



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on May 15, 2017

Le Pen's Views — Elites Consider National Sovereignty “Far Right?”

During a recent TV interview, Marie Harf, who had served as a spokesperson for Obama's State Department, referred to French presidential candidate Marine Le Pen (shown) as “far right.” Harf's categorization of Le Pen is almost universal among the elites, whether they are in government, media, or academia.



Harf was asked to explain what she meant in calling Le Pen “far right.” Harf said, “To me it means her policies on immigration, her policies on secularism in France, which has long been sort of a French tradition.... She has at times called for a complete shutdown of immigration. Combine that with her flirting with getting out of the EU, with getting out of NATO.”

Reduced to a short definition, then, it would appear that the globalist elites consider anything or anyone who stands in the way of the drive for increased international governance (a world government) is “far right.”

Le Pen certainly fits the bill of “far right,” if that means a person who is opposed to world government. In her unsuccessful campaign for president of France, Le Pen had promised to “destroy the New World Order.” The term New World Order has long been recognized as shorthand for some sort of world government structure.

{modulepos inner_text_ad}

“The people have spoken and their message is clear: the New World Order is finished. The elite are not safe hiding behind their propaganda fueled media institutions, making unaccountable decisions in Brussels, and silencing citizens who speak out against this insanity. When I am President a tidal wave of revulsion will be coming their way, the likes of which has never been seen before.”

Unfortunately, Le Pen was not elected president of France, and the New World Order is far from finished. But the election of Donald Trump in the United States and the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union (EU), along with the increased popularity of Le Pen's political movement, and others like it in Europe, do indicate that the push for world government by the elites is being resisted like never before.

Reduced to its core, Le Pen's candidacy was based upon national sovereignty for France. “When I am elected President, I will go to the European Union and say that I want four sovereignties back,” Le Pen promised. She then listed them. “Legislative sovereignty: our laws are more important than EU directives. Territorial sovereignty: we decide who comes and stays in our country, we want borders. Thirdly, economic and banking sovereignty: I have the right to promote economic patriotism if I so wish.



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on May 15, 2017

And of course, monetary sovereignty.”

Le Pen sees hope for the future, despite her recent defeat. “Something fundamental is happening: the comeback of nations, of sovereign states, with people, with frontiers. People want to be in charge of their destinies. For a long time they were prevented from doing so.”

This is “far right?” People wanting to be charge of their own destiny?

A review of headlines and stories from the elite media certainly reveals that they view such desire for national sovereignty as far right. The *Washington Post* called Le Pen’s campaign as a “far-right bid.” NBC News’ headline proclaimed, “Le Pen Loses but Propels Far-Right.” *The Guardian* wrote, “Marine Le Pen defeated, but France’s far right is far from finished.” The *Independent’s* story began, “Marine Le Pen, the far-right politician.” Even Fox News, which is supposedly “fair and balanced,” called her the “French far-right presidential contender.”

This is only a small sampling of the near-universal media description of Le Pen and her movement as “far-right.” In contrast, her run-off opponent in the French election, Emmanuel Macron was almost always referred to as “the independent centrist candidate.” Macron was clearly part of the very elite denounced by Le Pen, having been an investment banker with the Rothschild banking house.

Le Pen rejects the description of herself as far right. In fact, some of her views would best be described as “liberal” or “left-wing” in America. She chose to mostly avoid social issues, but considers herself something of a feminist, vowing to leave France’s pro-abortion laws alone.

Some have justified calling Le Pen far right, simply because of the views of her father, Jean-Marie Le Pen, the former leader of the Front National. The elder Le Pen is considered anti-Semitic, having denied the Holocaust. However, the younger Le Pen has repeatedly said that she disagrees with him on this and other such positions.

Besides that, what makes Holocaust denial or anti-Semitism “far right?” On the contrary, it would seem to make more sense to call someone who admits to the deaths of the Holocaust as far right. Adolf Hitler’s political party, which carried out the mass murder of millions of European Jews (and others), was the National Socialist German Workers Party. Nazi was basically a short way of saying “National Socialist,” much like saying “commie” to refer to communists. While it would be unfair to tar all socialist parties with mass murder, it is a fact of history that the political party that carried out the Holocaust was a left-wing political party (so it’s an atrocity they would want to hide or falsify), not a right-wing political party.

Which raises a basic question of just how useful are the terms left-wing and right-wing. Ironically, considering the labeling of Marine Le Pen, the French presidential candidate, the terms originated in the French Revolution. Those who favored the maintenance of the Bourbon monarchy sat to the right of the speaker’s platform in the National Assembly, and were thus called “right wing,” while the various opponents who sat to the left, were dubbed “left wing.”

Considering that there is little movement today to restore the Bourbon Dynasty in France, inside or outside of that country, it would seem that such terms have limited value in describing the current political landscape of France, Europe, America, or any other part of the world. But in labeling anti-Semitism and associating it with mass murder as far right, it is quite obvious that it is a more of a term of propaganda, designed to be used as a club against any efforts to resist the push for a new world order, or world government, rather than a serious attempt to convey useful information.



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on May 15, 2017

There is some indication that the general public is beginning to understand that such labeling is much like the little boy who cried wolf. By casting anyone who favors national sovereignty as far right, one is clearly abusing the use of the term.

According to the *American Spectator*, a poll of 10,000 Europeans by Chatham House, conducted in February, found that the public in eight of 10 countries agreed with the statement, “All further migration from Muslim countries should be stopped.” And of course, considering that a majority of the voters in the United Kingdom chose to leave the EU, under the reasoning of most of the media, academia, and the rest of the global elitists, those voters are “far-right.”

Last summer, I attended the Republican National Convention in Cleveland. While standing in line to get some food, I was approached by a couple of writers from the *The Economist*, a well-known elitist British publication. They wanted to know what I thought of Donald Trump. I explained that I agree with him on some issues and disagreed with him on some others. I expressed agreement with his expressions of support for American national sovereignty. I then asked them what they thought of British withdrawal from the EU (I knew, of course, that they would be opposed). They took a very strong stance in favor of staying in the EU, and told me that it really did not make any difference what the British public thought on the regulation of their personal lives, emanating from Brussels — Britishers were going to get more rules whether they liked them or not, whether they stayed in the EU or not.

Such is the globalist attitude — whether it comes from such globalists in the U.K., France, or in America. Globalists consider any person who opposes the push for world government (by whatever name it will be called) as extreme, as “far right,” and they view those who oppose their globalist intentions as ignorant or evil.

After the death of globalist David Rockefeller, William Jasper of *The New American* recalled how the late billionaire was extremely explicit in favoring a world government, citing Rockefeller’s comments from his autobiography, *Memoirs*.

“For more than a century ideological extremists at either end of the political spectrum have seized upon well-publicized incidents such as my encounter with Castro to attack the Rockefeller family for the inordinate influence they claim we wield over American political and economic institutions. Some even believe we are part of a secret cabal working against the best interests of the United States, characterizing my family and me as ‘internationalists’ and of conspiring with others around the world to build a more integrated global political and economic structure — one world, if you will. If that’s the charge, I stand guilty, and I am proud of it.”

Jasper noted that the push was aided by globalist elites in the media, quoting Rockefeller’s remarks praising the elite media’s support for the goal of a new world order.

“We are grateful to the *Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, *Time Magazine* and other great publications whose directors have attended our meetings and respected their promises of discretion for almost 40 years. It would have been impossible for us to develop our plan for the world if we had been subjected to the lights of publicity during those years. But the world is more sophisticated and prepared to march towards a world government. The supranational sovereignty of an intellectual elite and world bankers is surely preferable to the national auto-determination practiced in past centuries.”

Hopefully, this “march towards a world government,” desired by Rockefeller and his fellow global elitists can be stopped. But as Rockefeller clearly stated, it should be recognized that those publications in favor of abolishing our national sovereignty are considered “great publications” by supporters of



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on May 15, 2017

world government, and anyone who stands in their way is an extremist, whether that person is in France, in America, or anywhere else.

Photo of Marine Le Pen: [Jérémy-Günther-Heinz Jähnck](#)



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe