

What Is 'Liberalism'?

There is a little-recognized force within human nature, which may well help us as it has helped all movements that were poised for growth and expansion.

by Revilo P. Oliver

An excerpt from Dr. Oliver's book *America's Decline: The Education of a Conservative* (Londinium Press, London, 1981)

"LIBERALISM" IS A succedaneous religion that was devised late in the Eighteenth Century and it originally included a vague deism. Like the Christianity from which it sprang, it split into various sects and heresies, such as Jacobinism, Fourierism, Owenism, Fabian Socialism, Marxism, and the like. The doctrine of the "Liberal" cults is essentially Christianity divested of its belief in supernatural beings, but retaining its social superstitions, which were originally derived from, and necessarily depend on, the supposed wishes of a god. This "Liberalism," the residue of Christianity, is, despite the fervor with which its votaries hold their faith, merely a logical absurdity, a series of deductions from a premise that has been denied.

The dependence of the "Liberal" cults on a blind and irrational faith was long obscured or concealed by their professed esteem for objective science, which they used as a polemic weapon against orthodox Christianity, much as the Protestants took up the Copernican restoration of heliocentric astronomy as a weapon against the Catholics, who had imprudently decided that the earth could be stopped from revolving about the sun in defiance of Holy Writ by burning intelligent men at the stake or torturing them until they recanted. Pious Protestants would naturally have preferred a cozy little earth, such as their god described in their holy book, but they saw the advantage of appealing to our racial respect for observed reality to enlist support, while simultaneously stigmatizing their rivals as ignorant obscurantists and ridiculous ranters.

The votaries of "Liberalism" would have much preferred to have the various human species specially created to form one race endowed with the fictitious qualities dear to "Liberal" fancy, but the cultists saw the advantage of endorsing the findings of geology and biology, including the evolution of species, in their polemics against orthodox Christianity to show the absurdity of the Jewish version of the Sumerian creation-myth. The hypocrisy of the professed devotion to scientific knowledge was made unmistakable when the "Liberals" began their frantic and often hysterical efforts to suppress scientific knowledge about genetics and the obviously innate differences between the different human species and between the individuals of any given species. At present, the "Liberals" are limited to shrieking and spitting when they are confronted with inconvenient facts, but no one who has heard them in action can have failed to notice how exasperated they are by the limitations that have thus far prevented them from burning wicked biologists and other rational men at the stake.

It is unnecessary to dilate on the superstitions of "Liberalism." They are obvious in the cult's holy words. "Liberals" are forever chattering about "all mankind," a term which does have a specific meaning, as do parallel terms in biology, such as "all marsupials" or "all species of the genus *Canis*," but the fanatics give to the term a mystic and special meaning, derived from the Zoroastrian myth of "all mankind" and its counterpart in Stoic speculation, but absurd when used by persons who deny the existence of Ahuru Mazda or a comparable deity who could be supposed to have imposed a transcendental unity on the manifest diversity of the various human species. "Liberals" rant about "human rights" with the fervor of an evangelist who appeals to what Moses purportedly said, but a moment's thought suffices to show that, in the absence of a god who might be presumed to have decreed such rights, the only rights are those which the citizens of a stable society, by agreement or by a long usage that has acquired the force of law, bestow on themselves; and while the citizens may show kindness to aliens, slaves, and horses, these

beings can have no rights. Furthermore, in societies that have been so subjugated by conquest or the artful manipulation of masses that individuals no longer have constitutional rights that are not subject to revocation by violence or in the name of "social welfare," there are no rights, strictly speaking, and therefore no citizens -- only masses existing in the state of indiscriminate equality of which "Liberals" dream and, of course, a state of *de facto* slavery, which their masters may deem it expedient, as in the United States at present, to make relatively light until the animals are broken to the yoke.

"Liberals" babble about "One World," which is to be a "universal democracy" and is "inevitable," and they thus describe it in the very terms in which the notion was formulated, two thousand years ago, by Philo Judaeus, when he cleverly gave a Stoic coloring to the old Jewish dream of a globe in which all the lower races would obey the masters whom Yahweh, by covenant, appointed to rule over them. And the "Liberal" cults, having rejected the Christian doctrine of "original sin," which, although based on a silly myth about Adam and Eve, corresponded fairly well to the facts of human nature, have even reverted to the most pernicious aspect of Christianity, which common sense had held in check in Europe until the Eighteenth Century; and they openly exhibit the morbid Christian fascination with whatever is lowly, proletarian, inferior, irrational, debased, deformed, and degenerate. This maudlin preoccupation with biological refuse, usually sicklied over with such nonsense words as '*underprivileged* [!],' would make sense, if it had been decreed by a god who perversely chose to become incarnate among the most pestiferous of human races and to select his disciples from among the illiterate dregs of even that *peuplade*, but since the "Liberals" claim to have rejected belief in such a divinity, their superstition is exposed as having no basis other than their own resentment of their betters and their professional interest in exploiting the gullibility of their compatriots.

In the Eighteenth Century, Christians whose thinking was cerebral rather than glandular, perceived that their faith was incompatible with observed reality and reluctantly abandoned it. A comparable development is taking place in the waning faith of "Liberalism," and we may be sure that, despite the cult's appeal to masses that yearn for an effortless and mindless existence on the animal level, and despite the prolonged use of public schools to deform the minds of all children with "Liberal" myths, the cult would have disappeared, but for the massive support given it today, as to the Christian cults in the ancient world, by the Jews, who have, for more than two thousand years, battered on the venality, credulity, and vices of the races they despise.

There is one crucial fact that we must not overlook, if we are to see the political situation as it is, rather than in the anamorphosis of some 'ideology,' i.e., propaganda-line, whether "Liberal" or "conservative." The real fulcrum of power in our society is neither the votaries of an ideological sect nor the Jews, clear-sighted and shrewd as they are, but the intelligent members of our own race whose one principle is an unmitigated and ruthless egotism, an implacable determination to satisfy their own ambitions and lusts at whatever cost to their race, their nation, and even their own progeny. And with them we must reckon the bureaucrats, men who, however much or little they may think about the predictable consequences of the policies they carry out, are governed by a *corporate* determination to sink their proboscis ever deeper into the body politic from which they draw their nourishment. Neither of these groups can be regarded as being "Liberal" or as having any other political attitude from conviction. The first are guarded by the lucidity of their minds, and the second by their collective interests, from adhesion to any ideology or other superstition.

Bureaucracies contain, of course, ambitious men who are climbing upward. One thinks of the bureaucrats who, shortly before the "Battle of the Bulge" in the last days of 1944, were openly distressed "lest a premature victory in Europe compromise our social gains at home," meaning, of course, that they were afraid that peace might break out before they had climbed another rung on their way to real power. After the defeat of Japan, one of them, a major in the ever-growing battalions of chair-borne troops, too precious to be distressed by such nasty things as fighting battles, frankly lamented his hard luck: if only the war had lasted another three months, and a suitable number of Americans been killed, he would have been promoted to colonel and would

also have a "command" that would have qualified him as the foremost expert in his field and thus assured his prosperity after the evil day on which he would have to face the hardships of peace. This attitude may not be admirable, but it is quite common and a political force of the first magnitude, which it would be childish to ignore. It is not, of course, peculiar to the United States. When the National Socialists came to power in Germany, they had many enthusiastic adherents of the same type, who, after the defeat of their nation, did not have to be tortured to become witnesses to the "evils of Nazism" and endorse any lie desired by the brutal conquerors. The attitude, furthermore, though especially prevalent in our demoralized age, is not peculiar to it. One thinks of the Popes who are reported to have told their intimates, "How much profit this fable of Christ has brought us!" And the same realistic appraisal of the main chance was doubtless present in many ecclesiastics who did not reach the top or did not have so much confidence in the discretion of their immediate associates.

Unmitigated egotism, which is necessarily a prime factor on all the higher levels of society in a "democracy," is a political force with which one cannot cope directly; one can only attack the masks that are worn in public. It is, however, an obstacle that can be circumvented and one which could become an asset. The only strategic consideration here is represented by the truism, "nothing succeeds like success" -- a crude statement, which you may find elaborated with elegance and sagacity in the *Or culo manual* of the great Jesuit, Baltasar Gracián. Our formidable enemies today will become our enthusiastic allies tomorrow, if it appears that we are likely to succeed. I speak, of course, only of members of our race, but the most competent and acute "Liberals," who today declaim most eloquently about the "underprivileged" and "world peace," could become tomorrow the most eloquent champions of the hierarchical principle (with which they secretly agree) and a *guerre l'outrance* against our enemies, if their calculations of the probable future were changed. And, as the Jews well know, the great humanitarian, whose soul shudders today at the very thought of insufficient veneration of the Jews, could become tomorrow grateful to the Jews only for the wonderful idea about gas chambers that was incorporated in the hoax about the "six million," and he would probably find a real personal satisfaction in putting the idea into practice at last. As Gracián says, the prudent man will ascertain where power really lies, in order to use those who have it and to spurn those who have it not.

If one wishes to talk about principles or even long-range objectives to the representatives of this extremely powerful political force, one should wear motley and cap with bells; the only arguments that will be cogent to them are of the kind that always taught the Reverend Bishop Talleyrand precisely when it would be profitable to kick his less nimble associates in the teeth. Some historians claim, and it may be true, that Talleyrand had principles. If so, he never let them interfere with his conduct. He was a man of great talent and perspicacity, and he always found the right moment and right way to join the winning side in time for it to boost him yet higher. When age at last forced his retirement, he was equally adroit in conciliating impressionable historians by simulating regret for the methods by which he had attained eminence. He is one of the comparatively few perfect models for brilliant and pragmatic young men today.

Many of my conservative readers will find this fact disagreeable or even depressing, but I trust they will not dream of resuscitating an etiolated religion, and will not count too heavily on the *spiritual* effects of a possible restoration of racial self-respect and sanity. If the fact is unpleasant *per se*, it is also the basis for some cautious optimism, since it leaves open the possibility that movement on behalf of our race, if it ever seems likely to succeed, could quickly become an avalanche. In certain circumstances -- not likely, perhaps, but possible -- the despised "racist" of today could be astounded by the discovery that an overwhelming majority of the bureaucracy and of the White men in power above it had always been with him in heart. The sudden conversions will not necessarily be hypocritical, for it is quite likely that there is now such a majority which, *ceteris paribus*, would prefer to belong to a virile race rather than a dying one. But remember the proviso, *ceteris paribus*: no personal sacrifices, no risks.