

**Can Russian-supported European far rights become the bastion against  
postmodernism and save humanity?  
(And United States' possible stance on the matter)**

**Lawrence C Chin  
December 2015**

NOTICE

This essay forms the third essay in the cycle formerly including “How Russia may develop its soft-power” and “Why we support Marine Le Pen”, all derivatives from our *A Thermodynamic Interpretation of History*. We know for sure that some Russian government officials have been familiar with our thermodynamic interpretation of history since 2008. It may be the case that our theory has made little impression upon them back then. We have reasons to suspect that they have subsequently discovered our soft power essay and the Le Pen document and are, this time, impressed by our ideas. It could very well be the case that, following upon that, these officials have independently developed, at the same time as we are writing it in December 2015, or even preceding us, the rhetoric which we shall outline below for expanding Russia's ideological justification for supporting the European far right movements. If so, we shall welcome such development and will be happy to see that, in the real course of events to come, Russia does something like what we are to suggest below, as if its officials had read this essay and adopted its ideas, even though, in reality, they have preceded us. In which case, we are making “predictions” instead of offering “suggestions”, just as, at the end of this communication, we shall make “predictions” about the United States' responses to the rise of the European far right.

Should this happen, we suggest our readers not to confuse the simultaneous development of similar ideas with “plagiarism”. Neither side will have plagiarized the other in this possible case. Simultaneous development of the same idea is, for the specialists, easily distinguished from “plagiarism”. One need only recall the case of the origin of calculus between Newton and Leibniz or the case of the origin of special relativity between Einstein and Poincaré. Since Leibniz's method for the addition of infinitesimals is formulaic while Newton's remains geometric, there is no question that Leibniz has plagiarized Newton. In the other case, Poincaré's method to take account of the constancy of the speed of light does not involve a revolutionary re-conception of space and time whereas Einstein's does, so that one cannot suspect Einstein of having plagiarized Poincaré. We hope you have understood our point.

Our anti-American tone derives naturally from our objective analysis of the harmful effect of America's soft-power on humanity's future. We do not forget that

our tradition itself (i.e. a thermodynamic interpretation of history) is “American” in the sense of having originated in the United States. The objective of our tradition and movement is to persuade the United States to give up enforcing the Dollar standard on the rest of the world and to reindustrialize itself and restore the “production phase” of its capitalist system. If it takes Russia or the European far right movement to force the United States to pursue this path, so be it. We are, in effect, trying to import the National Front's program for France into the United States. This will be fundamentally at odds with the US official policy but, we believe, will gain widespread support among the American people on the grass-root level. Most importantly, the reindustrialization of the United States, we believe, will help tremendously in purging the world of the harmful effects which American soft-power has produced so far.

In the preceding we have attempted to devise a new platform for the Left which would enable them to find ideological congruence with the far right populism that is sweeping Europe at the moment. We have devised this strange sort of New Left not only because, as we believe, it is the “correct way”, but also in order to construct a very convenient sort of “political technology”. The convenience consists in the fact that this sort of New Left can wholeheartedly endorse far right ideologies and values on one front or when occasions demand so without contradicting its own ideology, while displaying itself as quintessentially “leftwing” on another front or when the occasion changes – again without contradicting its own ideology. We have, in effect, suggested that a country like Russia purposely reform its liberal wing in accordance with this strange sort of New Left because it does seem that Russia has such need for “double play” at this very moment: it needs to proclaim itself to be a conservative Christian (Orthodox) European nation to attract the far right elements that are gaining ascendancy in Western Europe, while at the same time projecting itself as a liberalized “new Russia” in order to maneuver more attractively in Asian Pacific. In a sense, of course, Russia has already been “double-playing” for a long time, as it is simultaneously supporting the leftwing populists in Latin America (Ecuador, Bolivia, Nicaragua, etc.) – as if it were the socialist revolutionary successor to USSR – and the far right populists in Europe – as if it were solely a Christian conservative middle-class nation.

As a “political technology”, of course, our notion of the “New Left” can be easily adopted by any nation which encounters the geopolitical necessity to project itself as a liberal nation on one front while endorsing right wing regimes elsewhere on another front. In fact, in this essay, we will note that United States itself might have to reform its liberal elements in accordance with the same platform in order to “double play” also like Russia does. (Since “New Left” has already occurred in the United States more than 40 years ago, we wouldn't know how to call this sort of new Liberals if they were to emerge in the United States, however. “New New Left”?)

Our platform should be properly characterized as: a “new liberalism based on a thermodynamic interpretation of history”. It is especially a “new form of feminism based on a thermodynamic interpretation of history”.

The greatest convenience of this new platform for the left lies in the potential ease with which to persuade elements from opposite ends of the political spectrum to cooperate wholeheartedly together on a common political platform for geopolitical purposes. Originally, you must recall, our document on the development of Russia's soft-power is to hopefully persuade Russian liberals like Igor Yurgens who has been the principal critic of Putin's increasingly authoritarian measures. The reform of his, and his crew's, liberal thinking according to our new platform would enable him to find congruence with the Putinites and support them initially during the pursuit of most important geopolitical goals – Russia's "right turn" to gain allies in Europe – while his own wing shall work, in the meantime, on the building of a new liberal foundation which shall not be unveiled until Putinites' geopolitical goals have been entirely accomplished and secured. In the same way, if the liberal elements in Europe and Russia can reform themselves according to our platform, the far right insurgencies in Europe, instead of alienating them, can in fact gain support from them, so that a certain geopolitical objective can be quickly achieved without the need to overcome resistance that is perennial in any democratic nation. (In the case of Europe, it might be the dismantlement of EU or the stopping of globalization.) The same method can of course be applied by political wings in every other nation which experiences contradiction in political ideologies or self-image during the pursuit of geopolitical necessities.

### **Russia as the "Third Rome", or "defender of the right values"**

Why does the United States have such success with "color revolutions"? Because of the attraction of Western Europe and United States to these former Russian satellites. Why? It's all because of "brand name", as we have noted. The US State Department and the CIA are extremely skillful in exploiting the stereotypes in people's mind to incite "color revolutions". The "brand name" is really just a "stereotype". What constitutes this "brand name"? Certainly, "prosperity", namely, life is more comfortable in North America and Western Europe. But the "stereotypes" in questions are certain ideas, politically correct ideas, like "democracy", "freedom", "equality", and "human rights". Even "women's rights" (such as in the case of Pussy Riots' attraction to the West). Russia and China are in fact no less "free" than United States – or, rather, no more "unfree". Russia has simply lost on the question of "brand name". As noted, by exposing the covert poisonousness of all these ideas which have constituted America's "brand name" – by exposing how these ideas are harmful to the human brain and earth's resources base – Russia, in its support of European far right parties (who are very often against these American values: more on this below), can claim itself to be the savior of humanity and live up to its self-proclaimed status as the "Third Rome". Consider more closely what we are suggesting. In a 30 July 2015 communication by the Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, "Soft power: the values that shape Russian foreign policy", we read:

Under President Vladimir V. Putin we have seen a renewed foreign policy assertiveness—castigated in the West, but welcomed in Russia as a renewal of national honor. Yet it was not until the Valdai Club meeting in 2013 that Putin presented a much more sophisticated vision of Russia, as a 21st century Orthodox power. In his speech, Putin claimed that Western leaders have caused a loss of human dignity by promoting a secular world-view and rejecting Christianity. He highlighted Russia's "unique experience" of mutual

enrichment of diverse cultures within its borders and urged its citizens to feel a common identity.

It's certainly because the “world's market” has already been dominated by the secular and liberal images which has originated in the United States that Russia has decided that, instead of competing with the United States in this respect, it should establish a foothold in the market place by propounding an opposite image which should differentiate itself completely from the United States. The advantage of this opposite image, as we have already known, is that it happens to attract just the right players at the right moment in the most strategic places, i.e., the far right movements in Europe. The essence of our previous communications “How Russia may develop its soft-power” and “Why we support Marine Le Pen” consists precisely in our belief that it's in fact quite possible to compete with the United States in the market place of liberal images. That is, if it should ever happen that our analysis of the poison inherent in the liberal and secular culture can win widespread acceptance, then a revised version of the liberal and secular culture will become an effective competitor on the world's market for liberal images. We have suggested that Russia do just this. On the other hand, even if Russia does not propose an “alternative liberal and secular” culture, it could still adopt our analysis and use it to discredit America's soft-power, which is largely based on the worldwide acceptance of, and taste for, this “mainstream” liberal and secular culture. (We can perhaps call it the “old liberalism”.) That is, our analysis can very much enrich Russia's claim to being a unique Christian nation that serves as the bastion against harmful secularization and liberalization. Even in this restricted manner, Russia can find itself a new niche and build its soft-power on the reputation of being the “saver of the world” by supporting the European far right movements. In other words, we are suggesting that Russia expand its claim to Christian preservation of “human dignity” and “national identity” to a “messianic claim” about its “world historical mission” to save humanity in contrast to the United States' “world historical mission” to destroy humanity. Of course, the best course, in our view, is to advance on both fronts at the same time – i.e. reforming its liberals while expanding its claim to Christian Orthodoxy as the “savior of the world”.

In the same way, of course, the European far right movements can also adopt our analysis – based, ultimately, on a “thermodynamic interpretation of history” – and thereby expand their claim to national, and *völkisch*, preservation to a messianic claim about “world historical mission” to save humanity. Since, of all the European far right parties, only the National Front has solid grounding in a philosophical and intellectual tradition (thanks largely to Marine Le Pen's *Pour que vive la France*), we have focused our suggestion on the Le Pen family.

When it comes to the United States, because it is the “incumbent”, it is not as easy for it to lay such claim as it is for the challengers. In the below, however, we imagine a scenario where a minority of American conservatives, by adopting our analysis and importing National Front's platform into the United States itself, can in fact preserve the United States' reputation – even against widespread acceptance of our analysis. And this, by blaming onto their domestic enemies, those “liberals”, all the harms which the United States has exported to the world and then taking charge of America's new image.

The whole world can benefit – in fact save itself – should all this happen. That is, if Russia shall attempt to enrich the new “niche” it has found for itself, it will result in a chain-reaction causing a world-wide abandonment of the harmful, secular culture and affirmation of either century-old local traditions or a completely revised version of a secular culture that is in large measures congruent with old traditions rather than contradicting them.

### **Same concepts, different meanings**

We need to qualify our statements. Both the left and the right, both in North America and Europe, in fact in the world over, hold, as their central values, “freedom”, “equality”, and “democracy”. How, then, is it the case that we have seemed to equate the right wing with the rejection of these politically correct notions? We have forgotten to add that, in actual practice, these politically correct notions are mostly the liberal versions of them. When the left and the right speak of these notions, they seem to mean very different things, resulting in proposing political programs that are going in the opposite directions. The problem is that there is one concept, “order”, which is a central tenet for those on the right but which is usually not explicitly reckoned as a fundamental function of their “democracy” – probably because the need for order is what both a free society and a totalitarian society have in common. Then, when the left speak of “freedom”, they really only care about “equality”. It is “equality” which is the central tenet for the left-wing. Because the European political debate is essentially the same as that in the United States, we may transplant the typical analytical framework used in American political science courses to the European case, i.e. just as in the United States, in Europe as well: those who prefer “order” to “freedom” and “freedom” to “equality” are conservatives, and those who prefer “equality” to “freedom” and “freedom” to “order” are liberals. European far right parties are essentially “conservatives” under this classificatory schema (having this in common with the typical European right), while the social democrats and *Parti socialist* are essentially “liberals”. (The third category, those libertarians who prefer “freedom” above all other values, are also found in Europe, and are occasionally found among, and frequently intersect with, the far right elements.)

Under this classificatory schema, one can see that the European Union is dominated by “liberals”. Like American liberals, the EU bureaucrats make every attempt to legislate “equality” into being (on both gender and ethnic issues), in order to artificially manufacture “equality” and impose it on all EU member states. Just as the artificial imposition of “equality” from above through government legislation – in violation of the spirit of freedom – has been the chief complaint which American conservatives have uttered against their liberal counterparts, so it is also one of the main grievances which the European far right elements have against the “Brussels bureaucracy”.

In this respect, our complaint that America is poisoning the rest of the world by exporting deadly values of “political correctness” should be refined. America is poisoning the world by exporting the “leftwing” or “liberal” versions of politically correct values like “freedom”, “democracy”, and “equality”. Namely, “democracy” as an instrument to artificially manufacture, and impose, “equality” at the expense of “freedom”. When European liberals have learned from their American counterparts, they go to their own European commissions to lobby for all these

programs like “Gender Mainstreaming”, “Frauenquote”, or “Gleichstellungspolitik”. These liberal programs for “artificially manufacturing equality” then, along with things like “Meinungsfreiheit”, become part of EU's entry requirement, causing the deadly idea to spread to eastern Europe and nations of the rest of the world which need to adhere to Western standards of humanitarianism in order to get benefits from cooperation.

What we need to notice is that, even when both the far right elements and the liberals argue for “Meinungsfreiheit”, they mean very different things. Geert Wilder's “Meinungsfreiheit” is not the same “Meinungsfreiheit” which the EU, or even the United States, is requiring the rest of the world to adhere to – otherwise Geert wouldn't be complaining about the lack of it in Europe.<sup>1</sup> When EU bureaucrats – and US State Department and NGO bureaucrats – speak of “Meinungsfreiheit”, they are *requiring* you to speak “political correctness”, i.e. the established, official, line about “gender equality” and “equality between cultures”. If you deviate from the “official line” – by saying “Males are intellectually superior to females” or “Western intellectual traditions are superior” – you will be struck down as “sexist” or “racist” and forced to shut up. The “Meinungsfreiheit” which the EU and the United States are trying to export to the rest of the world is an instrument to artificially impose “equality” at the expense of “freedom”. Eventually, as we have shown and will show continually, to make you believe in, and speak only, the opposite of reality. It is a method for “mind-destruction”. It is the “Meinungsfreiheit” of European far right figures – and American conservatives as well – which is actually “Meinungsfreiheit”.

### **The continuum of the European far right movements**

In accordance with our theme, we shall divide the European far right parties into two camps, “pro-American” and “anti-American”. The pro-American camp includes: Geert Wilder's PVV in the Netherlands; “People's Party” in Denmark; and the other “rechtspopulistische Parteien” in Norway and Sweden. These groups, should they come to power in their nations, are unlikely to leave their nations' security alliance with the United States (the chief concern of the United States, as we shall assert below). The anti-American (pro-Russian) camp includes: the National Front in France; Vlaams Belang in Flemish Belgium; Heinz-Christian Strache's Freiheitliche Partei Osterreichs in Austria; Viktor Orban's Fidesz in Hungary;<sup>2</sup> the Lega Nord in Northern Italy; and Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands. (Interestingly, the UKIP and the British National Party in the UK are often pro-Russia or anti-American as well.) This second group is very much in favor of leaving the security alignment with the United States and joining a Pan-European security arrangement with Russia. For a comprehensive summary review of all the parties, see Werner T. Bauer, “Rechtsextreme und rechtspopulistische Parteien in Europa” (November 2015).<sup>3</sup>

---

1 See, for example, Geert Wilder's speech at the Silicon Valley American Conservative Forum on 11 August 2015.

2 For the Hungarian case, see also Keno Verseck, “Wie Viktor Orban Ungarn puntinisiert”, Cicero, 20/02/2015.

In speaking of European far right parties' "world-historical function" in saving humanity, however, it is of course the values they represent which is essential, not their allegiance to one or the other camp in a growing new Cold War situation. As noted, these parties' geopolitical stance serves a function of catalyzing a possible chain of events, but is in itself of no significance to the saving of humanity. In the domain of values, all of them are in essence in agreement with one another. They may be summed up as "christliche, wertkonservative", very much like American conservatives. On the other hand, they are in agreement in: anti-EU, anti-Euro, and anti-immigration for the sake of restoration of the traditional, ethnic, nation-state with its sovereignty intact. Quite many of them are also anti-globalization and anti-neoliberalist free-trade, for the sake of restoring prosperity among the common people. All these values, we shall argue, are of great help in restoring the development of human potential and sparing the dwelling resources base of our planet earth.

### **The European far right's "accidental" defense of the human brain**

This is to suggest that the European far right figures expand their objectives beyond the protection of national identity and national tradition. Once again, we suggest the combat against the American value system which is destroying the earth and the human brain. The protection of national identity then serves a greater function, the protection of the earth and human intelligence.

Until they have explicitly recognized this, they are only "accidentally" doing something beneficial for the entire humanity, not just for Europe. Let's take the preservation of the human brain as an example. In an interview, Geert Wilders says:

Nicht in Europa. Überall in Europa, wo der Islam im Steigen begriffen ist, können Sie Angriffe auf die Meinungsfreiheit beobachten. Nehmen Sie die Anschläge gegen Karikaturisten in Dänemark oder Schweden oder das Attentat auf Charlie Hebdo. Lesen Sie nur die Sure 47/4 im Koran: „Wo immer du die Ungläubigen triffst, schlag sie auf ihre Nacken und verursache ein Blutbad.“ Das gilt bis heute.

....

Wegen solcher Aussagen bin ich in die Politik gegangen. Es ist eben keine Handlungsweise einzelner Personen. Es ist der Islam. Es ist kein Zufall, dass all diese Attentäter Muslime sind. Unsere Politiker führen die Menschen an der Nase herum, wenn sie behaupten, dass alle Kulturen gleich sind. *Ich sage, dass unsere westliche Kultur, die auf dem Christentum oder Judentum aufbaut, viel besser ist als die islamische Kultur.* Islam und Freiheit, Islam und Demokratie sind unvereinbar. Deswegen sollten wir die westliche Leitkultur auch in unseren Verfassungen festschreiben. (Interview with *Profil*, 30 March 2015.)<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Also: Benjamin Bidder and Gregor Peter Schmitz, "Putins rechte Freunde", *Spiegel*, 02/05/2014. "Soft power: the values that shape Russian foreign policy", *Carnegie Council*, 30/07/2015.

<sup>4</sup> Here: <http://www.profil.at/ausland/interview-rechtspopulist-geert-wilders-strache-putin-koran-5580374>.

When Geert proclaims the superiority of Western civilization to Islamic civilization, he is of course just speaking *what seems to be the obvious*. Everybody remembers the age of European imperialism: this used to be how all Europeans spoke when they came to China, India, the Ottoman Empire, Africa, etc. They spoke like that because they were just speaking what seemed to be the obvious for them: Western society was more orderly, more comfortable, more prosperous, offered greater opportunity for the development of human potentials, Western sciences were discovering a far greater part of our universe than ever before, and Western nations were much stronger. People can counter Geert, certainly, by pointing out that what seems to be obviously true might not be true after all, and reminding him that there was a time when Islamic civilization was “obviously” superior to the barbarous Carolingian empire, etc. But no. The “Diktatur of Political Correctness”, like the Ministry of Truth in *1984*, has simply required us to say what seems to be obviously not true as if it were obviously true and condemned us for saying what seems to be obviously true. Even when Geert is wrong, he has reasserted human freedom against the “Diktatur der Political Correctness” which has originated in the United States. Thinking is once again possible.

This of course is no wonderful insight. Even in America itself, many conservatives, and many people on all fronts in fact, have complained about the “straight jacket” condition of political correctness. What has been invented to free us is increasingly becoming an instrument for our oppression. The only way to get out of the straight jacket is the continuous repetition of courageous acts like Geert’s. The far right leaders’ frequent offensive statements in the public domain thus serves a very important function in liberating us – even when these statements are frequently over-simplifications.

Our own opinion on the matter is that different cultures are not equal but do frequently complement each other. At least when it comes to the more developed cultures. In the same way in which biology, chemistry, and physics complement each other. These different disciplines are not equal to each other at all. Physics, by being entirely mathematical, makes much greater demand on the brain than biology, chemistry, or psychology. On the other hand, biology or psychology are much “softer” on the brain. But both physics and biology are needed to comprehend the whole spectrum of the reality we live in. In the same way, Western intellectual traditions are much more demanding on the human brain than the Chinese intellectual traditions, even though the latter has explored areas of human experience which the former has neglected and is therefore absolutely indispensable next to the former. (We are very “Spenglerian” in this respect.) The political correctness we are required to speak and believe, however, would have covered up all these facts. We would be “blinded”, and “brain-crushed”, unable to recognize the most obvious differences among us and how we need each other to constitute the “whole picture”. Besides, China would not have been motivated to modernize itself if, during the era of European imperialism, the Chinese people were sheltered from Western judgments by political correctness. Hence it’s always necessary to also discover the positive side in what is generally regarded as “bad”, and the negative side in what is generally regarded as “good”.



It appears that, among all European far right parties, Alternative für Deutschland has most explicitly recognized the relationship between political correctness and brain deterioration. In its 2014 Leitlinien it is stated:

Seit Beginn dieses Jahrhunderts erkennen wir auf vielen Politikfeldern Fehlentwicklungen dieser für Freiheit und Wohlstand unverzichtbaren Säulen unserer Gesellschaft. In der Eurokrise kommt dies besonders deutlich zum Ausdruck. Die Alternative für Deutschland entstand als neu gegründete Partei, mit der viele besorgte und verantwortungsbewusste Bürger auf das Versagen der politischen Führung in der Eurokrise und bei der Bewältigung politischer Probleme reagierten. Das gilt insbesondere bei der Energie-, Arbeitsmarkt-, Familien- und der Einwanderungspolitik. *Dieses Versagen ging mit einer Abkehr von den ethischen Grundlagen einher, die eine freiheitlich-demokratische Grundordnung bedingen. Zudem besteht der weitverbreitete Eindruck, dass es einen Zusammenhang zwischen dem Politikversagen und der zunehmenden Behinderung offener Diskussionsprozesse gibt („political correctness“).*

....

Wir halten die Meinungsfreiheit – innerhalb der Grenzen einer freiheitlich demokratischen Grundordnung – und somit eine offene Diskussionskultur für eines der wichtigsten Güter der Gesellschaft. Wir wenden uns mit Nachdruck gegen zunehmend verbreitete Tendenzen selbsternannter Gesinnungswächter, Andersdenkende einzuschüchtern oder gesellschaftlich auszugrenzen. Die AfD setzt sich dafür ein, dass auch Religionskritik der Meinungsfreiheit unterliegt. *Wir treten dafür ein, dass auch Auffassungen, die abseits vom Meinungskorridor der etablierten Parteien liegen, angemessen in der Berichterstattung der Medien Platz finden. Die Freiheit der Medien darf nie eingeschränkt werden.*

### **The European far right ideologies as the temporary cure for poison**

The poison we are fighting against, remember, is “Genderpolitik” and “multiculturalism”. As is noted, “political correctness” is defined on two axes: race and gender. Hence it consists principally of these two types of “equality politics”.

We shall sum up the liberal political correctness on the axis of gender with the broad designation “Genderpolitik”. This seems to be a lesser concern among the European far right elements, probably because of the much weaker women’s movements in the continent in comparison with Anglophone countries. This, as we shall note, is probably also the cause for the European progressive Genderpolitik being of a proportion inverse of that in the United States.

Since, as is noted, the women's groups in Europe also belong principally to the progressive wings like it is the case in the United States, the fact that, in Europe, feminist consciousness is confined only to a small circle of specialists concentrated in universities and lobby groups, has created a situation there which seems to be the inverse of that in the United States. In the United States, the over-development of feminist consciousness on the grass-root, local, and state level has led to a

form of “reverse sexism”, i.e. sexism against males. (More on this below.) An entire legal structure has emerged on these levels which is pro-women and discriminatory against males. The reaction this has engendered is “men's rights movement”. Such is however not so much the case on the level of the elites or on the federal level, despite increasing federal statutes providing women with special protections. Certainly, the fact that United States' legal system remains decentralized has probably something to do with it, but we assert that this situation is also the consequence of the fact that feminist consciousness is very widespread among the common population here. In Europe, however, feminist consciousness is barely existent on the grass-root and local level – in the minds of ordinary people. On the level of the European Union, however, progressive, artificial, manufacturing of what is thought to be “gender equality” – but in fact the same attempt to achieve, eventually, “reverse sexism” – is being aggressively pursued, in the hope of imposing it on all EU member states through the centralized mechanism of the European Union.

We have asserted that feminist progressivism is a harmful virus in being overwhelmingly focused on the negative (preventing women from being harmed), which then creates a certain preconception (“archetype”) in the human mind – woman as the “perennial victim” which has as its correlate male as the “perennial oppressor” or “aggressor” – which, when it crystallizes into the fundamentalist form of “political correctness” and becomes fixed and unchangeable against a changing reality, disconnects the human mind from reality. The continual application of the increasingly outdated preconception then results in “reverse sexism”, which serves the function of not only oppressing males and wasting them away but also increasing consumption and waste.<sup>5</sup> We have asserted that this is part of the process of specializing human beings into mindless consumers and encouraging waste in order to augment the profits of multinationals. We have seen so much of this in the United States. The evolution of women's movement and women's situation in Anglophone countries seems to have followed this general schema: first

---

<sup>5</sup> To use, as an example, the case of domestic violence in the United States: it used to be the case that, if the husband beats up his wife, she can only swallow it. There is then women's activists' fight for legislation to protect women victims of domestic violence. By now, in any domestic case, the police always arrests the man because it is automatically assumed that woman is the victim and man the aggressor. When the woman beats up the guy, the police will arrest the guy. The “archetype” has become so fixed that it's impossible to imagine, and to legally consider, the possibility that it might be the woman who is hurting the guy. Unfortunately, objectively conducted research seems to indicate that, unlike in other domains of criminal conducts which are invariably “male dominated”, in the sphere of domestic violence the proportion between female and male offenders is almost the same (“gender symmetry in partner violence”). See, especially, Murray A. Straus, “Process Explaining the Concealment and Distortion of Evidence on Gender Symmetry in Partner Violence”, 14 July 2007. (A commentary on Gramham-Kevan's “Domestic Violence: Research and Implications for Batterer Programmes in Europe”.) In the US, the feminists have made every attempt to discredit, at all cost, evidences for gender symmetry in partner violence, not just because these threaten legislation which will lead to “reverse sexism”, but also because the “archetypes” (gender stereotypes) are so fixed in their mind that they would rather overlook reality when reality contradicts them. And yet, reality is bound to contradict the “archetypes” either because these are constructed only on the basis of a partial view of reality or because they are constructed on the basis of reality from the previous era and reality has since changed.

there is the (legitimate) fight against discrimination against women, then the (illegitimate) legislation to artificially manufacture equality, and finally the (horrifying) installment of “reverse sexism”, so that the whole society can enter the phase of decline and waste and become the “Opposite Land” (*terra inverta*).

We have noted that the motor for this process to install “reverse sexism” is “victimology” and have deplored American export of this process to the United Nations.<sup>6</sup> We have deplored the consequent allure (“vogue”) to become a “victim” which is spreading to every corner of the world. We have localized the cause for this “vogue” in the fact that, for most people, this is a tremendous “shortcut” to getting somewhere in the world. We have worried for the tremendous harmful effect on the human brain of the “competition to become victims” which the “vogue” has set in motion: when everybody no longer has to exert her or his brain power to invent, innovate, or reflect, but merely wants to suffer harm, in order to get ahead in the world, her or his brain can only deteriorate or atrophy. Above all, more and more resources are spent on rescuing mindless and worthless “victims” from real or imaginary harms rather than on inventing the wonderful things which have characterized human civilization. America is already the “victim nation”, where categories of “victims” proliferate to the innumerable and where “victims” are glorified more than those who have invented or reflected. “Victimology” not only disconnects the human brain from reality as it, under the “competition to become victims”, searches for every new avenue to *interpret* victimization out of one's circumstances, but it also wastes away more and more resources – even though this is good for business. We then see that corporate profits are in increasing conflict with the development of human potentials – especially of those that are deemed “victims”.

We have noted that, in the United States, the competition to become “victims” in the domain of Genderpolitik has culminated in the emergence of “One Dimensional Woman”, the kind of woman who is so engrossed in conceiving oneself as “victim” of “sexism” and “sexual violence” that she has lost all capacities to conceive of, and speak about, other aspects of reality, calling

---

6 Surfing on the website of United Nations on any random day, one finds something like “Dia Internacional de la Eliminacion de la Violencia contra la Mujer, 25 de Noviembre”. What follows is then horrifying numbers to impress upon us the desperate situation of women and children around the world: “El 35 % de las mujeres y las ninas sufren alguna forma de violencia fisica o sexual a lo largo de sus vidas. En algunos paises esta cifra asciende al 70 %.” The numbers are themselves suspicious. Then: “En el mundo, en la actualidad, mas de 700 millones de mujeres se casaron cuando eran ninas, de las cuales 250 millones eran menores de 15 anos. Las ninas que contraen matrimonio antes de cumplir los 18 tienen menos probabilidades de terminar su educacion y mas de sufrir violencia domestica y complicaciones en el parto.” Although this might be true, there is some serious problem with all this horrifying scenario to provoke our sympathy. First of all, the UN makes the same mistake which we have accused the American feminists – and European feminists as well – of making, i.e. believing that women from widely different corners of the world somehow form together a single, definable class, which notion has considerably hampered Western feminists' coming to terms with reality, which is that, while women may be oppressed and disadvantaged in one part of the world, they may be overly privileged in another part. Secondly is our perennial complaint: the ideology which underlies all these outcries, i.e. about protecting people regardless of their worth, is meant to condition us to gradually forget about the merits of human beings.

everything “sexism” no matter what happens and herself “victim” no matter what is going on with her. The direct correlate of the “One Dimensional Woman” is the “microlization of injustice”: more and more insignificant discomforts are now interpreted as “violence against women”. Nowadays, we see in America a campaign to end “online violence against women”. Namely, violence against women in the “virtual world”.<sup>7</sup> (Why don't American feminists spend their energy instead on fighting violence against women in the “real world” in other backward countries, insofar as “real” violence seems to hurt more than “virtual” violence?) It is as if women had no other function in society than suffering injustice and complaining about it.

Our concern in this communication is our observation that, thanks to American export, this same process is dangerously gaining ground in Europe, under the auspice of various EU commissions and that, as it becomes part of the package of Western soft-power, is even gaining ground in other male-dominated societies like Russia. Because the process, as we have demonstrated, is essentially the sacrifice of the human brain and earth's resource base for the benefits of corporate profits, any party that is hostile to it automatically becomes our “savior”. This is why the European far right movements are, in our view, while pursuing their own limited objective (the restoration of the traditional ethnic nation-state), are “accidentally” fighting against the force of much greater destruction and saving humanity. If the European far right ideologues are willing to adopt our analysis of the destructive effect of the EU political correctness on the human brain and earth's resources base in order to supplement their own cry for the threat it poses to their traditional nation-state, Western soft-power can be fundamentally transformed, so that this poison, this “opium”, can no longer attract more innocent outsiders to swallow it. The virus will be stopped on its track.

We will sum up EU political correctness on the axis of gender under the designations: “Genderpolitik”, “Gender Mainstreaming”, and “Gleichstellungspolitik”. For a brief statement on what EU Genderpolitik – or its official form “Gender Mainstreaming” – consists of, we shall rely on Anna Holz and Claudia Neusüss, “Die EU-Gleichstellungsstandards: Reformmotor für nationale Frauen- und Geschlechterpolitik in der erweiterten Europäischen Union?” (2006) and Martha Weber's lecture on “Gender Mainstreaming”. The definition of “Gender Mainstreaming” is as follows:

GM besteht in der Reorganisation, Verbesserung, Entwicklung und Evaluation von Entscheidungsprozessen in allen Politikbereichen und Arbeitsbereichen einer Organisation. Ziel ist, in allen Entscheidungsprozessen die Perspektive des Geschlechterverhältnisses einzubeziehen und alle Entscheidungsprozesse für die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter nutzbar zu machen.

Weber continues:

---

<sup>7</sup> The famous Anita Sarkeesian (Feminist Frequency) of course immediately comes to mind: somebody who devotes her life to complaining about video games. We do not necessarily consider her endeavor to be illegitimate, since the video game content she complains about does seem excessive at times. We are specifically referring here to other groups and other personalities whose targets are the smallest instances of name-calling and name-mentioning on social media.

GM wird in der Öffentlichkeit stark als „Erfindung“ und Gleichstellungs-Instrument der Europäischen Union wahrgenommen, dass „top down“ verordnet wird.

This clearly belongs to the typical „liberal“ attempt at manufacturing and imposition of gender equality through artificial, social-engineering, mechanisms – what American conservatives have so criticized their liberal counterparts for. One can especially get a sense of the attempt at such artificial manufacturing and imposition from above by following Holz and Neusüss' tracing of the history of EU's Gleichstellungspolitik during its „Osterweiterung“ – how it imposes its Gender Mainstreaming politics on the new entrants to the Union from the traditional eastern bloc.

Originating in the Third World Women's Conference in Nairobi (1985), propagated in the Fourth World Women's Conference in Beijing (1995), Gender Mainstreaming was first adopted by the EU in the 1997 Amsterdam treaty, which is soon afterwards ratified by, and so imposed on, all EU member states. The first two stages we have identified of the „evolution“ – the elimination of discrimination and then the progressive, artificial, manufacturing of equality – are both clearly present in the treaty. Since it's largely the product of feminist lobbying groups (like the „Europäischen Frauenlobby“ under Barbara Helfferich) we can easily imagine its evolution into the third stage („superiority“ or „reverse sexism“) already in process in Anglophone countries – if the conditions of continental nations permit the blossoming of the germ, of course. Martha Weber continues:

Eine Bekräftigung fand die GM-Strategie **1997 im Amsterdamer Vertrag**: alle europäischen Staaten verpflichteten sich, das GM-Prinzip in ihrer Politik anzuwenden um die Ungleichheit der Geschlechter zu beseitigen. Seit 2001 verabschiedet die europäische Kommission jährlich gleichstellungspolitische Arbeitsprogramme.

### **Voraussetzungen für erfolgreiche GM-Strategie**

Genderkompetenz = ein Wissen um die Bedeutung und Auswirkung der Kategorie Geschlecht in allen Politik- und Handlungsbereichen.

- Selbstreflexion der eigenen Geschlechterrolle (Geschlecht als soziale Kategorie und nicht als biologische Determiniertheit)
- Fähigkeit geschlechterpolitische Zielsetzungen zu formulieren und in der Praxis anzuwenden
- Befähigung zur Durchführung einer Gender Analyse
- Vertieftes Wissen über die Geschlechterverhältnisse

The fundamental concept at work here is therefore the same sort of “consciousness-altering” forced upon the individuals by state mechanisms which used to be in vogue in totalitarian states. This in itself is not our criticism. However, here again, the mind is supposed to not recognize what is obvious as obvious and be forced to reckon what is not obviously true as obviously true –

without any reasoning and evidence. This is only the early stage of the process, of which the end result is the mind's acceptance of the opposite of reality as reality. This *is* our criticism.

The result is the European feminists' continual belief in women's oppression and disadvantages no matter how women's position has actually improved – just like their counterparts in North America: a total inability to adjust reason and perception to a changing social reality. This is clearly evident in Holz and Neusüss' never-ending complaints about the insufficiency and ineffectiveness of EU's Gleichstellungspolitik and all the horrifying discriminations and violences against women – as if Europe were Rwanda or Pakistan. In their mind, “égalité déjà-là” is simply not a possibility. Clearly, should their campaign be victorious, “reverse sexism” will be the norm on European continent just as it already is in all Anglophone countries. By then, the European society will also enter the phase of decline and waste just like the North American society, sustained only by “imports” (whether products or brain).<sup>8</sup>

The problem, we shall sum up, is not just that the feminists, on both sides of the Atlantic, invariably subscribe to the liberal preference of “equality” to “freedom”, but also that, due to ideological reasons, their mind is not flexible enough to adjust to a reality that is always in flux. In this way, they become subjected to the “cunning of Reason” (*List der Vernunft*) which demands that Western civilization should become the motor for humanity's self-destruction. The feminists are no different from those evangelical “Creationists”: once a certain idea enters their head (in the case of the “Creationists”, the first two pages of the Bible; in the case of the feminists, the gender inequality of a by-gone era), it will never leave, no matter how much evidence you pile up in front of their eyes to contradict their idea.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> It's only too interesting to note that Holz and Neusüss themselves have deplored Poland's suffering of “brain-drain” to the benefit of the western, established members of the EU. Pretty soon, as males are dumped away through female dominance, this will be the only way by which those western states of the EU can sustain themselves.

<sup>9</sup> In this connection we may perhaps also find the explanation for the general feminist tactic of “propaganda in the mirror”, i.e. doing a certain evil on others and then accusing the others of doing that evil to oneself. The European feminists seem in general exactly the same as American feminists in regard to the strange deployment of such tactic. Namely, just like American feminists, European feminists like to frame themselves as struggling against capitalism and corporations, even though they themselves are the greatest proponent for corporate profits, and as fighting to preserve the earth from corporations' destruction and exploitation, even though they themselves provide the greatest support for corporations' over-exploitation of the earth. It appears that the feminists, in Europe as well as in the United States, really do believe that, when they beat up a dog, they are saving the dog from being beaten by others. (See, for example, *Waffen der Kritik, Linker Feminismus und Genderpolitik: Frauen: Zwischen Imperialismus und Sexismus*”, at <https://waffenderkritik.wordpress.com/category/linker-feminismus-und-genderpolitik/>. A typical European feminist linking of struggle for gender “equality” with fighting against capitalist power.) The feminists are not really lying and being hypocrites – for they really do believe their own lies – and have simply been too conditioned to perceive the opposite of reality as the true reality due to the acquisition of an inflexible mindset similar to that of the religious fundamentalists.

Now a brief statement on the European far right as the temporary cure for this feminist poison. Enough commonality among the European far right parties exists to permit us to generalize by saying that the European far right's position on political correctness on the axis of gender is based on two fundamental assumptions: (1) they share the same interpretation found among the American conservatives of the meanings of "freedom", "equality", "democracy", and "human rights", i.e. they share the same preference of "order" to "freedom", and of "freedom" to "equality"; and (2) "égalité déjà-là". Both assumptions are anathema the "liberal" or "progressive" interpretation and perception which are currently the official stance of the EU as well as the UN.

As has been noted, the European far right elements are less concerned with the gender question than with the race question ("multiculturalism", "Islamicization"). In consequence, there is less far right utterance on EU's Gleichstellungspolitik from across Europe. Certain far right parties, like Alternative für Deutschland, and Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands in Germany, have developed an explicit stance against the EU-imposed Gleichstellungspolitik.<sup>10</sup> One can reasonably expect that their explicit pronouncements on the matter will be shared by all other far right parties, whether pro-Russian or pro-American. We shall therefore base our analysis on the pronouncements of AfD and NPD and do not question whether these parties' viewpoints on the matter might not be generalizable across all far right parties in Western Europe. We shall take their pronouncements as the "ideal form" (*eidos*) of the European far right in general.

This "ideal form" may be summed up as follows – namely, the European far right parties are against EU Gleichstellungspolitik for the following reasons: (1) Gleichstellungspolitik violates the spirit of "freedom", whereas the far right elements are interested in protecting the traditional nation-state as the protector of citizens' liberty and their equality before the law. The Gleichstellungspolitik fanatics are the most offensive in their eyes because women are already equal to men in the eyes of the law so that violation of citizens' liberty to impose female superiority is a most serious affront to the traditional concept of a nation-state. (2) Since the traditional nation-state is an ethnic nation-state as well, the far right elements have an interest in the protection of traditional gender roles for the sake of the protection of the traditional nuclear

---

<sup>10</sup> In the case of AfD, see especially Andreas Kemper's special contribution, "Keimzelle der Nation? Familien- und geschlechterpolitische Positionen" (March 2014), in which he concludes: "Die ›Alternative für Deutschland‹ existiert nun ein Jahr. Während von Anfang an eine strake Orientierung auf familienpolitische Themen bestand, entwickelte sich erst nach und nach eine geschlechterpolitische Positionierung. ... Die sehr deutlichen Antworten der Mitgliederbefragung zu geschlechterpolitischen Themen gegen Gender-Mainstreaming und Gleichstellungspolitik machen deutlich, dass auch die Parteibasis antifeministisch und heteronormativ eingestellt ist. Es ist nicht ausgeschlossen, dass die AfD zusätzlich zur Euro-Kritik und der Positionierung als ›Anti-Parteien-Partei‹ einen dezidiert antifeministischen dritten Schwerpunkt ausbaut: Die radikalen Kritik an jeder Form von Gleichstellungspolitik, von der AfD als ›Genderismus‹ diffamiert, könnte zum dritten Markenzeichen der Partei avancieren." In the case of NPD, its Ring Nationaler Frauen is especially devoted to fighting Gender Mainstreaming in German schools. Its official blogger, Ronny Zasowk, also frequently devotes columns to this subject matter. For an example, see his November 2015 posting on NPD's blog, "Schluss mit verwirrter Sexualpropaganda an unseren Schulen!"

family. The traditional nuclear family constitutes, for them, the kernel of a traditional ethnic nation-state. (“Die Familie als die Keimzelle der Nation und der Gesellschaft”, in the words of AfD, or “Grundlage unseres Volkes ist die deutsche Familie” in the words of NDP.)<sup>11</sup> In this respect, Gender Mainstreaming, the specific form of Gleichstellungspolitik, which the EU attempts to impose on all EU member nations in order to deconstruct traditional gender roles and the normative character of the traditional nuclear family across Europe, is a most serious threat to the survival of the traditional nation-state. In addition, one must know that, just as in English-speaking countries, the feminists in Europe also share a grave interest in protecting gay rights, all because they see the traditional nuclear family as a principal mechanism for women's oppression and gay rights as one of the most effective means to deconstruct it. In consequence, the far right elements are universally opposed to gay rights, especially gay marriage rights (Homoeh). But gay “rights” also include citizens' obligation to perceive homosexuality as “legitimate”, as something as “normative” and “natural” as heterosexuality. Feminist-driven Gleichstellungspolitik, or Gender Mainstreaming, therefore, includes measures for compulsory education of children in schools about the “legitimacy” of homosexuality and transgenerness – or anything which may help deconstruct the nuclear family. The far right groups therefore are vehemently opposed to all this.<sup>12</sup> Among the most enlightened far right parties, the opposition to gay marriages is not directed toward any discrimination against homosexuals in society's functions. The protection of minority from discrimination is taken for granted. It is an opposition

---

11 So is noted in the Parteiprogramme of NDP: “ Die Familie – als Trägerin des biologischen Erbes – ist die Keimzelle des Volkes. Die besondere Bedeutung der Familie für die Zukunftsfähigkeit unseres Volkes wird angesichts einer katastrophalen Bevölkerungsentwicklung in einem vergreisenden Deutschland immer deutlicher.” In the case of AfD, see again Kemper, *ibid.* See also AfD's Leitlinien, point 14: “Nicht nur aus Gründen der Nachhaltigkeit sorgen wir uns um die negative Bevölkerungsentwicklung unseres Landes. Für die Alternative für Deutschland sind eine kinder- und elternfreundliche Familienpolitik, die Förderung der Vereinbarkeit von Kindererziehung, sozialem Leben und Beruf, und die stärkere Förderung von Familien mit Kindern deshalb von entscheidender Bedeutung. Die Alternative für Deutschland möchte junge Menschen ermutigen, eine Familie zu gründen und sie setzt sich für eine familien- und kinderfreundliche Gesetzgebung ein. Die AfD steht für eine eltern- und kinderfreundliche Politik, die Menschen mit Familien - unabhängig von ihrem Lebensentwurf - so gut wie möglich unterstützt. Die Ehe zwischen Mann und Frau ist familienpolitisch wünschenswert. Da wir demographische Nachhaltigkeit ernst nehmen, bejahen wir die Zuwanderung integrationswilliger und integrationsfähiger Einwanderer nach Deutschland.”

12 See, for instance, the blog post of Ring Nationaler Frauen, 16 August 2015, “Schützen wir unsere Kinder! Heidrum Walde spricht auf der MAGIDA: “Früher war es üblich, dass Kindern in der Schule Lesen, Schreiben, und Rechnen und später die Naturwissenschaften beigebracht wurden. Heute ist das alles nebensächlich, heute scheint das wichtigste Lernziel die Frühsexualisierung zu sein. Es wird die Akzeptanz von sogenannter sexueller Vielfalt, u.a. Homo, Bi-, Trans-, und Intersexualität gefordert. Der Unterricht ist verbindlich, d. h. wer dem staatlich verordneten Zwang zur Frühsexualisierung nicht Folge leistet, wird vom örtlichen Ordnungsamt aus seinem Elterhaus gezerrt und in die Schule verfrachtet. Den Eltern wird Haftstrafe angedroht bzw die Eltern wurden schon verurteilt, weil sie ihre Kinder von diesem 'Unterricht' fernhalten wollten.” This is a complaint about the totalitarian measure to impose aberrant (at least in the statistical sense) sexuality as the norm.



to allowing the minority to impose its deviation from the “norm” (even if the “norm” is defined solely statistically) on the majority under the disguise of “protection of minority from discrimination”. Since the minority view cannot result in a healthy, or ethnic, nation-state, the minority group cannot, while being protected from discrimination, expect to normalize their essence across society.<sup>13</sup> We must say that the European far right groups have perceived the situation correctly: if society permits those Gender Mainstreaming fanatics to destroy the nuclear family in such fashion, European civilization, given that the general birth rate is already below the replacement rate, can only be expected to sustain itself, eventually, with immigration. The European civilization will then be dead – since, unlike the situation in North America, the immigrants there cannot be expected to adopt and carry on European norms and intellectual traditions once all the indigenous people are replaced. Once again, we see that the essence of political correctness is a society's self-destruction.

Here we can see that the European far right parties are thoroughly coherent in their ideology – unlike their counterparts in the United States, the conservatives. (More on this below.) Because their primary objective is the preservation of their respective traditional, ethnic, nation-state, they are extremely hostile to the European project and the Euro which together are dissolving the European nations and depriving them of their autonomy and sovereignty. They are then also expectedly extremely hostile toward EU's Gleichstellungspolitik, whose very purpose is the destruction of the foundation of the traditional, ethnic, nation-state. It's all the more offensive when all this Gender Mainstreaming is imposed on them mostly from Brussels, not even from their own capitals. An alien invasion. One needs to consider this in combination with the official enforcement of multiculturalism in all EU member states, then it is as if there were a conspiracy to replace the indigenous population with alien citizens. The entire European Union cannot thus be anything other than a conspiracy to destroy the European civilization. And why does the EU want to do that? In the end, one can only fall back upon Marine Le Pen's understanding of the motive, which is the multinationals' need to specialize consumers into something not any more than mere consumers. Certainly, this makes all the more sense when the other function of Gleichstellungspolitik is clearly to institute “reverse sexism” in order to increase society's consumption of resources while reducing its male capacity to produce and innovate. While Le Pen's perception is unavoidable that the nation-state stands in the way of corporate profits, our perception is similarly so, that males stand in the way of corporate profits.

You thus see how we differ from the far right's position by a further refining: *the purpose of “Politische Korrektheit” is not just to destroy European civilization, but to specialize European*

---

13 In the case of Alternative für Deutschland, for example. Wolfgang Hübner has noted (2013): “Kein vernünftiger, aufgeklärter Mensch will Homosexualität diskriminieren... Eine Bürgerpartei wie die AfD soll und muss Platz für viele Menschen haben, die irgendwelchen Minderheiten angehören. Aber sie darf sich nicht zum Sprachrohr von Minderheiten machen lassen. Im konkreten Fall bedeutet das: Familien mit Kindern sind, wie überall auf der Welt, die Zukunft und die Basis der Gesellschaft. Wer sich anders entscheidet bzw. entscheiden muss, also keine Familie bilden will oder kann, ist ohne Wenn und Aber zu respektieren. Aber seine Entscheidung oder Schicksal darf kein Leitbild sein für eine Gesellschaft, die Bestand und Zukunft haben will. Das zu sagen und zu vertreten, ist nicht ›rechts‹, sondern ganz einfach vernünftig.”

*civilization at the same time into no more than a consumer of foreign products by reducing males to the status of second-class citizens and exterminating them, if it is possible, through the legal system, just as in North America.*<sup>14</sup>

In this brief communication, we shall not dwell on the even greater mechanism for the destruction of European civilization, i.e. enforced multiculturalism in EU nations. This is unfortunate for now because multiculturalism, or the “race question”, is the axis of political correctness against which the far right elements are struggling the most. We are here simply to provide an illustration – how political correctness is a covert method for self-destruction through consumption and waste under the disguise of teaching us to be good human beings. We have thus provided a simple analysis of EU-enforced Gleichstellungspolitik and the resistance against it – which, without citing numbers, is certainly insufficient to be convincing. But this is no more than a suggestion for a new line of research. The research is supposed to be some form of “critical theory”, critically examining whether what is usually thought of as “good” is in fact “evil” and what is usually thought of as “evil” is in fact quite “good”. We are here recasting the European far right parties as some sort of “savior” of humanity. Certainly, such is not their intention at all: they merely want to save Europe, or rather European civilization and nations. But we want to point out that the consumerist wasteland into which political correctness is attempting to transform Western civilization will suck in the entire humanity by assimilating to itself the whole world, exhausting all resources, extinguishing all civilizations, and, most of all, exterminating all brains – and all human abilities to perceive what is the most obvious.

In contrast, we are commending the European far right elements as possessing the “right interpretation” and “correct perception” – even if we are saying at the same time that they haven't yet perceived the whole picture. We recall the Buddhist notion that the foundation for the cure for suffering lies in “right perception” and “correct understanding” of what constitutes both “suffering” and “happiness” (or the “cessation of suffering”). We believe that the European far right's perception of the threat posed by the political correctness of Genderpolitik and multiculturalism is completely correct, although not comprehensive enough (i.e., the issue about the preservation of the human brain should be added to that about the preservation of the nation-state), and we assert similarly that their solution – the defense of the traditional nuclear family with its attendant gender roles and values, and of the traditional Christian religion – is surely an effective cure against the poison, although not deep enough. The European far right constitutes the first step in the right direction, even if it is not the final step.

We emphasize that we are operating on the level of the leaders – making you understand the world-historical function of such figures as Geert Wilders, Marine Le Pen, Heinz-Christian Strache, and the like. We are defending them against charges of bigotry, “racism”, “fascism”, and so on – by pointing out how unreflective such stereotyping can be. We emphasize that, while

---

<sup>14</sup> We thus disagree fundamentally with the usual critics of Gender Mainstreaming, e.g. Barbara Rosenkranz's lecture, “Gender Mainstreaming: auf dem Weg zum geschlechtslosen Menschen” (Bielefelder Ideenwerkstatt). The most fundamental objective of Gender Mainstreaming is not the creation of genderless human beings, but the reduction of the productive power of a society and the magnification of its consumption rate. “Genderless human beings” is but a means to this end.

these leaders are developed personalities with “correct perception” along with a coherent ideology, we understand that most of their constituency do not belong to the sophisticated stratum of intelligentsia and probably cannot comprehend much of what we say here. We emphasize also that we understand that many of them are probably not so pleasant to be around because we aren't white or German or French. In this respect, some parties, like the Vlaams Belang, probably won't even invite us into their meetings. But this is not the point. It is the consequences of their actions which we desire, not the substance of their character and mindset. List der Vernunft. Most of the liberals in Europe who have so much sympathy for the poor Muslim immigrants and any other supposedly disadvantaged people like women and children, simply have no comprehension that they are destroying humanity and human civilization. Until you have reformed those with sympathy, those *seemingly* without sympathy are far more preferable.

What we have been suggesting is that, since, at the moment, it is Russia alone which officially espouses its support for the European far right parties, it could very well adopt our analysis and proclaim, in addition to its world-historical mission to preserve human dignity against secularization, that it is also doing so because these “right wing nutheads” are exercising “correct perception of reality” and “correct understanding of notions”. What if, when Russia markets itself as the conservative Orthodox Christian nation”, it also declares its conservative “perception of reality” and “understanding of notions” to be “right”, “correct”, and “true”? Then denounces the progressive understanding and perception currently in vogue in the American-supported EU as “false” and “corrupt”? And what if United States is thus required to respond by doing the same?

### **“MacDonaldization” in Europa?**

Our concern is of course ultimately with the destruction which these fanatics of EU political correctness attempt to effect on the human brain and on the earth's resources base, and not quite with the destruction of the traditional nation-states of Europe – although, of course, in the spirit of Spengler, we see any civilization as a precious *Entfaltung* and would hate to see it go to waste by its own kind-hearted effort. We have observed, in the above, how Gender Mainstreaming's effect on the human brain is to force the human mind to affirm the opposite of reality as the true reality, i.e. to see destruction and death as regeneration and life-affirming, and to denounce regeneration and life-affirming as destruction and death. Meanwhile, a consumerist wasteland is created to waste away earth's natural resources so that human civilization can run out and die.

If, however, Russia does intend, in its support of the European far right, to expand its “world-historical mission” of saving “human dignity” from secularization to one of saving the human brain as well, we must suggest that it adopt other analyses of ours concerning the destruction of the human brain through other facets of the postmodern life, i.e. not only digital media and so on, but also “bureaucratization” and “fundamentalism”, which may be summed up as “MacDonaldization”. That is, those issues which the European far right movements have not much made into their agendas. This is, of course, where the congruence between our new form of liberalism (based on a thermodynamic interpretation of history) and the European far right ends.

We have extensively talked about brain-destruction through digital media (“digital dementia”) and also about the same “dementia” caused by “fundamentalism” (mere repeating of words without regard for their meaning) in all aspects of institutions, the dark side of “rule of laws” or “rule of letters” against “rule by arbitrary will”. We have also been quite concerned with a particular aspect of “bureaucratization” which serves to destroy human comprehension, especially of other human beings, i.e. the increasing reduction of the categorization of human beings to simple and quick bureaucratic procedures like “check-listing”. We have seen so much of this in the United States, where criminal lawyers, mental health professionals, and law enforcement officers who are required to produce a profile of an individual or a case description within an hour and so can only resort to “check-listing”, and where the whole society attempts to understand each criminal, each issue, and each case within a short time. The result is the tremendous over-diagnosis of mental illness, especially of the psychotic sort, in the mental health and criminal justice system, and the shrinkage of the common person's mental capacity to understanding only simple stereotypes: “violent”, “delusional”, “radicalized”, etc., allowing mindless fear-mongering about dangerous monsters to gain widespread currency and permitting the security industry to grow tremendously beyond necessity.<sup>15</sup> Then results a society that has become so oriented toward security at the expense of freedom that its status as a “free society” is but in name. As the American mind simplifies, the categories by which it can understand the world also diminish in number, leaving only simple stereotypes and completely unable to understand any complex personality or phenomenon.

It remains to examine whether, and to what extent, the European mind is also in the process of simplification through the same causes. Also whether it has any relationship with the destruction of the European mind through Gleichstellungspolitik and multiculturalism. In a crusade to save the human being, the issue concerning the possible simplification of the European mind should perhaps supplement the right wing parties' defense of traditional family values and traditional religious beliefs. This task, however, only a reformed European left can take up. Because the European far right shares the same conservative preoccupation with order, they are likely to find unsavory our complaint that postmodern society is more and more geared toward a “security state” (the proliferation of the security industries to fight crimes and terrorism) at the expense of

---

<sup>15</sup> This “simplification of the American mind” which we have much discussed may be illustrated in another way in this connection. The mind understands reality through categorization. While the traditional mind has a more complex categorization, the postmodern mind operates according to a much more simplified categorization. To use an analogy: the traditional mind may be said to use the categories of “red”, “purple”, and “blue” to understand the complexity of reality, while the postmodern mind, because it is simplified, uses only “red” and “blue”, “purple” having disappeared from it altogether. When the postmodern person encounters a traditional person who is “purple”, s/he will not understand what this traditional person is about. S/he will attempt to categorize the traditional person as “blue”, but then this “purple” person doesn't look quite like “blue”. S/he will then try to categorize the traditional person as “red”, but then this “purple” person doesn't look quite like “red”. Clueless, s/he designates him either as “blue” or “red”, which is mis-categorization, or mis-diagnosis. We are saying that a lot of sane and sane people have been misdiagnosed as “insane” or “dangerous” precisely through this kind of mis-categorization, all because the postmodern mind no longer understands categories that used to exist in between “dangerous” and “not dangerous” or “insane” and “not insane”.

Russia-supported European far rights as the savior of humanity?  
December 2015

individual liberty. Nevertheless, our position is to endorse the far right parties, because our congruence with them (the fight against political correctness) overrides in importance our disagreement with them (the drive to increase security measures) while the “liberals” are far more evil than the conservatives.

### **The American response: overt operation: copying Russian support (first version, 9 December 2015)**

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 are 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 racialists 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 continual 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>16</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 – 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

---

<sup>16</sup> See, for example, Clemens Wergin, “America needs a pivot to Europe”, *The New York Times*, 03/04/2015.

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 a 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>17</sup>

### **The American response: covert operation: personal impression on European far right leaders (first version, 9 December 2015)**

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>17</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" shares 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.

### **The American response (the second version: diversification of soft-power image)**

We shall, in the final version of this communication, revise our prediction of the American response. In view of the possible rise of the far right parties in Europe, the United States' most reasonable response should be the *diversification* of the image it projects of itself to the outside world. That is, the United States should be pursuing all of the following simultaneously: (1) maintaining the status quo (its liberal image) and strengthening the established parties in Europe against far right insurgency; (2) establishing dialogues between American conservatives and European far right leaders and creating domestic opposition, from conservative circles, to the liberal connotations in those democracy-promotion programs, etc., i.e., getting ready to project, although not doing it just yet, the image of itself as a conservative Christian nation like Russia does, just in case Europe does turn far-right; and (3) reforming its liberals according to our new platform within a limited circle, although not allowing them to replace the status quo just yet, in order to get ready to project a new liberal image concurrently with the projection of a conservative image. Because the “status quo” (America's liberal image) has served the United States quite well in attracting oppositions in competitor nations like Russia (e.g. the Pussy Riot phenomenon), the United States is expected to carefully weigh between the option of maintaining only the status quo in response to the static situation in Russia and that of diversifying its image in response to the changing situation in Europe.

### **A preliminary correction:**

**political correctness in the European context  
(28 February 2016)**

Two months afterward, we wish to make an initial correction to our communication above. We have been correct in pointing out that the purpose of political correctness, in Europe as in North America, is society's self-destruction. However, as we observe such figures in speech as Elizabeth Montford and Béatrice Bourges, and such movement in action as La Manif pour Tous, we realize that there is a light difference in the crisis of feminization facing Europe than in that facing North America. The upcoming imposition of the theory of gender (*la théorie du genre*) on EU member states<sup>18</sup> is more attuned to the European population's greater affinity with the issue of immigration and multiculturalism, whereas the dominance of cultural feminism (or difference feminism) in the United States belies American society's greater emphasis on the relationship between women and men.<sup>19</sup> Whereas the true objective of political correctness (in respect to gender) in the United States is to institute reverse sexism and reduce society's capacity to produce and think so as to encourage the nation to import products and brains rather than make and grow them itself, the primary purpose of political correctness (on the same gender axis) in Western Europe seems to be to force the society to import population as the only way to survive. Certainly, the theory of gender, with its attendant normalization of homosexuality and transgenderism on a par with traditional heterosexuality, is designed to further inhibit birth rate in a society which is already suffering from birth rate below the replacement level. The world-historical mission of the gender feminists who are dominating the EU bureaucracies on women's issues is therefore to force into being *la Grande Remplacement* as a way to annihilate the particularity of European civilization, since, as is noted, immigrants in the European context, unlike in North America, cannot be expected to carry on the traditions of the indigenous population. In accordance with our theoretical framework, the *Grande Remplacement* that is in process right now must be making a particular contribution to the increase of consumption, the decrease of brain activities, and the faster exhaustion of earth's limited natural resources in the European context. As always, the true purpose of political correctness lies in replacing the process of growing anything on the native soil with that of importing it from abroad, i.e. part of the globalization process or the division of labor on the international scale.

We continue to hold dear Spengler's notion of *Morphologie der Weltgeschichte*. As every civilization goes through Spring, Summer, Autumn, and Winter, Western Europe, with its multiculturalism and Gender Mainstreaming, is clearly entering its Winter phase and hence is implementing these clever ways to destroy itself. The fault with Spengler is that the process of maturing and decaying among civilizations is much more complicated than he has described. China, for instance, goes through the cycle of maturity and decay politically and economically every 250 to 300 years or so (the succession of dynasties) whereas culturally and socially it has gone through a single cycle of maturity and decay from the inception of the Three Dynasties 4,000 years ago to the end of the Qing dynasty in 1911. We must point this out in order

---

18 The measure to force children to choose for themselves their male or female roles independently of their biological sex, in defiance of society's tradition to assign them these gender roles according to their biological sex.

19 To be sure, the theory of gender is also being imposed by feminists in public schools in the United States. In a communication dated 10 March 2008, Gary Bauer warns: "Last year, the California legislature passed a radical law that redefines gender for the purpose of public school instruction. Forget everything you thought you knew. Liberals in California will teach your children that 'gender means sex, and includes a person's gender identity and gender related appearance and behavior whether or not stereotypically associated with the person's assigned sex at birth.' In short, it means that kids can 'choose' their gender, regardless of their sex 'assigned at birth'". The same thing. But the issue is never as hot in the United States as it is in Europe right now, for reasons we will explain later.

Russia-supported European far rights as the savior of humanity?  
December 2015

to preemptively counter those who would pick bone with conceiving the current European situation with a theory which has long ago lost its popularity.

This short notice is certainly not the end of our discussion on political correctness in the European context.

**FINIS**