

# **How Russia may develop its soft-power base in order to counter Western destabilizing forces: a program to reflect on after Russia's loss of Ukraine**

**A series of short essays**

**Lawrence C Chin**

**Materials from my old blog, 2014  
Redacted September – December 2015**

Russia's recent loss of Ukraine as its key-ally is caused as much by its lack of soft-power (its former Soviet subjects' being more attracted to Western societies than to Russian societies) as by Western nations' attempt to destabilize the Russian sphere (supporting political oppositions under the pretext of promoting democracy around the world). There is only one way to develop Russia's soft-power to such point that the Russian sphere will never have to fear Western destabilizing influences again. I have, throughout 2014, developed, on my old blog, a concise program for this one way. I include the series here.

Note that my notion of soft-power is rather vulgar, focusing chiefly on pop-culture and less on other institutional and legal infrastructures of the civil society which are usually included in any academic discussion on "soft power". My reason is that most of the participants in the Maidan Revolution, for instance, probably don't have any real understanding of the civil society infrastructure of Western nations which have made them prosper and "free". I believe that the usual academic discussions have attributed too much power to the more developed infrastructures of the civil society as a whole.

The result: I always say to myself: "The United States rules the world today because of its superior STEM-PC": STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) as its hard-power base, but PC ("pop-culture") as its soft-power base.

As the current Putin administration becomes increasingly fearful for the possibility of color revolutions' coming to Russia itself, it should seriously consider the content of "my program" in order to immunize itself against the West once and for all. I'm sure many of them have already, from time to time, thought about what is presented below; they just don't have the resources to implement these ideas.<sup>1</sup>

## **I**

---

<sup>1</sup> In her "The "Russian World": Russia's soft power and geopolitical imagination", Center on Global Interests, May 2015, Marlene Laruelle sums up Russia's attempt to increase its influence in its Near Abroad through non-military means, which can thus be considered Russia's soft-power approach which has so far worked: economic investment; multilateral organizations; NGO diplomacy; culture, media, and language promotion; repatriation programs; citizenship policy and passports. Thus, soft power means goes beyond the usual infrastructures of the civil society to include many other things as well. Note that when the MGIMO professor Sergey Markov commented that Russia has lost Georgia and Ukraine during the previous color revolutions because its political technologies were inferior to those of the West, he was essentially saying the same thing as I do here, that it's all because Russia lacks soft-power. Soft-power is a form of political technology.

The first short essay came from a blog post from July 2014 in which comments about how Russia might develop its soft-power are only incidental.

I have commented before (“The Cheney plan, CIA’s war with the neocons, and the crimes against Russia”, and post 12/03/14, “Outline...”) that it is very easy for the CIA to destabilize pro-Russian regimes in Belarus or Kyrgyzstan but hard for the SVR to destabilize pro-American regimes anywhere in the world because American pop-culture is liked everywhere in the world whereas Russian pop-culture is virtually unknown outside Russia and Ukraine. Thus, in order to draw East Asia into Russia’s sphere of influence (starting with S. Korea), the Russians not only have to make things American disgusting to the Koreans and so on, but also need to make Russian movie stars and pop singers lovable to Koreans, etc. Whereas, whenever you open up Asian fashion magazines (especially the Japanese) you see nothing but a bunch of Western white girls and boys and American movie stars, the Russian government probably hopes Asians would want to see, in the future, Russian white girls, etc. In other words, in order to replace the US as the dominant power in Asia, Russia will have to establish its soft power by making its culture more attractive to Asian people. This is common sense; and this is probably why Russia’s Ministry of Culture has been funding those Russian movies which only look pretty but are devoid of substance (like “Dark World”, 14/05/14 post). If you look at the pop music group Podium’s music video...

Although this is absolutely stupid, the girls are nothing but silly dolls, they are just so cute! The Russian Ministry of Culture has funded “Dark World” certainly for the same reason: ordinary people like “pretty garbage”, and so, to make Russia more attractive, the Ministry has decided to abandon the old Soviet policy of promoting high culture (classical ballets) and adopt the American way of “pretty garbage” – since high culture bores people but pretty garbage entertains people (hence why Belarusian youngsters hate the old USSR and love things Western). Ordinary people like to kill their brain with pretty garbage (“opium of the masses”), and so, if you want their support....

I have then often thought about how the Russian government may use Putin’s daughter Ekaterina’s marriage with her (rumored) South Korean boyfriend to draw South Korea into its sphere of influence, as well as by promoting Russian pop culture oversea. It’s laughable, but *Russia really is shifting its focus to Asia and away from Europe*. But, of course, since the whole Macrospherian business is about “sustainable civilization”, presumably, the Russian Ministry of Culture is going to find a way to devise a new Russian pop culture which doesn’t just look pretty but also promotes conservation spirit and brain development – something that has as much substance as classical ballet and yet attracts youngsters as much as Americans’ pretty garbage does. I don’t know how you can do that, given the low intelligence quotient of “ordinary people”. But this is presumably the (Macrospherian) “plan”.

And the Russian people will have to look more like those well-traveled, multilingual German youngsters, who think of themselves more as global citizens rather than just Germans. I’m sorry to say, it seems that ordinary Russian people are quite provincial in mentality. There is a long way to go before they will know how to make their country attractive to foreigners.

You have basically witnessed – in my story about the secret ICJ trial – how I have made the

ultimate sacrifice for Russia, China, and those poor people in Africa, etc. That's why I don't like Russians who don't like Russia – the most typical Russians I see in America. As if I had sacrificed so much for a piece of shit. Granted, it's all accidental; I barely thought about Russia until the US government somehow lumped me together with this country. It's indeed after the fact that one needs to find meaning for the bizarre sacrifice (i.e. to commit crimes and look crazy and be ridiculed). Then it's just most upsetting to know that some completely unrelated foreigner has to sacrifice for a country like this whereas nobody native born in that country even gives much fuck about this country. Most people in Russia are probably unconscious of geopolitics, because it doesn't seem to affect their lives. And yet it does. Think about the miseries in the Yeltsin years, or the economic collapse in late 1990s. It's the Americans who were behind it, not just corrupt Russians and oligarchs. Americans want a weakling Russia so that they can easily steal Siberia's natural resources and oil and natural gas. Think about how terrible life was in those days; merely getting paid for work done was like a miracle. And yet, that's geopolitics. And after Putin makes sure everyone in Russia gets paid, neocons want to do it again, for the same reason. Hence geopolitics does affect ordinary people's lives. If I don't look crazy and commit crimes and get ridiculed here in America, those of you in Russia would have gone through again the tough times you have already experienced in the 1990s. Think about this.

People often accidentally contribute to society and their nations in unexpected ways. Michael Jackson, when he sang, never thought about how his music was contributing to America's soft power oversea. Just looking pretty and dancing around like a silly girl might in fact contribute to the power of the state. What you don't expect is that somebody committing crimes and looking crazy in America might be helping Russia by an amount greater than any respectable-looking Russian man going to his regular job in a nice corporate building ever does.

## II

The second essay came from a blog post from late July, 2014. "White Roses" is a technical term I have developed by generalizing the famous *Weisse Rose* (Sophie Scholl et al) to mean all self-critical elements in any country whatsoever.

The following is framed as a fantasy address to the ultranationalist elements in Russia.

### **The development of Russian soft power: pop-culture, "prettiness", parental attitude, and Russian White Roses: Some proposals**

How has Russia lost the Cold War to the United States? Not just the collapse of the USSR, but the loss of one former Soviet state after another to the Western alliance in the past two decades, through a series of "colored revolutions"? The Russians have lost their former satellite states essentially because they have lost the "Culture War". They have lost the Cold War on the cultural front. We have already named the problem: the Americans (CIA/ State Department) have been able to grab away all Russian satellite states with "color revolutions" and bring them into the Western alliance against Russia, essentially by taking advantage of what has previously been

named “cultural fatigue”.<sup>2</sup> The memory of persecution, oppression, and poverty easily combines with boredom with everything Russian to persuade the youngsters in former Soviet Satellite states to aspire to the West and to overthrow their pro-Russian regime in one colored revolution after another. The breakaway of Ukraine is but the latest example. Simply denouncing the colored revolutions as a Western organized conspiracy against Russia (Vitali Ivanov) is useless – even if the accusation is correct; it’s more useful to examine why the conspiracy could succeed at all, and why Russia is vulnerable to such conspiracy. If Russia wants to establish itself as a dominant power in East Asia in the future, it must make its culture and pop culture known everywhere in Asia and market it as an alternative to American pop culture, so that Russian pop culture may eventually supplant American pop culture in the region.

After much examination of the Russian pop music scene, or pop culture in general – various melodramas, some hit movies, and groups like Myrakami, Fabrika, Vintage, and Podium, and singers like Irina Ortman, etc. – we can easily conclude that Russian pop-culture is already of the same quality as American pop culture. There is in fact, when it comes to pop culture, not much of a question about “quality”, since the whole point about pop-culture is that everything looks pretty enough even though there is no substance in it. Therefore, we are saying no more than the fact that Russian pop-culture is as “pretty” as American pop-culture. The question of Russian pop-culture’s quality will have a special significance in Asia. Russia has no possibility of ever gaining back confidence, or rather interest, among the new generations in the Baltics, Poland, Ukraine, and other Eastern European nations within a short period of time because, once bored with you, people will not regain interest in you until they are done with their new fascination with the West and United States. But peoples of East Asia, these American allies in the Pacific rim, especially South Korea, Taiwan, and Japan, have never suffered fatigue with things Russian. They have feared Russia because of fear for communism, which is no longer Russian. The people there reserve some special place in their psyche for the “white cultures” (English and American movie stars and singers), which naturally bind them to political alliance with the United States. If somehow, through a certain catalytic event, this place is suddenly left vacant, the Russians, insofar as they are as pretty and exotic as the Americans, can easily take up the place. The aesthetic attachment among ordinary people will then easily translate into political alliance on the level of the elites. The change from living within the American sphere of influence to living within the Russian sphere of influence will then no longer be something unthinkable as it is currently. The key to Russia’s move into the Pacific therefore lies in making the sight of Russian people, Russian culture, and things Russian, not just familiar, but also “good tasting”, among the common people in East Asia.

Why, then, is American pop culture dominant everywhere in the world, but Russian pop culture unknown outside the former Soviet space? It’s essentially a question of “brand name”. People buy Guess Jeans essentially because there is the label “Guess” sewn on the pair of pants, not because this pair is of superior quality than other pairs. To establish its pop culture in Asia, therefore, Russia must find ways to market its name in Asia. The word “Russian” must sound as “cool” as the word “American” in the mind of Asian people.

After marketing, the most important quality is the attitude of the Russian people. Here we name,

---

<sup>2</sup> “The Cheney Plan, CIA’s war with the neoconservatives, and the ‘crimes against Russia’”; posting 19/03/14, “Outline...”, and conversation with my best friend on 21 July, “cultural fatigue”.

besides physical beauty (“prettiness”), a second component that is equally important in the establishment of soft power. The Russian people have to make themselves admirable. Soft power does not come from the government alone, but from the entire population of the nation. The problem is this. How to establish the “brand name”? Perhaps, for example, what I have called the “West’s crimes against Russia” can be advertised. The truth will completely change people’s image of Russia as the totalitarian successor to USSR. In this Americanized world, people like victims. And yet, once people have discovered Russians are victims and not aggressors, they will merely be disappointed with the fact that, just because these people are victims, that doesn’t mean they are anything special. The most important thing about “attitude” which the Russian people need to assume to make their nation look like a world power at all: a global consciousness and parental attitude. Americans speak like this in their country: People are allowed to disagree with me, and people of every look, nationalities, and religions are welcome in my midst, because this is why I’m fighting at all in Iraq, etc., i.e. to keep my country free, to give people the freedom to disagree with me. This is the universalist, globalist, mindset. The problem with Americans is that they are hypocrites. They don’t actually mean what they say. The Americans were not in Iraq fighting to keep their country free, but to dominate the world. They say one thing but do another. They guarantee freedom to people in the constitutions, but then, behind people’s back, they invent brain chips to insert into others’ brain to take away their free will. This is the real reason why Americans should not rule the world. If Russia wants to become a world-leader, a respected world power, Russians must learn to talk like Americans, *but then mean it*. What we mean by attitude can be gathered simply from a first impression. Look at this concert by Fabrika during the Sochi Olympics.

What strikes me here is the contrast between the women on stage and those below the stage. The women on stage look fabulous, run the show, welcome everybody, take care of everybody, while the audience below was fundamentally reserved, looking like they are here to enjoy the music but do not want to be bothered. We sense that “lack of spirit” in the majority of Russians whom we see in the US. They are far from being open-minded, globalist in consciousness. This is not the attitude and personality of citizens of a world-power.

Now all this is just common sense and personal observation. But here is something specific that we wish to address to the ultranationalists in Russia: the problem of “Russian White Roses”, which is the most relevant issue if Russia should ever rise again. If the foregoing is merely common sense, this issue is ground-breaking. This is something we are specifically concerned with after we hear much about the points of views and learn much about the attitude of Russian ultranationalists, e.g. someone like Alexander Dugin.

We are envisaging a tactic, to increase Russia’s prestige in the eyes of others by promoting the Russian version of White Roses. This is very important. Now by the Russian version of “White Rose”, you might think we are referring to those figureheads glorified in the West like Anna Politkovskaya or Natalya Estemirova. This problem especially comes to our mind because, on appearance, somebody like Estemirova would be especially attractive to minorities and foreigners.

Now, we must agree with Putin’s regime in suppressing these Russian “White Roses” because these dissidents who profess to speak for the oppressed are not real dissidents. They are not

helping the Chechens address their grievances against Russian oppressors. They only look like they are doing so. Their dissidence has become fundamentally a form of hypocrisy when Politkovskaya went to the US State Department or when Estemirova connected up with Amnesty International. They are Western agents working to hand over Russia's former satellites, along with the natural resources found in them, to the West. They are West's imperialist agents sent out to help West conquer Russia's traditional space under the disguise of helping the oppressed, hence they are not real "White Roses". This is the same problem which has been pointed out earlier: Western intervention in anti-Russian issues in former Soviet satellites has changed the meaning of the natives', and Russian dissidents', actions from resistance to oppression to imperialist oppression of Russia. In fact, Russia's actions in the Caucasus, Central Asia, or eastern Europe, while looking like imperialist actions, are not really so, since Russia's intention is to increase the nation's power only to resist Western imperialists' encroachment upon Russia. What looks like imperialist actions in the former Soviet space is really self-defense. The real Russian White Roses will be possible only when Russia is no longer on the defensive vis-à-vis Western powers, but has already regained the parity which the USSR used to possess vis-à-vis United States and NATO powers, and only when speaking out for minorities in Russia's space no longer entails a pro-Western stance – just as anti-authority in America and Europe does not entail a pro-Russia stance. Then, instead of suppressing White Roses, Russia should promote them, i.e. someone like Estemirova who, a Russian, would speak out on behalf of the disenfranchised minorities *against her own people*. For it is precisely the White Roses who will make the best impression upon foreigners outside Russia and minorities inside Russia and who embody the most what is referred to as the necessary "parental attitude". In order for non-Russians who are of smaller stature to feel truly comfortable about falling within Russia's sphere of influence, they must feel that the Russian people are parental or maternal enough toward them, that there are many, even among the Russians themselves, who will protect them, simply for the sake of fairness, when they feel trampled over by the main Russian ethnic group. The ultranationalists will find this totally unsavory, but this is precisely why the white Anglos in United States, and even more so in Canada, are able to maintain dominance in society. Since the 1960s, they have generally transited to a parental attitude toward the minorities and it is they themselves who have legislated laws to protect the non-Anglo minorities in their midst. It is the same parental attitude which has enabled the United States to maintain its satellite states throughout the world more firmly than Russia can maintain its former satellite states. The parental attitude among the dominant group creates a situation where the minorities look to them for approval rather than wanting to run away from them, as it is often the case in Russia. If all this sounds utterly bizarre to the ultranationalists, they should surely note that it's simply incorrect to refer to the anti-Russian sentiments prevalent in the CIS and former Soviet satellites as "extremist" or "sickness". They should exercise their common sense and realize that it is essentially boredom combined with deep memory of rejection which has fueled the sentiment (of course the West has purposely inflamed the pre-existing sentiment). Then the ultranationalists will realize that the biggest mistake which the Russian Soviet regime has made during the time of USSR – when they had the chance – is the failure to cultivate a "parental attitude" among the main Russian population toward non-Russian minorities. This is ultimately the reason why, as soon as the system crashed, all the minorities couldn't wait to run away from the Russians and into the bosom of Westerners.

Certainly, the former Russian or Soviet empire suffers three disadvantages in comparison to

United States or Canada. The first is that the minorities in Russia retain memory of their own cultural traditions, whereas those in North America lose them quickly (second and third generation). Next is that the minorities in Russia are clustered in their own lands rather than dispersed among the dominant group, as is the case in North America. But the third, no less influential, factor is certainly the culture of the main Russian ethnic group itself: they have never developed a parental attitude vis-à-vis the non-Russians in their midst *as part of their very Russian culture*.

We are saying that the apex of a parental attitude among the dominant group is the prevalence of the White Rose phenomenon. The White Roses in the dominant group create a whole image for that group whereby the non-Russians will feel protected by the dominant group within the dominant group's sphere of influence. One must keep in mind that the White Roses look like traitors only in the short run, but in the long run they are in fact contributing the most to a nation's prestige or soft power. Some best known example of this is Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir. During the time of Algerian war, they looked like traitors to the ultranationalists for constantly speaking out against France's imperialist actions.<sup>3</sup> But, in the end, they are the reason why foreigners admire the French, and it is their manuscripts which are preserved in Bibliothèque nationale, not those of ultranationalists. If France has, second to the United States, successfully marketed its cultural glory to the rest of the world, the French intellectuals who are usually highly critical of France's imperialist actions have made the greatest contribution in this respect. In the same way, it is someone like Edward Snowden who has made a better impression on foreigners about the United States than those nationalists back home who call him a "traitor". The White Roses are ultimately something of a luxury. As is said, only when Russia is no longer on the defensive, is finally secure by itself, can it afford to tolerate real dissidents within itself. Self-criticism is a sign of maturity, an indication of the greater differentiation of consciousness (to use my favorite Voegelinian terminology),<sup>4</sup> and makes the minorities and satellite peoples feel comfortable about falling within the sphere of influence of the dominant group, admire them, and seek approval from them. But if self-criticism shall lead to death, or if it's hijacked by one's enemy to destroy oneself, then it's not something to be tolerated. We have seen what Gorbachev's promotion of self-criticism has led to. Hence, while self-criticism is the apex of soft power expression, it's a "luxury" only of the truly powerful.

There is a specific reason why we are appealing to the ultranationalists in Russia. First of all, we, even as non-Russians, are *for* the ultranationalists' idea of Russia as an empire. There is no such thing as a world power without being an empire, and no empire without being a multinational entity governing over a group of satellites. We, however, as outsiders, do not consider Russia's historical mission to be a specific civilization, a specific way of being, like Orthodoxy, but, in agreement with the Eurasian notion of Russia as a stabilizer in the Eurasian space, to be the other pole which balances the power of the United States, a necessary entity in the balance of power in a multipolar world. With such historical mission, Russia will act as a world power again, not simply in Russians' interests, but in the interest of whole humanity. This is why we have an interest in teaching the Russian nationalists about how exactly to maintain power over other nationalities, if it should ever come about that Russia can recover parity with the West through an

---

<sup>3</sup> Again, Deidre Bair, *Simone de Beauvoir*.

<sup>4</sup> See my "The Origin of Feminism in the Differentiation of Subjectivity":  
<http://www.lawrencechin2011.com/1/wollstonecraft.html>

ICJ judgment. We have argued for physical beauty and a parental personality and culture, rather than for any “Russianness”, or Orthodoxy, or Russia’s specific autocratic and state-over-the-individual tradition, and might look like we are appealing to the wrong people in Russia. But we mean this: presumably, any national identity is as valid as any other, conceiving one’s people as descendants of Unicorn on the Moon is as valid as bearers of Orthodoxy. But, if Russia is to recover world-power, there are only a very few ways to maintain it. If the Russian nationalists are any serious about their imperial project, our suggestion will probably work better than the cultivation of Orthodox national identity and so on, all of which mean very little to outsiders whom Russia might want to attract to its circle. With military and economic might only a tiny fraction of that which the US possesses, workable soft power tactics like what we have suggested are the only options.

Secondly, our experience with the Russian émigrés in the US is that the Russian people seem to suffer generally some form of inferiority complex, and so don’t like Russia and flock to the West. This is certainly not the sort of people who can be reformed into a parental personality and world citizens within a short period of time. People who have low self-esteem certainly can’t be parents, and nobody will feel like looking up to them for guidance either. Even if the majority of people in Russia are nationalists and hate the United States, this is not the sort of global citizens who can guard an empire, either. We consider the pride which the ultranationalists express in Russia to be the necessary foundation on which a parental personality to which an empire may be trusted may be formed; but for this they would have to rid themselves of the xenophobic, and generally exclusionary ethnocentrism inherent in the pride. Giving privileged status to the Russian ethnicity within the Russian empire is not the problem per se, but the exclusionary attitude which precludes the development of a parental attitude toward other nationalities, whether satellite or domestic. Exclusionary ethnocentrism by nature is unattractive to outsiders, and therefore should never be made the main line of the narrative of any imperial project, otherwise the system of empire will be at best precariously held together as it was the case with USSR.

Such is the address. It is essentially a proposal for a Russian culture reform program along the following lines: from observation of the preceding episode with A/K (stay tuned for this), the Russians will modernize their society by adopting certain useful traits in the American system, like dominant group’s parental attitude and globalist talk, while preventing their negative sides from developing, like victimology or “sacralization of the victims” (which is the consequence of over-development of the parental attitude in the American system), and then market to the world a new Russian pop-culture that looks as pretty and attractive as the American or Anglophone pop culture and yet promotes conservation and develops intelligence rather than encouraging waste and killing the brain, which will then establish the “Russian brand” as an alternative to the “American brand”. It really looks more like a Medvedev program than a nationalist program, and yet I feel it more useful to talk to ultranationalists, since they seem like the only Russians who actually like Russia and or want Russia to be a world-power on a par with the US.

### III

In the third short essay, from August 2014, I began seriously developing a program for how Russia might develop its soft-power – especially via a brief



critique of Joseph Nye, the originator of the concept of “soft-power”. Nye’s concept of America’s greatness is very conventional, which I attempt to transcend. Note that the few persons I refer to in this short essay, like “Dr P”, “Angelica”, “Maura”, and “Kiersten”, since you don’t know them, you must ignore them for now. These are not necessarily real names, either. In essence, they may be summarized as “fear-mongering, selfish, petty, and stupid” – so that, when you present them as “typical Americans”, you can really mess up America’s reputation. Note also that the original essay was written for blog-posting, which includes embedded Youtube videos to illustrate pop-culture products, videos which can’t be included here. You will have to try to comprehend the point I’m making without the visual illustrations.

Please note that the notion of “American White Rose” is a mistake in my (2014) conception of CIA’s future policy. To my knowledge, the CIA has no future plans about exposing the poison in American culture in order to sacrifice American power to save the world – in obedience to judge Higgins’ order. (Please don’t laugh.) My current understanding is that, as a reward for doing Higgins’ job in reactivating the ICJ trial, the Agency really gets the right to maintain America’s power in the world in the future as much as possible, despite all the evils which the US has done in the past.

### **The steps toward establishing Russian soft power in Asian Pacific: some applications of Joseph Nye’s ideas.**

“Culture is the set of values and practices that create meaning for a society”  
(Nye’s definition, *Soft Power*, p. 11).

We here continue our proposals regarding Russia’s possibly establishing soft power in Asian Pacific. After our last initial address, it’s proper to bring in Joseph Nye’s insights in his classic which has started the whole discourse, *Soft Power: The means to success in modern politics* (2004 edition). His definition of soft power runs: “It’s the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payments [which are hard power]. It arises from the attractiveness of a country’s culture, political ideals, and policies” (p. x). Thus the legitimacy of policies and political ideals also count, and this we have not spoken of in our last address to the Russian ultraconservatives. Also: “This soft power – getting others to want the outcomes that you want – co-opts people rather than coerces them” (p. 5). This further refines what we want to be Russia’s goal in Asian Pacific. When we discussed, the last time, the problem of Russia’s lacking a “brand name” for its pop-culture, we were thus only referring to a tiny portion of the soft power which Russia must exert to become a world power in Asian Pacific.

More on this “brand name” problem. We have had a tour of the current Japanese magazines in a representative Japanese bookstore. We saw all these Western fashion magazines in Japanese editions: Figaro, BAZZAR, Elle, Marie Claire, Numéro, FUDGE, etc. American, French, Italian, or British. The last time we were there we saw Olivia Palermo on the cover of either FIZZ or In CELEB. She is here seen on another cover. Again, we wish to emphasize this to ordinary Russian people, especially ordinary Russian women. Olivia Palermo, when she decided to get into

fashion and modeling, had never thought about contributing to society or the power of the state. She was simply trying to do something she enjoyed doing. Yet, the global channels of cultural diffusion, the globalized world in which we live and which is centered on USA, is set up in such a way that, merely by doing what she likes to do, she would make a considerable contribution to the power of the United States in Asian Pacific. The Americans have built their empire partly in such a fashion: the self-reinforcing convenience. This is something you need to think about. Right now, whatever you do stays in Russia, and so has no effect on the power or the reputation of your nation. But one day, perhaps, this will change. Russia would be set up in the international domain in such a way that, when you simply try to look pretty, you can have tremendous effect on the influence of your country on other countries. Be prepared for this.

The situation with the Japanese didn't seem as bad as it was in late 1980s or early 1990s. At that time, even in purely Japanese editions, you can only see European and American models. There seem now to be actually more Japanese faces on these magazines. I don't know if this is what has sometimes been spoken about American pop-culture's power:

“... globalization of American popular culture... may well prove to be a temporary phenomenon, an issue internationally only so long as it takes to generate a local response that tests which premises can be successfully adapted to local circumstances and expectations...” (John G. Blair, “First Steps Toward Globalization”, cited in Nye, p. 53)

This is itself something very bad: for this (“local response in adaptation”) means the internalization of American values by local cultures, the Americanization of the planet nonetheless. The point is that this is how soft power works, and that this is what Russia must do. Nye likes to criticize those who think soft power consists only in Coca-Cola or Hollywood movies as being too narrow-minded in thinking about the matter, and yet these simple images and brand names are the most important part of soft power when you are in Asia. Forget about the high culture of literature or science. Forget about those more academic measurements of soft power in its totality, including legal forms, etc., like the ones conducted yearly by Monocle (<http://monocle.com/film/affairs/soft-power-survey-2013/>). The Asian cultures are just as good as you are in the domain of high cultures or legal traditions. It is in the pop culture domain that you must first make your mark – the most important mark.

What the Americans have done – with Julia Roberts formerly or Olivia Palermo currently – is nothing other than the colonization of the mind. It is to inculcate in the Japanese youngsters' psyche the thought regarding what the ideal human being looks like. They naturally develop feelings of intimacy with the countries from which the ideal looking human beings have come, which, among political elites, translates into expectations for political alliance. Long exposure to images of Euro-American pretty faces creates familiarity, so that political alliance with Euro-American nations will feel “natural”, a matter of course. Long term inculcation of the Euro-American pretty faces as “ideal” will also reinforce the acceptance of American world leadership as “natural”. Especially in combination with the fact about American military and technological might. What we have been saying is that, since the Russian pretty faces are essentially not that different from Euro-American faces, once the catalytic event leaves the “spot” open, the Russians can easily move in, so that Russian leadership in the Pacific rim would become “natural” – without encountering resistance. Just the opposite of the situation which the Russians

find themselves with the peoples in Central Asia, Caucasus, and Eastern Europe. Looking at a typical Russian “melodrama” below, I fail to distinguish how it is in any way inferior to a movie in which you see Cameron Diaz or Julia Roberts moving around. The only problem is “brand name”, the lack of which has caused people to not think it cool to pay attention to the Russian side, and so caused them to overlook what might be worth looking into.

We wish to address the ultranationalists particularly in regard to this issue. The other day we have discovered Quest Pistol (we know they are Ukrainians; but let’s assume they are Russians):

In the battle field of culture, everything is permissible. However much this kind of Western rockn’ roll images might offend a devout Orthodox, we remember a time (in late 1980s) when the Japanese were crazy about this kind of stuff. Carefully market such brands – and these “degenerates” might turn out to be the nation’s most effective weapons (turning Japanese youngsters’ attention away from United States toward Russia). What is utterly important is a two-fold message: first, that the image, despite being “Western-like”, is “Russian”. Now, this is what you find when you search for some samples of Russian fashion magazines using Google or Yandex:

The same American and European editions for the Russian people, for the most part. Instead of developing their own brands which they are perfectly able to do, the Russians have succumbed to Western colonization. “Fashion magazine” (as an idea) might be a Western thing, but the actual magazines which people hold in their hands must be entirely “Russian” to them. What we mean is this. Orthodoxy was originally a Greek thing. But, after Russian appropriation, when people are confronted with Russian Orthodoxy, people do not think of “Greek”, but only of “Russian”. When people hear “Russia is an Orthodox country”, there is no connotation of “Greek” or “Hellenic” in people’s mind. Russians must make such effort in appropriating these attractive Western images as to be able to present them, in the end, as entirely “Russian”, without conjuring up, in the mind of the audience, any thought about “American”. This is an advantage, for there seems to be some inherent lure in the Western images; but if you try to market the image of some Orthodox Archbishop, you probably will never get anywhere in a million years.

Whereas complete appropriation of things Western makes them assets to the Russian nation, incomplete appropriation – when the connotation of “Western” remains quite conspicuous – makes them poisonous. This is perhaps why the Pussy Riots, and a bunch of other anti-Putin oppositions, instead of opposing the authority of their own accord, oppose him only on the basis of a pro-Western attitude. Again, looking at this French documentary below, we say: the problem with these “most dangerous women” is not that they are anti-Putin, but that they are pro-Western. This is poisonous – when otherwise opposition can be quite healthy. Our position is always that oppositional parties, by creating a wider range of choices of “brand” for the people, are actually conducive to the power of the state, in the sense of reinforcing its soft power by making the nation more attractive, because, being multi-colored, it’s less likely to bore people. Of course the Kremlin understands this quite well, which is why there has been a conscious effort within the United Russia party to create oppositional camps within the party itself. Putin’s regime is evidently not dictatorial; they are simply afraid of Western co-opting of oppositional elements within Russia, and do not want to repeat Gorbachev’s mistake, which is liberalization beyond the system’s capacity to result in system’s collapse. The Putinites are furthermore quite aware that

single party rule kills off creativity, and so lessens the state's power; but that gratuitous multiplication of oppositions and differences to infinity creates confusion, and so also kills brain and lessens the state's power. The most healthy state of affairs is always a moderate amount of opposition and diversity. But the oppositions must not be agents under the employment of one's enemy to undermine oneself. This is a message to both the conservatives and the liberals in Russia at once. You must first strengthen the nation's foundation, so that self-criticism does not cause death, and eliminate the pro-Western orientation *inherent in the tendency to oppose*. We don't know why: but somehow, in Russia, when people think of opposing the authority, they naturally think of pro-Western: the two sides must be dissociated in people's mind! (In the US, only a minority within the opposition to authority actually turns to Russia Today, despite RT's deliberate effort to cultivate "conspiracy theories".) Then, you must nurture oppositions, if only to make the society more exciting to outsiders.

Now soft power is the trickiest business in the world. Merely having beautiful women in fashion magazines can convince another nation to become your ally. It's low tech, and the easiest thing to do in the world: just look pretty, smile, and be nice. So is ethical, mature, and parental behavior and personality. It takes a lot of technological foundation to build a B-2 bomber, but just looking pretty and admirable can be as effective as having these stealth bombers. See this line in the Wikipedia entry on "soft power": "a nation with a large amount of soft power and the good will that engenders it inspire others to acculturate, avoiding the need for expensive hard power expenditures." Since Russia lags behind the West in technological hardware by a whole decade perhaps, in the coming era of the balance of power, the use of soft power is Russia's only option.

We can sum up the essence of Russian appropriation of Western and Americans' advantages with these further thoughts on the necessary ingredients of empire-building with soft power:

- A. The development of an indigenous self-critical apparatus (White Roses). This means the development of an indigenous human rights tradition that has no relationship with the West. Like ACLU in the US, but unlike the Helsinki Group in Moscow. (Be careful though, for the ACLU in the US is clandestinely influenced by the CIA, a state agency, at least technically speaking.) We cannot overemphasize the fact that this is one of the most important and necessary components for the reconstitution of the Russian empire. A certain apparatus must exist to keep the Russian government's imperial policies and actions within the narrow, "right" path, i.e. appealing to subjects and satellites rather than offensive or scary to them. Unlike the existing Russian White Roses who are invariably under Western dictate, and who are here to make Russians look bad and Westerners look good, the new, indigenous Russian human rights activists *must be complaining about Russian authorities only in order to make Russians look good* by representing the Russian people and by successfully reigning in their government and preventing their government from engagement in excessive actions. Thus, the Kremlin, by promoting the development of an indigenous human rights tradition without ties to outsiders and allowing itself to be constrained by them, might actually succeed in holding an empire together this time.
- B. The whole point is that if people outside see that Russia in fact has an indigenously grown self-critical apparatus, they will feel much more comfortable with Russian society

and Russian influence; same with Russian common people's attitude change – an attitude rivaling the Anglophone Canadians in welcoming outsiders to their land... We have been saying that a self-critical apparatus, parental attitude, and openness in attitude... these are *necessary* components of a modern superpower, or empire, because, given technological change, empires simply cannot any more rule through hard power alone – speaking as a Machiavellian, not even considering any ethical dimensions of the problem.

- C. The chief reason why the United States attracts foreigners is that it is a relatively more comfortable place to live in, and more comfortable because everything in America is big, spacious, and abundant, and where the people are polite and weather is good. Nye has overemphasized the roles played by American policies, practices, and values in making United States attractive to foreign talents; from immigrants' perspective it is clearly comfort and convenience which have most attracted them. Now Russia is also spacious, and so, supposedly, the Kremlin can think a little more about consciously guiding urban development to make life more comfortable there. I suppose the Kremlin might do a market research to find out what kind of neighborhood exactly foreigners like the most, and what kind of attitude foreigners would feel most comfortable with in Russian people. Nye has repeatedly emphasized the contribution to America's soft power when foreign students come to the US to study and become impressed by it. The effect is especially large when it is the children of the elites who have come and who, after going back home, end up in important positions in their society. You can presumably start a movement to train ordinary people into the right attitude, etc., then give scholarship, etc., so as to attract students in Asia to Russia instead. But, unfortunately, there is nothing you can do about Russia's inherent disadvantages in comparison with the US: the harsh Russian weather and the difficulty of the Russian language.

We have to understand that the major reason why the West continually exceeds the Eastern alliance (Russia-China axis) in soft power (or in reputation) is that they have a better ad campaign which not only make themselves look good, but also make the Eastern alliance nations look bad, so as to undercut their soft power potential. China should have greater soft power. But America has significantly hampered China's development of soft power by constantly making the Chinese government look bad. (This has been CIA's and State Department's main trade, of course.) The above documentary is another example.

It thus seems that, to replace United States as the dominant power in Asian Pacific, Russia cannot but make America look bad. Sorry, nothing personal in this. For the peoples here have already been sufficiently colonized in their mind by the Americans since a long time ago, and what is the fastest way to get people addicted to Coca Cola to drink Pepsi instead? You say that there is poison in Coca-Cola. Only then can Russia promote its different way of life, its different culture, as a better alternative. The steps are, evidently: (1) Show itself to be the victim rather than the aggressor, in order to clear people's misconception of Russia as the imperial successor to the USSR; (2) show its people as rivaling Americans in looks and attitude (pop-culture and change of attitude); (3) show itself as having a way of life that is both comfortable and healthier, and as possessing better values.

**The problem with America's soft power**

How to make America look bad? Let's quote Nye again: "In international politics, the resources that produce soft power arise in large part from the values an organization or country expresses in its culture, in the examples it sets by its internal process and policies, and in the way it handles its relations with others" (p. 8). Nye has always analyzed America's soft power in terms of culture, domestic policies and practices, and foreign policy objectives. And so why does United States exercise such greater degree of soft power?

"Soft power has been a strong suit for the United States virtually from its inception – certainly long before the country became a recognized world power in the twentieth century. American 'exceptionalism' – the nation's devotion to freedom, the rule of law, and the practice of republican government, its openness to immigrants of all races and religions, its opposition to traditional power politics and imperialism – has had a great deal to do with the rise of the United States to its currently dominant global role." (Carnes Lord, "Public Diplomacy and Soft Power," in Waller, ed., *Strategic Influence: Public Diplomacy, Counterpropaganda and Political Warfare*, 2008, p. 61.)

And so Lord notes that American culture expresses universalist values (freedom, rule of laws, openness to Otherness), which are reflected in American institutions, practices, policies, and relationships with others. Well, we have noted that Americans do talk about universalist values and pretend to practice them; but they are in fact practicing the opposite of what they preach. Americans look like good people and attract others because they know how to hide their "dark side". Therefore, the way to make America look bad is simply to expose the truth – to show Asian peoples what Americans are really practicing and what American values are really about. We are talking about two different things here. First of all, Americans are hypocrites. The respect for freedom is written down in American laws; but in practice Americans do everything they can to undermine other people's freedom. Both the US government and the American people do this. You see this in "crimes against Russia": behind every promotion of democracy there is but a hidden calculation to achieve domination over others in order to rob the indigenous people of their riches. While guaranteeing rights of speech and religion, the US government is planning to insert chips into people's brain to regulate their free will. We see over and over again that Americans commit crimes of all sorts against the Chinese and the Russians but then accuse the Chinese and the Russians of committing these crimes against Americans. My experience, my story, has taught me that those resources named by Nye which have produced this "American soft power" only exist on the level of appearance. Even on that level, it isn't really these resources which have attracted foreigners. In reality, it's pure comfort and convenience which has attracted immigrants. People are stupid, and so just having an appearance is usually good enough to fool them. We are disgusted with American values and practices because we have penetrated the appearance and seen their core: just the opposite.

The second is to demonstrate that even many of those very values which Americans preach but clandestinely undermine – human rights, democracy, and equality – only sound good to the ear in the short term, but are in fact devastating to the wellbeing of humanity in the long term. If the episodes in the reactivation of the lost ICJ trial can be advertised to Asian peoples, this will clearly be visible. What have "rights", "democracy", and "equality" produced in America? They

have enabled the masses of stupid and amoral people to get on top of intelligent and moral people and rule them as if it were Planet of the Apes. There are Angelica and Kiersten who want to dispose of geniuses like trash; there are Homeland Security idiots who want to dispose of the CIA campus like trash. The respect for stupid, worthless people's rights has destroyed the quality of American education; there is Dr P who is able to earn a doctorate without ever understanding anything about psychology and mental illness – and without any awareness that she doesn't understand it. There is Maura, and countless people like her, who have gone through college and yet who can't distinguish between science and delusion. These people are becoming the norm in American society. Surely, the majority of humanity have always been stupid; but when you accord stupid people the same rights as those accorded to intelligent people, they will dominate by sheer number. You will then have this "Opposite Society", and the only reason why this society is still surviving is that it draws on immigrants from Asia and South Asia to do the engineering and science whom the original Americans can't even distinguish from delusion. The lesson here is not simply to exhibit the dark side of those American values which have been penetrating the whole world; but also to demonstrate that, when Asian immigrants go to America to seek comfort, they are building weapons for American people who have degenerated to the state of apes to use against the rest of the world.

Here again, we have to ask: why are these American Apes able to attract humans with brains to invent the things they are losing the ability to understand? Because America is comfortable. America is surely a society of rule of laws – there are more laws in this country than anywhere else in the world – and is surely open to peoples of all kinds. But you have again seen that unconditional practice of these values is source of disasters. America has become the Planet of the Apes due in part to the increasing influx of Mexicans. Americans want to regard Mexican immigrants as of the same value as those from Asia, because, well, they don't want to be called "racists". Americans will call me "racist" if they hear me denouncing the Mexicans like this. They seem to forget that Mexicans are the most racist against Asians. Try to wear a Chinese mask and walk around in Mexico. Why aren't Americans calling Mexicans racist? And why are Mexicans racist against Asians, when they only know how to pick fruits, wipe tables, kill people, and sell drugs? Oh, see, I sound like a racist here, again. Those vast number of Hispanics and white trash trailer parkers inside Department of Homeland Security whose IQ are barely 85 and who conduct surveillance and investigate geniuses and university professors... They have no talents themselves, and so try to make a name for themselves by trashing those who have brain. And yet you can't point that out, for that would be "racist".

What we are saying is that Russia must expose to Asian peoples, and to the rest of the world, the fact that these values for which the world admires America are often tools by which talentless peoples may convince society to overlook their lack of merits and elevate them to positions which they otherwise will never attain, and disguises under which criminals may commit crimes and not get caught. Many intelligent people have for a long time noticed this, and Nye has consistently dismissed them. He has described, e.g. the traditional European anti-Americanism, but we must emphasize that there is in fact quite a lot of truth in it: "Although some 19<sup>th</sup> century Europeans saw America as a symbol of freedom, others, such as the author Charles Dickens, saw only a 'clamorous gang of fakes, fools, and tricksters...'" (p. 18). The European conservatives have been correct in denouncing American commercial culture as legitimizing the "lowest common denominator", which is echoed in various authoritarian regimes' rejection of American

pop-culture as “degenerate”. They are in fact speaking the truth, but why is it that Nye, siding with the unintelligent masses, can successfully dismiss them as reactionary? Because it is a fact that this appeal to the “lowest common denominator” has proven to be the path toward power, since United States has become the most powerful empire in human history. *And yet the truth is that America’s power is by now almost entirely, or essentially, generated by immigrants from Eurasia.* You may say that America has become great through these egalitarian values and by eschewing elitism; and yet the reality is that that phase is past and that the current generation of Americans is merely squandering away all the wealth and power which their ancestors have accumulated and is disguising this reality by hiding behind competent immigrants from Eurasia – and they can do this because the comfortable environment which their ancestors have left behind is still relatively well-kept. And worse: “But, in general, polls show that our popular culture has made the United States seem to others ‘exciting, exotic, rich, powerful, trend-setting – the cutting edge of modernity and innovation.’ And such images have appeal ‘in an age when people want to partake of the good life American-style, even if, as political citizens, they are aware of the downside for ecology, community, and equality’” (p. 12). The goal of all American values – consumption – is in the process of sucking dry our earth’s resources and decimating our atmosphere. (For this demonstration, you may even appeal to our Thermodynamic Interpretation of History.) This is a very important point to emphasize – even though it didn’t seem to bother Nye at all: the downside of American values. Nye has made the same point we have tried to make – that the USSR has lost the Cold War to the United States in major part because it has concentrated its effort in promoting high culture and neglected pop-culture (p. 73 – 75), when it is really pop-culture which would gain people’s heart. American pop culture is more attractive than Soviet high culture essentially *because it is a form of indulgence and waste.* As is said, “Opium for the masses”. America’s secret of success lies simply in appealing to human beings’ “bad side” – just as it is said that Marxism fails because it expects ordinary people to be saints and capitalism succeeds because it encourages them to be selfish and greedy. Is there any way out of this dilemma – that you can only succeed in the world by appealing to the lowest common denominator or the “bad side”?

On this second point we are at the same time presenting a sort of critique of Nye’s very conception of soft power. The problem is more than this. Basically: his over reliance on simplistic, linear measurement of what is good. First of all, the measurement itself is suspect. How do we know that a greater number of people graduating from college is a better state of affairs than a lesser number of people graduating from college? Secondly, the “good” that is measured, that is considered soft power resources, might not really be good at all. Individualism and diminished deference to authority are not really “good”. Americans’ individualism has made their nation attractive only because it appeals to people’s lazy side; this has tremendously weakened the nation, and yet prompts their government to develop very sophisticated technique of deception. The US government is the most deceptive entity in the whole history of humankind – this must be exposed as well. Another example of Nye’s fault is his criticism of America’s frequent deviance from other advanced nations’ values, like death penalty. There has to be a campaign to expose the ridiculousness and insidiousness of these values themselves by appealing to substance rather than to appearance. Although America allows for death penalty, it’s more humane than China since it uses lethal injection rather than firing squad. But say: if you are condemned to death for murder, do you rather get a bullet in the head or lethal injection? In the former you die instantly and painlessly, in the latter you might suffer the most horrifying pain for



hours – as recent episodes of Democracy Now on botched executions have demonstrated. It must be exposed that many of the things we regard as good simply because they look good and we regard as bad simply because they look bad. Reality might be quite different. The exposure of truth might be easier in Asia than elsewhere, insofar as the people here are still to a greater extent attached to traditional values like deference to authority, etc. If Russia can demonstrate the superiority of traditional values and create a pop-culture embodying them – this is an alternative which would indeed have appeals, in contrast to the failure of the USSR in promotion of high values.

Have you not understood our point? We are advocating the creation of a Russian internal practices and pop-culture that look like Western's ("images") but which embody better, maybe more traditional values. This can then be marketed as an "alternative" in Asia after exposure of the "dark side" of American values and culture. None of this presumably can possibly happen without an ICJ judgment; in which case it only happens because the Americans themselves (the White Roses) would have to cooperate with the plan to withdraw from Asian Pacific by making themselves, or rather their culture, look bad. Why would they do that? How have the American White Roses made of this when they have accepted the "plan" between 2011 and 2013?

Presumably they have thought that, by exposing the poison and evils in their own culture to save the world from their poison, they would in fact make themselves look good. American withdrawal from Asian Pacific would then make both sides look good while saving human civilization's future at the same time. The Democrats and the CIA, when it comes to choosing between ruling the world or looking good, I guess, would choose the latter. This, presumably, was the original results of the bargain both sides have made under DH's direction.

Then, after people's shock over the truth about American culture, I suppose the next move you can make is to advertise (Putin's daughter) Ekaterina's marriage with her (rumored) Korean boyfriend (see below) – and if this boyfriend then moves into high positions, presumably the Korean TV will suddenly be filled with documentaries and shows introducing people to the "real Russia" (after people have found that Russia is really a victim trying to survive rather than an imperial aggressor robbing from the weak).

But what is "real Russia"? We don't know if the information we get about Russia on Western media is any accurate – supposedly the way the slander works is to present minority views in Russia as if they were majority views – but we have heard enough stories from politically neutral people who have gone to Russia about the terrible problems there with bureaucracies and corruptions: how you can avoid a ticket by paying 10 dollars to the police officer, etc. This kind of stories is extremely disheartening, just like the Russian people we see here who are invariably characteristically reserved and unsophisticated. It just doesn't seem to be the case that the Russians are ready to present themselves, their real self, any time soon – to present themselves as a viable, and healthier, alternative.

Russian women must learn to present themselves as the opposite of Kiersten and Dr P, the sort of American women who are so stupid and self-centered that, unable to recognize competence in others and thinking themselves to be some sort of genius, all because they are too stupid, they are willing to trash away national treasures just to promote themselves as victims, and think that

widespread damages to other people in society are worth it to justify themselves... If you can present yourself as the opposite to Asian peoples, think of the massive benefits... Not everyone can be high tech engineers and so on to build up the nation's hard power, but these things like knowing oneself to be not very smart and becoming aware of the consequence of one's own actions is really very simple, and yet the soft power effect is tremendous...

#### IV

The fourth short essay came from a blog post of mine from late September 2014. It is then that I began seeing how "color revolutions" and "soft power" are two sides of the same coin.

#### **More on the relationship between color revolutions and soft power:**

I have discovered two very interesting memos from the PONARS Eurasia Annual Conference 2014 (22 – 23 September 2014) which relate to "color revolution". The faults in the perspective on "color revolution" illustrate my earlier posts on the methods which Russia may employ to establish soft power in the Asian Pacific region.

The first memo is from Dmitry Gorenburg from Harvard University, "Countering Color Revolutions: RUSSIA'S NEW SECURITY STRATEGY AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. POLICY", PONARS Eurasia Policy Memo No. 342, September 2014, which is also available on his blog: <http://russiamil.wordpress.com/2014/09/15/countering-color-revolutions-russias-new-security-strategy-and-its-implications-for-u-s-policy/>. Gorenburg reports on the Russian definition of "color revolution" during the 2014 Moscow Conference on International Security:

"The May 2014 Moscow Conference on International Security (MCIS), sponsored by the Russian Ministry of Defense, was focused on the role of popular protest, and specifically color revolutions, in international security. The speakers, which included top Russian military and diplomatic officials such as Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu and Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov, argued that color revolutions are a new form of warfare invented by Western governments seeking to remove independently-minded national governments in favor of ones controlled by the West. They argued that this was part of a global strategy to force foreign values on a range of nations around the world that refuse to accept U.S. hegemony and that Russia was a particular target of this strategy."

The second memo of interest comes from Mikhail Troitskiy from the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO), who has noted the Indian way to characterize "color revolution" as "doctrinal innovation" (Unable to Lead, Reluctant to Follow: RUSSIAN, CHINESE, AND INDIAN APPROACHES TO BALANCING AND BANDWAGONING WITH THE WEST, PONARS Eurasia Policy Memo No. 334, August 2014. On PONARS' website: <http://www.ponarseurasia.org/memo/unable-lead-reluctant-follow-russian-chinese-and-indian-approaches-balancing-and-bandwagoning>):

"Western doctrinal innovation – the concepts of solidarism, universal human rights, and "responsibility to protect" in the absence of UN Security Council approval – has also elicited a

distinct asymmetric response. At different times, Chinese, Indian, and Russian authorities have taken care to limit the freedom of maneuver of both local and transnational nongovernmental organizations that are commonly viewed by these states as agents of hostile Western influence disguised as the promotion of universal rights or values.”

Clearly, the Russian perception of “color revolutions” as a new type of warfare invented by the West against Russia is some sort of exaggeration. So are also China’s and India’s characterizations of it as “doctrinal innovation”. The Russians, along with the Chinese and the Indians, must have themselves recognized that the problem here is no more than West’s (especially United States’) taking advantages of their greater attraction (or “attractiveness”) among the common people around the world. “Color revolutions” are simply a phenomenon of the more attractive ones bullying the less attractive ones by taking the latter’s friends away (like what is frequently seen among American high school students). The solutions which the Russians have come up with here (see “Russia’s counter-strategy” in Gorenburg’s memo) are no more than efforts to attack the symptoms without addressing the disease. The only real cure – attacking the disease – is to increase Russia’s own soft power, to increase its own attractiveness among the common people in areas affected by color revolutions or “doctrinal innovations” – such as along the line which have been suggested in my previous two postings on how Russia might increase its soft power in Asian Pacific.

Click on “soft power” in the tags below to see what I mean. If you know anything about my life right now – my years of suffering under the exigency of the ICJ trial – you know that I don’t particularly hold Russia in such high esteem at the moment as to want to help them, since it’s due to Russian government’s mistake in 2010 that the requirement has arisen for the [French and the Republiclans] to allow various sorts of Mexicans to torture me and turn me into a criminal. But what I have written about the increase of soft-power (which alone may permanently extinguish “color revolution” as a possibility anywhere once and for all) applies equally to China and India.

## V

The fourth short essay is the most important. It is also very difficult to understand. It’s first posted on my old blog in November 2014. I really hope this essay will end up on the desk of Putin himself – to save him.

It was originally written as an appendix to one of my stories documenting my life in early 2013, hence the opening line...

Within three months Ukraine would be swept away by another “color revolution”, this time undoing Russia’s gain in February 2010. Here I would like to modify my observation on the Ukrainian crisis which I have made on my blog post for June 9, 2014, “The international background of the K Affair: the Ukrainian crisis...” We can be certain that what has happened in early 2011 was that the Republicans have decided that, the ICJ trial dismissed, the United States, back on the track of neoconservatism, should take back what was lost during February 2010 specifically as a consequence of my ICJ trial, i.e. the loss of Yulia Tymoschenko to Viktor Yanukovich, orchestrated in accordance with Russia’s command of the CIA resources as part of

the ICJ judgment. Now, throughout 2011, 2012, and 2013, the Macrospherians (and specifically the CIA), because they have had to lie low, couldn't stop the Republican project. The Macrospherians had therefore secretly decided on a plan for Russia to trade Ukraine for South Korea – this would become apparent, however, only years after the reactivation of the ICJ trial. Now we have to note the problem of the “revolutionary minority” which was intimately connected with the Ukrainian crisis. Insofar as the Macrospherian program was to save human civilization from “Americanization”, we have commented that the revolutionary minority in the US (i.e. the CIA) would have to orchestrate the coming scandal in order to convince the “sleeping majority” – who knew nothing more than to follow what was “trendy” and repeat established slogans, much like Kiersten (“God wants diversity”) – that what everyone had thought was good, and that of which the Americans were so proud as their crowning achievement, as their world-historical mission, i.e. all the political correctness (along with “democracy” and consumerism), was actually very bad. We have commented on this problem in the conclusion to the upcoming Syrian scandal: that values emerge as a function of the current social structure (or economic substructure) in order to reinforce the current direction of society, i.e. that people will be socialized to believe as “good” whatever reinforces the continuing progress of society toward its natural destiny; and that, since human society at the present, with the United States leading the way, is entering its phase of old age and so progressing rapidly toward its natural destiny of death and extinction, values have emerged in the United States which teach people that behaviors and beliefs which will best contribute to the eventual death of society are “good”, as if self-destructive behaviors could somehow lead to the opposites, i.e. health and continual survival. It's the task of the “revolutionary minority” who have escaped the “cunning of Reason” and could see self-destruction as self-destruction to wake up the “sleeping majority” to the truth of the matter. This is a difficult task, as you can imagine. What you should now know is that there must have existed a similar “revolutionary minority” in Russia whose gospel about the salvation of the Russian empire is not heeded by the “sleeping majority”. While the “sleeping majority” in Russia have also wanted to save the Russian empire or recover its former glory, they simply don't know how to do it, and know only how to do what would actually further corner Russia into the status of a provincial national entity on the verge of extinction under Western pressure – just like the “sleeping majority” in the US who, as they practice self-destruction and export their self-destructive ways to the rest of the world, actually believe they are doing good to themselves and to the world. Who are the “sleeping majority” in Russia? They consist of two camps, the liberals and the conservatives. The conservatives<sup>5</sup> seek to return Russia to its Tsarist past, Orthodoxy, collectivism, and authoritarianism, as the proper path toward recovering its former world-status, while the liberals seek to remake Russia in the image of Western neoliberalism, this corporate and consumerist “democratic” wasteland called “economic freedom” or “liberalism”.<sup>6</sup> While the conservatives are really locking Russia further into its provincialism – just the opposite of the imperial status formerly held by the USSR, for, as has been noted, Russian orthodoxy has no universal appeal, but only local appeal – the liberals' program would only hasten Russia's subordination to, and integration into, Western imperialism. Only the “revolutionary minority” has seen the true path. What Russia desperately needs is a thorough cultural reform – the most important task once you continue to retain the power to blow

---

<sup>5</sup>Represented by, and thinking along the line of, Alexander Dugin, for example. See blog post for August 1, 2014.

<sup>6</sup>Most notable of the “liberals” must be Igor Yurgens, the founder of the Institute of Contemporary Development (<http://www.insor-russia.ru/>) and chairman of the Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs (<http://www.rspp.ru/>).

up the entire earth several times over – in order to secure soft-power on the same par with the West. Although this sounds much like the liberal agenda – thus Dmitry Trenin has advocated that Russia, to become a superpower, must value its attractiveness above all else<sup>7</sup> – it is fundamentally different in such wise. You must remake yourself in the image of the West *to a certain extent* in order to secure the same attraction which the West has exerted upon the rest of the world; but you must also avoid the pitfalls of the Western model so that liberalization doesn't lead to integration into Western imperialism but rather to strengthening of one's own camp (the Eurasian Union, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, and BRICS). Thus, even though Trenin was completely correct in his criticism of Putin's Russia, he couldn't be taken seriously because he was clearly advocating Russia's turning its focus to becoming attractive only in order to facilitate Russia's integration into the Western order<sup>8</sup> – something which the Putinites, or anyone who wants to recover Russia's former greatness, will never accept. If the conservatives' approach is certainly not the way toward becoming a superpower again, and if a liberal like Dmitry Trenin, although correct in the beginning, is not going to lead Russia to the status of a superpower either, what exactly is the right path, the “middle path”, which can lead to that desired superpower status? It's difficult for the “sleeping majority” to comprehend what such “middle path” could be because everybody could only imagine “reform” (either forward or backward in time) in terms of what exists or has existed, rather than in terms of something brand new which has never existed before. The “modernization” which the “revolutionary minority” has in mind must be something

---

<sup>7</sup>Thus Dmitry Gorenburg summarizes a lecture given by Dmitry Trenin in 2011 (from:

<http://russiamil.wordpress.com/2011/11/14/new-directions-in-russian-foreign-policy-editor%E2%80%99s-introduction/#comments>): “The first, 'Modernizing Russian Foreign Policy,' examines the current goals of Russian foreign policy and makes some recommendations for its future trajectory. Trenin argues that for the last decade, Russian foreign policy has been aimed primarily at maintaining the country's status in the world. He argues that since the start of Vladimir Putin's second term as president in 2004, Russia has been focused on cementing its status as an independent power in a multipolar world. Its primary emphasis has been on maintaining its preeminent status in the former Soviet republics. A second goal has been to ensure that it has a say on all the critical issues facing the international system. And the final goal is for the Russian economy to realize a profit from the country's foreign policy. Trenin criticizes these goals as inadequate for the twenty-first century. He argues that to be a superpower it is no longer sufficient to be able to destroy the rest of the world or even to be able to export rare natural resources at a premium. The greatness of a state in the modern world, according to the author, lies not in what it can offer the world but in how attractive it is to others. He finds that Russia has little to brag about in this department.” Trenin was certainly correct so far. But, soon, he would show his teeth.

<sup>8</sup>And so Trenin continued in the same lecture, as summarized by Gorenburg: “To change this dynamic, Trenin proposes that Russia focus on wide-scale international cooperation in all possible areas. Economic cooperation would be greatly enhanced if Russia were to join the World Trade Organization. He then takes on the question of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) expansion, arguing that although he is not a proponent of further expansion, *he finds it difficult to see how the admission of states such as Ukraine or Georgia to NATO could be seen as a threat to Russia*. The old Soviet mentality of maintaining a buffer zone around its border does not correspond to present realities, in which Russia and NATO are developing a *partnership in dealing with the real security challenges*. In this environment, the best strategy for Russian foreign policy is to let these states make their own foreign policy decisions while using its cultural influence to ensure that its neighbors are positively disposed toward Russia. Having addressed the general outlines of Russian foreign policy in the first lecture, in 'Russia and the New Eastern Europe,' Trenin focuses more specifically on Russia's relations with Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova. His first point is quite simple: these three countries now constitute a distinct and durable geopolitical reality that he calls the New Eastern Europe. Given the history of Russia's interactions with this region, it is not at all surprising that these states' political elites have devoted a great deal of effort to ensuring that their countries develop distinct political identities that are separate from Russia.” Trenin here clearly reveals himself to be an agent of the West, asking Russia to surrender itself to Western administration of all that exists in Russia. No wonder that he is the director of the Carnegie Moscow Center.

which looks like Westernization at the outset but which quickly turns into something entirely new, something which has never existed before. Higgins' team must have thought that this latter phase of “liberalization” – something unseen before – is the opportunity by which the model sustainable civilization may be implemented in reality for the first time. It's something that looks like Westernization on the outside, but which is actually something else in the inside.

Let's not confuse two entirely different issues. The Russian revolutionaries' goal in any reform or modernization is to make Russia a great power again, while Higgins' team's goal is to create a economic structure of human civilization that is actually sustainable in the long run. If the conservatives' program can never result in a Russia that has significant leverage in soft-power, and if what Igor Yurgens wants for Russia to become is clearly more attractive to outsiders, Yurgens' agenda can only result in Russia's integration into the world system – which is the opposite of what Higgins' team wants in order for human civilization to be sustainable – and possibly in Russia's integration into Western imperialism – which is the opposite of what the Putinites want, a great Russia on its own feet like the former USSR. Russia must be isolated from the West while developing soft-power toward its immediate neighbors (presumably, most importantly, vis-a-vis Asian Pacific as well as the CIS, BRICS, and SCO member states). Russia thus must create for itself a “liberal image” like that which the West has exercised on the world – since it's always the liberals, the left, in the US and in Western societies in general which have attracted the rest of the world to them, not the conservatives in them (not the homophobic, the nationalist, the Christian conservatives, but every kinds of left) – but then eschew the West at the same time, as some sort of “virus” in accordance with some rhetoric of Russian conservatives. This is on the cultural front. Translated into the economic domain, this “liberalization” means Yurgens' “economic liberalization” but only within the boundaries of Russia's own sphere of influence. Remember, the goal is to satisfy both Higgins' goal and those of the Putinites (the “imperialists”).

It's of course difficult to imagine how economic stagnation could be equated with superpower status, and how isolation from the world's market could *not* mean “economic stagnation”; further, it's difficult to image how you can look like the West while eschewing the West at the same time. The only way to avoid economic stagnation – the killer of the state's power – when retreating from the world system is if all nations retreat at the same time from the world system. Here is the fundamental problem of “collective action” – human civilization can be saved only if all nations do the same at the same time. At the same time, this becomes the ultimate dilemma if Russia wants to recover its former status as a superpower. Everybody must remember that the “world system” is fundamentally a Western, and increasingly a US, system; one can never expect to become a world power rivaling the United States by becoming a part of it. And it's increasingly impossible to become a world power rivaling the United States by isolating itself from it: the system is the source of both technology and attraction. The problem is therefore that the means by which a nation might become a superpower will, in the end, frustrate the very same goal of becoming a superpower. As the American lesbian feminist, Adrienne Rich, has once said, “You can never use the master's tool to dismantle the master's house.”

Certainly, Higgins' ICJ judgment must amount to just this – forcing all nations to retreat from the world system at the same time by an ICJ judgment. For, while the world system is the only avenue for every nation to achieve prosperity, advance in development, and acquire power, it's

also the cause of planetary destruction. If a nation chooses to withdraw from it in order to refrain from contributing to this planetary destruction, it will end up a backward weakling like North Korea. No nation is willing to sacrifice itself to save the human civilization *en entière*. Nations will only be willing to withdraw from the world system to save the planet if every other nation does it at the same time: hence the problem of “collective action”. And yet this is precisely the environment in which it is possible for Russia to rise again as a superpower. For the world today is very different from the time of the Cold War. Back then, there were two world systems. After one world system has collapsed, the victorious world system has been able to engulf the territory of the former competing, but now losing, world system – the United States, under the leadership of the Bilderberg Majority (to whom belonged the Clintonites), has done this quite consciously in order to guarantee its status as the sole, and last, superpower of the planet. China, in order to achieve a better life for itself, has succumbed to it, and now Russia's liberals are trying to tread China's path. And yet there was really no alternative, unless Russia is given to the conservatives and becomes just another provincial nation – distinct, but just another nation like any other, and, for this reason, completely vulnerable to Western imperialists' destabilization. Thus, Higgins' condition of the break-up of the world system is really Russia's only chance to achieve prosperity (relatively speaking, of course, not in absolute terms) and independence (such as only a superpower can afford to possess nowadays) at the same time.

The revolutionary minority's vision thus must be this, once the condition of the breakup of the world system has arisen: to convince the liberals (like Igor Yurgens) of what I have just noted, so that they may modify their program in such a way as has been laid out: to look Western in order to attract Russia's neighbors, but to differ fundamentally in substance so as to eschew the West at the same time – while Higgins' judgment would require that this substance is in conformity to her program of sustainable civilization and human brain-growth. Then to persuade the conservatives to rally behind the liberals, since this is the only way to avoid provincialism and to acquire universal appeal.

The necessity of looking “Western” arises because of the following two conditions: (1) people of the whole planet have already been used to seeing “Western-looking” as “attractive”, and (2) the Russian left itself has already been trying to look “Western”. It's certainly more efficient to make use of the appearance which is already in vogue in order to sell new substance than to invent a whole new vogue altogether. There is a tremendous catch here. The “American way” has attracted because it is good presentation. The “American way” is virus because it is fundamentally devoid of substance and destructive. It is a form of “honey trap”; it mesmerizes you, but then traps you and – either kills you or conditions you to kill others. It's the mechanism by which the world may come to an end – the ultimate goal of the “American way”. It's hypocrisy, and psychopathic. Certainly, nobody will buy into it if it were repulsive. To look “Western” in order to sell a different substance means to transform what is a “honey trap” into a “honey meal”, delicious and healthy at the same time. The American success story essentially depends on the average person's shallow mind which is unable to distinguish between presentation and substance. I would note much later that part of the American success lies in the successful cultivation of a parental attitude toward allies and minority groups, and that Russia's greatest failure lies in the failure to cultivate such parental attitude toward allies and minority groups. One must note that, as the following scandal shall demonstrate, the parental attitude in vogue among the common American people is essentially devoid of substance, cultivated mostly

by repetition of fundamentalist slogans (political correctness) which deadens the brain's capacity to understand anything rather than deepens the brain's capacity in order to achieve true empathy. The circulation of so much politically correct “parentalism” results in fact in shallow politeness and fundamentalist legislation to protect the “weak” but “Monkey morality” in people's mind. As long as human relationship remains as shallow as it is in postmodern life under consumerism and MacDonalidization, it indeed satisfies most people. And when Monkey morality surfaces during conflicts whereupon shallow politeness dissolves, only the outsiders would notice that this “parental people” are in fact bad-to-the-bone bullies without any sense of right and wrong, i.e., just the opposite of “good parents”. That the American way is exclusively focused on “presentation” without bothering with substance is the fundamental meaning to be derived from the following scandal – and from so many inexplicable instances of residual “racism”. Certainly, you will have seen that the “suspect” in question is victimized entirely because of people's stereotypes about “looks”, in combination with people's need to always have a scapegoat on whom to project their own bad qualities or on whom to exercise domination, all in order to make themselves feel good: the psychological needs which arise when people's intellectual development is quite low. Meanwhile, you have the instances where, when a black man, in a metropolitan city, dates and hangs out with whites without anybody passing judgment – the consequence of political correctness – one still continues to hear statistics like “being blacks means much greater chances of being shot dead by the police without cause”. This is all because, while political correctness has taught people not to judge others by their skin-color – for racism differs from traditional ethnic conflicts because it's entirely based on looks – people have never learned to judge others beyond their looks – so that, when circumstances change, people are easily provoked to act as if they were still racist. Then, as to the American governing elites, they are clearly parental toward their foreign allies only when the latter are willing to submit to their will. Otherwise, they have very sophisticated technique reserved for you, by which they could make you look bad and excommunicate you from the global community while not making themselves look like what they really are, i.e. bullies, just the opposite of “good parents” . Certainly, if the “American way” had emerged in Russia instead, Russia would have been the sole, and most attractive, superpower today – as long as people around the world are increasingly ignorant and shallow and couldn't distinguish, or no longer have the occasion to distinguish, politeness from true respect for another human being.

What the revolutionary minority in Russia wants must be, of course, more power for Russia, in order for Russia to recover its former glory: *état fort* and *politique de grandeur*. If this is all you want, and since soft-power is increasingly more important in today's world than hard power, the American way is of course far more efficient. Americans' sole purpose in life – whether you are talking about the governing elites or the common people – is to establish power and domination over others, and they want to be attractive (thought of as “good”) only as a means to this end. If your goal is to merely be thought of as being smart by others, why spend the extra effort to educate yourself to make yourself *really* smart? This is of course Kiersten. Thus, she merely collects good books and puts them on the shelf without actually reading them, since her goal is not to be really smart, but simply to be thought of by others as being smart – since her goal in life is not to know things, but simply to establish power and influence over others. If your goal is simply to be thought of by others as being “good” in order to establish power and influence over others, why spend the extra efforts to be *really* good? Thus Americans go around the world acting like they care about people while, behind people's back, they secretly plan how to hurt



people without anyone's knowing. Americans are extremely wasteful when it comes to human resources (brain) and earth's resources because that's their historical mission: to bring down human civilization altogether; but they are extremely efficient when it comes to establishing domination over others and hurting people: they don't ever waste their time and resources building up substance inside as long as most people in the world are dumb enough to not be able to see through mere packaging. Americans are smart enough to know that they shouldn't even bother to educate themselves any longer; just looking attractive is enough, in which case immigrants will come from east and south Asia to do the necessary engineering work for you, while you can afford to sit around indulging yourself in astrology and New Age spirituality without losing any hard power over the world at all. Employing slaves is a far more efficient method, and only the CIA is complaining about it because of the very nature of its trade, as you have seen, but the neocon Americans don't care about them.

The more rational choice for Russia's revolutionary minority would thus be to practice presentation and hypocrisy just like the Americans – except that they can't, because Americans already own up the whole world system. Pepsi can't establish a respectful foothold in the market because Coca-Cola already owns it all. Pepsi has to offer something different while at the same time tasting the same as Coca-Cola, in order to find a niche in the market. In other words, the Russian revolutionary minority must ask the Russians to look, and *to be*, “good” and “parental” at the same time toward the rest of the world. But this is a less efficient way to establish power and influence: the problem is that it's a waste of efforts because most people on the planet are too dumb to be able to notice, or even want, anything beyond good packaging for the products they want to buy. In an Americanized (i.e. shallow) world, being really “good” and “smart” doesn't pay off as well as simply looking “good” and “smart” without actually being so.

Again, it must be Higgins' intention to have Russia, and in fact every nation on earth, be really “good” and “smart” as well as looking “good” and “smart” – and here she runs into the problem of “collective action” again. In this current American-centered world system, true goodness doesn't pay as well as hypocrisy, so that no nations will be willing to be *really* good – because you will then fall behind others in power and influence, having wasted your resources on cultivating your invisible self. Once again, Higgins' solution is to break up the American-centered world system by exposing hypocrisy “American style” – this in so plain a view that even common, stupid, people can understand it – so that, from now on, power and influence – or “attraction” – can only be had when you are *truly* good, rather than just looking good. Thus, once again, Higgins' ICJ judgment is Russia's only chance to ever rise in the world again through soft-power acquisition. The Russian revolutionary minority has again to appeal to “Higgins' universe” as the condition necessary for Russia's recovery of its imperial past.

Let's summarize. The “revolutionary minority” on both sides were thus burdened with the task of convincing the “sleeping majority” in their respective domain that what has existed, and is thought of as good, is not actually good. The deal thus became that each side shall strike the other on the latter's “weak spot” – so that the revolutionary party might convince the rest, unenlightened majority that the “weak spot” is indeed such – one's weak spot. Let's leave aside for now Russia's coming strike at America's weak spot. Since the destabilization of Ukraine has been in the preparation for years and the Macrospherians could not stop it, they will allow this to be Americans' strike at Russia's weak spot. Thus, in regard to the Russian side of things, once

everybody in Russia is convinced, through the disasters in Ukraine, that cultural reform for the sake of the construction of soft-power is the most important task facing Russia – but liberalization not entirely as the liberals have imagined it – the whole corps of the elites in Russia could then be devoted to this task without being bogged down in disagreement.<sup>9</sup> The Russian conservatives are indeed required to recognize the harsh reality: that the soft-power of the West is entirely founded on the leftist tendencies in Western, or American, societies, simply because it is only that side in a nation which attracts the outsiders. The conservative evangelicals in America have contributed nothing to American soft-power around the world, and it is for this reason that the CIA has always aligned itself politically with the American left (hence the leftist tendencies of CIA's secret boss, George Soros). There was once a Chinese saying: “The woman masters the domestic sphere while the man masters the world outside the home.” That was, of course, old-fashion patriarchal value, but it might be transformed to describe the current political necessity: “The conservatives' duty is to keep order at home, while it's the liberals' duty to make good impressions on the outside world.” Orthodoxy at home and in privacy, but vibrant, modern pop-culture for outside showing. It's said that the current Putin regime has purposely adopted certain conservative policies (like what sounds like anti-homosexual laws) in order to appeal to the European far rights, who are, for the moment, in ascendancy in western Europe. This is indeed the right policy – to diminish pressure on the European front and increase admiration of Russia among certain reactionaries in the Western camp – and seems to speak against the revolutionary minority's vision. But it's not clear, and it's questionable, whether it will be the right policy on the Asian front, or whether it will be the right policy in the long run. Presumably not, since the revolutionary minority has seen the computer simulation of the future states of the world, and has developed their program and vision only in accordance with that simulation. In the American case, soft-power is built on leftist tendencies and not on the rightist because the former have the qualities of indulgence in desires, relaxation, and toleration of otherness, while the latter are programs of austerity, hard-work, and ethnic exclusiveness. Without commenting on the matter of toleration, we can say that the USSR has had less appeal in the world precisely because it is more into austerity and hard-work than indulgence and relaxation, thus investing resources in classical ballet and classical music rather than in pop-culture and pop-music. The USSR has lost because it has tried to appeal to higher human functions (the *nous*, or the *logistikon*, in Plato's schema of the tripartite structure of the soul) while the Americans, much smarter, are appealing to the “lowest common denominator”, i.e., the base human instincts for comfort and sensual desires (the *appetite* in Plato's schema) – and the harsh reality is that there are always more shallow, stupid people in the world than there are intelligent people who are interested in cultivating their higher functions. Given this condition, attraction, or soft-power,

---

<sup>9</sup>For it is truly amazing that many influential people in Russia do not recognize the urgent necessity of cultural reform, although they must understand the importance of soft power in the modern world. During the 2014 Moscow Conference on International Security, those among the Russian elites who have called Americans' destabilization of Ukraine “a new type of warfare” have included even the foreign minister Sergei Lavrov. Given his experience, he must have understood that the cause for loss of Ukraine lies in Russia's relative unattractiveness in the mind of its former subjects, and yet he has fallen into the trap of objectifying the destabilization tactics into a sort of “thing” (“a new type of warfare”) – which the intellect is fond of doing when it sort of understands something but can't exactly find the right words to describe it, in which case it just invents a new technical term to name it, as if it were something never seen before and so couldn't be described by existing vocabulary. Without being able to truly understand it in complete clarity, these elites therefore cannot understand that the enemy is merely exploiting their weakness rather than inventing a new weapon, and that the cure is really self-improvement rather than tactical response.

should always, in the long run, come from the left side of a nation, not from its right side. Higgins' trick will then be to use the appearance of indulgence and relaxation as a venue to clandestinely cultivate the masses' higher functions – or at least respect for higher functions, so that, if the common people can't be made smarter to save the world, they at least wouldn't become an obstacle to intelligent minority's effort to save the world. Again, there must be a certain agreement among Higgins' team and Russia's revolutionary elites in regard to cultivating a special, Western-like, liberalism and leftism out of the current Russian liberals and projecting it outward to both cultivate Russia's soft-power and to save the world from destruction through the establishment of an alternative to “wasting – the American style”.

As has been noted in other blog posts, no matter how Russia might develop an alternative form of soft-power from its leftist side, it will always run into the problem of lacking a “brand name”. Without a “brand name”, anything of good quality will not be noticed. It must therefore be Higgins' intention, and Russians' interest, to have the following ugly scandal advertised so that the complete lack of substance in American attraction (the politically correct way) – in addition to the fact that it is specifically designed to destroy human civilization altogether – may be exposed, just so that Pepsi might have a chance next to Coca-Cola once the latter is shown to have poison in it. I highly suspect that this “New Feminism” I have spoken of everywhere is in fact related to this task, for Russian women might be asked to play a very important role in the enterprise of soft-power projection. I also highly suspect that the enterprise will have a lot to do with South Korea – through Ekaterina – perhaps leading to the unification of the Korean peninsula.

καὶ ἐγένετο συνδρομὴ πάση τῇ παρεμβολῇ, διεβοήθη γὰρ εἰς τὰ σκηνώματα ἡ παρουσία αὐτῆς· καὶ ἐλθόντες ἐκύκλουν αὐτὴν ὡς εἰστίκει ἔξω τῆς σκηνῆς Ὀλοφέρνης, ἕως προσήγγειλαν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτῆς. Καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τῷ κάλλει αὐτῆς καὶ ἐθαύμαζον τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἀπ' αὐτῆς, καὶ εἶπεν ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ· τίς καταφρονήσει τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, ὃς ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ γυναῖκας τοιαύτας; ὅτι οὐ καλὸν ἐστὶν ὑπολείπεσθαι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἄνδρα ἓνα, οἱ ἀφεθέντες δυνήσονται κατασοφίσασθαι πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν.

There came about quite a commotion throughout the entire camp, for the rumor of her arrival quickly spread among the tents. They came and gathered around her as she stood outside the tent of Holofernes while they announced her presence to him. They marveled at their beauty and, because of her, wondered about the Israelites, each saying to his neighbor: “Who will dare despise this people with women like that among them? Surely it's not wise to leave even one of their men alive, for if we let them go they will be able to outwit the whole world.”

Judith, 10: 18 – 19.

#### **NOTE:**

Russia's construction of soft-power will be a movement of the entire Russian people, for, just as Joseph Nye has observed, the soft-power of a nation is mostly projected from its civil-society rather than from its government. This, despite the fact that the Russian civil society can only be

constructed correctly under government guidance, since the task is urgent and, as in the American case, civil society left to its own accord (developing spontaneously) will merely develop according to market's needs, which will result in the “pitfalls” which it is precisely Higgins' order to avoid. As I have noted, the most important task for the Russian people is the change of their attitude, from timidity, shyness, and reservation to assertiveness, self-engrossment, and thus readiness to lead. Westerners, and especially Americans, are assertive and self-engrossed mostly because they are bullies, and have grown up accustomed to having everything they want and being the bully on the block, while people in the rest of the world are timid, reserved, and shy because they are accustomed to scarcity, disorders, and powerlessness. And of course bullies who are used to having their ways are always more attractive to others than the weaklings being bullied in this shallow world, as everybody knows from experience in those high school years. Those who would go onto the side of the weaklings are a tiny minority, and they are only doing so out of sympathy, not admiration. (Today, Russia finds friends only among those reactionaries in Venezuela or Bolivia who resent bullies, while everybody else gets cozy with the Americans.) Russia's “alternative style” thus must consist in “assertiveness because the leader is really here to care about, and set things right for, everybody” rather than in “coming here to dominate”. I suppose this is a very difficult task for a people who are so used to the role of being victims – of natural disasters, internal social disorders, and foreign invasions.

Just note the difference in attitude between the Russian participants and the Western participants in this Metagalaxy affair. This video is entirely chosen at random. You see the same thing in every video you find.

In the following you will see that the American mind has so deteriorated, under conditions of always having what they want, political correctness, and, in the case of women, feminism, that, when Americans speak of their “rights”, they just mean “what they want”. Americans believe that they have the “right” to “whatever they want” – whether what they want violates other people's rights is a question that is long ago forgotten – even though that's how the notion of “rights” has originally developed (“You are entitled to your boundaries when you don't violate others”). You will see that, under certain conditions, the average American women, and many American men, manifest moral cognition not beyond stage two on Lawrence Kohlberg's moral development scale: a significant deterioration since three decades ago. Americans are no longer anything more than Monkeys, and the average Russians have certainly seen many times the American habit of accusing you of doing to them what they are doing to you. You see below in Putin's 18 December 2014 news conference how he points out the obvious – the American, and Western, habit of aggressively encroaching on Russia's boundary and then, when Russia tries to defend itself, accusing Russia of being the aggressor. Quite often, Americans actually *believe* that the victim of their aggression is the aggressor and that they themselves are the victims. In the following you will see that America is terra inverta, where people literally believe the opposite of reality to be the reality. This severe cognitive dysfunction has come about because Americans really believe that they are superior, are more deserving, and have more rights than others. When they harm you (violate your rights), this is the natural order of things, but, if you resist, you are violating their rights, and so are the aggressor. You will see in the following how the “stalking victims” in this false flag stalking scandal manifest precisely this mentality toward the “stalker”, just as Western governments have manifested it vis-a-vis the Russian government. Both the American elites and the average Americans expect the whole universe to revolve around them,

and everybody to cater to their every whim; if not, then it's called “injustice”, “sexism”, “misogyny”, and “victimization”. The proper way to characterize America is, therefore, “1984”: America actually resembles, in many respects, the world of “1984” far more than do Saddam Hussein's Iraq or Kim family's North Korea. Recall:

Freedom is slavery,  
War is peace,  
Ignorance is strength.

To which Americans will want to add:

The victim is the victimizer.

This is the true face of America: 1984. Except that Americans have come to this way through liberation rather than through oppression.

The plan must be to make others see Russia in the way I see Russia, the perennial victim, the weakling on whom the more fortunate gang up. That's precisely my situation. But the gang has in fact less substance than I do. Soft power is thus important, for it's questionable whether the common Russians have in fact more substance than the Americans who gang up against them...

## VI

The last remaining comments on how Russia might develop its soft-power to counter Western destabilization I have developed out of one of my many conversations with my former professor and mentor, Dr G. This conversation took place on November 2, 2012.

My meeting with Dr G today is recorded in: “[wdrguerriere\\_11\\_2\\_12\\_1206-358PM.MP3](#)”.<sup>10</sup> I met up with Dr G on 14:00. He was in Santa Cruz, Los Gatos, visiting a fellow professor of his. About my depression, caused by the perception of the extraordinary shallowness of ordinary life (in comparison with the business with the control center and the ICJ trial). At the restaurant. Dr G agreed to treat me (32:00). About the British author, David Pryce-Jones, and his book, “The Strange Death of the Soviet Empire”. About my meeting with the conspiracy theorists (38:00). About de Barruel’s classic (43:00). About academics’ conservatism in regard to the role of secret societies in French Revolution. About the crisis of our current civilization, specifically in regard to Peak Oil (49:00). Dr G didn’t believe in all the Peak Oil worries. Note that his opinion on this matter was rather shallow, and so don’t give too much weight to it. Then I noted that contemporary industrialists will no longer agree with Hayek (58:00). I asked this because, by this time, I had begun writing the long preface to the volume on the Pyramid, “The Cheney Plan, CIA’s war with the neoconservatives, and the ‘crimes against Russia’”, and had begun understanding Cheney’s abandonment of Hayek’s classical liberal model. But Dr G couldn’t be shaken in this regard, and believed that the free market contained within itself the mechanism to make itself sustainable (1:09:30). Then Dr G’s refutation that the case of China disproved the notion that free market could sustain itself indefinitely with mechanisms internal to itself. Note

---

<sup>10</sup> The recording can be heard at: [http://lawrencechin2011.com/drG/wdrguerriere\\_11\\_2\\_12\\_1206-358PM.MP3](http://lawrencechin2011.com/drG/wdrguerriere_11_2_12_1206-358PM.MP3).

his strange belief that there were plenty of undiscovered oil reserves inside China, which is absolutely absurd. Then his explanation that the free market did not mean pure “laissez-faire”. From here on his views were very sophisticated, and truthful, and so you shall definitely pay attention. He noted that a certain type of culture – he called it the “bourgeois culture” – was the necessary condition in which laissez faire may produce “good results”, and that such “bourgeois culture” contained within itself some naturally occurring moral constraints to prevent “laissez-faire” from degradation to wild orgy. We noted then the case of the opium trade in China in the 19<sup>th</sup> century: how “laissez-faire” almost destroyed the country. Thus a cultural background where certain types of transactions, although “free” and conforming to the practice of “laissez-faire”, were nevertheless abhorred by the people, was necessary if laissez faire was to bring “good” to the whole system. Not just the Western bourgeois culture, but anything equivalent to it, such as the Confucian culture, Dr G noted. Dr G thus advised Russia – where free market had brought disasters during the Yeltsin years – to develop a “bourgeois culture” – and, because of this precondition in culture, some countries were at a disadvantage in advancing themselves through free-market (1:47:00). Dr G was of course thinking that Russia’s failure in the 1990s was Russian people’s own faults – and in this regard his views were again erroneous, because we know that the Russian failures were largely caused by Western, especially American, meddling.

In any case, Dr G thus believed that the free market needs to suppress certain types of free enterprises, those which might damage the bourgeois culture on which free market depends for its healthy functioning, e.g. prostitution. Or rather practices and transactions which might corrupt the morals of the culture in question, since whether prostitution actually corrupts morals at all is a question which itself depends on which culture we are speaking of. (For peoples like those living in Western Europe, who don’t make a big deal out of it, prostitution can hardly corrupt anything.) Such is the limit of “free market” (1:52:00). I thus concluded that certain countries therefore do not have the necessary background for achieving prosperity, technological advancement, and therefore power. (Is there any other way nowadays to achieve all these without participating in world’s free market?) Then Dr G noted: it also had something to do with IQ (1:58:00)<sup>11</sup>. He believed that the cause for intelligence was ultimately genetics, about 60 to 80 percent of the causal pool. Dr G then noted that IQ meant the ability to recognize patterns and extract them for different contexts (2:07:00). Although Dr G was of the opinion that certain racial groups were genetically predisposed to higher intelligence than others, he believed that the failure of African Americans was not the result of their genetics alone, which could in fact be easily remedied through education. Rather, it’s due to American liberals’ attribution of blacks’ failure entirely to their oppression (2:13:00). He then noted that it’s the black females who required black males to become “bourgeois”. I then asked Dr G’s opinion on electronic communication, since, according to my impression, the Macrospherians had determined that it was this more than anything else which was nowadays degrading human intelligence and therefore undermining the very culture on which free market depended to thrive (2:22:00). Dr G’s opinion differed somewhat from my impression of the Macrospherian conclusions. He drew on his own teaching experience to illuminate the cause for the decline of intellect he saw among American students (2:24:00). He attributed the decline to the whole value system behind political correctness which the “liberals” had caused to become dominant in the “bourgeois culture”:

---

<sup>11</sup> The books which Dr G referred were probably Richard Lynn and Tatu Vanhanen’s *IQ and the Wealth of Nations* (2002) and *IQ and Global Inequality* (2006). See also the July 18, 2012 review by Ron Unz at *American Conservative*: <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/race-iq-and-wealth/>.

creativity and intuition at the expense of analytical reasoning, and favoring the sort of teaching where inequality among students would not manifest itself. Through his explanation I had come to understand the philosophical difference between libertarians and the conservatives: the former don't notice the "presuppositions", the "bourgeois culture", whereas the conservatives understand the necessity of preserving these "presuppositions" (2:39:00). Asked where this "liberal" culture originated which, according to his "conservative" scheme of things, was ruining American society, Dr G was emphatic, that the destructive forces came from outside the Anglophone "bourgeois culture". Free market, or any free society, risks allowing forces to freely develop within itself which will undermine it (2:48:00). I tried to understand Dr G's view point by drawing on Hayek: Hayek has attributed the Anglo-Saxon superiority over the Gaulican to the fact that the Anglo culture allows for exceptions to develop within itself which would eventually improve the system or carry its development to the next stage; but, in the case of the liberals, the exceptions have developed – having been tolerated by the culture – which then attempt to take over the whole system in order to undermine it. Dr G agreed. Dr G characterized: The conservatives have no problems with gay people, but have problems with "gay activism" (2:56:00). We were then leaving the restaurant on 3:02:00. Dr G would send me the draft of his new article on Aristotle's notion of justice. About his friend, Bill Cauley, a teacher of history. About his injuries. Journalism and education are not "real studies" (3:14:00). Dr G dropped me off at Portfolio on 3:26:00.

Dr G's view is essentially a mixture between paleoconservatism and traditional rightwing conceptions of the world. If you can understand his views, and carefully distinguish, in what he had expressed here, between what is true and what is false, then you can pretty much understand the Macrospherian – or specifically Higgins' team's – reform program, not just for the United States, but for the whole world – for, despite the offensiveness, and politically incorrectness, of his opinions, there is a lot of truth in what he has said. It's certainly true that free market, or prosperity in general, and "freedom", depend on a certain set of cultural values which cannot be violated in order to "bring good results". This is the question concerning the "limit of freedom". Not all free actions should be allowed in a free society, for certain free actions are detrimental to freedom, or "will bring bad results". But what do we mean by "good results"? Presumably, Higgins' team's definition of "good results" is the proper development of the original human potential. Since American culture, giving its people a (albeit illusory) sense of freedom, has caused the serious deterioration of brain functioning which you will see manifested in the following scandal, it is, in this sense, a case of "freedom" bringing "bad results": the serious deterioration of the most important human potential while inculcating a false sense of freedom, in the sense that people are being manipulated, and enslaved, without noticing it. As a liberal-hating conservative, Dr G of course blamed this "liberalism" – about whose detrimental effects he was quite correct – on outside forces, whereas the Macrospherian SWS simulation must have confirmed that this pernicious "political correct" culture is a development indigenous to the Anglophone, or Western, "bourgeois culture". Besides that, Dr G has grossly underestimated the negative impact of digital technology on the human brain. But since this "political correctness" or "liberalism" is eating human civilization alive – in that it in fact inverts the natural order of things which has developed in order to help human society thrive: and now this natural order is being inverted in order to hasten human society's death – Dr G's disdain for the left is half-justified and should be "half-adopted".

Since above, in IV, which also appears on my blog post for December 23, 2014, it is argued that the Macrospherians on the Russian side must be pushing for a genuine form of liberalism (the left) in Russia that is not pro-Western and which is not based on hypocrisy as it is in the US, it might be in order to expose here what exactly the “Macrospherian position” could be if these super geniuses are here to dismantle the left in the United States while advocating the left in Russia. You must be quite confused – unless they are here to advocate opposite things according to the differences in circumstances. This is presumably not the case, for there does seem to be *one* correct way for all cases. We must take our clues from what has been said in the very beginning, i.e. that the best *politea* is one which is some sort of hybrid between left and right, between progressivism and conservatism, and between liberalism and authoritarianism. In Appendix III it is argued that, for the case of modernization of Russia, the best *politea* is: “conservatism for the domestic, but liberalism for exterior presentation”. There, the *goal* aimed at in this arrangement is power – for, the best *politea* differs according to what you are trying to achieve, of course. Now here we should further elaborate on the proper arrangement between left and right when the goal is the proper development of the original human potential – *Higgins’ ultimate goal*: “authoritarianism from infancy to maturation, and liberalism for adulthood”. In other words, when the child is growing up, s/he must be properly taught what is good for the development of human potentials and what is detrimental, and this can only be done under an authoritarian educator *who does not permit you to think freely*, but only to think what is right. But, once the person has matured, then it’s time to let him/her go freely without censorship on his/her thoughts and with full liberty of expression. The lack of an authoritarian education when the child is young but the same liberalism all the way through is the reason why American people are becoming increasingly stupid and amoral – like “Monkeys”. Finally, to conclude the Macrospherian way, we must say that they are ultimately “revolutionaries” in Lenin’s sense: i.e. the emancipation of the masses from servitude can only be accomplished under the leadership of an altruistic genius, who is not average – but above average – and therefore not part of the masses.<sup>12</sup> People with average intelligence can only achieve average results at the very best – and usually worse than average results – and never good results. The Macrospherian slogan thus must be: “conservatism for the inside, liberalism for the outside; authoritarianism during childhood, liberalism during adulthood; and mass liberalism during adulthood only under the guidance of a small cadre of geniuses.”

The remainder of the discussion came out of my conversation with my best friend Wes (or Professor N) on July 5 2012. That day he noted three alternatives for the coming development of the United States as a nation: to make the US stronger, to make the US more ethical, and to make the US weaker. Obviously, it’s the first alternative which has so far caused our world – and Russia – so much problem and is destroying the planet right now. Is there a correlation between being strong and being ethical? Wes and I certainly disagreed on this point. Wes believed that only those who are good can be powerful at the same time, while I professed the more cynical view that evil people, and evil nations, can of course be powerful and dominate the whole world.

This point of contention is of paramount importance, since it has precise bearing on Russia’s program on soft-power construction and the Macrospherian reform program. Why was Wes professing to believe that only those that are good (“ethical”) can truly be powerful? Such

---

<sup>12</sup> For this, refer to Issac Deutscher’s three-volume classic on Trotsky, which I would be programmed to read next year.



optimistic statement is clearly falsified by any consideration of empirical reality and world history. Only if the world were really like that! Currently, the United States is the absolute “Great Satan”, and yet it is the most powerful. This common “optimistic” notion that only those states that are truly “good” can be powerful is a “traditional notion”, i.e. it is widely expressed in traditional cultures, as you see it expressed in Confucian writings or in the Old Testament (Tanakh). In the latter, the prophets (Isaiah or Ezekiel, for instance) continually attribute Israel’s and Judah’s weakness (being conquered by the Assyrians and then exiled by the Babylonians) to their disobedience to Yahweh’s order and adoption of common Mesopotamian deities. This is because Yahweh’s order is considered “good” whereas the other common deities around are considered “bad”. If you refuse to be good and want to be bad, then you’ll become weak and get swallowed up by your enemies. Why do people believe in such idealistic, or strangely optimistic, point of view? As if the forces of good would always by necessity triumph over the forces of evil. Clearly, the “good” in those ancient times is identified with “order”.<sup>13</sup> The Israelites have abandoned Yahweh’s order because it’s too austere a life and have adopted the Mesopotamian common deities because it’s all about indulgence in desires and selfishness. In the process, social order is weakened, and the state becomes unable to muster enough strength (through solidarity) to withstand enemy attacks. This is basically the substance of the “traditional view”.

While such viewpoint is generally correct at the time – more has to be said about the origin of such perception in order to completely clarify the matter – the transposition of such “traditionalist” notions to modern societies is certainly increasingly anachronistic. The advancement of technology and diversification and complexification of life in modern times have increasingly rendered obsolete such simplistic identification between “goodness” and “power”. While it will always be the case that a strong state is one which embodies a great degree of order – no state that is characterized by disorder, such as Mexico for its entire existence, Russia under the Yeltsin, or China during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, etc., can possibly be a strong state – it is increasingly untenable to identify “goodness” entirely with “order”. To understand the Macrospherian program, you must make further differentiations: power, goodness, order, and the development of human potential. All four are different things, and while a great degree of social order is a necessary condition for the power of the state, goodness and the development of human potential do not necessarily lead to a powerful state at all; if anything, under Pax Americana (i.e. under the current US-centered “world system”), these only lead to weakness. As will be noted in Appendix IV, it is far more efficient for becoming powerful to pretend to be good rather than to be really good; and, as my case shall demonstrate, being good actually weakens you and puts you in a disadvantage vis-à-vis the bad persons, for you are then more constrained in actions by moral scruples and are always on the defensive because you don’t bother to attack people first but only defend yourself and retaliate after the bad person has already attacked you. (This is clearly borne out in the story of the power struggle between Trotsky and Stalin which I would soon begin reading about in Issac Deutscher’s three-volume biography on Trotsky.) Those who are more developed in terms of human potential are also weaker and at a disadvantage vis-à-vis the under-developed persons who, because bad, attack first, and are more ferocious in attacking because they don’t spend their time doing anything else. This, again, my case will have demonstrated – and history is full of cases like that. The underdeveloped, and bad, persons – such as everybody in Kiersten’s Secret Society – attack

---

<sup>13</sup> The following account of the traditional identification between “order” and “goodness” is of course most clearly explored in Eric Voegelin’s *Order and History*.

first, are not constrained in actions by moral scruples, are technologically and numerically superior (since there are always more of them and they are as a rule backed up by the “system”, if only because we all live under a “criminal regime”: see below), and have far more free time to spend on attacking people, since they usually have no such goals or routines as are necessary for people who want to develop themselves. These considerations also apply to nations. As will be noted in Appendix IV, unless the world-system has fundamentally changed, the bad, hypocrite, and stupid parties will always be the ones on top and will eventually succeed in eliminating all goodness and human potential from this world.

The most important point here is that “order” can no longer be identified with “goodness” or the development of human potential – when the Israelite prophets admonished Israel and Judah, they were essentially basing themselves on the obviousness of such identification. The identification might be automatic in ancient times, when life was simple and social and material technology was backward, but it could no longer hold today. The United States is a very orderly society but this is a society where goodness is rapidly disappearing and human beings are more and more underdeveloped. It must be kept in mind that, in modern times, the orderly functioning of a society can be achieved by other means than being “good” and “wise”. The orderliness of the American society is maintained by technology, aggressive law enforcement, and the discipline of the population for robotic behavior. People no longer have to understand anything, certainly not any morals, in order to act in concert with the whole; they can simply be made into robots. We have seen this not just with the United States; Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan – in both of which a great degree of order was found to enable the central authority to muster the maximal degree of power against external enemies – work according to the same principle.

Now this issue is of paramount importance for any program to build up Russia’s soft-power because any advice for Russia to be “good” or to develop its citizens’ human potential risks harming Russia unless the world-system has been fundamentally changed. In this American-dominated world, sadly, the most important thing is obviously power – you simply can’t get anywhere in the world unless your fist is large enough to withstand American aggression. Since the necessary condition for power is “order”, which is nowadays something entirely different from goodness, ethics, morality, or anything like that, your obvious advice for the Russian authority is to instruct the Russian people to become a more orderly crowd – in which domain, too, the Russians lag behind all Western nations by a huge margin. Everyone is aware of how easy it is to bribe police officers in Russia and how hard it is to do so in the United States: corruption is a sign of “disorder”, not just “lack of goodness”. Of course the Russian government has been very aware of this, hence Medvedev’s effort to make Russia also a “nation of laws” – i.e. to further mechanize the state’s functioning to ensure orderliness (which is usually identified as “eradication of corruption”). In other words, whether Russia’s soft-power development should be substantive nor simply “good presentation” is a question that will depend on the result of an empirical investigation concerning whether, in the new environment of the world-system, real goodness will strengthen the state or rather weaken it, and what relationship will still hold between the order of society and the intellectual and moral development of its citizens.

As is noted, one needs to understand how such perception of a correlation between power and goodness could have arisen in ancient times at all in order to fully comprehend the present issue. In the case of the ancient Israel, the admonishment based on the attribution of the nation’s

weakness to disobedience to Yahweh's order (which encompasses the meaning of "moral corruption") occurs mostly with the prophets of the second period, around 8<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> century BC, when society everywhere in the Mesopotamian region was undergoing significant urbanization and centralization of state bureaucracy – due to the intensification of trade and further consolidation of nationhood away from tribal organization.<sup>14</sup> This was simply a natural stage in the evolution of any society. As more wealth was generated through intensification of trade, disparity between the rich and the poor became more pronounced, and people were becoming more greedy and materialistic, which had thus caused the prophetic souls to perceive a disintegration of social order – because people were becoming more selfish.<sup>15</sup> The prophets couldn't simply express their perception in purely empirical terms ("You are becoming more greedy and selfish"), but must frame it in religious terms ("You are diverging from Yahweh and moving toward idolatry") because living for the sake of the community rather than for the sake of the self was the original spirit of the commandments which Moses had supposedly passed down. Again, this sort of admonishment makes sense under conditions in ancient times, but not much sense in modern times. Religious fundamentalists, whether in the Islamic world or in the United States, are essentially perceiving their surroundings in the same way as did the ancient Israelite prophets. They perceive the increasing economic transactions and diversification of viewpoints as a form of "disorder" (synonymous with disobedience to God) – since people are becoming more selfish and can hardly agree with each other on anything or act in concert on any issue – and will attribute the society's, or nation's, failure, when it occurs, to such "disorder". In their view, the nation can only stand up to external pressure and outlive internal discords if order ("goodness") is restored through the return of the lost religion in full force. However, we have seen that, in the case of Iran, when Khomeini restored social order (in the form of Shiite Islam) to Iran, the nation was actually significantly weakened. This clearly demonstrates that "order" is no longer synonymous with "goodness". In the past, if society is in disarray (when people are "selfish" and don't care about the whole), the nation will become weakened; this is because the "power of the state" at the time still resides mostly in the strength of human muscle. In today's world, however, power is no longer maintained by such simple things: hard power resides in the machineries which engineers have designed and industrial complexes have built, and soft power in the ability of a "brand name" (a way of life and mentality) to persuade outsiders. In this way, being "good" and "wise" alone can no longer keep you strong. If anything, it just wastes your time and energy. Only technology and "presentation" matter in the domain of power-struggle. The Iranian revolution has produced a weakened state because all the "orderly people" – as one should certainly refrain from calling religious fundamentalists "good" – are unskilled in technology and failing socialites. The dissociation between "order" and "goodness" is the very

---

<sup>14</sup> Carol Meyers divided the prophets into three periods: (1) before the 8<sup>th</sup> century BC, when they advised the royal power. (2) "Prophets of the 8<sup>th</sup> century (Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah) interpreted international affairs, critiqued complacent religious practices, and condemned the abuse of social justice that accompanied the increasing urbanization and centralization of state power characteristic of the 8<sup>th</sup> century". And (3) during the Babylonian crisis. *The Jewish Study Bible*, ed. Aelee Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler, with Michael Fishbane, 2004, p. 459.

<sup>15</sup> E.g. Ezekiel, 22: 9 -12: "Base men in your midst were intent on shedding blood; in you they have eaten upon the mountains, and they have practiced depravity in their midst. In you they have uncovered their father's nakedness; in you they have ravished women during their impurity. They have committed abhorrent acts with other men's wives; in their depravity they have defiled their own daughters-in-law; in you they have ravished their own sisters, daughters of their fathers. They have taken bribes within you to shed blood. You have taken advance and accrued interest, you have defrauded your countrymen to your profit. You have forgotten Me – declares the Lord God." Admonishments like this one of course abound among the Prophets.

basis of American power: the American way teaches you to indulge in your selfish desires, in which way it attracts people away from the austerity of communism (which expects the common people to live like saints); but it then maintains social order and harmony through aggressive law enforcement, in which way it forces people to harm others only through the justice system. This has made the American system into a “criminal state” – people have learned to use the justice system (law enforcement and courts of laws) to legally commit crimes against each other – but it continues to function beautifully (remain powerful) because it is an “open system” (thanks to its “attraction”). You should notice that the need for human intelligence to build the machineries which make a state powerful is on the decrease nowadays because more and more of the machineries are being built by other machineries which have already been built by forerunners: nevertheless, some sort of human intelligence, and hence human potential, is still needed. In this regard, as long as the “criminal regime” – in which all human potentials have shrunk to the criminal mind concerned only with the gratification of base desires – is an “open system”, whatever human potential is necessarily wasted under such regime is immediately replenished, until the coming of the “last day.”

You might, in fact, consider Machiavelli’s *Prince* as the definitive point in time when it has been recognized by the managerial mind in the state apparatus that wisdom and morals have at last become completely dissociated from “order”, rendering all the advices of the wise men to the kings in the past entirely obsolete. Hence the wise men now advise the Prince that it’s wiser to be a hypocrite – for, unless your fist is large enough, you can’t survive, and why bother to develop yourself if you can’t survive? The United States is the culmination of the Machiavellian era.

## VII

A short blog post I made in February 2015 however must be included at the end – because, well, you’ll see why.

### **The formation of the Russian “New Left” and the European “New Left”?**

I have begun to worry about the apparent incompatibility between Russian government’s official policy of alliance with European rightwing groups and my program for Russia’s development of soft-power. See this speech by Marine Le Pen, one among Europe’s growing number of rightwing ideologues who are pro-Russia. How to square my program for Russia’s development of soft-power (which depends on an indigenous development of the Left in Russia) with Russia’s alliance with European rightwing groups? The only solution is to make the Russian Left absorb certain rightwing conceptions, so that Russia can be liberalized while maintaining an alliance with European rightwing groups at the same time. This will be Russia’s “New Left”.

History is filled with instances where the Left, upon development, begins to acquire what are traditionally rightwing agendas. American and European left’s frequent anti-Israel stance is an example. How has this occurred? The Left is defined by a desire to help the weak (the “oppressed”). When what is traditionally the “weak” has become the “strong” (such as Israel vis-à-vis Palestine), then the Left will change sides. Then our example. The Left is usually pro-women, pro-feminist, since women are traditionally the “weak” or the “oppressed”. But when the “liberation of the oppressed” turns out to further the global agendas of the powerful

(multinational corporations and globalization), we the Left then become anti-feminist.

The European right is defined by: (1) anti-EU; (2) anti-American (hence pro-Russian); (3) anti-immigration (“anti-Islamicization”). Thus you can see that the European right’s central concern is with traditional national identity. Anything which weakens it they are against. Can the Russian New Left (to be developed) be anti-EU, anti-American, and anti-immigration? They can be anti-EU and anti-American since they are against “imperialism”, hence against the monstrous EU and powerful America. But can they be anti-immigration to Europe? If Europe’s open immigration policy (a leftist policy) can be exposed as a clandestine way to further the interests of some powerful multinationals (even the Bilderbergers), then the Russian New Left can absorb an anti-immigration stance in the case of Europe (although not in Russia itself), and achieve congruence with the European far-right. This is “congruence by a different route” – since the European far right and Russian New Left will have agreed on something but for different reasons. In fact, if such exposure occurs, even the European Left will become anti-immigration themselves (given that anti-immigration policy doesn’t mean discrimination against the immigrants who are already in Europe). Then, there will be a “European New Left” as well.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> We should be very happy to discover, and read, Marine Le Pen’s latest work, *Pour que vive la France* (2012), in which she launches her most intelligent criticism of the builders of the European Union who comprehend, nowadays, both the left (Parti socialist) and the right (UMP) in France. To summarize her argument: the American elites have invented this “globalization” to enrich themselves, the very rich, at the expense of the middle class and below. They have converted both the right and the left in Europe to their project of globalization, for which the project of the European Union is but a surest means. Globalization does not simply mean the impoverishment of the middle class (and below) to enrich the very rich, but also the destruction of traditional nationhood, national identity, since, to enrich the very rich, the sources of all products and services, all peoples have to be “standardized” into consumers without national and historical identity in order to more efficiently consume up the products and services that are marketed to them. This is one of the objectives of the European Union, the “United States of Europe”, where the difference between the French and the Germans shall all disappear and where there will only be “Europeans” and, eventually, “global citizens”. Marine Le Pen is thus arguing in a vein very similar to my Thermodynamic Interpretation of History: that “political correctness” is really invented, not to enlighten us about tolerance of otherness, but to increase of the profit of the very rich under the disguise of teaching us about tolerance of otherness. In this respect, Le Pen’s whole section on immigration – which she thus also sees, correctly, as at bottom a mechanism by which the big corporations might increase their profits at the expense of the common people – should be cited in full (L’immigration, offensive économique et culturelle du mondialisme: emphasis added): “L’immigration est un point fondamental de convergence entre les gouvernements successifs depuis des lustres. On estime que ces trente dernières années, dix millions d’immigrés sont entrés dans notre pays. Au-delà des discours plus ou moins fermes selon les périodes, les grands équilibres de cette politique sont toujours les mêmes : accueil de nombreux immigrés (quatre-vingt-dix-sept mille par an selon l’INSEE en 2000, sous Lionel Jospin, et cent trente-cinq mille en 2005, alors que Nicolas Sarkozy était place Beauvau ; plus de deux cent mille aujourd’hui), cent mille à cent cinquante mille naturalisations chaque année selon l’INSEE toujours, sans compter les régularisations effectuées massivement au cas par cas. Quand Lionel Jospin reconduit à la frontière une vingtaine d’Afghans dans leur pays en 2001, personne n’en parle. Quand Éric Besson ou Claude Guéant font la même chose avec neuf ou dix personnes, ils prennent soin de bénéficier d’une très large couverture médiatique. Mais derrière l’esbroufe électoraliste, la réalité est exactement la même. Alors pourquoi l’immigration de masse dans notre pays depuis trente ans ? Qu’est-ce qui justifie qu’un pays accablé de dettes et confronté à un chômage endémique ouvre à ce point ses frontières, et persiste même en période de crise ? On ne peut le comprendre si on ignore que l’immigration est d’abord une arme économique, au service du grand patronat. On se souvient des confessions du président Pompidou, qui reconnaissait avoir engagé la France dans une politique très large d’accueil des immigrés sous la pression des grands patrons, désireux de pouvoir bénéficier d’une main-d’œuvre docile et bon marché. L’industrie était à l’époque la seule concernée, mis ce sont aujourd’hui l’ensemble des secteurs de notre économie qui doivent faire face à cette concurrence venue de l’extérieur. L’immigration, régulière ou pas, a pour principal objectif de faire pression à la baisse sur les salaires. C’est en cela qu’elle sert le projet mondialiste dans son volet économique et

---

social. Ce qui peut être délocalisé l'est progressivement, grâce à l'ouverture des frontières, ce qui ne peut techniquement pas l'être, comme la restauration ou le BTP, est soumis à l'immigration massive, sorte de « délocalisation domestique » : ce n'est pas l'usine ou le chantier qui se déplace vers le travailleur étranger à bas coûts, mais cet étranger qu'on fait venir en France, pour concurrencer le travailleur français et maintenir bas les salaires. Certains répondent que l'immigration permet de fournir de la main-d'oeuvre aux secteurs peu attractifs qui en manquent, comme le bâtiment par exemple. Ce raisonnement est à courte vue. Il néglige en effet la raison fondamentale pour laquelle les métiers manuels attirent peu : la faiblesse des salaires qu'ils proposent. C'est parce qu'il y a cette réserve de l'immigration que le patronat n'est pas obligé de les revaloriser. Destinée d'abord à limiter les hausses de salaires et les revendications sociales des ouvriers européens, l'importation de centaines de milliers de travailleurs sous-qualifiés et souspayés s'est progressivement transformée, par le biais du regroupement familial, voulu conjointement par la gauche et par la droite, en une immigration de peuplement. Cette politique traduit la volonté clairement exprimée par les dirigeants européens de combler un déficit de population qu'ils estiment en Europe à 56 millions d'habitants d'ici 2050. Je rappelle pour mémoire que les « experts économiques », dès les années soixante-dix, considéraient qu'une des raisons de la crise économique d'alors était notre démographie « trop dynamique » et que le chômage résultait de l'importance des générations issues du baby-boom de l'après-guerre et qui arrivaient alors sur le marché du travail. Arguments d'ailleurs repris récemment par le ministre Frédéric Lefebvre qui a expliqué les difficultés du gouvernement à faire baisser le chômage par « notre taux de natalité beaucoup plus important que d'autre pays ». Très rapidement d'ailleurs, conformément à cette analyse, la politique familiale se dégradait avec une baisse constante des allocations familiales (désindexées de l'inflation depuis cette année) et une volonté farouche de favoriser le travail féminin sans pour autant l'organiser, pour permettre les possibilités de concilier travail et désir d'enfant. Là encore, les contradictions du système se manifestent clairement. Comment concilier l'affirmation que nous nous étions trop nombreux pour les postes à occuper avec l'importation massive de travailleurs immigrés, très rapidement assortie de l'arrivée de leurs familles ? Ces contradictions ne sont qu'apparentes et là aussi elles ne sont que la suite logique de choix politiques et économiques et non pas le fait d'une fatalité historique. Cette immigration, qui va permettre à la fois la maîtrise des salaires et le contrôle des revendications sociales dans notre pays, a été voulue pour permettre de restaurer le taux de profit qui avait baissé en Europe depuis la fin de la Seconde Guerre mondiale. C'est clairement la réponse des financiers, des actionnaires et des banquiers à l'ensemble des concessions qu'ils avaient dû faire sur la base du programme du Conseil national de la Résistance et qui, je le rappelle, avait permis les Trente Glorieuses et l'immense progrès économique et social qui en découla. À cet instant de mon propos je ne résiste pas au plaisir de vous livrer les analyses et les démonstrations de l'extrême gauche la plus radicale, la vraie, pas celle des bobos de Jean-Luc Mélenchon ou des jeunes bourgeois du NPA, fascinés par le lointain souvenir de cette espérance qui se leva à l'Est mais déboucha sur le totalitarisme. Non je parle de ceux qui s'arc-boutent encore dans cette défense intransigeante des intérêts des classes populaires et ne les ont pas abandonnés – comme le recommande Terra Nova, la boîte à idées du Parti socialiste sponsorisée par Areva, Total et Microsoft. Ces forces politiques-là, même si elles se trompent sur les solutions, partagent avec nous beaucoup d'analyses et auront comme beaucoup d'autres, leur place dans ce grand mouvement d'unité nationale que j'appelle de tous mes vœux. Dès que l'on a décrypté leur jargon parfois obscur et qu'on a surmonté les inévitables hystéries anti-américaines et anti-sionistes, voire le traditionnel antisémitisme économique de la gauche et de l'ultra gauche, on trouve les mêmes fondements d'une opposition sociale à l'immigration. Dans Critique de la société de l'indistinction (sous-titrée « Commentaires sur le fétichisme marchand et la dictature démocratique de son spectacle ») aux Éditions Révolution sociale, on peut lire : « Les trosko-altermondialistes, en tant qu'adeptes forcenés de la vénération des “sans-papiers” composent l'avant-garde de la mondialisation marchande en ce sens qu'ils sont les fourriers hystériques du processus par lequel – à partir d'une inepte fabulation, déguisée de trompeurs “bons sentiments” indistincts – la classe capitaliste pose et impose sa logique de transfert et de substitution de populations de façon que le vieux salariat européen critique soit remplacé par un peuplement allogène et historiquement immature dont le seul horizon sera la boulimie marchande... On comprend dès lors que le patronat et l'État aient systématiquement décidé pour les années qui suivirent d'importer du salariat paisible et crédule d'outre Méditerranée pour faire notamment tourner tranquillement les usines automobiles [...] ». Tout est dit ici sur cette volonté de détruire les obstacles à la marchandisation effrénée : *l'immigration n'est pas autre chose que le point ultime du libre-échange généralisé qui, après les produits, s'applique maintenant aux Hommes dans une sorte d'esclavage consenti*. Nos « républicains » de droite et de gauche ne sont en réalité que de purs esclavagistes qui, plus malin que les négriers d'hier, non seulement échappent, eux, aux condamnations morales, mais s'offrent même le luxe de se draper dans la dignité, tout en faisant payer le voyage à ceux qu'ils exploitent aujourd'hui. *Mais l'immigration est également une arme au service du mondialisme d'un autre point de vue, identitaire*. En imposant aux Français le multiculturalisme, fruit de l'immigration de masse, on les a progressivement coupés de leur culture,

But this means that the chosen leaders of Russian liberals (like Igor Yurgens) will have to officially announce that they agree with a “thermodynamic interpretation of world history”.

## VIII

As Russia is currently seeking to become the embodiment of conservative ideas in

---

cherchant à affaiblir la conscience nationale, rempart à l'édification du « village global ». L'arrivée de millions d'immigrés en quelques décennies, une première dans notre Histoire, secoue bien sûr un peuple dans ses profondeurs, et crée un malaise naturel. Elle affaiblit les anciennes solidarités et rend plus perméable le corps social au discours mondialiste. L'immigration a facilité le travail de déracinement des Français, sommés de se réjouir de cette nouvelle société, aux couleurs Benetton. Le métissage, qui devrait relever d'un choix personnel tout à fait privé, a été institutionnalisé, au point que le président de la République s'y soit déclaré favorable dans une tribune parue en 2009 dans *Le Monde*, comme s'il s'agissait d'une doctrine politique ! Le flux jamais tari de l'immigration alimente enfin le communautarisme qui, outre qu'il rompt l'égalité républicaine et alimente la guerre de tous contre tous, vise à briser l'identité collective de la nation. Le culte de l'immigration de masse, qui sert donc les intérêts bien compris de l'hypercapitalisme transnational, a été facilité par l'engagement à son service d'associations prétendument antiracistes, comme SOS Racisme, le MRAP ou la LICRA, cautions morales d'une politique difficilement vendable à l'opinion. Le système a trouvé cette géniale astuce de faire porter par la gauche moralisatrice et internationaliste une cause au bénéfice des puissants. Julien Dray, éminente figure du mouvement antiraciste au sein du PS, voilà qui vaut bien plus que toutes les collections de montres de luxe... Jamais ces associations n'ont dénoncé un seul acte de racisme anti-blanc, alors qu'ils sont monnaie courante désormais dans nos bus de banlieues. Elles n'ont eu de cesse de stigmatiser les discours politiques de remise en cause de l'immigration massive, les assimilant à du racisme. Ces éléments démontrent que ces associations, très liées à des partis politiques en place, remplissent une mission qui dépasse très largement leur objet social officiel. Pour conclure sur ce sujet, je crois, n'en déplaise à nos moralistes de pacotille, m'inscrire bien plus dans la postérité de Victor Schoelcher que les adorateurs des « sans-papiers ». J'ose dire que la défense de l'immigration n'est que le masque hideux de l'esclavage moderne, de l'exploitation la plus éhontée des peuples, qu'on oppose les uns aux autres dans la confrontation d'une misère qu'on importe avec une pauvreté que l'on s'acharne à créer. La conscience de chacun devrait être heurtée doublement : d'abord par le spectacle insupportable de familles déracinées abandonnant leur pays pour un eldorado qui n'existe plus aujourd'hui ; ensuite par le constat que cette concurrence de misères permet d'abord de peser à la baisse sur les salaires des travailleurs de notre pays, ce qui permet de maintenir le taux de profit des grandes entreprises multinationales. La politique de nos gouvernants ne semble en réalité plus que se limiter à organiser un lent démantèlement de l'État-providence, et à remettre en cause tout notre système de protection sociale. Mais cela permet aussi d'arracher des élites formées aux pays de départ de l'immigration, assurant ainsi le ralentissement de leur développement et le maintien de leur statut de fournisseur de « l'armée de réserve du capital ». Si l'on rajoute à cela que ce départ de populations formées favorise le maintien de dictateurs qui retardent l'émergence de sociétés démocratiques et livrent, moyennant finances, leurs richesses naturelles aux multinationales, la boucle est bouclée. Défendre l'immigration, c'est en réalité faire partager le maigre niveau de vie de nos concitoyens les plus démunis avec de plus pauvres qu'eux, dans une spirale baissière dont on ne voit pas aujourd'hui le fond. Car nos élites elles, en général, ne vivent pas dans les HLM, ne bénéficient pas des aides sociales, et ne sont donc pas en concurrence avec les populations immigrées. Là encore, qui parmi les hautes consciences morales de notre République, qui parmi les soutiens des manifestations des « sans-papiers » (appellation commode de personnes rentrés sans visa sur le territoire national, donc en contravention avec la loi, je le rappelle), qui parmi les contempteurs du Front national, qui parmi les juges qui apprécient avec un trébuchet la qualité républicaine ou non de mes propos, qui ose proposer un véritable pacte de co-développement avec les pays émergents comme le fait le Front national depuis longtemps déjà ? En effet, pour lutter contre cette immigration déferlante, il faut certes mettre fin aux pompes aspirantes sociales qui l'encouragent, mais aussi en tarir la source. Faire l'inverse de Nicolas Sarkozy, le champion de l'immigration. Enfoncer cette porte ouverte, sur ce sujet comme sur d'autres, est rendu chaque jour plus nécessaire, tant la politique menée par nos élites ne consiste plus qu'en de pitoyables sparadraps, appliqués comme des cache-misère, chaque fois qu'un problème surgit.” Insofar as Le Pen is anti-immigration on the ground of anti-hypercapitalism (globalization), you can't see why it should not also be the stance of a New European Left – and certainly of the Russian Left.

order to pose itself as an alternative to Western models, my suggestion of “liberalization” (albeit an uncommon form) must sound totally odd to anybody among the mainstream in the Russian government. This is because, as I have noted in the following (derived from a blog post of mine from 19 February 2015), “liberalization” is at bottom an offensive strategy which is thus at odds with Russia’s perennial defensive posture.

### **Problems with the previously laid out program for the development of Russia’s soft power**

My concern with (1) the possibility that the Russian government might find the preceding idea for Russia’s development of soft-power “stupid” because it contradicts Russia’s current policy of “turning right”, not just for the sake of an alliance with the European far-right but also for the sake of an intensification of “patriotic education” at home; and (2) the difficulty that, even after the idea is fixed, Russia really doesn’t have the sort of hard power that is a match for a soft-power development program based on universalist pretensions.

In this connection, consider the latest military doctrine adopted in December last year (Margaret Klein, “Russlands neue Militärdoktrin”: [http://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/aktuell/2015A12\\_kle.pdf](http://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/aktuell/2015A12_kle.pdf)):

Das entscheidende Neue an der Militär-doktrin besteht aber in der engen Verknüpfung außen- und innenpolitischer Risiken und der starken Betonung Letzterer. Dabei stehen zwei Szenarien im Vordergrund. Erstens, dass ethnische und religiöse Konflikte eskalieren und den inneren Zusammenhalt des Vielvölkerreichs untergraben könnten. Derartige Spannungen machen sich in islamistischen Tendenzen im Nordkaukasus, aber auch im Anwachsen eines russischen Nationalismus bemerkbar.

Den breitesten Raum nimmt jedoch das zweite Szenario ein: ein »gewaltsamer Sturz der verfassungsmäßigen Ordnung«. Die Militärdoktrin offenbart, wie sehr Moskaus Führung um die Stabilität ihrer Herrschaft fürchtet und wie verwundbar sie sich gegenüber gesellschaftlichem Protest fühlt. Die Legitimität des Systems Putin beruhte bislang vor allem auf wirtschaftlichem Erfolg. Dieser ist aber nun durch die Auswirkungen der westlichen Sanktionen und den niedrigen Ölpreis gefährdet. Besonderes Augenmerk richtet die russische Führung dabei auf »Aktivitäten zur informations-technischen Beeinflussung der Bevölkerung, vor allem junger Bürger«, womit die Gefahren gemeint sind, die in ihren Augen von neuen Medien und sozialen Netzwerken ausgehen.

(Note that, while the Russian government’s concern with social networking sites originates from Western powers’ successful use of these as the basis for color revolution operations, the advertisement of my own stalking scandal can considerably discredit the good reputation which common people have attributed to this online phenomenon.) In Russia’s new military doctrine, the Russian government has also made it clear that it shall make an intense effort to imitate the strategy of the West vis-à-vis Russia since the end of the Cold War, i.e. to rely more on covert operations in the socio-economic domain (“color revolutions”) and guerrilla proxies than on



regular military units during confrontation with competitor nation-states (obviously in order to avoid the risk of escalation to nuclear warfare). My idea for the development of a New Left in Russia and Europe fits, again, perfectly with Russia's new focus (called "non-linear warfare").

Zwar taucht der Begriff »nicht-lineare Kriegsführung« nirgends in der Militärdoktrin auf. Was die russische Führung darunter versteht, hat Gerasimov aber bereits im Februar 2013 ausgeführt. Im 21. Jahrhundert, so der Generalstabschef, verschwimme die Grenze zwischen Krieg und Frieden, da Kriege nicht mehr formell zwischen Staaten erklärt werden. Dementsprechend veränderten sich die Spielregeln des Krieges. Dazu gehört, wie es in der Doktrin heißt, die »komplexe Anwendung militärischer Gewalt sowie politischer, wirtschaftlicher, informationstechnischer und anderer nicht-militärischer Mittel«. Ergänzt wird dieser Ansatz durch »indirekte und asymmetrische Einsatzformen«, das heißt durch den Einsatz von Spezialkräften, irregulär bewaffneten Gruppen und privaten Militärunternehmen. Auf diese Weise lässt sich eine offene militärische Intervention verschleiern. Demselben Ziel dient die »Ausnutzung des Protestpotentials der Bevölkerung« oder »extern gesteuerter politischer Kräfte und gesellschaftlicher Bewegungen«.

One might also want to consider Klein's other piece, "Russia: A Euro-Pacific Power?" (September 2014: [http://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/research\\_papers/2014\\_RP08\\_kle.pdf](http://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/research_papers/2014_RP08_kle.pdf)) Note especially the discussion about Putin's Korea policy. Toward the end, Klein concludes:

### **Russia's Weak "Soft Power"**

In order to be recognized as a great power in East Asia, Russia must develop "soft power" as well as "hard power". Here it continues to exhibit great deficits. Russia's economic, political and social trajectory since the end of the Cold War exercises no attraction for other countries in the region. Instead it is China that is becoming the alternative to the Western model. *President Putin may be attempting especially hard in his third term to push Russia as the conservative alternative to the liberal democracies of Europe and the United States*, and seeking to present it on the international stage as a defender of traditional principles of international law against Washington's supposedly aggressive unilateral interventionism. But considerable doubts remain as to whether these methods can actually expand Russia's "soft power" in East Asia. The Ukraine crisis demonstrated that Russia will also violate central principles of international law, such as non-use of force, non-intervention in the internal affairs of other states, and territorial integrity. Here Russia revealed that it follows the logic of power rather than the framework of norms. Additionally, Putin's conservative political ideology lacks any attractive economic component. Moreover Russia, although geographically Eurasian, is perceived culturally as clearly belonging to Europe rather than East Asia, and none of Moscow's attempts to strengthen cultural exchange with East Asia can alter its image as a "distant neighbor". Numerous events have been staged, for example the 2009 Year of the Russian Language in China or the Russian Cultural

Festival held annually in Japan since 2006. In the sphere of education, student exchanges have been especially encouraged. China and Vietnam are the two biggest countries of origin, with about 20,000 Chinese and 6,000 Vietnamese studying at Russian universities in 2013. Beyond that Russia has upgraded its university infrastructure in its Far East, for example by expanding the Far Eastern Federal University in Vladivostok. But Russia still comes far down the list of East Asian students' preferences. By comparison there were 194,000 Chinese and 15,500 Vietnamese studying in the United States in 2012. Apart from student exchanges and tourism, societal ties between Russia and the East Asian countries tend to be weak. This also affects political relations. Above all at the middle level there is a lack of individuals with knowledge of the languages and cultures. This applies to Japan and South Korea, which cannot draw on contacts from the Cold War era, but equally to China and Vietnam, which always maintained close relations with Moscow, also in the field of education. Even in the 1990s many senior positions in China and Vietnam were still occupied by politicians and economists trained in the Soviet Union. Those connections are now becoming increasingly rare.

The program that has been laid down on this blog can clearly remedy this dismal situation (associated with Russia's "right turn") under a certain conditions: if American culture is discredited through some catastrophic event – like a huge scandal – and if the National Front comes to power in France to cause the entire re-alignment of the geopolitical situation in Europe. (Le Pen's pro-Russia and anti-American foreign policy goals.)

For most people who understand the matter, I must appear to be speaking of a parallel reality. *The current dilemma arises because "liberalization" to achieve soft-power is essentially an offensive strategy, which Russia at the present juncture cannot possibly afford because it is right now entirely stuck in a defensive posture.* Conservatism and ultra-nationalism are the only possible responses given its current defensive position and weakness. And yet, anybody who understands how soft-power works, why Russia has failed and the United States has succeeded, will see that "liberalization" is really the only workable long term strategy for Russia. There will never be attraction in conservatism and nationalism for the majority of foreigners. Russia must liberalize if it wishes to gain favor and admiration from outsiders beyond the realm of "reactionaries" – reactionaries either on the left like peasant revolutionaries in Bolivia or on the right like Front national in France. As it is, Russia has only appeals for "reactionaries" because these people – they like Russia purely because they hate their current American overlords, not because there is anything inherently likable about Russia.

### **Other postings:**

This one, humorous, came from a blog post of mine in November, 2014:

On 5 November I came up with the strange notion that the Russians have lost the Cold War because they didn't have a hippie movement in the 1960s, that the United States has won the Cold War because it did have a hippie movement in the 1960s, and that it is the hippie movement which has largely changed the dominant group's attitude toward minorities. It sounds almost

absurd, but that's because the matter was expressed in an overly simplified manner.

Actually, the cause of Russia's loss of Cold War: not just that Russia has missed out on the hippie movement, but that it has missed out on the entire "cultural revolution" which was sweeping through the West, or the United States, during the 1960s, from the civil rights movement through protest movements to the hippie movement. If Russia had gone through similar cultural transformation, it wouldn't have the problem today that virtually all former Soviet states around the Russian Federation are anti-Russian. We say that such cultural transformation would have changed the Russian people's attitudes toward non-Russian ethnicities in the USSR.

You might object that we are contradicting ourselves – for "political correctness" in North America today is the direct result of the cultural revolution of the 1960s, and we have been emphasizing how deadly this "political correctness" is to all Anglophone societies: it's the mechanism of so much waste. Are we here advocating that Russia also transforms itself to a brainless consumerist wasteland in order to win the hearts of Ukrainians and Baltic peoples and Central Asians, etc.?

Our answer is that anything must be viewed in terms of "life cycle": a cultural movement might produce positive results in the beginning but might very well become deadly toward the end. We have mentioned "revolt against authority" as being the very essence of Western civilization, and we have noted that, during the first half of the process, such "revolt" has produced splendid results – Britain, France, Germany, and, later, United States, were the strongest nation-states coming out of such process during the age of Western imperialism, from 1500 to 1939. But we then note that, during the latter half of the process, such "revolt" is about to lead to the death of these Western nation-states: the decline of the quality of the population leading to import from foreign lands as being the only way to maintain their former power. You can clearly notice the "life-cycle" phenomenon in "political correctness": in the beginning, people say: "We shall not discriminate people because they have darker skin", thus removing the barrier to geniuses from India participating in our high tech industry. During the end of the process, people say: "We shall not discriminate people because they have darker skin", thus allowing hordes of unintelligent people from run-down societies coming into our society to become parasites. This is how an ideology which, in the beginning, has led to splendid results, has, during the end of the process, shall lead to deadly results. The trick which the Russians must learn when implementing a "cultural revolution" in the style of that which has swept across North America in the 1960s thus consist in this: carefully diagnosing the element which dominates in the beginning of the movement but wanes during the end of the movement and making sure it will dominate in the end as well, and carefully diagnosing the element which is dormant in the beginning of the movement but becomes dominant during the end of the movement and making sure it will remain dormant in the end as well: e.g. the ideology of "merits" in the former and the ideology of "equality" in the latter.

#### **A final note**

We must emphasize that we are speaking as a Machiavelli, and not as an ethicist. We are not here to debate what is "social justice", but about "how to win a struggle". "Social justice" is another

topic for another time.

We are aware that our suggestion (the liberalization of Russia) is fundamentally at odds with Kremlin's current position, which is to build up Russia as a fundamentally conservative culture:

Although the geography of Russia as a civilization remains imprecise, the contents of this civilization are clearly rooted in conservative values. The frequency of the term "morality" (*nравственность*) and of the adjective "spiritual" (*духовный*) in Putin's speeches has increased in recent years, especially since his return to the presidency in 2012. The Kremlin understands morality as respect for "traditional" values: the heterosexual family (non-recognition of LGBT rights); an emphasis on having children as a basis for individual life but also for the country's demographic health; the fight against alcoholism; and respect for the elderly and for hierarchy. This has been put into practice in a series of new laws, or draft laws, since 2012, including the law against so-called gay propaganda, the anti-blasphemy law in response to the Pussy Riot trial, the Internet restriction bill in the name of child protection, the ban on obscene language in movies, books, and music, and others. In addition, there have been new state policies granting financial benefits to families with two or more children, new draft laws to limit abortion, and numerous PR campaigns to promote healthier lifestyles.<sup>17</sup>

Although we have consistently argued that our liberalization is a hybrid *mélange* with certain authoritarian values, these authoritarian values are not the shallow "conservative values" which Kremlin is advocating in the above. "Respect for authority" (because the authority knows better) is not the same as "suppression of homosexuality". We are thus advising the Kremlin to fundamentally change its way, reforming its liberals instead of developing its conservatives.

## **APPENDIX I**

Since the reconstruction of Russia's soft-power shall depend intimately on the destruction of America's soft-power (the exposure of the poisonousness and hypocrisy in American values) we shall also include the following short essay (January 2015) on the relevance of German Romanticism to the current examination of the corruption of American values and systems. Our point of view is that United States has started out with genuine good values (the Founding Fathers' Constitution) but is now completely corrupted in accordance with the natural life-cycle of any system whatsoever.

Note again that the following discussion is localized in a hypothetical scenario of "UN Study Group" and the associated negotiation and confrontation between "Madam Higgins" and CIA's "Invisible Hand". This will not be intelligible to you unless you are familiar with the stories contained in "The Secret History". You shall therefore not pay attention to it, for now.

### **The Macrospherian project for the restoration of democracy**

---

<sup>17</sup> Laruelle, *ibid.*

## And the revival of German Romanticism in scholarship

The particular evolutionary approach to the study of all forms of human collectivity (“supraorganism” in the terminology of the thermodynamic interpretation of history) which was especially influenced by German Romanticism – so much in vogue from 1750 onwards until 1933 among the Germans and but which, along with the rest of the Grand Narratives, has after the Second World War been purged from Western academia – must be something which the Macrospherian Study Group has wished to revive in the academic and scholarly community. This is because the sort of world-view that the larger entities created by human beings may themselves exhibit the sort of life-cycle which characterizes the organisms who have created them – such world-view would be necessary to understanding the ills of the post-modern societies and therefore to comprehending the essence of the reform programs that are being called for to save human civilization. Again, the trick of the matter – to see that what is commonly thought to be good is actually very bad – can best be performed only when it is clearly understood that what in the beginning might be producing good results might toward the end of the process produce very bad results. For instance, political correctness, democracy, etc.

By “German Romanticism” is meant that approach first hinted in the views of Goethe, then the particular evolutionary approach seen in the works of Herder, Hegel, Humboldt, and others in minor domains (Auguste Schleicher in historical linguistics, Ernest Haeckel in evolutionary biology, Oswald Spengler in world history, Julius Wellhausen in Biblical studies, etc.). For example, Wellhausen in his *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*:

“[Wellhausen] followed an evolutionary model, arguing that the religion of Israel had developed in three stages, from a primitive, spontaneous phase in the era before the monarchy, to its high point in an ethical monotheism, from which it degenerated into a sterile legalism (this reflected a Christian view of rabbinic Judaism).”<sup>18</sup>

By “sterile legalism” is meant the same “fundamentalism” which I have pointed out, not just in the religious domain (Protestantism), but also in the current US mental health industry (in relation to the case of Dr P). Namely, a mere ability to repeat, on exam or on job, what is written on textbooks, on manuals (e.g. the DSM-V), or on sacred texts, without understanding of, or without regard for, the meaning behind the words that are repeated – as if the words found on papers describing the complexities of human life were as “one-dimensional” as the differential equations describing the movement of liquids. When you have specified the rate of change of the speed of the water stream against a certain landmark, you have pretty much exhausted all that there can be said about the movement of waters; but when you talk about human psychology or human interactions, the matter is hardly this simple. There is thus a *meaning* behind the description. While the Protestant sects (e.g. Evangelicals) reading the book of Genesis as if it were some sort of geology textbook dispassionately describing past geological events is the most usual example used to illustrate this kind of “abuse of words” (“literal interpretation”), legal scholars have since a long time ago noticed the problem of “fundamentalism” in the practice of laws as well. They have called it “abuse of process”, or “violation of the spirit of the law”, i.e. staying only on the surface of the literal meaning of the words in a certain code of law in order to

---

<sup>18</sup> Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler, “The Modern Study of the Bible”, in *The Jewish Study Bible*, *ibid.*, p. 2085.

use the law to accomplish a purpose which could never have been intended by the framers of the code of laws. In the foregoing such abuse called “fundamentalism” has been elucidated in the domain of mental health practices. What you need to understand here is that, even in the domain of the functioning of democracy, the whole system has already entered the age of “fundamentalism”, a mere semblance of democratic functioning without there being the slightest democracy in substance. D. Higgins must have objected, right in Invisible Hand’s face, to the American style of “totalitarianism”, i.e. brutal control of every aspect of citizens’ life without their noticing it, deceiving them into believing, instead, that they are still free, still live under the same old democracy passed down from two centuries ago without much change. Namely, “hypocrisy”. For this must have been what the CIA has proudly proclaimed to the Russians in their face in the aftermath of the collapse of the USSR: “You see, we are cleverer than you; we control our people far more meticulously than you have ever done your people, but we deceive them into the impression that they are free from our control. You try to control your people, and you don’t do it well; you let them notice your ambition and feel the burden of your control; that’s why they all rebel against you and run to us, as if we championed their freedom. Ha!” The American elites monitor their citizens’ movements far more comprehensively than the communists have ever done theirs, but they have learned to hide it from their people. They have come up with all these sophisticated lies and staged shows in order to train their people to want what they want them to want, so that it appears as if there were no Big Brother above them telling them what they should do. This situation has originated in World War II and has come to perfection by now – but it wasn’t there in the beginning. Clearly, “democracy” has all but eroded away in substance but still subsists as “appearance” to deceive people.

You can see that American democracy has precisely followed the same course which Wellhausen has prescribed for the Israelite religion, with the primitive phase lasting until the late 1800s (when something like “democracy” has actually existed), the high point lasting until the end of the Roosevelt era (when democracy has become so massive that it is hardly anything like “people’s rule”, but where the system is vigorous enough that the people are still relatively free), and the final phase of degeneration into “sterile legalism” (mere appearance) continuing to the present (where the whole system has hallowed out, the people having lost all control of their life and perception of reality, being manipulated like puppets by the government).

You can also see that women’s movement has followed the same course of blossoming, development, and decay. In the 1970s, the women activists demanded special protection of women because of women’s special circumstances. It looks sort of legitimate. Today, much of the same demands has degenerated into simple expression of narrow-minded selfishness without regard for reality and others – even though, on appearance, the actions of demanding looks the same. In the interior, however, much of the substance has dissipated.

Fundamentalism has permeated every facet of the American institutional framework by now. Another example: when the Bush administration decided to torture captured “terrorists” in Guantanamo Bay or in secret prisons, or when they decided to authorize the NSA to intercept and store all domestic communications, they would invariably ask some lawyers in the Justice Department to conduct a “review” of the new authorization. The lawyers would then produce a report specifying how “enhanced interrogation” did not contradict US obligation under the Geneva Convention or how NSA mass surveillance did not contradict the traditional legal

framework forbidding government intrusion in citizens' life (e.g. the scandal surrounding "Stellar Wind") They did this by playing on the wording in Geneva Convention ("no mention of 'Enemy Combatant' in the Convention") or in the Constitution, etc., without regard for the meaning behind the wording – because whatever was authorized clearly contradicted the meaning of the wording (the "spirit of the law"), although not the wording itself (the "letter of the law", after you have played on it). Thus is "fundamentalism", in this case, another form of "abuse of process".

The Macrospherian study group must have wanted to revive German Romanticism because their computer simulation must have confirmed the correctness of the traditional German view, i.e. that "fundamentalism" (or sterile legalism) is simply the natural conclusion of the course of development of any institution which human beings have created. When the descendants have been further away in time from their ancestors, they have also become further alienated from the original spirit in which their ancestors have created the institutions under which the descendants still live (the "original intent"), so that these latest generations have nothing but the superficial appearance of these institutions to rely on. Eric Voegelin is of course the one German scholar who has most clearly defined the underlying mechanism for this process of "decline" (*Order and History*). Thus, after a long period, the institutions would have to be "reinvented".

D. Higgins must have been particularly concerned with the increasing tendency toward "fundamentalism" or "sterile legalism" in the domain of international laws itself – insofar as this is her domain. The sort of "abuse of process" we have seen prevalent in the tactics of the Bush administration is also becoming the norm in international laws, and D. Higgins, in her years as the president of the ICJ, must have seen so much of it that it has become a serious issue for her, such that she has wanted to use this opportunity to also clean up *this* mess. As nations have felt increasingly constrained in exercising their traditional acquisitive ambition, they have become more prone toward exploiting the wording of international laws and agreements to accomplish their clandestine purposes. This is very similar to what would later become the major theme of this narrative, the "use of justice system to commit crimes", here to exploit the literal wording of international laws to legally commit crimes against other nations (to invade them), thus without fear of punishment or damage to reputation. The result is the gradual erosion of the international legal regime, so much so that the international justice system is also becoming more and more a criminal regime, just as the justice system has become so in the United States. The international justice system has thus lost its original substance and become the opposite of (according to D. Higgins) its original design, i.e. a system to ensure equitable existence for all nations regardless of their respective strength.

We must understand why the evolutionary approach of such grand style as seen in German Romanticists has gone out of fashion after World War II. If Hegel has been rejected by modern historians, if Schleicher has been rejected by contemporary linguists, if Wellhausen has been rejected by contemporary Bible scholars, this is because the grand systems they have constructed have failed due to their inability to access a more comprehensive set of data – not because their approach was fundamentally flawed. If Schleicher could have compared several hundred languages at the same time as it is common among contemporary historical linguists, he would have surely arrived at a cyclic view of language change, rather than a linear evolution of languages. But, because contemporary scholars eschew "grand narratives" under the destructive

influence of postmodernism – where the trend is to divide the big into many small pieces rather than integrating the small pieces into something big – they reject wholesale the traditional German evolutionists along with all nineteenth century grand narrators (like Auguste Comte) as if the earlier generations' failure lay in some deficiency inherent in such approach itself – as if reality were fundamentally incomprehensible in its wholeness – rather than in the contingent failure to access a more comprehensive data-set. Certainly, the Macropsherian study group is extremely concerned with contemporary academic specialization under which contemporary “specialists”, each confined to a tiny subset of human knowledge, have come to dominate the entire realm of human knowledge. The “specialists” are simply not equipped with the background knowledge necessary to understanding the results of the simulation of sustainable civilization.

## APPENDIX II

The following came from my old blog post for 15 February, 2014. It's a commentary on three documentaries. Again, you have to find the documentaries in question to understand the commentary. It will supplement, and clarify, what has been said above.

We have, in the above, set up an ideal (the standard) for the projection of soft-power by (in the case of women) quoting from Judith, 10:18 – 19.

Now how have the actual “Russen” fared in comparison with the ideal? Often, they are the exact opposite of “Judith”.

Look at these two, “Russische Frauen” and “Straßenkämpfe, Drogen und schöne Frauen - Das ist Moskau Russland”. People will laugh their teeth out at these images. Just like the stereotypes foreigners have of Russian women – who are willing to marry anything to get out of Russia, the most unsubstantial creatures in the world – and Russian men. The opposite of “superpower's people”.

(The impression one gets from observing the two main female figures in “Russische Frauen”, Tatjana (Ogorodnikova) and Irina (Budko) is that of extreme shallowness, and almost “plasticity” – as if they were made of plastics rather than flesh – without any sort of care for their society or humanity in general. Of course, people in the Hollywood show business in Los Angeles are kind of the same as those Russian “high society people” seen in the documentary; but the rampant, senseless materialism in the Moscow world is truly disgusting rather than attracting, and yet these people seem to have no idea, and actually think that they are “cool” and “vanguard”.)

In the case of women, those in the world who most approach the ideal (although of course falling short of it), I always think, are German women. Like Eva, Stefanie, Mieze, Franka, etc., below, whose consciousness is more of a “global citizen”, thus befitting the citizenship of a (global) superpower nation. (They are always onto something, like Eva is “Umweltschützerin”.) And yet Germany is just a medium size nation whose culture has only local appeal (because of, again, lack of a “brand name”).



In the case of America, the real “superpower” on earth today, its people are as much “bullies” as is the nation itself. Look how confident this “Rochelle” appears. But I suspect that, once you get to know an American woman radiating in this seemingly attractive manner, she will turn out to be just a typical “American Monkey”, i.e. when she bumps into you and pushes you off the cliff, she barely notices it; but once you merely poke your finger at her having barely retaliated against her for pushing you off the cliff, she’ll annihilate you filled with the sense of justification and righteousness. What is “confidence” is actually just “arrogance”.

(Disclaimer: I don’t know who this “Rochelle” is. I’m just using her *image* to illustrate a point. I have no idea whether she is a nice person or a mean person. Maybe she’s actually Mother Teresa once you get to know her.)

What we are doing (in the construction of a nation’s soft-power) is to study how to project an image of a people and its society outward, sort of like hiring an advertising firm to market a product, like what Keanu Reeves is doing here in “Sweet September”. The product here is “Putins Volk”, and we find it exceedingly difficult to market it because of its inherent defect. It’s much easier to market “Merkels Volk”.

**Notice:** You can see that our approach is very different from the usual approach seen in Russian government’s official policies. For instance, the Russian Federation’s State Policy toward Compatriots Living Abroad. The official approach is oriented toward protecting aliens who are already Russian and projecting Russian culture as a local phenomenon beyond the local sphere. This is not how the United States, or Western Europe, project their cultural influence abroad. They are into projecting themselves as representatives of universal values which every human being should adopt if they are smart (e.g. human rights, human dignities, liberty, etc.), rather than a particular culture (a particular national history) that is, after all, just another culture among many other cultures (many other national histories). The nationalist and, often, ultra-nationalist, tone in the policies and organizations protecting Russians in former Soviet states cannot but increase resentment from former Soviet subjects, Estonians or Latvians or whatever. Russia is doing what South Korea or Japan are doing (making foreigners appreciate Korean and Japanese cultures), rather than what the United States or EU are doing (making foreigners appreciate universal human values), which means that Russia will only doom itself to being “just another country” rather than recovering its former superpower status. I don’t know what the Russian government is thinking, really. Of course, again, the United States is doing it correctly, it’s just that it’s all hypocrisy.

Reference:

Russian soft-power in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: an examination of Russian compatriot policy in Estonia:  
[https://csis.org/files/publication/110826\\_Conley\\_RussianSoftPower\\_Web.pdf](https://csis.org/files/publication/110826_Conley_RussianSoftPower_Web.pdf)

Addition:

Another useful reference in the study of Russian women is ARTE’s 2012 “Flirten auf Russisch”. While it is commendable that, in Russia, there isn’t any taboo about women pursuing the

traditional role of seducing men (i.e. women will not feel insulted for doing so), we seem to see the same problem: women in Russia always seem slightly underdeveloped (having lower self-esteem) in comparison with women in Western countries.

We suppose the trick of the matter is how to develop women's self-esteem without making them into unreasonable bullies.

### **Postscript**

The future direction of our research shall be this: how (perhaps "left turned") Russia's support of the European far right movements may be the catalysis for saving humanity from the deadly American values that are ravaging our planet and destroying our brain – how Russia may save the world, and live up to its status as the "Third Rome", in this way instead. Stay tuned.

**FINIS**