



THE FALSE RED FLAG

Paul Cudenec

The False Red Flag

Paul Cudenec



winteroak.org.uk

Copyright © 2024 Paul Cudenec. The author formally
retains copyright over this work but permits non-com-
mercial reproduction or distribution

“The truth about communism is that it is not fit for purpose as a philosophy of revolt, offering us no way out of the existing system. It amounts to nothing but a scam – pseudo-resistance which aims to use its dead-end despotic ideology, along with endless lies and repression, to impose industrial slavery on behalf of the criminocracy”

PSEUDO-RESISTANCE

I have always had a rather uneasy relationship with the “socialist” and “communist” left.

On the one hand I have been deeply inspired by many thinkers and rebels loosely associated with this tradition, from John Ball of the peasants’ revolt [1] and the legendary Robin Hood (robbing the rich to feed the poor), to Gerrard Winstanley [2] or William Morris. [3]

I have campaigned alongside grassroots socialists and communists, in both Britain and France, on numerous occasions when our causes have coincided and would, of course, do so again.

However, at the same time I have the gut feeling that there is something *wrong* about this movement.

My ambivalent attitude embraces all the terms it uses to describe itself.

Two writers who have greatly influenced me, Gustav Landauer [4] and George Orwell, [5] described their thinking as “socialist”, while going out of their way to warn us against communism.

But at the same time, the most insidious “left-wing” organisation I have personally come

across is the UK's *Socialist Workers Party* – a Trotskyist outfit notorious in anarchist circles a quarter of a century ago for “parachuting” into struggles and diverting them away from genuine resistance to the system.

Its “Globalise Resistance” front group, or “Monopolise Resistance” as it was dubbed, was deliberately set up to hijack the anarchic energy of the anti-globalisation movement. [6]

In 2001 it effectively sabotaged the May Day resistance planned for Oxford Street in London by forming a march that led protesters into a police trap hours ahead of the scheduled protests. [7]

I can well remember helpful police officers gesturing to us to follow the SWP up Regent Street into the awaiting kettle at Oxford Circus – an offer my friends and I chose not to accept!

The SWP called on people [8] to vote for Tony Blair's neoliberal New Labour in 1997, just as the French Communist Party called in 2022 for people to vote for “former” Rothschild employee Emmanuel Macron in the second round of the presidential elections (to “keep out the far right”). [9]

This is typical of a certain hypocritical *falsity* about the left that strikes me as one of its primary characteristics, along with a naively blind acceptance of the social and technological “Progress” sold to us by the system and a

propensity for authoritarianism – a barely-concealed impulse to censor, silence and intimidate all those who fail to conform to its view of the world.

This showed itself once again in 2020, when the vast bulk of socialists and communists (as well as “anarchists”!) eagerly jumped on board the Covid bandwagon and started attacking dissidents with the “far right” and “reactionary” smears that their movement has often used to attack opponents who are actually more anti-establishment than they are.

My aim here is to put a bit more meat on the bare bones of my personal hunches and experiences and to sketch out what seems to be fundamentally wrong with the thing we call communism.

Obviously in one single article it would be absurd to even pretend to address the whole historical movement, with all its subtleties, varieties and complications, let alone the vast and immensely dull world of Marxist theory.

Instead, I will be focusing on a few select accounts of communism’s basic character as manifested in the former Soviet Union, before coming back to the ideology itself.

Many communists would no doubt insist that this is unfair and that the 70 years of communist rule there were not representative of their ideology or movement as a whole.

But I concur with the Russian anarchist Voline an important source for this essay, when he declares: “The history of repression in the USSR is not only, in itself, suggestive and revealing: it is also an excellent means for making clear the *very substance, the hidden aspects, the real nature of authoritarian communism*”. [10]

LIES AND REPRESSION

An authentic mood of revolt had been swelling up in Russia for some time before 1917, with a previous attempted revolution in 1905-06 violently repressed by the tsarist regime.

A great inspiration behind this mood was the back-to-the-land Christian anarchism of the revered Russian novelist and thinker Leo Tolstoy, [11] author of *War and Peace*.

Contemporary observer Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu wrote in 1910: "We know that Tolstoy's ideas about land are those of the majority of Russian peasants". [12]

This radical outlook regarded the earth as a common treasury for all, like air and water: the land belonged to those who dug it and not to speculators.

"Land and freedom" was the slogan that captured the imagination of peasant families, whose ideal was the *mir*, a village community based on traditional values and involving democratic decision-making, sharing of resources and mutual aid.

These peasants lived simply, healthily and

largely beyond the reach of both central state power and, crucially, of the money-based economy. [13]

The same sort of thinking, based on popular self-determination, was even behind the creation of the Soviets – workers’ councils – that were later to give the communist empire its name.

Voline, who was on the ground in 1905-06 when the first of these was set up in St Petersburg, insists that no party or “leader” was involved.

“It emerged spontaneously, as the result of a collective agreement in a small and private group that came together by chance”. [14]

He describes how the subsequent general strike in what was then the Russian capital was, likewise, entirely spontaneous and self-organised, with no political party having the chance to grab control of it.

This anarchic spirit emerged again in 1917-18, he says. “Its influence, very weak at the start, grew as events developed”. [15]

The aim was “to transform the economic and social basis of society *without making use of a political state, a government, a ‘dictatorship’ of any kind*, in other words to bring about the Revolution and resolve its problems not by means of *politics and the state*, but by the free and natural, *economic and social*, activities of *associations of the workers themselves*, after overturn-

ing the last capitalist government”. [16]

Voline describes how ordinary people gravitated towards these sorts of ideas all across the Russian empire, by some sort of process of natural shared intuition.

“When the working masses have the possibility of thinking, searching and acting *freely*, they see more or less the same path, whatever the locality, the mood and even – let's add – the era, if we refer back to previous revolutions. Independently of all other reasoning, this must lead us to believe that on the whole this path is the *right* one, the *just* one, the *true path for the workers*”. [17]

This true path of revolt proved particularly popular in Ukraine, under the inspiring leadership of anarchist warrior Nestor Makhno.

His insurrectionary army initially fought on the side of the Bolsheviks against anti-revolutionary Ukrainian nationalists and Whites.

But Voline explains that commitment to freedom ran deep in the blood of the Makhnovshchina, and, with their great “organic” vitality, [18] they were not prepared to bow to repression from any direction.

He describes how their army advanced at lightning speed – flying, on their leading two-horse cart, a large black flag embroidered with the words “Liberty or Death”. [19]

Whenever he took over a town, Makhno put

up posters declaring, more or less: “Your town is occupied, temporarily, by the insurrectionary revolutionary army (Makhnovist). This army is at the service of *no political party*, of *no power*, of *no dictatorship*. On the contrary, it aims to *liberate* the region from all power, all dictatorship”. [20]

Voline continues: “Total freedom of speech, press, assembly and association, of all kinds and for everybody, was immediately proclaimed”. [21]

But, of course, freedom, mutual aid and self-determination were the very last things the Bolsheviks were going to welcome. Their aim was to establish a centralised workers’ state, the long-cherished “dictatorship of the proletariat”. [22]

Voline recalls that he and his friends made desperate attempts to alert fellow Russians to the “imminent danger for the real Revolution” if the Bolsheviks established control. [23]

The weekly anarchist paper *Goloss Trouda* warned in 1917: “Instead of a free unification *from below*, we will see the establishment of an authoritarian, political state apparatus which will act *from above* and set about crushing everything with its iron fist”. [24]

By the end of 1918, the Bolsheviks were seriously worried by the growing influence of the pro-freedom, anarchist, spirit, says Voline. “From 1919 until the end of 1921 they were forced to conduct a very severe struggle against the ad-

vance of this idea: a struggle at least as bitter and lengthy as that against the forces of reaction". [25]

Part of this assault on authentic revolutionaries involved the use of smears, always a favourite tool in such circles.

Anarchist thinkers were dismissed as "utopian", "irresponsible dreamers", "abstract philosophers" or "mystics" whose ideas bore no relation to "real life", while anarchist activists were depicted as "enemies of the public", "fools", "bandits", "criminals" or "terrorists". [26]

The Makhnovshchina were described by the Bolsheviks as "rioting kulaks", [27] while Makhno himself was labelled a "looter", a "murderer" [28] and, despite the presence of numerous Jews in his ranks, an "anti-semite". [29]

The communists' propaganda assaults paved the way for physical attacks, with activists set upon, books burned and premises pulled down in what Voline calls "a real fury of repression". [30]

"No sooner had they got to power than they were planning *the suppression* of the popular movement by all the means at their disposal: press campaigns and meetings, smears, tricks, traps, bans, raids, arrests, acts of violence, ransacking of buildings, murders – they stopped at nothing". [31]

When their initial repression and censorship failed to stem the spread of anarchist ideas, they

started using even more violent means, systematically throwing them in prison, outlawing them, putting them to death.

Voline says the conflict in some parts of the Russian empire essentially amounted to civil war: “In Ukraine, notably, this state of war lasted more than two years, obliging the Bolsheviks to mobilise all their forces to stifle the anarchist idea and crush the popular movements it had inspired”. [32]

The communist repression in Ukraine got underway in April 1919, in reaction to the regional congress of peasants, workers and partisans held in Makhno’s home town of Huliaipole. The delegates from 72 districts represented a population of more than two million people.

Voline writes that he regrets no longer having access to the minutes of the congress – “they show quite clearly with what drive and, at the same time, with what spirit of wisdom and forward thinking the people sought, in the Revolution, *their own path*, their own *popular* forms of the new life”. [33]

Towards the end of the event a telegram arrived from a Bolshevik military commander declaring the congress to be “counter-revolutionary” and its organisers “outside the law”, he explains.

“This was the first direct attack by the Bolsheviks on the freedom of the region. It was at the same time a declaration of war on the In-

surrectionary Army”. [34]

The next month the Bolsheviks tried to have Makhno murdered [35] then in June 1919 they launched a military attack on his rear while he was holding back the White army of Cossacks led by Anton Denikin – a real stab in the back of what were supposed to be their allies.

“Bursting into the villages, the Bolsheviks seized activists and executed them on the spot; they destroyed the free communes and the other organisations”. [36]

The attack was ordered by none other than Leon Trotsky, today such a hero to the leftists of the Socialist Workers Party and similar organisations, who is described by Voline as intellectually limited but “inordinately arrogant and malicious”. [37]

Trotsky next ordered that no further arms should be supplied to Makhno’s army in its struggle against Denikin and then, “with monstrous cynicism, with unimagineable insolence and hypocrisy”, [38] claimed that his anarchist rivals had betrayed the revolution by deliberately letting Denikin advance.

Interestingly, and relevantly since we are here interested in the phenomenon of communism as a whole, Voline goes on to explain that a similar “tactic” was later used by communists during the Spanish Civil War, when one of their brigades was manning the front against Franco

alongside an anarchist brigade of some 1,500 men.

The communists deliberately and secretly abandoned their position in the middle of the night, allowing the fascists to move into the breach and surround the anarchists, of whom 1,000 were unable to escape and were duly massacred.

“The following day the ‘communists’ accused the anarchists of having betrayed them and opened the front to Franco”. [39]

Time and time again, Voline observes, communists use “brutal force, based on deceit and imposture” [40] to get their way.

For all his heroics, Makhno was finally defeated by the Bolsheviks, fleeing the country with a gaggle of followers.

Worse still, the freedom of the Ukrainian peasants was broken by the communist dictatorship and its massacres, intended to destroy forever their rebellious spirit and ensure that they would never rise up again.

Outside Ukraine, the most notorious example of communist repression was of the Kronstadt rebellion of 1921, in which sailors and civilians rose up against increasingly authoritarian Bolshevik rule, calling for freedom of speech, press and assembly. [41]

To cut a long story short, the rebellion was eventually crushed by the Bolsheviks in what

Voline describes as “a brutal massacre, a real bloodbath”. [42]

But the important thing to retain is that, as in Ukraine, the Bolsheviks were not actually repressing “counter-revolutionaries”, as they claimed, but people and groups who were *more radical than them*, who wanted a Third Revolution to achieve a genuinely free Russia.

It was the Bolsheviks themselves who were the *real* counter-revolutionaries, the real betrayers of the people’s movement, simply taking advantage of its revolutionary energy to grab power.

They then ruthlessly destroyed anyone seeking to take that power back into the hands of the people.

Their authoritarian gang “crushed and subjugated the working class to exploit it, under new forms, in its own interests”, judges Voline. [43]

“Their system depends on deception and violence, as in any authoritarian and state system, which necessarily dominates, exploits and oppresses.

“The statist ‘communist’ regime is just another kind of fascist regime”. [44]

INDUSTRIAL SLAVERY

Leo Tolstoy, with his dreams of a free Russian peasantry, had realised before his death in 1910 that the communists aimed to launch an assault on traditional rural life.

Having analysed Karl Marx's *Capital* and studied the new "scientific" socialism, he spoke out about what Pierre Thiesset calls the communists' "industrialised, urbanised and technocratised horizon, where Progress becomes a new religion". [45]

"He had felt that the revolutionaries were going to fool the people by leading them into a dead end: that of the modernisation of the country and the end of the peasantry.

"What is the point in socialising the means of production if it is to proletarianise the population, to send modern slaves to live in filthy cities and become appendages of machines?

"The writer called on people to resist this development, to struggle against this so-called 'civilization'." [46]

This, of course, made Tolstoy a "reactionary"

in the eyes of the Bolsheviks, while those who supported his call for land and freedom were labelled “naive” and “retrograde”. [47]

Vladimir Lenin, while recognising that Tolstoy was a spokesman for the ideas and desires of millions of Russian peasants, declared that his ideas were, as a whole, “harmful”. [48]

He announced, 15 years before his party came to power: “This patriarchal peasantry, which lives from its own work under the system of the natural economy, is condemned to disappear”. [49]

Even earlier, in 1899, Lenin had written a book called *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* [50] in which he described the mobility of the workforce and the extension of the market as representing “progress”.

He rejected the idea that the rural commune could serve as the basis for communism and that Russia could take an alternative path that avoided Western-style industrial development.

And he stressed the need to sweep away all the outmoded institutions that impeded the development of capitalism, that supposedly necessary stage on the road to socialism. [51]

When the communists finally grabbed power, they were true to their word and, under Lenin and then Stalin, declared war on the Russian peasantry.

Writes Carroll Quigley: “Communism in

Russia alone required, according to Bolshevik thinkers, that the country must be industrialized with breakneck speed, whatever the waste and hardships, and must emphasize heavy industry and armaments, rather than rising standards of living.

“This meant that the goods produced by the peasants must be taken from them, by political duress, without any economic return, and that the ultimate in authoritarian terror must be used to prevent the peasants from reducing their level of production to their own consumption needs”. [52]

He says: “The high speed of industrialisation in the period 1926-1940 was achieved by a merciless oppression of the rural community in which millions of peasants lost their lives”. [53]

“The chief elements in the First Five-Year Plan were the collectivization of agriculture and the creation of a basic system of heavy industry. In order to increase the supply of food and industrial labour in the cities, Stalin forced the peasants off their own lands (worked by their own animals and their own tools) onto large communal farms, worked co-operatively with lands, tools, and animals owned in common, or onto huge state farms, run as state-owned enterprises by wage-earning employees using lands, tools, and animals owned by the government”. [54]

Agriculture was industrialised by the use of

machinery, particularly tractors – the number of these in Russia rose from less than 30,000 in 1928 to nearly half a million in 1938, with the percentage of ploughing done by tractor shooting up from 1 per cent to 72 per cent. [55]

Voline describes how the Russian peasant had his patch of land and his possessions confiscated and was attached to a “kolkhoz” like a worker to a factory.

“The state transformed him not merely into its farmer, but into its serf and forced him to work for this new master.

“And, like any real master, it only leaves him, from the produce of his work, the minimum needed to live: the rest, the largest part, is put at the disposal of the government”. [56]

He comments that this system did not lead “towards socialism” but into state capitalism, “even more abominable than private capitalism” and just “another mode of domination and exploitation”. [57]

It was the same story in communist factories, in which the dehumanising production-boosting Taylorism used in the West was wrapped up in workerist propaganda and rolled out as Stakhanovism. [58]

This was all imposed through the regime's vicious totalitarian approach, spearheaded by the notorious Cheka secret police.

Some of the Kronstadt rebels were already

warning in 1921: “A new – communist – serfdom has been established. The peasant has been transformed into a serf of the ‘Soviet’ economy. The worker has become a simple employee in the state’s factories. The working class intelligentsia has been virtually wiped out.

“Those who wanted to protest have been thrown into the Cheka’s jails. And those who continued to agitate were simply put up against the wall. The whole of Russia has been turned into a huge penal colony”. [59]

Quigley writes: “By the middle 1930’s the search for ‘saboteurs’ and for ‘enemies of the state’ became an all-enveloping mania which left hardly a family untouched.

“Hundreds of thousands were killed, frequently on completely false charges, while millions were arrested and exiled to Siberia or put into huge slave-labor camps.

“In these camps, under conditions of semi-starvation and incredible cruelty, millions toiled in mines, in logging camps in the Arctic, or building new railroads, new canals, or new cities”. [60]

He says that most of these gulag prisoners had not even done anything against the Soviet state or the communist system, but were the relatives, associates and friends of persons who had been arrested on more serious charges.

And he adds that many of these charges were completely false, having been trumped up

“to provide labour in remote areas”, [61] among other reasons.

The communist regime effectively amounted, as Voline spells out, to a “totalitarian capitalist state”. [62]

Its society was characterised by “a stifling dogmatism”, the absence of all real individual life and “the despairing monotony of a glum and colourless existence, regulated in the smallest detail by the prescriptions of the state”. [63]

Critical thinking and any questioning of the official narrative was utterly out of bounds and children’s heads were stuffed full of rigid Marxist doctrine, he says. [64]

The communists particularly excelled in the field of propaganda or “more exactly of lies, deceit and bluff”. [65]

“Compared to them, the ‘Nazis’ themselves are nothing but modest pupils and imitators”. [66]

“This deceitful propaganda across the world is of unrivalled scope and intensity. Considerable sums have been sacrificed to it”. [67]

The communist state had declared itself the sole judge of truth on every subject – historical, economical, political, social, scientific, philosophical or anything else, he says.

“In all domains the Bolshevik government considered itself infallible and called upon to lead humanity”. [68]

Any person or group who doubted the state's infallibility, who criticised or contradicted it in any way, was considered to be its enemy, and an enemy of both truth and the Revolution – a “counter-revolutionary”! [69]

Voline adds: “Any opinion, any thought, other than that of the state is considered heresy: dangerous, unacceptable, criminal heresy. And, logically, unavoidably, there follows the punishment for heretics: prison, exile, execution”. [70]

He sums up the Soviet system as “a monstrous and murderous state capitalism, based on an odious exploitation of the ‘mechanised’, blind, unconscious masses”. [71]

And he wonders *why* it was that the long-awaited Revolution had resulted only in a “new dictatorship” and “new slavery”. [72]

The next part of this essay will go some way to answering that, along with the key question of why the Bolshevik New Normal of 100 years ago sounds so uncannily similar to the nightmare future towards which we are being herded today.

A REPUGNANT RACKET

Anyone wishing to understand what lay behind the brutal political repression and totalitarian industrial slavery imposed by the Bolsheviks would do well to read the work of historian Antony C. Sutton, notably his book *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*. [73]

He shows, with solid evidence, that the communist seizure of power was encouraged and funded by financial interests outside Russia.

This is not to say that there were not genuine revolutionary forces at play in the country and that the tsarist regime would not have been toppled in any case.

But the specific role of the Bolsheviks was to seize power, crush the genuine popular revolt and ensure that Russia was turned into an authoritarian centralised state – under the ultimate control of these financial interests – which could then impose their Great Project.

This project was, of course, all about making money.

Communist Russia was regarded as a “golden opportunity” [74] in certain circles.

An enciphered telegram sent by David Francis, US ambassador in Petrograd (St Petersburg), a year before the revolution began, is very telling for a couple of reasons.

Firstly because he sent it to the State Department in Washington, DC, to be deciphered and forwarded to Frank Arthur Vanderlip, the chairman of the National City Bank in New York, thus indicating which power he was truly serving.

Secondly because of his message to the banker: “*Opportunities here during the next ten years very great along state and industrial financing*”. [75]

This wouldn't have been the case if the genuine social movement, of which Voline was part, had won the day and managed to place power and wealth in Russia in the hands of the Russian people.

So the international bankers clearly had an important incentive in crushing any real revolutionaries and ensuring that their opportunity-providing placemen were firmly in charge.

Sutton in fact mentions Voline in his book and explains that “the betrayal of the Russian Revolution” which the latter witnessed first-hand was created by “the new powerbrokers of another corrupt political system... the ambitions of a few Wall Street financiers who, for their own purposes, could accept a centralized tsarist Russia or

a centralized Marxist Russia but not a decentralized free Russia". [76]

We are generally taught that there is a fundamental dichotomy between state control of industry and private control – state ownership of the kind exercised under “communism” would necessarily be to the disadvantage of those who profit under “capitalism”, we are made to believe.

But the public-private model tested in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany, and now championed by the likes of the WEF, should allow us to see through this illusion.

Like fascism, communism provided financiers with the authoritarian state muscle to *impose* their industrial development projects on people who would not otherwise have gone along with them.

Sutton muses about the apparent contradiction of somebody like George Foster Peabody, deputy chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, being an enthusiast for government ownership of railways.

He argues: “Given the dominant political influence of Peabody and his fellow financiers in Washington, they could by government control of railroads more easily avoid the rigors of competition.

“Through political influence they could manipulate the police power of the state to achieve what they had been unable, or what was too

costly, to achieve under private enterprise.

“In other words, the police power of the State was a means of maintaining a private monopoly... The idea of a centrally planned socialist Russia must have appealed to Peabody. Think of it – one gigantic State monopoly!” [77]

In 1922, the same year as they created their Gosbank central bank, the Bolsheviks formed their first international bank, known as the Ruskombank (Foreign Commercial Bank or the Bank of Foreign Commerce).

It was headed by “Bolshevik Banker” Olof Aschberg and on its board, alongside representatives of the Soviet Union, sat tsarist private bankers and representatives of German, Swedish and American banks. [78]

On joining Ruskombank, Max May of Guaranty Trust stated that it was “very important” and that it would “largely finance all lines of Russian industry”. [79]

Sutton’s detailed research and analysis utterly explodes the myths entertained by communists about their relationship to both capitalism and fascism.

Take this statement, for instance: “Trotsky was able to generate support among international capitalists who, incidentally, were also supporters of Mussolini and Hitler”. [80]

But an element of which he was evidently unaware was the true identity of the financiers

behind the funding of the Bolshevik beast, as well as of fascism.

Voline mentions in passing a treaty with London that “opened the doors of the country to British capital”. [81]

And Sutton himself provides a clue in his account of the formation of the Ruskombank, when he records: “The foreign banking consortium involved in the Ruskombank represented mainly British capital... The British government itself had already purchased substantial interests in the Russian private banks; according to a State Department report, ‘The British Government is heavily invested in the consortium in question.’” [82]

J.P. Morgan, the main Wall Street entity that Sutton links to the Bolsheviks, is in fact, as I set out in my booklet *Enemies of the People*, [83] a front for the Rothschild empire, in particular of its UK operation.

The Rothschilds needed a convincing front in the USA because the American public would not have been too pleased to learn that, despite the War of Independence, their country was still largely owned by the City of London.

Guaranty Trust Company – “Aschberg’s New York associate” [84] – was likewise a Morgan/Rothschild entity, as was the aforementioned National City Bank (the word “City” in all such US bank names being a reference to the City of Lon-

don).

Sutton looks at these bankers' duplicitous role in the First World War – a subject I have addressed in some detail elsewhere [85] – and concludes: “What is really important is not so much that financial assistance was given to Germany, which was only illegal, as that directors of Guaranty Trust were financially assisting the Allies at the same time.

“In other words, Guaranty Trust was financing both sides of the conflict. This raises the question of morality”. [86]

Financing both sides of a conflict, with utterly no regard for morality, is a notorious trademark of the Rothschild mafia.

Their familiar fingerprints can be seen all over Operation Bolshevik.

The bankers' involvement in the Russian Revolution used the vehicle of a “Red Cross Mission” which was yet another spurious organisation hiding behind the mask of “humanitarianism”.

Sutton explains: “In World War I the Red Cross depended heavily on Wall Street and specifically on the Morgan firm.

“The Red Cross was unable to cope with the demands of World War I and in effect was taken over by these New York bankers. [87]

“In August 1917 the American Red Cross Mission to Russia had only a nominal relation-

ship with the American Red Cross, and must truly have been the most unusual Red Cross Mission in history”. [88]

He reveals that all expenses, including those of the uniforms – the members were all colonels, majors, captains or lieutenants – were paid out of the pocket of William Boyce Thompson, director of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York! [89]

And, of course, Thompson’s interest did not have anything to do with the Red Cross’s usual activities.

The *Washington Post* published a report on February 2, 1918, entitled: “GIVES BOLSHEVIKI A MILLION. W.B. Thompson, Red Cross Donor, Believes Party Misrepresented”.

This stated: “William B. Thompson, who was in Petrograd from July until November last, has made a personal donation of \$1,000,000 to the Bolsheviks for the purpose of spreading their doctrine in Germany and Austria”. [90]

Sutton spells out the reality behind the Red Cross front: “The mission was in fact a mission of Wall Street financiers to influence and pave the way for control, through either Kerensky or the Bolshevik revolutionaries, of the Russian market and resources. No other explanation will explain the actions of the mission. [91]

“Thompson was interested in the Russian market and how this market could be influenced, diverted, and captured for postwar exploitation

by a Wall Street syndicate, or syndicates. [92]

“Whether the Russian people wanted the Bolsheviks was of no concern”. [93]

Sutton identifies the central co-ordinating point of the communism-funding project as 120 Broadway in New York.

“Two of the operational vehicles for infiltrating or influencing foreign revolutionary movements were located at 120 Broadway: the first the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, heavily laced with Morgan [Rothschild] appointees; the second the Morgan-controlled American International Corporation”. [94]

Intriguingly, the 1915 skyscraper that is 120 Broadway, the Equitable Building, [95] today features a luxury rooftop Bankers Club and is owned by Silverstein Properties. [96]

Property mogul Larry Silverstein was the man who bought the lease on the World Trade Center two months before 9/11 and later bagged a \$4.55 billion pay-out, successfully arguing that two planes hitting the two towers amounted to two separate incidents for which he should be re-compensated. [97]

Sutton also looks into the dubious role played by Raymond Robins, a wealthy businessman who, “for no observable reason”, [98] suddenly declared himself a socialist, backed the Bolsheviks and, according to French government documents, sent “a subversive mission of Russian

Bolsheviks to Germany to start a revolution there” – this being the Spartacist revolt of 1918. [99]

He concludes: “There is considerable evidence, including Robins’ own statements, that his reformist social-good appeals were little more than covers for the acquisition of futher power and wealth”. [100]

One might add that this seems to be true of a certain “left” in general and indeed Sutton quotes Quigley when he states that in around 1910 “the Morgan firm [Rothschilds] decided to infiltrate the Left-wing political movements in the United States. This was relatively easy to do, since these groups were starved for funds and eager for a voice to reach the people. Wall Street supplied both”. [101]

Quigley goes on: “It was this group of people, whose wealth and influence so exceeded their experience and understanding, who provided much of the framework of influence which the Communist sympathizers and fellow travelers took over in the United States in the 1930's.

“It must be recognized that the power that these energetic Left-wingers exercised was never their own power or Communist power but was ultimately the power of the international financial coterie”. [102]

Describing, in a rather cryptical way, “the relationship between the financial circles of Lon-

don and those of the eastern United States which reflects one of the most powerful influences in twentieth-century American and world history”, [103] he then gets to the core of the issue.

“The two ends of this English-speaking axis have sometimes been called, perhaps facetiously, the English and American Establishments.

“There is, however, a considerable degree of truth behind the joke, a truth which reflects a very real power structure.

“It is this power structure which the Radical Right in the United States has been attacking for years in the belief that they are attacking the Communists.

“This is particularly true when these attacks are directed, as they so frequently are, at ‘Harvard Socialism’ or at ‘Left-wing newspapers’ like *The New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, or at foundations and their dependent establishments, such as the Institute of International Education.

“These misdirected attacks by the Radical Right did much to confuse the American people in the period 1948-1955 and left consequences which were still significant a decade later”. [104]

Sutton adds, for his part: “We suggest that the Morgan firm [Rothschilds] infiltrated not only the domestic left, as noted by Quigley, but also the foreign left – that is, the Bolshevik movement and the Third International”. [105]

Ripples of the confusion mentioned by Quigley have lingered on today, in the age of the so-called Great Reset.

When some people notice the similarities between this 2020s authoritarian land-grabbing industrial project and that of the communists in Russia in the last century, they draw the conclusion that the Great Reset is “communist”.

This would seem to make no sense, given that Klaus Schwab's WEF is a body representing the world's biggest corporations and financial interests and, even though he has been pictured with a bust of Lenin behind him, he is hardly a “communist” in the generally-understood sense.

However, once we realise that communism in Russia was promoted and funded by the same mafia who are now behind the WEF, the fog of confusion quickly clears.

As we have seen, the *real* aim behind installing communism in Russia was to impose, by means of its totalitarian central state, a massive wave of highly profitable industrial development.

Sutton traces the start of the project to the setting up of the American International Corporation (AIC) at 120 Broadway in 1915 and the frustration, reported by Frank A. Vanderlip of National City Bank, that “there was not much more railroad building to be done in the United States”. [106]

Rail infrastructure was, as I have previously

described, a major element in the Rothschilds' empire.

Operation Bolshevik worked rather well in this respect. Soviet Railways, which started operations in 1922 under the direct control of the communist state, was “the backbone of the Soviet Union's economy” and “greatly upgraded and expanded the Russian Imperial Railways to meet the demands of the new country”. [107]

One of the directors of AIC was C.A. Coffin, chairman of General Electric, whose executive office was at 120 Broadway and, coincidentally, was chairman of the cooperation committee of the American Red Cross! [108]

The Rothschilds also had a massive vested interest in the global expansion of electrification, dominating as they did the world's supplies of copper, the main material required for the infrastructure.

As one website [109] enthusiastically relates, “the electrification of Soviet Russia came about unlike anywhere else in the world” and allowed the banker-backed Bolsheviks to bulldoze traditional Russian life.

“They turned a backward agrarian country into an industrial economy in a matter of years”.

Propaganda presented Lenin as a mystical symbol of electrification and the communist New Normal/Order.

“The electric light that now lit up every

home became known as ‘Ilyich’s lamp’, which brought enlightenment (quite literally) and a new way of life to the masses”.

With the “golden opportunity” of a “massive State monopoly” spurring them on, the gang in New York built a private vehicle “to exploit Russian markets and the earlier support given the Bolsheviks”, explains Sutton.

“A group of industrialists from 120 Broadway formed the American-Russian Industrial Syndicate Inc. to develop and foster these opportunities”. [110]

Financial backing for the new firm came from the likes of the Guggenheim Brothers, also of 120 Broadway, previously associated with William Boyce Thompson.

“Guggenheim controlled American Smelting and Refining; and the Kennecott and Utah copper companies”, [111] Sutton notes.

In 1918 The American League to Aid and Cooperate with Russia was set up, with the involvement of Coffin of the General Electric Company, and the talk was of “economic assistance” for Russia. [112]

Lenin spun the same line when he told the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party in March 1921 that the country would require “the assistance of capital”. [113]

But in truth the communist regime was not so much being assisted by capital as being *used*

by it as a tool to squeeze untold profit from the Russian people and their land.

As Sutton says: “The gigantic Russian market was to be converted into a captive market and a technical colony to be exploited by a few high-powered American financiers and the corporations under their control”. [114]

A final instructive detail is that, with their usual racketeering cynicism, the financial mafia backing the Bolsheviks also, at the very same time, whipped up fear of communism in the USA!

Writes Sutton: “The financial circles that were supporting the Soviet Bureau in New York also formed in New York the ‘United Americans’ – a virulently anti-Communist organization predicting bloody revolution, mass starvation and panic in the streets of New York”. [115]

Pointing to the involvement of Morgan/Rothschild entity Guaranty Trust in this duplicity, he says it “raises, of course, serious questions about the intentions of Guaranty Trust and its directors”. [116]

I can only agree with him that “spreading propaganda designed to create fear and panic while at the same time encouraging the conditions that give rise to the fear and panic” points to “utter moral depravity”. [117]

A DESPOTIC DEAD END

We have seen how the Bolsheviks in Russia repressed the grassroots revolutionary movement and imposed a centralised authoritarian regime that declared war on small farmers and hitherto independent individuals, turning most of the population into powerless slaves to a giant industrial machine.

We have also learned that they were funded and assisted by the global mafia, which obviously stood to gain by creating a forerunner of the dehumanised totalitarian industrial prison camp which they are currently trying to build via their Great Reset or Fourth Industrial Revolution.

One question that still hangs in the air, however, is whether the Bolshevik example is really a *fair* representation of the communist philosophy as initially set out by Karl Marx.

To address this matter, I will first call as a witness Mikhael Bakunin (1814-1876), the freedom-loving Russian revolutionary who was a one-time associate of Marx before falling out with him in a big way.

By the time he wrote the pamphlet 'Statism and Anarchism' in 1873, Bakunin had noticed the dangers lurking in the Marxist creed and astutely foresaw the nightmare that would be inflicted on his own home country when these authoritarian communists later came to power.

He warned: "They will concentrate all the powers of government in strong hands, because the very fact that the people are ignorant necessitates strong, solicitous care by the government.

"They will create a single State bank, concentrating in its hands all the commercial, industrial, agricultural, and even scientific production; and they will divide the mass of people into two armies – industrial and agricultural armies under the direct control of the State engineers who will constitute the new privileged scientific-political class". [118]

Two years previously, he had written in a letter that there was a connection between communism and big banks, namely that "the Communism of Marx seeks enormous centralization in the state, and where such exists, there must inevitably be a central state bank".

He commented: "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". [119]

In 'Statism and Anarchism', Bakunin also

pointed to the Marxists' determination that "on the morrow of the Revolution the new social organization should be set up not by the free integration of workers' associations, villages, communes and regions from below upward, conferring to the needs and instincts of the people, but solely by the dictatorial power of this learned minority, allegedly expressing the general will of the people". [120]

Bakunin also answered a defence of Marxism that is still being peddled today, namely that *in theory* its authoritarian revolutionary state will eventually disappear, allowing the final liberation of the people in a free socialist society.

He wrote: "They say that this State yoke – the dictatorship – is a necessary transitional means in order to attain the emancipation of the people: Anarchism or freedom is the goal, the State or dictatorship is the means. Thus to free the working masses, it is first necessary to enslave them..."

"They maintain that only a dictatorship – their dictatorship, of course – can create the will of the people, while our answer to this is: No dictatorship can have any other aim but that of self-perpetuation, and it can beget only slavery in the people tolerating it; freedom can be created only by freedom, that is, by a universal rebellion on the part of the people and free organization of the toiling masses from the bottom up". [121]

Inevitably there will be some who decline to take Bakunin's word regarding the reality behind the communist agenda, given that he was an anarchist and ended up a bitter enemy of Marx and his gang.

So I will now seek illumination from the horse's mouth, namely the famous *Communist Manifesto* [122] issued by Marx and Friedrich Engels in 1848, which announced the transition from "the period of the Utopian socialists" to "the period of scientific socialism", [123] as Quigley puts it.

There are parts of this document, addressing the necessity of grabbing back wealth and power from the hands of the ultra-wealthy ruling class, with which I obviously agree!

But there are a number of rather alarming details – real red flags indicating that there is something amiss with this supposedly revolutionary programme.

Take, for instance, the sneering dismissal of rivals who do not share their fetishistic obsession with the industrial working class and who promote "not the interests of the proletariat, but the interests of Human Nature, of Man in general, who belongs to no class, has no reality, who exists only in the misty realm of philosophical fantasy".

Human beings don't exist, only workers for the Machine.

Or the dictatorial threats to confiscate “the property of all emigrants and rebels” and to “replace home education by social”.

The pamphlet calls for the “establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture”, which is what Bakunin was referring to.

Their grim communist plan for a grey future is described as: “Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of all the distinction between town and country”.

The Manifesto condemns small manufacturers, shopkeepers, artisans and peasants (ie small farmers) as necessarily “not revolutionary, but conservative”. It adds: “Nay more, they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history”.

This is, of course the “wheel of history” as presented in propaganda painting industrial “development” [124] and exploitation as somehow inevitable and “progressive”.

Marx and Engels are not shy about setting out the authoritarian means that will be needed to keep the wheel of industrial and financial expansion turning.

They declare (and this is in 1848, remember, 70 years before events in Russia): “The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degree, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organised as

the ruling class; and to increase the total productive forces as rapidly as possible.

“Of course, in the beginning, this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property”.

And they demand:

- “Centralisation of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly”.

- “Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State”.

- “Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State”.

This sort of society is, of course, utterly alien to the desires of most ordinary people, which is why “despotic” measures would be required.

Their New Order/Normal would also have to involve the smashing apart of old customs and communities in a “radical rupture with traditional ideas”.

It is clear from all of this that the seeds of the brutal authoritarianism and repression seen in communist Russia were present in Marxist thinking right from the start.

While there are no doubt followers of Marx who *do not* support these toxic elements, they are embedded within the ideology and will always be available as a theoretical backdoor for pragmatic authoritarianism.

The truth about communism is that it is not

fit for purpose as a philosophy of revolt, offering us no way out of the existing system.

As I have shown, it amounts to nothing but a scam – pseudo-resistance which aims to use its dead-end despotic ideology, along with endless lies and repression, to impose industrial slavery on behalf of the criminocracy.

It has long since betrayed the original spirit of rebellion that animated popular uprisings over the centuries, replacing that love of life, land and freedom with a narrow and sterile “scientific” dogma.

Like the environmentalist movement in recent years, [125] it has been hijacked to serve the interests of the very forces it was meant to be opposing.

So what would a *real* resistance movement look like?

The main problems with the communist outlook are: its commitment to central control, on a national or international level; its commitment to the role of a central bank; [126] its obsession with increased industrialisation and urbanisation; its war on all tradition and cultural organicity; and its authoritarian, nay “despotic”, intolerance of anyone who declines to go along with any part of its programme.

It is quite easy to see how all of this fits in with the agenda of the financial-industrial mafia who aided and abetted the Bolshevik power grab

and who are today trying to push us into their world-state smart-city matrix of digital slavery.

It is therefore also quite easy to identify the specific contrasting positions that should be adopted by a genuine movement of resistance as part of its general dissident vision.

We can ensure that our resistance is – unlike communism – *incompatible* with the global mafia’s project if we:

i. Prioritise decentralisation of power and promote the principle that this process should be continued to the lowest possible level, thus reversing the current power structure and restoring decision-making to the people.

ii. Oppose the existence of central banks that place control of the economy, and thus of society, in the hands of parasitical financiers.

iii. Call for a halt to all further industrial expansion and for the abolition of all structural commitment to “development” and “economic growth” which undemocratically imposes the profiteers’ industrial racket. The long-term direction we want our societies to take should be a question of open public debate.

iv. Promote a rejection of digital culture and a return to real life. Work for a reversal of the system’s “social distancing” and for the rediscovery of our belonging to organic community and place, along with the celebration of traditional customs, arts, crafts and know-how.

v. Celebrate critical thinking, individual autonomy, diversity of belief and the right of free speech for everybody – even communists!

ENDNOTES

- [1] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/john-ball/>
- [2] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/gerrard-winstanley/>
- [3] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/william-morris/>
- [4] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/gustav-landauer/>
- [5] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/george-orwell/>
- [6] <https://libcom.org/article/monopolise-resistance-how-globalise-resistance-would-hijack-revolt-schnews>
- [7] http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/1307173.stm
- [8] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialist_Workers_Party_\(UK\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialist_Workers_Party_(UK))
- [9] <https://www.euractiv.fr/section/elections/news/un-appel-tres-large-de-la-classe-politique-a-voter-pour-emmanuel-macron/>
- [10] Voline, *La Révolution Inconnue: du pouvoir bolchéviste à Cronstadt* (Paris: Pierre Belfond, 1972), p. 79. I worked from the original French version of Voline's work and the translations are my own, so will not always correspond exactly to English versions such as that featured on the Anarchist Library website at <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/voline-the-unknown-revolution-1917-1921-book-one-birth-growth-and-triumph-of-the-revolution>
- [11] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/leo-tolstoy/>
- [12] *La Revue des deux mondes*, 15 décembre, 1910 cit. Pierre Thiesset, 'Tolstoï contre les bolcheviks', *Brasero: re-*

vue de contre-histoire, No 1, novembre 2021 (Paris: L'Échappée), p. 93.

[13] Thiesset, p. 94.

[14] Voline, *La Révolution Inconnue: de 1905 à Octobre* (Paris: Pierre Belfond, 1972), p. 80.

[15] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 154.

[16] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 155.

[17] Voline, *La Révolution Inconnue: la fin de Cronstadt et l'insurrection en Ukraine* (Paris: Pierre Belfond, 1972), p. 68.

[18] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 121.

[19] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 102.

[20] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 122.

[21] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 124.

[22] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 155.

[23] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 201.

[24] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, pp. 209-10.

[25] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 154.

[26] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 231.

[27] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p 85.

[28] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 46.

[29] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, pp. 196-97.

[30] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 48.

[31] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 171.

[32] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 154.

[33] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, pp.79-80.

[34] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 80.

[35] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*,

- p. 86.
- [36] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 89.
- [37] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 89.
- [38] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 92.
- [39] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 93.
- [40] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 165.
- [41] Marie Isidine, 'La Vérité sur Kronstadt', *Braséro No 1*, p. 26.
- [42] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 24.
- [43] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 141.
- [44] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 87.
- [45] Thiesset, p. 97.
- [46] Thiesset, p. 97.
- [47] Thiesset, pp. 94-95.
- [48] Lénine, 'Six études sur Tolstoï', revue *Commune*, no 17, janvier 1935, cit. Thiesset, p. 94.
- [49] V. Lénine, *Oeuvres*, tome VI; janvier 1902-août 1903 Editions sociales (Paris) et Editions du Progrès, Moscou, 1966, cit. Thiesset, p. 95.
- [50] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Development_of_Capitalism_in_Russia
- [51] V. Lénine, *Le Développement du capitalisme en Russie* (écrit entre 1896 et 1899), Editions en langues étrangères (Moscou) et Editions sociales (Paris), 1956, cit. Thiesset, p. 95.
- [52] Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of The World in Our Time* (New York: Macmillan, 1966. Reprint. New Millennium Edition), p. 250.
- [53] Quigley, p. 12.
- [54] Quigley, p. 251.
- [55] Quigley, p. 251.

- [56] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 109.
- [57] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 110.
- [58] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 98.
- [59] *L'Izvestia du Comité Révolutionnaire Provisoire*, No 10, 12 mars 2021, cit. Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, pp. 244-45.
- [60] Quigley, p. 254.
- [61] Quigley, p. 254.
- [62] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 28.
- [63] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 150.
- [64] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 149.
- [65] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 131.
- [66] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 131 FN.
- [67] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 132.
- [68] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 123.
- [69] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 124.
- [70] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 124.
- [71] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 125.
- [72] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 21.
- [73] Antony C. Sutton, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* (West Hoathley: Clairview, 2016).
- [74] Sutton, p. 156
- [75] Sutton, p. 54.
- [76] Sutton, p. 19.
- [77] Sutton, p. 100.
- [78] Sutton, p. 60.
- [79] Sutton, p. 63.
- [80] Sutton, p. 36.
- [81] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 29.
- [82] Sutton, p. 61.
- [83] Paul Cudenec, 'Enemies of the People: The Rothschilds and their corrupt global empire', <https://winteroakpress.files.wordpress.com/2022/12/enemiesofthepeople.pdf>
- [84] Sutton, p. 63.
- [85] Paul Cudenec, 'A crime against humanity: the Great

Reset of 1914-1918', <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/10/14/a-crime-against-humanity-the-great-reset-of-1914-1918/>

[86] Sutton, p. 67.

[87] Sutton, p. 72.

[88] Sutton, p. 73.

[89] Sutton, p. 73.

[90] Sutton, p. 83.

[91] Sutton, p. 87.

[92] Sutton, p. 97.

[93] Sutton, p. 87.

[94] Sutton, p. 127.

[95] <https://gothamtogo.com/the-historic-equitable-building-shines-a-spotlight-on-its-history/>

[96] <https://www.silversteinproperties.com/commercial-of-fice-space-nyc/120-broadway>

[97] Even “fact-checkers” admit this, although they like to wrap it up in weasel words that suggest it’s not true. See <https://www.snopes.com/fact-check/wtc-terrorism-insurance/>

[98] Sutton, p. 84.

[99] Sutton, p. 91.

[100] Sutton, p. 84.

[101] Quigley, p. 594, cit. Sutton, p. 127.

[102] Quigley, p. 604.

[103] Quigley, pp. 605-06.

[104] Quigley, p. 606.

[105] Sutton, p. 127.

[106] Sutton, p. 128.

[107] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Railway_system_of_the_Soviet_Union

[108] Sutton, p. 130.

[109] <https://www.rbth.com/science-and-tech/334322-electricity-soviet-bolshevik-russia>

[110] Sutton, p. 137.

[111] Sutton, pp. 136-37.

[112] Sutton, p. 156.

[113] Sutton, p. 157.

[114] Sutton, p. 173.

- [115] Sutton, p. 123.
- [116] Sutton, p. 163.
- [117] Sutton, pp. 163-64.
- [118] Mikhael Bakunin, 'Statism and Anarchism', Russian volume 1, p. 298, in *The Political Philosophy of Bakunin*, ed. by G.P. Maximoff, (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964) p. 289.
- [119] <https://libcom.org/library/bakunin-marx-rothschild>
- [120] Bakunin, pp. 238-39, Maximoff, p. 284.
- [121] Bakunin, pp. 296-97, Maximoff, p. 288.
- [122] <https://www.marxists.org/admin/books/manifesto/Manifesto.pdf>
- [123] Quigley, p. 237.
- [124] Paul Cudenec, 'A developing evil: the malignant historical force behind the Great Reset'. <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/08/02/a-developing-evil-the-malignant-historical-force-behind-the-great-reset/>
- [125] <https://winteroak.org.uk/the-climate-scam/>
- [126] Gosbank was the central bank of the Soviet Union from 1922 until the dissolution of the USSR in 1991-92, when its operations were taken over by the central banks of the successor countries, including the Central Bank of Russia, the National Bank of Ukraine and the National Bank of Kazakhstan. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gosbank>

Also by Paul Cudenec

NON-FICTION

The Anarchist Revelation (2013)

Antibodies, Anarchangels & Other Essays (2013)

The Stifled Soul of Humankind (2014)

Forms of Freedom (2015)

Nature, Essence and Anarchy (2016)

The Green One (2017)

Fascism Rebranded (2021)

The Withway (2022)

The Great Racket (2023)

Converging Against the Criminocrats (2023)

Our Quest for Freedom (2024)

FICTION

The Fakir of Florence: A Novel in Three Layers
(2016)

No Such Place as Asha: An Extremist Novel
(2019)

*Enemies of the Modern World: A Triptych of
Novellas* (2021)

All these titles are available to download for free via www.winteroak.org.uk. To get in touch with Winter Oak email winteroak@greenmail.net or follow [@winteroakpress](https://twitter.com/winteroakpress) on Twitter/X.