



ELEVEN REASONS TO SAY, “NO!” TO THE NEW MORAL ORDER

Posted on April 1, 2023 by José Vicente Pascual



(By Way of an Introduction)

1. It is not change from below, it is revolution from above. The rich and powerful of the world agreed, back in 2008, on the "refoundation of capitalism." Their aim is to "change everything so that nothing changes." They are succeeding, thanks, among other factors, to the enthusiastic support of the left, orphaned from a theoretical outline beyond gender ideology and the new climate religion. Nobody is surprised by the almost absolute coincidence, tactical/strategic, between the globalist oligarchy and the Western left. The only objection from this new pseudo-left to globalized capitalism is that the rich make too much money. Thus, the old social-democratic discourse and also the Leninist insurrectional discourse on the class struggle have remained: the comparative grievance, the complaint and nothing more.

2. They are not governments, they are managers of the New World Ruling Class. Democracy in the new globalized societies is a chimera. Individual liberties are a myth and the "government of the people" is almost a joke. The European Union is a more or less submissive branch, generally docile, of the great international business centers, whether they are located in America, the United Kingdom, Oceania or Asia. Those who hold "legitimate" power in the Western countries—with known exceptions—only operate with the prior consent of the owners of the huge racket. The democratic illusion died at the same time as the official theoretical and moral position of the New Order was born: that of the single thought.

3. It is not freedom; it is compliance with destitution as a natural state for the human being. The new concept of freedom implies the renunciation of freedom itself. Not to question the official dogmas, not to "offend" the collectives in permanent state of vindication, not to discuss the right of the State to interfere in each and every one of the facets of the life of the citizens—is the new paradigm of freedom. The only feeling of security and "democratic" protection, under the protection of the law, comes from renunciation: to accept intellectual and material destitution as the native and permanent state of the new deculturated citizen, domesticated and instructed in obedience. The rest are utopias. The rest, as a great rehearsal, was the pandemic of Covid 19.

4. It is not the benefit of the individual, it is the active hatching of the alienated mass. Until recently, buried in meekness and inane idleness, broad sectors of the masses have awakened to action, in the midst of an orcish nightmare. The "progressive" demagoguery does not differentiate between objective

and subjective rights—all are rights and what are not rights are considered unbearable obstacles to universal happiness, which has three solid pillars through which it intends to advance in history: victimhood, obedience to the one faith and poverty as the supreme virtue. That is the plan of the owners of the world, to the satisfaction of the miserly left.

5. It's not feminism; it's throwing women into the wolf's den of capitalism. There should be a middle ground between the woman content in her home, in the tasks of mother and housewife, and upsetting that scenario with unusual vehemence to elbows her in and properly exploited in the labor market by giving her priority over men. For the left and toxic feminism, this point of virtue is called "empowerment," a Darwinian ideal in which rich women and poor women are equally fulfilled because they all maintain a convulsive vigilance in their permanent competition against men; against men and not against the system that has exploited men and women for centuries. They also call that "sorority," which means, when translated into real events, that the cleaning lady of the Santander bank must feel very happy because the owner of the Santander bank is a woman. Vice versa does not work... well, let's face it, the owner of the Santander bank does not give a damn about the life, thoughts and feelings of the cleaning lady.

6. It is not equality; it is precariousness. Leftism, since paleo-Marxist times, has had an obsession: equality. But not everyone can swim in abundance at the same time—I refer to history—so they have invented a radical solution: everyone is poor. Everyone, except those who manage the invention, of course.

7. It is not nationalism; it is larceny. European regional identities not only make sense, but also form the essence, the spirit of our civilization. That is why some imaginative supporters of social engineering have wanted to associate the concept of cultural identity with that of national identity. The slogan "One language, one territory, one homeland, one shared unique values" was invented a long time ago, and the great dictators of the 20th century in Europe and America were no strangers to it, including our dictator. The formula seems not to have been exhausted. Reconverting a cultural environment to transform it into a nation is the great business of our time. Polydorus of Samos had already warned: "Steal a chicken and you will be a thief. Steal a whole country and you will be an emperor." Steal a territory and you will be honorable president, or Lehendakari, or whatever is appropriate in each case.

8. It is not taxation; it is confiscation. The vocation for poverty—that of others, it is understood—is almost an instinct in the contemporary leftist leadership. Therefore, they hate not only the rich but also

those who manage, thanks to their effort, their expertise or their talent, to "get ahead in life." Getting ahead in life, in societies governed by this miserly left, has an exorbitant cost—giving up one's own profit along the way, in the form of taxes given to the State so that the State can grow and grow without limits; and therefore manage more efficiently the compulsory poverty of the whole population. To confiscate to increase their power, to pay for loyalty and niche-breeding of votes, is their undisguised intention. The final cost: to wipe out all wealth. The mantra "leave no one behind" means, for them, "no one can get ahead." There are a few examples; there is no need to even point them out. The absurd myth that equality can be achieved if the rich pay a lot of taxes breaks down as soon as the rich run out. As there are few of them—the rich—this stream is immediately exhausted and the people have to continue paying until the productive lifeblood of society dries up. In the end, misery for almost everyone. Those who rule are spared.

9. It is not the public; it is the omnipotent State. The "defense of the public" is another of the fallacies of the possibilist left, founded on the ideal of precariousness as a common good. In any civilized society subject to the law, "the private sector" is conditioned by many more controls of efficiency, quality, service, prices, deontology and "good practices" than the public sector. When the current left demands more and more from the public sector, what they really mean is more and more coercive capacity, more and more control; more and more until they perpetuate themselves in power because the private sector will have disappeared and the services of the public sector will be squalid, while the starving masses will cling to them with desperation. The hunger queues to receive the thin gruel do not so much signify the failure of the system as they serve as a warning of the future that can still be avoided. In "socialist" countries like Cuba, Nicaragua or Venezuela, the normalized hunger lines are called by their proper name—going shopping.

10. It is not secularism; it is human faith. The globalist left hates religion because it establishes a utopian discourse that competes with it. Faith in the divine is reviled because it needs to be replaced by human faith. Faith in justice, in freedom, in equality, in the goodness of the rulers. It is only necessary to remember any staging and any speech of any "revolutionary" dictator to get an idea of the amount of human faith that is necessary to be convinced that these people are going to do—were going to do—something beneficial for their people.

11. It is not progress; it is regression. If being poor and living in squalor, surrendering life and liberty to the State, venerating the political leaders who sustain the comedy and the globalist billionaires who prop up the system... If all that is progress, then cannibalism is a picturesque form of gastronomy. It is

not progress, it is the degradation of each and every one of the values on which our civilization has been based until today: individual freedom and equality before the powers of the State; cultural identity and political power, exercised through democratic channels; the right to expression, happiness and beauty; the right to memory and the recognition of tradition as the bearer of the fire that has enlightened us up to the present. Without all that, we are nothing—and globalism and its managers of the left know it perfectly well. Without all that, they make sense, even if it is the most nefarious one—as activists of annihilation, ashes and oblivion.

If the long-suffering readers of this section of Postmodernism do not object, over the next few weeks we will develop these eleven points, one by one, until we find the foundations, origins and consequences of each of the propositions enunciated. We will see you then, if you wish.

José Vicente Pascual is a writer and novelist, living in Madrid. *La Hermandad de la Nieve* (*Brotherhood of the Snow*) is his latest work of historical narrative. This article appears through the kind courtesy of [Posmodernia](#).

Featured: *The Last Day in the Old Home*, by Robert Braithwaite Martineau; painted in 1862.

