## The Revolutionary Holocaust – live free...or die.

Welcome to a special addition of the Glenn Beck program. The story of America is really one of selfreliance and optimism, and profound faith, not only in the context of religious freedom, but also in the unprecedented faith in the abilitiy of human beings to control their own destiny. And while the spirit of personal responsibility was extraordinarily strong with our founders, great patriots like Thomas Paine, he argued for the redistribution of wealth right off the bat. Alexander Hamilton, he wanted a central bank. Well, they wound up losing those battles, but there were plenty who kept on fighting. Constitution kept those dogs at bay for a better part of 200 years. But eventually those seeking a different path than the ones the founders settled on, realized the only way to really defeat the constitution was for the people to stop reading it. Progressives realized victory required changing history. To defeat them, we have to correct that. Progressives know how powerful history is. When these truths get told, and the lies get corrected, the game is gonna be on--it's pulling the mask off the monster.

Next week we'll dive deeper into the Progressive Script, but today, we dismantle the first act. We've always been told that genicidal dictators of the world, "Oh, they're just manifestations of the hateful right, that the left wing icons like Che (<u>Ernesto "Che" Guevara</u>), Mao (<u>Mao Zedong</u>), and Stalin (<u>Joseph Stalin</u>) need to be understood in context." Tonight, we set the record straight.

"Some of the images in this program may be disturbing to some people. Viewer discretion is advised."

We live in a time that seems to move faster than time. A place, that seems to have no place for the truth. A reality that seems to have no connection to reality. So to get our feet on solid ground in the future, we must first walk through the past with our eyes wide open. "Government is not the solution to our problem, government is the problem." That's modern conservatism in a nutshell. Yet, we're always told that Nazi Germany who controlled every aspect of its citizens' lives was somehow right wing. Is that true? Or is it an attempt to distract for other much more inconvenient similarities?

You say, "Hitler was a right winger because of X, Y and Z', I say, well, "What was Stalin's position on X, Y and Z?" (Jonah Goldberg – Author of Liberal Fascism). The common assumption is that the Nazis were a right wing phenomena, they're a right wing party, that Hitler was a man of the right, and all the rest, and there are a lot of problems with this. His social agenda was for expanding universal access to healthcare, for expanding access to education, it was for a cradle to grave welfare state, it was for attacking big business and high finance. People say, "Well, Hitler abolished labor unions—he was right wing then." Well, how did labor unions do under Stalin? How are labor unions doing under Fidel Castro? Almost anything you can find on a checklist that allegedly proves Hitler was a right winger, you can apply to almost anyone of the major communist dictators of the 20th century, and the similarities are almost identical.

Today this idea may seem controversial, but as the Nazis were rising to power, it wasn't controversial, it was common knowledge. November 28, 1925, a tiny article printed in the New York Times describing the early internal struggle for the identity of the Nazis. A riot broke out after a Nazi speaker claimed that "Lenin was the greatest man second only to Hitler, and the difference between communism and the Hitler faith was very slight..." It wasn't just some nobody in the Nazi party who believed this, it was this

man; Hitler's closest ally to the very end, and his hand picked successor as Chancelor, Joseph Goebbels (Paul Joseph Goebbels). Because it was so controversial, Goebbels, a master of propaganda, stopped talking about it in public, but his private writings revealed his change in approach wasn't a change of heart. The Nazi Germany attacked the Soviet Union in 1941 (Edvīns Šnore – Director of the Soviet Story), just a week before that he wrote in his diary that the goal of the Nazi Germany would be to destroy this Jewish Bolshevism in the Soviet Union, as they described it, and instead of that, build the true socialism. That's what he wrote in his diary. And of course Goebbels was a liar, but why would he lie to his own diary?

The Red Shirts and the Brown Shirts in Germany had all sorts of members who were members of one group joining the other group, and vice versa. They saw themselves as equally revolutionary organizations fighting each other for control. The Nazis vs. the Bolsheviks in Germany was really a case of Coke vs. Pepsi. Even as the Nazis were taking control of France, the French Communist Newspaper found reason to celebrate: "In these sad times, it is exceptionally comforting to see many Parisian workers talking to German soldiers as friends in the street or at the corner café. Well done, comrades, and keep it up, even if it displeases some of the middle classes – as stupid as they are mischievious." - L'Humanité, July 4th, 1940.

The communists in the <u>Reichstag</u> voted almost uniformly with the Nazis. They voted in lockstep and the slogan for the communists in the Reichstag was "First Brown, then Red". The general understanding among the communists and socialists back then was that Nazism was a stepping stone towards the ultimate victory of socialism and communism. While Hitler certainly opposed communism outwardly, he did so mainly because he disagreed with its internationalism. He was a proud German, a German Nationalist, a German jingoist, not a patriot, but a nationalist, and he rejected that element of <u>Marxism</u>, but he embraced socialism entirely. He embraced the idea of racial solidarity, socialism for one race.

Even in Mein Kampf he acknowledged that the movements were so close that if not for the focus on race, his national socialist movement" ...would really do nothing more than compete with Marxism on it's own ground." But Nazi Germany had no corner on the market for racism and anti-semitism. We can find many Nazi-like passages in the writings of Marx and Engels where they put a scorn on the Czechs and Hungarians, and Poles. Marx didn't like (the) Spanish, for example. He said that Spanish are degenerate, and Mexicans are degenerated Spanish.

Marx, we need to remember was Jewish—a self-hating Jew, he rejected Judaism and all the rest, but he was Jewish, and Hitler hated Jews, you know, and this is not a news flash. Hitler was a passionate anti-Semite and he saw Marxism as corrupted with a deep seeded Jewish nature. The irony here, is that so did Marx. Marx was a real anti-Semite. He wrote about the Jewish problem a generation before the Nazis started talking about the Jewish problem. He said we have to purge the Jewish spirit from Western Civilization, from Global Civilization. He had horrible racist things to say about Jews and the blacks. And Hitler very much inherited that Marxist analysis when it came to things like Jews and other races.

Sometimes, it's hard to tell Hitler and Marx apart. Who wrote that Germany's neighbors should accept "...the physical and intellectual power of the German nation to subdue, absorb, and assimilate its

ancient eastern neighbors." That's <u>Karl Marx</u> and <u>Friedrich Engels</u>, authors of the Communist Manifesto (<u>Manifesto of the Communist Party</u>), almost a century before the holocaust. Hitler's underlying admiration for Marxism was obvious. When I made the film, I was actually expecting there will be similarities between the Nazism and Soviet Communism, but I was actually amazed to discover how similar were those posters, and the posters were so similar, that, as if one artist had drawn them. Of course, I think that it is because their ideologies were very similar, and their expression was very similar as well. In Mein Kampf, Hitler writes about the Nazi Party flag, which is this big red flag with a white disc in the middle and a <u>swastika</u> in the center. Hitler explains quite clearly in Mein Kampf that the red, the big sea of red that the <u>swastika</u> was in, intended to attract socialists to his movement, but the red flag was the emblem of the communists—that's why we call them the reds.

But, it went deeper than similar ideology and imagery. Until Germany launched a surprise attack on the Soviet Union in 1941, the Nazis and the Soviets worked together. They even put it in writing, signing what was originally sold as a non-aggression pact (<u>the Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact</u>), but just weeks later they would invade Poland from opposite sides. It wasn't until much later that we would learn the full scope of the agreement. They signed an agreement in 1939 that was called the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact which had secret protocol attached to it, and according to that secret protocol, they agreed on the division of the neighboring countries, being Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union.

Then there was a secret protocol (<u>Taras Huncrak – Professor Emeritus Rutgers University</u>) which essentially divided Europe into two spheres of influence between Hitler and Stalin. After all, it was not so difficult for them. Both of them were totalitarian regimes. They understood each other. The Soviets were delivering all kinds of raw materials to the Germans. It was not just theoretical friendship. An aspect of their collaberation was a mutual exchange of prisoners, basically, German communists and Jews, they fled to the Soviet Union in order to be safe, the Soviet Union sent them back to the Gestapo, and many of them, of course, were killed there in the Nazi concentration camps.

But is this just a story of brutal iron fisted dictators, or something inherent in the philosophy? The fathers of communism, Marx and Engels, believed that societies would evolve from capitalism to socialism, but they acknowledged that there were still, what they called primitive societies that hadn't even evolved into capitalists yet. They called them "racial trash." As the revolution happens, "The classes and the races, too weak to master the new conditions of life, must give way."

There was only one thing left for those too far behind in the process of societal evolution: "The chief mission of all other races and peoples, large and small, is to perish in the revolutionary holocaust." Up until the horrors of Hitler, prominent socialist supporters discussed these ideas out in the open. Nobel Prize winner, Fabian Socialist, and prominent Soviet supporter <u>George Bernard Shaw</u>, "I don't want to punish anybody, but there are an extroadinary number of people who I WANT TO KILL. I think it would be a good thing to make everybody come before a properly appointed board, just as he might come before the income tax commissioner, and say every 5 years, or every 7 years, just put them there and say, sir, or madam, now will you be kind enough to justify your existence? If you're not producing as much as you consume, or perhaps a little more, then... clearly we cannot use the big organization of our society for the purpose of keeping you alive, because your life does not benefit us, and it can't be of very

much use to yourself. And this was actually somewhat subtle for Shaw. He'd also foreshadow some of the worst atrocities in our planet's history. He wrote, "I appeal to the chemists to discover a humane gas that will kill instantly and painlessly, in short, a gentlemanly gas—deadly by all means, but humane, not cruel."

People like George Bernard Shaw were convinced that overpopulation was this terrible, terrible problem, particularly because the unfit, the genetically less desireable were swamping the good genetic types. In the late 19th century there are almost the cream of British intelligencia embracing <u>eugenics</u> well into the early 20th century, saying that thousands, millions had to be marched off into gas chambers and liquidated. George Bernard Shaw has this great line where he says, "We should do it while playing lovely classical music as we march them into the gas chambers. The idea..., a lot of people seem to think this concept of the gas chamber as a tool of social policy was invented by the Nazis. It wasn't. It wasn't--and I mean this in the most disgusting, evil way, it was perfected by the Nazis. But this idea of using things like gas chambers to kill off millions of people so that the rest of the good guys could prosper and move to the sunny uplands of history was immensely popular.

All of these systems are based on the idea that we know better. The little people who get in the way of our plan..well, first we'll go around them, and then we'll destroy them. This arrogance always ends exactly the same way. One of history's worst examples, the genocide you've never heard of—next.

The atrocities of Hitler are rightfully recognized as beyond abhorrent, but we must continue to be vigilant to make sure they never happen again. We must never forget. But we must also never stop learning. Here's another story of genocide that for some reason, history has erased:

Growing deep within the roots of socialism, is a brutal and dismissive view of human life. The essence of Marx is simply that the universe (Jonah Goldberg – Author of *Liberal Fascist*) is run by these cold, material, impersonal forces. And that over time, we are going to see us move from the feudal, to the capitalist, to the socialist, to the communist stage. Along the way, a lot of people are going to get killed, and Marx was completely fine with this.

In Nazi Germany, these groups, of course were defined by ethnicity. Like the Jews, for example, and the Soviet Union they defined them by social origin. But the idea was the same. Today, most have forgotten the scale of the Soviet atrocities, particularly, what may have been their most horrific. It began long before Hitler's horror was revealed. Popular uprising had become a problem in the Ukraine. Their spirit of individualism threatened the grand design of Moscow. Stalin decided to take steps and correct the problem. The objective was to put the Ukrainians on their knees. Stalin forced peasants to give up their farms under the banner of collectivization. And it is the peasants who are the army of nationalists. So what do you do? You've got to crush them.

"My wife's grandfather died in 1933. He was arrested for refusal to join the collective farm. While he was in prison his wife was forced to divorce him. When he returned from prison, he saw that he had no wife. He could not see his children. He had no house. He had no land. He had nothing. There are millions of such stories." Stalin took everything. Their independence, their livelihoods, and even their food, plunging the Ukraine into famine. And while the people were starving, it wasn't because the food wasn't

growing; grain production was skyrocketing. Instead of giving the grain to starving people, the Soviets exported it to fund the centrally planned industralization. How the Soviets dealt with the Hunger (Nikolay Melnik – Survivor from "The Soviet Story") was inhumane."

"They entered a house and asked "Where are your dead?" There was only a half-dead woman laying in the bed. They said: "Let's take her. She will die anyway." "Why come after her tomorrow?" She begged them, "Do not take me, I am still alive. I want to live."

It was horrible! (Maria Zaguts – survivor from "The Soviet Story") They were all dumped into the grave. The ground was moving.

The forced famine that resulted was so horrific, the situation so desperate, that there were even widespread reports of cannibalism. "I was once with a group of people going to one part of the Ukraine, and I said, "Is there some older lady that could tell me something about what happened?"

What the woman told him next, he would never forget. And she said, "Oh my God, I really don't like to talk about that." She said, "You see, there's this house on top of the hill there? A mother ate her daugther. She was already insane, because these people usually reach the level of insanity. And then she committed suicide."

How did the Soviets deal with this? They printed posters that said "...to eat your own children is a barbarian act... ." This period is known as "<u>The Holodomor</u>", roughly tranlated as "Murder by Hunger." "Death from hunger was not unusual in the 20th century but there is a difference between death from hunger and murder by hunger. " These intentional policies resulted in murder as efficient as has ever been seen in human history.

"You find that whole families actually die out, like 8 members in the family. " Many millions of people were killed, and given the fact that it was done within one year, I believe this is certainly comparable to the great genocides of the 20th century. Most know that the horrors of the holocaust resulted in the deaths of approximately 6 million jews, but what many don't know is that the government designed starvation in the Ukraine caused the deaths of between 7 and 10 million in just one year. None of this is meant to diminish the horrors of the holocaust; the pure evil that inspired it is above question, and must be remembered vividly, and at all cost, though, in addition, the other victims of vicious governments who have treated human life as nothing but a speed bump to their grand design must also be remembered. "It is not just the number of people, it's the national culture, also. Imagine how many writers, artists, all of them perished. "

One of the most disgusting things about the way we talk about communism is...you have people talk about it as if it was this well-intentioned social experiment, but even at the level of first principles, the sort of planning sessions, it was planned and pre-meditated mass murder on a massive scale. (audio..armed with the new devices of mass destruction..) All the while supported by prominent media members. The New York Times now acknowledges their role in the propping up of Stalin's regime by their reporter <u>Walter Duranty</u>. He called the forced famine in the Ukraine "mostly bunk." And viciously justified the millions dead by saying "...you can't make an omelette without breaking eggs..." Because of

this information, many people in the West reacted quite passively to what happened in the Ukraine. Duranty was there and his position was pro-Soviet and I think he did a lot of harm to the truth at that time. He reported, "No, there is no famine in the Ukraine, but there is widespread mortality due to diseases of malnutrition. " Yet, still, even in August of last year, The Times wrote in a book review that despite the fact that Fredrick Engels, one of the founders of communism, was an advocate of ethnic cleansing, he would have been a fine man to drink with. And it is surely true...that Engel's larger critique of capitalism...resonates down the ages."

"Recognizing this as a tragedy means not only to recognize the genocide of the Ukranian people, we should also speak about the the crimes—not only of the Stalin regime—but about the Criminality of Communism itself. In my opinion, it is a very difficult discussion for a larger number of people, including people from Europe, unfortunately" —and apparently, here in America as well. It is up to us to know the truth so our children don't face the same threat ever again. Each year Ukrainians gather to remember the Holodomor, by lighting 25000 (twenty-five thousand) candles. Why 25000? Because during this intentional famine, they lost 25000 people every single day. Allowing this to happen one more time would be unforgiveable.

The totalitarian system established by Stalin was responsible for murdering millions of innocent people in the most horrendous way, and nobody was interested in knowing about it. The question is, what kind of people are we? In case you're still not convinced that the famine was intentional, during our exclusive interview for this documentary with President <u>Viktor Yushchenko</u> of the Ukraine, he said during the famine of the Ukrainian people, they needed 10 million tons of grain to avoid hunger. They produced 12.2 million tons.

Now you've seen his face everywhere, maybe on your son's or daughter's t-shirts, but hopefully you'll soon realize why that has got to stop. Hmm, I guess we have to make a choice. Ah, Gazelle in a bikini. This is how to learn about history. You see, this is the hotest supermodel in the world. What is this? This is Che, and this too is Che, and so is this. He's a fashion icon among his revolutionary peers, and he is everywhere. In fact, all of this is Che, <u>Ernesto Che Guevara</u>.

There's the famous t-shirt. It is so famous, in fact, that you can buy t-shirts that have images of the tshirt on it. Che's image sells beer, it sells lighters, it sells belt buckles, it sells baby onesies. ("Che Guevara" T-mage Entertainment) "Why are you risking your life to fight for us?" And nowhere is Che seemingly loved more than in Hollywood U.S.A. "You'll see. When Fidel is running things, everybody will read and have food on the table."

But is that who Che really was? (<u>Nick Gillespie</u> – editor in chiefreason.com) One of the things that is fascinating about the cult of Che is that it effectively thrives in the absence of any historical understanding. For example, look around at an anti-war rally, and you'll probably see Che. Che was a self-taught revolutionary who was instrumental in Castro's takeover of Cuba, he became known as the "<u>Butcher of La Cabaña Prison</u>" in revolutionary Cuba where he personally oversaw the execution of anywhere from 175 to several hundred people. He's implicated in thousands of deaths that come after that. 14,000 (14 thousand) men and boys were executed in Cuba during the 1960s. He said that his

dream was to become a killing machine. He said to his revolutionary commrades if they weren't sure of someone's loyalty, if in doubt, kill him. These are the realities that we need to understand about Che. " You could probably call him clinically a <u>sadist</u>." (Humbertto Fontova – author: Exposing the Real Che Guevara). When you read his diaries, he goes into particular detail about when he, himself, shoots people in the head.

But it goes beyond war. Go to a rock concert and you're sure to see Che. This is a man who tried to ban free-expression, particularly musical expressions such as rock music and jazz music because he thought it was imperialist. He was the Caribbean equivalent of the Taliban. He enforced a single, moralistic viewpoint, and if you didn't agree with him, you would be killed. One of my favorite is Carlos Santana. At the 2005 Oscars, naturally, the *Motorcycle Diaries* won and Carlos Santana went there to play the theme song for it. He was wearing a Che Guevara t-shirt. Carlos Santana was showing off an emblem of a regime that made it a criminal offense to listen to Carlos Santana music. But surely Che was a "progressive", a uniting force on race, right? He says, "The negro is lazy and <u>indolent</u>, and spends all his money on <u>frivolities</u> and booze, whereas, the European is intelligent, and foreward looking." This is from his own diaries, and yet we got Jesse Jackson down there, "Viva Che." We've got Jay-Z with a song of the lyrics, "I'm (just) like Che Guevara with a <u>bling on</u>. I'm complex... ." Maybe he is complex, either that, or this guy doesn't know that this guy would have thought that this guy was nothing but a frivolous, lazy drunk, just because of the color of his skin.

So what's wrong with wearing the t-shirt of a war-mongering, blood thirsty racist? Well, what if he was also a terrorist too? "..to his home, to his places of work, to his places of recreation, we'll attack the enemy wherever he lives." Folks, this was written in 1966. He preempted Al Queda by 30, 40 years. Let's see if you can tell the difference. Which quote is from Che, and which one is from Osama Bin Laden? Who said that if he had nuclear weapons, he would use them "...against the very heart of America, including New York City... ?" And, who said "The U.S. is a great enemy of mankind...against those hyenas there is no option but extermination." Yea, it was kinda unfair, it was a trick question. Both of those quotes are from Che. Luckily his attempts at killing Americans on our soil were about as effective as his attempts to ignite revolution around the world.

We look 50 years into the future and there are only two unapologetic communist regimes: North Korea and Cuba. If they had enough nutrition in order to run out of North Korea, they would do that—they are starving there. In Cuba we see time and again people who are so desperate to get off that island hellhole that they will swim through shark infested waters. Che was the vanguard of the revolution, he was going to bring communism to everywhere around the world. In this sense, Che was an absolute abject failure, and it's a damn good thing that he was. While Che wasn't successful in his bid for world revolution, there are plenty of people trying to pick up right where he left off. So what was it like to live in the one place that Che was successful? Find out, next.

You've heard the infamous quote that one death is a tragedy, a million is a statistic. We've examined these events from a big picture perspective, but now let's move away from the statistics and look at the personal tragedy. Che Guevara, his image is a global fashion phenomenon. Hopefully, by now, you know why that's so offensive to so many. But giving you the number of executions he ordered is one thing,

seeing the effect is another. (Barbara Rangel – born in Cuba). They portray him in the movies as a hero and a humanitarian –He was a cold killer.

This is Barbara Rangel's grandfather Colonel Comelio Rojas. He was a freedom fighter way before **Batista** came into power. He was a decendant of patriots. His father was a general and his grandfather was also a general brigadier that fought for Cuba's war of independence against Spain. One day her grandfather was just gone. When Fidel Castro and Che Guevara arrived, it was in Havana in January of '59, and that's precisely when my grandfather disappeared. My family had no idea where he was. All of a sudden my family was in the living room watching television, and they see my grandfather walking, and they were extremely happy to see him, and then they realized that he was walking toward the wall. They started screaming and my grandmother collapsed. They realized that he was going to be executed. When they asked him if he wanted to be blindfolded, he said "no.... "There you have the revolution, take care of it." He asked if he could give the firing orders. And he says, "Aim, fire." He died like a hero. And he was executed by cowards. There was no trial whatsoever. Che Guevara did not allow a trial.

He was taken prisoner at the beginning of January and executed January 7th; that is something I will never forget. There's not one day in my life I don't think about him. Barbara's pregnant mother was so traumatized she went into labor three months early. What is a person supposed to do, you know, rejoice for the birth of your son, or cry for the death of your father? Meet Barbara's mother Blanca. "Che Guevara took away the greatest thing in my life because my father was the greatest. He was a good father. Che Guevara took that away from me, and that is why I have been suffering for fifty years. I will never forget what he did to me." For those who lived with the real Che, it is impossible to understand that in America, of all places, how anyone would want him on a t-shirt. Please, do a lot of research before you make a fool of yourself wearing a t-shirt of a cold killing machine.

Throughout the interview with Barbara and Blanca, they were incredibly strong, but you can see how deeply these events have shaken them, even to this day. "I am not the woman I was before." This is the real legacy of Che: It's murder, destruction, and broken families.

So what can we do to correct the lies? Maybe it's time to make the truth a bit more fashionable. Maybe it's time to remember what these governments were really responsible for. Maybe it's time to ignore the revisionist rehab of these figures, and recognize who they really were. Maybe telling the truth about socialism and communism now can help us avoid all of these things again. Just maybe, speaking up and bluntly telling the truth can stop the next generation from looking at things the same way.

Marx defines socialism as a pit stop between capitalism and communism. It isn't an endpoint. While sometimes this change happens slowly, it always ends badly, but perhaps never worse than with Chairman Mao. " Great leader, great commander, and great helmsman, Chairman Mao ... ." Of all the horror that communism has brought to the world, perhaps the worst was brought to us by Mao Zedong. "When I was in China, we were all told Mao was like our god. (Juan Chang – Co-author Mao: The Unknown Story). When we wanted to say, what I say is the absolute true, we would say, "I swear to Chairman Mao." Mao used his power to crush the Chinese people. The majority of his crimes came in two distinct waves. (Lee Edwards, Chairman – Victim of Communism Memorial Foundation). From 1959

to 1961, was the so-called "Great Leap Forward", which was actually a gigantic leap backwards in which he tried to collectivize and communize agriculture. And they came to him after the first year and said, "Chairman, 5 million people have died of famine, and he said, "No matter, keep going." And the second year they came back and they said 10 million Chinese have died", and he said, "No matter, continue." The third year, "20 million Chinese have died." And he said, finally, "Well, perhaps this is not the best idea that I've ever had." When he was told his people were dying of starvation, Mao said, "Educate the peasants to eat less. Deaths have benefit to fertilize the land." Mao's approach turned to brutal indifference to revenge. With the cultural revolution, his mission was to destroy both enemies and intellectuals. (Lee Stuarts Heritage Foundation). Professors, teachers, sat in the corner with a <u>dunce cap</u> on. They were made to get down on all fours and bark like a dog.

Jung Cheng and her family also found themselves in Mao's crosshairs. "My father was one of the few who stood up to Mao and protested the cultural revolution. My mother was under tremendous pressure to denounce my father. She refused. So as a result, my mother was made to kneel on broken glass. She was paraded in the streets where children spat at her and threw stones at her. She was exiled to a camp." When her father went to protest the cultural revolution. He paid the ultimate price. My mother tried to stop him. She said, "Do you want to ruin the lives of our children?" So he said, "Well what about the children of the victims?" "As a result, he was imprisoned, tortured, driven insane. He was exiled to a camp, and died prematurely, very tragically." As a victim of Mao's crushing rule, Jung Cheng's father was not alone. Some 65 million Chinese died under Maoist communism. "And Mao just didn't care. He said for all of his projects to take off, half of China may well have to die." By a ratio 3 or 4 to 1, we certainly can say that Mao was the greatest mass muderer of the 20th century.

"Two of my favorite political philosophers: Mao Tse Tung and Mother Teresa, not often coupled with each other,... " (Anita Dunn – White House Director of Communications for Barack Obama). Dunn's comments, once again, highlight the odd treatment that leftist totalitarianism receives by too many in our society. Communism is looked at as something that we can borrow from literally, even today. But the truth is that it is among history's most proficient killers. (The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression). According to The Black Book of Communism, published by Harvard University Press, nearly 100 million people died under communism in the 20th century. It all flows out of this idea that the communists think that they can create a new society, and anybody who gets in their way, they will cut down, they will kill, they will imprison, and they will eliminate in pursuit of that goal. With 100 million killed, communism exists in a very exclusive club, along side with the planet's worst communicable diseases like smallpox (Small Pox Documentary - History Channel) and the bubonic plague (The Black Plague). But it's not just communism, it is the truth of any government with too much power. Some government is necessary, too much is suicidal. Every all-powerful government has elements what Marx called the **Revolutionary Holocaust**, the relentless pursuit of **nirvana**, and the price it's worth paying to get there in human life. It is only in understanding history that we can stop this from happening again, and again, and again. America, this is only the beginning of rediscovering the things that have been lost ... .