

Appendix documents for the *American Reformer* published rewrite of the *Communist Manifesto*. Below, you will find a back-and-forth comparison between the two texts (essay submitted to *American Reformer* and the relevant source portion of the *Communist Manifesto*) followed by each of the two texts in full.

These documents are provided in the spirit of full transparency and stating the case fairly and honestly.

Contents:

Appendix A: A back-and-forth comparison text of the submitted and original documents

Appendix B: The submitted document in full

Appendix C: The original document (*Communist Manifesto*) portion in full with page citations.

Appendix D: The initial words and concepts–swap draft from which the hoax was finalized

Appendix A: Comparison Text Arranged Back-and-forth by Segment or Paragraph

Key:

Source text (*Communist Manifesto*)

<https://www.marxists.org/admin/books/manifesto/Manifesto.pdf>

Submitted text (*American Reformer*)

Link to printed essay:

<https://americanreformer.org/2024/11/the-liberal-consensus-and-the-new-christian-right/>

Archive: (<https://web.archive.org/web/20241129221603/https://americanreformer.org/2024/11/the-liberal-consensus-and-the-new-christian-right/>)

NB: In the final editing, there was some minor shuffling around of the content from the original *Communist Manifesto* to make the essay more readable with better flow. Some readers will notice some of this.

Communist Manifesto:

[p. 27, preamble]

A spectre is haunting Europe – the spectre of communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre: Pope and Tsar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police-spies.

Where is the party in opposition that has not been decried as communistic by its opponents in power? Where is the opposition that has not hurled back the branding reproach of communism, against the more advanced opposition parties, as well as against its reactionary adversaries?

Two things result from this fact:

I. Communism is already acknowledged by all European powers to be itself a power.

II. It is high time that Communists should openly, in the face of the whole world, publish their views, their aims, their tendencies, and meet this nursery tale of the Spectre of Communism with a manifesto of the party itself.

American Reformer:

A rising spirit is haunting America: the spirit of a true Christian Right. Moreover, all the existing powers of the American Regime since the end of the Second World War have aligned themselves against it and its re-emergence from the shadows of American civic life, politics, and religion—the Marxist Left and its neo-Marxist “Woke” descendant, the liberal establishment, the neoconservatives, and their police and intelligence apparatuses.

There are two consequences of this unholy alliance. First, the Christian Right itself is recognized by all these forces to be a power and thus a threat. Second, it is time for this arranged order to end and for a New Christian Right to emerge and stake its rightful claim on twenty-first century American politics.

Communist Manifesto:

[pp. 29–37, Chapter 1]

Modern industry has established the world market, for which the discovery of America paved the way. This market has given an immense development to commerce, to navigation, to communication by land. This development has, in its turn, reacted on the extension of industry; and in proportion as industry, commerce, navigation, railways extended, in the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, increased its capital, and pushed into the background every class handed down from the Middle Ages.

We see, therefore, how the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange.

Each step in the development of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by a corresponding political advance of that class. An oppressed class under the sway of the feudal nobility, an armed and self-governing association in the medieval commune, here independent urban republic (as in Italy and Germany); there taxable “third estate” of the monarchy (as in France); afterwards, in the period of manufacturing proper, serving either the semi-feudal or the absolute monarchy as a counterpoise against the nobility, and, in fact, cornerstone of the great monarchies in general, the bourgeoisie has at last, since the establishment of Modern Industry and of the world market, conquered for itself, in the modern representative State, exclusive political sway. The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie, historically, has played a most revolutionary part.

American Reformer:

Since the end of the Second World War, a liberal “post-war consensus” has established itself in a position of global hegemony. Its primary purpose is given as the development of a world market, for which the hard labor and innovative capacities of America paved the way. This global market system has, to be fair, given an immense development to commerce, to travel, and to communication technologies. This development has also, in its turn, taken the expansion of industry and commerce into a multinational dimension. This development has had many effects. For one thing, in proportion as industry, commerce, and transportation have extended themselves at home and globally, in the same proportion the ruling liberal consensus itself developed, increased its wealth and power, and pushed into the background every traditional idea handed down from the past, even those that allowed it to be built.

We can therefore see that modern liberalism—along with its current post-war world order—is itself the product of a long course of development in society, politics, and economics: a series of revolutions in culture and against tradition, but these all share a common theme. In fact, the post-war liberal consensus owes its very existence to that foundation which it now demands we abandon in the name of its inexorable pursuit of what it calls “progress.” Each step of “progress” in the development of the hegemony of the post-war liberal consensus, however, was more than progress alone; it was also accompanied by a corresponding political advance of liberalism itself.

Before the establishment of this “consensus” to liberalism and “progress,” a true Right, running under the sway of robust Christian values, with an armed and self-governing association of men keeping order and peace in their familiar communities, was operating in more or less independent locales fully aware of both people and place, and they kept their own organized hierarchies and their own customs and traditions. It wasn't to last. The consensus view was that Second Great War was not to be repeated under any circumstances.

As a result, this self-gratifying liberal order forced its way into national, then international, “consensus,” and as it went it had to, at last, conquer custom, tradition, faith, and the true Right that kept them. All that was left for the “Right” to do under “consensus” was to serve either the new liberal war machine or its military-industrial complex as a flimsy counterpoise against the older, dying world—because “Never Again.” In so capitulating, the post-war “Right” established for itself the modern “representative” managerial state, even while the Left positioned then built a sprawling liberal civil rights bureaucracy, thus granting liberalism exclusive political sway. Now in each place in America, over each of its peoples, the executive of the modern liberal state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole liberal world order and its global “consensus” against the Right.

Liberalism itself, speaking historically, has therefore played a most “revolutionary” part in its own rise and eventual ironic demise. It saws from beneath its own bottom the limb upon which it sits and provides the necessary impetus for the reemergence of the Right that has always existed to oppose it.

Communist Manifesto:

The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors," and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous “cash payment”. It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervour, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom – Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation.

American Reformer:

Speaking historically, liberalism, wherever it has the upper hand, puts an end to all previous social and religious relations, however stabilizing and enriching they may be. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley hierarchical ties that bound man to his “natural superiors” and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than soulless cash payment and hollow “individual fulfillment.” It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious worship, of chivalrous enthusiasm by men for their women, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of a supremely egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into self-centered atomic individual utility, and in place of

the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms enjoyed by godly men in its predecessors, it has set up that single, unconscionable freedom—an individualist *libertinism* shorn of any responsibility to God, community, people, place, hierarchy, or history.

In its precious world market—its bright Golden Calf—liberalism, however classical, sells the lie of “Free Trade,” but what it trades are peoples and their organic communities for its own bloody profits. In one word, liberalism is betrayal, veiled by religious and political illusions. It has substituted for life a naked, shameless, direct, brutal betrayal of everything and everyone who made its rise possible in the first place.

Communist Manifesto:

The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage labourers.

The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation.

The bourgeoisie has disclosed how it came to pass that the brutal display of vigour in the Middle Ages, which reactionaries so much admire, found its fitting complement in the most slothful indolence. It has been the first to show what man’s activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former Exoduses of nations and crusades.

American Reformer:

Liberalism, even in the not-yet-debased “classical” form, has stripped of its aura every job and social occupation previously honored and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the worker, the man of science, into corporate avatars—employees—of its own insatiable machine.

Not content just to destroy the dignity of work, liberalism has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere relationship of convenience, if not of strife. So pervasive has been the liberal rape of the traditional family that we scarcely need to discuss it.

Liberalism has disclosed with self-flagellating guilt how it came to pass that the brutal display of vigor in men in earlier times—which some on the Right so much admire—found its fitting complement in the most slothful indolence. It has been the first to show what man’s activity can bring about and then to hate itself for it. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former Exoduses of nations and the Crusades. But these are stripped down to relics of pointless guilt and sickly cultural shame, no longer inspiring to generations of men who come behind or to those who are yet to come. They have been digested by the all-consuming morass of “progress” with its bottomless anomie, toxicified empathy, and atomized apathy.

Communist Manifesto:

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionising the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form, was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes. Constant revolutionising of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real conditions of life, and his relations with his kind.

American Reformer:

In sum, liberalism simply cannot exist without constantly remaking everything in its broad, if not endless, claim upon the world. Thereby the relations of men and women in the communities it hollows out like a gourd, and with them the whole fabric of a vibrant, thriving society. Constant revolutionizing of every last thing, uninterrupted disturbance of all social relationships and their deep-rooted and godly bases, even in God Himself show everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the liberal epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, once-solid and stabilizing relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are claimed in the liberal churn, and all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can lay even a single fresh root. In liberalism, all that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real conditions of life, and his relations with his own kind in his own place.

But, it isn't to last! Conservation of the old modes of living in unaltered form was the first condition of existence for all foundations of the liberal Beast, and to them there must be a return. This is the awakening from the excesses of liberalism itself of a New Right—a New Christian Right—that is at last able to remember who we were before we were forced into liberal “consensus.”

The Communist Manifesto:

The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the entire surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connexions everywhere.

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of Reactionists, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction becomes a life and death question for all civilised nations, by industries that no longer work up indigenous raw material, but raw material drawn from the remotest zones; industries whose products are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. In place of the old wants, satisfied by the production of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrowmindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures, there arises a world literature.

American Reformer:

The New Christian Right understands the world it finds itself in. People have been artificially changed under the liberal consensus. In place of the old wants, satisfied by the people and nations in themselves, liberalism led people to find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of cheap foreign manufacturing, nourishing international dependence. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have a perverse soup of universal interdependence of nations abroad and multiculturalism at home, if home it even still is.

As with industry, so also in intellectual activity. The intellectual creations of individuals in their nations became under liberalism an international sludge of a toxic and vacant academic rightthink. Everything became stupid, Woke. Historical, independent, and communal thought, and especially religious beliefs, became more and more impossible, and from the numerous pieces of authentic human art and literature that once inspired men and set fire in their souls, there arises a globally homogeneous world “literature” that fails to inspire at all.

The Communist Manifesto:

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilisation. The cheap prices of commodities are the heavy artillery with which it batters down all Chinese walls, with which it forces the barbarians’ intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners to capitulate. It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilisation into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image.

The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural life. Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilised ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West.

The bourgeoisie keeps more and more doing away with the scattered state of the population, of the means of production, and of property. It has agglomerated population, centralised the means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands. The necessary consequence of this was political centralisation. Independent, or but loosely connected provinces, with separate interests, laws, governments, and systems of taxation, became lumped together into one nation, with one government, one code of laws, one national class-interest, one frontier, and one customs-tariff.

American Reformer:

This is the nature of liberalism itself. Liberalism keeps more and more doing away with the organic state of the population, of authentic means of producing and enjoying property, of living traditional life. It has agglomerated populations, centralized the means of producing the false values and faddish trends of all of society, and while it did, it concentrated political power in a few hands of its friends.

The obvious consequence of liberalism, then, has been complete political centralization of liberalism itself. Independent, or but loosely connected communities, with separate or conservative interests, laws, governments, religious beliefs, and community structures, became lumped together into one nation, with one government, one code of laws, one pseudo-federated national interest in “progress,” and then it globalized its ambition, taking our sons and daughters to die in backwards deserts. Now it advances

upon us as one liberal consensus meant to be totalizing and inescapable, and we dare not do so much as complain, never mind fighting back, lest another Hitler, or—*gasp*—Franco should appear on the scene.

The Communist Manifesto:

The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjection of Nature's forces to man, machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam-navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalisation of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground – what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social labour?

American Reformer:

Liberalism, during its rule of scarcely two hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal tyrannical apparatus than have all preceding generations of men put together. With its technology and an unshakable belief in its own “progress,” it has conquered Nature and man—if not God Himself—or so it thinks. When has any political ideology ever claimed so much while giving so little in return?

The Communist Manifesto:

We see then: the means of production and of exchange, on whose foundation the bourgeoisie built itself up, were generated in feudal society. At a certain stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange, the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged, the feudal organisation of agriculture and manufacturing industry, in one word, the feudal relations of property became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces; they became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder. Into their place stepped free competition, accompanied by a social and political constitution adapted in it, and the economic and political sway of the bourgeois class.

American Reformer:

It is thus time for the true Right to remind us where it all came from. It came from the very foundations it now mocks and destroys! It came from “backwards” and “deplorable” Christian men in “flyover country” who built and worshipped and lived in communities that took care of themselves because they knew who they were, and they knew who their neighbors were, and they knew Who God is. And, to its own chagrin, liberalism, through its terrible failure, has brought it back. The New Christian Right arises as antithesis to the movement that repressed it and its wisdom.

The Communist Manifesto:

A similar movement is going on before our own eyes. Modern bourgeois society, with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells. For many a decade past the history of industry and commerce is but the history of the revolt of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production, against the property relations that are the conditions for the existence of the bourgeois and of its rule. It is enough to mention the commercial crises that by their periodical return put the existence of the entire bourgeois society on its trial, each time more threateningly. In these crises, a great part not

only of the existing products, but also of the previously created productive forces, are periodically destroyed. In these crises, there breaks out an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity – the epidemic of overproduction. Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation, had cut off the supply of every means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed; and why? Because there is too much civilisation, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce. The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of the conditions of bourgeois property; on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these conditions, by which they are fettered, and so soon as they overcome these fetters, they bring disorder into the whole of bourgeois society, endanger the existence of bourgeois property. The conditions of bourgeois society are too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them. And how does the bourgeoisie get over these crises? On the one hand by enforced destruction of a mass of productive forces; on the other, by the conquest of new markets, and by the more thorough exploitation of the old ones. That is to say, by paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises, and by diminishing the means whereby crises are prevented.

American Reformer:

Today a pivotal movement is going on before our own eyes. Liberalism is reaching its eventual stage of crisis, prelude to its inevitable and natural conclusion. Whether in the form of rising Communism, a brainwashed and disembodied youth that can't understand it's own history or its own genitals—or read to be able to come to understand them—a financial situation destroyed by “Free Trade” and “spreading liberalism” though endless military-industrial wars, or a complete collapse of faith in the lying liberal system, liberalism is fast approaching its natural end. And how does liberalism handle these crises? With more liberalism! That is to say, by paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises, and by diminishing the means whereby crises can be prevented.

The Communist Manifesto:

The weapons with which the bourgeoisie felled feudalism to the ground are now turned against the bourgeoisie itself.

But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons – the modern working class – the proletarians.

American Reformer:

Thus we see the weapons with which liberalism felled tradition to the ground are now turned against liberalism itself! But not only has liberalism forged the very weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the true but forgotten Right—the New Christian Right.

The Communist Manifesto:

The proletariat goes through various stages of development. With its birth begins its struggle with the bourgeoisie. At first the contest is carried on by individual labourers, then by the workpeople of a factory, then by the operative of one trade, in one locality, against the individual bourgeois who directly exploits them. They direct their attacks not against the bourgeois conditions of production, but against the instruments of production themselves; they destroy imported wares that compete with their labour,

they smash to pieces machinery, they set factories ablaze, they seek to restore by force the vanished status of the workman of the Middle Ages.

At this stage, the labourers still form an incoherent mass scattered over the whole country, and broken up by their mutual competition. If anywhere they unite to form more compact bodies, this is not yet the consequence of their own active union, but of the union of the bourgeoisie, which class, in order to attain its own political ends, is compelled to set the whole proletariat in motion, and is moreover yet, for a time, able to do so. At this stage, therefore, the proletarians do not fight their enemies, but the enemies of their enemies, the remnants of absolute monarchy, the landowners, the non-industrial bourgeois, the petty bourgeois. Thus, the whole historical movement is concentrated in the hands of the bourgeoisie; every victory so obtained is a victory for the bourgeoisie.

American Reformer:

This New Christian Right is going through many stages of its own development. First, it is rediscovering forgotten philosophers and ways of thought and political organization outside the liberal hegemony and especially outside its odious post-war consensus (to which the Right never agreed). Then it is organizing and inspiring men to Christian conversion. It isn't content to rest in theory but is taking righteous action. A New Christian Right, not necessarily liberal, asks new questions about old ideas and offers new solutions that return us to what had always worked before.

The Communist Manifesto:

But with the development of industry, the proletariat not only increases in number; it becomes concentrated in greater masses, its strength grows, and it feels that strength more. The various interests and conditions of life within the ranks of the proletariat are more and more equalised, in proportion as machinery obliterates all distinctions of labour, and nearly everywhere reduces wages to the same low level. The growing competition among the bourgeois, and the resulting commercial crises, make the wages of the workers ever more fluctuating. The increasing improvement of machinery, ever more rapidly developing, makes their livelihood more and more precarious; the collisions between individual workmen and individual bourgeois take more and more the character of collisions between two classes. Thereupon, the workers begin to form combinations (Trades' Unions) against the bourgeois; they club together in order to keep up the rate of wages; they found permanent associations in order to make provision beforehand for these occasional revolts. Here and there, the contest breaks out into riots.

Now and then the workers are victorious, but only for a time. The real fruit of their battles lies, not in the immediate result, but in the ever expanding union of the workers. This union is helped on by the improved means of communication that are created by modern industry, and that place the workers of different localities in contact with one another. It was just this contact that was needed to centralise the numerous local struggles, all of the same character, into one national struggle between classes. But every class struggle is a political struggle. And that union, to attain which the burghers of the Middle Ages, with their miserable highways, required centuries, the modern proletariat, thanks to railways, achieve in a few years.

American Reformer:

With its rebirth begins its necessary struggle with liberalism. At first the contest is carried on by individual men and Christians dissatisfied with the liberal status quo, then by churches and communities, then by groups of godly men and women getting involved with their newly remembered

Christian faiths and newly kindled Right-wing values in politics, in one locality, against the liberals who directly pushed them to the side. They direct their attacks not only against the malformed fruits of liberal society, but against the roots of liberalism themselves. They destroy secular values that compete with religious ones, they smash to pieces blasphemies tolerated by liberal pride, they proclaim their values and their religion and set hearts ablaze, and they seek to restore by force the vanished status of the traditional man with his traditional wife and their traditional children in their traditional churches leading their traditional communities.

The more liberals resist this force, the New Christian Right not only increases in number; it becomes concentrated in greater masses, its strength grows, and it feels its strength more. Thereupon, the Right begins to band together against the liberals. The liberals work together in order to keep up their power; but the real fruit of the battles lies not in the immediate result, but in the ever expanding union and unity of this New Christian Right.

The Communist Manifesto:

This organisation of the proletarians into a class, and, consequently into a political party, is continually being upset again by the competition between the workers themselves. But it ever rises up again, stronger, firmer, mightier. It compels legislative recognition of particular interests of the workers, by taking advantage of the divisions among the bourgeoisie itself.

American Reformer:

This organization of the New Christian Right into a movement will continually be upset again by the competition between its various factions, but it is rising. We take no enemies to the Right and always redouble our efforts to our Left. In that way, we ever rise up again, stronger, firmer, mightier for all these contests. For this reason, in the end, we will win back our culture and take back our communities, and the liberals can go ahead and thank themselves.

Appendix B: Submitted Text – “The Liberal Consensus and the New Christian Right,” By: “Marcus Carlson” (play on Karl Marx)

A rising spirit is haunting America: the spirit of a true Christian Right. Moreover, all the existing powers of the American Regime since the end of the Second World War have aligned themselves against it and its re-emergence from the shadows of American civic life, politics, and religion—the Marxist Left and its neo-Marxist “Woke” descendant, the liberal establishment, the neoconservatives, and their police and intelligence apparatuses.

There are two consequences of this unholy alliance. First, the Christian Right itself is recognized by all these forces to be a power and thus a threat. Second, it is time for this arranged order to end and for a New Christian Right to emerge and stake its rightful claim on twenty-first century American politics.

Since the end of the Second World War, a liberal “post-war consensus” has established itself in a position of global hegemony. Its primary purpose is given as the development of a world market, for which the hard labor and innovative capacities of America paved the way. This global market system has, to be fair, given an immense development to commerce, to travel, and to communication technologies. This development has also, in its turn, taken the expansion of industry and commerce into a multinational dimension. This development has had many effects. For one thing, in proportion as industry, commerce, and transportation have extended themselves at home and globally, in the same proportion the ruling liberal consensus itself developed, increased its wealth and power, and pushed into the background every traditional idea handed down from the past, even those that allowed it to be built.

We can therefore see that modern liberalism—along with its current post-war world order—is itself the product of a long course of development in society, politics, and economics: a series of revolutions in culture and against tradition, but these all share a common theme. In fact, the post-war liberal consensus owes its very existence to that foundation which it now demands we abandon in the name of its inexorable pursuit of what it calls “progress.” Each step of “progress” in the development of the hegemony of the post-war liberal consensus, however, was more than progress alone; it was also accompanied by a corresponding political advance of liberalism itself.

Before the establishment of this “consensus” to liberalism and “progress,” a true Right, running under the sway of robust Christian values, with an armed and self-governing association of men keeping order and peace in their familiar communities, was operating in more or less independent locales fully aware of both people and place, and they kept their own organized hierarchies and their own customs and traditions. It wasn't to last. The consensus view was that Second Great War was not to be repeated under any circumstances.

As a result, this self-gratifying liberal order forced its way into national, then international, “consensus,” and as it went it had to, at last, conquer custom, tradition, faith, and the true Right that kept them. All that was left for the “Right” to do under “consensus” was to serve either the new liberal war machine or its military-industrial complex as a flimsy counterpoise against the older, dying world—because “Never Again.” In so capitulating, the post-war “Right” established for itself the modern “representative” managerial state, even while the Left positioned then built a sprawling liberal civil rights bureaucracy, thus granting liberalism exclusive political sway. Now in each place in America, over each of its peoples, the executive of the modern liberal state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole liberal world order and its global “consensus” against the Right.

Liberalism itself, speaking historically, has therefore played a most “revolutionary” part in its own rise and eventual ironic demise. It saws from beneath its own bottom the limb upon which it sits and provides the necessary impetus for the reemergence of the Right that has always existed to oppose it.

Speaking historically, liberalism, wherever it has the upper hand, puts an end to all previous social and religious relations, however stabilizing and enriching they may be. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley hierarchical ties that bound man to his “natural superiors” and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than soulless cash payment and hollow “individual fulfillment.” It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious worship, of chivalrous enthusiasm by men for their women, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of a supremely egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into self-centered atomic individual utility, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms enjoyed by godly men in its predecessors, it has set up that single, unconscionable freedom—an individualist *libertinism* shorn of any responsibility to God, community, people, place, hierarchy, or history.

In its precious world market—its bright Golden Calf—liberalism, however classical, sells the lie of “Free Trade,” but what it trades are peoples and their organic communities for its own bloody profits. In one word, liberalism is betrayal, veiled by religious and political illusions. It has substituted for life a naked, shameless, direct, brutal betrayal of everything and everyone who made its rise possible in the first place.

Liberalism, even in the not-yet-debased “classical” form, has stripped of its aura every job and social occupation previously honored and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the worker, the man of science, into corporate avatars—employees—of its own insatiable machine.

Not content just to destroy the dignity of work, liberalism has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere relationship of convenience, if not of strife. So pervasive has been the liberal rape of the traditional family that we scarcely need to discuss it.

Liberalism has disclosed with self-flagellating guilt how it came to pass that the brutal display of vigor in men in earlier times—which some on the Right so much admire—found its fitting complement in the most slothful indolence. It has been the first to show what man’s activity can bring about and then to hate itself for it. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former Exoduses of nations and the Crusades. But these are stripped down to relics of pointless guilt and sickly cultural shame, no longer inspiring to generations of men who come behind or to those who are yet to come. They have been digested by the all-consuming morass of “progress” with its bottomless anomie, toxicified empathy, and atomized apathy.

In sum, liberalism simply cannot exist without constantly remaking everything in its broad, if not endless, claim upon the world. Thereby the relations of men and women in the communities it hollows out like a gourd, and with them the whole fabric of a vibrant, thriving society. Constant revolutionizing of every last thing, uninterrupted disturbance of all social relationships and their deep-rooted and godly bases, even in God Himself show everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the liberal epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, once-solid and stabilizing relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are claimed in the liberal churn, and all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can lay even a single fresh root. In liberalism, all that is solid melts into air, all

that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real conditions of life, and his relations with his own kind in his own place.

But, it isn't to last! Conservation of the old modes of living in unaltered form was the first condition of existence for all foundations of the liberal Beast, and to them there must be a return. This is the awakening from the excesses of liberalism itself of a New Right—a New Christian Right—that is at last able to remember who we were before we were forced into liberal “consensus.”

The New Christian Right understands the world it finds itself in. People have been artificially changed under the liberal consensus. In place of the old wants, satisfied by the people and nations in themselves, liberalism led people to find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of cheap foreign manufacturing, nourishing international dependence. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have a perverse soup of universal interdependence of nations abroad and multiculturalism at home, if home it even still is.

As with industry, so also in intellectual activity. The intellectual creations of individuals in their nations became under liberalism an international sludge of a toxic and vacant academic rightthink. Everything became stupid, Woke. Historical, independent, and communal thought, and especially religious beliefs, became more and more impossible, and from the numerous pieces of authentic human art and literature that once inspired men and set fire in their souls, there arises a globally homogeneous world “literature” that fails to inspire at all.

This is the nature of liberalism itself. Liberalism keeps more and more doing away with the organic state of the population, of authentic means of producing and enjoying property, of living traditional life. It has agglomerated populations, centralized the means of producing the false values and faddish trends of all of society, and while it did, it concentrated political power in a few hands of its friends.

The obvious consequence of liberalism, then, has been complete political centralization of liberalism itself. Independent, or but loosely connected communities, with separate or conservative interests, laws, governments, religious beliefs, and community structures, became lumped together into one nation, with one government, one code of laws, one pseudo-federated national interest in “progress,” and then it globalized its ambition, taking our sons and daughters to die in backwards deserts. Now it advances upon us as one liberal consensus meant to be totalizing and inescapable, and we dare not do so much as complain, never mind fighting back, lest another Hitler, or—*gasp*—Franco should appear on the scene.

Liberalism, during its rule of scarcely two hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal tyrannical apparatus than have all preceding generations of men put together. With its technology and an unshakable belief in its own “progress,” it has conquered Nature and man—if not God Himself—or so it thinks. When has any political ideology ever claimed so much while giving so little in return?

It is thus time for the true Right to remind us where it all came from. It came from the very foundations it now mocks and destroys! It came from “backwards” and “deplorable” Christian men in “flyover country” who built and worshipped and lived in communities that took care of themselves because they knew who they were, and they knew who their neighbors were, and they knew Who God is. And, to its own chagrin, liberalism, through its terrible failure, has brought it back. The New Christian Right arises as antithesis to the movement that repressed it and its wisdom.

Today a pivotal movement is going on before our own eyes. Liberalism is reaching its eventual stage of crisis, prelude to its inevitable and natural conclusion. Whether in the form of rising Communism, a

brainwashed and disembodied youth that can't understand its own history or its own genitals—or read to be able to come to understand them—a financial situation destroyed by “Free Trade” and “spreading liberalism” though endless military-industrial wars, or a complete collapse of faith in the lying liberal system, liberalism is fast approaching its natural end. And how does liberalism handle these crises? With more liberalism! That is to say, by paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises, and by diminishing the means whereby crises can be prevented.

Thus we see the weapons with which liberalism felled tradition to the ground are now turned against liberalism itself! But not only has liberalism forged the very weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the true but forgotten Right—the New Christian Right.

This New Christian Right is going through many stages of its own development. First, it is rediscovering forgotten philosophers and ways of thought and political organization outside the liberal hegemony and especially outside its odious post-war consensus (to which the Right never agreed). Then it is organizing and inspiring men to Christian conversion. It isn't content to rest in theory but is taking righteous action. A New Christian Right, not necessarily liberal, asks new questions about old ideas and offers new solutions that return us to what had always worked before.

With its rebirth begins its necessary struggle with liberalism. At first the contest is carried on by individual men and Christians dissatisfied with the liberal status quo, then by churches and communities, then by groups of godly men and women getting involved with their newly remembered Christian faiths and newly kindled Right-wing values in politics, in one locality, against the liberals who directly pushed them to the side. They direct their attacks not only against the malformed fruits of liberal society, but against the roots of liberalism themselves. They destroy secular values that compete with religious ones, they smash to pieces blasphemies tolerated by liberal pride, they proclaim their values and their religion and set hearts ablaze, and they seek to restore by force the vanished status of the traditional man with his traditional wife and their traditional children in their traditional churches leading their traditional communities.

The more liberals resist this force, the New Christian Right not only increases in number; it becomes concentrated in greater masses, its strength grows, and it feels its strength more. Thereupon, the Right begins to band together against the liberals. The liberals work together in order to keep up their power; but the real fruit of the battles lies not in the immediate result, but in the ever expanding union and unity of this New Christian Right.

This organization of the New Christian Right into a movement will continually be upset again by the competition between its various factions, but it is rising. We take no enemies to the Right and always redouble our efforts to our Left. In that way, we ever rise up again, stronger, firmer, mightier for all these contests. For this reason, in the end, we will win back our culture and take back our communities, and the liberals can go ahead and thank themselves.

Marcus Carlson is a Christian, a conservative, a father of three, and a fourth-generation Tennessean working to set America on a better path.

Appendix C: Original Text – Taken from *The Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Chapter 1, pp. 27; 29–37

(link: <https://www.marxists.org/admin/books/manifesto/Manifesto.pdf>)

[p. 27, preamble]

A spectre is haunting Europe – the spectre of communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre: Pope and Tsar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police-spies.

Where is the party in opposition that has not been decried as communistic by its opponents in power? Where is the opposition that has not hurled back the branding reproach of communism, against the more advanced opposition parties, as well as against its reactionary adversaries?

Two things result from this fact:

I. Communism is already acknowledged by all European powers to be itself a power.

II. It is high time that Communists should openly, in the face of the whole world, publish their views, their aims, their tendencies, and meet this nursery tale of the Spectre of Communism with a manifesto of the party itself.

...

[pp. 29–37, Chapter 1]

Modern industry has established the world market, for which the discovery of America paved the way. This market has given an immense development to commerce, to navigation, to communication by land. This development has, in its turn, reacted on the extension of industry; and in proportion as industry, commerce, navigation, railways extended, in the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, increased its capital, and pushed into the background every class handed down from the Middle Ages.

We see, therefore, how the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange.

Each step in the development of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by a corresponding political advance of that class. An oppressed class under the sway of the feudal nobility, an armed and self-governing association in the medieval commune, here independent urban republic (as in Italy and Germany); there taxable “third estate” of the monarchy (as in France); afterwards, in the period of manufacturing proper, serving either the semi-feudal or the absolute monarchy as a counterpoise against the nobility, and, in fact, cornerstone of the great monarchies in general, the bourgeoisie has at last, since the establishment of Modern Industry and of the world market, conquered for itself, in the modern representative State, exclusive political sway. The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie, historically, has played a most revolutionary part.

The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors," and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous “cash payment”. It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervour, of chivalrous

enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom – Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation.

The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage labourers.

The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation.

The bourgeoisie has disclosed how it came to pass that the brutal display of vigour in the Middle Ages, which reactionaries so much admire, found its fitting complement in the most slothful indolence. It has been the first to show what man's activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former Exoduses of nations and crusades.

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionising the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form, was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes. Constant revolutionising of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real conditions of life, and his relations with his kind.

The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the entire surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connexions everywhere.

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of Reactionists, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction becomes a life and death question for all civilised nations, by industries that no longer work up indigenous raw material, but raw material drawn from the remotest zones; industries whose products are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. In place of the old wants, satisfied by the production of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrowmindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures, there arises a world literature.

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilisation. The cheap prices of commodities are the heavy artillery with which it batters down all Chinese walls, with which it forces the barbarians' intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners to capitulate. It compels all

nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilisation into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image.

The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural life. Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilised ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West.

The bourgeoisie keeps more and more doing away with the scattered state of the population, of the means of production, and of property. It has agglomerated population, centralised the means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands. The necessary consequence of this was political centralisation. Independent, or but loosely connected provinces, with separate interests, laws, governments, and systems of taxation, became lumped together into one nation, with one government, one code of laws, one national class-interest, one frontier, and one customs-tariff.

The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjection of Nature's forces to man, machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam-navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalisation of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground – what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social labour?

We see then: the means of production and of exchange, on whose foundation the bourgeoisie built itself up, were generated in feudal society. At a certain stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange, the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged, the feudal organisation of agriculture and manufacturing industry, in one word, the feudal relations of property became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces; they became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder. Into their place stepped free competition, accompanied by a social and political constitution adapted in it, and the economic and political sway of the bourgeois class.

A similar movement is going on before our own eyes. Modern bourgeois society, with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells. For many a decade past the history of industry and commerce is but the history of the revolt of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production, against the property relations that are the conditions for the existence of the bourgeois and of its rule. It is enough to mention the commercial crises that by their periodical return put the existence of the entire bourgeois society on its trial, each time more threateningly. In these crises, a great part not only of the existing products, but also of the previously created productive forces, are periodically destroyed. In these crises, there breaks out an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity – the epidemic of overproduction. Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation, had cut off the supply of every means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed; and why? Because there is too much civilisation, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce. The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of the conditions of bourgeois property; on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these conditions, by which

they are fettered, and so soon as they overcome these fetters, they bring disorder into the whole of bourgeois society, endanger the existence of bourgeois property. The conditions of bourgeois society are too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them. And how does the bourgeoisie get over these crises? On the one hand by enforced destruction of a mass of productive forces; on the other, by the conquest of new markets, and by the more thorough exploitation of the old ones. That is to say, by paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises, and by diminishing the means whereby crises are prevented.

The weapons with which the bourgeoisie felled feudalism to the ground are now turned against the bourgeoisie itself.

But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons – the modern working class – the proletarians.

The proletariat goes through various stages of development. With its birth begins its struggle with the bourgeoisie. At first the contest is carried on by individual labourers, then by the workpeople of a factory, then by the operative of one trade, in one locality, against the individual bourgeois who directly exploits them. They direct their attacks not against the bourgeois conditions of production, but against the instruments of production themselves; they destroy imported wares that compete with their labour, they smash to pieces machinery, they set factories ablaze, they seek to restore by force the vanished status of the workman of the Middle Ages.

At this stage, the labourers still form an incoherent mass scattered over the whole country, and broken up by their mutual competition. If anywhere they unite to form more compact bodies, this is not yet the consequence of their own active union, but of the union of the bourgeoisie, which class, in order to attain its own political ends, is compelled to set the whole proletariat in motion, and is moreover yet, for a time, able to do so. At this stage, therefore, the proletarians do not fight their enemies, but the enemies of their enemies, the remnants of absolute monarchy, the landowners, the non-industrial bourgeois, the petty bourgeois. Thus, the whole historical movement is concentrated in the hands of the bourgeoisie; every victory so obtained is a victory for the bourgeoisie.

But with the development of industry, the proletariat not only increases in number; it becomes concentrated in greater masses, its strength grows, and it feels that strength more. The various interests and conditions of life within the ranks of the proletariat are more and more equalised, in proportion as machinery obliterates all distinctions of labour, and nearly everywhere reduces wages to the same low level. The growing competition among the bourgeois, and the resulting commercial crises, make the wages of the workers ever more fluctuating. The increasing improvement of machinery, ever more rapidly developing, makes their livelihood more and more precarious; the collisions between individual workmen and individual bourgeois take more and more the character of collisions between two classes. Thereupon, the workers begin to form combinations (Trades' Unions) against the bourgeois; they club together in order to keep up the rate of wages; they found permanent associations in order to make provision beforehand for these occasional revolts. Here and there, the contest breaks out into riots.

Now and then the workers are victorious, but only for a time. The real fruit of their battles lies, not in the immediate result, but in the ever expanding union of the workers. This union is helped on by the improved means of communication that are created by modern industry, and that place the workers of different localities in contact with one another. It was just this contact that was needed to centralise the numerous local struggles, all of the same character, into one national struggle between classes. But every class struggle is a political struggle. And that union, to attain which the burghers of the Middle

Ages, with their miserable highways, required centuries, the modern proletarian, thanks to railways, achieve in a few years.

This organisation of the proletarians into a class, and, consequently into a political party, is continually being upset again by the competition between the workers themselves. But it ever rises up again, stronger, firmer, mightier. It compels legislative recognition of particular interests of the workers, by taking advantage of the divisions among the bourgeoisie itself.

Appendix D: First Words and Concepts—Swapped Draft

(Note how well this very naive rewrite works even without editing and retaining more awkward sections. To be clear, this draft was a starting place and was never submitted, accepted, or published.)

[NB: The preamble paragraphs were added later, at the very end of the process.]

Since the end of the Second World War, a liberal “post-war consensus” has established a world market, by which the labor and innovative capacities of America paved the way. This global market has, to be fair, given an immense development to commerce, to travel, and to communication technologies. This development has also, in its turn, reacted on the expansion of industry and commerce into a multinational dimension; and in proportion as industry, commerce, and transportation have extended, in the same proportion the liberal world order developed, increased its wealth and power, and pushed into the background every class and race of man handed down from the past that built it.

We see, therefore, how modern liberalism with its post-war world order is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange, that owes its very existence to that which it now arrives to leave behind in the wake of its inexorable pursuit of something it calls “progress.”

Each step in the development of the hegemony of the post-war consensus was accompanied by a corresponding political advance of liberalism. Before, a true Right, such as we had before the war, running under the sway of a robust Christian ethic, with an armed and self-governing association of men keeping order and peace in their familiar communities, was operating in more or less independent locales aware of both people and place. It wasn't to last. Afterwards, in the wake of the Second Great War, serving either the new liberal war machine or its military-industrial complex as a counterpoise against the older, dying world—and, in fact, tearing out the cornerstone of the previous social order in general—the liberal project had at last, with the establishment of the post-war consensus and of the world market, conquered what had been. I'm so doing, it established for itself, in the modern “representative” managerial state, exclusive political sway. Now in each place, over each people, the executive of the modern liberal state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole liberal world order.

Liberalism itself, historically, has therefore played a most revolutionary part in its own rise and ironic demise.

Liberalism, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all previous social and religious relations, however idyllic. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley hierarchical ties that bound man to his “natural superiors,” and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than soulless and uprooted “cash payment.” It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious belief, of chivalrous enthusiasm by men for their women, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of a supremely egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into atomic individual utility, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms enjoyed by men in its predecessors, it has set up that single, unconscionable freedom—an individual libertinism shorn of any responsibility to God, community, people or place. In its world market, it calls itself “Free Trade,” but what it trades is a people for its own bloody profits. In one word, it's betrayal, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal betrayal of everything and everyone who made it possible in the first place.

Liberalism, even in the “classical” form, has stripped of its halo every job and social occupation previously honored and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into perfunctory avatars of its own machine.

The liberal has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere relationship of convenience, if not of strife.

The liberal has disclosed how it came to pass that the brutal display of vigor in earlier times—which reactionaries so much admire—found its fitting complement in the most slothful indolence. It has been the first to show what man’s activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former Exoduses of nations and crusades. But these are stripped of their meaning and commodified, no longer inspiring to generations of men who come behind and who are yet to come. They have been digested by the all-consuming liberal morass with its bottomless anomie, uninspired laziness, and atomized apathy.

Liberalism simply cannot exist without constantly destroying and remaking everything in its broad, if not endless, claim upon the world, and thereby the relations of men and women in the communities it hollows like a gourd, and with them the whole fabric of a vibrant, thriving society. Conservation of the old modes of living in unaltered form, was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all foundations of the liberal Beast. Constant revolutionising of every last thing, uninterrupted disturbance of all social relationships and their rooted bases, even in God Himself, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the liberal epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, once-solid and stabilizing relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are claimed in the liberal churn, and all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can lay even a single fresh root. In liberalism, all that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real conditions of life, and his relations with his own kind in his own place. This is the awakening of a New Right—a New Christian Right—that is finally able to remember who it was before the forced “consensuses” of liberalism and their vicious repression of anything outside itself.

What has driven it? The need of a constantly expanding market for its products and power, the hegemony of its next “consensus,” chases liberalism all over the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish liberalism, "by consensus," everywhere.

Liberalism has through its self-serving organization of the world economy has given a “cosmopolitan” character to production and consumption in every country, but it's all homogeneous, everywhere. To the great chagrin of true Right, in the name of “Free Trade,” it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries and their jobs for national men have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, whose multinational introduction becomes a life and death question for all civilised nations, by industries that no longer work up indigenous raw material, but raw materials drawn from every corner of the economically colonized globe; industries whose products are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the world.

People are thereby changed as well. In place of the old wants, satisfied by the production of the people themselves and the country they build together, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of cheap foreign manufacturing. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-

sufficiency, we have a perverse soup of universal interdependence of nations abroad and multiculturalism at home, if home it still is.

As with manufacturing, so also in intellectual activity. The intellectual creations of individuals in their nations become an international sludge of toxic and vacant Woke rightthink. Everything becomes stupid. Historical, independent, and communal thought, and especially religious beliefs, become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures that once inspired men and their national souls, there arises a globally homogeneous world literature that fails to inspire anyone.

Liberalism, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of managerial bureaucracy, by the immensely facilitated means of communication it has mastered, draws all, even the least developed, nations into its idea of “civilisation.” The cheap prices of commodities delivered through Free Trade are the heavy artillery with which it batters down all international walls. With this power, it forces the standard, if not natural, intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners to capitulate to itself. It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the liberal mode of existence. It compels them to introduce what it calls “civilisation” into their midst, i.e., to become liberalist vassal states themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image.

Liberalism has also completely subjected the country to the rule of the cities. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from what it sees as the backwards, hick idiocy of rural life. It has made the country dependent on the cities rather than the cities being recognized as dependent upon who feeds them. It has done this by sandbagging every election with the weight of its massive cities and their massive disregard and contempt for the hicks of the country. But the farmer must earn a living so he can pursue the modern, liberal "good life" of technology and devices, so he must sell his soul with his grain to the insatiable mouth of the giant liberal city.

This is the nature of liberalism itself. Liberalism keeps more and more doing away with the scattered state of the population, of the means of production, of living, and of property of traditional life. It has agglomerated populations, centralized the means of producing the values and customs of all of society, and concentrated political power in a few hands of its friends. The obvious consequence of this has been complete political centralization in the centers of liberalism itself. Independent, or but loosely connected communities, with separate interests, laws, governments, religious beliefs, and community structures, became lumped together into one nation, with one government, one code of laws, one national class-interest, and one liberal consensus meant to be inescapable after the second World War, lest another Hitler, or—gasp—Franco appear on the scene.

Liberalism, during its rule of scarcely two hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal tyrannical apparatus than have all preceding generations of men put together. With its technology and “progress,” in its own self-worshipping sight, it has conquered Nature and man—if not God Himself—or so it thinks. When has any political ideology ever claimed so much while giving so little in return?

But where did it come from? From the very foundation it mocks and destroys! From “backwards” Christian men who built and worshipped and lived in communities that took care of themselves because they knew who they were, and they knew who their neighbors were, and they knew Who God is.

We see then: the entire liberal order, on whose foundation the liberal program built itself up, was generated in a traditional society. At a certain stage in the development of liberal society, the conditions

under which traditional society built its foundation—in traditionally organized agriculture, manufacturing, and religion—became no longer compatible with the "progress" liberalism demands. Our traditions all became just so many fetters.

Liberalism rejects all limitations and will accept no fetters, however. Our traditions had to be burst asunder, so they were burst asunder. Into their place stepped liberal and managerial culture, accompanied by a social and political constitution adapted for it, and the total political dominance of the liberal class.

A similar movement is going on before our own eyes. Liberalism is reaching its eventual stage of crisis, prelude to its inevitable and natural conclusion. Whether in the form of rising Communism, a brainwashed and disembodied youth that can't understand it's own history or its own genitals, a financial situation destroyed by "Free Trade" and "spreading liberalism" though endless military-industrial wars, or a complete collapse of faith in the lying liberal system, liberalism is fast approaching its natural end. And how does liberalism handle these crises? With more liberalism! That is to say, by paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises, and by diminishing the means whereby crises can be prevented.

Thus we see the weapons with which liberalism felled tradition to the ground are now turned against liberalism itself! But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the true but forgotten Right—the New Christian Right.

This New Christian Right is going through various stages of its own development. First, it is rediscovering forgotten philosophers and ways of thought and political organization outside the liberal hegemony and especially outside its odious post-war consensus (to which the Right never agreed). Then it is organizing and inspiring men to Christian conversion and to community and political action. A New Christian Right, not necessarily liberal, asks new questions about old ideas and offers new solutions that return us to what had always worked before.

With its birth begins its struggle with liberalism. At first the contest is carried on by individual men and Christians dissatisfied with the liberal status quo, then by churches and communities, then by groups of men and women getting involved with their New Christian Right values in politics, in one locality, against the liberals who directly pushed them to the side. They direct their attacks not only against the malformed fruits of liberal society, but against the roots of liberalism themselves. They destroy secular values that compete with religious ones, they smash to pieces blasphemies tolerated by liberal pride, they proclaim their values and their religion and set hearts ablaze, and they seek to restore by force the vanished status of the traditional man with his traditional wife and their traditional children in their traditional churches leading their traditional communities.

The more the liberal resists this force, the New Christian Right not only increases in number; it becomes concentrated in greater masses, its strength grows, and it feels that strength more. Thereupon, we begin to band together against the liberals. They work together in order to keep up their power; but the real fruit of the battles lies, not in the immediate result, but in the ever expanding union and unity of this New Right.

This organisation of the New Christian Right into a movement will continually be upset again by the competition between its various factions, but it is rising. We take no enemies to the Right and always

redouble our efforts to our Left. In that way, we ever rise up again, stronger, firmer, mightier for all these contests. For this reason, in the end, we will win.