

# **Unveiling Lies of the Cold War: What Lay Beneath Anti-Soviet Myths**

**Articles by Ekaterina Blinova**

These articles were originally published in 2015 in *SputnikNews.com*,  
except for one that was published in *Russia-Insider.com*

These articles are copyrighted by the original publishers and are  
reprinted here with the permission of the publishers.

February, 2016

[www.RedStarPublishers.org](http://www.RedStarPublishers.org)

## Contents

Introduction, by Roger Keeran.....	i
Untold Story of Soviet POWs Tormented in Polish Captivity in 1920s.....	1
Holodomor Hoax: Joseph Stalin’s Crime That Never Took Place.....	6
Holodomor Hoax: The Anatomy of a Lie Invented by West’s Propaganda Machine.....	11
Holodomor Hoax: West’s ‘Golden Embargo’ and Soviet Famine of 1932-33.....	16
British Fascism: Why British Nobility Hailed Adolf Hitler and Nazi Germany .....	20
The Munich Agreement: West’s Political Conspiracy Against Stalin? .....	26
The Munich Betrayal: How Western Powers ‘Sold’ Czechoslovakia to Hitler.....	31
Untold Story of Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact.....	37
US Historian: Stalin Not Guilty of Major War Crime Blamed on Him (Katyn).....	44
Post WW2 World Order: US Planned to Wipe USSR Out by Massive Nuclear Strike .....	49
History Repeated: Ukraine Neo-Nazis Turn to Old Ally US for “Help” .....	55
By Equating USSR to Nazi Germany West Covers Up Own Shameful History .....	58
Who Controls the Past Controls the Future: Why Does the West Hate Stalin?.....	62

## Introduction

The current pamphlet brings together articles challenging Cold War myths, written by the Russian journalist and political analyst, Ekaterina Blinova, in 2015 largely for the website *sputniknews.com*. *Sputnik* is a news service of the Russian government that began in November 2014. It offers high-quality news and analysis available in English as well as other languages. (One article, on the Katyn Massacre, was published by *Russia-Insider*, an independent online source since September 2014 dedicated to media criticism). In these pieces, Blinova draws on the work and views of scholars in the United States, Canada, England, Scotland, Russia and Poland to question the interpretation of certain events in the history of the Soviet Union and Europe promoted by western writers and politicians during the Cold War to feed animosity toward the Soviet Union. Among these events are the famine in the Ukraine in the early 1930s, the Munich Agreement of 1938 between Britain, France, Italy and Nazi Germany, the Molotov/Ribbentrop Pact of 1939, the collaboration of Ukrainian nationalists with Nazi Germany during World War II, and the post-World War II arms race.

These articles make a valuable contribution to setting straight the historical record. Beyond this, the articles make an extremely important political contribution, because just as history was used to fuel hostility toward the Soviet Union during the Cold War, it is being used again today to fuel hostility toward Russia in a new Cold War. The existence of a new Cold War cannot be doubted. The vaunted hopes of 1991 that, with the reunification of Germany and the end of socialism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe the Cold War was over and the threat of a nuclear confrontation was receding, has turned into a cruel joke. Beginning with the dismantling of Yugoslavia, then the expansion of NATO to the very borders of Russia and support of rebellions against Muammar al-Qaddafi in Libya and Bashar al-Assad in Syria, the United States and its compliant European allies have aggressively ignored or rather flaunted Russian interests. This aggression was even more on display in the Ukraine, where the United States and its European allies, in their efforts to bring the country into the European Union, supported the overthrow of an elected leader and his replacement by proto-fascists.

In 2014, after the Crimeans exercised their right to self-determination and voted to leave the Ukraine and join Russia, the West imposed economic sanctions on Russia, which they have since renewed and extended.

The underlying reason for the new Cold War is precisely the same as the first one, namely the desire of U.S. imperialism and its European allies to dominate the world for investment, natural resources and markets. Though U.S. policy-makers may disguise the underlying economic motivations, they do not disguise their aggressive objectives. In 1991, shortly after the collapse of the Soviet Union, President George Bush and Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney asked Paul Wolfowitz, Lewis Libby and Zalmay Khalilzad to prepare a Department of Defense Planning Guidance for 1994-1999. The result, in the words of Andrew Murray, was “a charter for super-imperialism.”<sup>1</sup> The Guidance declared:

Our first objective is to prevent the re-emergence of a new rival, either on the territory of the former Soviet Union or elsewhere, that poses a threat on the order of that posed formerly by the Soviet Union. This is a dominant consideration underlying the new regional defense strategy and requires that we endeavor to prevent any hostile power from dominating a region whose resources would, under consolidated control, be sufficient to generate global power.

This thinking has not been confined to Republican neo-cons. It prevails in the strategic thinking of Democrats as well. In 1997 Zbigniew Brzezinski, who had been the national security advisor of President Jimmy Carter and who remains an advisor to Democratic leaders, wrote *The Grand Chessboard*, in which he declared: “It is imperative that no Euroasian challenger appear capable of dominating Euroasia and thus contesting America.” This was clearly a call for weakening Russia and preventing its revival as an international power.

The Ukraine has been at the center of the new Cold War. The crisis in the Ukraine that developed in 2014-15 had roots in

---

<sup>1</sup>Two solid accounts of the unfolding of the new Cold War are Andrew Murray, *The Empire and Ukraine* (Manifesto Press, 2015) and Diana Johnstone, *Queen of Chaos: The Misadventures of Hillary Clinton* (Counterpunch, 2015).

three processes unleashed by the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991. The first process was the privatization, collapse and corruption of the Ukrainian economy. In the Ukraine a small group of emergent oligarchs, many of whom are former Soviet officials, privatized the bulk of energy and industry and wreaked havoc on the Ukrainian economy while fabulously enriching themselves and corrupting the government. By 2014 some 100 oligarchs controlled 80-85 percent of the country's wealth. Meanwhile the economy as a whole declined 60 percent between 1991 and 2001 and by 2014 it was no larger than it was in 1991. Unemployment was 10 percent, inflation 20 percent. Breathtaking corruption ruled everywhere, from traffic cops to top government officials.

The second process unleashed by the collapse of the Soviet Union was the revival of Ukrainian nationalism and fascism in the form of organizations such as Svoboda and the Right Sector. These forces were the political heirs of Stepan Bandera and his Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and its armed wing, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) which had collaborated with the Nazis during World War II in hopes of setting up a collaborationist Ukrainian nation. The OUN slogan was "Long live Ukraine without Jews, Poles and Germans; Poles behind the river San, Germans to Berlin, and Jews to the gallows." Bandera and the Germans were responsible for the death of 600,000 Ukrainian Jews, and in the wake of the German retreat of 1944, Bandera's forces killed 130,000 Poles in western Ukraine, mainly women and children. With the support of the CIA, Bandera continued armed resistance to Soviet rule until the early 1950s.

The third process unleashed by the collapse of the Soviet Union was the ambition of the U.S. and NATO to integrate the Ukraine into the western capitalist economy and western defense alliance. The Ukraine was not only rich in natural resources and industry, with great potential for markets and investment, but integrating it into the West would prevent the post-Soviet Russia from emerging as a major power. Such integration required that a Ukrainian government would be pro-West, would clean up corruption, and would adopt neo-liberal austerity. Toward this end, from 1991 until today, the U.S. invested \$5 billion in the Ukraine, making it the third largest recipient of America aid after Israel and Egypt.

All of these developments lay behind the crisis that emerged in 2014. The immediate cause of the Maidan demonstrations that overthrew the government of President Yanukovych was Yanukovych's refusal to sign an agreement with the European Union. Not only did Yanukovych want a tripartite agreement that included Russia, but he also refused to agree to the austerity and other measures demanded by the International Monetary Fund. Though the original demonstrations raised democratic demands and were fueled by immense discontent over the economy and corruption, the demonstrations were soon hijacked by Svoboda and the Right Sector with support from the U.S. Massacres occurred in Maidan Square and Odessa. Fearing for his life, Yanukovych fled the capital.

The new government followed the neo-liberal agenda. It cut welfare payments, taxed pensions, raised gas prices, slashed state payrolls, deregulated the economy, and reduced state spending by 17 percent. Neo-liberals from outside the country were appointed to top government posts, including the former Georgian President Mikhail Saakashvili and the new Finance Minister, Natalie Jaresko, an American. Under the new regime eight suspicious suicides of former supporters of Yanukovych occurred. The government effectively banned the Communist Party and restricted trade unions. Svoboda and the Right Sector emerged as armed militias linked to the regime. New laws exalted Nazi collaborators like Bandera as national heroes and made any display of Soviet symbols or praise of the Soviet Union punishable by up to five years in prison.

Several of Blinova's articles deal with the Ukraine. She shows how Ukrainian nationalists and western commentators have distorted history to justify their own narrative and policy objectives in the Ukraine. The most notable and discredited of these distortions is the Holodomor myth, the idea that Stalin deliberately engineered a famine in the Ukraine in early 1930s. She also explains the actual history of the Ukrainian fascists of the OUN and UPA, the heroes and progenitors of today's Ukrainian neo-fascists.

Beyond this, Illinova deals with other historical topics that have become grist for anti-Soviet and anti-Russian propaganda, including the Munich Agreement of 1938, the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact of 1939, and the Katyn massacre of Polish of-

ficers in the early 1940s. Blinova also deals with the recent law by the Ukrainian parliament equating Communism and Nazism, the history of pro-fascist sentiments and activity among the British ruling class before World War II, the Polish government's cover-up of the disappearance of 150,000 Soviet POW's after the Russian-Polish war of 1920-21, and the preparations of the United States for an attack on the Soviet Union after World War II.

All of this makes Blinova's articles inspired and timely reading.

Roger Keeran, January 2016

[Dr. Roger Keeran, *Ph. D.*, History, is a Professor Emeritus at Empire State College, State University of New York. He is the author of *The Communist Party and the Auto Workers Unions* (1980); and is a co-author with Thomas Kenney of *Socialism Betrayed: Behind the Collapse of the Soviet Union* (2004; 2010).]





## Untold Story of Soviet POWs Tormented in Polish Captivity in 1920s

*The incident with Ambassador Andrejev has indicated that Warsaw is unwilling to shed light on some inconvenient historical episodes, keeping them swept under the carpet. Unsurprisingly though, the story of tens of thousands of Soviet prisoners of war who died from hunger and torture in Polish captivity remains largely untold.*

Ekaterina Blinova

*SputnikNews.com*, 17:21 20.10.2015 (updated 18:25 21.10.2015)

<http://sputniknews.com/politics/20151020/1028815513/thousands-soviet-prisoners-died-poland-katyn.html>

On July 28, 2000, the Memorial commemorating Polish officers and Soviet civilians executed by the NKVD (the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs) personnel in the early 1940s was erected in Russia, 20 kilometers from the center of Smolensk, between the villages of Gnezdovo and Katyn, in the so-called "Katyn forest."

However, it is only a part of the story: in contrast to the Russian Federation, Poland is still unwilling to erect a monument commemorating tens of thousands of Soviet POWs who died in Polish captivity in the 1920s.

### How It All Began



Soldiers of the 1st mounted army. © *Sputnik*

In 1919, Poland unleashed an ambitious military campaign aimed against Russia, torn and exhausted by fierce internal strife.

*“By early 1920, Soviet armies had defeated their principal internal foes, but they still faced an external enemy in the western border-lands of Russia. This was the Polish Government of Jozef Pilsudski, Head of State and Commander-in-Chief of the army. Pilsudski was an ambitious man and an ardent nationalist who sought to regain the Polish frontiers of 1772 and re-establish Poland as a Great Power,” Canadian Professor Michael Jabara Carley of the University of Montreal narrates in his essay “Anti-Bolshevism in French Foreign Policy: The Crisis in Poland in 1920.”*

The Polish leader had quarreled bitterly with Czechoslovakia and fought for territories with both the Lithuanians and Galicia’s Ukrainians. The historian pointed out that in early 1919 Pilsudski had made substantial territorial gains while the Bolsheviks were fighting in the civil war.

In April 1920, the Polish Army kicked off a large-scale offensive and grabbed Kiev (Ukrainian Soviet Republic) in early May.

“But success was short-lived, as the Red Army launched a powerful counter-offensive, forcing the Poles to surrender Kiev and then throwing them back westward in headlong disorder,” the Canadian historian proceeded with his narrative.

In order to support Warsaw, France poured hundreds of millions of francs into Poland.

At a cost of some 350 million francs, Paris trained and equipped the seventy to eighty thousand men of Jozef Haller’s Army which had been deployed in Poland after the First World War. The French government also sent a large military mission to Poland comprising six hundred instructors and advisors.

*However, “the Polish retreat did not halt until the middle of August [1920] at the outskirts of Warsaw, where the Red Army was defeated and in its turn driven back,” the Canadian historian underscored.*

On March 18, 1921, the Treaty of Riga was signed between Poland, Soviet Russia (acting also on behalf of Soviet Belarus) and Soviet Ukraine.

In accordance with the treaty, Poland gained a territory of over 200,000 square km that belonged to Western Ukraine and

Western Belarus, with a population of four million people and over one million residents, respectively. It is worth mentioning that only 15 percent of the population living in these territories was ethnically Polish).

In addition, the aforementioned territories of Soviet Ukraine and Soviet Belarus were then returned to the USSR's republics under the provisions of the so-called Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact after the Polish government fled the country in early September 1939 (following Nazi Germany's invasion).

### **Soviet POWs in Polish Captivity**

During the Polish-Soviet war over 150,000 Soviet military servicemen became prisoners of war and were held in Polish POW camps. The camps were located in Strzalkowo, Pikulice, Wadowice, and Tuchola.

Professor Gennady F. Matveyev of Moscow State University carried out thorough research on the matter and published the book "Polskiy Plen" ("The Polish Captivity") which sheds light on this controversial historical episode.

Citing Russian and Polish archival documents the professor underscores that Poland had captured up to 206,877 Red Army soldiers, while 60,000 to 83,500 died in captivity due to unbearable living conditions, poor nutrition, torture and disease.

*In his memorandum of September 9, 1921, to the Polish Embassy in Moscow, Head of the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs of RSFSR (Soviet Russia) G. Chicherin called attention to the fact that "...within two years 60 thousand Russians died in Poland." However, Warsaw remained suspiciously silent on the matter.*

Soviet and foreign correspondents as well as representatives of the international Red Cross organization reported inhumane treatment of Soviet Army POWs by Polish military authorities.

Wounded Soviet soldiers captured by the Polish Army were often left to die on the battle field.

Many captured Red Army soldiers died of cold and hunger while being transported to the Polish concentration camps. Upon arrival to the camps they were subjected to torture, humiliation and mistreatment. They died by the thousands: Poland ignored the Geneva Conventions.

Famous Soviet writer Alexander Serafimovich, then special correspondent for Izvestia and Pravda newspapers at the Polish front, wrote:

*"The torture and humiliation that Russian prisoners were subjected to made privates of the Polish Army shudder with horror, but the officers in one voice advocated 'destroying the Red dogs, the Russian occupants'. The attempts of the Russian command to provide appropriate treatment to [Soviet] POWs were ignored by Warsaw. Our country's attempts to alter the situation by asking for the help of the League of Nations and Poland's neighbors also proved fruitless."*

### **Poland: Still in Denial**

Needless to say, Warsaw is still unwilling to admit any wrongdoing.

Polish historian Zbigniew Klemens Karpus insists that the number of Soviet POWs amounted to 80,000-110,000 people. Since 65,000 to 70,000 former Soviet troops returned to Russia in accordance with the Riga Treaty (while several thousand defected to Poland) there were just 18,000 who died from hunger and mistreatment in Polish captivity.

However, the devil is always in the details. Documents stored in Poland's Central Military Archive (CAW) proved otherwise, Professor Matveyev pointed out, slamming Karpus for his inaccuracy. Polish secret military reports indicated that the number of captives exceeded 150,000.

Furthermore, claiming that just 18,000 Soviet detainees died in Polish concentration camps, Karpus obviously ignored Colonel Ignacy Matuszewski's report of 1922. The colonel of the General Staff of Army of Poland Matuszewski wrote to Jozef Pilsudsky on February 1, 1922: "...Especially in the camp of Tuchola... about 22 thousand Red Army men died."

*"In September 1998, Russia's Procurator General Yuri Chayka sent a letter to Poland's minister of justice demanding an official inquiry into the deaths of Russian soldiers captured during the Polish-Soviet war of 1919-1921. The letter asserted that 83,500 internees had died "in Polish concentration camps as a result of cruel and inhuman conditions," Benjamin B. Fischer, then member of the History Staff of the CIA's Center for*

*the Study of Intelligence, reported in 2000, adding that Poland “rejected the allegation.”*

In October 2014, the Russian Military Historical Society addressed the Polish government requesting permission to erect a monument dedicated to deceased Soviet captives at Krakow’s Rakowicki Cemetery, according to RIA Novosti. The initiative prompted fierce protest from the Polish government: Poland’s Foreign Minister Grzegorz Schetyna branded it as a “provocation.” So far, the plea of the Russian Military Historical Society was dismissed.

There is a lot of controversy surrounding the history of Russo-Polish relations. It seems that to establish fruitful and mutually beneficial collaboration the countries should conduct a fair and unbiased investigation into the controversial matters.

The views expressed in this article are solely those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official position of *Sputnik*.

## **Holodomor Hoax: Joseph Stalin's Crime That Never Took Place**

*Playing into the hands of Ukrainian nationalists, a monument to the so-called Ukrainian "Holodomor," one the 20th century's most famous myths and vitriolic pieces of anti-Soviet Propaganda, has been erected in the US capital.*

Ekaterina Blinova

*SputnikNews.com*, 17:45 09.08.2015 (updated 20:29 12.08.2015)

<http://sputniknews.com/politics/20150809/1025560345.html>

Remarkably, the roots of the "Holodomor" ("deliberate starvation") myth lie in the longstanding Cold War standoff between Soviet Russia and the West. After the defeat of Nazi Germany in 1945, infamous Nazi collaborators — members of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and their paramilitary UPA (Ukrainian Insurgent Army) units — fled into Western Europe and the United States, escaping punishment for their hideous crimes, including ruthless terror against peaceful Jewish, Ukrainian and Russian civilians.

In 1949 the CIA and the US State Department sponsored the OUN-UPA leaders' immigration to the United States, planning to use them as subversion groups and intelligence agents in the Cold War against Soviet Russia.

One of them, Mykola Lebed was characterized as "a well-known sadist and collaborator of the Germans" by the CIA, according to Swedish-American historian Dr. Per Anders Rudling in his book "The OUN, the UPA and the Holocaust: A Study in the Manufacturing of Historical Myths." However, this fact had not prevented the CIA from recruiting the former Nazi collaborator.

*"Mykola Lebed [who was responsible for the murder of Poles in Volhynia and Eastern Galicia] lived in Queens, New York, until the 1990s, totally supported by the CIA or State Department," the US expert in Soviet history Professor Grover Carr Furr of Montclair State University, narrated in an interview with Sputnik in May, 2015.*

The CIA believed that Ukrainian nationalism could be used as an efficient cold war weapon.

While the Ukrainian nationalists provided Washington with valuable information about its Cold War rivals, the CIA in return was placing the nationalist veterans into positions of influence and authority, helping them to create semi-academic institutions or academic positions in existing universities.

By using these formal and informal academic networks, the Ukrainian nationalists had been disseminating anti-Russian propaganda, creating myths and re-writing history at the same time whitewashing the wartime crimes of OUN-UPA.



The sculpture of the Holodomor Memorial in Washington, DC  
© Photo: Embassy of Ukraine in the United States of America

One of these myths was “Holodomor” that claimed that the USSR and its leader Joseph Stalin deliberately starved to death from three to seven million Ukrainians.

*“In 1987 the film “Harvest of Despair” was made. It was the beginning of the ‘Holodomor’ movement. The film was entirely funded by Ukrainian nationalists, mainly in Canada. A Canadian scholar, Douglas Tottle, exposed the fact that the film took photographs from the 1921-22 ‘Volga famine’ and used them to illustrate the 1932-33 famine. Tottle later wrote a book, ‘Fraud, Famine, and Fascism: The Ukrainian Genocide Myth*

*from Hitler to Harvard,' about the phony 'Holodomor' issue," Professor Furr elaborated.*

After the collapse of the USSR, the Ukrainian diaspora played a substantial role in shaping the ideology of the new Ukrainian state. "Unlike many other former Soviet republics, the Ukrainian government did not need to develop new national myths from scratch, but imported ready concepts developed in the Ukrainian diaspora," Dr. Rudling underscored.

However, it was under Ukrainian President Viktor Yushchenko (who gained his power after the Western-sponsored Maidan uprising of 2004, also known as the Orange Revolution) when the anti-Russian myth making caught its second wind in Ukraine. Under Yushchenko, several institutes of "memory management" and "myth making" were established in the country.

Both Russian and Western historians have questioned the "Holodomor" concept as well as evidently exaggerated number of victims of the famine of 1932-33 in Ukraine.

American historian Professor Mark B. Tauger, West Virginia University, carried out thorough research on the famine of 1932-33 in the USSR, and came to the conclusion that the disaster was due to environmental circumstances and was evidently not related to the Soviet policy in the region.

*"Popular media and most historians for decades have described the great famine that struck most of the USSR in the early 1930s as "man-made," very often a "genocide" that Stalin perpetrated intentionally against Ukrainians and sometimes other national groups to destroy them as nations... This perspective, however, is wrong. The famine that took place was not limited to Ukraine or even rural areas of the USSR, it was not fundamentally or exclusively man-made, and it was far from the intention of Stalin and others in the Soviet leadership to create such a disaster. A small but growing literature relying on new archival documents and a critical approach to other sources has shown the flaws in the "genocide" or "intentionalist" interpretation of the famine and has developed an alternative interpretation," Tauger wrote in his research work "Review of R.W. Davies and Stephen G. Wheatcroft, The Years of Hunger: Soviet Agriculture, 1931-1933."*

Tauger stressed that climatic conditions played the main role in the famine of 1932-33.



Paradoxically, supporters of the “Holodomor” myth remain silent about the fact that Russia (including the territory of modern Ukraine) had suffered from periodic devastating famines since the end of 19th century, long before Bolsheviks came to power in 1917. They also ignore the fact that there were serious famines in 1920-21, 1924, 1927 and 1928.

Interestingly enough, official Soviet Ukrainian primary sources show that the 1928-29 famine, caused by natural disaster, mainly draught, was very serious, and Ukraine received more aid from the Soviet government, than it sent to other parts of the USSR. This obviously disproves the false theory of the Ukrainian nationalists’ “malicious” conspiracy against Ukrainian peasants in the Soviet Union, noted Grover Furr in his book “Blood Lies: The Evidence that Every Accusation Against Joseph Stalin and the Soviet Union in Timothy Snyder’s Bloodlands Is False.”



Azov battalion fighters in Kiev

In response to historians who suggest that the Ukrainian peasants starved and suffered especially because of Collectivization — Stalin’s policy of the early 1930s aimed at consolidating individual lands into collective farms — Tauger emphasized:

*“These studies minimize or ignore the actual harvest data, the environmental factors that caused low harvests, the repeated recovery from the famine and crop failures, the large harvests of the 1930s, the mechanization of Soviet farms in these years, Soviet population growth, and the long-term increases in food pro-*

*duction and consumption over the Soviet period*” (“*Soviet Peasants and Collectivization, 1930-1939*”).

According to the scholar, although the Stalin regime implemented collectivization “coercively,” the policy “brought substantial modernization to traditional agriculture in the Soviet Union, and laid the basis for relatively high food production and consumption by the 1970s and 1980s” (“*Stalin, Soviet Agriculture and Collectivization, 1930-1939*”).

Remarkably, the famine of 1932-33 was the last famine that struck the Soviet Union with the exception for the famine of 1946-47 the country suffered from after the Second World War.

Although the “Holodomor” myth was never based upon credible evidence and there are enough authentic sources to prove that it is a hoax, it is simply taken for granted. Unsurprisingly, Washington supports the myth as a part of its recent Cold War-style anti-Russian campaign. Alas, even repeated a thousand times a lie will never become the truth.

## **Holodomor Hoax: The Anatomy of a Lie Invented by West's Propaganda Machine**

*The Western propaganda machine, smoothly stamping fabricated reports about Russia's involvement in Syria, originated in the beginning of the Communist era in 1917; the Holodomor hoax of 1932-33 was invented by the West in close cooperation with Nazi Germany and pro-Nazi Ukrainian nationalists.*

Ekaterina Blinova

*SputnikNews.com*, 10:26 19.10.2015 (updated 16:25 19.10.2015)

<http://sputniknews.com/politics/20151019/1028730561/holodomor-hoax-invented-hitler-west.html>

Since the October Revolution of 1917 in Russia, Western media has made every effort to downplay the achievements of the Soviets, creating a picture of complete horror and despair which had allegedly engulfed the USSR.

The bold historical experiment kicked off by Communists and based on the concept of a "fair distribution of national wealth," egalitarianism and internationalism, made the blood of Western plutocrats run cold.

Historians note, that Soviet Communism was the absolute antithesis of capitalism. If the new system proved effective it would have changed the world forever. Needless to say, it did not comply with the plans of the Western financial and political elite.

*"Those in positions of power in capitalist countries see socialism as a threat to their continued profit and privilege. Both to undermine support of a socialist alternative at home, and to maintain a dominant position in international economic and political relationships, all manner of lies and distortions are employed to cast the USSR in as negative a light as possible," Canadian researcher, trade union activist and author Douglas Tottle wrote in his book "Fraud, Famine and Fascism: The Ukrainian Genocide Myth from Hitler to Harvard" in 1987.*

In his book Tottle presented the detailed history of the West's propaganda campaign based on the thesis that the 1932-1933 famine in Ukraine was a deliberately planned "genocide" of Ukrainians by the Soviet government. Tottle's research has acquired new meaning today, as a result of the so-called

“Ukrainian Holodomor” myth catching a second wind in Ukraine and in the West.

### **Colluding With Nazi Germany: The Birth of the Myth**

The roots of the famine-genocide propaganda campaign lay in a series of articles written by “noted journalist, traveller and student of Russian affairs” Thomas Walker for the Hearst press in 1935. The articles described the horrific famine of 1932-33 in Ukraine, while photographs, accompanying the stories, portrayed desperate victims of the famine.

The material and the photographs were truly impressive, but, as it turned out later “noted” journalist Thomas Walker had never visited Ukraine in 1932-1933, furthermore, he never existed.

As for the photographs, US investigative journalists revealed in 1935 that some of them were taken in war-torn areas of Europe just after the First World War, others depicted the Volga famine victims of 1921-1922 in Russia.

Tottle pointed out that American newspaper publisher William Randolph Hearst had no scruples about publishing fabricated reports.

“Not only were the photographs a fraud, the trip to Ukraine a fraud, and Hearst’s famine-genocide series a fraud, Thomas Walker himself was a fraud,” the Canadian researcher narrated.

*“However, the Walker famine photographs are truly remarkable in that, having been exposed as utter hoaxes over fifty years ago, they continue to be used by Ukrainian Nationalists and university propaganda institutes as evidence of alleged genocide,” Tottle noted in 1987, and remarkably, nothing has changed since then.*

In fact it was not Hearst who launched the famine-genocide campaign: the press mogul had powerful allies— German and Italian fascists.

In 1933, the hoax was devised by Reich Minister of Propaganda Joseph Goebbels, who is regarded as the genuine creator of the myth. It was he who started the propaganda campaign against the Soviet rule in Ukraine, by inventing stories of the Soviet atrocities in the region. Ukraine was viewed by Nazis as Germany’s potential “Lebensraum.”

In 1934, Hearst visited Nazi Germany and met with the infamous German Fuhrer.

*“It was following Hearst’s trip to Nazi Germany that the Hearst press began to promote the theme of ‘famine-genocide in Ukraine’,” Tottle stressed.*

Taking a soft line on the Nazis’ activities in Germany, Hearst unleashed an all-out propaganda war against the USSR. He denigrated Soviet industrialization and collectivization achievements, at the same time eulogizing about Nazi Germany’s economic developments.

However, “Hearst was by no means the only extreme right-wing news mogul” in the US, Tottle remarked.

It should be noted that Nazi Germany’s “economic miracle” had actually happened due to generous investments made by British and American capitalists (this story is brilliantly described by American economist Guido Giacomo Preparata in his book “Conjuring Hitler”).

### **Cold War Era: ‘Holodomor’ Myth Adopted by West**

Although the German “Lebensraum” dream had not come true, the famine-genocide hoax was willingly adopted by Western policy-makers as well as their subservient academics and media sources during the post-WW2 Cold War era.

“An anti-communist marriage of convenience took place between the American ultra-right and Ukrainian Nationalists, sections of whom collaborated with the Nazis. These now required new clothes and a cover story for past activities, while the Cold War promoters could point to such people as ‘living witnesses of the communist menace facing humanity’,” Tottle narrated.

There were dozens of books written by former Nazi Ukrainian collaborators and Western authors, which told false stories of Soviet atrocities, brutality and ruthlessness.

The number of victims of what they called “deliberate famine genocide in Ukraine” or “Holodomor” grew by leaps and bounds and reached almost ten million people.

Eventually, in 1986 British writer Robert Conquest published a book entitled “Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and the Terror Famine.”

Needless to say, the research conducted by Conquest, a former employee of the IRD (Information Research Department) — the British Secret Service disinformation project aimed against Soviet Russia — bore little, if any, relation to reality.

Tottle pointed to the fact that Conquest mostly relied on biased rightist Ukrainian sources, 1935 Hearst press accounts, Thomas Walker's non-existent travel notes and his fake collection of photographs, and books written by members of the infamous Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) that collaborated with Nazi Germany during WW2.

To illustrate the extent of Conquest's anti-Soviet paranoia, Tottle referred to another book, written by the British author together with John Manchip White — "What to Do When the Russians Come: A Survivalist's Handbook" (1984).

*"The book draws up a list of 'ingenious variations' of communist terror in store for democratic Americans, including the specter of gang-rape of American women by Russian soldiers, a miserable fate for American children, and warning of inevitable 'famine,'"* Tottle noted, adding with a touch of sarcasm: *"What better 'historian' to give a scholarly veneer to the famine-genocide campaign than Dr. Robert Conquest?"*

Indeed, it now becomes clear what propaganda techniques lie at the root of the West's present narrative of Russia's phantom "menace" and the "threat" it poses to Ukraine, the Baltic states and the rest of Europe.

### **What Really Happened in 1932-1933**

But what did really happen in Ukraine in 1932-1933?

*"The 1917 Russian revolution was followed by military intervention by fourteen foreign powers (including the United States, Britain and Canada) and an extended civil war. The destruction of seven years of war, revolution and intervention combined with severe drought, resulted in widespread hunger and starvation — the Russian famine of 1921-1922,"* the Canadian researcher pointed out.

Having survived these hardships the Soviets launched the project that had no precedents in history: the building of a socialist society. They had to transform a backward state into an industrialized country with an effective agricultural sector. The USSR's "collectivization" and "industrialization" projects were aimed at accomplishing this task.

It is worth mentioning that the Russian Empire had suffered from periodic devastating famines since the end of 19th century,

long before Bolsheviks came to power in 1917. Then there was a series of famines in 1920-21, 1924, 1927 and 1928.

“There was indeed a famine in 1933, not just in Ukraine, but also in the Lower Volga and the North Caucasus,” Canadian urban planner Dr. Hans Blumenfeld, who worked as an architect in Ukraine at the time of famine, recalled as quoted by Tottle.

To complicate matters further, the famine was accompanied by typhus epidemics, Dr. Blumenfeld remarked, adding that most deaths in 1933 were due to typhus, dysentery and typhoid fever.

*According to some estimates, during the famine of 1932-1933 about three million people died (both from famine and epidemics) in the USSR, while one third of them died in Ukraine.*

There was no deliberate famine-genocide against Ukraine, prominent American historian Dr. Mark B. Tauger of West Virginia University, states. The professor, who carried out thorough research on the famine of 1932-33, came to the conclusion that the disaster was due to environmental circumstances and was evidently not related to the Soviet policy in the region.

While pointing the finger of blame at the USSR, the proponents of “Holodomor” remain mute about the fact that after 1933 the Soviet Union never faced a famine disaster: Soviet leader Joseph Stalin’s collectivization project proved effective.

*“We are from 50 to 100 years behind the advanced countries. We must run through this distance in 10 years. Either we do this or they will crush us,” Stalin said in 1931, as quoted by American journalist Albert Rhys.*

“And run they did!” Tottle noted.

The Second World War clearly indicated that in ten years the USSR had indeed run through the distance of 100 years.

*“People are asking themselves how Bolshevism has managed to produce all this,” German historian Heinz Hohne wondered, as cited by the Canadian researcher.*

The views expressed in this article are solely those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official position of *Sputnik*.

## **Holodomor Hoax: West's 'Golden Embargo' and Soviet Famine of 1932-33**

*In an exclusive interview with Sputnik, Russian economist, author and politician Nikolai Starikov shared his views on the controversy surrounding the famine of 1932-33 in the USSR and shed some light on the Western anti-Soviet sanctions policy in the early 1930s.*

Ekaterina Blinova

*SputnikNews.com*, 08:33 12.11.2015 (updated 08:44 12.11.2015)

<http://sputniknews.com/russia/20151112/1029956744/holodomor-hoax-ussr-ukraine-starikov.html>

The disastrous famine of 1932-33 in the USSR, used by the West as a bludgeon against the Soviet Union during the Cold War era, should not be taken out of the surrounding historical context.

The famine, later heavily politicized and groundlessly dubbed “Holodomor,” is only a part of the story of the young Soviet state and the hardships it faced after the First World War.

Hit severely by World War I and exhausted by civil war and foreign intervention, the Soviet state had to rebuild its industry and modernize its agricultural sector to survive and improve the living conditions of the Soviet people.

### **West's “Golden Blockade” and Stalin's “Piatiletki”**

Western governments were initially hostile to the Soviet leadership and refused to recognize the new state. After the Entente intervention ingloriously failed, the Western powers – most notably Britain, France and the United States – tried to take over the USSR through economic pressure.

“In that period of time the Soviet leadership was focused on creating industries the Soviet state lacked. In order to accomplish the task, the Kremlin implemented so-called “piatiletki” (“five-year plans”). In fact the solution of the problem was divided into two phases: firstly, [the Soviet leadership planned] to construct new industrial facilities, secondly, to sharply increase the crop production through the use of farm machinery and then pay for new foreign equipment by money earned through agricultural



exports,” Nikolai Starikov, Russian economist, author and politician, told *Sputnik*.

“And here the West had made an attempt to catch the Soviet Union out,” the author remarked.

*“In 1925 a so-called “golden blockade” was imposed on the USSR: the Western powers refused to accept gold as payment for industrial equipment they delivered to Russia. All of a sudden they demanded that the Soviet government pay for the equipment in timber, oil and grain,” Starikov emphasized.*

Western governments explained that their decision was triggered by the Bolsheviks’ refusal to pay the Russian Empire’s debts.

But that is not all: in the early 1930s major Western powers – the United States, France and Britain – placed an embargo on trade with the Soviet Union and refused to sell anything to the USSR for everything but GRAIN.

*“Imagine, the Soviet Union had been “caught” amid an all-out effort to rebuild and modernize its industrial basis,” Starikov elaborated, “however, since then the equipment (the USSR had a crying need for) could be bought for grain only.”*

### **Vicious Cycle of Famine and Soviet Agriculture**

But what about Russia’s agricultural sector at that time?

It is worth mentioning that since the end of 19th century the Russian Empire had been suffering from repeated famines. Furthermore, during the First World War the area of Russia’s cultivated lands had diminished significantly.

*In the 1920s, Russia, including the territory of modern Ukraine, was struck by a series of famines, occurring every two to four years. The proponents of the so-called “Holodomor” concept (an idea that the Soviet government deliberately organized the devastating famine of 1932-33) usually ignore the fact that the Soviet Union had gone through severe famines in 1920-21, 1924, 1927 and 1928.*

“The year of the two Russian revolutions, 1917, saw a serious crop failure leading to urban famine in 1917-18. In the 1920s the USSR had a series of famines: in 1920-23 in the Volga and Ukraine plus one in western Siberia in 1923; in the Volga and Ukraine again in 1924-25, and a serious and little-studied famine in Ukraine in 1928,” Professor Grover Carr Furr of Montclair

State University wrote in his book “Blood Lies: The Evidence that Every Accusation Against Joseph Stalin and the Soviet Union in Timothy Snyder’s Bloodlands Is False,” quoting research works by Prof. Mark B. Tauger, a renowned expert on famine.

The famines, caused by then Russia’s agricultural backwardness, natural disasters and the wars’ long-term effects, were a part of a broader food supply problem in post-WWI Russia.

Then, the question arises: were Western powers aware of the USSR’s desperate need for grain when they imposed sanctions on the Soviet Union demanding grain as the only means of payment?

“Of course, Western political elites knew about that problem,” Nikolai Starikov told *Sputnik*, commenting on the issue.

“In fact the West’s demand that the Soviet Union should pay in grain for Western supplies could have led to the further deficit in grain in the USSR,” the economist underscored.

*Starikov explained that having no other instruments to overthrow the undesirable Communist regime, Western political and financial elites planned to instigate the internal unrest through, in particular, the artificial deficit of food in the Soviet state. The need to use grain as a means of payment also bolstered Soviet collectivization, according to the economist.*

In his book “Crisis: How is It Organized” (“Krizis: Kak Eto Delayetsya,” 2009) Nikolai Starikov called attention to the fact that the West’s “sanctions war” against the Soviet Union coincided with the Great Depression.

The embargo imposed on the USSR by Western governments dealt a severe blow to Western-Soviet trade. The economist emphasized that the move contradicted the best interests of Western producers, hit by the recession of the early 1930s.

There is nothing new under the sun: while imposing anti-Russian economic sanctions in 2014, Western political elites have again completely ignored the interests of their own national manufacturers and businesses.

Starikov underscored that the Western embargo could have been just one of a plethora of factors which lie at the root of the devastating famine of 1932-33 in the USSR.

However, the famine could by no means be called a deliberate attempt of the Soviet leadership to starve its population in Ukraine, the Volga region, North Caucasus or Kazakhstan to

death in 1932-33. Soviet collectivization also could not be regarded as a trigger for the famine.

### **Stalin's Collectivization: Breaking the Vicious Circle**

"The famines of the 1920s, and especially that of 1928, were the background, the immediate context, for the rapid and, in part, forced collectivization of agriculture," Grover Furr told *Sputnik* commenting on the matter.

"This cycle of famines is crucial because it allows us to see that collectivization did NOT "cause" the famine of '32-'33. Famines occurred regularly. As Tauger proves, and as I mention in "Blood Lies," the famine of '32-'33 had environmental causes, just like all the others for 1,000 years," the professor stressed.

*"The only way to stop this thousand-year cycle of famines was to modernize agriculture. This was the great triumph of collectivization – that it put an end to this cycle of famines," he underscored.*

Professor Furr pointed out that both the proponents of the "Holodomor" concept and those who reject the "Holodomor" but blame the famine on collectivization, never talk about this cycle of famines, or of the famines of the 1920s.

*"The famine of 1932-33 was the LAST famine! It really was an immense triumph, which is denied only because it was accomplished by communists and by socialism, not by capitalists and capitalism," Professor Furr added.*

According to Nikolai Starikov, the problem of the 1932-33 famine has become a highly politicized issue. Juggling with the numbers of the famine victims some policymakers miss the point: in the first place the famine of 1932-33 was a tragedy for millions of Soviet people of various ethnic groups.

Was it ethically appropriate to use this tragedy to drive a wedge between Russians and Ukrainians during the Cold War era? What had the Western political elite done to prevent or minimize the disaster? And who benefits from labeling the tragedy as "Stalin's killer famine" today?

*The views expressed in this article are solely those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official position of Sputnik.*

## **British Fascism: Why British Nobility Hailed Adolf Hitler and Nazi Germany**

*A 17-second video depicting young Queen Elizabeth II performing a Nazi salute has prompted a fierce debate among experts and the public. What other disturbing facts have the Allies swept under the carpet?*

Ekaterina Blinova

*SputnikNews.com*, 17:15 22.07.2015 (updated 14:22 23.07.2015)

<http://sputniknews.com/politics/20150722/1024922754.html>

While discussing the victory in the Second World War, historians usually praise Russia, Great Britain and the United States for their joint contribution in defeating Nazism — the true plague of the 20th century.

Surprisingly, the West now turns a blind eye to the emergence of neo-Nazi movements in Eastern Europe and in the Baltics, demonizing the USSR and today's Russia instead. Has this historical lesson already been forgotten?

### **How Anglo-Saxon Financial Elite Facilitated Third Reich's Rise**

The West is still in denial of the fact that the Anglo-Saxon political and financial establishment played a significant role in the Third Reich's rise. Furthermore, some representatives of the British nobility even went so far as to openly support Adolf Hitler, kicking off their own fascist organizations and conspiring with Nazi Germany.

Paradoxically, back in the early 1930s neither London, nor Washington considered Hitler's Third Reich as a "threat," facilitating the "Nazi economic miracle" and the industrial growth of the would-be military monster.

*After Adolf Hitler and his Brownshirts seized power in Germany in 1933, Britain started "grooming" Nazi Germany "as best as she could," American economist Guido Giacomo Preparata narrated in his book "Conjuring Hitler: How Britain and America Made the Third Reich."*

In July 1934 Britain and Germany concluded the Anglo-German Transfer Agreement — one of the "pillars of British

policy towards the Third Reich.” By the end of the decade Nazi Germany had become Britain’s “principal trading client.”

Furthermore, in December 1934, Montagu Norman, the Governor of the Bank of England from 1920 to 1944, “advanced the Nazis a loan of about \$4 million in order to ‘facilitate the mobilization of German commercial credits’: that is new money to pay old debts — or better said, a gift,” Preparata elaborated.

And that is not all. Both Britain and the US made a number of highly lucrative arms deals with Nazi Germany. For instance, Vickers-Armstrong, the prestigious British arms manufacturer, provided Berlin with heavy weaponry.

*When asked in 1934 to give assurance that the company was not used for secret rearmament of Germany, Chairman of Vickers Herbert Lawrence answered evasively: “I cannot give you assurance in definite terms, but I can tell you that nothing is done without the complete sanction and approval of our own government.”*

Meanwhile, the US was selling Nazi Germany most advanced airplane engines, while American companies Pratt & Whitney, Douglas, Bendix Aviation, to name but a few, provided German companies — BMW, Siemens and others — with patents and military secrets, Preparata pointed out.

According to the author, for the British and American establishment Nazism was seen as a convenient way of destabilizing Europe and turning it into a big unified market place, as well as a driving force that could dismantle the USSR.

### **Sir Oswald Mosley and the British Union of Fascists**

Remarkably, Great Britain also boasted its own influential fascist party.

*“It seems impossible to believe that the people of such an entrenched democratic country as Great Britain could ever harbor mainstream fascist leanings. However, fascism was not always such a vilified ideology in the West. In the late 1920s and 1930s in Great Britain, fascism was often admired by the public,” wrote US historian Bret Rubin, Princeton University, in his article “The Rise and Fall of British Fascism: Sir Oswald Mosley and the British Union of Fascists.”*

According to the scholar, the earliest fascist groups in Great Britain emerged in the 1920s, including the British Fascists, the

National Fascists and the Imperial Fascist League. However, these organizations lacked both leadership and a coherent ideology.

However, in 1932 British aristocrat Sir Oswald Mosley, 6th Baronet and popular ex-member of Parliament, founded the British Union of Fascists (BUF), launching “fascism into the British mainstream.” The organization swiftly brought together almost 40,000 new members. Although Oswald Mosley failed to make further political headway, he attracted a lot of followers and established close ties with top Nazi officials, including Reich Minister of Propaganda Joseph Goebbels and the infamous German Fuhrer.



Sir Oswald Mosley, leader of the Pro-Fascist Union movement, gestures while addressing a union meeting at Porchester Hall in London, United Kingdom, on April 16, 1936. © AP PHOTO

In 1940, the BUF leader along with other active British fascists was interned under Defence Regulation 18B and his party was proscribed. However, in 1943 Mosley and his wife were released because of Sir Oswald’s “poor health.”

Interestingly enough, neither Mosley's chronic disease, nor the British government, prevented the infamous British fascist leader from continuing his work after the Second World War. He formed the Union Movement and made a series of vain attempts to return into politics. His speeches attracted British youths and in 1977 he was even nominated as a candidate for Rector of the University of Glasgow.



Edward VIII reviewing a squad of SS with Robert Ley, 1937  
© Wikipedia/ Bundesarchiv, Bild 102-17964 / Pahl, Georg

### **What Secrets is Buckingham Palace Hiding?**

Mosley was not the only aristocrat enchanted by Nazi imperial ideas. The British king, Edward III, who gave up the throne to marry American divorcee Wallis Simpson, openly sympathized with the Nazis.

British diplomat Sir Robert Gilbert Vansittart wrote in his diaries that in the early 1930s Edward, then the Prince of Wales, expressed his full support to Hitler's dictatorship, turning a blind eye to the persecution of Jews.

After abdicating in 1936, Edward, who became the Duke of Windsor, visited Germany in 1937 and met Adolf Hitler personally. Confidential data, released in 2003, indicated that Nazi offi-

cials planned to reinstall him as a king once Germany invaded Great Britain.

Curiously, the Duke's sympathies with Hitler were not unusual for those of his class at this time. According to some reports, George VI and his wife wanted to avoid a direct military conflict with Nazi Germany at all costs and sent birthday greetings to Adolf Hitler weeks before he invaded Poland.

Baron Gunther von Reibnitz, the father of Princess Michael of Kent, was a Nazi party member and an honorary member of SS. Duke of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha Charles Edward, the brother of Princess Alice, officially joined the Nazi party in 1935 and gained the rank of Obergruppenführer. He also served a member of the German Reichstag.

*Renown historian and sociologist Manuel Sarkisyanz revealed in his book "From Imperialism to Fascism: Why Hitler's India Was to Be Russia" that the "longlist" of Great Britain's open sympathizers of fascism also included W. Churchill's son Randolph, the family of Lord Ridsdale, Lord Lamington, Lord Londonderry, and sociologist Houston Chamberlain.*

It is worth mentioning, that aforementioned Montagu Norman, 1st Baron Norman, the Governor of the Bank of England, was a close friend of German Central Bank President Hjalmar Schacht, a devoted supporter of Adolf Hitler and his Nazi party.

Manuel Sarkisyanz highlighted that Hitler himself borrowed much of his ideas from racist British scholars. The infamous Fuhrer considered ruthless British colonial rule in India a model for his future "colonial Russia."

Remarkably, eugenics, a doctrine aimed at confirming the concept of "white supremacy," was "invented" in Great Britain and then enthusiastically adopted by Nazis.

According to British and German racists, the Anglo-Saxons (including Germans), were destined to dominate the world, Sarkisyanz exposed.

*Rather embarrassingly, it was the famous author of "The Invisible Man," Herbert Wells, who stated laconically: "There is only one sane and logical thing to be done with an inferior race, and that is to exterminate it."*

Unsurprisingly, Buckingham Palace has not rushed to open its archives and unveil the truth about relations between the Windsors, the British aristocracy and the Nazis. According to



some experts, much of the British royal correspondence documenting their ties with top Nazi officials was destroyed.

A 17-second piece of footage, that depicts then seven-years-old Queen Elizabeth II raising her arms in a Nazi salute, has added fuel to the fire of the ongoing historical discussion of this burning issue.

## **The Munich Agreement: West's Political Conspiracy Against Stalin?**

*By signing the Munich Agreement with Adolf Hitler on September, 30, 1938, major European powers, Britain and France signaled to Nazi Germany: 'Move East, and we won't harm you!' Professor Grover Carr Furr of Montclair State University told Sputnik.*

Ekaterina Blinova

*SputnikNews.com*, 16:34 01.10.2015 (updated 17:08 01.10.2015)

<http://sputniknews.com/politics/20151001/1027851010/munich-agreement-conspiracy-against-stalin.html>

The Munich Agreement inked in the early hours of September 30, 1938, by Britain, France, Italy and Nazi Germany (excluding the USSR and Czechoslovakia) opened the doors to Hitler's aggression and marked the actual beginning of the Second World War.

In accordance with the agreement, Nazi Germany was permitted to seize the so-called "Sudetenland" — northern and western parts of Czechoslovakia inhabited predominantly by German speakers.

Earlier, on May 19-20, German military forces started to concentrate on Czechoslovak borders, prompting a partial mobilization in the country. Hitler's intentions were crystal clear to European powers. However, they were unwilling to help the Czechoslovak government which faced Germany's blatant aggression.

### **The Munich Agreement Handed Over Czechoslovakia to Hitler**

On July 20, French Foreign Minister Georges Bonnet informed the Czechoslovak minister Stefan Osusky that "France will not make war for the Sudeten affaire... The Czechoslovak government must understand that France as well as England will not go to war. It was important above all that matters should be clear" (Michael J. Carley "'Only the USSR has... Clean Hands': the Soviet Perspective on the Failure of Collective Security and the Collapse of Czechoslovakia, 1934-1938").

The Czechoslovak government was literally coerced into submission by Britain and France.

On September 15, British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain met with Adolf Hitler in Berchtesgaden to negotiate the cession of Czechoslovakia's territories. Three days later, there was a meeting between Hitler and French Prime Minister Edouard Daladier regarding the same issue. Needless to say, no Czechoslovak representatives were invited to the negotiating table.



Chamberlain (centre, hat and umbrella in hands) walks with German Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop (right) as the Prime Minister leaves for home after the Berchtesgaden meeting, 16 September 1938. On the left is Alexander von Dörnberg.

© Wikipedia/ Bundesarchiv

*“The Munich Agreement actually did what the liars claim the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact did but in reality did not do. The Munich Agreement handed over a country to Hitler. Moreover, the Allies did so without even asking the Czech government or President! Poland was complicit in this. [Warsaw] took the Teschen area, heavily industrial and with a minority Polish population. Winston Churchill compared Poland to a ‘jackal’, snapping up some morsels while the ‘lions’, the Great Powers, divid-*

*ed up the big prize. In 1939, when Hitler took the rest of Czechoslovakia, the Bank of England gave Hitler the Czech gold reserves!" US expert in Soviet history Professor Grover Carr Furr of Montclair State University told Sputnik.*

Czechoslovakia was really a "big prize" for Hitler: the country boasted a highly-developed military industry and had a 40 percent share in the world's arms market. Czechoslovakia's ten major military factories could produce each month 1,600 mounted machineguns, 3,000 light machineguns, 130,000 rifles, 7,000 grenade launchers, and hundreds of other weapons, including tanks and warplanes.

After grabbing the rest of Czechoslovakia, Hitler obtained its enormous military arsenal. So far, by allowing Hitler to annex Sudetenland and not raising a finger when the infamous Fuhrer occupied the whole territory of Czechoslovakia, Western powers provided the aggressor with the unique defense industrial base.

"So why? I think it is clear. The UK and France wanted to tell Hitler that he could move to the East and they would do nothing. Remember that when Poland was attacked, September 1, 1939, the British and French did nothing, despite their agreements to help Poland. They did nothing until May 1940, when Hitler attacked them!" Furr underscored.

### **‘Munich’ Was an Attempt to Encourage Hitler to Attack the USSR.**

*"Munich was definitely an attempt to encourage Hitler to attack the USSR. It cannot be interpreted any other way since, as you say, the USSR was excluded [from the Munich negotiations]. Certainly the British and French knew that the Soviets would understand it that way, and they didn't care. Probably the idea was that Germany, Poland, and Japan would all attack the USSR — that at least would have been the best result for the British and French governments," the professor highlighted.*

Indeed, besides Nazi Germany, Japan and Poland also planned to expand their "Lebensraum" ("living space") at the expense of the USSR. Up till the beginning of 1939, Warsaw was considering joining Nazi Germany in a war against the USSR in order to seize more territory, Furr noted in his book, "Blood Lies: The Evidence that Every Accusation Against Joseph Stalin and the Soviet Union in Timothy Snyder's

Bloodlands Is False,” citing Nazi Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop, who reported in January 1939: “I then talked to M. Beck [Polish Foreign Minister Josef Beck] once more about the policy to be pursued by Poland and Germany towards the Soviet Union... M. Beck made no secret of the fact that Poland had aspirations directed toward the Soviet Ukraine and a connection with the Black Sea...”

On the other hand, after the occupation of Manchuria in 1931, Japan turned its interests toward the eastern territories of the USSR. In May-August 1939 Japan, the USSR and Communist Mongolia were involved in a direct military conflict at Khalkhin-Gol, Siberia. The Japanese were defeated and temporarily gave up plans to attack the Soviets.

*“The USSR was fighting a serious war with Japan at Khalkhin-Gol, in Siberia. There is no question that the Japanese attack was intended to make the USSR fight ‘on two fronts’ — IF it were successful. But it was not successful. Why not? Because the military conspirators in the Far Eastern Army had been removed and arrested, including Marshal [Vasily] Bliukher. If the conspirators had not been stopped they would have aided Japan, and the USSR would have had a two-front war. Remember that it was Siberian troops who, freed up by the peace with Japan, were rushed to the defense of Moscow, and then later to the defense of Stalingrad,” the academic told Sputnik.*

Britain was well informed of the militarist plans of Germany, Japan and Poland. Citing British archival documents, Canadian author and researcher Clement Leibovitz noted that British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain regarded the Soviet Union as “a country which is likely to be the target of German aggression — possibly with Poland’s help — and of a Japanese aggression” (“The Chamberlain-Hitler Deal,” 1993).

### **The Munich Agreement a Product of Cynical Collaboration?**

It is naïve to believe that the Munich Agreement was a product of an irresponsible “appeasement” of Nazi appetites by the British and French governments, Leibovitz noted, presenting evidence that could have rather been a product of cynical collaboration.

*“I affirm that Chamberlain faced the option of either successfully preventing, and later resisting, Germany’s policy of*

*aggressive expansion, or allowing Germany to expand in Eastern Europe. Chamberlain was certain that Germany would end up declaring war against the Soviet Union. Motivated by anti-communism, he chose the second option though, and in doing so, he was gambling with Britain's security... Furthermore, it can be established that the deal was not a sudden policy but was the crowning of incessant efforts to encourage Japan and Germany 'to take their fill' of the Soviet Union," Leibovitz wrote in his book "The Chamberlain-Hitler Deal."*

Remarkably, in his letter to King George VI written on September 13, 1938, Chamberlain remarked that "Herr Hitler has made up his mind to attack Czechoslovakia and then to proceed further East." Inexplicably, in the same very letter Chamberlain asserted the king that "Germany and England... [are] the two pillars of European peace and buttresses against communism."

Furr pointed out that in his opinion, the Soviet Union and Joseph Stalin "were lucky that the British and French rejected 'collective security'."

"Why? Because the British and French would probably have violated any such agreement. They probably would not have attacked Germany when Germany invaded Poland, even if they had agreed to do so. But why did they do so? And why did they not attack Germany when Germany attacked Poland? The only answer is: British and French governments wanted to continue to signal to Hitler: "Move East, and we won't harm you!" the professor stressed.

"Remember," Furr emphasized, "Britain and France were trying to send a force to fight the USSR on the side of Finland during the Russo-Finnish War of 1939-1940. They could not do so, but they had it all planned. So, while they were formally at war with Germany but not doing any fighting, Britain and France were sending aid, and planning to send forces, to fight on the side of Finland, an ally of Germany's against the Soviet Union, which was anti-German!"

*"All in all, the USSR was the only country that acted not just honorably, but also intelligently, in World War II. The Soviet Union saved Europe from Nazism," Professor Furr concluded.*

## **The Munich Betrayal: How Western Powers ‘Sold’ Czechoslovakia to Hitler**

*The Munich Agreement of September 30, 1938, concluded by Europe’s major powers with Adolf Hitler, allowed the Nazis to absorb parts of Czechoslovakia and hammered the final nail in the coffin of the concept of European collective security pushed ahead by the USSR, Canadian professor of history Michael Jabara Carley told Sputnik.*

Ekaterina Blinova

*SputnikNews.com*, 15:55 26.09.2015 (updated 16:43 26.09.2015)

<http://sputniknews.com/politics/20150926/1027577179.html>

On September 30, 1938, in Munich, Europe’s major powers (Britain, Germany, France and Italy), excluding Moscow and Prague, negotiated an agreement permitting Nazi Germany’s annexation of portions of Czechoslovakia, paving the way for Hitler’s European triumphant march; the agreement marked the failure of the USSR’s numerous attempts to build a European anti-Hitler coalition.

*“Beginning in late 1933, the Soviet government pursued a policy of collective security in Europe. It was League of Nations jargon, but in reality it was plain old great power alliance building. The Soviet idea was to contain Nazi Germany, or to defeat it in war, should containment fail. Soviet diplomats tried to promote their policy just about everywhere in Europe and in the United States. At first the USSR made progress, but one by one, Soviet would-be allies fell away. I call it the Grand Alliance that Never Was,” Professor Michael Jabara Carley of the University of Montreal told Sputnik.*

The professor pointed out that in France and Britain pragmatists wanted to accept Soviet offers; on the other hand, anti-communists hoped for agreement with Nazi Germany.

### **‘A Hidden History of Early Soviet-Western Relations’**

In his book “Silent Conflict: A Hidden History of Early Soviet-Western Relations,” Professor Carley scrupulously analyzes the roots of European elite’s enmity toward Soviet Russia and reveals that major capitalist countries have been plotting against the USSR since 1917, when the Bolsheviks came to power.

“It was not just the European elite, but also the American elite, which from the first day sought to overthrow the Soviet government. Their reasons are not hard to identify. These elites were outraged that coffee house ‘anarchists’ could take power in Russia. It was turning the known world on its head,” Carley told *Sputnik*.

The professor stressed that as for the elites, from their point of view, their alarmism was certainly justified: the Bolsheviks annulled the tsarist state debt and nationalized banks and industries; as a result foreign financiers lost billions.



Soviet diplomat Maxim Litvinov

*“The ‘Entente’ [Allied Western powers] sent troops to the four corners of Russia and they armed and paid White Guard armies to overthrow Soviet authority and to get back their lost investments. If they had succeeded, the West would certainly have turned Russia into another semi-colony like China. White Russian compradors would have served the West much as liberal “oligarchs” did during the 1990s, or still do now,” Carley elaborated.*

In light of this, the Red Army defended not only the workers and peasants, but primarily the Russian state in its new Soviet



guise against Western domination. “Just what Putin’s government is doing now,” the professor stressed.

After the failure of the Entente intervention at the end of 1920, Soviet-Western relations seemingly improved: each side needed the other for economic reasons, much as is the case today, but Western Soviet-phobia obviously hindered the development of a Soviet-Western rapprochement, according to the professor.

*“This is why I say that the Cold War started after 1917 and not after 1945,” the Canadian academic emphasized.*

### **Western Elite Saw Nazi Germany as a Bulwark Against the USSR**

While Western elite demonstrated undisguised aversion toward “unwashed” and “ignorant” workers and peasants, it was at the same time fascinated by the brutal manliness of Nazis.

*“Many were sympathetic to Nazism and fascism as a way of controlling unruly workers and crushing communists. Many also saw Nazi Germany as a bulwark against the Soviet Union. There was frequent contact between members of the British and French elites and their counterparts in Nazi Germany,” the professor narrated.*

“I also think that many scions of the British and European elite were in doubt about their masculinity during the Interwar Years. I can easily imagine them as “submissives” in a dom’s studio in Paris or London. They were intoxicated by the manliness of Nazi Stormtroopers and by the manly odors of fascist sweat and leather. Perhaps it was a form of envy and the desire to emulate the Nazis. I am being a little facetious, of course, but not entirely so,” Professor Carley added.

The professor highlighted that from the Soviet diplomatic papers, one gains the unavoidable impression that the Conservative British government was the chief obstacle to building collective security against Nazi Germany. “Even some Western historians would agree [with that],” Carley stressed.

“The perennial question of the 1930s was ‘Who is enemy no. 1, Nazi Germany or the Soviet Union?’ Many people in power in the West got the answer wrong. Neville Chamberlain, the British prime minister, never wanted a real war-fighting alliance with the USSR. As I have often said, Chamberlain feared victory with

the USSR as an ally, more than he feared defeat at the hands of Nazi Germany,” the Canadian academic underscored.

### **‘Only the USSR Has... Clean Hands’**

In his essay “Only the USSR Has... Clean Hands: The Soviet Perspective on the Failure of Collective Security and the Collapse of Czechoslovakia, 1934-1938,” Professor Carley presents a detailed analysis of Soviet Russia’s repeated efforts to form an anti-Hitler coalition and the infamous Munich Agreement, also dubbed by historians as “the Munich Betrayal.”

Britain played the first fiddle in negotiations with Nazi Germany. When the infamous Nazi Fuhrer made a territorial claim for Czechoslovakia’s northern and western border regions, inhabited predominantly by Germans, the British reacted swiftly. On September 28, 1938, Chamberlain proposed the Nazi leader to hold a five-powers meeting in Munich where, as he assured Hitler, Germany would get what it wanted without war and without delay.

“Basically, Chamberlain wanted an agreement with Hitler and so was not interested in making threats against Germany to protect Czechoslovakia. That would have been illogical given Chamberlain’s view that Czechoslovakia was an unviable state and could not be saved,” Carley told *Sputnik*.

Embarrassingly for London, when Hitler seized Czechoslovakia’s capital Prague in 1939, the British voluntarily handed over nearly \$9 million worth of gold that belonged to Czechoslovakia to Nazi Germany.

*“If Chamberlain had wanted to stop Hitler, or contain Nazi Germany, the best way to do it would have been in an alliance with the USSR. Unfortunately, that course of action was abhorrent to the British prime minister and his closest advisors. As I say, it was Britain not the USSR which ought to be regarded as having been the main obstacle to collective security against Nazi Germany. Western propaganda (OSCE for example) to the effect that Stalin and Hitler were jointly responsible for the Second World War is rubbish,” the professor stressed.*

Some Western historians are pointing the finger at Soviet Russia for signing a non-aggression pact with Germany on August 23, 1939. However, they remain silent that earlier similar

agreements were concluded between France, Britain and Hitler, at the expense of Czechoslovakia.

“I think there was a direct link between the Munich accords and the Nazi-Soviet non-aggression pact, it was the Soviet tit-for-tat. The USSR gave collective security one last chance in 1939; that last effort failed because the British and French again dragged their feet about an anti-Nazi war fighting alliance. They were simply not serious or credible. And look at this way, for six years the USSR had promoted collective security with the West. Britain and France in particular repeatedly rejected Soviet overtures and proposals. They were not the only ones however. Poland played the role of spoiler right up to August 1939, attempting to sabotage collective security. Romania backed off seeing that France and Britain would not join a tripartite alliance with the USSR,” Professor Carley told *Sputnik*.



From left to right are: Reichsmarschall and President of the Reichstag Hermann Goering, Italian Foreign Minister Count Ciano and Italian Fascist Leader Benito Mussolini shaking hands with Prime Minister of Great Britain Neville Chamberlain during the Four Power Conference held in autumn 1938 in Munich, Germany. Others not identified. © AP Photo/ Hoffman

“If you had been Stalin, what would you have done? This was Stalin’s policy of appeasement, and that policy did not turn out any better than the Anglo-French version of it. In fact, I would argue it turned out worse. Of course hindsight is always 20/20; historians often forget that what is now in the past was once in the future,” Carley remarked.

Although the Soviet Union collapsed almost 25 years ago, Western media continue to beat the cold war drums, accusing the USSR of colluding with Adolf Hitler.

*“Why do the Western mainstream media accuse Stalin and Hitler of being two peas in a pod? The answer is simple: the West is using “rewritten” history as a primitive weapon of propaganda to damage the Russian Federation and its president, Vladimir Putin,” the professor emphasized.*

“In truth, western politicians and journalists cannot get straight whether Putin is the new Stalin or the new Hitler,” he noted with a touch of irony.

*“Most of them in their ignorance could not tell you the difference between fascism and Marxist communism. It goes without saying that such ideas are preposterous and very dangerous. It is part of a campaign of Russophobia to treat Putin and Russia as “the other,” not like the Western “us”. It’s a form of orientalism or racism,” Professor Carley stressed.*

Read more:

<http://sputniknews.com/politics/20150926/1027577179.html#ixzz3rIMy3p29>

## Untold Story of Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact

*The Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, inked by the USSR and Nazi Germany on August 23, 1939, is now used by Western “experts” and mainstream media to accuse the Soviet Union of “colluding” with Hitler and “betraying” his would be French and British allies, but evidence suggests otherwise.*

Ekaterina Blinova

*SputnikNews.com*, 19:01 23.08.2015 (updated 23:12 23.09.2015)

<http://sputniknews.com/politics/20150823/1026098760/molotov-ribbentrop-pact-untold-story.html>

On August 23, 1939, the USSR and Nazi Germany signed a Treaty of Non-aggression, also known as the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact; the document still triggers fierce debate, prompting the West to accuse the USSR of “colluding” with Hitler on the eve of the Second World War.

Furthermore, since 2008 on this day European countries mark “European Day of Remembrance for Victims of Stalinism and Nazism.”

*“It’s an annual event [August 23], anxiously awaited by western Russophobic propagandists, to remind us of the iniquitous Soviet role in starting World War II. Nowadays of course when the mainstream media say “Soviet,” they want you to think about Russia and its president Vladimir Putin. Western “journalists” can’t make up their minds about Putin: sometimes he’s another Hitler, sometimes another Stalin,” Professor Michael Jabara Carley of the University of Montreal emphasizes in an article for Strategic Culture Foundation.*

Curiously enough, Western “experts” and mass media remain silent about the fact that most major European powers had signed similar treaties with Adolf Hitler earlier than the Soviet Union did.

### **The Grand Alliance that Never Was**

For instance, Poland, the avowed “victim” of the Soviet-Germany non-aggression pact, had inked a non-aggression treaty with Nazi Germany on January 26, 1934.

*“During the 1930s Poland played a spoiler’s role. It was a far-right quasi-dictatorship, anti-Semitic and sympathetic to fas-*

*cism. In 1934, as the USSR raised the alarm about Hitler, Poland signed a non-aggression pact in Berlin. Who stabbed who in the back?” Carley asked rhetorically.*

While pointing the finger at the USSR for moving into territories of “Poland” (when no state of Poland existed any longer after German invasion of September 1, 1939) some Western historians are again demonstrating a peculiar form of amnesia, apparently forgetting that these very territories — Western Ukraine and Western Belarus — were annexed by Poland during the Polish-Soviet War (1919 — 1921). The war was unilaterally unleashed by Warsaw against the USSR, torn and devastated by the civil war.

In general, the USSR returned its own territories — with the exception of the small piece of Bukovina — that were grabbed by other European players during the chaos of the Revolution of 1917 and the Civil War of the 1920s, Russian historian, politician and diplomat Nataliya Narotchnitskaya noted in her book “Za Chto i S Kem My Voyevali” (“Who We Were Fighting and What For”).



German ambassador Hans-Adolf von Moltke, Polish leader Józef Piłsudski, German propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels and Józef Beck, Polish Foreign minister meeting in Warsaw on June 15, 1934, five months after signing the Polish-German Non-Aggression Pact.

© Wikipedia/ Bundesarchiv

“Until 1939, Poland did all it could to sabotage Soviet efforts to build an anti-Nazi alliance, based on the World War I anti-German coalition of France, Britain, Italy, and in 1917 the United States... In 1934-1935, when the USSR sought a mutual assistance pact with France, Poland attempted to obstruct it,” Carley emphasized.

*But what about Britain and France? Surprisingly, in the 1930s neither London nor Paris hastened to join the USSR’s anti-German coalition. Carley pointed to the fact that it was Maksim Litvinov, the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, backed by the Soviet leader Joseph Stalin, “who first conceived of the ‘Grand Alliance’ against Hitler.” However, “Litvinov’s coalition became the Grand Alliance that Never Was.”*

### **Conjuring Hitler: European Elites Played Into Nazi Hands**

Historians agree that European conservative elites viewed Adolf Hitler a less “evil” than Soviet Russia. Moreover, according to American economist Guido Giacomo Preparata, for the British and American establishment Nazism was seen as a driving force that could dismantle the USSR, thus far finishing what was started by World War I — complete dissolution of the former Russian Empire.

“To Churchill, [Stanley] Baldwin [the UK’s prime minister] would thus sum it up in July 1936: ‘If there is any fighting in Europe to be done, I should like to see the Bolshies [Bolsheviks] and the Nazis doing it’,” Preparata wrote in his book “Conjuring Hitler: How Britain and America Made the Third Reich.”

Meanwhile European and American elites were not only unwilling to establish any alliances with the Soviet Union, but also poured money into Nazi Germany’s economy, facilitating the rise of the Nazi war machine.

Prestigious British arms manufacturer Vickers-Armstrong supplied heavy weaponry to Berlin, while US companies Pratt & Whitney, Douglas, Bendix Aviation, to name but a few, provided German firms — BMW, Siemens and others — with patents, military secrets and state-of-art airplane engines, Preparata pointed out.

## The Munich Betrayal of 1938

The final accord of this game was the Munich Agreement signed by the major powers of Europe (Britain, Germany, France, Italy) excluding the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, on September 30, 1938, that permitted Nazi Germany to annex northern and western border regions of Czechoslovakia.

Embarrassingly, British archival documents released in 2013 exposed that the UK not only betrayed Czechoslovakia by allowing Hitler to invade it, but also voluntarily handed over nearly \$9 million worth of gold that belonged to Czechoslovakia to Nazi Germany. The Czechoslovak golden bullions were immediately sent to Hitler in March 1939, when he seized Prague.

The Munich Betrayal of September 29-30, 1938, is the actual date of the beginning of the Second World War, Director of the Center for Russian Studies at the Moscow University for Humanities and the Institute of System Strategic Analysis, historian and publicist Andrei Fursov underscores, citing Churchill's letter to Major Ewal von Kleist, a member of the German resistance group and emissary of the German General Staff, just before Hitler's seizure of Czechoslovakia:

*"I am sure that the crossing of the Czechoslovak frontier by German armies or aircraft will bring about a renewal of world war... Such a war once started, would be fought out like the last [WWI] to the bitter end, and one must consider not what might happen in the first few months, but where we should all be at the end of the third or fourth year."*

And that is not all. Incredible as it may seem, the British government actually prevented a plot aimed against Adolf Hitler in 1938. A group of German high-ranking military officials planned to arrest Hitler at the moment Nazi Fuhrer ordered the attack on Czechoslovakia. Inexplicably, the British political establishment not only refused to help the resistance but ruined its plans.

*In his essay "Finest Hour Regime Change, 1938: Did Chamberlain 'Miss the Bus'?" British author Michael McMenemy narrated: "there is no historical doubt that the German resistance repeatedly warned the British of Hitler's intention to invade Czechoslovakia in September 1938... In re-*



*sponse, however, the Chamberlain government took every diplomatic step it could... to undermine Hitler's opposition."*

Whatever Chamberlain's motivation was, instead of beating the drums over Hitler's aggression in Europe, on September 28, 1938, he "proposed [Fuhrer] a five-power conference between Britain, Germany, Czechoslovakia, France and Italy, where, Chamberlain assured Hitler, Germany could 'get all essentials without war and without delay'," McMenamin wrote citing official documents, and added that Chamberlain also turned a blind eye to the fact that Germany excluded Czechoslovakia from the conference.

After the four powers agreed to accept German occupation of Czechoslovakia's Sudetenland before any plebiscite and coerced the Czechs to go along, Chamberlain and Hitler inked the British-German Non-aggression Agreement, the author underscored.

Interestingly enough, Professor Carley narrated that during the Czechoslovak crisis Poland (the would-be "victim" of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact) demanded that if "Hitler was to get the Sudeten territories, Poland should have the Teschen district [in Czechoslovakia]. In other words, if Hitler gets his booty, we Poles want ours."

So, who colluded with whom? Who were the betrayers?

### **Why Is West Demonizing Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact?**

According to Andrei Fursov, in Munich the four powers created a "proto-NATO bloc" that was actually aimed against the USSR. Czechoslovakia's industrial complex was meant to facilitate the growth of the German military might and ensure its ability to launch a big war against "Bolshies" in the East, in order to extend the German Lebensraum. And European elites were interested in this war, expected to exhaust both Germany and Russia.

In light of this, the only move to undermine this plan and postpone its realization was to conclude a similar non-aggression pact between the USSR and Germany. Furthermore, the delay helped the Soviet Union to accumulate its resources in the face of an inevitable invasion from the West.

Michael Jabara Carley cited Winston Churchill, then First Lord of the Admiralty, who said on October 1, 1939, in an interview to the British national broadcaster that Soviet action

“was clearly necessary for the safety of Russia against the Nazi menace.”



Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs Vyacheslav Mikhailovich Molotov, seated, signs the German-Soviet non-aggression pact in Moscow, August 23, 1939, a few days before the outbreak of World War II. © AP Photo/ German War Department

Why then is the West making every effort to demonize the Soviet-German Non-aggression Treaty, the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact? Professor Carley noted that it is a vain attempt to white-wash Europe's grave mistakes of the 1930s, namely the incapability (or unwillingness?) to halt the rise of Nazi Germany and to establish an anti-Hitler alliance in the early 1930s.

*“These days western governments and their ‘inspired’ journalists, if one can call them journalists, don’t worry about ‘tendentious’ argument when it comes to blackening the Russian Federation. It’s anything goes. Should we let them equate the roles of the USSR and Nazi Germany for starting World War II? Certainly not. It was Hitler who intended war, and the French and British, especially the British, who repeatedly played into his hands, rejecting Soviet proposals for collective security and pressuring France to do the same,” Professor Carley stressed.*

## **US Historian: Stalin Not Guilty of Major War Crime Blamed on Him (Katyn)**

*Revisionist historian Grover Furr makes the case that the infamous Katyn massacre, in which 14,000 Polish soldiers, mostly officers, were supposedly executed by the KGB, was a Nazi hoax.*

Ekaterina Sokolova [Blinova]

*Russia-Insider*, Fri, May 1, 2015

<http://russia-insider.com/en/us-historian-stalin-not-guilty-major-war-crime-blamed-him-katyn/ri6305>



*An American professor says the Russians never did this*

The subject of this article, American Professor Grover Furr, is a controversial figure in the world of Russia watching, because his basic position is that Stalin was not the monster that accepted wisdom thinks he was, and that he was unfairly maligned by the Soviet leaders who succeeded him for their own political reasons, with the rest of the world gladly jumping on the bandwagon.

We don't know if this is valid or not, but we publish this here because this revisionist view is increasingly popular in Russia. Want to understand Russia? Here is what a lot of people think.

While Polish President Bronislaw Komorowski continues to point the accusing finger at Russia, blaming it for the Katyn massacre of 1940, facts on the ground prove the opposite, an American professor revealed.

During a speech devoted to the execution of Polish officers at Katyn in 1940, Polish President Bronislaw Komorowski once again slammed the Soviet Union for the massacre and even went so far as to say that “the 20th century knows no comparable crime.” But what if the crime had never taken place?



“In April 1943 Nazi German authorities claimed that they had discovered thousands of bodies of Polish officers shot by Soviet officials in 1940. These bodies were said to have been discovered near the Katyn forest near Smolensk (in Western Russia), which is why the whole affair including executions and alleged executions of Polish POWs elsewhere in the USSR came to be called the Katyn Massacre,” narrated Dr. Grover Carr Furr, an American professor, author and prominent expert in Soviet history, in his article “The “Official” Version of the Katyn Massacre Disproven?”<sup>1</sup>

Professor Grover Furr has called into question the “official” narrative that puts the blame for the Katyn massacre on the Soviet Union, in accordance with the version propagated by Joseph Goebbels, Reich Minister of Propaganda for Nazi Germany, in 1943.

The author has debunked the most common misconceptions surrounding the Katyn tragedy and highlighted that the evidentiary basis for the “official” viewpoint is astonishingly “thin.” It should be noted that many researchers usually refer to the “Closed Packet No. 1,” handed by the Yeltsin administration to Polish authorities in 1992. It contained documents which, if genuine, could prove the guilt of the USSR in the Katyn mass murder.

However, the document’s authenticity is in question.

“In October 2010 a credible case was made that the “smoking gun documents” [“Closed Packet No. 1] are forgeries. The materials adduced by [Russia’s] Duma member Victor Iliukhin in October 2010 constitute the strongest evidence so far that these documents may well be forgeries,” Professor Furr pointed out.<sup>2</sup>

Indeed, Victor Iliukhin revealed that the core document of the “Closed Packet No. 1” — Lavrentiy Beria’s note, demanding the capital punishment for 14,000 of Polish POWs and civilians, signed by Joseph Stalin in 1940 — was fabricated in late 1980s. The Duma member suggested that the prominent “Perestroika” figures such as Alexander Yakovlev, Dmitri Volkogonov, Rudolf Pikhoya and others could have been behind the falsification.

But let’s put aside the “smoking gun documents,” the professor noted, pointing to the latest discoveries made by a joint Polish-Ukrainian archaeological group in 2011-2012 in the

Ukrainian town of Volodymyr-Volynskiy, directly related to the Katyn massacre incident.

The group discovered a mass grave site identified by the specialists as a typical mass grave of “German manufacture.” Citing Dr. Dominika Siemińska, the head of the Polish archeological team, Professor Furr underscored that the victims buried in the mass grave were murdered no earlier than late 1941 or 1942.

Furthermore, 98.67 percent of the shells found on the site were of 1941 German manufacture, according to the Polish report. Remains of women and children had also been found in the mass grave.

But the most astonishing fact was that the Polish researchers had also unearthed the remains, metal badges, epaulettes and buttons which belonged to the Polish policemen believed to be killed in a so-called “Katyn massacre” in 1940.

It should be noted that German ammunition was found at other sites related to the Katyn case.

Remarkably, Joseph Goebbels wrote in his Diaries on May 8, 1943: “Unfortunately, German ammunition has been found in the graves at Katyn... It is essential that this incident remains top secret. If it were to come to the knowledge of the enemy the whole Katyn affair would have to be dropped.”

Professor Furr has analyzed a number of other important documents and facts, which are presented as “ample evidence” of the Soviets’ guilt by the proponents of the “official version.” He showed that many assumptions based on these documents fall apart under careful scrutiny.

However, Professor Grover Furr stressed that it is probable that the Soviets could have executed a number of Poles for military crimes conducted by the Polish armed forces during the Russo-Polish war of 1920-21 and the Polish occupation of Western Belorussia and Western Ukraine. “Somewhere between 18,000 and 60,000 Red Army POWs had died in Polish captivity. There is good documentation that they were treated brutally, starved, frozen, and many of them murdered outright,” the professor pointed out.<sup>1</sup>

Still, “there is no evidence that the 14,000+ Polish POWs who were transferred out of Soviet POW camps in April and May 1940 were in reality being sent to be shot,” the author con-

cluded, “The discoveries in the mass graves at Volodymyr-Volynskiy constitute a lethal blow to the “official version” of the Katyn Massacre.”

“I have gone back and reviewed the evidence many times since I published that article. I am still surprised that such an important story rests on such a thin basis of evidence. The only “real” evidence is the documents from “Closed Packet No. 1,” Professor Grover Furr told *Russia Insider*.

“In any case the finding of those Polish policemen in the mass grave at Volodymyr-Volynskiy demolishes the “official” version. And there is no other version! Therefore, the only way to “rescue” the official version is to suppress the results of the V-V [Volodymyr-Volynskiy] excavations. And the Polish and Ukrainian officials have done that. Plus, to keep pointing at the documents from “Closed Packet No. 1,” which means suppressing Viktor Iliukhin’s exposure of them,” he added.

Professor Furr bemoaned the fact that senior Russian officials and mainstream media continue to support the “official version” of the Katyn Massacre.

“Katyn is the best documented “crime of Stalinism.” If they admit that the “official version” of Katyn is a lie, what else might turn out to be false? <sup>3</sup> And then, what is the ideological justification for the dissolution of the USSR?” Professor Grover Furr asked.

The Katyn Massacre story, currently being used as a propaganda tool by both Warsaw and Washington, sparks a lot of controversy in Russia and the West. Lots of questions remained unanswered and only a new comprehensive investigation into the Katyn case could finally expose the truth and restore justice.

## Sources:

<sup>1</sup> Furr, Grover, “The ‘Official’ Version of the Katyn Massacre Disproven,” *Socialism and Democracy*, 2013, Vol. 27, No. 2, 96-129. [https://msuweb.montclair.edu/~furg/research/furr\\_katyn\\_2013.pdf](https://msuweb.montclair.edu/~furg/research/furr_katyn_2013.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Furr, Grover, “The Katyn Forest Whodunnit,” Revised August 6, 2013. <https://msuweb.montclair.edu/~furg/pol/truthaboutkatyn.html>

<sup>3</sup> Furr, Grover, *Blood Lies: The Evidence that Every Accusation Against Joseph Stalin in Timothy Snyder’s Bloodlands is False*, Red Star Publishers, August 2014, 583 pages. [www.RedStarPublishers.org](http://www.RedStarPublishers.org)



## **Post WW2 World Order: US Planned to Wipe USSR Out by Massive Nuclear Strike**

*Was the US deterrence military doctrine aimed against the Soviet Union during the Cold War era really “defensive” and who actually started the nuclear arms race paranoia?*

Ekaterina Blinova

*SputnikNews.com*, 20:12 15.08.2015 (updated 13:29 22.08.2015)

<http://sputniknews.com/politics/20150815/1025789574/us-planned-to-wipe-out-ussr.html>

Just weeks after the Second World War was over and Nazi Germany defeated Soviet Russia's allies, the United States and Great Britain hastened to develop military plans aimed at dismantling the USSR and wiping out its cities with a massive nuclear strike.

Interestingly enough, then British Prime Minister Winston Churchill had ordered the British Armed Forces' Joint Planning Staff to develop a strategy targeting the USSR months before the end of the Second World War. The first edition of the plan was prepared on May 22, 1945. In accordance with the plan the invasion of Russia-held Europe by the Allied forces was scheduled on July 1, 1945.

### **Winston Churchill's Operation Unthinkable**


The plan, dubbed Operation Unthinkable, stated that its primary goal was “to impose upon Russia the will of the United States and the British Empire. Even though ‘the will’ of these two countries may be defined as no more than a square deal for Poland, that does not necessarily limit the military commitment.”

The British Armed Forces' Joint Planning Staff underscored that the Allied Forces would win in the event of 1) “the occupation of such metropolitan areas of Russia so that the war making capacity of the country would be reduced to a point to which further resistance would become impossible”; 2) “such a decisive defeat of the Russian forces in the field as to render it impossible for the USSR to continue the war.”

British generals warned Churchill that the “total war” would be hazardous to the Allied armed forces.

However, after the United States “tested” its nuclear arsenal in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945, Churchill and right-wing American policy makers started to persuade the White House to bomb the USSR. A nuclear strike against Soviet Russia, exhausted by the war with Germany, would have led to the defeat of the Kremlin at the same time allowing the Allied Forces to avoid US and British military casualties, Churchill insisted. Needless to say, the former British Prime Minister did not care about the death of tens of thousands of Russian peaceful civilians which were already hit severely by the four-year war nightmare.

*“He [Churchill] pointed out that if an atomic bomb could be dropped on the Kremlin, wiping it out, it would be a very easy problem to handle the balance of Russia, which would be without direction,” an unclassified note from the FBI archive read.*



An atomic cloud billows above Hiroshima city following the explosion of the first atomic bomb to be used in warfare in Hiroshima, in this handout photo taken by the US Army on August 6, 1945, and distributed by the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum. © Reuters/ US Army

### **Following in Churchill’s Footsteps: Operation Dropshot**

Unthinkable as it may seem, Churchill’s plan literally won the hearts and minds of US policy makers and military officials. Between 1945 and the USSR’s first detonation of a nuclear de-

vice in 1949, the Pentagon developed at least nine nuclear war plans targeting Soviet Russia, according to US researchers Dr. Michio Kaku and Daniel Axelrod. In their book “To Win a Nuclear War: the Pentagon’s Secret War Plans,” based on declassified top secret documents obtained through the Freedom of Information Act, the researchers exposed the US military’s strategies to initiate a nuclear war with Russia.

*“The names given to these plans graphically portray their offensive purpose: Bushwhacker, Broiler, Sizzle, Shakedown, Offtackle, Dropshot, Trojan, Pincher, and Frolic. The US military knew the offensive nature of the job President Truman had ordered them to prepare for and had named their war plans accordingly,” remarked American scholar J.W. Smith (“The World’s Wasted Wealth 2”).*

These “first-strike” plans developed by the Pentagon were aimed at destroying the USSR without any damage to the United States.

*The 1949 Dropshot plan envisaged that the US would attack Soviet Russia and drop at least 300 nuclear bombs and 20,000 tons of conventional bombs on 200 targets in 100 urban areas, including Moscow and Leningrad (St. Petersburg). In addition, the planners offered to kick off a major land campaign against the USSR to win a “complete victory” over the Soviet Union together with the European allies. According to the plan Washington would start the war on January 1, 1957.*


For a long period of time the only obstacle in the way of the US’ massive nuclear offensive was that the Pentagon did not possess enough atomic bombs (by 1948 Washington boasted an arsenal of 50 atomic bombs) as well as planes to carry them in. For instance, in 1948 the US Air Force had only thirty-two B-29 bombers modified to deliver nuclear bombs.

In September 1948 US president Truman approved a National Security Council paper (NSC 30), “Policy on Atomic Warfare,” which stated that the United States must be ready to “utilize promptly and effectively all appropriate means available, including atomic weapons, in the interest of national security and must therefore plan accordingly.”

At this time, the US generals desperately needed information about the location of Soviet military and industrial sites. So far, the US launched thousands of photographing overflights to the

Soviet territory triggering concerns about a potential Western invasion of the USSR among the Kremlin officials. While the Soviets hastened to beef up their defensive capabilities, the military and political decision makers of the West used their rival's military buildup as justification for building more weapons.

Meanwhile, in order to back its offensive plans Washington dispatched its B-29 bombers to Europe during the first Berlin crisis in 1948. In 1949 the US-led North Atlantic Treaty Organization was formed, six years before the USSR and its Eastern European allies **responded defensively** by establishing the Warsaw Pact — the Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation, and Mutual Assistance.



The mushroom cloud of the first atomic explosion at Trinity Test Site, New Mexico. July 16, 1945 © AP Photo/ File

### **Soviet Nuclear Bomb Test Undermined US Plan**

Just before the USSR tested its first atomic bomb, the US' nuclear arsenal had reached 250 bombs and the Pentagon came to the conclusion that a victory over the Soviet Union was now "possible." Alas, the detonation of the first nuclear bomb by the Soviet Union dealt a heavy blow to US militarists' plans.

*"The Soviet atomic bomb test on August 29, 1949, shook Americans who had believed that their atomic monopoly would last much longer, but did not immediately alter the pattern of war planning. The key issue remained just what level of damage would force a Soviet surrender," Professor Donald Angus*

*MacKenzie of the University of Edinburgh remarked in his essay "Nuclear War Planning and Strategies of Nuclear Coercion."*

Although Washington's war planners knew that it would take years before the Soviet Union would obtain a significant atomic arsenal, the point was that the Soviet bomb could not be ignored.

The Scottish researcher highlighted that the US was mainly focused not on "deterrence" but on "offensive" preemptive strike. "There was unanimity in 'insider circles' that the United States ought to plan to **win** a nuclear war. The logic that to do so implied to strike first was inescapable," he emphasized, adding that "first strike plans" were even represented in the official nuclear policy of the US.

Remarkably, the official doctrine, first announced by then US Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in 1954, assumed America's possible nuclear retaliation to "any" aggression from the USSR.

### **US' Single Integrated Operational Plan (SIOP)**

Eventually, in 1960 the US' nuclear war plans were formalized in the Single Integrated Operational Plan (SIOP).

At first, the SIOP envisaged a massive simultaneous nuclear strike against the USSR's nuclear forces, military targets, cities, as well as against China and Eastern Europe. It was planned that the US' strategic forces would use almost 3,500 atomic warheads to bomb their targets.

According to US generals' estimates, the attack could have resulted in the death of about 285 to 425 million people. Some of the USSR's European allies were meant to be completely "wiped out."

*"We're just going to have to wipe it [Albania] out," US General Thomas Power remarked at the 1960 SIOP planning conference, as quoted by MacKenzie.*

However, the Kennedy administration introduced significant changes to the plan, insisting that the US military should avoid targeting Soviet cities and had to focus on the rival's nuclear forces alone. In 1962 the SIOP was modified but still it was acknowledged that the nuclear strike could lead to the death of millions of peaceful civilians.

*The dangerous competition instigated by the US prompted Soviet Russia to beef up its nuclear capabilities and dragged both countries into the vicious circle of the nuclear arms race. Unfortunately, it seems that the lessons of the past have not been learnt by the West and the question of the “nuclearization” of Europe is being raised again.*

## History Repeated: Ukraine Neo-Nazis Turn to Old Ally US for ‘Help’

*64 years ago, on March 17, 1951, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), notorious collaborators of Nazi Germany during the Second World War, called upon the United States to provide it with military assistance aimed against the Soviet Union.*

Ekaterina Blinova

*SputnikNews.com*, 19:12 17.03.2015 (updated 20:47 17.03.2015)

<http://sputniknews.com/analysis/20150317/1019622653.html>



Monument to OUN leader Stepan Bandera unveiled in Ternopil, Ukraine. © *Sputnik*/ Alexander Mazurkevich

After the defeat of German Nazism in 1945, members of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and their paramilitary UPA units continued their struggle against the Soviet Union. Although former Nazi collaborators officially dissolved the UPA in 1949, many of them joined foreign subversive groups and intelligence agencies, dreaming of revenge.

The OUN planned to establish a dictatorship in exile that would one day be transferred to a “liberated” Ukraine, noted Dr. Per Anders Rudling, a Swedish-American historian. Since the beginning of the Cold War, the West recruited many of the OUN leaders, particularly Mykola Lebed, who established contact with US intelligence in 1945. Curiously enough, while characterizing Lebed as “a well-known sadist and collaborator of the Germans,”

the CIA nevertheless considered him and his counterparts as valuable agents.

Rudling cited one of the CIA operative who argued that “some form of nationalist feeling continues to exist [in Ukraine] and... there is an obligation to support it as a cold war weapon.”

The CIA and the US State Department also sponsored OUN leaders’ immigration to the United States in 1949.

The collaboration between the OUN, the CIA and other intelligence services was mutually beneficial: former Nazi collaborators were shielded from prosecution for war crimes, while intelligence agents received valuable information about their Soviet adversaries. Furthermore, the CIA helped nationalist veterans to create “semi-academic” institutions and to assume high academic positions at established universities.

For instance, in 1956 the CIA incorporated a set of networks under Mykola Lebed’s leadership and created the nonprofit Proloh (Prologue) Research and Publishing Association, whose goal was to publish anticommunist propaganda, including radio broadcasts, newspapers and books.

For several decades, Ukrainian nationalist expatriates developed a new Ukrainian ideology and re-wrote the history of the Second World War. Hideous wartime crimes of the OUN-UPA were whitewashed, denied or justified by pro-OUN historians. The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 played into the hands of the Ukrainian nationalists: Soviet textbooks were abandoned in newly established Ukrainian state and replaced with diaspora’s accounts of the past.

“Unlike many other former Soviet republics, the Ukrainian government did not need to develop new national myths from scratch, but imported ready concepts developed in the Ukrainian diaspora,” Per Rudling underscored.

Predictably, numerous neo-Nazi and UPA organizations have begun emerging in Ukraine since the early 1990s. The movement received its second wind after the so-called “Orange Revolution” of 2004, backed by the West, that led to official legitimizing of many of far-right nationalist movements in Ukraine, including the VO Svoboda of Oleh Tyahnybok, who were active participants in the Euromaidan of 2013-2014. The Kiev regime of Viktor Yushchenko bolstered nationalism and encouraged an anti-Russia’s stance in Ukraine.



However, Ukraine's new democratically elected president Viktor Yanukovich (2010-2014), nearly destroyed the plans of ultra-nationalists and their supporters.

In February 2014, he was ousted during the US-backed military coup in Ukraine. Ultra-nationalists, who declared themselves heirs of the OUN-UPA played a crucial role in the Euromaidan. Supported by the Kiev regime, the neo-Nazi vigilantes then launched a campaign against Russian-speakers across the country that finally turned into full-scale war in eastern Ukraine. It looks like the OUN-UPA heirs have bad habits that die hard. Nowadays, as 64 years ago, Ukrainian nationalists are again calling upon Washington to provide them with military assistance aimed against east Ukrainian independence supporters and Russia. History repeats itself...

## By Equating USSR to Nazi Germany West Covers Up Own Shameful History

*By equating the Soviet Union to Nazi Germany and Joseph Stalin to Adolf Hitler, Ukrainian politicians and their Western supporters are trying to cover-up their own shameful history, American professor Grover Carr Furr told Sputnik.*

Ekaterina Blinova

*SputnikNews.com*, 15:34 12.05.2015 (updated 20:16 12.05.2015)

<http://sputniknews.com/analysis/20150512/1022040756.html>



Veterans of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (OUN-UPA)  
marching during the Heroes Festival in Lviv, Ukraine

© *Sputnik*/ Pyotr Zadorozhnyi

The West is turning a blind eye to the Verkhovna Rada's decision to equate Communism to Nazism, and declare that the infamous Nazi collaborators – the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) – were “fighters for Ukrainian independence.”

Law 2558, adopted by the Verkhovna Rada on April 9, 2015, stipulates that those who deny “the criminal character of the communist totalitarian regime of 1917-1991 in Ukraine” may face criminal prosecution.

At the same time the Ukrainian parliament proclaimed the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) “fighters for Ukrainian independence,” and restricted questioning the legitimacy of their actions during the Second World War.

Curiously enough, the majority of Western leaders have not rushed to condemn Kiev’s initiative with the exception of a few prominent scholars and experts, who expressed their deep concerns regarding honoring the notorious Nazi collaborators.

And it is hardly surprising, deems Professor Grover Carr Furr, a prominent American historian, author and expert in Soviet history.

*“This is nothing new. The United States permitted Ukrainian fascists to flee the Red Army to the USA, Canada, and elsewhere [after the Second World War]. The US CIA funded Ukrainian Nationalist research groups, newspapers, and of course spies,” the professor told Sputnik.*

“In short, the USA (and Canada, in an even larger way) spent a lot of money supporting Ukrainian fascists after 1945. When the USSR broke up the US began to get its money’s worth. The Ukrainian nationalists – the OUN, former UPA, and so on – flooded back to Ukraine after 1991. They soon captured the universities and education generally,” Professor Furr noted.

The historian emphasized that the post-war claims of the OUN-UPA to have fought Nazi Germany have collapsed under careful scrutiny.

*“Some scholars have looked for evidence that the OUN-UPA fought the Germans, but can’t find any. And the Nazis let [Stepan] Bandera and [Roman] Shukhevich out of prison in 1944 [and 1943, respectively] in order to enlist them to fight the Red Army. If the OUN-UPA had been fighting the Germans, they’d have been shot, not released,” the professor remarked.*

The OUN and its UPA military wing were behind the massacre of about 100,000 Poles in Volhynia and Eastern Galicia, the Khatyn mass murder in Belarus and involved in the hideous Holocaust cleansing.

*“The Ukrainian OUN-UPA fighters were Nazi collaborators and fascist murderers. They deserve zero respect,” Professor Grover Furr stated.*

However, “Mykola Lebed [who was responsible for the murder of Poles in Volhynia and Eastern Galicia] lived in Queens, New York, until the 1990s, totally supported by the CIA or State Department. Why would the US change its policies now?” Professor Grover C. Furr noted with a bitter irony.

The new Kiev legislation is not the first attempt aimed at equating Communism and Nazism: pro-nationalist Ukrainian scholars have been systematically spreading myths of the Soviet crimes against Ukrainians since the end of the Second World War. One of these well-known attempts to rewrite Soviet history is a “Holodomor” hoax.

*“In 1987 the film ‘Harvest of Despair’ was made. It was the beginning of the ‘Holodomor’ hoax. The film was entirely funded by Ukrainian Nationalists, mainly in Canada. A Canadian scholar, Douglas Tottle, exposed the fact that the film took photographs from the 1921-22 ‘Volga famine’ and used them to illustrate the 1932-33 famine. Tottle later wrote a book, ‘Fraud, Famine, and Fascism: The Ukrainian Genocide Myth from Hitler to Harvard,’ about the phony ‘Holodomor’ issue,” Professor Grover Furr told Sputnik.*

Furthermore, American professor Mark B. Tauger has done groundbreaking research on the Famine of 1932-33, and come to the conclusion that the disaster was due to environmental circumstances at the time and was not related to the Soviet policy in the region, Professor Furr emphasized.

Warsaw, which surprisingly failed to blast Kiev for its initiative to honor the OUN-UPA insurgents, is also supporting Ukraine’s anti-Soviet sentiment.

Warsaw has got its own skeletons in the closet: for instance, blasting the Soviet government for the Katyn massacre, Polish historians remain silent about the fate of 18,000 – 60,000 Red Army soldiers who died in Polish captivity in 1920s. “There is good documentation that they [the Soviet POWs] were treated brutally, starved, frozen, and many of them murdered outright,” Grover C. Furr pointed out.

Slamming the USSR for the Molotov-Ribbentrop non-aggression treaty, signed in 1939, Polish scholars apparently forgot that Poland’s First Marshall Jozef Pilsudski concluded the German-Polish Pact with Hitler five years earlier, in January

1934. While in 1938, Poland took part in the infamous partition of Czechoslovakia together with Nazi Germany.

“Then there are all the crimes of the Polish underground, the Armia Krajowa, and the post-war Polish underground. The AK collaborated with the Nazis, for example. They continued to murder Jews and communists, mainly Poles, after the war for years,” the professor underscored.

*“The only way to cover up as much of this shameful history as possible, and rationalize the rest of it, is to claim that the USSR was “just as bad as” the Nazis,” Grover C. Furr elaborated.*

Meanwhile in 2010, another American scholar Timothy Snyder published a study, translated into more than 25 languages, in which he blatantly equated the Soviet Union to Nazi Germany. In response, Grover C. Furr wrote his book “Blood Lies,” debunking a series of widespread myths about the USSR and exposing an astonishing lack of evidence for many of anti-Russia accusations presented by Professor Snyder.

By rewriting the history of the Second World War, downplaying the significance of the Soviet Union’s role in defeating Nazi Germany and manipulating the Soviet past, the West is targeting today’s Russia.

## **Who Controls the Past Controls the Future: Why Does the West Hate Stalin?**

*On August 23 Europe marked a so-called “European Day of Remembrance for Victims of Stalinism and Nazism” coinciding with the date of the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact; one of the purposes of this “day of remembrance” is to equate Stalin with Hitler, the USSR with Nazi Germany, Professor Grover Carr Furr told Sputnik.*

Ekaterina Blinova

*SputnikNews.com*, 14:21 25.08.2015 (updated 14:22 25.08.2015)  
<http://sputniknews.com/politics/20150825/1026165590/why-does-west-hate-stalin.html>

By attacking and stigmatizing the Soviet past the US and its NATO allies are targeting today's Russia and its leadership that is unwilling to bow before the West; anyway, the USSR never did anything remotely comparable to what major Western countries did in the last century — the US and NATO have been by far the most aggressive and murderous power in the world since WW2, US expert in Soviet history Professor Grover Carr Furr of Montclair State University told *Sputnik*.

Illogical as it may seem, despite the fact that the USSR collapsed decades ago the Western propaganda machine continues to vilify Soviet Russia; first British-American historian Robert Conquest and later American scholar Timothy Snyder have contributed a lot to the anti-Soviet and anti-Russian propaganda campaign.

*“Why [is there] so much anti-Stalin and anti-communism? Anti-communism because communism is the antithesis to capitalism. And anti-Stalin because the Stalin period in the USSR was the period when the world Communist movement did so much that was good. Also, anti-Stalinism and anticommunism because of the huge atrocities of capitalism and imperialism in the 20th century, which continue today,” Professor Furr emphasized.*

### **Cold War: Western Historians on Intelligence Service**


The professor pointed out that historian Robert Conquest (the author of “The Great Terror: Stalin's Purges of the 1930s” who passed away on August 3, 2015) had been working for the

British Information Research Department (IRD) since its establishment and up to 1956. The IRD, originally called the Communist Information Bureau, was founded in 1947, when the Cold War era began.

“[The IRD’s] main task was to combat Communist influence throughout the world by planting stories among politicians, journalists and others in a position to influence public opinion,” Professor Furr explained.

Conquest’s work was to contribute to the so-called “black history” of the Soviet Union, the professor noted, “in other words, fake stories put out as fact and distributed among journalists and others able to influence public opinion.”

“His book *The Great Terror*, a basic anti-communist text on the subject of the power struggle that took place in the Soviet Union in 1937, was in fact a recompilation of text he had written when working for the secret services. The book was finished and published with the help of the IRD. A third of the publication run was bought by the Praeger Press, normally associated with the publication of literature originating from CIA sources,” Professor Furr pointed out.



The Training Center One, a secret CIA guerrilla warfare training base at Fort Benning, Ga. © AP File Photo

The professor remarked that to this day Conquest remains one of the most important sources of material on the Soviet Union for anti-communist and Russophobic historians.

The propagandist activity, masquerading as scholarship, was aimed against the USSR and coordinated by US/British intelligence.

Furr noted that Conquest periodically met with heavy criticism from prominent Western scholars, which blasted him for “consciously falsifying information” about the Soviet Union. In fact Conquest just used any source that was hostile to Stalin and the USSR, turning a blind eye to the fact whether it was reliable or not.

### **Anti-USSR Discourse Has Caught Second Wind in West**

Needless to say that British-American historian Robert Conquest has lots of “followers,” especially today, when Western-Russian relations have deteriorated tremendously. The blatant falsification of history used as a traditional Cold War tool has caught a second wind.

*“He who controls the past controls the future. He who controls the present controls the past,” as George Orwell wrote in his famous book “1984.”*

Unsurprisingly though, the Western historical discourse is currently flooded with politicized myths about the USSR and Joseph Stalin.

One of those who contribute a lot to the blackening of Soviet Russia is Timothy Snyder, the Housum Professor of History at Yale and author of *Bloodlands*. Like Conquest, he is a celebrated Western author praised by both American right-wing and liberal sources.

While attacking Stalin, Snyder is trying to convince his readers that Hitler was no worse but in some sense “less evil” than the Soviet leader. Snyder goes even so far as to suggest that “in order to carry out the murder of the Jews [the Holocaust],... Adolf Hitler depended on Joseph Stalin [and his methods],” as Professor David A. Bell remarked in his recent review of Snyder’s “Black Earth” for the *National Interest*.

Remarkably, Snyder is largely following in the footsteps of Conquest — his narrative is based on controversial sources, rumors, semi-truths always hostile to the USSR, as Professor Furr exposed in his book “Blood Lies: The Evidence that Every Accusation Against Joseph Stalin and the Soviet Union in Timothy Snyder’s *Bloodlands* Is False.”



## Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact: Truth and Lies

The story of the 1939 Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact narrated by Snyder and other anti-communist historians is also full of incorrect assumptions.

“They say that in the treaty ‘the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany agreed to divide Eastern Europe between themselves.’ This is false. The treaty, in a secret clause, marked all of Eastern Poland as the ‘Soviet sphere of influence.’ This meant that when the German army defeated the Polish army, (a) the German army would have to withdraw from Eastern Poland, remaining hundreds of miles away from the pre-1939 Soviet border; (b) Poland would remain in existence, and hopefully be willing to ally with the USSR against Hitler,” Professor Furr stressed.

Furr pointed out that the USSR had been trying hard to get Poland, the UK and France to agree to “collective security,” that would oblige each country to declare war on Germany if Hitler attacked Poland. Alas, Warsaw and London refused to conclude any such treaty.

*“The ‘Munich Accords’ of October 1938, where the UK and France had given Hitler a large part of Czechoslovakia (later they also gave Hitler all the Czech gold reserves) had proven that the capitalists wanted Hitler to attack the USSR. The anti-communist and anti-Semitic Polish government also snatched a piece of Czechoslovakia at this time,” Grover Furr emphasized.*

In September 1939 the German army occupied Poland and the Polish government fled the country to Romania. When there is no government, there is no state.

“Hitler’s men told the Soviets they were ready to permit a pro-Nazi, anti-communist Ukrainian state in the former Eastern Poland. So the Soviets had no choice but to occupy Eastern Poland. ‘Eastern Poland’ was not really Polish anyway. It had been seized by force from Soviet Russia by imperialists in 1921. Most of the population was Ukrainian, Belorussian, and Jewish,” the professor underscored.

Professor Furr stressed that the significance of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact is enormous: it helped to save the USSR, and therefore all Europe, from Hitler’s domination:

*“If the German army had been able to start their attack 300 miles closer [to the Soviet border] the Nazi hordes would have*

*taken Moscow. If Hitler had conquered the USSR he would have had the immense material and human resources of this gigantic country to turn against England. Hitler had already conquered almost all of Europe,” he emphasized.*

So why do Snyder and his associates refuse to admit it?

### **By Attacking USSR West Is Targeting Today’s Russia**

Professor Furr elaborates that mainstream western “experts” are not interested in finding out the truth.

“Conquest was, and Snyder is, a propagandist. I call their work “propaganda with footnotes.” The footnotes and scholarly apparatus are necessary to fool the media and those intellectuals who will help to propagate their anti-Stalin and anti-communist lies,” he told *Sputnik*.



President Ronald Reagan meets in the White House Oval Office with conservative leaders of Washington’s national defense establishment. © AP File Photo/ Charles Tasnadi

“Snyder’s aim — and it is not only he, by a long shot, there are many others — is to equate Stalin with Hitler, the USSR with Nazi Germany, and communism with Nazism. That is also the purpose of this “day of remembrance” of August 23, and the position taken by the Polish, Ukrainian, Hungarian, and other far-right governments,” Furr underscored.

“I try to point out at the end of “Blood Lies: The Evidence that Every Accusation Against Joseph Stalin and the Soviet Union in Timothy Snyder’s Bloodlands Is False,” with some help from Prof. Domenico Losurdo, that it is accurate to compare Churchill with Hitler, or Daladier, or Chamberlain, but not Stalin. The USSR was as different from Nazism as could be, while Hitler and the Nazis were quite popular with Western politicians,” he added. But why is Washington so anti-Russian?

The professor explained that unlike Gorbachev or Yeltsin, President Putin does not bow before Washington and NATO, adding that the US’ capitalist competition will inevitably lead to imperialist competition and war.

*“In my experience — limited, I admit — there is a lot of naivete about US foreign policy. The USA has been by far the most aggressive and murderous power in the world since WW2, and it continues to be. Military bases in well over 100 countries, the largest military machine in the world by far. We should not be naive. No country builds such a military without intent to use it. So they are preparing for the next war,” Professor Furr told Sputnik.*

“My point is this: the USSR and world communist movement never did anything remotely comparable to what the capitalists and imperialists did in the last century. And this is unacceptable [for capitalists]. They must show communism and Stalin to be worse than, not better than, what the capitalists and imperialists were doing. Lying is the only way,” Professor Grover Furr concluded.