

“How Russia may develop its soft-power”
and
“Russian-supported European far right movement”

ADDENDA

Lawrence C Chin

(Started January, 2016)

The problem with Russia's current self-critical apparatus

We have mentioned, in our “How Russia may develop its soft-power”, that the problem with those human rights activists who constitute Russia’s current “self-critical apparatus” – Anna Politkovskaya, Natalya Estemirova, Svetlana Gannuschkina¹ and the like – is that, when they advocate for the oppressed in Russia, they make Russia look bad, whereas those entities which constitute the self-critical apparatus in the West, in the United States for example – Human Rights Watch, ACLU, Amnesty International – are different in that, when they advocate for the oppressed,² they make the United States look good.³ How has this come about? It is not just because the current Russian self-critical apparatus is funded mostly by the United States and its allies and the current American self-critical apparatus is funded by “just another American” (e.g. George Soros). We want to investigate the cause.

When we seriously reflect on the American and French self-critical apparatus (e.g. like Jean-Paul Sartre and many other famous French intellectuals like him) we notice two factors at work in all instances of Western self-criticism which have caused the act of criticism to build up the reputation and attractiveness of the Western nation-states being criticized rather than deduct from it:

- (1) Criticism of the state as deviating from its own founding principles which have already been universally recognized as “good”. (In the American case, i.e. the Constitution and the spirit derived from it, e.g. the respect for dissent and so on.)

1 For an example of Gannuschkina’s function as “Russian self-criticism”, see: Die russische Zivilgesellschaft wird vernichtet (9/12/15) http://www.deutschlandradiokultur.de/menschenrechtlerin-gannuschkina-die-russische.2165.de.html?dram:article_id=339292.

2 Such as when ACLU fought for Khaled El-Masri’s rights: <https://www.aclu.org/blog/speakeasy/now-can-torture-survivor-khaled-el-masri-have-his-apology>.

3 That the entity which has defended the innocent “terrorist” from American imperialist actions is just another group of Americans.

- (2) Criticism of the state which, because it remains a parcel of the state (or nation) and because it constitutes a more sophisticated function of *esprit humain*, has actually increased the sophistication level of the nation-state being criticized.

We can see that the American self-critical apparatus functions mostly as (1) and somewhat as (2), whereas the French self-critical apparatus functions mostly as (2). That is, when American intellectuals criticize the actions of their nation-state, they are accusing those in power of deviating from the “American spirit” (e.g. not granting constitutional rights to those imprisoned in Guantanamo Bay), and the French intellectuals' criticism of France's imperial actions in Africa has tremendously added to the existing allure of France as a nation of intellectuals and philosophers, from the existentialists to the structuralists to the post-structuralists, who, because they are so “smart” and so “highly developed”, embody the spirit of universal fairness instead of being stuck in provincial nationalism. This greater sophistication (a more developed intellect), because it remains “French” – everybody thinks of Sartre or Camus as unquestionably “French” – then attracts many foreigners to admire France and come to study in France. We have not classified French intellectuals as (1) because their sense of universal fairness is not explicitly written into the French constitutions, and, not to forget, many American intellectuals quite often criticize the actions of their own government also out of a sense of universal fairness. Again, nobody overseas questions that Noam Chomsky is “American”. You get the point. Such criticisms tend to add to the attraction of the American and French republic being criticized rather than demonizing it because the critical figures involved are seen by foreigners as embodying the essence of the American and French spirit. The current Russian self-critical apparatus however functions as neither of these two types.

Whenever Russian human rights activists criticize the actions of the Putin administration, they are really saying that Putin has failed to embody the “spirit” of the Western nations, which are thus taken to be superior to the Russian state. This is why the Putin clique cannot tolerate such criticism, for it will only weaken the Russian state and cause it to collapse. When we say that Gorbachev has allowed liberalization to progress beyond the capacity of USSR to bear it, it is in a way in this sense also, since, inherent in the meaning of Perestroika and so on, there is the connotation “We need to be more like the West”. While self-criticism strengthens the nation-state, and makes it more attractive, in the West, it weakens the state in Russia and makes it more ugly – why? We can only say that it is unfortunate that Russia, unlike Western nation-states, has never developed a solid foundation in the art of self-criticism for improvement's sake. Russia is for historical reasons gravely disadvantaged in this respect also, just as in many other respects.

As we have noted, self-criticism is very important for a nation's soft-power projection. Especially since United States and the EU have made “tolerance of dissent” into part of their “democracy promotion programs” around the world. Any state which can't afford to tolerate dissent from within risks looking “bad” and “ugly”. And so any nation must learn to do it safely, without hurting itself.

We may consider our own movement as one instance of “American” self-critical apparatus. Since we have never quite denied that the principles on which the American republic has founded itself (the Constitution and the general spirit which ordinary Americans have made of it) are “good” (universally), it would appear that our anti-American stance belongs to (1). To US bureaucrats, however, we probably look more like the Russian self-critical apparatus since it would appear that we belong to neither category and are here solely to make America look bad. This is because we have seen through it all – 看破红尘 to say it in Chinese – and realized that the principle by which the American republic functions in the world is really just the general principle for all nation-states whatsoever, i.e. *raison d’Etat*, that the state is an end in itself and that everything is justified in the name of increasing its power in the world, without consideration of right and wrong. We deny such thing as “American exceptionalism” – that America is distinguished from all other nations by a superior, humanizing and moral mission (*mission civilisatrice*) – but affirm instead that America is just like every other nation-state. But such stance does not, as you can see, affirm America’s moral inferiority to other nations either. All big nations’ sole mission in the world is to make themselves more powerful and influential and competitive. And yet, America is singled out for criticism because it has achieved its principle (the acquisition of power) more successfully than other nation-states and is more advanced than others on the evolutionary path of any nation-state whatsoever, i.e., to become the trash can of the world and waste itself away. (The decline of the West.)

We believe, however, that our movement could, as an “American self-critical apparatus”, belong to (2). It all depends on how those in power have decided to package and present us. American bureaucrats are quite familiar with this tactic, i.e. hijacking opposition. During the Abu-Ghraib scandal, you all recall, knowing that anger against Americans would be stirred up worldwide, the congress immediately set up a hearing to grill Donald Rumsfeld and broadcast the scene to the whole world. Tension was considerably diffused, when both the wrongdoers and the punishers were Americans. The worst thing is to allow the enemy (e.g. the Islamic fundamentalists) to monopolize the role of “advocacy for the victims”. We suspect that this will also be the US strategy in dealing with the anti-American factions of the European far right parties. (Namely, creating an American camp opposed to globalization as well.)

If you are discerning, you will have noticed the difference between constructive criticism and destructive criticism. The Russian oppositional forces, when they criticize Putin, never notice how destructive their criticisms are, and they should not be comparing themselves with their counterparts in Western nations, who are mostly engaged in constructive criticisms. Only if the Pussy Riots can realize this.

Prediction: the Russian solution

Upon realizing the necessity of developing an indigenous self-critical apparatus to replace the current, Western-oriented, human rights activists, the Russian authority obviously would have to find within Russia itself principles of humanitarianism which can achieve universal recognition to the same degree as Western notions of human rights and respect for dissent – which are

ultimately traced back to John Locke, Adam Smith, Rousseau, and all the other secular English and French enlightenment philosophers – and on the basis of which a new generation of human rights activists can criticize their own government in a way that is completely “Russian” and yet “universal”. The obvious indigenous source of such principles would be the Russian Orthodox tradition. Namely, the principle of Christian love, tolerance, and charity, the “spirit of Christ” as is manifested in all the narratives in the Gospel.⁴ It would take some work to develop these Christian notions into an alternative tradition of the protection of citizens' liberty and minority's livelihood and the respect for dissent – especially since the Orthodox tradition, unlike Protestantism, has served, throughout history, more as a tool for consolidating ethnic and national identity than as a source of universal ethics. After which development, however, somebody like Svetlana Gannuschkina can criticize Russia's lack of a protection system for asylum seekers not in terms of its failure to embody Western principles (for the protection of the alien and unfortunate)⁵ but in terms of its failure to live up to its own Orthodox spirit of Christian charity.

If such experiment is successful, China, for example, can also learn to develop its own self-critical apparatus on the basis of Confucian philosophy (or Daoism and Buddhism for that matter) rather than on the basis of the Western, abstract, principles of human rights and so on.

Why liberal white women defend the rights of minorities

We have been plagued by the mystery of American liberal women's fondness for joining the defense of minorities' rights. We have seen so many of them joining the Black Lives Matter marches, for instance. And yet we have been severely persecuted by American liberal women – to us they are just bullies, and we are minority too. Why? Evidently, when a minority person has nothing to do with the liberal woman, she will fight for his right as a “victim” – because, in this way, she can also consolidate her own status as the “victim” (mostly of white males). But when she gets into conflict with a minority male, no, she will make sure that *she* is the victim, and *he* the oppressor. She comes first, and she will help you only when you don't challenge her “first place”. In this race to be the “victim”, that is. What an ugly game it all is. So, the conclusion is inescapable that American liberal women (mostly white) only fight for the rights of other categories of “victims” because they are trying to consolidate their own status as “victims extraordinaires” – in this world where being recognized as a “victim” is the surest path to power and prosperity.

Excuse us for being so blunt and offensive. But we are minority too!

4 Or based on the works of saints in the Orthodox tradition, such as St Basil's *On Social Justice* (Paul Schroeder's translation, Popular Patristic Series, Vol 38) or Ομιλία προς τους πλουτουοντας or St Chrysostom's *On Wealth and Poverty*.

5 See Clara Vuillemin, “Russland plötzlich Asylland?“, in *Moskauer Deutsche Zeitung*, 12/04/2015.

Why the “decline of the West” is not quite visible in the decadence of the American state: immigration

The following is an extraction from the unpublished “Subhuman meets...” (Part II). It's from a diary entry for 3 July 2013 (recording a conversation which the author has held that day with his friend). It's included here to explain why, despite entering the phase of decline, the United States remains the sole superpower in the world, i.e., it replenishes itself with immigration from Eurasia while wasting itself away with political correctness. The argument is again localized in a hypothetical engagement between the CIA and Madam D. Higgins (the “Macrospherian” order).

TEXT

Recorded in: http://xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.com/xxx/7-3-13/IMPdrroachimmgrtionrod_7_3_13_1252-908PM.MP3.

... Then my presentation on how to destabilize the United States through immigration reform (from 3:18:00 onward). Summary: use interest groups, the only possible way: (1) make Hispanics hate Asians and Indians (e.g. promotion of Sinophobia among Hispanics); (2) prevent Hispanics from being assimilated into the American (white) mainstream by promoting their culture (promotion of “La Raza” ideology among Hispanics, including encouraging them into “Reconquista” ideology and persuading them that the path to survival is to have more children). Rod also suggested (it would work too): (3) make white people fear Asians (including Indians) more and fear Hispanics less. Such method, if fully effective, is guaranteed to weaken United States to the status of a third world country in 50 years. Why haven't the Russians adopted such method? They must have thought of it too. We need to understand something.

... We have mentioned already that D. Higgins has ordered the CIA to reform United States' interior while breaking up the world system together with the Russians. Since it is “political correctness” which has transformed United States into the “trash can of the world”, the CIA deemed it of utmost importance to reveal the real nature of all this political correctness to all the bureaucrats working in whatever level of the US government apparatus. It's almost impossible to convince people – who have never been trained in critical theories (not just the dominant figures in the Frankfurt School, but also Foucault and Weber) – that all that feminist protection of women and all that ideology about racial equality is a bunch of poison whose real purpose is to waste society and – insofar as the United States is an “open system”, i.e. absorbing talents from outside itself – the world away. How do you make people understand that the “good things” they have been taught are good since childhood are in fact devil's trick? People are making two fundamental assumptions here: (1) “social justice” is good for society and the power of the state;

(2) political correctness is “social justice”. Unfortunately, both assumptions are incorrect, and people, again, believe them to be true without ever conducting any scientific inquiry to verify whether they are correct. You might bargain with the first assumption: that social justice is worth fighting for even when it makes the society less healthy or makes the state less powerful; however, the CIA CS officers who have worked with D. Higgins on the simulation of the future state of the world, have seen indisputable scientific evidences that both assumptions are wrong to the core. “Racial equality” and “feminism” are not just injustice, but are also detrimental to the health of society and waste away the power of the state. But most people simply cannot be persuaded by evidence – since they believe whatever makes them feel good and superior. The method which the CIA was about to employ to persuade their fellow compatriots would be the inverse strategy: use the enemy of the United States to convince them. Since the enemy’s intention is indisputably harmful, if the enemy encourages you to perform what you think is good, then you’ll realize that what you think is good is in fact bad. They are in fact using the insight which I have noted down in my chapter on the “liberation of women” in the Thermodynamic Interpretation of History: the question about what the real purpose of the liberation of women is (to liberate women for the sake of social justice, or to exploit them further to build up the nation state) can be easily answered by looking at irrelevant third parties’ opinions about the matter: e.g. Ataturk’s attempt to liberate the women in Turkey – since, obviously, he harbored no particular compassion for Turkish women but was simply interested in doing whatever the European nation states were doing in order to upgrade the Turkish nation-state.

The Macrospherians had already (indirectly) programmed me to master the real trade of the CIA, i.e. destabilization of unfriendly nation-states from within. I had already “graduated” – with a master in things like the “color revolutions”: in the trade of the CIA, i.e. like an “inverse doctor”, diagnosing whatever internal diseases which Russia or China was suffering and then administering poison (instead of drug) to them in order to hasten the development of those diseases, causing their death. In search for methods to destabilize the United States, I of course quickly realized that immigration from the south constitutes one of the gravest threats to the health of the United States and that immigration from east and south Asia constitutes one of the greatest sources of strength for the United States. Of course, American feminism (or, rather, white women’s “rights” and “culture”) constitutes another gravest threat to the health of the United States, but at this point I had no yet recognized this. Ironically, only the Republicans were fully aware of this, but they were CIA’s political enemies; the Democrats were most unlikely to be persuaded by this, but they were CIA’s political backers. The Republicans can never do much about it, because they weren’t powerful enough for the task: they had been persecuted enough for uttering politically incorrect statements. But the fact of the matter is that Asians (excluding

Pacific Islanders), south Asians, *and white males* are the people who are maintaining the nation's productivity and power, while every other category of people is wasting the nation away. But any statement by the Republicans in favor of white males entails only persecution. It's not so serious because the benefits derived from "imports" from the east override the wastes which white women and Latin American immigrants have achieved, so that, when the Republicans signed onto the latest immigration reform, they had to pretend to favor immigration from everywhere equally as if all immigrants were of equal value, just in order to avoid persecution. Nobody is willing to face up to the fact that ethnic groups are of unequal values, that some are full of criminals and unintelligent low life, while others are full of intelligence and productivity. Again, Americans have been able to survive without facing up to the truth because United States is an "open system". But if the CIA is to enforce D. Higgins' order by closing up the United States, then Americans will have to face up to the truth, at last, for they, with their political correctness, are in fact engaging themselves in an orgy of self-destruction very similar to what Cambodia had gone through during the first years of Khmer Rouge, what the Iranians had gone through during the first years of Khameni's revolution, or what the Chinese had gone through during the Cultural Revolution, i.e. the liquidation of society's most important human resources for some "feel-good" ideological fantasies. When this happened, the nation's enemy almost immediately took advantage of it: thus Vietnam's invasion of Cambodia and Iraq's invasion of Iran. (Nazi Germany was of course quite particular: even after the Nazis wasted away half of the nation's best intellectuals, it could still wage war, and fought on for 6 years: an indication of the strengths of the half who remained.)

Certainly, if I could easily diagnose United States' greatest weakness in political correctness, Russia and China must have done the same, and yet, none of these enemies of America can make use of this in response to United States' "color revolutions". Why? Again, it's because they can't, because the United States is an "open system" – and United States is an "open system" because of global trade. While I have come up here with an ingenious technique to destabilize the United States, it's almost impossible to carry it through since you would have to work against the tide of globalization. But the CIA clearly wanted my analysis here for future references – when United States' enemy could in fact cut off United States' openness and carry out my "response to color revolutions".

Clarification on the meaning of our movement (its "neo-Marxist" connotation)

While we have not resisted the characterization of our movement as "neo-Marxist" – because its principal objective is "de-globalization" (anti-global commerce) – it should be clarified that we are not really Marxist at all, insofar as we advocate for the restoration of the production phase of

capitalism, which is precisely the “Enemy” for classical Marxists. The reason why we *look like* Marxists is that we have adopted, as correct, one of the most central theses in Marxist analysis of human society and history, i.e., that culture and social and political institutions of any society constitute merely the superstructure of the underlying substructure of the mode of production and consumption. To cite Engel's own words:

.... daß die ökonomische Produktion und die aus ihr mit Notwendigkeit folgende gesellschaftliche Gliederung einer jeden Geschichtsepoche die Grundlage bildet für die politische und intellektuelle Geschichte dieser Epoche.... (*Kommunistische Manifest*, Vorwort zur deutschen Ausgabe von 1883)

... daß in jeder geschichtlichen Epoche die vorherrschende wirtschaftliche Produktions- und Austauschweise und die aus ihr mit Notwendigkeit folgende gesellschaftliche Gliederung die Grundlage bildet, auf der die politische und die intellektuelle Geschichte dieser Epoche sich aufbaut und aus der allein sie erklärt werden kann... (ibid., Vorrede zur englischen Ausgabe von 1888)

We certainly do not believe in the other central thesis of classical Marxism, i.e. that human history is all about class-struggle.

Prediction (7 January 2016)

Our movement will succeed because US bureaucrats will realize that the reindustrialization of the United States is in the long term interest of the United States

On Chinese news channels you can see everyday the latest updates on the US continual encirclement of China with military bases and instrument. The United States has no intention of being dethroned without a fight, and it is responding to the rise of China as a superpower challenging the United States by reinforcing its existing tendencies, i.e. more military bases and more free trade agreements. Of course the US bureaucrats must have wondered why they even have to plan all this encirclement and “Pivot to Asia” in the first place. Where did China get all this capital with which to modernize itself to become a challenge to US unipolar world-domination? Alas, from the US itself. The United States has itself created China the challenger, this monster. Through free trade, that is, which has enabled its capitals to flow to China without coming back. Why all this trouble? Does the US really need free trade in order to remain on its throne? Hardly. Is it not the case that, before the 1980s, the US was the principal creditor and exporter in the world and yet was a superpower nonetheless? It wasn't the sole superpower then

only because the USSR hadn't collapsed yet. Should the US reindustrialize itself, it could make itself once again the principal exporter and remain as much a superpower as it is today, only without the risk of creating more challengers through exporting its manufacturing.

We thus predict that the US bureaucrats will eventually come around to adopt our suggestion about importing the National Front agenda, not just to ease the tension between the US and the far right elements in Europe, but for US' own long term interests' sake. Should this come about, of course, we the common people will benefit through the concomitant elimination of *Femmes souffrantes*, restoration of men's rights and values, the extermination of all political correctness, and, perhaps, the curing of “digital dementia”. The silent oppression all around will end, the human brain be restored to its original vitality, and planetary destruction be halted.

Front national, Jeanne d'Arc revenue pour le monde entier!

The “liberals” are the “imperialists” (No! We are not Rush Limbaugh)

Now the Koch brothers are commonly regarded by “liberal” women as the greatest polluters of all Americans.⁶ We believe our thermodynamic interpretation of history would be of great interest to them because, according to us, the responsibility for polluting our planet should be squarely thrown back upon the liberals' own shoulders. Why do the “liberals”, responsible for planetary pollution, like to blame the right wing great industrialists for what they have themselves caused? *Propagande en miroir*. The liberals, those liberal women, have caused the environmental problems by being the consumers, by creating the demands, while the Koch brothers are only the suppliers, supplying whatever is in demand. The suppliers' behavior is determined by the consumers who demand, who are thus the ultimate cause for environment destruction. Has anyone forgotten about that?

Our adversaries, the liberal white women, have called us “racist” for wanting to keep the Chinese and Indian graduate students out of America. They have pointed to us: “He is a bigot. He doesn't want you to come to America.” Meanwhile, they present themselves as the solution: “We are not bigots. We welcome all people to America. We like Indians and Chinese.” Then, since Indian and Chinese graduate students account for something like one fifth of America's high tech industry, these liberal women tell the US authority that they are good for America. By doing so, they are of course perpetuating “brain drain from Eurasia” and “brain gain at North America”. When you go to India, you see nothing but broken infrastructures. Indian navy and air force are full of broken ships and broken planes. And yet in America Indians are known to constitute the best corps of engineers and computer programmers. What are they doing here? Why don't they go home to fix their own country? And so American liberal women who have accused us are the embodiment of US imperialism. They like imperialist exploitation. We, on the other hand, are

⁶ Tim Dickinson, “Inside the Koch brothers' toxic empire”, *Rolling Stone*, 24/09/2014. Also, Jane Mayer's *The Dark Money* (2015).

suggesting “cooperation for mutual benefits”. China and India should keep their brains, and indigenous brains in America, because the supplies of foreign brains are no longer unlimited, would be forced to develop again. We are relying our position on a certain degeneration of native-born brains in America, especially white people's brains, attributable to high grade immigration from Eurasia. It's the same thing which de Tocqueville has noted in his most famous book: the South was economically less developed than the North because, by keeping slaves, the whites in the South have learned to be lazy, and devalue labor as “black people's thing”. And so, native-born Americans' brains today have been degenerating since more and more foreigners have been coming to do the brain work for them. You would like our position if you, that is, still care about being smart.

(Added 21/01/2016)

The New European Feminism (Nouveau féminisme européen) vs “liberation of women”

How exactly do we sum up this “New Feminism” which we have been pleading the National Front to adopt as their agenda on women? For, clearly, unlike their German counterpart, the NPD or AfD, the National Front does not have an official stance on the gender question. They need a stance, for the radical Gender Mainstreaming is fast taking hold of the European Union.

If you put together all our pronouncements on the matter, you see our “New Feminism” to consist in the following:

- (1) “Don't talk much about what you have suffered, but think much about what good you can do.” (Against “victimology”.) This is a very simple insight which everybody can think of. Somewhat reminiscent of John Kennedy's “Don't ask what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country”.
- (2) Focus more on how you can develop your intellect and moral virtues, meaning: forgoing the false nature attributed to women (relationship, psychology, feminine intuition) and being cautious of women's true nature (beings of consumption and comfort), i.e. curbing one's own habit of consumption.

(3) “You will get laid if you tell me how you really think of me, rather than if you flatter me.”⁷ This, in order to enable women to develop a more realistic assessment of their own capacities, something which they rarely have nowadays.

(4) To realize that women can save the world through Chris Knight's “sex-strike” method, not through what Old Feminists have thought (bringing women's special, soteric, nature into the public domain).⁸

The problem is that this looks more like a New American Feminism than a New French Feminism, since women in France do not suffer the same flaws to the extent to which American women suffer (grossly inflated estimation of oneself, extreme egocentrism, and excessive materialism). The New Feminism looks more like a cure for the harm which American feminists have done to the world and American women, than for the harm which French feminists have done to the world and French women.

⁷ The comes from my blog post for 16 August 2014: “I then realized that it’s precisely their arrogance – their conviction in their superhuman ability to understand another person’s psychology without talking to him or reading his writings, but simply through remote psychic reading – and their preconception –about some male violent nature – which have caused them to never bother to exercise their brain during human interaction but only to repeat, as if they were real, caricatures previously constructed to insult people, resulting in their complete lack of capacity to read people’s faces, etc. The same with women’s supposedly superior communication skill, etc. (Women’s inferior language skill is clearly visible when you randomly compare a book written by a woman and a book written by a man.) In other words, it’s precisely the trendy belief in female superiority in communication, relationship, and psychology which has prevented women from actually developing this very superiority and caused them to become inferior instead. Secondly, women’s increasing economic independence has also decreased their intelligence in these areas because – this is a point noted before – men now have to beg and flatter women in order to obtain sex from them. While women are also polite toward men, they do not flatter men as often as men flatter women, which causes men to have a slightly more realistic assessment of their ability. In other words, although women are equipped with the potential for greater ability in communication, relationship, and psychology, they do not usually have the opportunity to develop such potential because they constantly flatter themselves with ideologies about their natural superiority in intuition and they are constantly flattered by men and society in the same way – especially since it’s nowadays politically incorrect to not claim women are smarter than men. Thus, the King has never realized he’s naked because nobody has ever dared point this out to him – it’s not because the King is born mentally retarded. Presumably, in the context of the Macrospherian New Feminism, women will say: You get laid if you tell me what you really think of me, rather than just flattering me perpetually. In contrast to the aforementioned Berkeley Master’s Golden Rule: This is how you can get laid: Listen, smile – and agree! Always agree with her!”

⁸ This is derived from my blog post for 14 February, 2015: “DH’s New Feminism: to create a 'cult', which is the 'New Feminist Movement', where women (the feminists) renounce consumption and use mate-selection to breed males who are more into 'brain' than wealth and consumption – all this to save the Earth. Even though the 'cult' will remain a minority movement, certain elements from it (female devaluation of consumption and valuation of non-consumptive or non-acquisitive males) will eventually 'trickle down' to the general female population (just as, even though second wave feminism is restricted, at least today, to tiny circles in universities and on society’s fringes, certain elements from it have somehow been adopted by the entire American white female population most of whom are not feminist at all, i.e. the idea of some special female nature which, if expressed through women’s participation in the public sphere, will save the Earth). In this way, women will save the Earth. DH’s plan: some sort of Seneca Fall Convention III will perhaps be convened in response to [our] scandal, where American feminism is recognized as the 'biggest fraud in Word History' and where this 'New Feminism' is adopted as its replacement.”

We should thus reword ourselves. We want the National Front to adopt a New European Feminism whose principal purpose is to PREVENT American-style feminism from colonizing the European Union – something which is happening right now. Only then, the advocacy of Chris Knight's vision of a “New Sex Strike”. (This “Nouveau féminisme européen” is not to be confused with the Association NFE.)⁹

Furthermore, New Feminism, or New European Feminism, does not claim, as its objective, the “liberation of women”. According to our thermodynamic interpretation of history, a truly “liberated woman” is a woman who has withdrawn herself from all social functions and focused only on her own development, becoming a philosopher “leaving the Platonic Cave”, which is of course impossible for the majority of the female population. The true “liberation of women” applies only to the elite of womankind. Since New Feminism advocates training women to develop their potential and do the world a lot of good (i.e. and to “stay within the cave”), it's not about the “liberation of women”. Most women, like most men, are not capable of being “liberated”.

(Added 27 January, 2016)

ANOTHER POINT OF NEW FEMINISM

We have repeatedly emphasized that the greatest fault of American liberal women is that they are too proud – brainwashed by a liberation ideology which says the opposite of reality. For example, Hillary Clinton, in an interview with Glamour (September, 2014), continually suggests to her women audience that they need to raise their confidence, as if women's self-esteem weren't high enough or they were too focused on others and not on themselves – just the opposite of reality: encouraging the arrogant to become even more arrogant by deceiving them that they are too timid. And the opposite of Old Testament's main theme (the traditional style): Thou art too proud, be humble, and thou shalt then prosper. The advocacy of “humbleness” is also part of the “New Feminism” we propose.

(Added 27 May, 2017)

FURTHER CHARACTERIZATION OF OUR MOVEMENT

⁹ Website: <http://www.nouveaufeminisme.eu/L-Association-NFE>. Its president, Elizabeth Montford, has been going around warning about the danger of “gender feminists” – basically feminists of the American type – who have dominated the EU bureaucracies about women. Ms Montford speaks like a conservative, a strong advocate for the view that it is quite possible to have equality between women and men while maintaining their gender differences, or their respective gender roles. She is in fact a perfect fit with National Front. While we are in perfect agreement with her, our New Feminism is not quite identical with hers. Ours may be called “brain feminism” and “sex strike feminism”.

Here is an additional characterization of our “movement”. The creation of a “cult” to spread the right values to the largest segment of human population. It is a leftist movement, but at once the correction of the errors which the leftists have committed since the 1960s. Or since the time of Enlightenment. The ultimate goal of the cult is to cause a massive *decrease* of productivity of the masses across all domains of human endeavor, both cultural and material (economic). Material: ordinary people do not need to produce, and consume, so many goods. Cultural: ordinary people do not need to express themselves so much culturally (Facebook, Sound Cloud, Youtube, Self-Publishing Amazon Kindles). The principal error of the leftist movement so far has been a desire to increase the productivity of the masses across all domains. Hence they celebrate, for example, the freedom and power which information technology has imparted on the masses. It is precisely this increase of productivity which has led to environmental devastation, shortage of natural resources, waters, and energy supplies, and erosion of people's cognitive abilities (resulting in their inability to understand each other and the crisis facing human civilization).¹⁰ We must advocate the *de-powerment* of the masses. The masses must come to enlightenment – that they are stupid and that their life is not very important. Then they will acquire the *right* values: silence instead of expression, low self-esteem instead of high self-esteem, refrain from assertion of the self (rights, interests, protests) instead of constant assertion of the self in street protests and so on. (Hence advocacy of Old Testament's main theme: humbleness.) The reformed left must advocate the opposite of what it has done in the past in order to not become a “hand-maiden” of global free-market expansion and neoliberalism (Nancy Fraser). The unenlightened masses must be enlightened in the Socratic fashion – to realize how stupid they are and how senseless their life is: the majority of humanity has come to earth to digest food and reproduce and nothing more – so that they will be content with doing not very much each day: chatting with friends and watching some (perhaps educational) videos, i.e. leisurely passing time rather than exerting themselves to make something significant out of themselves. Except one thing: they shall perhaps be taught the value of paying attention to what the intellectual elites are debating about. The reformed leftist wants to revert to a more traditional form of social order. Since time immemorial, all things of value in human civilization have been produced by a tiny minority of intellectual elite. The majority should give due recognition to this minority, accept their leadership position in the domain of human opinions, and shut the fuck up (listen only, try to understand what the minority is talking about). This is Ortega y Gasset.

The depowerment of the masses will decrease overall consumption, save our planet, save our civilization, and make them smarter at the same time. (Hopefully, we will produce a statistical study demonstrating once and for all that empowerment of the oppressed masses and all the political correctness are leading to increased consumption and destruction of our planet.) Nevertheless, this is not the cult itself. It is the effect of the cult upon the general masses who are not part of the cult. Just as cultural feminism has instilled in all American women the simple idea that women have special talents, have been prevented by their sexist society from developing their talents, and will save the world if they are allowed to express it by going into professions,

¹⁰ I would elsewhere refer to ordinary people's increasing inability to understand each other as the erosion of communicative action (in Habermas' sense) in our society.

and yet is more than this (the theoretical discourse of cultural feminism is far more complicated and most women have no idea what it is about), so our cult is more than just the above simple things. Our cult is about going back to the past and eschewing the modern ways as harmful – both to our brain and to our planet. The cult is the cult of the human brain and awareness of the harmful effects of consumerism. Compare John Stuart Mill's narration of his childhood education (learning Greek and Latin and reading all the classics) with the contemporary image of a child holding his or her iPad. The past is superior, brain-cultivating. You see what I mean. The cult is into whatever is good for the brain, and eschews whatever is bad for it. It thus hates the way Internet is currently being used. It thus hates consumerist life-style. It thus hates feminism and all the political correctness.

This is called “leftist” because it is *real* resistance against global free-market and neoliberalism – real solution to the problem of environmental crisis.

(Added 18 February and 1 March, 2017)

FINIS