

Self-Indulgent Historical Mythology: The Fantasy of Stalin's "Antisemitic Russian Nationalism"

Matthew Raphael Johnson
Johnstown, PA

Almost without exception, American and western historians paint Stalin as both a "Russian nationalist" and an "Anti-Semite." The latter especially is believed without question. Stalin is presented this way because it allowed the western left to oppose the USSR in good conscience. Nationalism was universally hated by the ruling class from campus anarchists to corporate billionaires, hence, to recast Stalin as one is to make him non-socialist. Communism as a vague ideology was never a problem in the minds of the US the State Department or western corporate capital. Obviously, since corporate capital built the USSR, socialism was part of the profit structure of American capitalism.¹ Only nationalism was to be fought. Therefore, allowing Stalin to be hated by the left required him to be recast as a nationalist and anti-Semite. As with all American academic dogma, this is false.

The myth has been deliberately created. Jewish writers need the gentiles to believe that Hitler and Stalin were the same, lest they be forced to admit that Jews in the USSR slaughtered Christians. By claiming that Stalin was anti-Jewish, they can blunt this claim and argue that the Jews were also targeted. The fact is that the USSR was largely Jewish, based far more on Jewish ethnic identity than Marxism (and certainly had nothing to do with labor). Stalin continued this trend and backed Jewish ethnic interests indirectly throughout his life.

Stalin was a philo-Semite to the core. In his "Reply to an Inquiry of the Jewish News Agency in the United States" in 1931, Stalin write:

National and racial chauvinism is a vestige of the misanthropic customs characteristic of the period of cannibalism. Antisemitism, as an extreme form of racial chauvinism, is the most dangerous vestige of cannibalism. Antisemitism is of advantage to the exploiters as a lightning conductor that deflects the blows aimed by the working people at capitalism. Antisemitism is dangerous for the working people as being a false path that leads them off the right road and lands them in the jungle. Hence Communists, as consistent internationalists, cannot but be irreconcilable, sworn enemies of Antisemitism. In the U.S.S.R. Antisemitism is punishable with the utmost severity of the law as a phenomenon deeply hostile to the Soviet system. Under U.S.S.R. law active anti-Semites are liable to the death penalty (Pravda, No. 329, November 30, 1936).

This was never eliminated in Stalin's mind. The struggle against "cosmopolitanism" was due to the fact that Soviet science and culture developed since Peter I in admiration for the West. Cosmopolitanism in Stalin's mind refereed to the fact that there was one scientific technique that was universal in scope. For him, there was a socialist and a bourgeois science. This is true as far as it goes, but has nothing to do with the Jews. This was one of Stalin's preoccupations.

¹ See my article, "Our Kind of Enemy: American Capital's Love Affair with Soviet Communism." Radix: A Journal of the National Policy Institute, June 4 2015. As with the substantial work of Anthony Sutton and Kerry Bolton, I expose the massive role western corporations played in the building of the USSR. This remains the most incredible open secret of 20th century history.

Stalin had three wives, all of them Jews. His first wife was Elizabeth Svanidze who bore Jacob. After that, Kadya Allevijah, also Jewish, had Basil and one daughter Svetlana. No one is quite sure how his second wife died. His third was the sister of Lazar Kaganovich, Rosa. It is worth mentioning that Svetlana married four times, three of them Jewish men. Molotov's daughter (herself Jewish from her mother) was engaged to be married to Basil Stalin (Sebag-Montefiore, 2005: 266-269).

Through the purges, Jews remained in control of the Stalinist system. Through 1934 – 1946, the secret police was made up of, ethnically speaking: Jews: 39 % Russians and Ukrainians: 36 % Latvians, Germans, Poles: 14% Others: 12%. Jews made up less than 1% of the Russian population of the day.

Even in absolute numbers, the Jews. . . made up the largest group in the leadership of the Stalinist Secret Police. The Russian myth of the "Jewish NKWD" thus had a factual basis. The Nazis, who knew precisely of these facts, used it for their propaganda purposes of the Jewish-Bolshevik terror regime that they felt obligated to destroy (from Petrow and Skorkin, 1999).

While it is true that these numbers changed by the middle of the war, this has more to do with German killings and Soviet disorganization than anything else. Tens of thousands were captured as partisans and commissars, interrogated, and shot by the German *Einsatzgruppen*, who were created to pacify the areas conquered by the *Wehrmacht*.

Stalin was never an anti-Semite and never spoke in favor of it at any level at all. Throughout his life, Dzhugashvili fought for power in the party, and was guided only by personal power interests and not the interests of the Jews, or of any other nationality in the country. Even to the end of his life, Stalin did not become a Russian or Georgian nationalist, as evidenced by the destruction of those groups long before.

After the Bolshevik Revolution, about 90% of management positions were occupied by Jews. Therefore, any purge of the party was automatically a purge of Jewish activists. The Central Committee of the CPSU in the March 1939 showed an increase of Jewish representation compared with February 1934. In 1937-1938 there were 29,000 documented arrests by the NKVA, of which Jews were 1%, which is extraordinary given their dominance of the party. In Kevin MacDonald's excellent review of Solzhenitsyn's *200 Years Together*, he summarizes the writer's ideas this way:

Solzhenitsyn shows that there were fewer Jews in the party elite after the purge of Trotsky and his predominantly Jewish followers. However, the purge was “absolutely not anti-Jewish.” There remained very powerful Jews, notably Lazar Kaganovich who played such an important role in the mass murders of the period. While comprising less than 1% of the population, Jews were around one-sixth of the Communist Party membership and around 33%–40% of top party positions. Stalin assigned a Jew, Yakovlev-Epshtein, to the top administrative position in charge of collectivization (labeled by Solzhenitsyn “the destruction of the way of life of the people”), and notes several other Jews who worked under him. After listing dozens of Jews with high-level positions throughout the economy, Solzhenitsyn concludes that “Soviet Jews obtained a weighty share of state, industrial, and economic power at all levels of government in the USSR.” Similarly, in diplomacy, “Just as in the 1920s diplomacy attracted a cadre of

Jews, so it did through the early and mid-1930s.” Indeed, even after the purges, when Molotov took over the People’s Commissariat of Foreign Affairs in 1939, he publicly announced during a meeting with diplomatic personnel that he “will deal with the synagogue here,” and that he began firing Jews on the very same day (MacDonald, 2010).

The leaders of all the socialist countries of Eastern Europe created after the war were Jewish tyrants created by Stalin. The Romanian head of KP became orthodox Jewess Ana Pauker, the head of the Czech party was the Jew Rudolf Slansky. The chief of the Hungarian party became a close friend of Stalin and a Bolshevik internationalist, the Jew Matyas Rakosi (Rosencrantz). His closest assistants were Zoltan Gera Vaz and Hérault (Singer) also Jews. In Poland, the unofficial dictator became a Jew Jacob Berman, along with his three henchmen that ran the party, all Jews: Mink, Skryzhevski and Modzelev. Although officially Jews were only 3% of the population of Eastern European socialist countries, the Jews took them all the bureaucratic ladder from top to bottom and is practically a ruling privileged caste.

A third of the Stalin Prize received the Jews in the postwar period. Among them: the writers Samuil Marshak (1942, 1946, 1949, 1951), Ilya Ehrenburg (1942, 1948, 1951), Emmanuel Kazakevich (1948, 1950), Michael Isakovsky (1943, 1949) and others; filmmakers: Julius Reisman (1941, 1943, 1946 - twice, 1950, 1952), singer Mark Reizen (1941, 1949, 1951), actor Igor Ilyinsky (1941, 1942, 1951), the composer Dmitri Shostakovich (1941, 1942, 1946, 1950, 1952), Reinhold Gliere (1946, 1948, 1950), the violinist David Oistrakh (1943), cartoonist Boris Efimov (1950, 1951) and many others. This is “Stalinist antisemitism.” (Makarov, 2010).

In this regard, Solzhenitsyn writes:

No, the official Soviet atmosphere of 1930s was absolutely free of ill will toward Jews. And until the war, the overwhelming majority of Soviet Jewry sympathized with the Soviet ideology and sided with the Soviet regime.” Indeed, he cites a Jewish source noting that “At the end of 1930s, the role of the Jews in the various spheres of the Soviet life reached its apogee for the entire history of the Soviet regime (Quoted from MacDonald, 2010).

The USSR had a decisive voice on the issue of the establishment of the Israeli state in 1948, and it was used again in favor of the Jews. In addition, the Soviet Union was the first country to recognize the new Jewish state and to establish diplomatic relations with it. The Soviet Union was the only country in the world turns out to be a saving for the military aid to the Jews, not only a huge amount of weapons and military experts and volunteers.

On Stalin's orders, Molotov wrote:

Our brotherly feelings toward the Jewish people are determined by the fact that they begat the genius and the creator of the ideas of the communist liberation of Mankind,” Karl Marx; “that the Jewish people, alongside the most developed nations, brought forth countless prominent scientists, engineers, and artists [that undoubtedly had already manifested itself in the Soviet 1930s, and will be even more manifest in the post-war years], and gave many glorious heroes to the revolutionary struggle ... and in our country they gave and are still giving new, remarkable, and talented leaders and managers in all areas of development and defense of the Cause of Socialism (Quoted from Solzhenitsyn, 2002: Chapter

XIX).

This was Soviet policy. It was ingrained in the mythos of the entire empire. It is an admission that Soviet Marxism is Jewish and hence, is an ethnic rather than an economic ideology.

Solzhenitsyn describes the nature of Soviet political institutions under the purges:

Out of 25 members in the Presidium of the Central Control Commission after the 16th Party Congress (1930), 10 were Jews: A. Solts, “the conscience of the Party” (in the bloodiest years from 1934 to 1938 was assistant to Vyshinsky, the General Prosecutor of the USSR); Z. Belenky (one of the three above-mentioned Belenky brothers); A. Goltsman (who supported Trotsky in the debate on trade unions); ferocious Rozaliya Zemlyachka (Zalkind); M. Kaganovich, another of the brothers; the Chekist Trilisser; the “militant atheist” Yaroslavsky; B. Roizenman; and A.P. Rozengolts, the surviving assistant of Trotsky. If one compares the composition of the party’s Central Committee in the 1920s with that in the early 1930s, he would find that it was almost unchanged — both in 1925 as well as after the 16th Party Congress, Jews comprised around 1/6 of the membership. In the upper echelons of the communist party after the 17th Congress in 1934, Jews remained at 1/6 of the membership of the Central Committee; in the Party Control Commission — around 1/3, and a similar proportion in the Revision Commission of the Central Committee. . . . Jews made up the same proportion (1/3) of the members of the Commission of the Soviet Control. For five years filled with upheaval (1934-1939) the deputy General Prosecutor of the USSR was Grigory Leplevsky (Solzhenitsyn, 2002: Chapter XIX)

Thus, there was no purge of Jews at all. Stalin's tyranny was not directed at the Jews but was content to permit their utterly improbably dominance in Soviet institutions from cinema to police to the army. In this legend the Jews were self-interested. They sought to create around themselves an aura of the persecuted so as to achieve free immigration to Israel and to make everyone forget about the role of Jews in the revolution and the subsequent management of the country. It is also worth noting that the most faithful ally of Stalin from the beginning of the 20s until his death remained a Jew, Lazar Kaganovich, remaining faithful to him even before his death in 1991. Stalin was a promoter of Jewish interests against the Orthodox people of Russia.

Stalin was anti-Russian, as were all Soviet communists. He was quite systematic and ideological in this. It was not a matter of policy convenience. Stalin's works are available to all in English, yet they are apparently little read. He writes concerning the “heritage” of “Russian dominance” in their own country:

This heritage consists, firstly, in the survivals of dominant-nation chauvinism, which is a reflection of the former privileged position of the Great Russians.² These survivals still persist in the minds of our Soviet officials, both central and local; they are entrenched in our state institutions, central and local; they are being reinforced by the “new” Great-Russian chauvinist spirit, which is

² That the country was named “Russia” did not occur to him.

becoming stronger and stronger owing to the NEP. In practice they find expression in an arrogantly disdainful and heartlessly bureaucratic attitude on the part of Russian Soviet officials towards the needs and requirements of the national republics. The multi-national Soviet state can only become really durable, and the co-operation of the peoples within it really fraternal, only if these survivals are vigorously and irrevocably eradicated from the practice of our state institutions. Hence, the first immediate task of our Party is vigorously to combat the survivals of Great-Russian chauvinism. National Factors in Party and State Affairs (Stalin, 1923).

Stalin's stupidity is staggering. He struggles as to why Russians would dominate political offices in Russia. Even in their own country they might not be sovereign! Further, how the New Economic Program can be held accountable for "Russian nationalism" (in their own country!) is a mystery. The primary issue in this chilling statement above is that Russians were to be purged and Russian nationalism was banned (as it was in 1921). Nothing in the above quote was ever altered or removed in terms of policy or rhetoric.

At the same time, Stalin's attention was concentrated on a far more extensive and important matter. The first was the case of the Georgian nationalist movement which was smashed. The second, larger and more significant "Leningrad case" tried several Politburo members, including AA Kuznetsov (the military security chief) on charges of "Great Russian chauvinism." This was the eradication of the remnants of the Stalinist military of "patriotism" and "Russian nationalism." The total shot from the charge of "Great Russian chauvinism" were about 2,000 party leaders and many thousands were sent to the camps. Thirteen "doctors" versus thousands of Russian nationalists and yet, the mainstream press without exception calls Stalin a "Great Russian nationalist" and "antisemite."

Stalin also advocated for the slow development of a world state with a single language. At first, the socialist experiment could not hope to see this come about, but it will eventually. Stalin wrote in *Lenin and the National Question* (1929):

It would be a mistake to think that the first stage of the period of the world dictatorship of the proletariat will mark the beginning of the dying away of nations and national languages, the beginning of the formation of one common language. On the contrary, the first stage, during which national oppression will be completely abolished, will be a stage marked by the growth and flourishing of the formerly oppressed nations. . .

Only in the second stage of the period of the world dictatorship of the proletariat, to the extent that a single world socialist economy is built up in place of the world capitalist economy—only in that stage will something in the nature of a common language begin to take shape; for only in that stage will the nations feel the need to have, in addition to their own national languages, a common international language—for convenience of intercourse and of economic, cultural and political cooperation. . . .

In the next stage of the period of world dictatorship of the proletariat—when the world socialist system of economy becomes sufficiently consolidated and socialism becomes part and parcel of the life of the peoples, and when practice convinces the nations of the advantages of a common language over national languages—national differences and languages will begin to die away and make

room for a world language, common to all nations. Such, in my opinion, is the approximate picture-of the future of nations, a picture of the development-of the nations along the path to their merging in the-future (Stalin, 1929)

Ultimately, socialism would lead to common economic spaces that would, in turn, lead to a single language. Yet, “Stalin scholars” still insist that Stalin be depicted as a “Russian nationalist.” These same people also are aware that, throughout his rule, he was surrounded by a cabinet and Politburo almost 100% Jewish. This does not take away from their thesis that he was “antisemitic.” Genrikh Yagoda, a Jewish nationalist and one of Stalin's closest murderers, was a long-time Stalin ally. Another, Lazar Kaganovich, is responsible for the slaughter of millions. Since the west could not tolerate the notion of Jews killing Christians, the academic elite needed to invent the story that the “Jews suffered too” under Stalin. The truth is that they suffered, as Jews, not at all. They were the most elite and privileged caste in the USSR.

“In 1934, according to published statistics, 38.5 percent of those holding the most senior posts in the Soviet security apparatuses were of Jewish origin.” Many of these were purged later, along with thousand of gentiles. They were no purged as Jews. This “antisemite” had almost half his government of Jewish background throughout his tenure. Far more gentiles than Jews were purged (Makarov, 2010 and Solzhenitsyn, 2002).

Leonid Reichman was the NKVD's chief interrogator, which means in practice, he was the main torturer of Stalin's “antisemitic” regime. This privileged caste were in positions especially that involved torturing and murdering Christians. Hence, the Gulag system and the secret police saw a huge percentage of Jews throughout Stalin's reign. In western nations, oddly enough, it is rare to find Jews in these same professions.

Since the first generation of Soviet policemen were almost exclusively Jews, anyone can make it seem like he was attacking Jews as such. Hence, playing on public ignorance and the academic fear of believing the USSR was largely an ethnic enterprise, the Stalin myths continue. Academics publicly stating that the USSR was Jewish will lose their jobs. There is no “maybe” about that.

Connected with his alleged nationalism is the common claim that Stalin ordered the opening of many churches. Like all the other dogmas of the American academic, it is false. Mass executions of the clergy continued until 1943. In 1937-1938 106,800 priests were murdered, but from 1939-1943, 5,000 total. This counts as the “resurrection of the church” by the American academic. By 1943, only four bishops were left alive (in the mainstream church) out of 200 (Makarov, 2010).

While it is true that Stalin created a tiny “Moscow Patriarchate” to counter the Vlasov organization and others, the persecutions continued. In fact, this laughably fraudulent “church organization” was just another, more sophisticated, part of the persecution. However, for the few who remained, the Moscow sect was as close to Orthodoxy as they could hope for.

As for the Soviet church, and the pressure on it never ceased. Already in December 1944, the Regime began closing temples so that by 1949, 1150 parishes were closed along with 16 monasteries. Stalin created the “All-Union Society for dissemination of political and scientific knowledge” in 1947 for the sake of brainwashing Orthodox people. From January 1, 1947 to June 1, 1948, 679 priests were arrested. By the end of Stalin's life he closed about 1000 temples previously opened during the war.

Stalin's amendment to the Constitution of 1929 was on the prohibition of religious propaganda. This was also included in the Stalin Constitution of 1936, according to which the

believers were deprived of the right to "freedom of religious propaganda," while preserving the atheistic propaganda: it was not abolished until his death. Lenin wrote:

It is now and only now, when the hungry localities eat people and roads strewn hundreds, if not thousands, of corpses, we can (and must therefore be!) Carry out the confiscation of church valuables with the most savage and merciless energy and do not stop in front of the suppression of anything resistance (Lenin 1922a).

Stalin continued his policy. In reference to it, Stalin said in a speech,

There were then such eccentrics in our party who thought that Lenin understood the need to fight with the Church only in 1921 (laughter), and before that time, he allegedly did not understand it. This, of course, is nonsense, comrades. Lenin and I understood the need to fight the church well before 1921. The point is to link a broad mass anti-religious campaign with the struggle for the vital interests of the masses and to lead it in such a way that it is understandable by them and soon, supported by them (from Makarov, 2010).

Thus, Stalin and Lenin were identical. Not a single surviving order exist that says anything remotely about a revival of the church. Until the end of Stalin's reign the Bible and the Gospel, nor any other little bit of religious literature was available. The only reason Stalin did not resume with full force the persecution of the church after the war was the onset of the Cold War with the West. The "Soviet church" had a key and irreplaceable role in the communist propaganda and political influence abroad. That was the sole reason this "Moscow Patriarchate" existed (Makarov, 2010).

In the first class work of Kalkandjieva, she says:

Parallel with Decree No. 1325 of November 28, 1943, which allowed the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR to reopen Orthodox churches, Molotov ordered Karpov not to grant such permissions without the preliminary sanction of the government. In the period 1943–1945, believers submitted 5,770 requests for the opening of churches, but only 414 of them were granted (Kalkandjieva, 2015: 184).

Her work comes from the opening of the new Kremlin archives only recently unsealed and is anything but flattering to the ROC. However, to his credit, Sergius did reject Stalin's request to permit married bishops. On the other hand, it became very clear that ecumenism was part of the Soviet illusion of religious freedom. The first group were the naive Anglicans.

Acting as Stalin's PR adviser, FDR wrote to "Uncle Joe" and stated: "the Soviet image in the West would be improved, if they disbanded the Comintern and provided some evidence of religious freedom" (from Kalkandjieva, 179). The result was that Stalin ordered his kept bishops to "Create your own Vatican" (ibid). The result was the Patriarchate and the institution called the Council for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church (CAROC). The CAROC was the direct creation of Stalin with no input from any hierarch. Its purpose was to facilitate the connection between the NKVD and the ROC.

The bishop of York at the time was Cyril Garrett, who headed the mission to the USSR. Their reluctance to serve with Orthodox clergy did not come from any rejection of ecumenism,

but due to the undying hatred of the English for Russia. However, his subsequent book *The Truth about Religion in Russia* was as idiotic as his motives were tainted. He argued that the only reason the church was liquidated in the 1920s was their support for the monarchy. Now, under Stalin, the church is “reborn.” The BBC aired this as well, creating a mini-series that romanticized Stalin as the “religious leader” of the Russian church. The MI6 also beamed it into Eastern Europe so as to prevent any rebellion against Stalin.

Adding greater insult to this farce, the soi-distant Patriarch of Alexandria wrote: It must not be thought that the restoration of the [Moscow] Holy Synod is a political device imposed by circumstances. On the contrary it is due to an outspoken declaration of the national faith. Long before the dissolution of the Third International the Orthodox Church had assumed its rightful place (From Kalkandjieva, 2015: 190)

Soviet documents clearly show that this was written by MI6, who controlled Egypt at the time. It also shows that there was never any “Cold War” and the west, more often than not, served as the protector of Soviet interests. The emigre synod's statement, condemned by some “mainline” organizations, was accurate in that it stated this “election” existed only for political purposes. Documents uncovered by Kalkandjieva show they were right. Worse, the entire “mainline” Orthodox world recognized Stalin's church. This is a crime these jurisdictions refuse to address. Even worse was the fact that these bishops knew they were lying, but the subsidies paid from Moscow to the Middle East were large. It also created an isolated, corrupt clerical elite among the “Orthodox churches” of the Mideast and parts of Europe.

One of the important conduits of Soviet dominance over the other Orthodox sees was Princess Irina of Greece. On April 10 of 1945, Stalin met with Patriarch Alexei and laid out a plan for capturing the Orthodox world. Using the “victor over Fascism” was a major part of this movement. In addition, the minutes of this meeting also show how Alexei was to use “canonical arguments” to take all authority away from Constantinople. Due to Stalin's earlier directive, the “Orthodox Vatican” idea continues to be the Constitution of this abortion.

The CAROC was placed in charge of all efforts to bring “canonical” Orthodoxy over all the churches of the east. This was successful in Transcarpathia, western Ukraine, Czechoslovakia and unfortunately, in Poland. Soon, Finland and the Baltics were also to be forced under Moscow. None of these actions has any canonical validity for many reasons, but not the least of which is that it was merely Stalin's foreign policy only incidentally related to the church. This means that the “recognition” of Stalin's new sect was based almost entirely on financial pressure. Of course, Stalin spoke in lockstep with the MI6 in calling any anti-Soviet church “fascist.” The truth is that western media was far more enthusiastic about this than even the Soviet media.

Whenever the “canons” or church tradition got in the way of the ROC, the bishops would merely ask CAROC for assistance. They would then put “pressure” on the offending party or government, and quickly, fearing for their lives, did whatever Moscow wanted. Soon, the entire Orthodox world seemed “unified” around their Russian Marxist pope. Those dissenting were anathematized as “non-canonical.” This is the foundation of the “canonical” Orthodox church in the 20th century (the documents are collected and indexed in Kalkandjieva, 2015).

It gets worse. Metropolitan Dionysus of Poland is one of the new-martyrs of the Soviet yoke. He was also in Hitler's camps. This bishops condemned Stalin's new sect and the bishops that were Stalin's men in cassocks. These men claimed that Polish autocephaly could only come from Moscow, thus the 1924 tomos creating this church was null and void. The argument is

nonsense of course, there is nothing that suggests that Moscow can or should declare autocephaly, let alone this parody of the church. It does show the crude through process of the Church that Stalin built. Dionysus was a victim of CAROC, in that they began spreading rumors that he was a “Nazi agent” regardless of the fact that he did time in Dachau.

In 1949 the Polish Minister of Justice, G. Swentkowski, was summoned by CAROC to Moscow. The plan was then hatched that the Polish Church, which was actually the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church, would have its tomos revoked, then granted a new one from Moscow. Of course, the church was purged of “nationalists” and forced under Moscow, while still considered “autonomous” by “world Orthodoxy.” Patriarch Maximus V of Constantinople was given a check for \$50,000 American dollars, which in 1949 was an immense sum. He then kept quiet (Kalkandjieva, 2015: 226-228ff).

Another example is that of Metropolitan Seraphim (Lukyanov), who became the successor to Metropolitan Evlogius, serving under the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Seraphim was a former ROCOR bishop that had been smeared with the “collaborationist” accusation. Of course, it was collaboration with Hitler, since collaboration with Stalin was universally seen as praiseworthy. Extremely sensitive to his smear, Seraphim was seen as vulnerable. It was for this reason that he was chosen by CAROC to be the next “leader” of the ROC in the west (245).

This poor soul was forced to say the following:

The Orthodox ecumenical Church goes beyond national frontiers. Within this vast Orthodox ecumenical Church our Russian Church must occupy an honorable place as Mother of its people and Protector of other Orthodox Churches asking its support, especially the Churches of the Slav peoples who are near to us.... While calling us to him, the Patriarch allows us all Christian liberty. We may believe and profess our faith freely. He binds us by no political obligations. We may be subjects of any country and live in it (From Kalkandjieva, 2015: 246)

In exchange for this nonsense, Seraphim was assured that all accusations for collaboration would go away. It is worth noting that this also meant that western newspapers would also drop the accusation. How could that be? How could they have such influence in the western media? Unfortunately for Stalin, the Paris Orthodox voted for Metropolitan Vladimir over Stalin's appointee. Ultimately, this is what led to the failure of Stalin's church in western Europe.

The point of this is to show several things: first, that the “Orthodox church” under Stalin was neither Orthodox nor a church but rather a political tool. Second, that the west, as was almost always the case, supported and backed Soviet interests in these areas and attacked anti-communists in their own countries who disagreed. No pro-Stalin collaboration was more blatant than the western churchmen, especially the Anglicans. Finally, it goes far to show how much Stalin hated the Orthodox church. These were elaborate plans designed to destroy and discredit Orthodoxy not only in Russia, but in the rest of Europe as well.

Also connected to this nationalism is the myth that Stalin was “resurrecting the cult of the Tsars.” In this argument, having a good thing to say about a Tsar once in a while makes the speaker a monarchist. The proof text states:

I want to say a few words which may not seem too festive. The Russian Tsars did much that was bad. They robbed and enslaved the people. They led wars and seized territory in the interests of the landowners. But they did do one good thing – they put together an enormous state stretching out to Kamchatka. We inherited this state. We

Bolsheviks were the first to put together and strengthen this state not in the interests of the landowners and capitalists, but for the toilers and for all the great peoples who make up this state (quoted from David Brandenberger, 22).

This is supposed to be the resurrection of the “Tsarist past.” It is clearly no such thing, and re-emphasizes the Party's hatred of the royal office. Peter I was a self-described revolutionary that bulldozed the church wherever he could. He was as violently anti-Christian as the Reds were. Making positive reference to him proves only the point being made here. The proof of “Russocentrism” is supposed to be discovered in these scattered references to pre-revolutionary writers like Pushkin, references to Peter I and other such nonsense. Even titling an official school text “A History of the People's of Russia” is sufficient to convince the alienated dons of Stalin's nationalism (Zalampas, 1993).³

Lenin's statement to the *New York Herald* in 1922 that

those who intend to offer humiliating terms to the Russian delegation at Genoa are deeply mistaken. Russia will not allow herself to be treated as a vanquished country. If the bourgeois governments try to adopt such a tone towards Russia they will be committing the greatest folly (Lenin, 1922).

This sounds terribly nationalist, at least in the elastic western definition of the term, and yet, no one uses this to show that Lenin was resurrecting the cult of Ivan IV. He is a “Soviet Patriot” now that he has power and as such, he will use the appropriate language. The motive, however, is clear: awful men of history must have been on the “right of the spectrum” to use a contemporary distorting label. It also shows how readily the left, even its academics, believes and utilizes poor arguments when their ideological interests are at stake.

It is one thing to show Stalin was not a nationalist and was philosemitic. It is another to explain why these myths have been around for so long. Stalin's writings and policies were not secret. His works are available to all. The leftist mind eventually tired of the USSR and its misery. A search for legislation that assisted the cause of labor will prove fruitless. It was never about the workers but rather the enrichment of a small oligarchic elite that was overwhelmingly Jewish. The USSR could not be hated by leftists on these grounds, so other foundations were needed. If he could be depicted as “another Hitler” then not only would it be OK to hate Stalinism, but it would also give the left an excuse to say that “Leninism has never been tried.”

Recently, the BBC has attempted to claim that North Korea is a fascist state rather than a communist one. When the icons of Marx and Stalin were taken down for cleaning and maintenance, it was said that they were permanently removed. The failure of Soviet economics is well known. The left could no longer milk the Russian population nor could they cover over Soviet crimes. The only option left to them is to say that the Soviets were “fascists” and “Russian nationalists.” The truth is that Stalin, in no respect, differed from Lenin or Trotsky. The only difference was the machinery they had at their disposal. Stalin's was far more advanced than Trotsky's so it killed more people. Otherwise, they are identical in all respects.

³ Zalampas' work is very useful since it shows in striking relief the grounds upon which the US ruling class opposed the USSR. It was almost exclusively as “Russia” and all the Mongol-like associations it conjured.

Bibliography:

Primary Sources

Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich (1922a) Letter to Comrade Molotov for the Politburo. (reprinted in *The Unknown Lenin : From the Secret Archive* (1996) edited by Richard Pipes, pp. 152-4).

Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich (1922) Interview with the Correspondent of *The New York Herald*.
Petrograd: *Krasnaya Gazeta* 84, April 14

Stalin, J (1936). Reply to an Inquiry of the Jewish News Agency in the United States, January 12, 1931. *Pravda*, No. 329, November 30, 1936

Stalin, J (1923) Thesis for the Twelfth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Approved by the Central Committee of the Party 1 March 24, 1923

Stalin, J (March 1929) *The National Question and Leninism: Reply to Comrades Meshkov, Kovalchuk, and Others*. Works, Vol. 11, January, 1928 to March, 1929

Secondary Sources

Makarov, NI (2010) *The Myths of Stalinism*. *Eschatology Journal*, edited by Archbishop of Slavyenskiy Viktor (Pivovarov)

Brandenberger, D., A. M. Dubrovsky (1998) 'The People Need a Tsar': The Emergence of National Bolshevism as Stalinist Ideology, 1931-1941. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 50(5): 873-892

N.K. Petrow and K.W. Skorkin (1999) *Who led the NKVD, 1934-1941?* N.G. Ochotin, A.B. Roginskij, Verlag Swenja

Kalkandjieva, D (2015) *The Russian Orthodox Church, 1917–1948 From Decline to Resurrection*. Routledge

Sebag-Montefiore, Simon (2005) *Stalin: The Court of the Red Tsar*. Random House.

Korey, William (1950) Zinov'ev's Critique of Stalin's Theory of Socialism in One Country, December, 1925-December, 1926. *American Slavic and East European Review* 9(4): 255-267

Zalampas, M. (1989). *Adolf Hitler and the Third Reich in American Magazines, 1923-1939*. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press

MacDonald, Kevin (2010) In the 1930s: Chapter 19 of Alexander Solzhenitsyn's "200 Years Together" *The Occidental Observer*

<http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2010/12/in-the-1930s-chapter-19-of-alexandr-solzhenitsyns-200-years-together/>

Solzhenitsyn, Alexander (2002) *200 Years Together*. Unofficial English Translation reprinted at: <https://200yearstogether.wordpress.com/2010/12/11/chapter-19-in-the-1930s/>