

# **The Regime: Usury, Khazaria and the American Mass**

Matthew Raphael Johnson  
Johnstown, PA

## I.

This author uses the term “Regime” in a very specific way. It refers to the present rulers of global capitalism, that informal network of elites in government, academia, journalism and finance that control the capital flows worldwide. They are unified in their liberal views and that history has chosen them to bring humanity to the next level in “collective evolution.” They are building the new Tower of Babel. Debt and usury is an extremely effective method for their control.

The Regime's banks use two mechanisms to use debt as control. These are the destruction of national independence and, as a result, the relegation of the victim society into a raw materials producer for the system. The typical rate is between 10 and 20% for international loans, there is no way for economic growth to keep pace. The point is that the country falls into the hands of its creditors, who are not state bodies. The target country is then sold off until, as in Ukraine, no economy remains.

Speculation drives up the price of securities in an area for a short time and the press trumpets an “economic boom.” As always, this “boom” has nothing to do with production, it soon self-destructs. Then, once those profits have dried up, the assets of the victim society can be bought up for very little. Soon, another illusory “boom” is created which only increases the presence of foreign capital. The point is that little is actually produced. Profits are made from perceptions of economic growth. It is quite literally taking something from nothing.

Usury is defined normally as an “excessive” rate of interest. This cannot be a definition because it contains a value judgment. Definitions of objects cannot be value judgments because objects are the foundation for such judgments. Usury, rather, is the ability to extract rents. Usury is the result of a power relation where the superior is able to use that status to extract non-economic rents out of the inferior. This is to say rents that are not based on market, labor or use values.

## II.

In Russian history, this was the role of Khazaria. Charging tolls on passing merchants was their primary form of income. Domestically, the top layer of society, mostly Jewish, extracted tribute from their conquered peoples. The Khazar empire had a small but powerful group of Jewish bankers in Kiev as early as the 10<sup>th</sup> century.

Prince Svyatoslav destroyed this parasitic growth on the planet in the Middle Volga region as well as the North Caucasus. The result was the Jewish support for the Mongol attackers and Turkic nomads of the south. Overall, maybe 5 million Russians were taken into slavery from these raids according to VI Lamansky from the 15<sup>th</sup> to the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The Venetian war rowers were often Slavic.

Much later, this threat did not abate, as even state supported loans did not compete with Jewish houses at the local level, who would even sell for a loss for the sake of undercutting

competition. Allegedly barred from owning land, Russian Jews miraculously owned 513,000 acres by 1889. refusing to engage in manual labor, they exploited the peasants, using ignorant nobles as front men.

The heavy impact of usury on the economic life of Russians is easy to find. Credit was hard to find, so the kahal was charging about 120% yearly on loans. At the local level, Jewish usury was linked to their near monopoly on vodka sales, which also meant that, after the abolition of serfdom, an entirely new market was opened for them that incorporated both areas. In 1892-1893, anti-Jewish riots broke out over the manipulation of peasants with vodka to mortgage their newfound lands.

The Criminal Code of the Russian Empire (1903) continued to see usury a crime. It defined the crime like this: Firstly, if a borrower is forced under extreme circumstances to take an unfavorable loan, the foundation is laid. The concealment of the compound idea over time was a large part of the criminal aspect of it. Also adding “penalties” to the rate itself made the crime even worse. Finally, using this liquidity to buy grain from peasants in rough straits at very low prices was another aspect of the crime. For the sake of practicality, the law stated that anything over 12% is “usurious” as was compound interest.

Try to mentally compare cities, especially the capital city [Petrograd], and our rural countryside, and wonder at the contrast between the two: in the cities – luxury to the point of insanity, millions spent on unnecessary splendor. In our villages, poverty, simplicity, rye bread, water or tea. They might possess a few sheep or a horse, basic food and clothing. If you take into account the incessant fires that burn all to the ground in the village, then there is no surprise as to the widespread misery. Urbanites are surrounded by wealth, the village is immersed in poverty. Villagers are the martyrs, they are always a sad people. Of these last, many are the first in the new age to come (St. John of Kronstadt, from his Last Diary).

By 1900, Jews made up almost 40% of the Russian merchant class, being less than 1% of the population. In 1914 there were more than 187 credit institutions, including 26 banks, 15 banking houses, 33 banking offices and 37 credit societies. Of these, only two were without Jews in positions of management. Marx called money the Jew's “worldly god.” he states, in Part II of his *On The Jewish Question* (1944)

Let us not look for the secret of the Jew in his religion, but let us look for the secret of his religion in the real Jew. What is the secular basis of Judaism? Practical need, self-interest. What is the worldly religion of the Jew? Huckstering. What is his worldly God? Money. Very well then! Emancipation from huckstering and money, consequently from practical, real Judaism, would be the self-emancipation of our time. . . Money is the jealous god of Israel, in face of which no other god may exist. Money degrades all the gods of man – and turns them into commodities. Money is the universal self-established value of all things. It has, therefore, robbed the whole world – both the world of men and nature – of its specific value. Money is the estranged essence of man's work and man's existence, and this alien essence dominates him, and he worships it. The god of the Jews has become secularized and has become the god of the world. The bill of

exchange is the real god of the Jew. His god is only an illusory bill of exchange.

Karl Marx's early works contain many excellent insights. E. Michael Jones' work on modern Jewry centers around the thesis that their rejection of Christ as logos meant that reality became fluid, fragmented, meaningless outside of human control. Logos is the essence of all creation or, seen from another angle, the creator of the essences, the archetypes, that typify different aspects of creation and grant them their law and purpose. Once this essence is removed, reality either descends into the meaningless flux or it seeks a substitute. In the case of the Jews, it was money. The famed Manuscripts from 1944 contain this comment on money similar to the above,

It is the visible divinity – the transformation of all human and natural properties into their contraries, the universal confounding and distorting of things: impossibilities are soldered together by it.

It is the common whore, the common procurer of people and nations.

The distorting and confounding of all human and natural qualities, the fraternization of impossibilities – the divine power of money – lies in its character as men's estranged, alienating and self-disposing species-nature. Money is the alienated ability of mankind.

That which I am unable to do as a man, and of which therefore all my individual essential powers are incapable, I am able to do by means of money. Money thus turns each of these powers into something which in itself it is not – turns it, that is, into its contrary (Marx, 1844).

Usury and capitalism are heresies for this reason: they are an implicit denial of creation. Money gives value to things, but their existence or part of a broader ecosystem. Human virtues and talents are also denied, being projected into the currency-fetish. There can be no doubt as to the truth of this. Money in Marx, not God, is the result of man's projecting his own pathetic weakness onto something. His alienated potential and thrust on an object, money, which is granted this near-absolute power.

Khazaria existed as a multinational state ruled over by an oligarchy of Jewish converts. Few historians will touch this issue, and with good reason. The advantageous location of the Khazars (through the Khazar Khanate went the famous "Silk Road") caught in the Persian Jews from the tribe of Simon, who began to settle there after their revolution in Persia where the Jews completely robbed the Persian people, and with all their riches fled the country.

Having come to Khazaria already wealthy, the Jews quickly pushed the gentiles out of the parasitic niches of the economy. According to the testimony of medieval travelers, the main source of income of the Khazar Khanate, except for usury, was the slave trade. Regular raids on neighboring lands (mostly Slavic) gave the Khazars a large number of slaves which were sold all over the world. Strengthened in the Slavic lands by the construction of new fortresses, the Khazars, being under the power of the Jews, carried out their raids on medieval Russia. Trade in general and the slave trade in particular, has always been the traditional source of income for the Jewish entrepreneurs and a source of super-profits, which made it possible to get rich quick, and further strengthen its parasitic power.

Intermarrying with gentiles, Jewish women guaranteed that their sons would be Jews, since its a matrilinear sect. Occupying high positions among the elite, the Jews began to do

everything to facilitate the development of commercial business for their fellow tribesmen. Having the economy of the country in their hands, they also began to dominate the state and hence, the region.

As soon as the real power in Khazaria completely passed to the hands of the Jewish king Obadiah and his inner circle, he made Judaism the state religion of the Khazars. In contrast to the political elite, Khazar warrior aristocracy was still a very powerful force and adhered to the Vedic tradition. Obadiah, relying on the Jewish Khazar clan, used mercenaries such as the Pechenegs and Guz, which unleashed a civil war. The result was the native Turks were defeated and were forced to leave their homeland and settle on the territory of modern Hungary. After the victory over the Khazar Turks in the civil war, the Khazar Jews besieged local populations for heavy tribute.

By controlling the "Great Silk Road", the Khazar Jews fully seized the trade between East and West, between North and South, that is, all the trade routes passing through the Caucasus Mountains. This was the main purpose of their migration to the region, after they destroyed and sacked the Persian Empire. Full control of the caravan routes passing through the Khazar Khanate allowed the Jews to establish a trade monopoly, where they began to control the prices of imported and local goods. As a result, consumers were gouged.

When the civil war in China led to a sharp reduction in trade turnover, the Khazar Jews moved north and defeated and subjugated Kama (Volga) Bulgaria and the Great Permian land. Soon, this parasitic state began sucking the gold and silver out of all neighboring societies. By the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century, they were immensely wealthy and powerful and known throughout Central Asia and Europe for their brutality in war. Kievan Rus, the most consistent enemy of the Khazars finally defeated them under the leadership of Sviatoslav in 964, sending the Jews throughout Europe.

The defeat of Khazaria was one of the most significant events of the middle ages, since, had this empire grew in strength, it would have imposed a Jewish, Talmudic slave empire across Europe. Historians such as Nikolai Levashov shows how, even within Khazaria itself, the Jews lived in castled within cities. At night, the gates were closed and entry was impossible. They were hidden from the rest of the population like a sacred race that could not be touched.

The outcome of the struggle between these two states depended not only the fate of Eastern European peoples, but much of Asia too. Byzantines and Arabs were brought in to reinforce these towers and fortresses in an attempt to create an impregnable Jewish fortress. Khazaria also served to restrain Kiev, so for a time, even the Byzantines tolerated their existence and supported them.

Universally feared and totally amoral, the Khazar mercenaries were in the process of draining eastern Europe of its manpower in their slave raids. Warfare in the west was usually accompanied by Khazar slave merchants, making lucrative deals for the conquered women and children.

Vassals of the Khazars were Burtases from the Volga Bulgaria and the Middle Volga. The mouth of the Volga was controlled by the capital of the Khazars, the city of Itil, well-fortified under the direction of Byzantine engineers. This major commercial and political center was well protected. In the North Caucasus the main stronghold of the Khazars was the city of Samandar, the old capital. Fortress Sarkel covered the western borders and controlled the Don. Tumantarhan (Samkerts or Tamatarha) controlled the Taman Peninsula. Whole cities were well protected, especially Sarkel, with the most advanced military and architectural technology available to human beings. Mercenaries included a substantial number of Islamic cavalry, Islam seen as little

more than an offshoot of Talmudic Judaism.

### III.

It is comical to watch the *boobus Americanus* in an election year. Those who style themselves the most educated, advanced and progressive of all history speak of the President as a demiurge. All they believe is superstition, taking labels as identical with the thing. “The country is in your hands” Hilary Clinton once said to her husband. The executive is seen to be a projection of the alienated powers of a down trodden American. Gene Healy's book *The Cult of the Presidency: America's Dangerous Devotion to Executive Power* makes this point. Public intellectuals see the president as a symbol of the nation or the embodiment of the hopes of a people (cf 281-285). Presidents are fetishes: they are perceived to control the economy, crime, legislation, morale, gas prices and interest rates without input or influence from elsewhere.

Clinton Rossiter lists in his *The American Presidency* the most common perceptions of the this office: “world leader,” “spokesman for the nation,” “preserver of the peace,” “chief legislator” and the “manager of prosperity,” among other pompous titles. Without endorsing these of course, both authors seem the American as a royalist, demanding that power have a human face and be an individual, one that can be blamed for things. Parliaments cannot be personalized.

One thing neither author will mention is that this fetishization of the presidency permits attention to be directed elsewhere while those with real power work their black magic. Presidents are blamed for economic prosperity and failure, even by academic political scientists. This is inexcusable for an academic as it is a mystification. Those who actually control investment flows and make decisions for overseas investment, research, development or employment policy remain anonymous. The pompous roles a president is perceived to have are not constitutionally mandated, and that which is mandated, outside of foreign affairs, is very modest. In misdirecting attention, the errors of economic elites are transferred to an often clueless chief executive who is usually said to “run the country.”

As the above as shown, real power lies elsewhere. Those with power are not stupid enough to have it a matter of public record or discussion. Power is economic, or more specifically, the ability to promise satisfaction to the passions of the mass. Corporate America has more coercive power than the Egyptian Pharaoh could have ever hoped to amass. Yet, they are not seen as capable of oppression, since governments alone are so capable.

### IV.

The Constitution of the US was written with several assumptions in mind. These were unspoken at the time because they were seen as obvious and built-in to the social and civic life of the era. Today they can be seen as axiomatic of the time:

1. Capital was not radically centralized and was not seen to be capable of this. The creation of the conglomerate, especially in media and banking, makes capital far more powerful than the state. This was not even conceivable at the time;
2. That the “money power,” the power to coin money and to regulate its value, will remain with the House;
3. Given the first two, that the only oppression worthy of the name comes from the state, never from capital. Bankers were seen as a threat by Jefferson and other founders, but the idea of a massive, global conglomerate dominating almost all the planet's wealth was not

- conceivable in 1790;
4. That this state will never become large enough to have much of a standing army, let alone colonize the globe; government was a part-time affair;
  5. That Christianity, even the 18<sup>th</sup> century's watered down, schismatic form, will be the foundation of social life, including the family, local associations and relations between the sexes and that this will not be amenable to public regulation;
  6. That the US would be more or less homogeneous racially, or at least, its racial components strictly kept separate. Otherwise, racial demagogues would appear, destroying the unity necessary for even the simplest form of civic action. What John Adams worried about concerning class was able to become a problem for race as well. Adams predicted the rise of John Brown and the coming violence of anti-slavery agitation;
  7. That Greco-Roman culture would be the cornerstone of education;
  8. That “representation” would be among groups of small property holders, having much in common in race, basic moral foundations and culture, sending one of their own to administer the small government in Philadelphia or DC. This would be a minor, part-time job that would lead to great levels of turnover in office;
  9. That conceptions of Roman aristocracy would remain for the Senatorial rank and would also create the class of intellectuals. Senators were not to be elected so as to keep them from the vulgarity and monosyllabic pageantry of modern elections;
  10. That ideological competition would be kept to a minimum, basic moral and social agreement was necessary for any vigorous debate;
  11. That local communities and the extended family would be the primary sources of socialization and social assistance; divorce would be extremely rare
  12. That foreign trade would be minimal, as would be needs and the requirements for money;
  13. That the US remain an agricultural country, meaning that its people would be self reliant and tightly connected to the rhythms of life, capable of feeding themselves in times of struggle;
  14. That a “free man” refers to someone who was not dependent on others for their livelihood, that is, a basically self-sufficient landowner and “production,” the manufacture of objects, was the foundation of the economy;
  15. That these same men would be heavily armed and make up the primary law enforcement and militia of the nation.

These fifteen assumptions are very general and are just the beginning. The loss of any one of these destroys the coherence of the political ideas informing the US civic system. Of course, they are all gone and worse, few even know they are missing. This means that references to the Constitution are incoherent. That the First Amendment is being applied to pornography proves as much. The American political tradition was destroyed in the Civil War and the industrialization that came later. Oligarchy ruled from roughly the First World War until the present moment.

Assumption 13 is particularly important. Even in Adam Smith's work, the assumption was that the main economic actor would be a self-sufficient, non-dependent producer, not someone working for a wage. He would include usury as a form of demeaning, unproductive labor. Further, he saw the possibility of a dependence on foreign trade as very remote, resorting to that only in extreme need. He also could not envisage the extreme mobility of capital or the utter domination of finance regimes worldwide. This makes his analysis completely irrelevant to

modern times. For the capitalist to trot out Smith is indicative of extreme ignorance.

The first paragraph of this paper made reference to this author's use of the term "Regime." The destruction of the fifteen assumptions above are a prerequisite for the Regime to function or even come into existence. The Regime is what happens when the cornerstones of culture are destroyed. The result is the creation of the "mass," another technical term referring to huge numbers of superfluous people not aware of any higher purpose. They suffer from aboulia, a term they have never heard. Aboulia is not mere lethargy, its a lethargy that comes from a profound alienation. The Regime thrives on this.

The system of usury is based on debt. Debt buys more debt and, when it crashes down, the Shylock gets out of town. The usurer is a hated parasite, not a "respected businessman." The Regime found its origins in Babylon and Egypt, son to fully manifest itself in Khazaria. The Khazar idea solidified its control in Northern Italy in the Renaissance and a more explicitly Jewish form of financial rule was built when this capital moved to Amsterdam and London.

One of the most important facts of all modern life, one applicable almost exclusively to modernity, is that power seeks to hide itself. In Florence, the Medici family maintained the facade of the old Republic while ruling all financial decisions from behind the scenes. They financed the art, literature and science (that is, alchemy) of the era while making it seem these were spontaneous developments of a "free people." Savonarola denounced precisely this, being sentenced to death by the Medici pope, signaling the end of the Roman church as a Christian body. To this day, professional historians will not deal with this question lest they be called "conspiracy theorists" and find their tenure endangered. Modern academics are no different than television talking heads, partaking of the same bias and the non-critical nature of contemporary thought. Usury rules and nothing else.

## Bibliography

The Imams of Tyumen (2012) Запят и запрет ростовщичества - гарант от потрясений. Islamic News

Бём-Баверк, Ойген фон (2009) Капитал и процент, 1884—1889. Античные философы и канонисты как противники ссудного процента: Избранные труды о ценности, проценте и капитале. Эксмо

Нуреев Р. М. (1987) Ветхий завет: борьба с ростовщичеством и долговым рабством. Всемирная история экономической мысли (VI Volumes). Moscow

Новосельцев А. П. (1990) Хазарское государство и его роль в истории Восточной Европы и Кавказа. Moscow

Артамонов М. И. (2001) История хазар. Petrograd

Калинина Т. М. (1976) Древняя Русь и страны Востока в X веке. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, USSR Academy of Sciences, Institute of History of the USSR

Brook, KA (2006) The Jews of Khazaria. Rowman and Littlefield

Drabic, J (2002) The Usury Civilization. RFE

Perelman, Michael (2000) The Invention of Capitalism. Duke University Press

Rossiter, Clinton (1956) The American Presidency. Harcourt and Brace

Healy, G. (1987) The Cult of the Presidency: America's Dangerous Devotion to Executive Power. Johns Hopkins University Press