

Putin: New World Order Worships Satan

By Jonas E. Alexis, 14 November 2019

“It is worth noting that Russia and Iran – the two nations most successfully resisting NWO regime change – are doing so in the name of God.... Putin’s reference to Satanism was a pointed rebuke to the New World Order elites...”

-
During the Cold War, it was meticulously and rightly argued by scholars of various stripes that the Soviet Union created what was known as “godless communists.”[1] These “godless communists” built their ideology on Marxism/Leninism, an essentially diabolical system which sought to eradicate religion during that era.[2]

These “godless communists” failed miserably largely because you cannot fight Logos and win. Moreover, the fact that Russia has thrived over the years is a clear indication that Alexander Solzhenitsyn was right all along. Back in 2013, Vladimir Putin changed the political calculus by saying that much of the West was committing political suicide. How?

Ideologues, said Putin, were surreptitiously declaring that “faith in God is equal to faith in Satan.” For many, that was an interesting move by Putin. As Patrick Buchanan put it then, “In the new war of beliefs, Putin is saying, it is Russia that is on God’s side. The West is Gomorrah.”[3] Putin said:

“Many Euro-Atlantic countries have moved away from their roots, including Christian values. Policies are being pursued that place on the same level a multi-child family and a same-sex partnership, a faith in God and a belief in Satan. This is the path to degradation.”[4]

The *Washington Times* reported then:

“In his state of the nation address, Mr. Putin also portrayed Russia as a staunch defender of ‘traditional values’ against what he depicted as the morally bankrupt West. Social and religious conservatism, the former KGB officer insisted, is the only way to prevent the world from slipping into ‘chaotic darkness.’

“As part of this defense of ‘Christian values,’ **Russia** has adopted a law banning “homosexual propaganda” and another that makes it a criminal offense to ‘insult’ the religious sensibilities of believers...”

“Although Mr. Putin has never made a secret of what he says is his deep Christian faith, his first decade in power was largely free of overtly religious rhetoric. Little or no attempt was made to impose a set of values on Russians or lecture to the West on morals.”[5]

Certainly Putin put the moral equation back on the table. **Kevin Barrett** declared that Putin was trying to “put the fear of God in the New World Order.” Barrett moved on to make the

forceful argument that much of the Zionist establishment in the West is afraid of Putin because the establishment leaves in fear. “Russian President Putin is resisting,” said Barrett. “That is why the Western propaganda machine is calling him names.” Barrett continued to argue cogently:

“It is worth noting that Russia and Iran – the two nations most successfully resisting NWO regime change – are doing so in the name of God.... Putin’s reference to Satanism was a pointed rebuke to the New World Order elites, who – though they push militant secularism on the societies they are trying to undermine – are closet Satanists.

“Anyone who doubts this should run the name ‘Lt. Col. Michael Aquino’ through a search engine. Aquino, an avowed Satanist and credibly-accused mass child abuser, was rewarded for his crimes against children with an appointment as Chief of Psychological Warfare for the US military...

“The shock troops of the NWO’s war against religion and tradition (and Russia and Iran) are the neoconservatives. Operation Gladio terrorist Michael Ledeen explains:

“‘Creative destruction is our middle name, both within our society and abroad. We tear down the old order every day, from business to science, literature, art, architecture, and cinema to politics and the law. Our enemies have always hated this whirlwind of energy and creativity which menaces their traditions (whatever they may be) and shames them for their inability to keep pace ... We must destroy them to advance our historic mission.’

“Putin is stopping New World Order ‘creative destruction’ in Syria and Ukraine. He is part of a growing coalition opposing the NWO – not just religious traditionalists, but also progressive anti-globalization forces, including Hugo Chavez inspired anti-imperialists in Latin America.”

Kudos for Barrett here. The regime proved Putin right by applauding the Pussy Riot,[6] a Trotskyite group that ended up having sex (literal pornography) at the Moscow National Museum. (We have discussed this issue in the past.) The interesting thing about all this was that Neocons like Seth Mandel of *Commentary* were on the front line defending the Pussy Riot.[7]

But the crucial point here is that Putin, like Emmanuel Kant and even John Adams and others, understands that a nation cannot exist without objective morality, and objective morality cannot exist without Logos,[8] the essence and sustainer of the moral universe.

In that sense, and whether he notices it or not, Putin was implicitly or indirectly attacking the Neo-Darwinian ideology, which states that objective morality is an illusion and has no metaphysical basis. It is here that we find again that Neo-Darwinian metaphysics is intellectually useless and worthless because it denies the very essence of a moral universe.

As we have noted in the past, serious Darwinists agree that objective morality is an illusion. The noted biology philosopher Michael Ruse once again said that “there are no grounds

whatsoever for being good.... Morality is flimflam.”[9] Yet like his intellectual antecedent Charles Darwin, Ruse ends up contradicting himself in the very next sentence by saying,

“Does this mean that you can just go out and rape and pillage, behave like an ancient Roman grabbing Sabine women? Not at all. I said that there are no grounds for being good. It doesn’t follow that you should be bad.”[10]

Well, duh! If there are no grounds for objective morality, then good and bad are also illusion. And if good and bad are just illusion, then Nietzsche’s *transvaluation* of all values is the next logical step. What is good for you may not be good for me, and there is no way of adjudicating competing explanations. In that kind of world, might makes right. Ruse does not really have a problem with this argument here. In fact, he moves on to say that morality

“is something forged in the struggle for existence and reproduction, something fashioned by natural selection. It is as much a natural human adaptation as our ears or noses or teeth or penises or vaginas. It works and it has no meaning over and above this. If all future food were Pablum, we would probably be better off without teeth.

“Morality is just a matter of emotions, like liking ice cream and sex and hating toothache and marking student papers. But it is, and has to be, a funny kind of emotion. It has to pretend that it is not that at all! If we thought that morality was no more than liking or not liking spinach, then pretty quickly it would break down.

“Before long, we would find ourselves saying something like: ‘Well, morality is a jolly good thing from a personal point of view. When I am hungry or sick, I can rely on my fellow humans to help me. But really it is all bullshit, so when they need help I can and should avoid putting myself out. There is nothing there for me.’ The trouble is that everyone would start saying this, and so very quickly there would be no morality and society would collapse and each and every one of us would suffer

“So morality has to come across as something that is more than emotion. It has to appear to be objective, even though really it is subjective.”[11]

Ruse, like some genetic theorists, really believes that “morality is an illusion put in place by your genes to make you a social cooperator...”[12]

This, by the way, is logically congruent with Darwin’s survival of the fittest. (I am currently writing a critique of Kevin MacDonald’s recent book for *Culture Wars* magazine, and these issues will be thoroughly and methodically examined.) And survival of the fittest is logically congruent with Zionism. If evolutionary theory “explains how warfare contributed to fitness in the course of the evolution of *Homo sapiens*,” as scholar Bradley A. Thayer maintains,[13] then how can a serious Darwinist say that Social Darwinism or even Zionism is really bad on a consistent and logical basis?

Thayer, of course, struggles mightily to rationally defend the thesis that “Warfare contributes to fitness”[14] and that “people wage war to gain and defend resources”[15] while

maintaining that social Darwinists were wrong in taking social Darwinism to its logical conclusion. He says that “social Darwinists perverted Charles Darwin’s argument” and

“distorted evolutionary explanations because they misunderstood Darwin’s ideas and were ignorant of or consciously chose to ignore the naturalistic fallacy. Those who use evolutionary theory to explain aspects of human behavior must recall the social Darwinists’ errors. Doing so makes it possible not only to avoid repeating errors but also to advance scientific understanding.”[16]

But Thayer moves on to make this argument:

“The ultimate causation for warfare is anchored in Darwinian natural selection and inclusive fitness....warfare can increase both the absolute and relative fitness of humans...From the classical Darwinian perspective, warfare contributes to fitness because individuals who wage war successfully are better able to survive and reproduce.”[17]

Thayer repeats this thesis over and over in the course of the book:

“An ultimate causal explanation for warfare based in evolutionary theory begins with the recognition that warfare contributes to fitness in certain circumstances because successful warfare lets the winner acquire resources.

“For evolutionary biology, a resource is any material substance that has the potential to increase the individual’s ability to survive or reproduce. As such it may be food, shelter, or territory, especially high-quality soil or wild foods; abundant firewood; or territory free of dangerous animals, such as lions, or insect infestations, or disease; and also status coalition allies, and members of the opposite sex.”[18]

And then this: “Warfare might be necessary then for offensive purposes, to plunder resources from others. In these circumstances, an individual becomes fitter if he can successfully attack to take the resources of others.”[19]

Thayer cites evolutionary theorist William Durham saying that

“War is one means by which individuals ‘may improve the material conditions of their lives and thereby increase their ability to survive and reproduce...Thus successful warfare would help the tribe gain resources, and for a wider agricultural economy land is critically important.”[20]

So, is Thayer really against social Darwinism? Ideologically, yes. Consistently and logically? No. I honestly don’t blame him, for his intellectual grandfather could not solve that problem either and had to live in contradiction until his dying day. Darwin declared at the end of his *Origin of Species*:

“Thus, from the war of nature, from famine and death, the most exalted object which we are capable of conceiving, namely, the production of the higher animals, directly follows.”[21]

Correct me if I am wrong here: isn't Darwin saying that war and famine and death are things that will get the higher animals ahead? It is agreed among scholars that this is Darwin at his best. Yet when social Darwinists took Darwin's thesis and spread it across the political spectrum, Darwin disagreed![22]

If “Jewish intellectual and political movements” are in the struggle for survival, then the Goyim must swiftly be eliminated. That is certainly consistent with Darwin's grand scheme. If people cannot see this and try to avoid this vital contradiction, then you can be sure that they are not to be taken seriously or they do not want to follow their own ideological project to its bitter end.

So, when people are trying to maintain an objective morality by either appealing to the so-called “evolutionary theory” or even DNA, then you can be sure that those people either are out of touch with the scholarly literature, are not well equipped to understand or articulate their own position, or are just deliberately lying.

Furthermore, to appeal to reciprocal altruism to prove objective morality, a central protocol in Darwin's grand scheme,[23] is also a dead end because the life of Mother Theresa and countless other examples prove that this idea will not work. I was hoping that modern Darwinists would make some good improvement on this warfare theory, but so far virtually everyone has failed.

I am certainly not asking people to drop their cherished belief. In fact, there are many people who believe in the tooth fairy. But so long that this Neo-Darwinian ideology remains intellectually incoherent and morally indefensible, they can leave me out of it.

Going back to Putin, he said in 2013:

“People in many European countries are ashamed, and are afraid of talking about their religious convictions. [Religious] holidays are being taken away or called something else, shamefully hiding the essence of the holiday.”[24]

The Zionist regime, of course, made the false accusation that Putin was persecuting homosexuals. But Putin moved on to diffuse the regime's silly argument this way: “We need to respect the rights of minorities to be different, but the rights of the majority should not be in question.”[25]

So, yes, Patrick Buchanan. Putin is one of us! Any serious politician who stands against the diabolical establishment is one of us. As Friedrich Hansen of *Asia Times* put it,

“Make no mistake, Putin is not targeting homosexuals, as he made clear with his welcoming them to the Sochi Olympics. It also seems only fair to remind Western readers that ever

since the 1980s, Sochi has been the center of Russia with a vibrant homosexual subculture. Rather, Putin is addressing the whole gamut of post-modern incarnations of the ‘sex and drugs’ revolution: binge drinking of both genders until the doctors move in, elite illicit drug use, unmanageable crime rates, surging divorce numbers, Hook-Up sex on campus, out of wedlock births, fathers and mothers in puberty, abortion on demand, public nudism and human copulation in parks, gay promiscuity with a good conscience, swinger clubs and darkrooms, ruthless Internet dating and pornography and what have you.”[26]

How does the regime respond? Well, you know the drill. Owen Matthews, a useful idiot, declared in the *Spectator* that Putin has a “new plan for world domination”![27] In order to slander Putin, Matthews indirectly linked him with Willi Munzenberg, a revolutionary Jew who wanted to take the Western world to perdition at any cost. Munzenberg was so passionate about his revolutionary goal that he wrote:

“We must organize the intellectuals and use them to make Western Civilization stink! Only then, after they have corrupted all its values and made life impossible, can we impose the dictatorship of the proletariat.”

When Putin said that Russia will “defend traditional values that have made up the spiritual and moral foundation of civilisation in every nation for thousands of years,” Matthews declared that Putin “is on to something.” What is it? Matthews told us:

“Putin’s new mission goes deeper than political opportunism. Like the old Communist International, or Comintern, in its day, Moscow is again building an international ideological alliance.”[28]

He again emphasized this point so that readers could get it: “And again, like the Comintern, Putin appears convinced that he is embarking on a world-historical mission.”[29] He moved on to talking about “Putin’s conservative Comintern.”

At the other end of the political spectrum, David Cameron likened Putin to Hitler.[30] John McCain, Lindsey Graham, among other usual suspects, all placed Putin and Hitler on equal footing.[31]

Historian Paul Johnson (sad to say) even went so far as to say that Putin and Hitler are basically two sides of the same coin. Johnson said that Putin

“believes in a strong Stalinist state. His goal is to reverse the events of 1989—the end of the Soviet state and dissolution of its enormous empire. He seeks to do this by using what remains of Russia’s Stalinist heritage: the military, a huge stockpile of nuclear weapons and immense resources of natural gas and other forms of energy.”[32]

Johnson was sad because “there is no Churchillian voice to sound the alarm and call the democratic world to action.”[33]

Johnson has got to be kidding. What he ended up saying was that someone like Churchill needed to step up and started lying to the West about Putin. It was so sad to read silly comments such as this by a generally good historian like Johnson. But since Johnson himself was intellectual crippled by the Zionist establishment, he could not think clearly.

But the real question is this: why did puppets of the current regime hate Putin so much? Well, Putin suggested back in 2013 the Soviet government was guided by a dark force whose “ideological goggles and faulty ideological perceptions collapsed.”^[34]

“The first Soviet government,” Putin added, “was 80-85 percent Jewish.”^[35] Sounds like Putin has read Alexander Solzhenitsyn’s *Two Hundred Years Together*. If so, then it seems clear that much of the entire media had good reasons to fear him. Perhaps Putin has been encouraged by Solzhenitsyn’s bravery. It was Solzhenitsyn who said:

“And thus, overcoming our temerity, let each man choose: will he remain a witting servant of the lies, or has the time come for him to stand straight as an honest man, worthy of the respect of his children and contemporaries?”^[36]

Putin was saying enough is enough. And this maybe one reason why nearly all the major news outlets were relentlessly slandering him. Kevin Barrett ended up his excellent article saying, “God bless President Putin, who is putting the fear of God into the New World Order.” Let us hope that he will never be weary in well doing, for in due season he shall reap, if he faints not.

This slightly altered article was first published in the summer of 2015.

-
- ^[1] See for example William Husband, *“Godless Communists”: Atheism and Society in Soviet Russia, 1917–1932* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2002); Daniel Peris, *Storming the Heavens: The Soviet League of the Militant Godless* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998).
 - ^[2] See for example Sabrina Petra Ramet, *Religious Policy in the Soviet Union* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 4; for similar studies, see also John Anderson, *Religion, State and Politics in the Soviet Union and Successor States* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
 - ^[3] Patrick J. Buchanan, “Vladimir Putin, Christian Crusader?,” *American Conservative*, April 4, 2014.
 - ^[4] Marc Bennetts, “Who’s ‘godless’ now? Russia says it’s U.S.,” *Washington Times*, January 28, 2014.
 - ^[5] Ibid.
 - ^[6] Peter Pomerantsev, “For God and Putin,” *Newsweek*, September 10, 2012.
 - ^[7] Seth Mandel, Contentions: Putin Vs. the Punk Rockers,” *Commentary*, August 17, 2012.
 - ^[8] E. Michael Jones has made this very point in his article “Ethnos Needs Logos: or Why I spent Three Days in Guadalajara Trying to Convince David Duke to Become a Catholic,” *Culture Wars*, June 2015.

- [9] Michael Ruse, “God is dead. Long live morality,” *Guardian*, March 15, 2010.
- [10] Ibid.
- [11] Ibid.
- [12] Ibid.
- [13] Bradley A. Thayer, *Darwin and International Relations: On the Evolutionary Origins of War and Ethnic Conflict* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2004), 96.
- [14] Ibid., 99, 100, 107, 114.
- [15] Ibid., 99.
- [16] Ibid., 102.
- [17] Ibid., 103, 104.
- [18] Ibid., 108.
- [19] Ibid., 109.
- [20] Ibid. 110, 111.
- [21] Darwin, *Origin of Species*, 459.
- [22] For a decent historical study on this, see for example Gertrude Himmelfarb, *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1962). Darwin was not as open-minded as people thought he was. “Former Darwin enthusiast St. George Mivart published anonymous articles critiquing Darwin’s theory. A gifted zoologist, Mivart would eventually publish a volume titled *The Genesis of Species*, an influential book that raised serious questions about the limits of natural selection, especially in its application to man. Far from rejecting Darwin wholesale, Mivart continued to embrace evolution and believe that the physical capacities of human beings had developed from the lower animals. But he continued to insist—like [Alfred] Wallace—that man was radically unique from the rest of creation and had a soul. Egged on by Thomas Huxley, Darwin became increasingly bitter over his former disciple’s criticisms, despite Mivart’s attempts to be personable in private correspondence and his public praise of the ‘invaluable labours and active brains of Charles Darwin and Alfred Wallace.’” John G. West, *Darwin Day in America: How Our Politics and Culture Have Been Dehumanized in the Name of Science* (Wilmington: ISI Books, 2007).
- [23] See Denis L. Krebs, *The Origins of Morality* (New York: Oxford University, 2011), 41-42.
- [24] Neil Buckley, “Putin urges Russians to return to values of religion,” *Financial Times*, September 19, 2013.
- [25] Ibid.
- [26] Friedrich Hansen, “Putin Stands Up to Western Decadence,” *Asia Times*, February 28, 2014.
- [27] Owen Matthews, “Vladimir Putin’s new plan for world domination,” *Spectator*, February 22, 2014.
- [28] Ibid.
- [29] Ibid.
- [30] Owen Jones, “David Cameron and the cynicism of comparing Putin to Hitler,” *Guardian*, September 3, 2014.
- [31] Michael Kelley, “11 Prominent People Who Compared Putin To Hitler,” *Business Insider*, May 23, 2014.
- [32] Paul Johnson, “Is Vladimir Putin Another Adolf Hitler?,” *Forbes*, April 16, 2014.
- [33] Ibid.

- [34] “Putin: First Soviet government was mostly Jewish,” *Jerusalem Post*, June 20, 2013.
- [35] *Ibid.*
- [36] Alexander Solzhenitsyn, *The Solzhenitsyn Reader* (Wilmington: ISI Books, 2007), 558.