

TWO MODELS OF WHITE RACIALISM:

A PRELIMINARY EXPLORATION OF A CHANGING MORALITY

GIL CALDWELL

How would white men of previous centuries or even those of earlier decades of the twentieth century view contemporary presentations of the case for racialism? As surprising as it may seem to some, in all probability they would have seen recent racist apologetics as hopelessly infected with many of the central assumptions of multiracialism. This is due in no small measure to the fact that, although it may be possible (albeit rare) to dissent from widely accepted public policies, it is far more difficult to reject the assumed and often unstated philosophical assumptions of the age. This presents racialists with a particularly difficult task. Conceding their opponents' core beliefs before engaging in theoretical battle is akin to wrestling with a handicap: all right for legendary wrestlers like Haystacks or Andre, but poor strategy for lesser men.

For example, in the past half-century we have seen a consistent movement away from the advocacy of segregation (which was always far from "separate but equal" in reality), apartheid, colonialism, and general political disenfranchisement of nonwhites, toward the far less harsh positions of racial separatism (including acceptance of "black nationalism") or the "level playing field" of the libertarian minded.

These latter positions would have seemed curious to white men of earlier times who, by and large, had little philosophical or moral problem with conquest, slavery, imperial domination, economic exploitation or in America's early days, official exclusion of nonwhites and at times non-Christians, from any participation in the legal or governmental process.¹ As George Fredrickson, a critical student of the early Republic's racial attitudes, writes, "In the United States, a true 'Herrenvolk democracy' emerged during the Jacksonian period, when the right to vote was extended to all white males and denied to virtually all blacks, including some who had previously voted under a franchise restricted to property holders."² This was echoed in the post-reconstruction South in the absolute political and social supremacy of whites.³ Even in the North non-whites were routinely excluded from housing, employment, education, and other areas via a host of legal, semi-legal, and informal barriers. In Fredrickson's words, "Emancipation could not be carried to completion because it exceeded the capacity of white Americans—in the North as well as in the South—to think of blacks as genuine equals."⁴

Despite the fact that many in the racist movement see themselves as firmly holding the fort against changing social views on race, this is far from reality. Instead they have recast their views so as to fit comfortably with certain modern notions of universal and reciprocal morality. These notions they have absorbed, probably largely unconsciously, from the general culture.⁵

Even the nether reaches of neo-Nazism are not free of this process. Whereas one finds in the writings of many Hitler sympathizers of the immediate postwar (such as Savitri Devi⁶ and George Lincoln Rockwell⁷) an acknowledgment of the Holocaust but also an advocacy of it or indifference to it, today the neo-Nazi position has completely reformed. Ernst Zundel and similar figures always say that the Holocaust is a "vile lie placed upon the German people." Zundel "refuse(s) to allow the German people [to] go down in history as mass murderers."⁸ Zundel's anonymous biographer relates in *Ernst Zundel, His Struggle, His Life* that "Ernst Zundel vowed in a symbolic act, standing and touching the Wailing Wall in Israel in 1968, that he would lift the blood libel of the Holocaust from the German World War II generation and free their children from the curse that is fraudulently peddled 'Holocaust.'"⁹

Neither Rockwell, Devi, nor many of the SS prisoners the latter encountered during her imprisonment in Germany, had any compunctions of this sort. Even as late as 1980, Professor Revilo Oliver, writing under his frequently used pen name of Ralph Perrier, put forth the older position, albeit with a revisionist twist. "Suppose that the Jews' characteristically big lie were the truth – that the Germans really had made a desperate attempt to rid themselves of their parasites by killing six million of them. If the Germans had done that, what of it? Why should Aryans be concerned about that effort at national sanitation?"¹⁰

The last defenders of racial inequality in Africa, Rhodesia, and South Africa were (unlike their predecessors in the initial postwar period) always at pains to tell the world that their systems were temporary. This is in stark contrast with the earlier leaders.¹¹

Consider the statement of H. F. Verwoerd, South African prime minister from 1958 till 1967: "I wish to state unequivocally that South Africa is a white man's country and that he must remain the master here." Or "On the basis of an inherent superiority, or greater knowledge, or whatever it might be, the European must remain master and leader."¹² On the other hand, the later leaders claimed to be working toward "power sharing" and eventual "equality." This is the constant theme of Ian Smith's autobiographical *The Great Betrayal*. There he describes the Rhodesian Unilateral Declaration of Independence of November 11, 1965, as one in which "there would be no diminution of African advancement and prosperity." It was all a matter of time. His policy was "to bring the African into government on a basis *acceptable to them*."¹³ The temporary delay toward racial equality was simply "in order to ensure that the people fully understood the complicated democratic system."¹⁴ To Cecil Rhodes and the *Voortrekkers* these sentiments would have been incomprehensible.

FEAR OF DENYING EQUALITY

In short, by advocating either an egalitarian separatism or “level playing field,” many racialists have accepted the fundamental dogmas of their opponents that all men are, by virtue of their humanity, “entitled” to certain political and social “rights.” One must search long and hard in movement literature today to find a clear advocacy of a dual moral standard, differentiating between the in- and out-group, or of the right to wield power and domination over the out-group.¹⁵

The examples of colonialism and expansion are instructive in this regard. A white man of the nineteenth century, be he an Afrikaner *Voortrekker* or an American settler, would not feel the need to explain his invasion and conquest of black or Indian lands and subsequently either exiling the natives or forcing them into subservient status.¹⁶ In the case of the Trekkers of the 1830s Great Britain’s freeing of their native slaves was a major factor in the decision to launch the march to the north. Of course, if things could be done peacefully, that is, if the nonwhites surrendered their land without struggle, they might be treated with some kindness. Often though, even this was not the case.¹⁷

However, after the Second World War, a change came over white racial consciousness. The causes are varied. Certainly widespread revulsion at the crimes attributed to the Nazis played a role. More simply, the Allied victory meant the widespread execution and persecution of racialists in Europe and outlawing of political parties with racialist affinities as well as prohibition of racialist views. In America the defeat of Nazism and the political and cultural triumph of the Democratic leftism (even among Republicans) made it very difficult for racialists to continue the public expression of their perspectives. Thereafter racialists tended to present supremacy and separatism as good for nonwhites as well as whites. This need to always note that racialist policies were always good for all races, although somewhat intended for leftist consumption, was also internalized. Thus, segregation or apartheid was invariably justified as good for blacks and often as desired by them.

In Senator Herman Talmadge’s 1955 *You and Segregation* we read, “Each race has its own culture, its own heritage and its own talents. These are all developed best when the races are not mixed.”¹⁸

And even the more robust 1947 defense of repatriating blacks to Africa, Senator Theodore Bilbo’s *Take Your Choice Separation or Mongrelization*, couldn’t resist a bow to universalism: “Just imagine the degree of happiness and respectability that could be attained in an all Negro government for the black race.”¹⁹

In sum, the popular leftist/universalist notion that all men have moral obligations to all men, even those outside one’s tribe, nation, religion or race, had become incorporated into much of contemporary postwar racialist ideology.

Even as this transformation was taking place, other racist thinkers were doubtful whether human conflict could be resolved for the betterment of all in every case. For example, James Burnham, noted conservative philosopher of the postwar period, believed that conflict is often ended only by the assertion of power and authority and that this assertion is not always good for or acceptable to all concerned.

In *Suicide of the West* Burnham wrote:

Disputes among groups, classes and nations can and should be settled by free discussion, negotiation and compromise when – but only when – the disputes range within some common framework of shared ideas and interests. When the disputes arise out of a clash of basic interests and an opposition of basic ideas, as is from time to time inevitably the case, then they cannot be settled by negotiation and compromise but must be resolved by power, coercion and, sometimes, war.²⁰

And, surprising as it may seem today, William F. Buckley Jr. himself advocated the old, racist morality at length in *Up from Liberalism*, calling for depriving Southern blacks of the right to vote. Basing his conclusions upon “the statistics evidencing median cultural advancement of white over Negro,” Buckley reasons that the issue is whether “the claims of civilization supersede those of universal suffrage.” He also argued that blacks would, if given the vote, “use it to levy even further (Negro facilities are for the most part paid for by dollars taxed from whites) against the propertied classes, which is [largely] composed of whites. I believe it is a man’s right to use his political influence to protect his property.”²¹

TWO VIEWS OF RACIALISM AND CONFLICTS BETWEEN THEM

Thus, it emerges that there are, in reality, two philosophies of racial loyalty. The first sees morality as care solely (or at least primarily) for one’s own. This was the view of traditional man. It was most definitely the view of the Old Testament, which called for the expulsion or extermination of the “nations of Canaan” by the Hebrews.²² The Talmud is a vivid example of an in-group morality which is most demanding when discussing moral obligations to Jews. On the other hand it prohibits doing anything for the welfare of others except as a practical means to limit Gentile hatred of Jews.²³ Any kindness or ethical behavior outside the tribe is good only so long as it advances the needs of the tribe. This is in-group morality at its purest.²⁴

This view would find nothing morally wrong with the white man’s conquest of the Indian or the enslavement of the African, and it would certainly see the denial of civil rights to nonwhites as the least any tribe might do to preserve its dominance and identity.²⁵

The more recent expressions of racialism would demand some degree of ethical even-handedness toward all men. They would view it as morally wrong to deprive an out-group, either as individuals or collectivities, of the “right” to

self-determination or the “right” to civil liberties. It is this latter view which lies behind the white racist embrace of Garveyism, the Nation of Islam, and other black-nationalist movements.²⁶ Marcus Garvey, a black-nationalist leader of the 1920s who advocated black return to Africa, has frequently been featured in the pages of racist journals.²⁷ In the late 1980s the “radical” National Front in England published an article by Abdul Wali Muhammad, the then editor of The Nation of Islam’s newspaper, *The Final Call*, which praised the Front and discussed the two group’s similarities. The article quoted Louis Farrakhan as saying that he “respected those who desired to keep their race white, just as we want to keep ours black.”²⁸

However, *Instauration*, a journal of the old racialism, was highly critical of this attempted embrace of black nationalism. The Nation of Islam’s calls for separation were seen as insincere. If they desired to truly live in black lands the opportunity was always there. Thus, *Instauration* saw the organization as simply another effort at agitation and parasitism.

The Black Muslims and the majority of their ethnic brethren – who agree with them and respect them we are told – have a freedom now denied to half the human race, the freedom to emigrate. But, motivated by a desire for the high standard of living provided only by the white man, the collective impulse of Negroes everywhere seems to be, where possible, to seek the very white society, not brown, yellow, or red, that they profess to hate. It is upon this weakness that the Black Muslims and all other Negro movements founder, become doubly ludicrous, and lose the respect of those who observe them.²⁹

In South Africa’s final days this difference was witnessed in the advocacy by the formally pro-apartheid Conservative Party of nothing more than white secession from the unitary majority rule state. On the other hand the HNP (*Herstigte Nasionale Party*), under the late Jaap Marais, insisted to the end and beyond that all proposals and referendums to end white minority rule were inherently “illegal,” as were all future multiracial elections.

Many European nationalist groups have chosen the universalist model of white nationalism in recent decades. The French New Right of Alain de Benoist is certainly a primary and most articulate incarnation of this view.³⁰ Some in this school have even dropped their opposition to non-European immigration, claiming that separate racial and ethnic communities could function, side by side, in the “New France.”³¹

Perhaps it is this fundamental disagreement that may explain the ideological basis of the dispute between the rival British National Party visions of John Tyndall and Nick Griffin in Great Britain at present, as well as many of the earlier ruptures in British nationalism. Griffin had already embraced the notion that “every people should have self-determination in their own lands” during his days in the “official” or “radical” National Front of the late eighties.³² Tyndall, on the other hand, has advocated recolonization of Africa and other parts of the world in his writings.³³

Let us listen to Tyndall for a moment as he states explicitly the tribalist, racial morality view:

It is the natural function of every healthy living organism on this planet to grow, spread, colonise and increase its power. When all the pretty rhetoric of ideology is swept away and we get down to first basics, history can be seen as a chronicle of the rise and fall of states proceeding in accord with nature's rule of survival of the fittest. To acknowledge this is not to say that it should be the only ethical consideration governing our affairs; that would be to reduce man to the level of the animal world. We should, however, take care that our formulation of the complex ethical systems necessary to civilized society should proceed *within*, and not against, that fundamental *truth*.

Again a few pages later the same theme appears: "*power* precedes and establishes every condition for the achievements of the refinements of civilization, culture, decency, humanity and order. These latter things, desirable as they are, must always be regarded as predicates of the first, never substitutes for it."³⁴

It is illustrative to contrast this older perspective with the following excerpt from a *National Front News* cover story of the post-1986 period.

The National Front is not based upon hatred of any sort. Our movement is based upon Love. Love for our own people's cultures, races, traditions, and nations and respect for all others.

The article was titled "Stop the Race War!" and featured a picture of black youths who were described as "victims of multiracialism."³⁵ One cannot imagine racialists of the nineteenth century writing in this fashion. Indeed, this faction of the NF directed its fire against publications of the NF itself of just a few years earlier, for preaching "race hate."³⁶

IS UNIVERSALIST RACIALISM RECIPROCATED?

Whites who advocate the more liberal stance of universalist racialism have to deal with the reality that other tribes of men seem not to reciprocate their sense of fairness and equality.

Neither Robert Mugabe nor Thabo Mbeki is much interested in the rights of whites in their lands, either as individuals or as groups. Blacks in America have long since come to oppose a level playing field with whites. They demand and receive from whites a privileged and dominant position in society.

The ANC refused and continues to refuse all pleas by the Afrikaners for self-determination. To them, whites are needed to provide tax dollars. The ANC is not interested in self-determination for all.

Black juries routinely find blacks innocent of crimes against whites, much as a deep South jury in decades past would have found whites innocent, even if clearly guilty, of crimes against blacks.³⁷ Blacks have long since learned how to manipulate the white man by utilizing white compassion, fair play, and the like while having no intention of practicing the same virtues in return.³⁸

The Jews have demanded and received their own state based upon religious/tribal identity. Yet when they live amongst non-Jews they always advocate pluralism and universalist states. Thus, they too have mastered the skill of using the rhetoric of universal morality only when and if it advances their own tribal agenda.³⁹

This then is one of the powerful arguments against the universalist racialists. Their policies are counterproductive. No other groups behave the same way. Others will invariably take advantage of their fair play and compassion.

This is not limited to matters of race. The Stormont, the majority-rule government of Northern Ireland (1920–1972), was accused by Catholics of allowing institutionalized discrimination against them. The argument was that some form of legal power sharing would guarantee Catholic equality. No sooner was this implemented, though, than the cat was allowed out of the bag. The real goal of almost all Catholic political activism in Northern Ireland was no longer the protection of rights but the eventual absorption of the state into the Republic of Ireland, where Catholics would then be members of the dominant majority.

Did the Protestant majority mistreat the Catholic minority in the days of the “Protestant ascendancy”? Once again it depends on whether one accepts the notion that an in-group must grant an out-group equality. It is true that Protestants of wealth and power generally sought to keep social dominance (and well-paying jobs) in the hands of their co-religionists via economic and political double standards. The approach is largely similar to that in Israel today, where a combination of law, custom, and tribal loyalty ensures that Jews control the culture and economic/political power of the state. This is the old approach of tribal morality, understood by some but condemned, today, by most.

HISTORICAL GUILT COMPLEXES

The lack of a contemporary articulation of the old model of racialism is what makes it difficult, if not impossible, for most whites, including many “movement” people, to explain the racial approach of pre- and early twentieth century America, with its guilt-free, relaxed, and widely accepted exclusion of blacks, Indians, and Jews from political, economic, and even athletic and entertainment realms.

Thus, for example, whites, even racialists, sometimes find it hard to defend racial separation in sports. Why shouldn’t blacks have been allowed to play major league baseball, for example?

The old model was not afraid to say, in effect:

This is our society. We really don’t want you here altogether. If you must be here, you will have to accept some degree of exclusion and secondary status. We intend to live among our own. We do not want our people socializing with yours. This country and its institutions exist for the sake of our people, their survival and betterment. If you accept this you will generally be treated well. If you refuse, then watch out!

This stance was backed by both the force of law and the power of the masses. It clearly worked as far as its stated goals went.

“NEO-CON RACIALISM”

Just as Christians in America have been reduced from the status of being the dominant culture as institutionalized in schools, laws, and public places to their current state of humbly begging to be allowed the “right” to pray and practice their religion, so too have racialists abandoned their former world view.

“Please,” neo-con racialism says, “Give us just a little space where we won’t have to live with nonwhites or send our children to school with them. Racial pluralism may rule society; all we want is a tiny corner for ourselves.”

White racialism is obviously a doctrine in a state of much theoretical flux. Some might be tempted to view this flux as one of consistent retreat. Whatever description applies, the new model is very different than the old.

IS THE NEW MODEL MORALLY SUPERIOR?

Having examined the different approaches to racialism from historical, cultural, and pragmatic perspectives, it is worth dwelling for a moment on the underlying philosophical assumptions of these two views. We leave aside, for the moment, libertarian racialism, that is, the advocacy of nothing more than a level playing field among individuals. This creed, rooted as it is in the individual and his freedom as the fundamental “social” value, seems to offer white society no protection from races that are more intelligent, industrious, and disciplined than Europeans. (And given the inabilities of the dark races, it seems sure to feed their resentment as they fail repeatedly to compete and progress.) Asian races and Ashkenazi Jews might well come to dominate European lands given the level playing field approach.

The universalist version of racialism, however, need not yield an individualist vision. It might also legitimately advocate racial separation within nations or strict racial barriers to immigration in order to reserve national racial identity, provided, of course, that there be no accompanying expansionist or colonial efforts or needless cruelty. Given the assumptions of the contemporary white world, this fair play version of racial self-determination for all is very appealing. Racialists in this camp are now able to say to the world, “We are all for equal rights, self determination, cultural integrity, and survival for nonwhites provided that we are separated from them and granted the same.”

This perspective also allows racialists to keep within the confines of the accepted morality of the post-World War II white world. No one likes to feel completely out of step with the accepted moral conscience of humanity, and it is very difficult to do so emotionally. In other words most of us have a hard time relating to the concepts of slavery, conquest, exploitation, and even political supremacy.

The conquest of America is an example of this. Just a century ago the vast majority of white Americans had no problem with the notion that their ancestors came here and took the continent away from the indigenous population simply because it was there for the taking and they were not us and we were not them. It is unthinkable that any white nation or people would behave that way today. And most white nationalists would be heavily influenced by this trend.

But is this latter model definitely morally superior to the previous one?

Surely even modern thinkers (including those that are not racially inclined) would grant that we have greater obligations to family and friends than to strangers. We would not claim that all men have the same rights to our homes, property, protection, and personal aid as do family and friends. Thus it seems not too far-fetched to believe that one's own people (nation, culture, or race) could or should come before others.

Having seen that mainstream morality posits that one may care or do more for one's own we turn to the further question: Would a man, on behalf of his inner circle, be allowed to take from or infringe upon others? To do unto them what he would not do to his own?

Contemporary universalist ideologies in European lands prefer to see people as individuals rather than groups; race is seen as one of many "illegitimate" group categories.⁴⁰ Thus, racialists must emotionally escape a powerful ideological double bind. First, they must break through the public dogma which declares group loyalties to be illusory or, in the case of whites, somehow "evil." Then they are confronted with the now deep-seated notion that groups must treat each other, at the very least, fairly and equally at all times.

Further, what is the appropriate moral response when one's own requires the space or resources of outsiders? What degree of suffering must one's own be subject to before that of others may be taken or exploited?⁴¹ Although the thought may seem harsh to eco-radicals, all men are willing to displace thousands of insects and animals when they decide the time has come to build a house. How is this done morally? Quite simply, all men conclude that their own life and comfort and that of their wives and children are a far greater value to them than that of other mammals, snakes, insects, and the like. We engage in wholesale slaughter because they are not us. Surely, could these creatures of the meadow be consulted about our massive extermination attempt, they would be quite opposed.

To this example the universalist racialist must respond that humans are radically different. All people must always be dealt with exactly as we would treat those closest to us.

Clearly, though, except perhaps for Catholic clergymen taking vows of poverty, no one treats the other, either as an individual, family, group, race, or nation, as his own. We do not abandon our homes as long as any man on the

Earth is homeless. We do not survive on bread and water so long as any man is hungry. We give our children money and opportunity that we withhold from all others who are starving and suffering on the planet. And when our loved ones attend college or work or travel or whatever, they are living the lifestyle they do because hundreds and thousands of those less fortunate work for them in very rough conditions producing their needs. All of us put ourselves and families first.

For the individual to whom his nation, people, or race is very dear, the question is, may or should he regard their needs as of primary and, perhaps, singular importance. Just as he does not subject himself to reciprocal morality as an individual, so too would he exempt his larger group.

Who is to say that race demands this loyalty? Where is the imperative that one be concerned about nation, people, or race? Practically speaking, at least for whites, the loss of racial cohesion has left them defenseless as individuals. The group best protects the individual. Beyond that, though, most men did, some still do experience themselves as group members. This is common outside of Europe today but increasingly rare among whites.

Is it somehow more natural or morally superior to experience oneself as a member of a tribe and to treat fellow tribe members better?

Who is to say what is "natural"? What does seem clear, though, is that in a world of fiercely loyal groups, each battling for its own survival and prosperity, it ill serves the group that feels compelled to behave in accord with the dictates of universal morality and reciprocity.

However, this universalist model, whether motivated by Christianity or simply the "spirit of the age," is merely the current moral consciousness of European society. It was not the consciousness of previous generations. Its claims to universal moral standards are little understood or practiced by the rest of mankind.

If current trends continue then we will not see universal morality until nonwhites take over. Then at that late date whites will have plenty of time and cause to ponder the wisdom of universalist racialism.

Gil Caldwell is the pen name of an academic who fears the results of a racialist movement weakened by absolute universal morality.

ENDNOTES

1. For an overview of all the above in the Colonial era and early days of America, see Winthrop D. Jordan, *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro 1550-1812* (Chapel Hill: North Carolina, 1968).
2. George M. Fredrickson, *Racism: A Short History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002) p. 69.

3. For a thorough overview of the racist morality of pre-World War II America, see the critical but well referenced *Jim Crow's Defense: Anti-Negro Thought in America, 1900-1930*, by I. A. Newby (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1965).
4. Fredrickson, op. cit., p. 81.
5. One finds in the ranks of the neo-Confederates a classic evidence of this surrender. For example, the journal *Southern Partisan* is forever defending the Confederacy while viciously attacking all those guilty of "racism." Why the leaders and citizens of the CSA are somehow exempt from this crime remains a mystery.
6. In Devi's work, *Gold in the Furnace* (Temple Press: 1952), based on her experiences in Germany in 1948, she writes that she was told by many, including a "woman who held an important post in the management in five concentration camps...a women who, knowing full well how little I really care, at heart, to what extent such acts took place and how far they were discouraged, had no reason whatsoever to hide the truth from me" that "there were gas chambers in some of the concentration camps under the Third Reich.... There were five in Auschwitz; there was one in Lublin. However, she continues "the people who met their death in them were all sentenced for some serious offense for which that particular penalty was foreseen; they were not "innocent" people guilty only of being Jews...." This is an early form of revisionism: gas chambers existed, but only for criminals. In a 1978 taped interview with her recorded in New Delhi, sold by Zundel's Samisdat Publishers in 1979, she declared that although "now knowing" that the Nazis had not killed six million Jews in gas chambers, she "didn't care. They were just damn Jews anyway."
7. Rockwell's position is somewhat difficult to pin down. In his famous *Playboy* interview he argued against the six million figure and also "den[ie]d that there is any valid proof that innocent Jews were systematically murdered by the Nazis." However, in the same interview he noted that should Nazism come to power in America, "there are going to be hundreds of thousands of Jewish traitors to execute" and that "mass gassings are going to be the only solution" (<http://www.rebel.com/artists/rockwellplayboyinterview.html>) (p. 9). And in *This Time the World* he wrote, "This time we will not permit traitors to 'escape' so that they can move in and betray them as the German Communist Jews did to America. None shall pass or escape retribution, not one!" (<http://www.churchoftrueisrael.com/rockwell/world/rocttw-18.html>) (Chapter 18, p. 14). Whether the reference is to "Jews" or only "Communist Jews," of which "there are hundreds of thousands," one couldn't imagine many racials speaking in this manner today.
8. These quotes appear in the 1999 film *Mr. Death: The Rise and Fall of Fred Leuchter Jr.*
9. *Ernst Zundel His Struggle, His Life*, no date, no author (Samisdat Publishing) p. 65.
10. "Ralph Perrier" in *Religion and Race* (Liberty Bell: 1980), p. 23.
11. It should be noted that apartheid generally attempted to allow for and often assist blacks in their development, in their own areas. For example, Prime Minister J. B. M. Hertzog said in 1936, speaking to a "Native" audience, "We want as few of you as possible in the White man's area. For that reason we are setting aside defined areas for you in which you can carry on your farming operations, in which you can go and live. When you come within the White man's area you should know that really you come, in the first place to serve his interests. If possible in your own areas we would like to see you govern yourselves" (*Debates, Union of South Africa Assembly*, 1936, p 4085).
12. *Verwoerd Speaks: Speeches 1948-1966*, edited by A. N. Pelzer (Johannesburg: APB, 1966), pp. 16, 24.

13. Italics added.

14. Ian Smith, *The Great Betrayal* (London: Blake, 1997), pp. 105, 108.

15. A recent, lucid exception to this may be found in David Lane's *Deceived, Damned & Defiant: The Revolutionary Writings of David Lane*, edited by Katja Lane (14 Word Press: 1999) where we read in the "88 Precepts" that "nature has put a certain antipathy between races and species to preserve the individuality and existence of each" and "inter-species compassion is contrary to the Laws of Nature and, is, therefore, suicidal." (pp. 88, 89)

16. The title of Madison Grant's racial history of America's settlement is instructive in this regard. *The Conquest of a Continent or the Expansion of Races in America* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933) is an event that Grant and his many admirers saw as positive. The "races" referred to in the title are all white sub-races.

17. One hesitates in referencing here that sixties' favorite by Dee Brown, *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee: An Indian History of the American West* (originally published by Henry Holt and re-issued by Owl Press in 1991). It is, however, despite its dated New Left polemical style, highly instructive on the racialism of nineteenth-century Americans toward the long-standing Indian inhabitants of this continent.

18. Herman E. Talmadge, *You and Segregation* (Birmingham, AL: Vulcan, 1955), p. 49. Interestingly, Talmadge limits his opposition to racial mixing by ruling out "the use of force, or any other unlawful means" (p. 80). Apparently even racial survival was not as vital as peace or law. This was quite a difference from the attitude of Talmadge's ancestors, who sang in *The Bonnie Blue Flag*, "Then here's to our Confederacy, strong we are and brave; Like patriots of old we'll fight our heritage to save; And rather than submit to shame, to die we would prefer, So cheer for the Bonnie Blue Flag that bears a single star."

19. Theodore G. Bilbo, *Take Your Choice, Separation or Mongelization* (reprinted by Historical Review Press, 1980), p. 280.

20. James Burnham, *Suicide of the West* (New York: John Day, 1964), p. 130.

21. William F. Buckley Jr., *Up from Liberalism* (New York: McDowell Obolensky, 1959), pp. 126-131.

22. Historians today are largely agreed that Joshua's wars of extermination and expulsion are mythical. Thus, Bible-believing Jews are the only people who claim, proudly although falsely, to be genocidists. Holocaust revisionists would argue that Germans have been persuaded to make the same claim, albeit with much guilt and self-imposed penance.

23. Thus, for example, Jews do not have to return money that Gentiles mistakenly gave them in a business transaction (*Talmud Bavli, Bava Kama* 113b), they need not return to them their lost objects (*Talmud Bavli, Bava Kama, ibid.*, and *Sanhedrin*, 66b) and one must always give precedence to a Jew in business (buying and selling, hiring and renting) (*Torat Kohanim*, Section 3). On the other hand one may not steal from them because this could cause "hatred." According to the Talmud Yerushalmi (*Bava Kama* 4:4), theft from Gentiles was originally permitted but was later forbidden by rabbinic decree when a Gentile King became aware of the original law. Few Jews today are aware of or would support these standards.

24. It is important to note that various Talmudic authorities, even in the Middle Ages, sought to limit the binding nature of these laws by claiming they were only relevant to "idolaters" who lived in Talmudic times. There is, also, another stream of Talmudic literature citations, less numerous than the first, that seems to embrace universal morality. For a brief overview of the former attempts, see David Novak, *Jewish-Christian Dialogue* (New York: Oxford, 1989), particularly chapter two, "Christianity in Medieval

European Halakhah" (pp. 42-53). For many citations of universalism in Talmudic and later traditional Jewish sources, see Yosef ben Shlomo Hakohen's *The Universal Jew: Letters to My Progressive Father* (New York: Feldheim, 1995).

25. Of course, Talmudic morality has nothing to say about what other peoples do to each other when there is no impact on Jews. That is the whole point about pure in-group morality. The definition of "good" is something good for the tribe. "Bad" is bad for the tribe. Events that don't have any impact on the tribe are simply non-events. Our point is that the logic of in-group morality would allow for these practices.

26. The Marcus Garvey school of black nationalism has long attracted white sympathy. Garvey met with Klan leaders in the 1920s to explore the possibility of a black return to Africa. See, for example, Michael C. Dawson, *Black Visions: The Roots of Contemporary African-American Ideologies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), p. 104.

27. "Garvey's Vision" in *Nationalism Today*, No. 42, pp. 20-22.

28. "Nation of Islam: a Photo Essay" in *Nationalism Today*, No. 39, pp. 16-19.

29. "Mr. Yacub Goes to Patmos" in *Best of Instauration 1977*, pp. 53-54.

30. A presentation of this view in English may be found in the journal *The Scorpion*, edited by Michael Walker. See, in particular, issue number 10 of autumn 1986, titled "Against all Totalitarianisms."

31. *Telos*, a New York-based journal, formally of the left, but having undergone many creative changes over recent years, often features translations of de Benoit's writings.

32. The post-1986 split in the National Front saw a two-year period in which there were two National Fronts. Griffin's faction, the self-styled "radicals," went to great lengths in order to embrace self-determination for all peoples. Among those featured prominently among their mentors and models were Muammar Qadhafi of Libya, American Garveyite Osiris Akebela of the Pan African International Movement, the black Nation of Islam, the American Indian Movement, and many others. See, for example, *National Front News*, issue number 109, p. 1.

33. Tyndall has always advocated the repatriation of nonwhites from Britain. This was to be done even if the non-whites refused. Griffin, for his part, supported compulsory repatriation during his NF days. Indeed, when the "radical" NF split in 1989 into Third Way and Third Position, it was Griffin's Third Position that continued to advocate this view. It is only recently, in the context of Griffin's having assumed control over the British National Party, that he has moved to the voluntary repatriation stance.

34. John Tyndall, *The Eleventh Hour* (Albion: 1998), pp. 395, 397.

35. *National Front News*, issue 71, p. 1. Similar cover stories are found in issues 93 and 109.

36. "The Bulldog Breed" in *Nationalism Today*, No. 41, pp. 25-26.

37. The routine policy of white Southern juries of finding their racial kinsmen innocent of crimes against blacks, even when the evidence was overwhelming, became a national scandal in the Emmet Till murder case in Mississippi in 1955. The acquittal of Roy Bryant and J. W. Milam is a good example of this phenomenon of tribal racialism. Interestingly, though, by that time things had changed in the state to the point where the governor, Hugh White, called for the conviction of the murderers. (The defendants later admitted their crime to a national magazine reporter.) It should be noted in passing that this leniency was not always extended in Mississippi to whites whose crime was the rape of blacks, as in the 1957 Dillon/Duncan case.

38. A recent example of tribal morality from black intellectuals may be found in the summer 2003 *Black Scholar*. There one may read a well-written defense of the person, philosophy, and lyrics of the late black “gangsta rapper” Tupac Shakur. Neither Shakur’s calls for racial murder nor his vicious attitude toward all women are seen as grounds to criticize him (*Black Scholar*, 33, no. 2, pp. 44–50). Can one imagine a mainstream publication, on sale at every scholarly bookstore in America, making the same case for the late Ian Stuart of the white racist band Skrewdriver, whose life and lyrics are positively genteel when compared with Shakur? Indeed, even among racials, Skrewdriver was a subject of controversy. The “radical” National Front embraced, in the late eighties, a rival band called Skullhead and rejected Skrewdriver because the former endorsed self-determination for all in its lyrics.

39. The contradiction between the Jewish identity of Israel and the “pluralism” that is now official state dogma throughout the West is slowly becoming a subject for public discussion. See Tony Judt’s “Israel: The Alternative” in *The New York Review of Books* of October 23, 2003 (pp. 8, 10). Judt applies antitribalist morality to Jews, a once rare but now more common event. “The very idea of a ‘Jewish state’ — a state in which Jews and the Jewish religion have exclusive privileges from which non-Jewish citizens are forever excluded — is rooted in another time and place. Israel is, in short, an anachronism.”

40. We leave aside for the moment the fact that race is seen as an illegitimate form of identity only for whites.

41. The Zionist movement, in most of its streams, has always referred to Jewish persecution in Europe as a warrant to dispossess the Palestinians.

THE STATE OF THE EUROPEAN “RIGHT”:

A WIDE VARIETY OF FORTUNES FOR A WIDE VARIETY OF PARTIES

DEREK TURNER

The picture presented by parties of the nationalist and populist Right in Europe is one of great complexity and fluidity. Almost every country in Europe has a party that considers itself, or is considered by others, to be rightwing nationalist—although such parties often attract other epithets too! With the disappearance of communism in the East, and the continuing degradation of the quality of life across Europe, has come an unprecedented upsurge in populist, anti-establishment nationalism.

As can only be expected from such a diverse assemblage of countries, they are all very different in their styles and emphases. In the northern and western parts of Europe, such parties are often at least partly free market, tax-cutting, Atlanticist, pro-Israel, and sometimes even libertarian in tendency. In southern Europe they are more usually corporatist or semi-corporatist, often with a strong traditionalist Catholic support base. In the east these parties often include many ex-communists and have a nationalist veneer; they fear their neighbors’ territorial ambitions, and are usually strongly anti-American and anti-Semitic. Often they are centered around individuals rather than particular ideologies, and reflect their leaders’ personal tastes and character traits.

Furthermore, these parties are often extremely volatile. Facing, as they do, unique cultural, ideological, and credibility barriers; unused to success and government; filled with strong personalities and fragile egos; often made up of unlikely coalitions of interest groups, they are especially prone to splits and internecine squabbling. In the east, the situation is especially confusing, with parties springing up and disappearing overnight. In Bulgaria alone, there are over two hundred political parties. Such parties often experience spectacular victories followed by equally spectacular defeats.

In Austria, Jörg Haider’s Freedom Party (FPÖ) has been in government, out of government, and back into government within the past two years, as a junior partner in a conservative coalition with Wolfgang Schüssel’s Austrian People’s Party. After Haider stepped down as leader in 2001, to deflect attacks by the European Union at the time of his party’s original election to office, the party had a succession of short-lived caretaker leaders, who between them helped lose the FPÖ half of its support. To be fair to these politicians, much of this