

Lev Tikhomirov on the Jews, Revolution and The “People's Will”

Translated and Introduced by
Matthew Raphael Johnson,
Johnstown, PA

Abstract:

Lev Tikhomirov remains almost entirely unknown among English-language readers. There is very good reason for this. He was a member of the terrorist cell “People's Will,” the group who murdered tsar Alexander II in 1881. Tikhomirov, seeing that he was one of the only non-Jewish members of the group, and appalled by the loathsome murder of a highly popular tsar, he abandoned the revolution and became one of the most articulate defenders of monarchy and the Orthodox church before World War I.

Revolutionary terrorism became a fact of life in Russia by 1870. For the most part, the terror cells were small. Their ideology had an esoteric and exoteric nature. The exoteric doctrine was couched in the language of popular demands, or demands as viewed by the left. The real doctrine, the hidden core, was kept only for initiates. This was essential in Dostoevsky's novel *The Possessed*. Dostoevsky himself a former revolutionary, knew this first hand. The popular press reports the exoteric doctrine only.

One of the myths about revolutions and leftist violence is that they are part of a campaign for equality and are directed against the elites. Leftist revolutions without exception have been elite driven and motivated by secular ideologies. Without fail, they create a clique of rulers with absolute claim to rule, a claim known to initiates during the initial phase of terror. The elite often go to great pains to hide their involvement. History texts are littered with revolutionary conspiracies that seem to come from nowhere and are organized with great precision seemingly from that same void.

In Russia, terrorism became a way of life. It was almost exclusively Jewish and made up of the highest and most wealthy elites of urban society. These groups are only rarely understood because of the deliberate misreporting of the groups purpose and goals by journalists and historians of all stripes. However, the unanimous testimony of former revolutionaries from Dostoevsky and Tikhomirov to Whitaker Chambers speaks of a deliberate plan of subterfuge and elitism.

The “Narodnaya Volya”

The most violent and amoral terror organization in Russia was the “People's Will” (Народная воля), the group who murdered tsar Alexander II in 1881. Its membership was almost entirely Jewish, and included members Vera Figner (its leader), Gesia Gelfman, Lyudmila Volkenstein, Pavel Axelrod, Mikhail Ashenbrenner, Lev Sternberg (Chaim Leiba), and Alexander Shtromberg. In fact, “Narodnaya Volya” could be called a Jewish ethnic movement without distortion or exaggeration.

While some will do doubt recoil at the above statements, one need not be a Black

Hundred royalist to see both the Jewish nature of these groups and the fact that many are financed by the elite. The godfather of Russian anarchism, Mikhail Bakunin wrote:

Himself a Jew, Marx has around him, in London and France, but especially in Germany, a multitude of more or less clever, intriguing, mobile, speculating Jews, such as Jews are everywhere: commercial or banking agents, writers, politicians, correspondents for newspapers of all shades, with one foot in the bank, the other in the socialist movement, and with their behinds sitting on the German daily press — they have taken possession of all the newspapers — and you can imagine what kind of sickening literature they produce. Now, this entire Jewish world, which forms a single profiteering sect, a people of bloodsuckers, a single gluttonous parasite, closely and intimately united not only across national borders but across all differences of political opinion — this Jewish world today stands for the most part at the disposal of Marx and at the same time at the disposal of Rothschild. I am certain that Rothschild for his part greatly values the merits of Marx, and that Marx for his part feels instinctive attraction and great respect for Rothschild (Bakunin, Works: vol III).

“People's Will” advocated mass extermination and the erection of a totalitarian police state ruling from a central capital. Advocating total nationalization of land in public while promising the peasants private property was quite typical of leftist double-speak at the time. Lenin claimed to desire the redistribution of land to peasants while privately advocating collectivization.

In his famous 1956 book on Russian revolutionary terror, A. Yarmolinsky writes,

When the Party's [People's Will] fortunes were at this low ebb there occurred a significant and rather paradoxical shift in its ideology. The issue of its organ dated 5 February, 1882, contained a striking statement. If the masses spontaneously effect a social revolution, at the time when the conspirators seize political power, the leading article read, then the task of the Provisional Government will be merely 'to sanction the economic equality wrested by the people from their age-old oppressors and exploiters.' But the people may fail to act. In that case the Provisional Government will not only establish a free political order but will make an economic revolution by abolishing the right of private property in land and other means of production. Only then will the Constituent Assembly be made up of 'true representatives of the people (Yarmolinsky, 1956: ch 16).

Such scholarly admissions are not common. The above quote does not develop why or how such views are “striking” or “paradoxical.” Yarmolinsky refuses to come to the conclusion that the “scholarly community” has failed for decades to grasp even the most elementary ideas of these groups, refusing to be critical concerning their public statements. In chapter 11, he states:

It was plain that, as Kravcbinsky put it, socialist propaganda was making no more impression on the masses than a beanshooter would on a stone wall. Why had they

failed to win the ear of the peasant? Had their message been too remote for his needs? Was there something basically wrong with their whole outlook?

The solution was to “organize” with greater focus on centralization. Without mentioning the strange lack of an answer to this question, the author glosses over the fact that the group merely concluded that its propaganda machine was not powerful enough. The fact is that the “masses” or the “people” are whoever the left demands that it be. The fact that people are mere “masses” to the revolutionaries shows just how little they value their humanity.

The “Pogroms”

Since the pogroms come up constantly as a way to excuse leftist terrorism and shift attention elsewhere, some historical light should be shed on them. It is argued that the pogrom was a mindless attack on Jews by Russian “monarchists” and “Black Hundred” fanatics after the murder of tsar Alexander. Jews were totally innocent, unarmed victims, and the attacks were merely an example of “scapegoating.” To add insult to fantasy, all of this was allegedly financed by the “Russian government.” No mainline publication in English rejects this view.

First of all, the “pogroms” in the 1880s-1890s had nothing to do with the assassination of Alexander. Jewish militias have existed in cities like Odessa for much of the middle 19th century. Millions of Jews lived in Odessa, probably the most Jewish city in the world at the time. The militias were there to protect Jewish capital. Police reports are consistent that leftist organizations alone benefited from the violence and are likely the culprits.

More importantly, about 1 million Jews lived in western Ukraine by 1890. Some cities were entirely Jewish in composition. Beginning in the 1870s, Jews had bought much of the region, serving as absentee landlords and controlling the labor of Christian peasants. Contrary to the myth that Jews could not own land, they, in fact, possessed almost 50,000 Christians as “serfs” on their properties. Though serfdom had been abolished, contemporaries report that the Jewish absentee landlords exploited their peasants far worse than during serfdom (Platonov, 2005).

The results were not pogroms, but riots and shootouts. Of the dead, by 1900, about 45% were Jewish. The first time pogroms occurred were in Odessa from 1821 to 1871. These, of course, were not “pogroms” against Jews, but were riots between Greek and Jewish merchants. Of the 150 cities where “pogroms” occurred after the murder of Alexander II, 19 Jews were reported killed, while the western press said that “millions” were slaughtered. Pobedonostsev and Russian conservatives condemned the violence, and official society was sympathetic to the Jews (RNE, 2006).

Jewish historian YI Hesse says the pogroms at this time were created by the “populists” and other terror cells seeking to provoke general confusion and sympathy for the Jewish cause. In fact, Hesse argues that, in total, the “pogroms” after the Jewish murder of Alexander led to 2 Jewish deaths. Hesse writes: “Indeed, the Jewish population of the southern provinces are in prosperous economic conditions. However, local peasants are extremely poor. Since Jews took most of the land and raised rent significantly, life became unbearable for the peasants.” (Quoted in Platonov, 2005).

Official documents from the municipalities of Odessa, Kiev and Kishinev have been deliberately overlooked in the absurd American analyses of the “pogroms.” Odessa was the hotbed of Marxism in southern Russia, and was also the most Jewish city in the empire. On

October 18 1905, in the midst of the Russo-Japanese war, a series of huge and violent communist rallies featured thousands of armed Jewish youths. Without any government interference, the Jewish militias engaged in extorting shop owners of all backgrounds to finance the Red cause. In the inevitable clash with Russian patriots, the local press universally reported that unarmed Jews were attacked by “Black Hundred” activists for no reason. To this day no English language article or book has reported anything but the official view.

One of these October rallies in Odessa featured the defacing of a portrait of Nicolas II by a communist lawyer named Reithman. Clearly a deliberate provocation, armed Jews were ready for the ensuing fighting between Russians and Jews. On November 14, 1905, armed Jewish groups looted Odessa for the sake of funding the revolution. The few police on duty were shot at, while the nearest military regiment was ordered to stand down. Once the troops were withdrawn, the “people's militia” created a “Provisional Government” and engaged in expropriation of gentile property. Shortly after, an unarmed royalist demonstration was met with a hail of Jewish bullets. Several were killed, and among the injured were 200 Russians and 70 Jews. This was reported in the western press as an “anti-Jewish” pogrom.

Lev Tikhomirov

Lev Tikhomirov (1852-1923) is one of the great rightist thinkers in the late Russian empire. The lack of work available to the English-speaking reader is lamentable, especially given the significance of his work to the anti-revolutionary cause during and after World War I. What makes him more important than most in this field is that he was once a member of the “People's Will.”

Tikhomirov spoke of the Jewish, ultra-elite membership of the group, the curious non-existence of law enforcement, and their ability to travel abroad with no problem. Awash in foreign funds, the most violent of terror cells was romanticized by both the Russian press of the day and the corrupt academic elite in America.

As a member of the “People's Will,” Tikhomirov was arrested and imprisoned in 1873 for his activities. In 1888, while in a very comfortable Swiss exile, he wrote “Why I am No Longer a Revolutionary” which marked his move to royalism and Orthodoxy. After the senseless murder of tsar Alexander, the nature of the “revolutionaries” was made clear.

Translated here is a brief part of his (1913) *The Philosophical and Religious Doctrine of History* (Религиозно-философские основы истории). It comprises important passages from Section VII, “the New Israel” and a brief passage on the Kabbalah from section IV (chapter 28). It is a fairly complete view of his developing concept of Jews and their role in the revolution.

All errors in translation are mine alone, and I am quite sure there are many—MRJ

“The New Israel”

The new Judaism seems to have no real belief system. The idea of the Cabala is pantheistic while the authors of the Talmud are pagans. The problem is that a belief system for Jews is not considered important: only actions are. Following the law is the fulness of the law. What is God? For the modern Jew, it is the uncertainty of all doctrine, from the Cabala to the

tablets of Moses the Law Giver. It leaves the Jew with only action.

How is it then the mission of the Jews to give a better picture of a God they do not know? Their view of the law is in contradiction to the Old Testament prophetic tradition. Not merely external observance was required, but also internal transformation. Jeremiah wrote: "I will put my law in their minds and write it on their hearts. I will be their God, and they will be my people. . . No longer will they teach their neighbor, or say to one another, 'Know the Lord,' because they will all know me, from the least of them to the greatest" (Jeremiah 31: 33-34). Thus, not knowing God means that one cannot follow him. One cannot love that which one does not know.

What sort of morality can be based on Jewish cosmopolitanism? Judaism has faith, it exists with some trace knowledge of God but still functions as a mechanical application of legal norms. Legalism knows no love: the inner man is not affected. The law can be followed as a result of training, habit or the desire for social esteem. This is no longer a virtue.

Christianity says you have to believe in certain doctrines as true, and, by virtue of that, action follows. The new Jewry says that one can believe as one pleases. But this point of view destroys man as a moral person. Following the law in this case is a purely formal rather than a moral act. Moses Mendelssohn says that "the state and religion are one" and "the relation of man to God and to society completely integrated."

But how can this be? Is God and society the same? Even if we assume that God dwells in social life, his presence in the church is not of this type regardless. Christians do not venerate the social body. However, once the church and the social body become one, God is quickly forgotten. The point is that the new Jewry is completely at odds with the view of the ancient Jews.

Ancient Judaism was based on the knowledge of God that could then be spread to others. Today, they cannot teach what they do not know, meaning that Judaism is now reduced to "pure morality." Jewish morals centers around carrying out the proper acts. This is done at the same time their own supremacy as people is preached. This means that one morality exists for Jews and another for the rest of us.

Conversion is impossible, since converts are not genetically related to "Abraham." A foreigner cannot believe in Jewish supremacy since it limits the rights of all non-Jews. Becoming a Jew is not about faith, but about genetic inheritance. In the Talmud, Rabbi Akiba argues that the rabbis knew God better than the prophets due to the universality of the rabbinic message while the prophets spoke only to the local community.

One crucial doctrine of the new Jews is their concern with individual freedom. Freedom in social life was initially connected with the idea of Jewish domination. The old religious idea of the Messiah is replaced by the notion of the Messianic aspect of the Jewish people, showing the total merger of religion and state. Law matters, not God. This means that Jews matter alone since they are both the executors of the law and the genetic descendants from those for which it was made.

This ideological nonsense will produce the Antichrist walking "in his own name." The Jews reject the Messiah, and their own god is born, by definition, as anti-Christ. However, this development has not been unanimously accepted by all Jews. If this conception of Israel takes over, then it negates the Old Testament and the legitimate good the old religion can offer. Their world mission is not based on knowledge of God but on the destruction of others. This is the origin of the Antichrist, or he who comes in his own name, rather than in God's.

The work of the lawyers did not follow Moses or the prophets. Without question, the

entire Jewish loyalty to the “Old Testament” exists because it does not contain Christ. The awesome inner strength of the Jewish leaders would never have maintained coherence without some elements of the Old Books. Without them, his power is minimal. Yet, the duality of faith remains.

The new Judaism claims that there is no Jewish dogma and that God can be thought of as anything. However, Jews were, at one time, taught their creed, which reads:

1. I believe that God is One and there is no other like Him.
2. He is incomprehensible and infinite in His unity.
3. He is incorporeal.
4. He was before the world.
5. I believe that Yahweh gave the Law to the people of Israel through the great prophet Moses, his faithful servant.
6. I believe that the Lord will reward each according to his works.
7. I believe that in the last days, before the end of the world, the Lord will send us His Savior, the Redeemer.
8. I believe that Yahweh will resurrect the dead.

Jews used to study the bible, but now, they study the rabbis. He hears about God's care for his people. . . the Law was associated with ritual worship and legal regulations, customary holidays, Saturday observance, etc, has not removed some trace element of God from the Jews. It is not possible to claim, however, that through these rules and laws the Jew comes to God. He does not.

The Talmud has cut the Jews off from the rest of humanity. In actual action, the law can contain the essential ties that bind man to God. However, Scriptures are something else, since brotherhood in that case is fraternity under a single Father. Now, the rabbis interpret Scriptures to the detriment of others and even refer to the goyim as animals. Yet, the kernel of old truth here can still be revived. . .

In the Christian era the Jews maintained their two historical features: earthly power and self-less service to an ideal. One motivated the apostles, the other, the Pharisees. Looking into modern Jewry, we can say that the legacy of the Pharisees has dominated. But we also see a part not looking for earthly rewards, but truth. At the moment when the fate of the world will reach its end the Jews will show both of these traits to the full.

**Tikhomirov says in chapter 43,
relative to the origin of anti-Judaic persecution:**

Spanish Jews were free at one time. However, seeking to destroy Christianity, they supported the Arian movement. When the monarchs of the Germanic Visigoths rejected Arianism, they, naturally, restricted Jewish preaching. Jews, now not permitted to own Christian slaves, saw themselves “oppressed.” The Jews, to retaliate, used the developing Islamic juggernaut as a means to restore their freedom. They assisted the Islamic conquerors, treacherously the Christian populations as they opened the city gates. They did this in Toledo and Christians were massacred as a result. . . .

The Jews were closely organized in each country, and the international Jewish

organizations were in constant communication, warning about possible persecution, offering asylum and assisting one another in economics. This network gave Judaism its power. His support for trade was international and designed especially for him. This was the cause of his rule in economic life and was resented by the non-Jewish population. Rulers, however, loved the access to easy credit.

The Jewish international was well organized. Powerful Jews created a financial network as early as the 18th century. Moses Mendelssohn and Moses Montefiore dominated in the 19th century. They were known as the “Jewish princes,” just as Theodore Herzl is today. Some communities are secret, but a purely and totally cosmopolitan Jewish financial network was created by Montefiore.

Moses Montefiore, from Spain, bet on the loss of Napoleon and made his fortune. His network was essential. Strictly observing all the requirements of Jewish law, he could pass for an enlightened European. Jewish goals were covered over as “philanthropy.” The strength of the network was its ability to use external and superficial flattery to make powerful friends. Their “philanthropy” was based solely on what was good for all factions of Judaism, not a party.

This network joined with groups of heretics and enemies of Christ, hiding their hostility behind the criticism of official church behavior. Protestants and their offshoots merged perfectly with Jewish interests. They gradually distorted the Christian idea. Jews made friends with every heretical group. The Albigensian sect and the Hussites were both financed by Jews. They fought against Spain in the Netherlands. Cromwell gave them safe harbor in England as a rebel and regicide. The protests against the Roman Catholic hierarchy, the enemies of Christianity transferred these protests to Christianity itself.

The modern revolutions emancipated the Jews, making them a privileged nation. The basic idea of the revolutionary state structure was that the private union or guild was abolished. The Guilds undermined Jews by matching their coherence. Under the revolution, French unions were banned. Napoleon in 1806 gathered the Jewish Sanhedrin with the full compliment of 71 members. This administration had as its official goal of supervision over Jews, but this was merely the restoration of peculiar Jewish government. So as the Christians were atomized, the Jews became more cohesive. Nations were passe as Jews increased the power of their international network.

From Chapter 28:

The Kabbalah is part of the occult doctrine undermining the foundations of the Christian system. It is supposed to be “reformatory” and “revolutionary” as opposed to the older Christian concept. Human freedom is placed against the idea of hierarchy, or the submission to the will of God. Along with Gnosticism, secret societies take their material from Kabbalah. However, it is not “democratic” but aristocratic as a system. It is the oppressive system of submission to the Rabbis that is advocated.

For this movement, there is no power greater than that of man. For Kabbalah, inequality is enshrined, since nature herself obeys the rabbinical magician. Some people are better endowed in the magical arts than others. Those less sensitive need to be ruled. This is not productive, but a “mystic aristocracy” of magical control of the elements. Soon, a “dynasty” formed about the Hasidic elite in which magical ability was concentrated.

Therefore, the Kabbalistic idea is far from democratic. Freemasonry is not either, but

claims submission to secret “higher elites.” It is remarkable that the “higher initiates” have no open political power, since they rule by influence only. They have the ability to hypnotize their followers. The higher degrees of Masonry show these “secret” abilities in certain human beings.

In Judaism, there has long existed the notion that “God's Chosen” of Israel has stronger “prophetic abilities” because of their racial descent from Abraham. These traits for the Kabbalah are found only in the Jews. Hence, this kind of gnosticism is removed from the European views and is about the global influence of Jewish elites. Its existence, in other words, coincides with the growth of Jewish influence on a global scale.

Bibliography:

Тихомиров, Льва (1923) Религиозно-философские основы истории. “Москва” 1997 год (1997 Edition from the Journal “Moscow”)

(М. Смолин. Всеобъемлющий идеал Льва Тихомирова)

Belfer, E (1978) Zemlya vs. Volya. From Narodnichestvo to Marxism. Soviet Studies, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 297-312

Ascher, A (1965) Pavel Axelrod: A Conflict between Jewish Loyalty and Revolutionary Dedication. Russian Review, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 249-265

Yarmolinsky, Avrahm (1956) *Road to Revolution: A Century of Russian Radicalism*. Princeton University Press

Bakunin, Michael, 1871. Personliche Beziehungen zu Marx. In: Gesammelte Werke, B3, Berlin 1924: 204-216 (quoted from The Libertarian Socialist Collective)

Russian Unity Party. The Truth on the Pogroms, 2006 (unsigned article in Russian)

Platonov, Oleg. (2005) Myths and Truths on the Pogroms. (Мифы и правда о погромах). «Издательство “Яуза”» Пресском