

The New Right – a book review about the European right
But I don't have the book!

What did we learn from this book

First of all that Sweden has been involved in the so-called new right for longer than you would imagine. It is finally coming into its own. It is closely linked with the French new right, Guillaume Fay, Alan Deb and West.

It is decidedly European. This book does not talk much about the United States. Europe's issues are somewhat different, and certainly the chronology of their development has been different

There is a triumphal tone throughout the book. A belief that the European traditional left is collapsing,. It is certainly the case that membership in the new right parties, such as the Sweden Democrats, is burgeoning. They also credit the Internet with the decline of the traditional centers of liberal power, the newspapers.

What the word that does not appear anywhere in the book is a Jew. The great majority of the Swedish press has been owned by Jews. He mentions the publisher of Expo he mentions Expo, a publication which he equates with the Southern poverty Law Center in United States, which zealously prepares acute's its enemies, conservatives. What he does not note is that he is the ethnicity of Robert Ashburn, the driving force behind Expo, and Morris Dees, the driving force behind the Southern poverty Law Center. Likewise, UK

He has a valuable chapter on meta-politics, the cultural underpinning of political change. Rather, the cultural precondition for political change. People do not support a political system that is out of step with their beliefs. Gramsci noted that the Italian Communists had been unsuccessful in attempting to the socialize factories after World War I because the people were simply not ready for it. The Frankfurt school set out to change culture, and thus it is prepare the soil for a communist takeover. To this end they changed the infiltrated and successfully changed the whole schooling system in both the United States and Europe. The introduced political correctness. They introduced notions such as the New World order, multiculturalism, humanity, and so on. As these notions they likewise downplayed the notions of nationalism, differences among the races, and other things were antithetical to their program. Once this indoctrination had been done, the populations were prepared to be seated with leftist thought. This leftist thought succeeded.

An interesting observation is that in the belief of the author the leftists were dominant from 1945 through 1989. 1989 seems like an early date at which to fix the begin of their demise. It looks like their power remains quite strong today to this observer. However, the author sees the traditional left in rather for retreat. He scoffs at their increasingly frantic and futile efforts to stem to stanch the rise of the new right, the addenda Terry and movement.

The author offers specific advice for what to do in Sweden. If you are approached by a journalist from the left, or especially somebody from the Expo organization, simply say no comment. Do not talk to them. You have nothing to gain. This echoes what Boxing Day says in his book, asked JW's always lie. There is a new line of thought emerging worldwide, a rebellion in the confrontation of culture against cultural Marxism. In the United States this is exemplified by the rise of Donald Trump in the current election cycle. Perhaps the most telling thing about Trump is his defiance of political correctness. The American populace is tired of it.

The American press absolutely cannot understand, cannot fathom, how Donald Trump can so thoroughly ignore political correctness can be cheered and celebrated by the populace. They are tired of it. One sees the same in Europe. Nigel Farage in England it does a wonderful job of putting down the cultural left. Marine Le Pen and her niece do the same in France. Geert Wilders does it in Holland. It is marvelous to see these voices rise up. Even when Garrett Jones is brought to court for hate speech against Muslims or something like that, it is now more of a victory than a defeat. The what they win by confronting political correctness far overshadows what they may lose in fines and so on. The left is simply losing the ability to stanch her to withstand the the wave of revulsion at the mass immigration and political correctness.

A wonderful piece on the difference between men and women. We are traditionally different and we have different roles to fill in society. Unfortunately, our leftist dominated education has attempted to force the notion that sex doesn't matter that gender doesn't matter and that we are all equal upon us. This is not true. Men have a leadership role to fill and we should willingly step into it. We should marry and pass on not only our genes but our culture. We should marry early and be loyal to women.

He talks about the difference between the real rate and the so-called conservatives in modern European and American politics. The so-called conservatives are advocates of global business, world trade, immigration and free movement of people, and rule of law.

They do not recognize ethnicity or nationality. They do not recognize the interests of the people within a nation. The establishment right-wing parties tend to be quite tend to be at the national level, and no established party seems to favor the state and local government or local governments over the national government they favor bureaucracies, and are quite comfortable with experts in the capital cities making decisions that favor that apply to everybody. They are not interested in preserving cultures, and certainly not interested in preserving the multiple ethnicities native to a given country. Well they may in a self-congratulatory fashion dilute the native Europeans with immigrants from Africa, and allow them to maintain their tribal ways, they're not politically thrilled when Britain's Bretons, Linda Linda Quan and several yards in France maintain their own individuality. Conservatism as it has been practiced favors big business at the expense of the people

The new right favors the people. It is conservative in the sense of conserving what the people have among themselves. In a sense it is rather socialistic. It appeals to the pathos, the traditional culture, and the mutual support that is present in a traditional site society. It celebrates not the atomized individual, but the local community in which that individual exists. It celebrates again not that atomized individual, but his family, his heritage, and his progeny.

Words that do not appear in this short book include Jews, banks, evolution, and intelligence.

Modern conservatism, free-market liberalism, is a an economic competition that assumes all people are equal. There are winners and losers, and that is accepted as the natural order. It has always been like that.

Northern European societies especially have had a and egalitarianism. Evolutionary psychologists Kevin McDonald says that this was essential to for survival in their harsh Nordic homelands. The survival of the group was of paramount importance. Therefore the group, the relatively homogeneous groups of Norsemen, would overlook individual differences in talent, inability, in order to preserve all individuals for the survival of the tribe. This provided them

with more warriors. More numbers were more important than judging the individual value. They also had a fairly strong monogamy. Everybody got a meet, although the stronger men in the tribe was certainly enjoy more of more and better selection.

This altruism, this mutual support worked well among homogeneous, relatively isolated tribes whose greatest threat was invasion from other tribes. It has not it has led the northern Europeans to an altruistic acceptance of people who are altogether different from them, first the Jews, and now Muslims and Africans.

McDonald's most well known works are a trilogy on the evolutionary psychology of the Jews. Like the northern European peoples, they seek the survival of their own. Unlike the northern Europeans, the Jews for the past 2500 years have lived in Diaspora. They have lived scattered among host populations who were unlike them. Therefore they have evolved the ability to not only exist, but to thrive among people unlike themselves. They have succeeded because they are in general more intelligent than the people among whom they live, and they succeed because they support one another. They support their own group interests above the interests of the groups among which they live.

This has certainly been true in Europe. The Jews had dominated banking, the media, entertainment and other industries. They have used this domination to propagate their views, the views which according to this book have so weakened traditional Europeans. Let me, the reviewer, emphasize that the word shoe never appears in this book. It is certainly an intentional omission. The author does not need to be picking enemies. This reviewer simply brings it up to tie the intellectual concepts of this book in with other modern currents of thought. I had in this context that the that McDonald's thesis is that this is not an articulated, conscious survival strategy on the part of the Jews, but rather one that has a vault over the course of 2 1/2 millennia. One observes that it is not particularly beneficial to the Jewish population today. As is observed in this book, they are losing their grip. They have been the Jewish population has been at least is the ability of the Jewish population or the Jewish culture to reproduce itself in Europe has been at least is badly impacted is out of native Europeans themselves by the bisexual ambiguity and immigration. So as is often the case in evolution, a strategy that is successful and one euro may turn out to be unsuccessful in the next. It is not a an articulated, reason and process.

The situation with Middle Eastern and African immigrants is the opposite. Like the Jews they are interested in their own evolutionary goals, which are antithetical to those of the host populations. Unlike the Jews, they are less capable intellectually and less controlled temperamentally than host populations. So the Nordic countries altruism is simply misplaced. The immigrants come to the immigrants come, and the best of cases, to seek work. They simply do not have the intellect and the discipline required to succeed in the European workplace. That's best case – in the worst case they come simply to sponge off the wealthy Europeans, for whom they have no respect, and whom they regard as suckers to be parasitical he exploited. In any case, the Europeans altruism definitely does not serve their best interests.

=====