

NOTICE

(18 February 2017)

The essay below was written in November 2015. Since then, a lot has changed, both in the world and for the author of the essay. First of all, the election of Donald Trump to the White House in November 2016 has considerably softened the attitude of the European far right figures toward the United States. Should Marine Le Pen be elected to France's presidency in May 2017, it would no longer necessarily mean that France will form an alliance with Russia against the United States. Trump's America's relations with both Putin's Russia and (possibly) Le Pen's France remain unclear. Secondly, the author has had, since November 2015, a falling-out with Le Pen's Partisans. (This is documented in "The third ICJ trial over the suspect".) He is no longer quite clear about supporting the National Front. Thus, the introduction of the following essay, with all its anti-American rhetoric, is no longer valid. However, the author continues to regard Le Pen's ideology as superior to alternatives and hold as valid his own ideas which continue to be quite congruent with hers.

TEXT

The following is written to persuade the left in France, and in Europe and Russia as well, to rally behind a quintessential ultra-right, Marine Le Pen. The sort of leftwing that is so persuaded shall be called the "New Left".

Marine Le Pen, and her National Front, have, in the past few years, evolved from a fringe protest movement (under Jean-Marie Le Pen) to a mainstream political party. After National Front's spectacular victory in the European Election in May 2014, it's now even projected that Marine Le Pen has the potential of winning the French presidency in 2017.¹

You must appreciate the tremendous import for the United States, and for the whole world, if *Front national* shall win the French presidential election in 2017 and Marine Le Pen become the president of France. She will withdraw France from the European Union (in addition to ridding Europe of Euros) and dismantle NATO as well, and then realign France with Russia in security arrangements while persuading Germany to follow her footsteps, creating an alliance Paris-Berlin-Moscow that would serve as a counter-weight against the United States in world's geopolitical structure. If she should succeed, United States' unipolar domination of the whole planet would effectively come to an end. Don't forget that France is a permanent member of the UN Security Council with its own veto power. Currently, the United States still dominates the UN Security Council since both Britain and France are behind its every decision while Russia is

¹ According to Figaro's survey in September 2014, Marine Le Pen could enter the second round of the 2017 presidential election and, there, if she shall be faced with the socialist candidate (Holland's party), she will win the second round, but will lose it if she shall be faced with a UMP candidate (Sarkozy, Juppé, or Fillon). See: <http://www.lefigaro.fr/politique/2014/09/05/01002-20140905ARTFIG00167-sondage-marine-le-pen-en-tete-de-la-presidentielle-dans-tous-les-cas-de-figure.php>.

backed only by China: the United States wins over Russia by 3 to 2. But if France goes to Russia's side, the United States will lose by 2 to 3. Even if Germany joins UN Security Council deliberations – as it frequently does nowadays: the 5 + 1 talk, such as in the case of negotiation with Iran over its nuclear programs – it is still 3 to 3. This is assuming that Germany will not change side. Whatever shall be Germany's decision, if France allies with Russia, the cleavage between Eastern Europe and Western Europe will only worsen, with Eastern Europe aligning more with the United States than with Western Europe.

If you agree that, as we assert, United States represents a deadly, and poisonous, force in world history, Marine Le Pen's coming to power in France will mean the salvation not only of France, but also of Europe and, beyond that, the entire humanity as well. She will become the most important *événement* (*Ereignis*) in the 21st Century. This is why, as she and her National Front are becoming increasingly popular in France, you should pay careful attention to her agendas. She is not only France's business, but the business of the entire world.

Why we support Marine Le Pen

Extrême-droite* and the construction of a European/ Russian New Left: A review of Marine Le Pen's *Pour que vive la France

A European/ Russian New Left Manifesto

Lawrence C. Chin

Our point of view has been expressed in *A Thermodynamic Interpretation of History*, the introductory remark in "Document A", and "Conclusion".²

The following discussion is a sequel upon our document on the artificial growth of a Russian New Left and European New Left, "How Russia may develop its soft-power base in order to counter Western destabilizing forces". There, we have expressed, at one point, the opinion that the Left – a European and Russian Left – should rally behind the Frontists, the "ultra-right", in which case they will be called the "New Left". How can this be? How can the "ultra-left" converge with "ultra-right"?

The exploration of this question will have laid bare the theoretical foundation or orientation of our planned European/ Russian New Left. The following statement about our support for Marine Le Pen and her National Front shall therefore also serve as a manifesto for a possible European/ Russian New Left.

² Here: <http://enlightenment1998.com/diaryreview2013-12-40/diaryreview2013-12-40W.pdf> and: <http://enlightenment1998.com/conclusionrev10-2/conclusionrev10-2-cnsrd.pdf>.

Summary of Marine Le Pen's thinking and position and her congruence with ours: the hypocrisy called "political correctness" (*tout ce qui est politiquement correct*)

The most fundamental lesson from our *Thermodynamic Interpretation of History* is that the contemporary "political correctness" is at bottom a consumerist ideology and serves the function of supporting and reinforcing globalization and globalized free commerce (Le Pen's "hypercapitalisme mondialisé"). It's not about having sympathy and respect for the oppressed and disadvantaged people, or teaching us about tolerance of Otherness (women, minorities, or whoever is identified as "disadvantaged"). Rather, it's about reinforcing the most dominant power structure at the present moment (the multinational corporations) under the disguise of helping the (or their) victims and respecting those who are different from us. We have based ourselves, in this respect, principally on Michel Foucault, whose later work may be encapsulated in the slogan: "The resistance against power is the reinforcement of power." Since the Left has more in congruence with "political correctness" than the Right – although the Right has found it nowadays increasingly difficult to violate "political correctness" – our *Thermodynamic Interpretation of History* is all about exposing the true nature of the Left – how it is in fact the support of the dominant power structure rather than resistance against it.

Interestingly, Marine Le Pen has been arguing in the same way. Le Pen's latest, and most seminal, book, *Pour que vive la France*, consists of two parts. The first part is the analysis of the "Enemy" (*Le Mondialisme: Horizon du Renoncement*). The "Enemy" is defined as the cause of the decline of France's importance in world affairs, the disappearance of the traditional national identity in French people's self-consciousness, and, most importantly, the increasing impoverishment of the French middle-class and below. This Enemy is "globalism" (*mondialisme*), or the ideology which encourages the process of "globalization" (*mondialisation*). In the very beginning of her march, Le Pen summarizes her agenda (p. 26 – 28):

Je ne confonds pas mondialisme et mondialisation. La mondialisation est un phénomène technique, qui se caractérise par une intensification des échanges entre régions et entre nations. Notre communauté humaine a prospéré depuis cinquante mille ans en partie grâce à ce développement des échanges qui a multiplié les richesses, rapprochant les hommes et apaisant les rapports entre les peuples... La mondialisation ne doit pas être combattue, mais elle doit être maîtrisée par les nations qui doivent pouvoir peser sur la place qu'elles entendent chacune y occuper, en utilisant pour cela tous les ressorts de la coopération, de la politique économique et de la diplomatie, et tous les outils régaliens de l'État. Le mondialisme vise précisément à empêcher les nations de garder cette maîtrise de leur place dans la mondialisation.

Le mondialisme est en effet une idéologie, qui a pour trait principal de nier l'utilité des nations, leur adaptation au monde « postmoderne », et qui vise à façonner un nouvel homme, sorte d'*homo mondialisus*, vivant hors sol, sans identité autre que celle du consommateur global, rebaptisé « citoyen du monde » pour masquer le caractère profondément mercantile de cet objectif. Le

mondialisme est une alliance du consumérisme et du matérialisme, pour faire sortir l'Homme de l'Histoire et le précipiter dans ce que Gilles Lipovetski nomme « l'ère du vide ». Il est en quelque sorte la traduction politique de la doctrine économique ultralibérale, qui se devait, pour assurer sa pérennité et achever dans l'ordre politique ce qu'elle a entamé dans l'ordre marchand, d'étendre à la sphère sociale et politique l'emprise intellectuelle qu'elle a acquise sur la pensée économique. Le mondialisme a ainsi phagocyté la doctrine universelle des droits de l'homme, doctrine de bonnes intentions assez abstraites par ailleurs, pour « vendre » l'idée d'un citoyen mondial uniforme et universel doté de droits abstraits et universels.

L'*homo mondialisus* est ainsi un homme vidé de toute croyance, de toute solidarité, de toute identité nationale, de toute référence historique. Il est là pour produire et consommer. L'*homo mondialisus* idéal est le « consommateur moyen global », uniformisé dans ses goûts et ses actes d'achat, peu revendicatif et peu critique, un individu dont on fait en sorte qu'il se pense de moins en moins comme citoyen, c'est-à-dire comme être capable d'agir sur le cours des choses. Pour cela, il faut l'arracher au cadre de solidarité le plus performant, la nation, foyer de la politisation, et le plonger dans le grand bain du « village global » métissé et de la « world culture ».

Le mondialisme est donc avant tout l'idéologie qui permet le règne sans limite d'un marché sacralisé, prétendument « autorégulateur », et qui devient dans les faits divinisé : une entité invisible et éternelle qui secrète naturellement ses propres règles, qui plus est par essence non discutables, n'est-elle pas un concept de nature divine?

The impoverishment of France, its weakening in world affairs, and its loss of identity are thus connected with – surface reflections of – a more fundamental issue: the decline of humanity (or human potential) itself (*homo mondialisus*) for the sake of maximizing corporate profits through the specialization of “consumers”. It's the same issue of “One Dimensional Man” of which Herbert Marcuse has spoken more than forty years ago. Are you beginning to see the connection between “ultra-right” and “New Left”?

In our own works, we have focused much of a very similar analysis on feminism “the American style”, how it serves as the ideological support for the hyper-capitalist class (the multinational corporations) and the consumerist world order (the “global market”), and how the “oppressed” identified in American feminism is in fact no such thing, but a privileged class: how the ideology “American feminism” is not a “liberation ideology” at all but an ideology to reinforce the dominant power structure and the privilege of the already privileged class, just the opposite of what it claims itself to be. Ours is the exposure of this hypocrisy “political correctness” in regard to the issue of gender (the elevation of the female sex). The other axis of “political correctness” is the issue of race and national origins (the tolerance of other races, cultures, religions, and nations). The exposure of this hypocrisy “political correctness” when it comes to the “other

nations”, the “other cultures”, the “other religions”, and the “other races” is the focus (or one of the focuses) of Marine Le Pen’s thinking.

To summarize her argument: the American elites have invented this ideology of “globalism” to enrich themselves, the very rich, at the expense of the middle class and below. They are exporting this ideology to the rest of the world in order to hasten globalization and enrich themselves further. In Europe, they have converted both the right and the left 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 principal 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”.

It is to increase the profits of the multinationals that the European elites have wanted this superstate “United States of Europe” to supersede the traditional European nation-states and advocated absolute free trade in Europe (Anglo-American neoliberalism brought to the European continent), for the superstate is set up to enable absolute free trade and the result is perpetual outsourcing of France’s manufacturing and thus the weakening of France’s industrial capacity and, again, the impoverishment of its indigenous middle-class.

Being engulfed in a superstate which, under the direction of the United States, has become furthermore a vassal of the United States, the only superpower remaining in the world, France is also losing all its traditional influences in world affairs. France is disappearing.

This is why Marine Le Pen regards globalism and the project of European Union to be the Enemy of France. She has other complaints about them as well. The Enemy has also caused the decline of democracy in France, since, as many others have also complained, the superstate “United States of Europe” is increasingly run by technocrats who are not elected by the people but merely hired by the elites – and yet, as has been estimated, virtually 80 percent of all the laws which now impact the citizens of France (and other European nations as well) are passed in Brussels rather than in France (or in other respective European nations).

Another of her complaints, the increasing indebtedness of France which the Enemy has also brought about, can be assimilated to her concern with the “impoverishment of France”.

Le Pen is thus a nationalist, a democrat, a humanist, and, as shall be emphasized, something like a neo-Marxist. Such is today’s “ultra-right” (*extrême droite*), or what a Gaullist – what Le Pen really is – has become. (More on this below.)

The issue which concerns us the most is Marine Le Pen’s “political incorrectness”, especially in regard to the accusation of “racism” which her political enemies have most frequently levied against her in view of her staunch anti-immigration and “anti-Islamicization” stance and her

unwavering nationalism (to protect France's sovereignty). The political elites' real purpose in teaching us to overlook other people's national origins, whether fellow Europeans in the EU system or, more importantly, immigrants from the Islamic world – “political correctness” in regard to race, culture, religion, and national origin – is to condition us to think only of working and consuming, without any of the traditional ideals getting in the way. This Marine Le Pen has very much emphasized throughout her book. It's hypocrisy. She is thus arguing in a vein very similar to our *Thermodynamic Interpretation of History*: that “political correctness” is really invented, not to enlighten us about “tolerance of Otherness” (*l'Autrui*), but to increase the profit of the very rich under the disguise of teaching us about this “tolerance of Otherness”. Again, it's only that, while Le Pen has focused more on the issue of race, national origins, and religious background, we have focused on the issue of gender.

Le Pen is thus shamelessly anti-immigration and “anti-Islamicization”, for, at bottom, the effect of *immigration en masse* is the impoverishment of the indigenous middle-class and the weakening of France's national identity, while the elites want the citizens to tolerate the poor immigrants not because they have so much sympathy for the poor people from Arab nations and respect for their cultures and religion, but because they are working to increase the profits of the multinationals. Thus, the new generation of French politicians, when they encourage their citizens to tolerate immigrants and condemn traditional nationalism as “provincial”, are in fact trying to brainwash their citizens into professional (“one dimensional”) consumers and impoverish them rather than teaching them anything about “humanity”.

Furthermore, it's because the multinationals and their stooges – the political elites – need to destroy national boundaries for the sake of their profits that they have developed this desire to demonize traditional nationhood and national history (*la diabolisation de la Nation*). It's not for the sake of self-criticism in order to improve and grow in humanity that the political elites have been sending their citizens on a guilt trip about their national history, emphasizing all the inhumanity which France has perpetrated against subjects of its past colonies in Africa and elsewhere, and all the Nazi collaborators as well during the Vichy period, and disparaging all the nationalist worship of traditional national heroes like Charlemagne and Napoleon. By making their citizens feel guilty about their national identity, the elites are trying to make them forget about their national origin and condition them to become “global citizens” whose mental horizon shall consist solely in the consumption of products and services.

Thus, when Marine Le Pen tries to re-excite, in French people, traditional national pride, or even incite them against “Islamicization” of French society, we should, instead of blindly charging her with “inciting racism”,³ see through to the true nature of her efforts and praise her for her attempt to preserve our full humanity against the political and corporate elites' pernicious project to reduce us to professional consumers without identity while concealing it all under the disguise of teaching us about “tolerance”. Marine Le Pen is here to save our humanity (our human potential), not trying to train us to become “provincial” and “intolerant”. She is here to help us expand our humanness, not to shrink it with provincialism. It adds substance and dimension to

³ Just recently, in October 2015, Marine Le Pen is due in court charged with inciting racial hatred for her speech in 2010 comparing Muslims praying on the streets to Nazi occupation of France.

our consciousness when we are conscious, not just of consumption, but also of our national history. It is in fact the elites who are trying to shrink our humanness when they want us to think no longer of our national history, culture, and religious heritage, but only of consumption and work. The elites, the *hypocrites extraordinaires*, are speaking the opposite of reality. (More on this below.)

We have said, in our past works, very little about political correctness' anti-racism. We have shown, mostly, how political correctness in regard to gender issues have emerged: the big corporations have wanted women to go to work and become independent so that population's consumption may be expanded and they may increase their profits, and they have wanted women's values and personality to permeate all facets of this traditionally masculine society so that consumption of products and services may be valued more than manufacturing, construction of infrastructures, and saving. Le Pen's discourse and our analysis thus complement each other. When put together, these two sides constitute a whole indictment on the hypocrisy and hidden perniciousness of the reigning political correctness.

Le Pen at times speaks like a "conspiracy theorist" (*Verschwörungstheoretiker*) – as anyone outside the power system is destined to do – such as when she speaks of the obvious, that there is no longer any fundamental distinction between the Left and the Right. They are distinguished only by superficial disagreements, on issues which neither side takes to be essential. They pretend to disagree on these inessential, superficial issues in order to perpetuate the illusion that the distinction between the Left and the Right is still valid and that democratic debates still exist. When it comes to the essentials (globalization, "United States of Europe"), however, the Left and the Right speak completely alike and never disagree.

Je n'ai pour ma part aucun état d'âme à le dire : le clivage entre la gauche et la droite n'existe plus. Il brouille même la compréhension des enjeux réels de notre époque... Depuis quelques décennies, le vrai clivage qui sépare les hommes politiques en deux camps est celui-ci : il y a ceux qui croient en la France et ceux, beaucoup plus nombreux, qui n'y croient plus...

La principale illustration de cette tromperie politique perpétuelle réside, je l'ai dit, dans la fameuse « alternance » qui se joue à chaque élection nationale, entre les deux camps au pouvoir, et ce depuis les débuts de la Cinquième République. Elle consiste à donner le sentiment d'un affrontement politique âpre entre deux projets antagonistes, alors même que ces projets, dans leurs orientations fondamentales, sont jumeaux. Ce sont deux déclinaisons d'un même thème, mondialiste et antinational. C'est le sens du terme « UMPS »....

Liés par leurs idées, leurs représentations communes de l'ordre économique et social, et leurs conceptions également dociles de l'action publique, les deux partis dominants et leurs satellites ont besoin de cette théâtralité de la vie politique, de ce faux affrontement mis en scène entre deux familles politiques proches....

Dans la mesure où il reste tout de même difficile de cacher l'évidente collusion entre les projets de chaque camp sur les sujets fondamentaux (appartenance à la

zone euro, décentralisation et désengagement de l'État, immigration, politique étrangère indexée sur celle des États-Unis, etc.), l'illusion démocratique est renforcée en permanence par l'accent mis sur les oppositions, parfois réelles, qui subsistent sur des sujets secondaires, en particulier sociétaux comme le mariage homosexuel par exemple, sujets certes importants, mais très éloignés des grandes orientations politiques et économiques qui engagent l'avenir des Français. (L'UMPS: l'illusion de l'alternance au service du projet mondialiste.)

Most importantly, Le Pen laments the disappearance of the *real* Left⁴ – and then the absorption of the rest of the Left by the Rightist's agenda (Anglo-American neoliberalism, globalism). Her point of view will certainly be the position of the (European/ Russian) New Left. In fact, it seems almost as if Le Pen were really a leftist: for why would an ultra-right lament the disappearance of the Left?

It's even said that Le Pen sounds more like a “neo-Marxist” than anything else.⁵ Who would have thought, thirty years ago, that, today, the fight for the oppressed would pass onto the hands of the “ultra-right wing”?

Ce projet, je l'ai construit pour le bien du peuple français dans son ensemble, mais je l'ai surtout pensé pour ceux que j'appelle les oubliés de la politique française. Ceux auxquels les médias ne donnent guère la parole, ou alors pour s'en moquer. Ceux qui ne sont pas aux manettes du système, ceux qui ne bénéficient en rien de la mondialisation, au contraire même en souffrent, ceux qui sont aujourd'hui broyés par une caste toute-puissante. Ces oubliés, ces invisibles, ces anonymes à qui l'on veut retirer toute identité, en leur imposant une immigration massive et déstabilisatrice, en les transformant en machines à consommer, obéissants, serviles face aux injonctions publicitaires ou commerciales des sociétés du CAC 40, je les porte dans mon coeur et je veux les aider à retrouver toute leur dignité. Les oubliés pour qui je me bats, ce sont les petits salariés, les employés, les fonctionnaires, les ouvriers, les classes moyennes, les retraités, les jeunes ou les seniors sans emploi, c'est cette France qu'on a dédaigneusement qualifiée de « France d'en bas », parfois de « France moisie ». La dignité que je veux leur offrir à nouveau, c'est celle du citoyen, éclairé, participant pleinement aux affaires de la

⁴ « Y a-t-il encore une solidarité de classe en France ? On pourrait en douter : le mouvement ouvrier s'est disloqué à mesure que le Parti communiste s'effondrait, notre pays affiche désormais un nombre de jours de grève par habitant inférieur à l'Allemagne, ou même aux États-Unis. Les syndicats ne regroupent ni ne représentent plus grand monde » (p. 116).

⁵ Yvan Blot, « Un livre néo marxiste? Quand Marine le Pen devient Marine la rouge.. », Atlantico., 04/03/2012 : <http://www.atlantico.fr/decryptage/marine-pen-pour-que-vive-france-livre-marxisme-rouge-yvan-blot-301601.html>. Blot is extremely, even unfairly, critical of Marine Le Pen. Nevertheless, his assessment of her as neo-Marxist is almost unavoidable. Yet, Danièle Masson, in his superior review, “Pour que vive la France’ de Marine Le Pen”, denies that Le Pen is any sort of neo-Marxist. “Qu’elle cite Marx et ne cite pas Maurras ne la rend ni marxiste, ni maurassienne. S’il fallait vraiment caractériser son texte – ce qui est réducteur – on le dirait plutôt gaullo-chevènementiste.” Nevertheless, Masson notes, “Aux références nationales de son père, elle préfère l’éclectisme, mais un éclectisme qui puise largement à gauche, de Marx à Jaurès, de Mendès à Marchais, de Michéa à Gauchet... Elle s’inspire largement du philosophe Jean Claude Michéa et de l’économiste Maurice Allais qu’elle cite, et peut-être d’Hervé Juvin, auteur d’un remarquable et terrible *Renversement du monde*, qu’elle ne cite pas.”

Nation, c'est celle de l'individu libre et affranchi de toutes les manipulations du monde contemporain, celle de cette France autrefois glorieuse et indépendante, aujourd'hui asservie par les puissances financières (p. 17 – 18).

In reality, of course, Marine is a nationalist, a neo-Gaullist. Like us, she is revolting against the degradation of humanity through the postmodern culture invented – especially by the Americans – to support global consumerism. She's revolting because, in the new structure, nation-state, and everything high culture, and even human potential, the human brain, itself, are out of date. She's revolting probably also because she really is a sympathetic person and so cares about the common people. The changing circumstances of the world – the way the power structure has ascended – has now caused the traditional far-right to adopt the agendas of the traditional far-left.

After providing a structural analysis of the Enemy, Marine Le Pen then also provides an account of its historical origin. The adoption by the French elites of the American globalist agenda dates from the administration of Valéry Giscard d'Estaing. From thence onward, France began following in the footsteps of the Anglo-American tradition and a series of measures privatizing state-owned enterprises and decentralizing the state apparatus began to be implemented. One cannot help but note the coincidence that this was precisely the time when the Americans dismantled the Bretton Wood system and enforced the new US Dollar standard. It was an American trick after all: the beginning of American imperial domination of world's economy.

The most significant event in this period signifying France's falling under the American globalist agenda is the adoption of the law of 3 January 1973 prohibiting the French state from borrowing from the central bank of France at low interest rate. Thenceforth, France is required to borrow from the private banks in world's market to finance its debt, resulting in the enrichment of financial multinationals but the increasing indebtedness of France. This marks France's entry into the Anglo-American neoliberal ideology.

The cure which Marine Le Pen offers to the disease (the Enemy) is Gaullist nationalism: “La nation est la seule réponse crédible à la mondialisation” as she repeats again and again in her work. As she notes:

La nation est la seule à avoir la taille suffisante et la légitimité démocratique nécessaire pour représenter une protection et un cadre de vie pour nos concitoyens. Je pense que plus la mondialisation sauvage progresse, plus l'exigence de nation se renforce (p. 174).

Just as one of the principal goals of globalism is the destruction of the traditional nation-state, the nation-state, for Le Pen, is the only viable cure for this disease called “globalism”. A strong state not only preserves national identity and restore the nation's influence in the world, but also protects the common people from dispossession and impoverishment under globalization. She would evidently also agree that only a strong state can protect the citizens from the mind-destruction which the political and corporate elites have desired for them, i.e. from what we will call below the “American project for the simplification of the human mind”. We, the New Left, shall agree whole-heartedly with Le Pen in regard to the promotion of nationalism to stave off

humanity's degeneration to the one-dimensionality of consumption ("thermodynamic dissipation"). More on this below.

Marine Le Pen elaborates this solution of hers in the second part of her book (*Un avenir français, la voie du redressement; La refonte de l'école, un enjeu premier*). The foundation of Marine Le Pen's reform program is the restoration of the powerful, centralized state (*État régalien*) which has always been France's tradition since Louis XIV, the French Revolution, and Napoleon, which has been the object of ridicule by the Anglo-American laissez-faire tradition (the "French welfare state"), and which has been dismantled by the French elites' adoption of the Anglo-American neoliberalism and France's absorption into the "United States of Europe". The *État régalien* shall perform all the wonders which a laissez-faire, decentralized, neoliberal state cannot do under market competition: the dismantlement of affirmative action (*la discrimination positive*), the revision of France's participation in the European project, the restoration of public moral (prevention of corruption), tougher fighting on crimes and the building of more prison spaces, the reconstitution of the welfare system to protect the poor and the seniors, the reconstitution of protective tariffs to protect French workers and industries and prevent outsourcing (*relocalisation*), the reindustrialization of France, the rejection of Euro, the balancing of the state budget and the rejection of national debt as a viable solution, and the restoration of "classical education". Le Pen summarizes these functions under: l'État régalien, l'État protecteur, l'État solidaire, l'État stratège, l'État influent, l'État solide.

What's most important is of course Le Pen's readiness to fundamentally restructure France's foreign policy objectives: the creation of a pan-European alliance which includes Russia and which refuses to be subject to the dictates of the United States (alliance with the US against Russia). France will in this way reassert its influence in world affairs.

Insuffisamment anti-Américaine

Now we shall express any possible dissatisfaction with Le Pen's agendas. Marine Le Pen is anti-American only in the matter of geopolitics and *politeia* (the political and economic structure of the nation-state). Le Pen is anti-American because it is the United States which has invented, and is promoting, "globalism":

Or, les États-Unis, sous l'impulsion de leur élite, sont au coeur du projet mondialiste dont ils sont, en quelque sorte, le réacteur nucléaire : leur monnaie, leur langue, leurs banques, leurs pratiques financières, leurs multinationales, leur culture, leurs lobbies, leur diplomatie et leur armée y tiennent le premier rôle. Si l'élite américaine a progressivement affaibli l'État sur le plan intérieur, elle en a fait sur le plan extérieur un outil guerrier au service du projet mondialiste dont elle constitue le principal groupe bénéficiaire. En conséquence, tout alignement excessif des gouvernements français et européens sur les États-Unis, toute admiration inconditionnelle et naïve de leur civilisation dans ce qu'elle a parfois d'admirable, mais parfois aussi de démesuré et de désespérant, n'est pas dans l'intérêt de la France pas plus d'ailleurs, j'ose le dire, que dans l'intérêt bien compris du peuple américain (p. 36).

Through globalizations, American elites rule and profit. France loses and disappears. In other words, Le Pen is anti-American because she sees France as also the victim of American imperialism. It's not just Russia, China, Iran, Bolivia, etc., who are the targets of American aggression. The majority of European elites don't care about "vassalisation à l'Amérique" (don't see it as a problem) because they have already been converted to "globalism" and "American exceptionalism".

Le Pen especially deplores the French elites' adoption of the Anglo-American neoliberalism in France, starting from the 1970s (under Valéry Giscard d'Estaing) and resulting in a series of liberalization, privatization, and decentralization in the French economic and political structure. The trend has significantly accelerated under Sarkozy (Sarkozy l'Américain), the most pro-American ideologue in French politics since World War II.

To save itself – its power, identity, and prosperity – France, therefore, must distance itself from the United States.

We would wish that Marine Le Pen might also be anti-American in the domain of culture. Insofar as United States is the origin of all this "political correctness" which is destroying our human potential under the disguise of enlightening us, a campaign must be launched to demonize American culture as the carrier of this virus "political correctness" and shut it off from the front door of every nation. While Marine Le Pen has taken the initial steps in deconstructing the European elites' "political correctness", she has not explicitly named it "American" and thrown it out of the house because it is "American".

Let us be more precise. While Le Pen has designated the "Enemy" as "globalism", our designated Enemy – the ultimate Enemy – is postmodernism, that culture which has been specifically invented by the Americans to support global commerce and consumerism and is synonymous with "American culture". Postmodernism is the superstructure of the current economic model (the substructure). The foregoing "political correctness" is one, but the most important, characterization of the postmodern culture. It is "political correctness" which presents to us this poison of our humanity as its exact opposite, as something wholesome. Why do we so hate postmodernism? Why is postmodernism so poisonous? Because its purpose is to simplify the human mind into the mind of a beast – a deeper characterization of the postmodern project to specialize all human beings into consumers. In other words, we have developed a much more comprehensive characterization of this *homo modialisus* which Le Pen has only cursively noted. As we have noted:

... "postmodernism", of which the left wing is feminism, and the right wing is neoconservatism. The purpose of postmodernism is: to turn civilized human beings back into wild beasts.

We should have noted that the left wing of postmodernism includes, not just all this feminism business, but also all this tolerance for other racial, cultural, and religious groups. Now what does this "simplification of the human mind" mean? In "Conclusion", we have characterized it in many ways: the reduction of concerns for others to absolute selfishness, self-centeredness, and the shrinkage of one's mental horizon to that of the Self and no more. The devolution of an adult

immersed in a community who is constantly preoccupied with others to a selfish baby who only cares about himself or herself. This devolution (“regression”, “atrophy”) is especially switched on – against the morals and ethics we have inherited from our ancestors – under the ideology of “rights”, “human rights”, “women’s rights”, and all the “political correctness”. Elsewhere, we have provided an illustration of the “devolution” (or “atrophy”) through analogy with historical linguistics. What we are so concerned with when it comes to American-invented postmodernism is not the decline of morals and ethics per se, but the disintegration, simplification, of the human mind which is the biological, cognitive, and psychological basis of moral decline.

We believe that a process which we have called the “simplification of the mind and human experience” has been going on since the 1970s in the United States and, from there, around the world – a process which is chronologically coincidental with the onset of neoliberalism which Marine Le Pen has noted earlier (the dismantling of Bretton Wood, the “reform” under Valéry Giscard d’Estaing) – what a surprise! – and that this process has greatly accelerated under the Digital Age, specifically the culture of Facebook, Twitter, and Wikipedia. Again, the following should be read in conjunction with our introductory remark on the destruction of the human brain under democracy, digital electronics, and consumerism (“Document A” and “Conclusion”). “Political correctness” is part of the problem called “democracy”: what is “politically correct” is (1) democracy, (2) human rights, (3) feminism, and (4) tolerance for other races, cultures, religions, and national origins.

As noted, we have likened the process of the simplification of the human mind to the loss of grammatical structures in the recent evolution of the Indo-European languages. Here we shall invoke again the concept of “cognitive map”.

To understand this, it is important to keep in mind the important difference between the human cognitive world and that of the animals... between culture and nature. We have said that culture is a negation of nature, so that the mindset, or cognitive map, of a socially active human is structured in inverse of that of an unsocial, free-roaming animal: whereas self-interest and the drive for satisfaction of desires govern that of the latter (for most species and during most of the time, at least), social duties implying self-sacrifice, altruism, and repression of desires structure the former. And while concrete, tangible reality fills the latter, invisible, intangible and non-existent entities organize the former. (“The communal map unique to humans is sociocentric, its motivational biases regularly inverting those of ordinary perception -- so that onerous social duties... are positively marked, while opportunities for sexual self-indulgence are marked 'danger' or 'taboo'. The representations central to the communal map are intangibles, without perceptual counterparts. 'God', 'Unicorn' and 'Totem' are among the possibilities.” Chris Knight, “Darwinism and Collective Representations”, in *The Archaeology of Human Ancestry*, p. 331.)⁶

⁶ From CHAPTER 6.2, “The Origin of the Sexual Division of Labor and the First Stage of Supraorganismic Formation”, *A Thermodynamic Interpretation of History* (<http://www.lawrencechin2011.com/1/oppressionofwomen20.htm>).

When the mind of the beast is inverted to create the mind of a human being, “concerns for others” (onerous social duties with their enforcers, whether morals and ethics in the modern sense or God and the Ancestor Ghost in the archaic sense) are structures added to the animal mind. The human mind, the human cognitive map, is more complex than the animal mind, the animal cognitive map. Today, these added structures are rapidly disappearing. The mind is being simplified.

Along with the “concerns for others”, all human critical thinking abilities are disappearing as well. Hence the decline of the uniquely human ability for moral reasoning: today, the average level of moral development for the new American generation is probably something like stage two on Lawrence Kohlberg’s moral development scale, whereas it used to be stage four in the 1970s.

Elements of traditional human psychology – like shame and guilt – are also rapidly disappearing from the postmodern cognitive map. The postmodern human being grows up completely freed from the constant feelings of shame and guilt which have characterized the interior of any human being in time past.

The postmodern human being usually only thinks of himself or herself, how to gratify his or her own desires at every moment. If s/he socializes, it’s because s/he can get something out of it for himself or herself, not out of any sense of duty to others and society. If there is no reward for the Self, s/he prefers to stay home in front of his or her computer, on Facebook, Twitter, and Wikipedia. Without reasoning about right and wrong, without concerns for others, and without shame and guilt, the postmodern mind has become identical to that of a beast, and it has become like this by losing all the structures which have been added onto the mind of the beast when the human being becomes a social animal, like the way Sanskrit loses its structure, becomes simplified in grammar (loses all inflections), and turns into the modern day, child-play, Hindu languages (without any grammar and completely disorganized in syntax).

This is the ideal picture, and may seem like an exaggeration to you. People in America still always have the habit of volunteering and donating to charities, you’ll protest. But something like this is going on.

You cannot truly appreciate the simplification of the mind without at the same time noting the simplification of the human experience (human psychology) under the postmodern life-style. The fast-paced economy of marketing and consumption, increasing bureaucratization of institutions, and instant, but shallow, communication on social media instead of letter-writing and face-to-face communication have resulted in increasing superficiality of all human interaction. Deep emotions are disappearing as well as deep thinking and reflection on life experiences.

You can easily produce physiological proofs for the “simplification of the human mind”. If you use MRI (Magnetic Resonance Imaging) to scan the brains of tens of thousands of people in “advanced nations”, you’ll certainly have noticed that, the newer the generation, the simpler, and of less variety, are their brain’s functioning patterns. The brains of human beings from traditional societies produce a greater variety of functional patterns and these patterns show more details. The brain of Americans born in the digital age will show a lesser variety of functional patterns

and these patterns have less details in them. This is the empirical meaning of the “simplification of the human brain/ experience”. The reason is obvious: the traditional human being has to think and feel more things than a postmodern human being: other people’s welfare, social duty, all sorts of negative emotions and self-admonishment. While human beings from the past and the present show no difference in outer appearance, their respective inner, subjective reality is completely different. It is the same phenomenon as the progressive loss of inflections, since antiquity, in Indo-European languages. Take, as examples, English and the Romance languages. Cases are first reduced in number, and then disappear altogether. In English, all verbal conjugations have disappeared in favor of auxiliary verbs. In Romance languages, half of them have disappeared. Of course, in academic English and French, the loss of grammatical complexity is compensated by increasing logical tightness in syntactical constructions. But the loss of brain’s functional complexity in contemporary “consumers” is more like the English slang among ordinary people in comparison to Old English a thousand year ago, whose nouns have cases and whose verbs inflect for tenses and moods, etc. MRI scans of both human beings from traditional societies and their equivalents from postmodern societies will show that, where the image for the former’s brain functioning patterns is a complex mosaic, the brain functional patterns of the latter are like monochromes. What’s worst is that things, once lost, are never regained. While it’s possible for a traditionally minded human being to understand the simpler psychology of the postmodern human beings, the latter can never understand the former. The postmodern human beings will never understand what shame, guilt, and moral and critical reasoning are about. The situation is like: young American students, when they are somehow required to take classes in Greek, Latin, or Russian – and this is the first time they are learning a foreign language – simply don’t understand why the nouns in these languages have to change their endings according to whether they are the subject, direct object, or indirect object of the verb, etc. What are these: nominative, accusative, dative? And they have no idea that English used to be like that too. When you see a “socially conservative” (Marine Le Pen included) deploring the loss of morals in the young people of contemporary consumerist societies, they are essentially critiquing the “simplification of the human mind”. It’s not just a moral issue; it’s an issue about the underdevelopment of the human potential under the postmodern age.

Again, Le Pen’s lamentation about *homo mondialisus* is ultimately an instance of the older generation’s alarm over the increasing shallowness of the cognitive and emotional life of the younger generation.

The use of historical linguistic typology as an analogy to explain the simplification of the American experience/ brain should remind us of the nineteenth century Indo-Europeanist August Schleicher’s theory that the advancement in civilization is the cause for the decay of its associated language, e.g. that, the more advanced a civilization, the greater its accompanying language’s loss of inflections, such that, within the Germanic world for instance, English has suffered the greatest loss of inflections in its nouns and verbs and has become the most isolating, while the English culture has become the most advanced in thought, letters, and political forms, and that Icelandic has preserved most of the old Germanic grammar and is the most archaic, while the culture of Iceland is the most primitive. Since, as we have noted everywhere, the destiny of humanity is the collapse of its civilization through over-exploitation of its natural

habitat and its energy resources, the United States is most advanced toward this destiny, so that its human brain is also by now suffering the greatest degree of simplification/ mechanization/ disappearance. Elsewhere in the world, as other nations become Americanized, their population should also undergo the same simplification, until the human brain becomes reduced to simple mechanical reflexes: the postmodern professional consumer.⁷

⁷ We have asserted that, while culture has inverted the animal mind into a human (social) mind, postmodernism is inverting it back into the animal mind. This conversion of the human (social) mind back into the animal mind can in fact be traced to its root in Enlightenment. The philosophy of Marquis de Sade – whatever is “natural”, i.e. satisfaction of selfish instincts, is “good” – is in essence the espousal of the conversion of the human mind back into the animal mind: the instincts which he says Nature has installed in man and which he glorifies as “right” are just those beastly desires which were suppressed when the animal mind was converted into the human mind. For example, Christina Geyer's short and concise introduction to Marquis de Sade, “Der Gott des Lasters” (Hoheluft Magazin):

Sade versucht, seinen Amoralismus durch das Gesetz der Natur zu rechtfertigen. Jene bildet ihm zufolge die Basis jeglicher Ordnung. Die Natur kenne keine Verbrechen – es gibt sie nicht, sie existieren einzig in den Köpfen der Menschen. Das einzige wirkliche Verbrechen, schreibt Sade, wäre es, die Natur zu beleidigen. Was den Menschen erregt, was ihm zur Lust verhilft, kann nicht verbrecherisch sein – selbst wenn er dafür morden muss. Die Natur selbst würde, so der Marquis, ja auch ständig morden. Dementsprechend würde der Mensch gegen das Gesetz der Natur verstoßen, wenn er nicht alle nur erdenklichen Mittel ergreift, um sich Befriedigung zu verschaffen. Grausamkeit, sofern sie der Lust dient, wird zur Pflicht, die Natur zur Gegengottheit. Damit sieht Sade alle Gewalt legitimiert – sich ihrer zu bedienen wird zum rationalen Akt. Für den Philosophen und Autor Rüdiger Safranski ist Sades Wille zum Bösen gar genauso rein wie der Kant'sche Wille zum Guten, obwohl der Marquis ohne Weiteres als »Anti-Kant« begriffen werden kann.

For another short, but comprehensive, introduction to Marquis de Sade, see John Phillips' *The Marquis de Sade: A Very Short Introduction* (2005). (Phillips also sees a postmodern in Sade, although in a different sense than ours.) The foundation of Sade's philosophy is his adoption of the materialist philosophy of his days, resulting in his seeing as “good” and “right” whatever Nature has installed in human beings – and consequently his seeing pleasure as the only guiding principle in human life. He sees all morals (usually the suppression of selfish seeking of bodily pleasures) as “bad” because human beings have invented this “God” to propagate this deceptive idea that whatever Nature has installed in human beings is “bad”. It is the perversion of Nature, and it is those human beings who have perverted Nature who should be condemned. Sade's error lies in his misconception of Nature. While it is Nature which has installed pleasure and all selfish desires in human beings taken as solitary beings, it is also Nature which, in order to further develop these solitary beings into social beings, has installed in them the idea to suppress mere selfish seeking of pleasures. Sade has never looked into the fact that the suppression of selfish seeking of bodily pleasures is for the sake of both the self – in order to better concentrate oneself on higher ideals than mere satisfaction of bodily pleasures – and others – in order to enable reciprocity between human beings. He has also never considered the fact that a mind which operates on the cognitive mind centered around the suppression of selfish instincts for the sake of focusing on higher ideals and factoring in other people's interests is a mind which is more complex and more developed than a mind which operates solely around the principle of satisfaction of bodily pleasures. Thus Marquis de Sade has ushered in the reversal of the human being back into an animal through a misconception of Nature – by considering only the basic stages of Nature as Nature and relegating its higher stages to fantasies he calls “religion”. His conception of Nature is oversimplified, that is. The fact is that one can very well hold onto a materialist conception of the world and remain an atheist without at the same time degenerating into a hedonist without consideration for others and higher development of the self – when one, that is, does not forget that the social cognitive map that is peculiarly human is also Nature's invention.

When one considers how similar Marquis de Sade is to Thrasymachus in Plato's *Republic* – e.g. the stories of Juliette vs Justine: “Deux soeurs, l'une très libertine vit dans le bonheur, dans l'abondance et la prospérité, l'autre, extrêmement sage tombe dans mille panneaux qui finissent enfin par entraîner sa perte...” i.e. the question whether a

We are anti-American because America's mission in world-history is the destruction of our Planet Earth and the extinction of all humanity (all human potential). While everyone can see that the exhaustion of earth's natural resources (especially hydrocarbon energy) and the destruction of its natural environment are directly caused by growing global consumerism – of which United States, as the principal motor of globalization, is therefore the most guilty, with new comers like China merely following on its footsteps – we wish to point out that United States is also the most guilty party for the increasing destruction (atrophy) of the human mind. Note that all the causes which we have elsewhere identified for the “atrophy of the human mind” – digital technology (especially the Facebook world), mass culture, mass consumption, the culture of “rule by lowest denomination”, McDonaldization, and democracy – are American inventions. We have hence elsewhere, as a stern warning, tried to create the stereotype of Americans as “brain-hating” (μισονοουσος).

Given our agenda, any possible criticism from us of Marine Le Pen's thinking and position therefore shall relate to her insufficient anti-American stance. While she has identified United States as the principal obstacle to France's (Gaullist) independence and prosperity, and while she has made initial steps in identifying the phenomenon of brain-atrophy under specialization of consumers (*homo mondialisus*), she has not quite explicitly identified the United States as the chief cause for the crisis facing our planet and our very brain itself. We are suggesting that, should a New Left emerge in Europe and Russia and make alliance with the ultra-right (with for example the National Front in France), it will expand the spectrum of anti-Americanism beyond the rhetoric about traditional national identity and national independence, to include concerns with our planet's environment and energy resources and our very brain itself. Anti-Americanism shall not just be for the sake of saving France or any other European nations, but for the sake of saving our planet and the human brain itself. That is, we mean to suggest an expansion of the “Frontist mission” (*le mission frontiste*).

Further congruence between the “New Left” and the “Extreme Right”: preferring the production phase of capitalism to its consumption phase

That said, we should note in passing another important area in which we have found our New Leftist agendas in complete agreement with Le Pen's Frontist agendas. Specifically Marine Le Pen has implicitly criticized the increasing shallowness of our existence due to the elites' abuse of our economic structures.

Other than exposing political correctness, Le Pen is concerned with the “financiarisation” of France's national and world's economy, the increasing neglect of production and manufacturing – the foundation of any economic system – in favor of financial speculation (moving around money generated by production and manufacturing) as the sources of wealth. The elites are increasingly becoming mere parasites on ordinary people's work: they have, more and more, rather than causing anything to be produced, preferred to move around money which others at the bottom have worked hard to make to generate enormous wealth for themselves. They do this

just life is worth the effort – one is further reminded that the nostalgia for the animal life while living a human, social life has always existed and surfaced from time to time throughout history, not the first time during Enlightenment.

because this is an easier way and a short cut. It's however wealth-generation only on the short-term; in the long run it's a drain upon world's economy, and it's the common people who do produce who will have to pay, in the future, for the phantom wealth generated through all the slight-of-hands in the illusory financial speculation. Marine Le Pen, who cares about the common people and the long-term prosperity of France, thus detests financial speculation.

Aujourd'hui, le marché des produits dérivés, c'est-à-dire des contrats financiers de couverture, le plus souvent spéculatifs, représente plus de 100 000 milliards de dollars sur les marchés organisés et 520 000 milliards de dollars sur le marché de gré à gré.

Le simple bon sens conduit à comparer la richesse réelle produite par l'économie du monde, soit 56 000 milliards de dollars, avec des flux financiers déconnectés de cette réalité et qui représentent dix ou quinze fois sa valeur réelle, soit aux environs de 800 000 milliards de dollars (p. 66).

Any New Left should share the same sort of preference, preferring solid work to short-cut (parasitical) speculations and schemes, and would like to see their nation's economy grounded in industrial production of concrete products rather than in services and transactions which generate incomes merely by moving around, throughout the circuits of the economic world, products which other nations have produced, and money which other people have worked hard to make. The growth of parasitical structures on the "real economy" does not simply generate phantom wealth for the present at the expense of the future, but also contributes to the increasing superficiality of everything we do, resulting in brain-atrophy. We have said elsewhere:

To elaborate on the topic of the mental health industry: mental health professionals have to look like they are treating mental illnesses because the pharmaceutical companies need a pretext under which to feed their products into people. There is in fact barely such thing left in the world as "mental illness" now that human beings have been simplified into robots. Other than purely physical illness in the brain (like hallucinatory schizophrenia or some bipolar conditions). There is no such thing as "depression" because this kind of illness is no more than misinterpretation of circumstances, a purely intellectual error, the result of stupidity or ignorance. Things like "Borderline Personality Disorder" such as is diagnosed in contemporary population are so watered down that they are merely an indistinct shadow of the real Borderline Personality Disorder which people suffer half a century ago. Human beings are no longer capable of suffering from mental illnesses, just as robots have no ability to suffer mental illnesses. Most of the medication which psychiatrists prescribe don't actually correspond to any mental illnesses, because the "patients" are actually healthy and not suffering any mental illnesses. Everybody is pretending to suffer mental illnesses and treat mental illnesses – a staged show – in order that pharmaceutical companies may collect earnings. This is why the vast majority of mental health professionals nowadays don't understand anything about human psychology; there is no need for them to understand it, and no real psychology for them to understand. There

are hardly any real “mental patients”. Both doctors and patients are merely “pretexts”, actors and actresses. Most doctors have never noticed that they have actually never witnessed any “mental illnesses”, and most patients have never noticed that they are actually not sick. This is the same with the American university system. Half of the professors and most of the students are in fact neither teaching nor learning, they are just pretending to teach and to learn. The whole American society is but a staged show, the purpose being to let foreign-made consumer products obtain a pretext to circulate throughout the society.

The whole business therefore clarifies the issue: why is the US so much in debt? It’s precisely because the US society is merely “pretending”. To enable foreign made products to circulate throughout American society, Americans have to pay the foreigners. How do Americans come up with the money? In the past, one country buys products from another country with money earned from selling one’s own products to that country or to another country. But since American society is only a staged show, and is not actually producing anything worthwhile at all – people are merely pretending to work by moving money, services, and foreign made products from one place to another – Americans have nothing to sell to foreigners and so can only print money or treasury notes with which to feed foreigners. This is why STEM fields have become so important in American economy since the only things which Americans can possibly sell to foreigners in a real sense are high tech weapons and electronic gadgets or communication services (Internet). For the rest, Americans can do no more than print money, and get away with it through the US Dollar’s special status as world’s preferred reserve currency.

The US is in a very similar situation as China was between 1850s and 1920, when the whole country was addicted to opium.

America is thus only pretending to make a living for itself, and this course is of course unsustainable. And yet America survives because the US Dollar is the world’s preferred reserve currency. The United States survives by *forcing* foreign nations to buy, sell, and save only with US Dollar. It is said that, when one walks into the Pentagon, one will see this huge picture of a Nimitz class aircraft carrier hanging over the hallway, on which is the saying: “As long as we have these supersize aircraft carriers to float around the world, we can enforce the use of US Dollars as the principal currency in economic transactions around the world.” The United States is consciously enforcing this rule with brute force because this is the only way for United States to survive – because the American economy is but a chimera. The United States is also the “parasite of the world”.

Marine Le Pen deeply fears that France might be going in the same direction, becoming a nation with a completely empty economy except for high technology production and which survives by parasiting on the rest of the world. And this is what really explains her hatred for “financiarisation” of France’s economy and increasing outsourcing of manufacturing out of France: “Le mondialisation qui fait de la France une victime des pays émergentes...” And this is

why she intends to recreate tariffs to protect France's manufacturing sectors and implement government initiatives to help medium-size and small businesses. She intends to restore France to what we have called the "production phase of capitalism". This, again, is in perfect congruence with the New Left's agenda.

However, once again, we do not see Marine Le Pen having sufficiently explored this issue to its ultimate depth. Implicit in our above lamentation over "all pretending" is also the worry over the deadly effect which such an empty economy has exerted on the development of the human brain itself. When the human being is devoting himself or herself only to a staged show rather than to any concrete reality, his or her brain inevitably deteriorates and simplifies. Everything "hangs together" (*zusammenhangt*): increasing quantity of cheap consumer products, outsourcing, the replacement of manufacturing with services, spending (in debt) instead of saving, the massive growth of the financial sectors, and the atrophy of the human brain.

A possible difference: concern with moral decline and education

Marine Le Pen is, like us, also concerned with moral decline, not just among political elites, but also among the general public. This is of course not surprising since she is usually identified as speaking conservatism. It will be a surprise if the concern with common people's moral development has also become a major issue in the leftwing. But, if postmodernism is about turning human beings back into "apes", the shrinkage of one's whole concern, or mental horizon, to that of the Self, or what we have called the "Ape Morality", the New Left, identified as speaking about the "restoration of humanity", should of course be concerned with this issue. The New Left's difference from ordinary conservatives is that the latter are usually content with maintaining those superficial indexes of the morals of a population (no sexual indulgence, no abortion, and everybody goes to church) whereas we are concerned with something far more substantial, i.e. the loss of moral reasoning and understanding of fairness in the newer generations. We have said elsewhere:

Most people nowadays will harm you if you are obstacles to their goals and cause them unpleasantness. That's all. There is no thought-process associated with their actions. "Kiersten" hates me because she has failed to destroy me.⁸ That's all. She does not pause to think that it's not my fault, but her own fault, or the government's fault, that she has failed to get me. There is no "motive" in her action because she is not really capable of it. She is simply acting on reflexes. People from the past have "motives" because, before acting, they would conduct moral reasoning, which would alter the expression of their instincts and reflexes. That's called "motive". But, by now, moral reasoning has been removed from the human brain, so that there is actually no such thing as "motive" anymore. Hence it no longer matters that criminal psychologists have failed to analyze a suspect's motives. The time when Lawrence Kohlberg can describe six stages of moral reasoning in people has gone... People simply don't reason anymore, at least about right and wrong... People in the past are more concerned with ideas. They

⁸ You must refer to many of our stories on the matter.

live for certain ideals of honor, loyalty, etc., these constitute the content of their self-esteem, self-concept, whereas people in postmodern society express themselves entirely through making money and purchasing products and gratifying their unreflected desires. Every measurement of achievement in American society is in terms of money and purchase. Have women made any progress in achieving equality? Go measure how much money they make and how many products they purchase. And this is what is going to bring down the world. Traditional cultures shall be promoted because, in the past, it is ideas which serve as the measurement of achievement, not consumer products. The use of ideas as measurement saves and conserves; the use of consumer products as measurement wastes and is unsustainable in the long run...

We presume that Marine Le Pen will indeed agree with much of what have said here. The sign is that, insofar as we have maintained that the enormous decline of morals among the newer generation is intimately associated with the decline of educational standards, she has herself deplored in similar fashion and spoken in favor of classical education – just as we would do.

Évidemment, on se débarrasse peu à peu de la culture classique, le Latin, le Grec, la Littérature, la Philosophie, l’Histoire, on élimine ces éléments « dévastateurs » qui sont la base d’une culture classique, d’un raisonnement autonome et de l’objectif central qui était autrefois celui de notre école républicaine, former un « honnête homme », disposant d’un esprit critique, capable de discernement, apte à se diriger lui-même (p. 114).

Elsewhere, Le Pen has clearly understood, as we have, that the purpose of all that “liberal” education favored in contemporary times – the politically correct emphasis on exciting the students’ creativity rather than forcing them to memorize boring facts and classical texts – is really to kill minds rather than to cultivate them. She has noted in her “Programme” in the National Front platform:

Fin de l’aventure pédagogue : la méthode syllabique sera obligatoire en CP, l’histoire sera apprise de façon chronologique tout au long de la scolarité. La géographie sera enseignée sur des cartes, et l’apprentissage de la géographie française obligatoire.

L’histoire de France retrouvera sa place au coeur de l’apprentissage.

Maintien obligatoire de la note.

In other words, everything has to return to the traditional way. Not any the less traditional discipline: “à l’école tout le monde n’est pas au même niveau. Le professeur est au dessus de l’élève. Et le parent d’élève n’est pas le client du professeur. L’accent sera mis sur cette évidence dans la formation des enseignants. La valeur centrale de respect du professeur retrouvera toute sa place à l’école...” This will certainly be the New Left’s position as well. All that catering to the

desires of the students, whether in elementary education or in universities – this bizarre inversion of the natural order of things which has made America the “Opposite Society” (as we have called it) and which is being exported to the rest of the world – has in fact originated from the quintessential American cultural trend: the culture of the rule of the lowest denomination, or the “revolt of the masses” (Ortega y Gasset). Marine Le Pen has echoed our concern with the inversion of “natural order” under postmodernism when she persistently quotes Plato (in both the “Programme” and *Pour que vive la France*):

Platon a écrit : « Lorsque les maîtres tremblent devant leurs élèves et préfèrent les flatter, lorsque les jeunes méprisent les lois parce qu’ils ne reconnaissent plus au dessus d’eux l’autorité de rien ni de personne, alors c’est là en toute beauté et en toute jeunesse le début de la tyrannie. »

This certainly makes her sound “conservative”. The New Left sounds like a traditional conservative here because, remember, we believe in a certain mélange between conservatism and liberalism: authoritarianism during young and liberalism during adulthood. Only under an authoritarian, and classical, education, can a child grow up to become an adult endowed with the sort of critical thinking capacity and moral reasoning necessary to any meaningful exercise of freedom without the supervision of an authority above him or her. What distinguishes the New Left from the traditional right is therefore the position that authoritarianism is a means to an end rather than an end in itself. The traditional conservatives want authoritarianism for the whole lifespan of an individual whereas the New Left only wants it during the early periods of life. The New Left adult will pay more attention to the genuine exercise of fairness rather than superficial indexes like condemning homosexuality for the sake of condemning it (“because it’s contrary to human natural functions”). We do not expect the Frontists to disagree with us in principle on this point, however.

What is wrong with the American feminization of culture: “victimology” and New Feminism:

The issue which we have not seen Marine Le Pen addressing sufficiently is certainly that regarding womankind, the “Question of Woman” (*Frauenfrage*).

We have asserted throughout that American feminism is fundamentally wrong, an ideology of oppression, and, in its place, have proposed a “New Feminism”. We have deplored American feminism because it’s too much focused on the negative (protecting women from harm), and we have continually proposed a refocusing on the positive (developing women’s capacity). The tendency to focus on the negative is summed up under the designation “victimology” or “sacralization of the victim”. We have noted repeatedly that American women, despite becoming financially independent and being constantly praised by their fellow citizens for “great contributions”, constitute in fact a huge drag and waste on their nation, and we have attributed this to this persistent focus on the negative which has dominated American feminism and any American ideology in regard to the “Question of Woman”.

Our New Feminism, insofar as it has refocused on the positive (developing women's capacity), is devised not only to help women gain the independence that is needed for their equality with men, but also to enable them to become a positive force that would strengthen the nation-state rather than becoming a burden wasting away its power-base. While we propose "New Feminism" as the New Left's answer to the gender issues, we thus hope that, Marine Le Pen, insofar as she is a nationalist, would explicitly make this her position as well.

We have elsewhere already talked extensively about our "New Feminism". Here we shall make some supplemental, or general, comments about it. There are, generally speaking, "American feminism" and "French feminism" already on the table. Our "New Feminism" will differ significantly from both.

As said, New Feminism shall be an instrument to liberate women and do good to society at the same time, rather than an instrument to destroy society and the world and in the process destroy women themselves, such as is the case with American feminism. New Feminism will then put the greatest emphasis on women's brain development, in contrast to American feminism, which has been about retarding women's brain development under the disguise of rejecting harmful, false knowledge of men (which is in fact just true knowledge). There is nothing more important than developing the capacities of the brain, which will cause the person to know, and care about, what is real, and to understand, and care about, her fellow human beings. While American feminism has been about taking care of women's body (preventing it from being injured even when nobody is trying to injure it: paranoia over nothing; feminist fear-mongering), New Feminism will be about taking care of women's brain. In this way, New Feminism will try hard teaching women to value men who care about their brain development, their ability to know, and care about, what is real, and what is beyond the Self, rather than teaching them to fear men as potential rapists, to constantly complain about society's sexism, and to perpetually seek special benefits and protection.

Of course, it would sound like the most obvious rather than great wisdom to say that any feminism should focus more on developing women's brain capacities, and it would shock American feminists themselves to say that they have no interests in developing women's brain capacity. Of course they do. But in practice, American feminists spend the majority of their time trying to protect women from (mostly imaginary, non-existent) harm. This situation has come about because American feminists have this fundamental assumption that women are already endowed with special powers which would do the world a lot of good but are prevented from expressing that power to do the world a lot of good by a society which represses them and is physically dangerous to them. New Feminism thus distinguishes itself from American feminism by rejecting this assumption altogether. The New Feminist will take seriously the results of all empirical researches and reject the dual notion that women are somehow endowed with special talents which men don't have and that, in advanced, post-industrial nations, women are still repressed, discriminated against, and frequently victims of violence. And, because the New Feminist rejects this dual notion, she will spend the majority of her time addressing issues regarding women's development and underrepresentation in certain key domains of a nation-

state's functioning (e.g. STEM and politics) rather than complaining nonsensically about sexism, discrimination, and violence against women.

In the United States, the greatest obstacle to women's development, as we have repeatedly stressed elsewhere, is feminism itself. However, in Europe and Russia the obstacle will be something else. New Feminism will not tackle American feminism because it is not designed for the United States. In fact, since we regard United States as the Enemy of humanity, it's all the more satisfying to see American feminists train American women to become a drag upon their society and nation – as long as we can close off the American system. (See below.) However, French feminism – with its origins in semiotics, psychoanalysis, and philosophies of that sort (Julia Kristeva, Hélène Cixous, and Luce Irigaray) – although very different from American feminism, has been developing in a similar direction, seeing women as being essentially of a different nature than men and eschewing women's equal participation in these traditionally male domains (especially STEM and politics) as *the* way to achieve equality with men. New Feminism, should it come about in France, will therefore have to introduce its rejection of the “dual notion” and tackle French feminism on just this point.⁹

We have extensively addressed this issue elsewhere, especially in “Conclusion”. We have argued that it's due to the widespread adoption, among American women, of the American feminist notion that women are endowed with a special, different power (“intuitive”, “relational”) that, while women's participation in law, psychology, and medicine has exceeded that of men, they are conspicuously absent in STEM and politics; and that, because these womanly professions, although high-paying and requiring extensive educational backgrounds and so respected, are really wasting away a nation's resources when they are overpopulated, women in America are more like burdens on their nation than assets. Unfortunately, the aforementioned three pillars of French feminism have also been fond of arguing for women's special, different nature (that they live in a different sort of time-dimension; that their true nature can't be named, is non-binary and outside of the masculine symbolic order, etc.) and therefore have the potential of producing women that would become a burden rather than an asset to their nation and society. And yet there have never been any solid empirical evidences for the existence of this “special female nature” derived from pseudo-scientific metaphysical constructs like Lacanian psychoanalysis. New Feminism will be thoroughly materialistic and will waste no time on these imaginary constructions which exist only in self-contained discourses without reference to reality but not in reality itself. It will condemn all attempts by “difference” feminists to reject women “doing men's things side by side with men” as in anyway achieving equality with men. That women must work outside the order of society created by men, or that “égalité-déjà-là” is an illusion (Christine Delphy) – these are to be exposed by the New Feminist as harmful to both society and to the women themselves.

⁹ For both a brief summary of the three prominent French feminists' views and a criticism of the very concept of “French feminism”, see Caroline Crawford, “La Création du féminisme français par les féministes anglophones dans les années '80 et '90” (2009).

New Feminist must warn women in Europe and Russia to not commit the faults which American women have committed. American society is hardly “sexist” in any way nowadays, and yet, as we have noted elsewhere, American women are able to present their society as “sexist” mostly through tricks of “selective attention”: (1) by talking only about their own problems and ignoring other groups’ problems in comparison; (2) by talking only about what others have done to them and never about what they have done to others. In other words, the condemnation of such notion as “égalité-déjà-là” is really based on a certain self-centeredness and “Attention Deficit Disorder”.

You can see that New Feminism is essentially a new version of liberal feminism, in opposition to “difference feminism” (cultural feminism).

What we are particularly concerned with is the spread of certain elements in American feminism to the rest of the world through NGOs with all their political correctness and the official organs of the United Nations. Specifically the very focus on preventing certain categories of people designated as “oppressed” from suffering harm rather than on developing their capacities. This tendency we have designated by the term “victimology” or “sacralization of victims”. We, the New Left, need to tackle this “victimology” in Europe and Russia, and everywhere else in the world, because it is, again, a pernicious device (“hypocrisy”) to reinforce globalization and global commerce under the disguise of having sympathy for the weak and downtrodden. American feminism has a particular focus on protecting women from harm rather than on developing their capacities because it is at bottom a consumerist ideology to reinforce America’s transition to a consumerist society under the disguise of liberating and caring about women. In the same way, the “political correctness” which the UN agencies and NGOs carry around the world has such a focus on the suffering of the victims rather than on their development because it is at bottom also a consumerist ideology to bring the idea of consumption originating in the developed world to the rest of the world. We have once explained how this is the case in this way.

All the political correctness assigns a certain “sacredness” to the victims. Victims are not just considered to be morally superior to the victimizers, but are always given the red-carpet treatment. This sort of ideology develops as a consequence/symptom of: (1) the revolt of the masses (Jose Ortega y Gasset); and (2) consumerism. (1) We live in a culture, in a world, where victims, by simply suffering some harm, are automatically glorified, praised, hugged, and loved. Simply passively suffering harms has become some sort of short-cut to becoming a worthwhile person in the eyes of the world. In the past, nobody gave a damn about victims; victims were laughed at. It is the few elites who could accomplish amazing things who were glorified. In the modern world where the masses have gained control of society, they require society to confer upon victims a special status because this would enable a far greater number of people to acquire worth. If worth is a function of accomplishment and special talents, then only a few people can possibly become worthy. That’s in the past, where only a few geniuses

are worthy. If worth is a function of suffering harm, however, everybody can become worthy, since suffering harm is something which everybody is capable of; it requires no skill, no functioning brain, etc. *The* fool-proof way to become a worthwhile person in the public's eyes. Since the majority of people have no special talents, they will prefer this "fool-proof" way to become worthy to the traditional way which sees worthiness as a function of some special talents. The "sacredness of victims" is an ideology which permits the vast majority of people who have no talents to become worthy without actually having to accomplish anything special. On the other hand, people like us try to avoid becoming victims at all cost because this kind of people have already something going (some special goal, some special talent) by which they believe they will acquire worth, and suffering harm is a distraction from this original way of becoming worthy: a waste of time. (2) Protection of victims costs, consumes, a lot of resources. Since most victims are in fact useless persons who can't really produce anything worthwhile, this means that protecting increasing number of victims will help increase the consumption of resources without the consumption being balanced by their inverse replenishment through production. In this way, a culture which values the protection of victims above everything else will end up consuming more resources than replenishing them, resulting in its collapse. The "sacredness of victims" is therefore simply the expression of the "death gene" of a given civilization when it has subconsciously realized that it has gone past its prime and should therefore die soon. Such, then, is the underlying "program" by which we are being programmed to rush to the aid of victims as if it were our most sacred mission: the expression of senility.

What everyone needs to understand is that what is doing good in this moment – rushing to help some victim as if it were some sort of sacred mission – might be doing harm in the long run. Everybody is used to rushing to victims and helping them when victimization happens; nobody understands how this kind of actions will, in the long run, destroy the entire planet and cause the extinction of human civilization.

You can see that we the New Left will be anti-American also because America is the principal motor of this notion "sacralization of victims" and is forcing all nations around the world to adopt it. Every once in while American politicians will come up with some new idea about protecting a newly discovered group of poor victims (recently it's "victims of human trafficking" who are becoming popular)¹⁰ and every other nation will have to follow the cause for fear of looking bad if it doesn't. While everybody is so focused on what horrible fate "victims of human trafficking" (even assuming that there really is such epidemic) are suffering, nobody is bothering to calculate what special things those victims, once rescued, can possibly do to contribute to the world. Well, obviously, because it's more beneficial financially to big corporations to make sure

¹⁰ C.f. Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, Feb. 2015, *Christian Science Monitor*, 30/03/15.

one more mouth is not being extinguished but still eating than to make sure one more brain is still thinking and inventing wonderful new things, which only a few brains in the world can do in any case. Do you see our point? America knows only how to export bad ideas to the rest of the world and to force everybody to swallow the poison as if it were something wholesome.

Like Marine Le Pen, we the New Left prefer the value system associated with the production phase of capitalism, when human beings are valued for possessing merits and talents and contributing something special to their society and nation, to the value system associated with the consumption phase of capitalism, when human beings are valued just because they have suffered some harm and got the sympathy of everybody. We want to restore the valuation assigned to merits and talents – by which a few stand above the masses – and relegate the valuation assigned to being victimized – by which the masses can stand above the few – and we understand that this will cause us to clash with the traditional Left, who have always had so much sympathy for the oppressed, victimized, and downtrodden. We hope that the so-called “ultra-right” like Marine Le Pen will be congruent with our position here.

We will certainly clash with the traditional Left because, by our position, our preference for the traditional value system, we will, such as in the case of the uproar over the differential treatment of General Petraeus and Bradley Manning (for the same crime, the big boy got probation, and the little boy 99 years), not disagree with the authority’s decision. The person who is in possession of greater merits, experience, and talents should indeed be considered more important than those low ranking people with few merits, experience, and talents. We argue for the traditional value system because this is not only good for the earth’s resources base but also beneficial for the development of the human brain. A society where individuals yearn for talents in order to be recognized will be more conducive to the development of the human brain than a society where individuals compete as to who have suffered more harm. The United States is increasingly becoming the latter.

The decline of morals among the general population is also the consequence of the latter kind of society. We will claim that, contrary to ordinary feminist portrayal of women as more caring than, and morally superior to, men, American women are in fact characterized by a lack of concern for others and an exclusive focus on their own interests and inability to see the long-term consequences of their actions for the whole society. We have raised concern elsewhere that American women are becoming increasingly stupid due to their greater addiction to social networking media. We will again raise the issue concerning the enormous harm which feminists in this land have done to women’s brain development by constantly lobbying for special protection of women in accordance with their (false) notion that women continue to suffer disadvantages and discriminations in this country up to the present time. The lobbying, and all the political correctness concerning gender stereotypes which dictates special catering to women’s feelings and desires, have created a legal system and cultural atmosphere in the United States that is extremely biased toward women. We see this in all the reports about how women can easily ruin the life of their male counterparts by making false accusations about sexual violence, how women always obtain more favorable results during divorce, etc. We will assert that, because women in the United States have increasingly realized that the legal system is

biased toward them and that that they are now specially protected creatures, their capacity for critical thinking and moral reasoning is atrophying at a fast rate, becoming little “Empress Dowagers” due to everybody’s catering to their every whim, just as children in China are for a while becoming “little Emperors” when their parents cater to them too much under the one-child per family policy. American women activists have never considered the truism that over-protection and over-catering will produce human beings of inferior quality, never having learned to use their brains to think about the welfare and interests of others.

We will note that American women’s selfishness and self-centeredness is in sharp contrast to women from time past or in traditional societies who constantly try to take care of other people. While American feminists in the 1970s have criticized this kind of selflessness of traditional women as symptoms of oppression (“male-identification”, as the Radical Feminists used to call it), we wish to bring out its positive aspect. (We are not advocating that women’s role should be restricted to supporting their man from behind the scene, but are interested in striking a balance between traditional selflessness and postmodern self-centeredness. More on this below.) The main lesson here is not one of morality or virtue, but is about brain development. Insofar as the ability to think about others is a function of brain’s capacity for complex functions, what can be inferred about the brains of postmodern American women is that these are probably of far simpler structures than the brains of women from the past or in other societies who have been required or socialized to think about other people’s desires or interests and who have therefore developed more complex brain structures for the performance of such functions. The New Feminist is supposed to recognize the negative aspect of the value system “fight for your rights”, i.e. the promotion of selfishness and self-centeredness and, consequently, the underdevelopment or atrophy of the brain under the disguise of fighting evil (feminism, civil rights, and political correctness).

We will restore, in a certain way, the traditional “dutiful woman” cultivated in traditional patriarchal societies. New Feminism will encourage women not only to develop their brain, but also virtues, i.e. a sense of duty to society. We have once deplored,

Compare these two, the 1989 Japanese movie “226” (on the 226 incident) and the conference “Where are the women candidates, 2012”.¹¹

Highlights of these women’s testimonies, which illustrate the selfishness, self-centeredness, and narcissism in American women’s perspective on themselves and on the world which they disguise under the politically correct notion of “women lifting themselves up from oppression”: 15:00: “We decide what we can’t do...” (i.e. “we are not aggressive enough in getting what we want”). “We need to only listen to ourselves...” 20:30: Condemn: “We should sit down and

¹¹ The video can be seen at: <https://youtu.be/FvvVKpYvRGk>. Description: “Tonight at 8 pm (EDT), join us for a free live webcast of a panel discussion on women in politics, presented with Glamour, moderated by Chelsea Clinton and featuring Sandra Fluke, Christine Quinn, Nicolle Wallace, Abby Huntsman Livingston, Stephanie Schriock and Amy Holmes. This marks the launch of 92Y’s Campaign for the American Conversation, a new initiative to promote a better informed and more involved electorate engaging in civic and civil conversation.”

shut up...” 45:00: “We have to be involved... Policies where more women are involved are better for communities.” 45:30: like the advice: “Be hyper-aggressive in asking for salaries and titles... All the men do that already...” 1:07:00: “We do things better...” 1:08:00, “We are tough, we are...” (self-praise). 1:18:00, “Women socialized differently, better at diplomacy and negotiation, should run for office because they are special...” 1:20:00: “Not enough women, minorities... but not white men...” Note that they were talking about women’s going into political offices. But the same complaints are definitely heard in regard to women’s going into business.

For a long time we have been quite impressed by the contrast between the two cultures manifested in these two video documentations. Both groups of people – the Japanese ultra-nationalists in the 1930s and American women in 2000s – are immersed in their respective bizarre neuroses – their fervor and conviction in what they are doing and in their conception of themselves is just so crazy to outsiders who don’t share their circumstances – but their respective neuroses are mirror images of each other. It’s just so bizarre. In the case of the Japanese, these people are so deluded that, if they don’t end up dead for their emperor and country, they can’t live with themselves, as if they have done something very, very, wrong; in the case of the latter, the women are so deluded by their self-importance and self-assigned specialness that, if they don’t find themselves doing something important and being admired and catered to, they have done something very, very, wrong, both to themselves and to their society. One delusion is absolute selflessness, self-effacement, the other absolute self-centeredness and vainglory. Both are absolutely crazy and bizarre to a third party observer, and both are to bring disaster upon their respective societies. What do you make of it? Some cultural anthropologists need to study this: the typology, structural transformation in the case of collective/ mass delusion. The above comment about American women’s destruction of their society should really remind you of the comment which Hannah Arendt has made about Adolf Eichmann in her *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, in that these women have absolutely no idea of the havoc they are wrecking when they attempt to bring their “special experience” into the world.

From the view point of our legal institutions and of our moral standards of judgment, this normality was much more terrifying than all the atrocities put together, for it implied... that this new type of criminal, who is in actual fact *hostis generis humani*, commits his crimes under circumstances that make it well-nigh impossible for him to know or to feel that he is doing wrong.
(Epilogue)

These American women are certainly not rebelling against anything, since their point of view is already the norm, hence, “normality” (political correctness). In

their case, the “circumstances” are simply ideology, their way of looking at themselves and the world, and political correctness. The ideology is preventing them from realizing the fact that they are actually destroying their society and the world.

In another place, Arendt writes of Eichmann: “Ich bin in der Tat heute der Meinung, daß das Böse immer nur extreme ist, niemals radikal, es hat keine Tiefe, auch keine Dämonie. Es kann die ganze Welt verwüsten, gerade weil es wie ein Pilz an der Oberfläche weiterwuchert. Tief und radikal aber ist immer nur das Gute.” (Grunenberg, p. 384.) The evil which encoats the surface of things but has no depth is just ‘ideology’.

Again, you really need to learn to be amazed by the structural transformation of mass delusion. If you go to World War II Japan and tell the men there that they are very special, they will die, absolutely deny it, and emphatically assert that they need to die soon for the emperor, as if it were a crime to not kill themselves and be “special” like the way American women think of themselves.

.....

We have then elaborated further:

**American white women’s “culture”
as the *inverse* of military fascism
(or the “universalization of kingship”)**

What exactly is this “white women’s culture” which we have seen as so pernicious that everything must be done to prevent it from spreading to the rest of the world? As has been indicated previously, it’s that complete inverse of traditional value system, i.e. the complete sacrifice of others and society for the sake of the self as the inverse of the complete sacrifice of the self for the sake of others and society. If the case of Japanese Shintoism-based nationalism is bad, this American white women’s culture must be equally bad. It’s basically the “universalization of kingship”, i.e. the attitude of American white women is identical to that of Emperor Hirohito or North Korean leader Kim Jong-II: the valuation of oneself as so supreme as to demand shamelessly the sacrifice of all others for the sake of the self without ever saying thanks – except that, if one man lives like that in society, maybe the society could afford it and survive, but if half of the population live like that in a society, the society is bound to become broken. Any random examination of American liberal women’s speech will reveal consistently this very particular view of their relation to the world around them: that these women have grown up convinced that the society owes them something – even when the society has in fact provided for their welfare more than for any other group in society – and that these women are convinced that they have had to labor so hard just to get by – even when all social indexes indicate that middle-class American white women enjoy a living standard second highest in American society – which means almost the highest in the world. This is the most classical instance of “believing in the opposite of reality when it comes to social reality”

which, as noted in *A Thermodynamic Interpretation of History*, is frequently practiced throughout history by those who are in power.

In the previous note, a comparison is made in ways of speaking between loyal Japanese soldiers during the age of military nationalism and American women during the postmodern age. You can easily see that, in the former case, the soldiers behave the way they do because they are deeply convinced that they owe the Emperor something – as if they have been born into this world only in order to pay back to the Emperor what they have mysteriously taken away from him in their previous life: whereas postmodern American women’s attitude is the exact opposite, i.e. they have come into this world in order to reclaim from society what society has mysteriously taken away from them in their previous life. (“Society has been sexist, and we must demand compensation from society, in the form of special benefits and protection.”) Since there is no previous life for anybody, they – on both sides – think the way they do only because they have been taught to think like this: the inculcation of guilty feelings toward the Emperor starts very early on in pre-1945 Japanese education. Here, of course, the state has clearly an interest in cultivating such a false sense of “debt” among its population because the state wants them to sacrifice for its interests. The most mysterious thing in the American case must be: why has the American state taught American women that the state owes them something, when this is clearly detrimental to the interests of the state? If the Japanese empire is slavery, at least it’s rational; the American empire of women is *inverse slavery*, and therefore makes no sense. This is clearly the most demonstrative evidence that *the American state is quite enthusiastic about wasting itself away*.

Ezekiel 16: 30 – 34
Israel as the “Opposite Whore”

Gifts are made to all prostitutes, but you made gifts to all your lovers, and bribed them to come to you from every quarter for your harlotries. You were the opposite of other women: you solicited instead of being solicited; you paid fees instead of being paid fees. Thus you were just the opposite!

(Denn allen andern Huren gibt man Geld; du aber gibst allen deinen Buhlern Geld zu und schenkst ihnen, daß sie zu dir kommen allenthalben und mit dir Hurerei treiben. Und findet sich an dir das Widerspiel vor andern Weibern mit deiner Hurerei, weil man dir nicht nachläuft, sondern du Geld zugibst, und man dir nicht Geld zugibt ; also treibst du das Widerspiel. Luthers Bibel.)

In other words, we have emphasized that the dominant theme in American liberal women’s worldview is “debt”, that their society has unfairly disadvantaged them so that they shall spend the majority of their attention on getting the society to pay them back all the monies and benefits owed to them, without much considering what they might have owed their society. If society really does disadvantage them, of course, such attitude is legitimate, perhaps. But we have elsewhere indicated that longitudinal empirical researches and data simply do not support the

claim that women in North America are still being disadvantaged and discriminated against. Most women who believe in the “debt” notion believe it not because they have seriously studied the matter, but because their culture has taught them so, specifically “political correctness”. It’s politically correct to constantly shower on women sympathy for their being disadvantaged, but politically incorrect to assert *égalité déjà-là*. As nationalists, we need to discredit this “debt” notion; we will prefer to train women to feel obliged to pay back to the nation-state rather than to demand from it compensation for past, or current but imaginary, “sexism. We believe that this is not only in the state’s interest, but also in women’s: this will help grow women’s brain too.

This is the occasion where we will elaborate on our vehement rejection of any sort of “difference feminism”. By focusing on the positive rather than on the negative, New Feminism must eschew any notion of “women’s culture” which has dominated American feminist thinking and the consciousness of ordinary American women. This is because, behind the notion of “women’s difference”, is operative another pernicious device which consumerist ideologues have invented to dumb down the human race.

It is a legacy of second wave American feminism that it is widely believed among American women that women are good at understanding and manipulating human psychology and relationships, and that males are not, but only understand boring things like fixing cars and building computers. That women have greater verbal skills and men greater ability for mathematics. Women are “smarter”, “superior”, because, by understanding human psychology and relationships and with greater verbal skills, they can manipulate the males to fix their cars and computers for them, rather than learning the skills themselves. This “superiority” has become the foundation of American women's self-esteem. They will explode like a volcano if this self-image, or self-esteem, is violated or contradicted.

We have contended that this self-esteem, self-image, this concept of the “natural order of things”, originates with Carol Gilligan’s *In A Different Voice*. When she reads the research that women virtually never reach stage five and six on Kohlberg’s moral development scale, she decides that the best strategy to compensate women’s apparent inferiority is, not to push women to reach there, but to invent a new domain in which women naturally excel males, i.e. the domain of relationships and human psychology, which eventually becomes the art of manipulation. The sexual stereotypes created by Carol Gilligan – no less pernicious than those created by male psychoanalysts in the 1950s to denounce Mary Wollstonecraft – have become a regular staple in American academic discourse. We have elsewhere once discussed one of the latest instance, Louann Brizendine’s *The Female Brain* (2006).

In other words, another aspect of “political correctness” which has originated in the United States and which the Americans are exporting to the rest of the world is a disease which consists in the wish to make oneself equal to the superior, not by improving oneself, but by degrading the superior; to make oneself intelligent, not through making oneself intelligent, but through making others stupid. We have seen this operating in Carol Gilligan’s “ground-breaking” work and in all of American feminist discourse since the second wave, resulting in the notion that women have a different “culture” than men. The result is the retardation of the development of women’s brain, and society’s brain development in general. The New Left, and New Feminism, will eschew this sort of *ressentiment*. It will encourage women, both in the developed world and everywhere else,

to achieve equality with men by becoming more like men. Again, it endorses “liberal feminism” rather than “cultural feminism” (or “difference feminism”).

It would seem that our Marine would agree with us on this point, as is indicated by her stern opposition to affirmative action (*la discrimination positive*). Like her, we are opposed to any sort of affirmative action because it is based on the same sort of logic: the way to help a disadvantaged group is by making everybody else dumber rather than by making the disadvantaged people smarter. The result can only be that the whole society becomes dumber. Why would any nationalist agree with this?

Lastly, we have elsewhere also noted that American women are characterized, as well, by beast-like aggression and “brain-hating”.

As noted, the liberal portion of American white females have learned their extraordinarily aggressive behavior from their white male counterparts: if American white females are bullies, it’s because American white males are bullies. If the American government is a bully in the international domain, it’s because the American people are bullies. One has learned it from the other. The US government bullies other countries in international relations, and American people bully foreigners in foreign lands. When American people are at home, they bully each other (which they call “fighting for their rights”). There is more gender equality in the United States than in Asian countries because American women have bullied their men to submission, and Asian countries are more male-dominated because, while Asian males are more passive and quiet (in comparison to Western males), Asian females are even more passive and quiet, for the latter have learned it from the former. Thus Asian societies are more male-dominated because Asian women have let their men rule and never bothered to speak up. “The government is a shadow of its people, women are the shadows of men, and boys are the shadows of their mothers.” Our caricature of the “American woman” is representative of American culture in general, not merely of American liberal women....

One must remember that American women have more in common with American men, that Chinese women have more in common with Chinese men than with American women, etc. The American feminist notion that women across different societies somehow form a class of their own and have more in common with each other than with the men in their respective societies, is simply incorrect. American women are more “American” than “women”.

We wish to have made plain our position that American feminism is the leftwing of postmodernism, a device to turn human beings back into apes. The European/ Russian New Left’s struggle should be to prevent the export of American “political correctness” (postmodernism) to the rest of the world, in order to prevent the Americans from turning our human planet into “Planet of the Apes”.

To summarize our position, we deplore the increasing focus on the negative in the current climate of political correctness because (1) this shrinks the capacity of the human brain and discourages the development of human talents and (2) this is ultimately a device to increase consumption rate and therefore the profit margin of the big corporations and thus reinforce the process of globalization. For this reason, the New Left, and New Feminism, will be vehemently opposed to such tendency and converge with the traditional emphasis on the positive. Our stance is in fact quite common sense: we believe that overprotection of women, and indulgence in the ideology of their “specialness”, such as are practiced in the United States and in other Anglophone nations, have resulted in the retardation of women’s brain capacity, both their critical thinking ability and moral reasoning capacity, just as children who are overly protected and constantly praised for being special will never learn to become an effective, and independent, adult. Society must treat women as harshly as it treats men – without any special protection and benefits – in order to force them to develop their human potential.

We have followed the principle of a thermodynamic interpretation of history, according to which the more consumption is required for a society’s economic functioning and therefore valued in that society, the more feminized this society will become and the more women will be on the ascendancy in this society. Reversely, the more production is required for a society’s economic functioning and therefore valued in that society, the more masculinized this society will become and the more men will be on the ascendancy in this society. Thus, according to this principle, women are most valued in Anglophone countries because these countries are virtually devoid of manufacturing and entirely service-based and consumerist-oriented. Meanwhile, even though Germany is as much a developed nation as United States or UK, because it is still a manufacturing nation, women’s movement will be much weaker there.¹² An interesting conclusion we have reached elsewhere is this:

As I have noted, contemporary American society is the exact inverse of the dynastic Chinese society. I have paid increasing attention to Chinese female foot-binding because such is the most direct evidence that the ancient Chinese society was organized around wasting away the female labor. Meanwhile, the contemporary American society is organized around wasting away the male labor, and increasingly the male brain. However, whereas the dynastic Chinese waste away female labor by destroying their mobility (by destroying their feet), Americans waste way male labor and male brain usually through the criminal justice system and laws to protect women. Thus, America’s largest criminal justice system in the world (with the largest incarceration rate), and the most elaborate laws in the world to protect women, are both direct evidence for this. My hypothesis – when we don’t appeal directly to a thermodynamic interpretation of history – is that, when any society is over-supplied with something, it will automatically develop mechanisms to waste away whatever is over-supplied.

¹² C.f. Rosemarie Have-Herz, *Die Geschichte der Frauenbewegung in Deutschland*, p. 48. The women activists in Germany never quite understood the real reason why they couldn’t advance as far as their counterparts in North America could over there. Similarly, how “difference feminism” could never gain popularity in Germany, p. 49.

Thus, female foot-binding appeared in ancient China when the society became over-saturated with male labor power. This is confirmed, firstly, by the fact that female foot-binding, while originating in Sung dynasty (or a little bit before that), really became enough widespread as to affect the majority of the female population only during the Qing dynasty – and despite the Manchu effort to ban it. We note that the population of China had remained stable, around 100 million, for almost two millennia, from Han dynasty until the beginning of Qing dynasty. It was however during the Qing dynasty (from 1700s onward) that China's population suddenly quadrupled to 400 million (largely because of the introduction of new crops thanks to the European colonization of the Americas). The society had more than enough males to labor in the fields, so that female mobility became extraneous to society, and thus must be wasted. Thus, my hypothesis is, secondly, confirmed by the fact that the poorest peasants in Qing China, and other minority groups in China where females were still needed to help in farming, never adopted the foot-binding custom – because they simply couldn't afford to waste away the girls in their house....

But my hypothesis is further that, given that the majority of the prison population in America consists of males without talents, Americans find it more urgent to waste away male labor power than male brains, and that this is largely the consequence of the “de-manufacturization of the American society” (the export of manufacturing industries to foreign nations). Without labor to perform, males are thus becoming increasingly extraneous to society, and are therefore demonized as violent criminals and disposed of in jails. Meanwhile, since women's talent lies especially in consuming and wasting resources, they become especially protected in American society, since they are more able to digest the massive amount of consumer goods imported into the country. This, of course, has already been noted in my Thermodynamic Interpretation of History.

Saman Rejali, in “From Tradition to Modernity: Foot-binding and Its End (1839 – 1911) – the History of the Anti-Foot-binding Movement and the Histories of Bound-Feet Women in China”, has noted especially that the anti-foot-binding movement was mostly led by reformist males whose justification was that female labor shouldn't be wasted away. These reformists had begun conceiving China as a modern-nation state defined by industries rather than by farming, and, for this reason, their conception of women had changed. Rejali of course deplores the fact that Chinese women who have suffered foot-binding were never given much a chance to give voice to their own experiences, so that, sadly, it is others who take up the task of speaking for the victims, and only on utilitarian grounds, rather than out of respect for them. Again, I deplore the sort of “feminist research” of Rejali because of its subjective orientation (explaining, and even half-justifying, a cruel social practice by reference to the subjective experiences and mental ideas of the participants). The right approach should always admit the truism that it is the

objective reality (in this case, the pattern of production and consumption dominant in a social system, and supply, oversupply, or undersupply of labor to maintain it) which determines the formation and course of subjective experiences. Again, this is the difference between the “Marxist” approach and the “Radical Feminist” approach.

Finally, we have to note two possible objections. During the 2014 UN conference, “International Women’s Day: Equality for women is progress for all”¹³, it is noted:” “Nations where women have achieved relative equality with men” – the United States and other Western countries foremost – “have higher economic growth”. Are we not contradicting this basic fact when we disparage American women as a waste upon their nation? We need to remind our audience that, as we have noted elsewhere, the United States is an “open system”, and then bring in the fact that America is a “parasite upon the world”. What is really meant by “higher economic growth” is “higher consumption rate” (and so “greater profits for corporations”). Namely, “nations where women have achieved relative equality with men” are wasting away our planet at a much faster rate. But, certainly, these nations are also much stronger. But if you close off the United States – if you ban immigration, especially from Eurasia, to the United States – and then remove the US dollar as the universal currency in global commerce, you will see American politicians gradually speaking out against all this catering to womankind because it will be making America weaker and weaker. Because, then, the waste in brain and material resources promoted by pro-women ideology (“political correctness”) can no longer be replenished through import of brains and financed by foreign creditors. In other words, women’s current form of participation or “equality” (“feminization of society”) is good for the nation only so long as the nation can parasite on the rest of the world.

Secondly, as noted, when we deplore much of contemporary “struggle for rights” as hypocrisy to disguise selfishness and self-centeredness (Ape Morality), we are not encouraging people who are truly oppressed to kept silent and accept their fate. Obviously, for we are the left. What we are deploring is the *abuse* of the struggle for rights: that ideology for the liberation of the oppressed has been hijacked by the privileged group to further increase their privileges. The one single standard by which we shall judge whether oppression has indeed occurred or whether the struggle for one’s rights and interests is legitimate and not an abuse is Christ’s “Golden Rule” (Mathew 7:12):

Παντα ουν οσα εαν θελητε ινα ποιωσιν υμιν οι ανθρωποι, ουτως και υμεις ποιετε αυτοις. Ουτος γαρ εστιν ο νομος και οι προφηται.

Or Confucius:

What you don’t want to be done to you, don’t do it to others.

¹³ See: <http://webtv.un.org/watch/international-women%E2%80%99s-day-2014-equality-for-women-is-progress-for-all/3309104866001>.

己所不欲，勿施于人

Both are the same. Kant's Categorical Imperative, John Rawl's "theory of justice", or Kohlberg's sixth stage of moral reasoning.

“Putinverstehung”

In the geopolitical domain, Marine Le Pen may be characterized as what is called “Putinverstehung”. She would be an actor in a growing movement in Europe which might be called “Putinverstehung”. For now, this movement is mostly shared by the far-right in European countries and the minority of “conspiracy theorists” here and there. We hope that “Putinverstehung” may become mainstream among the left in Europe as well. In which case, it is the New Left.

Since the left is traditionally characterized by sympathy for “victims”: the weak, oppressed, downtrodden, it should be natural for the left to be pro-Russia. We were pro-Russia because Russia has been a victim of US aggression, and we, coming from the left, always have more sympathy for the weak and the downtrodden. Gradually we have begun to taste the downside of “victimology”, even in regard to Russia itself. Just because Russia is a victim, that doesn't mean Russia is a wonderful country. Hence we have proposed ways for Russia to reform itself fundamentally. But France has always been “okay”. If the Le Pen family can reform France all in accordance with our complaints against postmodernism, then France will be a perfect country. This family is truly God's gift to humankind.

If you are familiar with our story, then you should find it most natural that we would be “Putinverstehung”. We have suffered so similarly and under the same Enemy, i.e. the “American”. This “American” is first the US government. Then later, this “American” is the American private citizen. This suffering takes two form: slander and what Marine Le Pen has named in her book “propagande en miroir”.

Our story is one about the most slandered person in human history. Between 2007 and 2014, he is slandered by the US government. But, now, the slandering of him originates with a group of women, private citizens, who simply don't like him talking about them on the Internet, but who get all the help from many US agencies and institutions. The particular evil which the United States practices is slandering people, making up bad stories about innocent people, making normal people into the most grotesque disgusting monsters in the eyes of the world. Like Viktor Bout, and many of the so-called “terrorists”. Our long history of suffering is just another case of this sort. It's just that, in this case, private US citizens have participated in the effort. American people are as bad as the American government.

The most pernicious part of the whole game is of course the fact that all the slander of the “suspect” here is kept a secret from him. Since he has never done any of the things which the slanderers have claimed he has done and is nothing like the creature which the slanderers say he is, he will never have any idea how badly others think of him until after he has spent his whole

life investigating it. But this is the point: he must not know about it, for otherwise he might try to point out the falsehood. The slanderers don't like it when their victim defends himself. Typically American.

Our story is the quintessential case of the pinnacle of post-modernism which we have just complained about: “brain-hating”, the “Opposite World”, and “victimology”, the story of how a group of women have developed such hatred toward a guy's website that is filled with literary masterpieces and the most insightful pronouncements on world history, sociology, philosophy, and science. These American women are anti-intellectual and aren't educated, and so behave in this way, like illiterate people from the Middle-Ages. They spent more than three years trying to exterminate him and his website using the legal system just because they saw their names mentioned on this website. They made up to law enforcement thousands of most monstrous and disgusting false stories about him to this effect, and the entire legal system and tens of thousands of people rushed to their aid – just because they were women. They had no talents, no education, understood nothing else in this world than rape, stalking, sexual violence, and knew only how to complain about (imaginary) rape, stalking, sexual violence – and for this they got the red-carpet treatment wherever they went. Nobody, in the legal system or in the public, paused to ask what good they could do in this world. The only thing that matters is what evil they were able to complain about – even when the evil they spoke of had never existed. Meanwhile, the guy they (falsely) portrayed as absolute evil had to be disposed of, no matter what talents and wisdom he possessed in other domains. Our story is the most grotesque illustration of “American waste” and “American Opposite Land” – where the more useless you are, the more you are valued, and the more useful you are, the more you are to be disposed of. Moreover, this group of women bespeak America's “world-historical mission”, since they are mere reflections of American society in general: their suspect's past theories contain insights that can save the world, and so must be suppressed. This is in line with the United States' world-historical mission: to destroy humanity and the planet earth. American people will instinctually carry out their nation's “mission” without awareness.

Our story is also a template illustration of the quintessential American technique of slander, “propagande en miroir”, i.e. after you have victimized your victim, you then make everybody believe that your victim has victimized you. We have once been victim of United States' most ingenious invention, the “faulty surveillance Machine”, a quintessential American surveillance Machine which, when somebody beats you up, will show you beating somebody up, so that, when somebody beats you up, you may be arrested for beating somebody up. Now, we have become the victims of a group of American women who, when they stalk you, will report to the police saying you stalk them, so that, after they stalk you, you may be arrested for stalking them.

We have witnessed Russia becoming the victim of US aggression precisely in these two ways. The United States has maintained its moral leadership position in world affairs by being the expert in slandering its opponents and making them look bad. Thanks to the United States' expertise in lying, China and Russia have got this stinky reputation of “totalitarianism” and “human rights violation”. Undeserved. Worse, when the United States launches its assault on Russia, it will then make everybody believe that Russia has launched an assault on the United

States. After United States has taken away Ukraine from Russia, if Russia dares try to prevent the robbery in any way, Russia is considered the “aggressor”. That is, if Russia defends itself, it’s called “aggression”, while American and NATO aggression against Russia is taken as the norm, the expected “matter of course” which everybody should have the right mind to accept. Such double standard, such an inability to perceive the most basic outline of “fairness” (the Golden Rule) is illustration of how much Western civilization has degenerated. Again, this is not just an issue about “right” and “wrong”, but an issue about brain development and human intelligence. In our story, the group of women have practiced precisely the same double standard. When they stalk their guy, it’s not considered “stalking”, but expected “matter of course” – because they are women. But if the guy tries to track how these women have stalked him, that’s called “stalking”. And these women really believe that their perception is correct – because their brain is so underdeveloped that they are simply incapable of performing the cognitive function called “reciprocity” – to see things from other people’s perspective – and therefore practicing the Golden Rule.

The difference with American political elites is that, as we have emphasized elsewhere, they do not victimize Russia and then accuse Russia of victimizing them because they suffer underdevelopment of cognitive functions. They do so fully conscious of what really is the case (i.e. Russia is the victim rather than the aggressor) and simply because this is how power struggle works in international affairs. It is for the sake of power and domination that American elites have purposely cultivated a double standard in their favor.

However, when Americans are able to assume world’s moral leadership through this sort of most sophisticated forms of hypocrisy, hiding the evils they do and blaming them onto others, or misrepresenting their evil actions as good deeds and others’ good deeds as evil actions, they have seriously confused their audience as to what is really right and what is really wrong. It’s not just Russia which is the victim of US aggression; the rest of the world has also suffered American aggression when they can no longer figure out who the aggressor is and who the victim is.

The “double standard” against the victim is precisely what Simone de Beauvoir has said, most famously, about the distinction between the Essential and the Inessential – about the “Other”:

[La femme] se détermine et se différencie par rapport à l’homme et non celui-ci par rapport à elle; elle est l’inessentiel en face de l’essentiel. Il est le Sujet, il est l’Absolu : elle est l’Autre. La catégorie de l’Autre est aussi originelle que la conscience elle-même.

Russia is considered the “aggressor” when it defends itself against aggression because it’s the Other in the eyes of the world while United States is the Subject. The guy is considered the “stalker” when he defends himself against women’s talking of him because he is the Other in the eyes of American society and legal system while women are the Subject. American society is sexist against males.

We shall therefore define the essence of “Putinverstehung” as the defense of Otherness as the Norm, as the struggle for equality between the Other and the Self; as the correct perception of

reality, the proper recognition that Russia is the victim of US aggression, in the Ukrainian affair and in virtually every other affair where Russia is thought to be, incorrectly, the “aggressor”. It is an expression of the understanding of Christ’s Golden Rule, an indication that one’s brain has developed properly. For the sake of justice, we therefore side with Russia against aggression. It is *not*, however, for the very same reason, about praising Russia as a wonderful and flawless country.

On the other hand, Marine Le Pen’s France might be such wonderful and flawless country. The designation of Marine Le Pen, and all the Frontists, as “Putinverstehher”, is therefore meant to say that their perception of reality has been correct, that they possess a real sense of justice, and that their brain has properly developed.

The true moral person of the New Left

Needless to say that the New Left does not see nationalism, and a staunch anti-immigration stance, as in any way being equivalent to “racism” when these do not imply the exclusion of immigrants already here. Le Pen’s requirement for “assimilation” shall be regarded as the most reasonable expectation in a nation located in the Old World:

C’est elle qui rendra possible l’assimilation des nouveaux Français, ceux qui ont fait le choix sincère de notre pays et de vivre en harmonie avec ses traditions, ses lois et ses valeurs.

The sentiments which Marine Le Pen has expressed in *Contre-flots* in regards to a variety of human circumstances clearly indicate that she is a sympathetic and caring person. Yet, because of her anti-EU and anti-globalization stance, she has incurred the wrath of the power establishment. To discredit her, the power establishment employs the simplest method, to demonize her by exploiting her political incorrectness. Because she cares about her country and her poor fellow citizens, and often the poor immigrants themselves, she is anti-immigration. And so the power establishment charges her with “racism” and demonizes her as a “racist”. It is now as if she were a mean-hearted person who hates poor people. This is a concrete instance where, through the grid of political correctness, she who is a kind-hearted person who cares about poor people is suddenly transformed into just the opposite, a mean-spirited, and arrogant, person who hates poor people. And yet, as Le Pen repeatedly emphasizes, it is the power establishment itself who doesn’t really care about the poor immigrants but merely uses them, by pretending to care about them, to prop up a globalized system where their profits may increase at the expense of the poor. Hypocrites.

The New Left is supposed to right things up, presenting the good person as a good person and an evil person as an evil person. We will praise Marine Le Pen for her superior moral constitution because she cares about disadvantaged people. It is indicative of the evilness inherent in political correctness that, by merely repeating some politically correct slogans (“We have to help the poor immigrants”), those elites who otherwise feel no sentiments for the misfortunes of others deep inside them can mark themselves as “moral” and “good”, while, by refusing the slogans in order

Why we support Marine Le Pen
November 2015

to connect with reality, the democrat who feels genuinely for the misfortunes of others is marked in official discourse as “bad”, “ignorant”, and “uncaring”.

Once again, political correctness is the “Opposite World”. Again, we are fired up about this issue because we have suffered similarly in the United States.

The most important mission of our Movement is therefore to recreate the cultural and intellectual climate where it is the substance inside which shall serve as the index of moral goodness of a person, rather than the slogan repeated mechanically on the mouth.

FINIS