-62, the vast majority were Jewish and their trials had strong anti-Semitic overtones. What was obviously insinuated was that the shortages of consumer goods and their poor quality were not to be blamed on the leaders of the country or the Soviet economic system, but on a handful of Jewish moonlighters and corrupt petty officials” (35 ).

In July 1965, for the first time since 1918, a senior Soviet official, Aleksei N. Kosygin, declared, in a speech given in Riga and published the next day in Pravda (36), that anti-Semitism, like nationalism and racism, was foreign to the communist worldview (37). A year earlier, Brezhnev had become First Secretary of the Party and therefore the main leader of the Soviet Union; he vigorously condemned anti-Semitism fourteen years later, on February 23, 1981, in a speech on general policy delivered at the 26th Congress of the Communist Party (38). In the meantime, the official message was that “there never was and there is no anti-Semitism in the USSR” (39).

According to Kostyuchenko, Israel's dazzling victory in the Six-Day War in June 1967 marked a resurgence of state anti-Semitism in the USSR and the countries of the Eastern bloc (except Romania), all defenders of Arab cause. It would be more appropriate to speak of anti-Zionism. Proof of this is that, on October 4, 1967, the Ideological Commission of the Party's Central Committee disavowed, following vehement protests abroad, Iudaizm bez prikras ( Judaism Without Embellishment , 1963), an anti-Semitic work by Trofim Kichko, employee of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences who had had close relations with the National Socialist regime during the war. The same day, Kitchko published an article in the Ukrainian newspaper Komsomolskoye znamyaon “a plot of Zionist bankers”; on January 20, 1968, Pravda Ukrainy, the official newspaper of the Ukrainian Republic, reported that Kichko had been awarded by the presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet a certificate of merit for "services rendered to atheistic propaganda". Kichko soon after published Judaizm i Zionism(kyiv, 1968), one of whose central theses was that Judaism – practiced by a large part of the three million Jews of Russia – bears a great deal of responsibility for the “crimes” of the Israeli “aggressors”; “There was a direct link between the morality of Judaism and the actions of the Israeli Zionists. Aren't the actions of Israeli extremists during their latest aggression against Arab countries in accordance with the Torah? (40). Meanwhile, many Soviet publications had tackled the subject of the Jewish conspiracy; so, for example, the Komsomolskaya pravdaof October 4, 1967 wrote: “Zionism is an invisible, but enormous and powerful empire, of financiers and industrialists, an empire which does not appear on any map of the world, but which exists and acts everywhere in the world (41). In August 1968, a few days before the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, the main Soviet organs dedicated long articles to the mysterious "saboteurs" who threatened to undermine the Socialist Republic. Judaism was condemned on the grounds that it prescribed "racial exclusivism" and justified "crimes against Gentiles." The Kremlin's views on the matter were summarized in a book published in 1969 (75,000 copies), Beware of Zionism!, by Yuri Ivanov, a specialist of the Party's Central Committee on Zionism. “In 173 pages, it brought together the various threads of the anti-Zionist theme woven over the previous three years. Zionism was presented as the giant international 'business' of world Jewry. With 'most of the capital' at its disposal, the Affair maintains a vast 'international intelligence center' and a 'well-organized disinformation and propaganda service'. The objective of all the various 'offices' of the Affair, which supposedly depend on a 'single management', is 'profit and enrichment' and, ultimately, the 'preservation' of its powers. The book described in detail the influence of international Zionism on the politics of Israel […], as well as his shrewd efforts to subvert both socialist states and new nation states. He also dealt at length with the so-called branching network of Zionist propaganda outlets, supported by the mainstream media, which he claims was behind the creation of a Zionist propaganda network” (42).

No sooner had the Red Army crossed the border into Czechoslovakia than the official Soviet organs portrayed that country as the embodiment of the "counter-revolution", in which the Zionists played an important role (43). In the following months, they continued to denounce, with increasing vehemence, the Zionist forces which, according to the Kremlin, were at the origin of this "counter-revolution". It was not just demonstrations of anti-Zionism. When, the day after the entry of Soviet tanks into Prague, Brezhnev had summoned the Politburo of the Czechoslovak CP, Piotr Chelest, Secretary General of the Ukrainian CP, had called Kriegel, a member of the Czechoslovakian Politburo, a "Kid from Galicia". (44), “under the approving or indifferent gaze of the other Soviet leaders” (45). “If Tsarist anti-Semitism [was] displayed shamelessly, Stalinist anti-Semitism, including under […] Brezhnev, tries to camouflage itself. Sometimes the mask crumbles, but the Kremlin bureaucrats try hard never to drop it” (46). The bureaucrat Alexandrov, in a report to the secretariat of the central committee, denounced the over-representation of Jews in Russian cinema, “just capable of thriving like parasites” (47). It was not just a question of words: thus, for example, on October 28, 1973, the police prevented a group of Lithuanian Jews from laying wreaths at the place where the National Socialists and the Lithuanian nationalists had shot dead Jews in 1941 near Kaunas. In 1974,

But why then, in 1981, did Brezhnev, as noted above, officially condemn anti-Semitism and, to begin with, just as officially acknowledge its very existence in Russia?

“Two distinct, although complementary, hypotheses can be put forward. The first is related to external considerations, the second, much more crucial, to internal factors. The urgent need to restore the image of the Soviet Union, seriously tarnished by the public revelations of the Kremlin's virulent anti-Semitic propaganda campaign, was to be made clear to Soviet decision-makers. The Council of Europe in Strasbourg had officially documented this campaign, as had an Australian parliamentary inquiry. At the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, held in Madrid in November and December 1980, several delegates, including the Belgian René Panis, took up the accusations of anti-Semitism made against the Soviet Union. In fact, the communication from the Belgian was one of the few, during the Madrid meeting, to enrage the Soviet delegates: they vigorously denied the existence of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, which provoked laughter from the other participants. The leaders of the Kremlin could very well have calculated that, in order for the relations of the USSR with the West, which had deteriorated following the adventure of Moscow in Afghanistan, to improve, they had to stop take extreme anti-Semitic positions. It is significant that Brezhnev vigorously underlined the value of detente several times in his speech, notably observing that 'the vital interests of the European peoples' require following the 'path… which was charted in Helsinki'. The Madrid process, he said, must continue 'without interruption'. Brezhnev's public acknowledgment and denial of Soviet anti-Semitism could presumably contribute to this process. It is certain that the Kremlin badly needs to polish its image” (49).

The second hypothesis is indeed much more crucial: "Exactly two years before Brezhnev's speech at the party congress, on February 23, 1979, a six-page typewritten article filled with anti-Semitic invectives had been placed in all the mailboxes of Moscow and distributed in Leningrad. What was striking about this article was that it openly referred to Brezhnev and seven of his Politburo associates as 'Kremlin Zionists' (50). »

“Impossible in the USSR” because it is “prohibited by law and constitutes a crime”; such was Gorbachev's answer to the question posed to him by a journalist from L'Humanité in February 1986, Gorbachev, a year after his appointment as head of the Party, to know whether anti-Semitism existed in the USSR Indeed, Article 123 of the Constitution of the Soviet Union (1936) provides that The equality of rights of citizens of the USSR without distinction of nationality and race, in all spheres of economic, public, cultural, social and political life is a immutable law. Any direct or indirect restriction of rights, or conversely, the establishment of direct or indirect privileges for citizens according to the race and nationality to which they belong, as well as any propaganda of exclusivism or hatred and racial or national disdain, are punishable by law”; moreover, under Article 74 of the Russian Criminal Code, reproduced in the criminal code of each Soviet republic (51), incitement to hatred or hostility between members of the "national community" was a a crime punishable by imprisonment for several years (52). At a plenum of the Party Central Committee in January 1987 and in his bookPerestroika , published the same year, Gorbachev dismissed anti-Semitism and Zionism back to back, calling them examples of unacceptable forms of national chauvinism (53), in tune with the Declaration of the International Conference on Zionism and Anti-Semitism held at United Nations Headquarters in April 1986 (54).

February 1, 1988 marked a dramatic turning point: Pravda , "breaking with past official pronouncements" of the Soviet press organs (55), categorically condemned anti-Semitism; the newspaper accused the Russian nationalist organization Pamyat of anti-Semitism and derided its thesis of a Judeo-Masonic plot to dominate the world. He "stigmatized not only the overt anti-Semitism of far-right groups, such as the Pamyat , who blame Jews for all the country's past and present problems, but also that of Russian nationalists who use anti-Semitism in their efforts to revive Russian culture” (56). He was preparing the ground for the Kremlin.

On October 2, 1991, the Washington Postreports the information, little taken up by other media, according to which, during a meeting with American Jewish leaders the same day in Moscow, Gorbachev had admitted that anti-Semitism was a problem in the Soviet Union, but that he did not did not consider it a “deep disease” in society; as for the American Jewish leaders in question, they acknowledged that progress had been made in matters of "emigration and in granting freedoms to synagogues, Hebrew schools and other Jewish institutions"; he had, however, refused to make a public statement condemning anti-Semitism, which Russian and American Jewish leaders had long demanded, because, bizarre justification, "he didn't think it would serve anyone's interests to single out anyone in particular" (57). Their patience would be rewarded. A few weeks later, the faithful adviser to the Russian president, Aleksandr Yakovlev, responsible for representing him at the ceremony commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the Babi Yar massacre, read a statement by Gorbachev in which Babi Yar was presented as "an appeal to politicians of our time to be vigilant, to remember everywhere and at all times that they have been given the power to serve the people, that immoral politics should never have a place in the world. The Nazis speculated on the lowest feelings, jealousy, national intolerance and hatred. They used anti-Semitism to infect people's minds with racism… The Stalinist bureaucracy, which publicly dissociated itself from anti-Semitism, actually used it as a means of isolating the country from the outside and to strengthen its dictatorial position” (58). Already clearly affected by various disorders, including those of the memory, the ventriloquist did not fail to perorate on the "venomous germs of anti-Semitism" and to "draw from the history of the persecution of the Jews a warning against the resurgence of 'nationalist excesses' in this country and elsewhere in Europe" (59). The media slogan that anti-Semitism is on the rise has been familiar to Western Europeans for a good decade; he was drummed into the Russians by the which publicly dissociated itself from anti-Semitism, in fact used it as a means of isolating the country from the outside and of reinforcing its dictatorial position” (58). Already clearly affected by various disorders, including those of the memory, the ventriloquist did not fail to perorate on the "venomous germs of anti-Semitism" and to "draw from the history of the persecution of the Jews a warning against the resurgence of 'nationalist excesses' in this country and elsewhere in Europe" (59). The media slogan that anti-Semitism is on the rise has been familiar to Western Europeans for a good decade; he was drummed into the Russians by the which publicly dissociated itself from anti-Semitism, in fact used it as a means of isolating the country from the outside and of reinforcing its dictatorial position” (58). Already clearly affected by various disorders, including those of the memory, the ventriloquist did not fail to perorate on the "venomous germs of anti-Semitism" and to "draw from the history of the persecution of the Jews a warning against the resurgence of 'nationalist excesses' in this country and elsewhere in Europe" (59). The media slogan that anti-Semitism is on the rise has been familiar to Western Europeans for a good decade; he was drummed into the Russians by the including those of memory, the ventriloquist did not fail to perorate on the "venomous germs of anti-Semitism" and to "draw from the history of the persecution of the Jews a warning against the current resurgence of 'nationalist excesses' in this country and elsewhere in Europe” (59). The media slogan that anti-Semitism is on the rise has been familiar to Western Europeans for a good decade; he was drummed into the Russians by the including those of memory, the ventriloquist did not fail to perorate on the "venomous germs of anti-Semitism" and to "draw from the history of the persecution of the Jews a warning against the current resurgence of 'nationalist excesses' in this country and elsewhere in Europe” (59). The media slogan that anti-Semitism is on the rise has been familiar to Western Europeans for a good decade; he was drummed into the Russians by the The media slogan that anti-Semitism is on the rise has been familiar to Western Europeans for a good decade; he was drummed into the Russians by the The media slogan that anti-Semitism is on the rise has been familiar to Western Europeans for a good decade; he was drummed into the Russians by thePravda since 1988.

Yeltsin, in a televised interview after his electoral victory in May 1990, deplored anti-Semitism and declared that Russian organizations promoting fascism would be outlawed (60). On February 24, 1999, the members of the European Affairs Subcommittee of the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, during its first session (61), entitled "Anti-Semitism in Russia", congratulated themselves that " Yeltsin attended the inauguration ceremonies of the Synagogue of the Holocaust in Victory Park in Moscow in the first days of September [1998]. He was the first Russian head of state to attend a Jewish event this century,” recalled that "President Yeltsin has repeatedly denounced anti-Semitism and has formed a special commission to combat the rise of anti-Semitism in the country", while deploring that "this is not enough for the moment. [He and the local figures who support him] must continue to take concrete action against those who violate Russian law. We call on the Russian government to strictly enforce the laws that are already in place prohibiting participation in racist activities and we hope that it will take strong action”; they lamented even more that "Communist Duma deputies rejected the motion to ban the use of Nazi symbolism, used by fascist groups." On March 23 of the same year, concurrent Senate Resolution No. 19 “Concerning anti-Semitic statements made by members of the Duma of the Russian Federation” specifically targeted “the Chairman of the Duma Security Committee and member of the Communist Party, Viktor Ilyukhin”, who , in December 1998, “accused President Yeltsin's 'Jewish entourage' of being responsible for an alleged 'genocide against the Russian people'” (62). Nothing shows that Yeltsin gave in to American blackmail. “Although he relied to some extent on Jewish advisers (63), Yeltsin never actively defended Jews against Russian extremists and several prominent politicians […] openly used anti-Semitic rhetoric in their political campaigns” (64).

If, provided that we manage to picture the picture that has just been drawn of the attitudes and policies of the Russian presidents of the 20th century with regard to the Jews like a sky, Gorbachev appears as a real UFO, Putin, whose advanced judeophilia (65) is not taken into account in the analyzes of Bolton (66), holds the extra-terrestrial.
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