

mailstar.net/Darryl-Cooper-wrong.pdf

The Fall of the West: did Trotsky win the Cold War?

by Peter Gerard Myers

September 19, 2024; updated Sept. 25, 2024

Darryl Cooper and Tucker Carlson, in a discussion on Sept. 2 concerning World War II, agreed that mass immigration and cultural decline since the war amount to defeat. The history books say that we won, but the streets tell us that we lost.

[01:25:30] TC: if Churchill is a hero, how come there are British girls begging for drugs on the street of London? And the place is, you know, London is not majority English now. Like what?

[01:25:42] DC: Well, the people who formulated the version of history that considers Churchill a hero, they like London the way it is now.

[01:25:50] TC: But that's not victory. That's like the worst kind of defeat, is it not? I'm just confused.

(Darryl Cooper: The True History of the Jonestown Cult, WWII, and How Winston Churchill Ruined Europe. Video at <https://x.com/TuckerCarlson/status/1830652074746409246?t=5079>; Transcript at <https://www.happyscribe.com/public/the-tucker-carlson-show/darryl-cooper-the-true-history-of-the-jonestown-cult-wwii-and-how-winston-churchill-ruined-europe>)

In this article I argue that Carlson and Cooper are wrong to blame the demise of our civilisation and heritage on Churchill. The implication is that, if only Churchill had been more accomodating to Hitler, World War II could have been avoided.

The reason I disagree is that our Civilisation remained intact and strong for twenty years after World War II.

The Soviet Union was unable to defeat the West. Joseph McCarthy correctly warned about Soviet infiltration via agents such as Harry Hopkins, Harry Dexter White, Alger Hiss, and the Rosenbergs. McCarthy was vindicated when the Venona Papers were published.

But McCarthy had no idea of the difference between Stalinists and Trotskyists. Whereas security services belatedly cracked down on Soviet agents, Trotskyists were given carte blanche, because they were deemed 'on our side' during the Cold War. They were, in fact, even more dangerous because they were more widespread and more extremist, the Ultra Left intent on destroying Western Civilisation from within. And they were funded by the big Foundations (Rockefeller, Ford, Carnegie); Herbert Marcuse was brought to the United States by the Rockefeller Foundation.

The damage done since was done by the anti-Stalin Left, not with a gun but using Gramsciist culture-war tactics.

What the New Right call 'Cultural Marxism' should be called 'Trotskyism' instead. But since most Left activists now belong to fluid networks rather than party hierarchies, the word 'Trotskyoid' is more accurate.

Trotskyoids are Communists or fellow-travellers in Trotsky's camp but not necessarily orthodox and not necessarily members of a Trotskyist organisation, who repudiate Stalin and who support a Gramsciist strategy of cultural subversion, that is, a "march through the Institutions" to destroy Western civilisation from the inside, using the Universities as seminaries of subversion, or the Media, Courts or other cultural instruments. This Gramsciist strategy follows Gramsci's unconventional Marxism in attacking the mental or civilisational "infrastructure" (in Marxist terminology) rather than the economic "base".

The demonstrators on the streets who hold 'Socialist' placards are Trotskyists; academics promoting the Culture War in the Universities are Trotskyoid.

Greens, who hide ties to early Bolshevism, are nevertheless Trotskyoid too. They promote Green Communism, not the Red kind. Daniel Cohn-Bendit, despite proclaiming himself an Anarchist and a Green, visited the grave of Karl Marx in London, and sang the Internationale.

Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (DEI) bureaucracies in universities and businesses are a mark of this Green Communism; so are acknowledgments of prior ownership by indigenous peoples. Of course, indigenous peoples *were* the prior owners, but the acknowledgment implies that the White race and the Christian religion have been overthrown, an impression reinforced by the current mass immigration and by the Satanism in Hollywood and Rock Music.

Various new 'proletariats' defined by 'Identity politics', thus Feminist, LGBT, Black etc, replace the old working-class proletariat, who are now deemed 'deplorables' on account of their 'homophobia' and social conservatism.

One result of Left politics has been the empowering of women, blacks and native peoples. But, thus empowered, conservative leaders have arisen in their ranks to challenge the Left.

Bettina Arndt has campaigned against their Feminist war on Men.

Jacinta Nampijinpa Price, an aboriginal woman and former Deputy Mayor of Alice Springs, led the opposition to the Voice Referendum in Australia. Decades of land-rights laws have turned Aborigines into land-owners once more, and made them more conservative. About 55% of the Australian landmass is now Aboriginal-owned, and 40% of Aborigines voted NO in the Referendum. At the back of the NO campaign was a warning by a former member of the Communist Party of Australia (CPA), Geoff McDonald, that the Referendum was part of a plot, hatched within the CPA, to break Australia up. If that were to happen, major powers like China would surely align with some of the breakaway regions, as they have with some of the Pacific Islands.

In the United States, conservative black leaders have arisen, who are able to break through the taboos surrounding Left political positions. Candace Owens has been able to do so, claiming that men are being socially engineered to be Gay. She debated Rabbi Shmuley Boteach on Piers Morgan Uncensored, to an audience of over 2 million viewers, and in my opinion she won decisively. She has been so successful that the Zionist Lobby has tried to block her visit to Australia. Marc Lamont Hill, a black American, did an impressive interview of John Mearsheimer on Al Jazeera, about why the U.S. backs Israel's Genocide of Palestinians.

MLH: Is supporting Israel vital to U.S. national security?

JM: Israel is a strategic albatross around our neck. It's a liability. Let me just point out, the US doesn't just give Israel lots of weapons and lots of money. It gives it unconditionally. This is truly remarkable. We don't treat Israel like a normal country and help it because it's to our benefit strategically. But that's not what's going on here. The US does what it does because of the Lobby. (AIPAC).

(Marc Lamont Hill UPFRONT

<https://www.aljazeera.com/program/upfront/2024/3/29/john-mearsheimer-israel-lobbys-influence-on-us-policy-as-powerful-as-ever>; PalMedia

@PalBint <https://x.com/PalBint/status/1802284350077038787>)

Whereas Trotskyists and Greens support LGBT, Stalin made homosexuality a crime, as did the governments of China, Vietnam and other Soviet allies. Marx and Engels themselves opposed homosexuality.

Denis Freney, a leading Australian Trotskyist and LGBT advocate, quit the Communist Party of Australia (CPA) when it was still Stalinist, and rejoined it once it had abandoned Stalinism, in effect becoming Trotskyist.

Most LGBT activists know nothing of Trotsky, but their movement has Trotskyist ancestry.

It is Trotsky's faction in the West which promoted the LGBT movement, aided by funding from Left billionaires such as George Soros. Those Trots engaged in 'entrism', a tactic used to infiltrate other groups. The targets may not even be aware that their movement was influenced or taken over by Trotskyists.

The Frankfurt School's synthesis of Marx and Freud was pioneered by Trotsky himself. They are not Trotskyist in the narrow 'party' sense, but they are Trotskyoid in the wider culture-war sense. Most were Jewish and also Zionist. Trotsky's book *The Revolution Betrayed* (1937) berates Stalin for restoring God and the Family, whereas he (Trotsky) aspired to turn wives against husbands and children against parents.

The books of H.G. Wells, a supporter of Trotsky, promoted the same agenda. Wells proclaimed, "The family can remain only as a biological fact. Its economic and educational autonomy are inevitably doomed. The modern state is bound to be the ultimate guardian of all children and it must assist, place, or subordinate the parent as supporter, guardian and educator".

The destruction of the Family in the West has Trotskyist pedigree.

Fabian socialism produced the Attlee Government in Britain and the Chifley Government in Australia, both of which introduced mixed economies with substantial public ownership. Both Attlee and Chifley were Christian; there was no public atheism and no LGBT then.

The change came from the 60s/70s movement, which is the real cause of the fall of the West. But as John Laughland pointed out, the same 60s/70s movement which deconstructed the West, aimed to bring down Stalinist regimes in Eastern Europe too.

The libertarian ideology of 1968 had a massive influence in Western Europe in the 1980s and 1990s, when those who had been students in the 1960s came to power. But it is often forgotten that such people were often anti-Soviet because anti-Stalinist. Like Trotsky, they hated Stalin for his social conservatism and for having abandoned the project of world revolution. ...

Just as the anti-Soviet left was completing its long march through Western institutions, a similar movement was taking place in the East. Critical Marxists (critical, that is, of the actual regimes in power in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, but not critical of Marxism as such) played a key role in discrediting the practice of communism in Eastern Europe while upholding much of the theory. Many of the leading dissidents, especially those popular in the West, were leftists. Such people continue to be fêted today—the Sakharov Prize is awarded by the European Parliament to icons of political correctness ... while patriotic anti-communists like Solzhenitsyn or Alexander Zinoviev have been dropped down the memory hole. ... The events of 1989, therefore, did not mark the victory of conservatism over communism but instead of international liberalism over more or less nationalist socialism. As a poster in a Prague shop window in 1989 eloquently pointed out, "89" is nothing but "68" turned round.

https://hungarianreview.com/article/20131128_president_klaus_european_manifesto

The 60s/70s movement was substantially Trotskyist. In its wake, and following Margaret Thatcher's de-socialist movement, Fabians abandoned nationalist socialism and took up the Trotskyist culture-war and H. G. Wells' World State.

Apart from the Trotskyist component of the 60s/70s movement, there was a libertarian component, which was mostly beneficial. The author took part in it.

H. G. Wells was the 20th Century's leading exponent of One World Government, which he also called The New World Order

He was a champion of minorities, yet his New World Order is totalitarian. He was a militant rationalistic atheist; religious people he deemed less mentally evolved, and therefore their ideas do not count. Whilst campaigning for Peace—by which he meant One World Government—he advocated any violent means necessary. His system would be run by an elite, which would attempt to make its rule eternal by suppressing all dissent and rival educational systems. He supported Communism as an ideal system, but criticised its implementation in the U.S.S.R. His Internationalism is really Trotskyism in a disguised form.

Wells was a Fabian at one stage, but dropped out when the Webbs stopped him from taking it over. He was a eugenicist, a supporter of Lenin and Trotsky but opponent of Stalin, and the founder of the Green Left.

Prior to Wells, socialists had emphasised industrialisation, but Wells wrote of the need to limit industry and protect the natural environment. He was the biggest-selling Left author in the 1910s, 20s and 30s; he shaped the minds of a whole generation. Apart from his non-fiction books, he wrote many novels, into which he inserted his political viewpoint. Those novels influenced many people who did not share his political philosophy; even Winston Churchill, who had debated Wells over whether Bolshevism was good or bad, had only good words to say in his obituary for Wells.

The dystopian novels by Aldous Huxley and George Orwell were both responses to Wells' books on the Open Conspiracy for World Government.

Even before the development of nuclear weapons, Wells had argued that we had needed a World Government, because otherwise nations at war with each other would destroy themselves and the planet.

The same theme was advocated in a book issued with the Baruch Plan to control Nuclear weapons, titled *One World Or None*. It had a leftist slant, and a large core of Jewish authors.

The One World Or None theme was in later years applied to ecological damage (only a World Government can save the environment), and then to Biological Warfare (only a World Government can eliminate that threat).

There are many on the Right who oppose not only the solution (World Government), but also deny the reality of the threat too. That is not my position; I think that some of the threats are real, even if exaggerated by the Left.

Wells presents a strong case for World Government, and it is a topic we should be discussing openly and agonising over, because we are in a Catch-22 situation. The threats are real (some of them, anyway), but the outcome could be Tyranny and the End of Civilisation.

The One World forces, co-ordinated by the World Economic Forum, are using these threats to panic us, like cattle being rounded up, into an end-goal they long planned.

The lessons of the Bolshevik Revolution are starkly before our eyes. Whereas, a century ago, its victims were unaware of the fate that would befall them, today we, with hindsight, know what's coming, and are doing all we can to stop it.

In 1929, when Stalin expelled Trotsky from the U.S.S.R., Wells and the Webbs sent him messages of support, and then lobbied to have him admitted to Britain; the Webbs even visited him in Prinkipo, Turkey.

Wells, the apostle of Cosmopolitanism, presented his plans for a World State in his book *The Open Conspiracy* (1928 and 1933); a 1931 edition was called *What Are we To Do With Our Lives?*. The 1928 edition was published just after Trotsky's overthrow by Stalin.

Wells spelled out his ideas most clearly in the 1933 edition of *The Open Conspiracy*.

His aim is "a single world commonweal, preventing war" (p. 30). But it may be "systems of world control rather than a single world state" (p. 32).

The method is "The Open Conspiracy, the world movement for the supercession or enlargement or fusion of existing political, economic, and social institutions ... a movement aiming at the establishment of a world directorate" (pp. 32-3).

It would not lead to a parliament of mankind, but rule by committees of experts:

"in a polyglot world a parliament of mankind or any sort of council that meets and talks is an inconceivable instrument of government.. ... we should have the collective affairs of the world managed by suitably equipped groups of the most interested, intelligent, and devoted people" (p. 31).

The movement would be cosmopolitan: "We have to make an end to war, and to make an end to war we must be cosmopolitan in our politics" (p. 28). The early U.S.S.R. gave high place to cosmopolitanism, but in Stalin's later years, 'cosmopolitan' became a codeword for Jews.

Eugenics is a core part of it: "Intelligent control of population is a possibility ... later, directed breeding will come" (p. 34).

The profit motive would cease: "removing credit and the broad fundamental processes of economic life out of reach of private profit-seeking and individual monopolization" (p. 44).

Wells' Open Conspiracy is based in the West, and bankers are the leaders:

"And when we come to the general functioning classes, landowners, industrial organizers, bankers, and so forth, who control the present system, such as it is, it should be still plainer that it is very largely from the ranks of these classes, and from their stores of experience and traditions of method, that the directive forces of the new order must emerge" (p. 46).

More tribute to bankers:

"there remains a residuum of original and intelligent people in banking or associated with banking or mentally interested in banking, who do realize that banking plays a very important and interesting part in the world's affairs, who are curious about their own intricate function and disposed towards a scientific investigation of its origins, conditions, and future possibilities. Such types move naturally towards the Open Conspiracy" (p. 46).

The Open Conspiracy will introduce the Millennium: 'the nearer draws its uprising, its constructive "dictatorship," and the Millennium' (p. 44).

Wells anticipates the decolonisation movement, freeing nations from the European empires. But then they will be swept up into the One World movement:

India, China, Russia, Africa present melanges of social systems ... the Open Conspiracy may come with an effect of immense invitation. At one step they may go from the sinking vessel of their antiquated order, across their present conquerors, into a brotherhood of world rulers. They may turn to the problem of saving and adapting all that is rich and distinctive of their inheritance to the common ends of the race. But to the less vigorous intelligences of this outer world, the new project of the Open Conspiracy will seem no better than a new form of Western envelopment, and they will fight a mighty liberation as though it were a further enslavement to the European tradition. They will watch the Open Conspiracy for any signs of conscious superiority and racial disregard. Necessarily they will recognize it as a product of Western mentality. (pp. 58-9)

Or should that be Jewish, perhaps? A replacement of Aryan rule with Jewish rule, as Harry Waton predicted? He wrote,

The Aryans will enlarge and beautify the earth; but they will settle to enjoy the world which they created only in the tents of the Jews. These tents are communism, internationalism, the universal brotherhood of man, the emancipation of the working class and the human society—a society of free and morally autonomous rational human beings. The destiny of the Aryans is to become Jews. (A Program for the Jews: An Answer to All Anti-Semites: A Program for Humanity, p. 102) <https://mailstar.net/waton-program.html>.

Wells claimed that the Bolsheviks had no interest in a World State. He criticises 'Marxism' to disguise his pro-Trotsky sympathies; his real target was Stalin:

"Marxism never had any but the vaguest fancies about the relation of one nation to another" (op. cit., p.60). But Lenin and Trotsky did advocate a world-state, which they called "a workers' republic".

The likening of Stalin's system to Czarism is a standard Trotskyist strategy: "the new Russian government, for all its cosmopolitan phrases, is more and more plainly the heirs to the obsessions of Tsarist imperialism, using the Communist Party, as other countries have used Christian missionaries, to maintain a propagandist government to forward its schemes" (p. 60).

Soviet propaganda may be overpowered by Western propaganda:

Nevertheless, the Soviet government has maintained itself for more than twelve years, and it seems far more likely to evolve than to perish. It is quite possible that it will evolve towards the conceptions of the Open Conspiracy ... Its fate may be to develop upon lines that will make its more intelligent elements easily assimilable to the Open Conspiracy for a world revolution. (p. 60)

If the Soviet government can be induced to join the Open Conspiracy, that can only come from the top, via a Gorbachev-type figure:

Russia is a land of tens of millions of peasants ruled over by a little band of the intelligentsia who can be counted only by tens of thousands. ... the only hope of bringing the Russian system into active participation in the world conspiracy is through that small minority. (p. 61)

Yet Wells argued that his One World will be ruled by "an elite of intelligent, creative-minded people" (p. 45). So what's the difference from the Soviet system? Wells' target appears to be Stalin; he is a Trotskyist, despite calling his system "constructive liberalism".

Wells anticipated the Activist groups of the 1960s-70s Culture War (Green, Gay, Feminist, Ethnic, Animal Rights):

There should be many types of groups. Collective action had better for a time—perhaps for a long time—be undertaken not through the merging of groups but through the formation of ad hoc associations for definitely specialized ends, all making for the new world civilization. Open Conspirators will come into these associations to make a contribution. (p. 72)

They will be cosmopolitan:

"In this book we are not starting something; we are describing and participating in something which has started. ... its cosmopolitan character becomes imperatively evident" (p. 73).

A connection with the Illuminati movement?

"Whenever possible, the Open Conspiracy will advance by illumination and persuasion" (p. 88).

The Open Conspiracy fights for Open Borders:

the movement is bound to find itself fighting for open roads, open frontiers, freedom of speech, and the realities of peace in regions of oppression. The Open Conspiracy rests upon a disrespect for nationality, and there is no reason why it should tolerate noxious or obstructive governments because they hold their own in this or that patch of human territory. It lies within the power of the Atlantic communities to impose peace upon the world and secure unimpeded movement and free speech from end to end of the earth. (p. 89)

It will take control of Education; but a Resistance will develop:

While the Open Conspiracy is no more than a discussion it may spread unopposed because it is disregarded. As a mainly passive resistance to militarism it may still be tolerable. But as its knowledge and experience accumulate and its organization becomes more effective and aggressive, as it begins to lay hands upon education, upon social habits, upon business developments, as it proceeds to take over the organization of the community, it will marshal not only its own forces but its enemies. A complex of interests will find themselves restrained and threatened by it, and it may easily evoke that most dangerous of human mass feelings, fear. ... The establishment of the world community will surely exact a price—and who can tell what that price may be?—in toil, suffering, and blood. (pp. 90-1)

Convergence to One World was a Zionist/Trotskyist idea which influenced Gorbachev, and which destroyed the Soviet Union. The aim was to seize control of the U.S.S.R. from the Stalinists, while securing the West for 'Marxist' values of the early Bolshevik period: Gay Rights, Feminism, the abolition of Marriage, cultural revolution, minorities against the majority. David Ben-Gurion proposed it in 1962 (I Predict—The Next 25 Years. Look Magazine Special Issue, January 16, 1962): <https://mailstar.net/bengur62.jpg>.

Andrei Sakharov put a similar Convergence scenario, in books published in the West in the late 1960s and early 1970s, gaining a reputation as one of the Soviet Union's leading dissidents. Yet there was a great difference between his view and that of Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

Solzhenitsyn repudiated the entire regime, from the time of Lenin on, denouncing Lenin as the originator of all the evils; whereas Sakharov proclaimed himself a Marxist, and shielded Lenin from blame. He seems to make no mention of Trotsky, but it can be inferred that he was in the Trotskyist camp.

Sakharov was officially pardoned on December 9, 1986, soon after Gorbachev gained power. But treason charges against Solzhenitsyn were only dropped in September 1991, a month after Gorbachev fell in August 1991.

Sakharov mapped out a four stage plan for Convergence between East and West, leading to World Government. Note that 'leftist Leninist Communists' means 'Trotskyists'; they overthrow the Stalinists:

In the first stage, a growing ideological struggle in the socialist countries between Stalinist and Maoist forces, on the one hand, and the realistic forces of leftist Leninist Communists ...

In the second stage, persistent demands for social progress and peaceful coexistence in the United States and other capitalist countries ... will lead to the victory of the leftist reformist wing of the bourgeoisie, which will begin to implement a programme of rapprochement (convergence) with socialism, i.e., social progress ...

In the third stage, the Soviet Union and the United States, having overcome their alienation, solve the problem of saving the poorer half of the world. The aforementioned twenty per cent tax on the national income of developed countries is applied. ...

In the fourth stage, the socialist convergence will reduce differences in social structure, promote intellectual freedom, science, and economic progress and lead to the creation of a world government and the smoothing of national contradictions (Sakharov, *Progress, Coexistence and Intellectual Freedom*, 1968/1976, pp. 75-7).

The bottom line is that the forces that Stalin overthrew, via the Purges, are now running the West. Yes, some of them are bankers, but bankers supported some of the Bolsheviks, notably Trotsky but not Stalin. Stalin was very cruel, and I do not mean to whitewash his crimes, but he kept an even worse enemy at bay, an enemy that has since come close to destroying Western Civilisation.

Even the collectivization in Ukraine, which led to the Famine, was a policy first called for by Trotsky. At that time Trotsky, although exiled, was setting the agenda for Stalin. That's why Stalin abandoned Bukharin's 'New Economic Policy'. Later, Deng Xiaoping adopted it, to save China after Mao's Great Leap Forward.

A number of authors have wondered whether Wells supported a violent revolution, or only a peaceful one. They need only have consulted *The Outline of History*, where Wells condones the Kronstadt Massacre. He did not feel it necessary to devote more than a few words to it, making out that the Bolsheviks had no choice but to execute the sailors who, a few years earlier, had installed them in power. The 1931 and 1940 editions have the same text and the same page#s:

'In March, 1921, the Bolshevik government had to suppress, and did suppress, an insurrection of the sailors in Kronstadt, "the Pretorian Guard of Bolshevism"' (Wells, 1931 & 1940, p. 1134).

Wells' *Outline of History* (1931 & 1940) makes no mention of the Ukraine Famine, or of the Concentration Camps—which were inaugurated by Lenin—or of the Red Terror, except where he says, "The old inquisitorial and tyrannous Tsarist police was practically continued under the new government" (Wells, 1931 & 1940, p. 1133). In fact, Bolshevik rule was much more ruthless than the Czar's had been.

The view that Wells was a 'Liberal Fascist', not a Communist, was put by Philip Coupland:

The relationship between these two sides of Wellsism is well illustrated by the 'Liberal Fascism' which Wells called for in his addresses to the Young Liberals at their Summer School in Oxford in July 1932. The reason why he was there, Wells stressed, was to 'assist in a kind of "Phoenix Rebirth" of Liberalism'. 'Central' to this reborn 'Liberalism' would be what Wells called a 'competent receiver',

by which he meant 'a responsible organisation, able to guide and rule the new scale human community'. The 'competent receiver' was also, Wells carefully explained, 'flatly opposed' to the norms of 'parliamentary democracy', being a 'special class of people' of the type anticipated in 'the Guardian of Plato's Republic' (Coupland, 2000, pp. 172-3).

An alternative view is that what Wells advocated was 'Marxism for the Elite'. He repeatedly bagged Marx, but praised the early Soviet Union—the regime of the Old Bolsheviks, who later coalesced around Trotsky.

Wells criticised Marx's claim that the New Order would be led by the working class, i.e. the uneducated proletariat. Instead, Wells envisaged leadership by the same class that led the French Revolution—the progressive intellectuals and professionals. This time, however, instead of establishing a national state, they would create a World State.

Did not Trotsky try to do the same? Wells often praised him, and tried to have him given asylum in Britain. How could Wells be a Nazi or Fascist, if he was pro-Trotsky?

The Old Bolshevik leaders themselves were mostly intellectuals, not workers; they were like the Jacobins, and so, fit Wells' model rather than Marx's. Could it be, then, that Wells was just 'calling a spade a spade'?

An alternative way of looking at it is that the Marxist movement of the nineteenth century was using Buonarroti's textbook, which itself was based on principles worked out by Adam Weishaupt. In this light, the Marxist movement is seen as Illuminist, and the fall of the Soviet Union marks only the end of the Stalinist deviation.

Real Illuminism was pro-Trotsky. And like Weishaupt's movement in its early years, it was led by intellectuals and professionals—not workers (they are now deemed 'Deplorables'). So Marx's proletarian formulations are a deviation, from which true Illuminism has re-emerged. Rather than calling Wells' policies 'Marxism for the Elite', they could be called 'Illuminist'.

Wells seems to have divined the intent of the Left Billionaires and Progressives leading us toward One World today. At present we have a sort of 'Liberal Communism', Communism without public ownership, in which billionaire plutocrats such as George Soros and Larry Fink (chairman and CEO of Blackrock) impose Communist (read 'Trotskyoid') social values with an increasing totalitarianism. It's Green Communism, not the Red kind.

Many people were deceived about Wells' agenda, but George Orwell was not one of them. His book *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is a response to Wells' World State.

Isaac Deutscher is an example of a Trotskyoid writer. He is Trotsky's leading interpreter in the West; his 3-volume biography of Trotsky calls him a 'Prophet'. Deutscher was an original thinker, not someone who followed a party line. He is sometimes erroneously called a 'Stalinist' because he credited the Soviet Union with achieving some sort of socialism, even though it was "deformed", whereas hardline Trotskyists refuse to say anything good about it at all.

But Deutscher kept hoping and predicting that it would abandon Stalinism {"vulgar Marxism"} and return to Trotskyism ("classical Marxism"). In the same way, Trotsky, defending the Soviet Union as a "deformed workers' state", hoped to return as leader after Stalin's clash with Hitler, during which, he envisaged, both would be overthrown; this may be why Stalin had him killed.

On December 4, 1939, Trotsky published in his Bulletin of the Opposition an article The Twin-Stars: Hitler-Stalin, in which he noted that in the event of war between Hitler and Stalin, both might be swept away by revolutions. He quoted the French ambassador's comment to Hitler, "In case of war the real victor would be Trotsky" (Volkogonov, *Trotsky: The Eternal Revolutionary*, 1996, p. 342).

Volkogonov comments: "he believed that the world war might end in world revolution, and then the sixty-year-old revolutionary might get his last historical chance" (p. 343).

Deutscher was employed by the Economist magazine during the 1930s and 40s. Given that the Gramscian attack is cultural, not targeting capitalists *per se*, some capitalists have been in league with it, such as David Rockefeller and George Soros; the Economist magazine of recent decades is also on board.

The Deutscher Prize is awarded annually for an innovative book in the Marxist tradition; its winners are announced in the London Review of Books, and the recipient presents the Deutscher Memorial Lecture at the London School of Economics. Deutscher lectures often are published in New Left Review, which is a Trotskyoid publication; authors regularly published in New Left Review, given its clear pro-Trotsky stance, are also Trotskyoid by this definition.

Putin, meanwhile, has re-established Christianity in Russia. The new Cold War is between the atheistic, LGBT, Trotskyoid, Cosmopolitan West, and a coalition of Christian-socialist Russia and Confucian-Stalinist China.

There is no need to look to Hitler for salvation; that would only encumber us with his baggage, and expose us to the 'Nazi' slur.

Readers may wonder why, despite Stalin's crimes, I say that he kept an even worse enemy at bay.

The reason is the tacit alliance between bankers (e.g. Jacob Schiff and George Soros) and the Trotskyoid Left.

Two of Trotsky's close family members were bankers. They were Abram L'vovich Zhivotovsky—Trotsky's uncle Abram—and Abram Givatovzo, Trotsky's cousin.

Richard B. Spence in his 2017 book *Wall Street And The Russian Revolution, 1905-1925*, corrects his own earlier writings on Trotsky. On Sidney Reilly—who was actually Jewish, born Sigmund Saloman Rosenblum—Spence shows that Reilly, nominally a British spy, actually double-crossed the British, and was part of a clique of pro-Trotsky Jewish bankers and businessmen. Others in the clique included Abram L'vovich Zhivotovsky—Trotsky's uncle Abram, who was a Wall street banker—and Sir William Wiseman, the chief of Britain's intelligence service in New York. He, too, was pro-Trotsky rather than pro-Britain, and ended up working at Kuhn Loeb, the Jewish bank.

Spence uncovered a letter from Uncle Abram to Trotsky when he was in internal exile at Alma Ata; the letter was dated 3 October 1928. It acknowledged Trotsky's plan for "active struggle" against "Kinto" (Stalin), and noted that "the material side of the project is completely secured" and "the money sent has been deposited". The message was signed, "your Abram" (Spence, 2017, pp. 254-5).

This alliance operated until Stalin deported Trotsky, and from 1968 until early 2024. The period from 1968 coincided with Globalization and the Culture War, in which these two forces undermined the Nation State by promoting Open Border immigration, and eroded traditional values, e.g. the stable family life of the 1950s.

The LGBT movement is premised on the concept of Androgyny, i.e. that there is really only ONE sex; it's in opposition to the view found in all prior civilisations and cultures, of Complementarity between TWO sexes. At present, women cannot keep 'Trans Women' (women with penises) out of Women's sporting events, toilets and prisons; this violates the need for women-only spaces defined by sex not gender. The LGBT movement has had the temerity to cancel Germaine Greer, J. K. Rowling, John Cleese, Barry Humphries, and Richard Dawkins—despite Dawkins' fame as a biologist.

The Trotskyist site marxists.org, which promotes LGBT, has censored the correspondence of Marx and Engels on homosexuality. The letter of 22 June, 1869, which condemns homosexuality, used to be at marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1869/letters/69_06_22.htm,

but the Marx-Engels Archive now says "File No Longer Available!" Yet it's at the Wayback Machine.

Engels writes,

{warning—strong language ahead}

Dear Moor,

[...] The Urning you sent me is a very curious thing. These are extremely unnatural revelations. The paederasts [homosexual paedophiles] are beginning to count themselves, and discover that they are a power in the state. ... Guerre aux cons, paix aus trous-de-cul [war on the cunts, peace to the arse-holes] will now be the slogan. ... Incidentally it is only in Germany that a fellow like this can possibly come forward, convert this smut into a theory, and offer the invitation: introite [enter], etc. Unfortunately, he has not yet got up the courage to acknowledge publicly that he is 'that way', and must still operate coram publico 'from the front', if not 'going in from the front' as he once said by mistake. But just wait until the new North German Penal Code recognises the droits du cul [rights of the arse-hole] then he will operate quite differently. Then things will go badly enough for poor frontside people like us, with our childish penchant for females. ...

Your
F. E.

Another Trotskyist provided the rationale for censoring Marx & Engels:

Socialism and Gay Liberation: Back to the Future

By: Doug Ireland

Winter 2009 (New Politics Vol. XII No. 2, Whole Number 46)

Well before the invention of the word “homosexual” by Karoly Maria Kertbeny in 1869, the correspondence of Marx and Engels is riddled with what we would now characterize as unmistakable homophobia of a vicious character. When the pioneering German homosexual liberationist Karl Ulrichs sent Marx one of his books on the subject, which Marx forwarded to his collaborator, Engels described Ulrichs' platform of homosexual emancipation from criminal laws as “turning smut into history.” Marx, in commenting on Karl Boruttau's *Gedanken über Gewissens Freiheit* (Thoughts on Freedom of Conscience), disparaged the author as “this faggoty prick” (Schwanzschwulen).

The alliance between bankers and the Trotskyoid Left weakened early in 2024 when plutocratic Donors clamped down on Diversity Equity & Inclusion (DEI) policies at universities because they had helped mobilise students against the Genocide in Gaza. Trotskyists are divided over Israel, because some Jewish Trots are Zionists, but the broader Trotskyoid Left (which includes Jews, Palestinians and other ethnicities) share a similar view of Israel to the antisemitic Right. They are coming to believe, not that Zionists run the world—that would be an overstatement (although Eric Clapton and Roger Waters *did* recently say so)—but that they dominate the West. The Global South, at the United Nations, is holding the United States to account for backing Israel, and the West is losing face over it. This will have geopolitical implications, and it disproves the claim of Noam Chomsky that Israel is merely America's sheriff in the Middle East.

The Zionist Federation of Australia has sued Mary Kostakidis for Antisemitism over her comments on Palestine, using a Race Hate law against her. She is a popular journalist who hosted SBS World News for decades, and has many admirers in Left circles. This case is setting off alarm bells, because "Hate Laws" are now being seen for the deadening censorship weapons that they always were. Louise Adler asked the media whether taboos about Israel (and by implication Jews) have made them too cowardly to report what is going on in Palestine.

The Right's main concern is the overthrow of Western Civilisation and the role of Atheistic Jews therein, i.e. the replacement of the WASP Elite by a Jewish Elite.

In October 1994, the Spectator magazine published an article by William Cash, titled *Kings of the Deal: William Cash investigates Hollywood's new Jewish Establishment*.

It stated that the East-coast WASP Establishment had been displaced by a new Jewish establishment. On November 5 the Spectator published letters critical of Cash—including one from The Board of Deputies of British Jews—and Cash's reply.

The editor, Dominic Lawson, who was Jewish, later wrote that Advertisers had threatened to withdraw their business. Conrad Black, owner of the Spectator, was assailed, and his media empire threatened.

The Right is also concerned by an upsurge of Satanism, for example in the Opening Ceremony of the 2024 Olympics in Paris, in which drag queens mocked the Last Supper; Jesus Christ was represented by a Jewish Lesbian in that event.

The annual Hollywood Emmy Awards (for actors, directors, producers etc.) are awarded by the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences (NATAS). Written in reverse, that spells SATAN; this is hardly accidental.

To dismiss all these concerns as 'antisemitic' is to render that epithet meaningless.

This article is derived from my book *The Cosmopolitan Empire: One World but Whose?* The book contains a lot more detail than I have provided above, and exposes many misconceptions. For a 6"x9" book of 467 pages, the List price is very low (\$29), So, Reader, I hope you will consider buying it and reviewing it:

<https://www.amazon.com/Cosmopolitan-Empire-One-World-Whose/dp/0645836117>