

**Possible American response to the rise of European far right  
under Russia's support in messianic spirit**

**Lawrence C Chin**

The following is an excerpt from our upcoming “Can Russian-supported far right movements in Europe become the bastion against postmodernism and save humanity?” It's a prediction on the US response. We shall post it here first.

9 December 2015

**The American response: overt operation: copying Russian support**

A nation-state's objective is to maintain its power in the world (“raison d'État”). The US government couldn't of course care less whether American soft-power is destroying the planet. America's natural response will be to simply repeat that the values it has exported to the world is saving humanity. America will do everything it could to maintain its “brand-name”. And of course it's far easier to do that. It's far easier for Coca-Cola and Pepsi to maintain their brand names against the emergence of “Virgin Cola” than it is for “Virgin Cola” to grab a share of the market from Coca-Cola. (If you know the story.) This is of course a bad situation for humanity.

It's possible, however, that, when it comes to the future situation of Europe, the United States might be forced to devise an alternative response. Namely, when it seems all but certain that the far right parties will soon rule every European nation except Germany – thanks to widespread unemployment, Islamicization (mass immigration), and terrorism.

This is not entirely bad news, for, as noted, approximately half of the far right regimes in Europe will remain loyal to United States and the trans-Atlantic relation. Therefore NATO. It is only the European Union which is in definitive jeopardy.

One must not underestimate the “threat” which the European far right insurgency is posing to the United States. In response to the 2014 European election, the State Department has actually installed a special project in its Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs: “Rise of the Far Right Parties in Europe and Political Implications for US Foreign Policy”. While the United States has remained quiet about the affair in public in order to not appear to be intent on interfering in friendly nations' internal politics, it is of course devising backup plans since its vital interests are at risk. Although we find nothing of the project's content in the public domain, this is sign that the United States is indeed in the process of formulating backup plans. Now, the State Department has defined the US “foreign policy goals” that are at risk from the “European insurgency” as: (1) “promoting the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (T-TIP) agreement; (2) strengthening prospects for increased defense/ security spending in Europe; (3) responding to the threat of Foreign Fighters, (4) combatting anti-Semitism, and (5) promoting religious freedom.” These public statements might be more for show than containing substance. It's safe to say that the United States must be worrying, principally, about preserving Europe's security alignment with the United States (NATO and its purpose) and trans-Atlantic free trade

arrangements. As we have seen, these two foreign policy goals can be fundamentally at odds with the platforms of many European far right parties, especially the anti-American factions among them. One can easily imagine the United States pursuing the “hard” policy – which is the easy way out – by simply calling the far right groups “racists”, “fascists”, “separatists”, etc. This might discredit, in the eyes of third parties, those newly emergent nuisances to its traditional foreign policy goals, but it will make no difference in the European continent itself. Therefore, since the United States is expected to try to keep as much of its goals and resources in Europe as possible – even when some of them are destined to be lost – it will most likely pursue a “smart” approach. Let’s speculate on what this “smart” approach might consist of and then calculate what the over-effect it will have on the world at large.

It’s obvious that United States’ primary objective will be to preserve Europe’s traditional security alignment with itself, so that the drifting of many European far right groups to the bosom of Russia is considered by the United States as most dangerous. The preservation of NATO, its purpose, and similar security arrangements with non-NATO European nations will rank higher on the US foreign policy priority list than trans-Atlantic free trade agreements. The United States’ most obvious “smart” move would consist in copying whatever method Russia has used to attract the European far right elements. This, as we shall note, might precisely preserve for the United States the security arrangements it has deemed essential while sacrificing trans-Atlantic free trade.

The Russian method consists of course in sharing the same geopolitical interests while speaking the same language (conservative values, ethnic/ national identity). “Speaking the same language” means that the United States will attempt to establish dialogues between the American conservatives and right wing groups on the one hand and those European far right parties that are hostile to the United States and drifting to Russia on the other. This however will not work easily. You can quite easily imagine American skinhead groups or their derivatives connecting well with some of the European far right elements, but this is obviously not a solution in the sense of official diplomacy. The acceptable elements in the United States that are closest to European far right groups in thinking and speaking are the American conservatives, evidently. Specifically, the paleoconservatives, since the imperial tone of American neoconservatives can only offend the European reactionaries even more. From now on, then, we shall, by “American conservatives”, mean only the “paleoconservatives”.

Again, any dialogues between American conservatives and European far right groups will not be as easy as that between Russian nationalists and European far right groups. The latter groups have more in common than the former groups do. We must explore why this is so.

Let’s review the problem. While the European far right elements often speak very much like American conservatives – whether in the domain of cultural values, on immigration issues, or in terms of nationalistic rhetoric – one cannot expect the Republicans, or any American conservatives, to easily endorse the far right movements in Europe, especially those in France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Italy who are overtly anti-American. Not even those in Belgium and the UK, perhaps.

Anybody can see that, when it comes to geopolitics, the far right movements in Western Europe are going in the opposite direction from American geopolitical interests. Because of their concern with national independence and national identity, those anti-American European far right elements are extremely hostile toward the EU, NATO, and the United States because it is the United States which has inserted their nations into these supranational security architectures like NATO and the EU which have deprived them of national independence and forced them to advance US geopolitical interests instead of their own. Instead, they prefer to get cozy with Russia, which shares their interests in national identity and national independence since Russia sees United States, the EU, and NATO as threats to its security.

Insofar as maintaining American dominance in the world is one of the goals of American conservatives and Republicans *qua* Americans, this is where communication will break down with the Europeans. This is the first obstacle: conflict of interests when it comes to NATO.

Here is the second obstacle. Something which we have already noted is that, whether United States is under Republican or Democrat administration, whether it is the liberals or the conservatives who are in power in the United States, the image which the United States has been projecting into the world is essentially a “liberal” one. American pop-culture is thoroughly “liberal” (all American movie stars are liberals), American innovators and entrepreneurs are mostly “liberal”, American NGOs for the promotion of democracy around the world are vaguely “liberal”, and American programs for promoting “democracy”, “human rights”, and “equality” are run through more with the progressive interpretations of these notions than with the conservative interpretations. These constitute the backbone of America’s soft-power. As we have also noted repeatedly, it is mostly the American “liberal spirit”, or “liberal wing” associated with the Democrats, which has so attracted young people around the world, especially during those special occasions called “color revolutions”. The American evangelical culture has exerted very little influence in America’s favor in the international domain. When the State Department and the CIA carry out their “color revolutions”, they rely on the prestige of the American “liberal” and “progressive” traditions in the eyes of the world, not on the reputation of America’s Christian conservative traditions. Hence Russia is able to find an effective niche in Europe by asserting its Christian (Orthodox) heritage and criticizing the secular traditions of Western nations.

The pro-EU, and pro-American, majority in the EU bureaucracy are essentially disciples of the American “liberal” and “progressive” traditions. This, as has been noted, is clearly evident in the political correctness with which they have been infecting the EU and which they want to impose on all European nations.

This fact can only add more fuel to the anti-American rhetoric of those anti-American factions of European far-right parties. When Russia offers itself to them as the bastion of Christian conservative values against the American liberal and progressive traditions – in addition to sharing the same hostility toward the EU and the same sentiment for a Pan-European civilization – it’s no wonder that they become allies of Russia and enemies to the United States.

America’s obvious response is to change the liberal image which the United States has been projecting onto the world to attract foreigners. Namely, do exactly what Russia has done,

offering itself to Europe as a Christian conservative nation embodying all the traditional family values which the European far right elements are espousing. People will always be attracted to each other when they share the same values.

This is relatively easy to do, since both the European far right and American conservatives share the same “conservative” interpretation of “human freedom”, “democracy”, and “equality” and the same emphasis on a Christian heritage and fiercely eschew the progressive interpretation of the meanings of these notions.

Built upon this might be the strategy of the “common enemy”. The cultivation of a “common enemy” is always a good way to sooth tense relationship between rival parties. While both sides might emphasize the threat which Islamic fundamentalism is posting to each, there can even be another “common enemy”, the “Diktatur der Political Correctness”. In fact, the more common enemies the European far right elements might share with American conservatives, the less hostility there will be between the two sides.

Here is a third obstacle, a rather minor one. Some, though not all, of the European far right elements speak of the “preservation of race”. That might be okay in Europe since that’s the Old World where everybody is indigenous, but this is not a reasonable stance in the US since the US is an immigrant nation where everybody has come from somewhere else. Meanwhile, the hidden issue of “preservation of race” has united European racialisists with Russia under the nebulous concept of a “pan-European civilization”, from which the United States, as an immigrant nation, is increasingly excluded.

This, however, we don't suppose would be a grave hindrance to dialogue, since it's easy for each side to respect the origin and destiny of the other side.

The fourth, and the greatest obstacle, however, regards the stance on global trade. This is where, again, the American conservatives *qua* Americans and the European nationalists are simply going in completely opposite directions, a fundamental conflict of interests. The American conservatives will continue to affirm their support for the contemporary version of “free trade”, namely, precisely the “neoliberalism” which the European far right elements, especially the anti-American factions among them, view as the “Enemy” *par excellence*. Insofar as the average people in Europe more and more regard “neoliberal” free trade, along with immigration, as the cause for their high unemployment rate, American conservatives’ unwavering allegiance to neoliberalism – and to its master, Milton Friedman and his tradition – will make them the most offensive creatures to the European consensus.

The mystery, for us, has always been that, according to our framework, American conservatives’ espousal of conservative values and denouncement of liberal values should have constituted a fundamental contradiction to their pro-corporation, and pro-free trade stance. The foundation of our position has always been that the progressive notions of “freedom”, “human rights”, “democracy”, and “equality” (political correctness) – the products of continuing the secularization – are *dispositifs* of consumerism, and so mechanisms supporting global free trade and the multinationals. If American conservatives support global free trade and the freedom of multinationals, why then are they against the liberals’ interpretations of human freedom, etc.? In

contrast, the European far right populists are much more consistent when they speak like American conservatives in the domain of values while going in the opposite direction when it comes to economics. In the same way, the liberal image and message which the United States has always projected onto the outside world – the progressive version of the noted compatibility between “democracy” and “economic prosperity” – is much more consistent internally. “Hillary Clinton” is a much more consistent image than any American conservative.

The impression is unavoidable that American conservatives espouse family values and denounce gay-marriage, etc., only because they are conservatives, namely, because they are always trying to conserve the value system left over from the previous generations. They want to fix a society’s value system from evolving further. The value system from the previous generations, however, is one that has evolved to support (being the superstructure of) the production phase of capitalism, but which is increasingly out of date as the society’s economic model evolves further. As capitalism continues to evolve, free-market ideology is now being applied to an ever expanding market, the global market, hence global commerce and consumerism, which, as it requires increasing specialization of consumers, has become also increasingly incompatible with the traditional value system which American conservatives still uphold. It is the “liberals” whose value system is the true companion of current phase of “free trade” on a global scale. We are saying that there is an inherent contradiction in the world-view and ideology of American conservatives. While they have kept up with market evolution by continuing to espouse laissez-faire, they have fallen quite behind by continuing, as “conservatives”, to adhere to the value system of the previous generations, who lived inside a market that was more or less confined to national boundaries. This of course also means that it is only those offensive, tribalistic European far right elements who can bear the burden of saving the earth and the human brain – not the American conservatives.

If the United States does intend to cultivate dialogues between American conservatives and those anti-American European far right elements, the question of free trade will constitute the greatest obstacle in this respect. Now, why does United States name “free trade” as one of its principal foreign policy goals? We are not speaking of American conservatives here, who support neoliberalism for ideological reasons. The United States has wanted the TPIP both because corporations have lobbied for it and because the United States, in the wake of the Ukrainian crisis, is seeking more means to bind Europe to itself.<sup>1</sup> TPIP, however, is unpopular not just among the European far right, but also among the European left. Whenever the current system is threatened, those in charge of the system can continue to hold it together by either strengthening what has hitherto held the system together – in this case, trans-Atlantic security alliance and trans-Atlantic free trade – or by changing their way altogether in order to address the grievances which are threatening the integrity of the system. In this case, the United States has chosen the former course, certainly because it’s the far easier, and less resource-demanding, way.

We shall however speculate on a different course of events. The dialogue imagined is only possible if a minority among the American conservatives takes up the lead on the American side

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Clemens Wergin, “America needs a pivot to Europe”, The New York Times, 03/04/2015.

– that minority who has been advocating that the United States should not continue to allow its manufacturing capacity to be outsourced to overseas but should restore itself to its pre-1970 state, protecting American workers in a genuine way. We want to note that American elites, both on the left and on the right, have wanted global free trade because globalization is currently centered on the United States and so is one of the backbones of American power in the world, but that America is in the center of the process only in the sense that it is the “central market” of the world where the rest of the world dumps its products on American consumers, who are therefore responsible for the economic prosperity of the whole world. We are giving a vastly simplified picture, of course, but something like this is true. This responsibility has of course resulted in America's enormous indebtedness, of which the United States is able to avoid the consequences only by imposing its Dollar as the universal medium of exchange and reserve. Because this is a form of “parasiting” on the rest of the world, an increasing number of nations are challenging it by swapping out of the Dollar Standard. The United States then resists the grievances because this has been how United States is able to maintain its global empire far beyond its means to pay for it. The result is a conflict of interests between the United States and the rest of the world – and the difference between the US position and the European far right's position in regard to global trade is essentially a conflict of interests that is part of the larger conflict of interests between the United States and the rest of the world. We have to imagine that there must be a minority within the US elites who advocate a change of course altogether – instead of strengthening the current course to resist world-wide resistance – so that the United States will no longer find itself in a situation of conflict of interests with the rest of the world while pursuing its power and preeminence, but will encounter less resistance which is exemplified here by the European far right insurgency. The change of course is certainly the “reindustrialization” of United States, i.e. to bring manufacturing back home and to establish itself as a premier manufacturing nation in the world like it used to be before the 1970s. If it can compete on the world market, not just with high tech weapons and information technology, but with everything else, then it will no longer feel compelled to impose its Dollar and its debt on the rest of the world in order to maintain its power and preeminence in the world.

This change of course is more costly and takes longer time to implement, and requires certain artificial measures (“interferences in free market”) which most American conservatives will find unsavory. But this change of course is essentially the same “reindustrialization” which some European far right groups, like the Le Pen family, are advocating for their own countries. In other words, only if there is plan of “reindustrialization” on both sides of the Atlantic – with the abandonment of TPIP – then there will no longer be any conflict of interests between the American conservatives and the European far right elements. There will in fact be one more area of congruence to facilitate dialogue between the two sides. The result might just be that United States will be able to keep NATO intact despite the rise to power of far right regimes in most Western European nations. We highly suspect that, eventually, the minority in the US who have wanted the “reindustrialization” of the United States might win the struggle since, as we have

asserted, the preservation of NATO must rank higher on the US priority list than the enforcement of TPIP.<sup>2</sup>

### **The American response: covert operation: personal impression on European far right leaders**

A major reason which is usually overlooked in all the literature on the causes for the rise of the European far right – especially the anti-American wing among them – is the waning of the memory of World War II. We can safely surmise that the experts on the matter in both the State Department and the CIA will have easily diagnosed this problem: whereas American grace in the liberation of Europe from the Nazis has served the important function of promoting pro-American sentiments – and, inversely, of toning down anti-American ideologies – in contemporary Europe, this “grace” is no longer the dominant theme in contemporary European consciousness as, every year, the memory of the war recedes further into the abstract. Let’s illustrate our point with the case of France.

Everyone knows that Charles de Gaulle hated the Anglo-Americans: such is “Gaullism”. Why? In the old days, French language and culture were the central objects in Western consciousness: all diplomacies were conducted in French, and all nations emulated France. After the war, however, all diplomacies around the world were conducted in English, and all nations admired the United States. France has lost the battle to the Anglo-Americans, so the narrative goes in the mind of Charles de Gaulle. Especially the Americans, who represented an assault on his French pride. And so, as he began implementing his program to revitalize his post-war France, he expelled American forces from France, legislated that all academic discourse be conducted in French, etc. While both the British and the Americans had always considered him a “problem”, the memory of American liberation of France had served the function of obstructing the full expression of his anti-American sentiments. Although de Gaulle had been strenuously cultivating France as the “Third” in between the United States and USSR, he felt compelled, during the Cuban missile crisis, to stand behind Kennedy like a vassal to the United States. We can easily see that it was all because the memory of American liberation of France had created a condition where it was simply impossible for him to not behave like a friend of the US during crisis situations. This is so with all French leaders who have felt the same “American assault on French pride”. Despite its ideology, Gaullism has never completely installed France “right in the middle”; France is always somewhat closer to the United States than to the USSR.

Today, however, the Le Pen family in France can be blatantly anti-American without any restraint. We can easily observe that their anti-Americanism is rooted in the same sentiment over “American assault on French pride” – and yet the memory of World War II was so distant in their

---

<sup>2</sup> In “Dominant and Dangerous”, *The Economist*, 03/10/2015, the instability of the Dollar system is noted: (1) the increasing discrepancy between America's financial and economic clout (while the American financial sector is expanding its management of world's assets, America's ability to absorb imports is declining) and (2) the rest of the world is increasingly experiencing the cost of the Dollar system as outweighing its benefits. Besides that, the United States has overused its Dollar system to exert political pressures on other nations. The United States is increasingly holding the Dollar system together by force than by consensus.

mind that it can no longer restrain them from going to the Russian side. The end of the Cold War and the emergence of the European Union have done the work of displacing, permanently, the theme of World War II in the mind of the newer generations. American experts will have realized that, should the National Front come to power in France, converting the Le Pen family away from their geopolitical stance is simply impossible. This, even if the Americans begin to speak their language like the Russians do. Despite their ideological coherence, many politicians' geopolitical stance is conditioned more by personality traits, personal taste, and personal experience than by reasoning. Cultural fatigue with the Americanized world (i.e. boredom with Pax Americana), Gaullist pride in France, and personal identity have almost guaranteed that making them like America again is like making those who fear spiders like spiders again. For them, it's time to refresh the picture by siding with the Russians.

If the National Front should come to power in France, we can imagine United States contemplating two possible responses. First, simply destabilizing their regime, i.e. removing them like the United States has done with Schroeder and Chirac. The Le Pen family will then be a "one termer". The second response is however to simply influence them. We can in fact imagine a hypothetical "covert operation": to create an incident whereby the American conservatives can make a good impression upon the Le Pen family, and speak their "language" (anti-EU national independence, conservative values, but more importantly, "reindustrialization" on both side of the Atlantic), so that, afterward, if they shall come to power in France, they could, like de Gaulle, never stray very far away from France's traditional connection with the United States. It would certainly greatly impress the Le Pen family if their program for the reindustrialization of France is carried over to the United States as well. Presumably, this strategy of "speaking the same language" will be combined with the "cultivation of the same enemies" (Islamic terrorism, unemployment) to effect even greater impression upon them.

Finally, we must not forget that "Putinverstehers" exist among US elites as well, although quite a minority here. There are a few US former diplomats who have served in Russia and who nowadays defend Russia's actions from time to time on the media, contrary to the official position. As Americans, they of course are not as pro-Russia as their European counterparts are. Nevertheless, we can very much imagine the State Department sending them to establish dialogues with the Le Pen family and other European far right elites. Since the American Putinverstehers share the same perception of Russia as "victim" rather than "aggressor" and yet does not dare deviate from key US foreign policy goals, their relationship with their European counterparts can also serve to restrain the latter from straying too far away from Europe's traditional alliance with the United States.

We certainly hope that the United States will adopt this "soft" and "smart" approach rather than the "hard" approach (discrediting, destabilizing) toward the "European insurgency".

**Summary of the United States' possible "smart" reaction to the rise of European far right parties:**

In sum, the United States' "smart strategy" would consist of: (1) fundamentally revising its position on global trade and its own economic model, voluntarily forgoing the Dollar Standard



and reestablishing its manufacturing capacity, namely, incidentally following the path of the “reindustrialization” which the Le Pen family is advocating for France; (2) fundamentally revising its linguistic policy in Europe and giving up the primary role of the English language in European diplomatic negotiations; (3) cultivating extensive dialogues between American conservatives and European far right parties and projecting, in the European sphere, a revised image of the United States as a conservative Christian nation; (4) revising its democracy-promotion programs in order to purge the “liberal” (or progressive) meanings from politically correct notions like “democracy”, “equality”, and “human rights” and bring these notions in line with conservatives’ interpretation of their meaning; and (5) reforming its liberals in accordance with our new platform (European/ Russian New Left) in order to retain the ability to project liberal images (especially in the pop-culture domain) in places where impression of America as “indulgence in sensuality” plays a key role in attracting youngsters.

If this should come about, our prediction that the European far right parties have the “world-historical mission” to save humanity will have been fulfilled. If the European far right parties shall come to power in the majority of European nations, they might very well generate such reactions, especially from the United States, as will begin to clear human civilizations of the virus with which the American model has infected it. In order to maintain its military and diplomatic preeminence in the world, the United States might have to “reindustrialize” itself and rid itself of its world-historical function as the “trash can of the world”. In the process, the poisonous “political correctness” and “feminization of human civilization” which have originated in the United States will begin to dissipate.