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Abstract

As Betty Dobratz and others have noticed, Christian Identity, a racist and anti-Semitic form of Christian theology that argues that the European peoples are the true Israelites, is no longer the only religious influence in American white nationalism. New religious movements such as Creativity, Cosmotheism, racialized Norse paganism, or Odinism, racialized esotericism and Satanism, and even racist articulations of atheism have become more influential in the white nationalist milieu in the last thirty years. Since the 1970s an increasing number of those involved in white racist activism have rejected Christianity in favor of non-Christian, and often virulently anti-Christian, religious alternatives. I discuss this phenomenon and offer a theory to explain why this shift in religious outlook among American white nationalists has occurred by discussing the most influential persons within the movement. In an engagement with Bergson’s *Two Sources of Morality and Religion* and Appadurai’s *Fear of Small Numbers: An Essay on the Geography of Anger* I argue that though the individual expressions differ, a growing number of white nationalists have come to see Christianity as a problem because they regard it as inhibitive of white racial survival because of its “alien,” Jewish origins, and because of its message, from their point of view, of universal love and brotherhood rather than exclusive love of one’s race.
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Introduction: Finding a Truly White Religion

This idea cuts straight across the old “national” divisions of the West. It is simply the soul, the mission, the ethical form, of a new Nation, a nation whose population and home territory are coterminous with those of the older “nation” formations of the West... It is a spiritual unity. —Francis Parker Yockey, Imperium

Hitler demonstrated the truth of The Two Sources— Henri Bergson

For historical reasons the phrase ‘Religious Right’ in America has mostly referred to those involved in politically conservative Christianity, especially in the wake of Reagan’s success in wooing evangelical support in the 1980 presidential election. Christianity and the political right in the United States have long shared space. The history of white racist religion in the U.S. in particular has also for some time followed the historical contours of the relationship between a white supremacist and Nativist political power structure informed by Protestant Christianity. The Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s, for example, as Kelly Baker argues, sought to preserve Anglo-Protestant supremacy in the face of demographic and political changes of that decade. However,

3 Kelly Baker, Gospel According to the Klan: The KKK’s Appeal to Protestant America, 1915-1930 (Lawrence, KS: University Of Kansas Press, 2011).
the assumption that racial mythologies informed by Christianity exclusively influence the racist right in America is one that can no longer be entertained.

In her 2001 article “The Role of Religion in the Collective Identity of the White Racialist Movement,” Betty Dobratz demonstrated that Christian Identity is not the only theology of racism.¹ She noticed that other religions, such as Odinism, a racialized Norse-inspired Paganism, and Creativity, a racialist new religious movement founded in the 1970s, were supplanting the former dominant position of Christian mythological tropes for an increasing number of American white nationalists. Some monographs on Odinism, racialist esoteric movements, and Creativity have been done by Matthias Gardell, Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke, and George Michael respectively in which they have discussed some aspects of this shift in religious preference. However, no one has to date done a study dedicated to describing and understanding why this shift in religious outlook among American white nationalists has taken place. By looking at statements about religion by some of the most important figures in American white nationalism, including William Pierce of National Alliance, author of The Turner Diaries, and Revilo Oliver, a co-founder of the John Birch Society and early articulator of white nationalism, I argue that a growing number of American white nationalists have come to regard Christianity as a problem because they view it as something that inhibits the exclusive preservation and expansion of the white race.

This study is not however simply the investigation of the fringe figures in American society. It should rightly be regarded as a node of access to understand better

the discourses that inform religiously and racially motivated hate and violence. I propose that through such a study we may gain a better understanding of the complicated and shifting religious terrain among the racist right in America discussed by Dobratz, but we also see how the internal logics that have produced the rejection of Christianity by white nationalists emerge from the same obligation to protect the white race that has and may yet still produce acts of racialized violence. Understanding well the dynamics of religious and racialized violence, even if it is among those who may be regarded by many as marginal, should be a priority in light of the extraordinary devastation that can be wrought by even a small number of individuals, or even one person. One can site immediately relevant instances like the Oklahoma City Bombing and the devastating attacks in Norway committed by Anders Breivik.

In examining why a growing number of white nationalists have come to regard Christianity as a problem one a diverse number of specific articulations. It is true that individual expressions differ, but one common theme runs through the spectrum of answers. White nationalists have come to see Christianity as a problem because it is regarded by them as inhibitive of white racial survival because of its Jewish origins and because of its message, from their point of view, of universal love and brotherhood. For them, Christianity is alien to white racial consciousness and therefore alienates the individual white racialist from his or her obligation to love and protect the white race and the white race alone. Through a reading of Bergson’s *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion* I describe the white nationalist community as a “closed society” in the sense that it is one “whose members hold together, caring nothing for the rest of humanity, on the
alert for attack or defense, bound, in fact, to perpetual readiness for battle.”² Further, as Bergson argues, a closed society “ensures the cohesion of the group by bending all individual wills to the same end” by the “force” of “moral obligation”; and in the case of white nationalism the obligation to protect the white race from perceived racial enemies.³ That is to say that in the closed society of white nationalism, the obligation to love and protect one’s race from perceived threats manifests as the need to purge it not just of physical threats, but also ideological elements that weaken and imperil it. In this case, the love of the white race produces a suspicion, and in many cases a loathing, of Christianity.

This suggests yet another point that emerges from the Bergsonian inspired reading of suspicion of Christianity in America white nationalism. The manufactured need to act against enemy elements, to hate and war against them, does not stand alone. To understand racial hatred in this context one must appreciate the pronouncements of love—love of one’s race—that consistently accompany such hateful speech, and treat these pronouncements more seriously as a motive for ideological shifts within the community of white nationalists and motivation to commit acts of violence. For white nationalists, love of one’s racial community and the hate of anything or anyone that threatens it exist together as two aspects of the same obligation emergent from the same ethical principle of group protection—or, as I have described it, racial protectionsism. I submit that to understand this is to understand better the social aspects of hatred and

³ Ibid.
violence, not simply the individual pathological ones, as well as to better understand why Christianity has become a problem in contemporary white nationalism.

My work here is therefore intended to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of contemporary racist movements in the United States, and in particular the little studied religious pluralism within it. However, while this study is limited for the most part to a discussion of movements in the United States, it necessarily involves discussion of the trans-Atlantic exchanges that have come to shape American white nationalism. This study is intended as an example of how perhaps we can more comprehensively explain the emergence of ethnonationalisms that Arjun Appadurai describes as an effect of the “anxiety of incompleteness” and conditions of “uncertainty” that are intensified in globalization, and that can “spark large-scale ethnocidal mobilization.” Further, by looking anew at what Kaplan and Weinberg described as the new Euro-American Right, we can see more clearly how and why Europeanness has become an important signifier for the transnational affiliation of Rightists in American and Western Europe. As Appadurai has rightly noted, such work is not merely a conversation about the fringe of the political spectrum, but about the dynamics of ethnic and racial anger and violence that have intensified in globalization. The stakes of my study here are therefore not simply to just understand the extremists or the fringe and why they have come to reject Christianity in some cases, but to better understand the role

---

of moral obligation in the production of exclusionary logics that inevitably inform logics of exclusion and violence.

Exploring the rejection of Christianity by American white nationalists also allows us to understand further how religion, to use Dobratz’s words, “helped reinforce pride in the white race and the development of white ethnic identity.”\(^6\) In particular, it highlights the insecurity inherent in that particular subject formation as so much of the discourse mobilizes subjects to protect the imagined racial community. Though this study focuses on discourses of exclusion and belonging rather than acts of violence, exploring how Christianity became a problem in white nationalism may help us understand how these discourses act as idio-motors, to borrow a term from Bergson, for acts of violence. The discourses of racial protectionism that are the focus of this study need always to be understood not simply as that which provides justification for acts of violence, but also as evidence of the “anxieties of incompleteness” that Appadurai argues produces violence.\(^7\)

In other words, “predatory identities” formed in the collection of the “ethnos into a modern nation,” in the case of white nationalism, strive to assemble the “white” ethnics into a new imaginary collective, and seek to reify that identity by obsessive attempts at defining themselves against imagined enemy others.\(^8\)

One does not have to search long in the news to find conflict between groups described along the lines of group self-protection. Indeed the “War on Terror” and the attacks of September 11\(^{th}\) that preceded it have both been advocated as the fulfillment of the obligation to defend one’s group from the other. The basic Bergsonian claim is that

\(^7\) Appadurai, Fear of Small Numbers, 8.
\(^8\) Ibid, 51 & 6.
these forms of limited and exclusionary obligation to one’s group, however it may be defined, produce violent conflict and war as subjects are morally compelled to act against the perceived enemy other in defense of the imagined community. In the long history of raced violence in America, the protection of the white race from miscegenation and destruction was often supported by religious claims to obligation to society and to the god who was imagined to have instituted it. In this context, religious and racialized discourses of exclusion and belonging can never be responsibly disentangled from the threat of violence. The study of these discourses is in a sense always-already the study of the violence that inevitably follows claims of racial exclusivity and superiority. This study matters, therefore, to quote from Michael Barkun’s introduction to Religion and the Racist Right, because to “close the door on a subject because it is distasteful is to pretend a part of the world does not exist and hence to leave open the possibility of facing unpleasant surprises in the future.” Here I move to hold the door wide open and to expose an often hidden world of racialized and religious discourses that may yet still find a place in the ongoing political battles over immigration and multiculturalism.

Approaching new religious racialism:

This project is situated within a certain approach to the cultural study of religion. I agree with Craig Prentiss, that “the academic study of religion is, after all, the study of human expression that is shaped by the particular social and temporal status of those giving life to distinctive religious traditions,” and that religion so defined has played a

---

significant role in shaping notions of racial identity. Especially in the context of the United States, notions of race and religion have grown up together. One could say that they are perhaps the most powerfully formative concepts in American history. Further, I also follow Bruce Lincoln’s discourse analysis that Prentiss emphasizes as the methodological point for understanding race as mythology. For Lincoln “certain modes of discourse—myth, ritual, and classification—can be, and have been, employed as effective instruments not only for the replication of established social forms… but more broadly for the construction, deconstruction, and reconstruction of society itself.”

To go further in this direction, Charles Long’s discussion of signification in mythologies is important as well. Long argues that “religious symbols, precisely because of their intrinsic power, radiate and deploy meanings; the spread of those meanings creates an arena and field of power relationships which, though having their origin in symbols and symbolic clusters, are best defined in terms of signification and signs.” While I do not think that this force is inherent in the same way Long does, his influence in this regard is still present in the way I think about meaningful significations of whiteness in the context of the religious thought of influential white nationalists. Together with the insights from Benedict’s Anderson’s *Imagined Communities*, that the nation, however it is signified, is imagined as limited, sovereign, and as a community, this Lincoln and Long influenced approach allows us to describe white nationalism as an

---

imagined community that owes its existence to racial mythologies that allows the line between in and out group to be described, but also constructs the white race as a community that must be defended. This gives shape to a methodology for reading the interaction between racialized and religious discourses of belonging and exclusion as social mythologies that inform the construction of moral obligations that are not simply individual racist pathologies. In this way the social conditions that produce the racist subject are treated more seriously when we see individual expressions of racism or religious exclusion, or, as a matter of short-had, hate speech.

In white nationalism the imagined global white community, signified through mythologies of biological, ideological, and cultural purity and imperilment, is hemmed about with the obligation pressed upon the individual white nationalist to protect it. This both creates white nationalist subjectivity and binds the individual white nationalist to the imagined racialist community via the obligation to defend it, even as that obligation gives shape to the community itself. As Bergson puts it, “Obligation, which we look upon as a bond between men, first binds us to ourselves.”¹³ To put it another way, the imagined community of white nationalism, instantiated in the minds of the individual actors through mythologies that signify its existence and attributes, sutures the individual white nationalist to the imagined racial community, binding itself together through the individual duty to defend the white race, which imbues the community with meaning that is passed through the individual. The duty to love and protect the community discursively constructs the imagined racial community and binds all that belong to it to itself, even as it binds the individual white nationalist to themselves as white nationalists. Duty then is

¹³ Bergson, Two Sources, 15.
not simply individual, but communal; not simply indicative of the individual in the community, but creative of the individual and the community.

Informed by the approaches defined by Lincoln, Anderson, and Long, read through a Bergsonian lens, we may see changing modes of religious discourse as relational to the re-formation of the white racialist milieu in America after WWII and the successes of the Civil Rights Movement that were so troubling for white racialists in the 1970s to the present. Further, the social-ego of the white nationalist is one that is cultivated with the duty to protect the imagined global white community from any threats to its existence. My argument that American white nationalists regard Christianity as a problem for white racial survival, especially as it is suspected to teach racial tolerance certainly points to what may be described as racial hatred. After all, one may argue, that Christianity is rejected by a growing number of white nationalists because their anti-Semitism and racism is so strong they cannot abide any ideology that seems to have a connection to Jewishness or that teaches racial equality, as they accuse Christianity. However, I want to contrast my Bergsonian approach in the emphasis on love and obligation to that of two works that emphasize the role of sexualized tension in white nationalists narratives intersexuality and the place of ressentement a la Nietzsche in the rhetorics of victimization that are always present in discourses of white angry males. The first of these works is Abbey Ferber’s 1998 book White Man Falling. In this book she focuses on the relationships between hateful racist discourses and fears of intersexuality, which she argues constructs and maintains “racial and gender boundaries” that the
“construction of whiteness requires.” The second work is an essay by Jeffery Nealon titled “Performing Resentment: White Male Anger; or, ‘Lack’ and Nietzschean Political Theory,” in which he argues from Nietzsche’s *On the Genealogy of Morals* that “white angry males,” or “WAMs,” engage in “pernicious symbolic economy of othering, creating enemies solely to bolster the WAM’s own sense of inherent goodness.”

These works respectively focus on analyses of anger and hatred through psychoanalytic and Nietzschean approaches. Racial hatred for Ferber is related to sexually neurotic response, while for Nealon it is a sick reaction to a sense of powerlessness. But what if we look at hate’s supposed opposite? Ferber, for example, opens her study with a quote from the white nationalist periodical *Instauration* that lauds “hate” as, in Ferber’s words, “an integral part of life.” However, if we examine this quote more as it appears in Ferber’s book, we find something else to consider. The quote in part reads as follows:

Enmity is a key component of the art of individual and group survival. The man who hates to hate is only half a man and a poor defender of his family and race… Without love there is no creation. Without hate the creation cannot be defended. Hate is as much a unifier as love.

Here we notice not only a reference to “love,” but a connection drawn between love and hate, especially in what it means to defend the white race. While there are elements of

---

16 Ferber, *White Man Falling*, 3. Also, it should be noted that the journal *Instauration* was founded by Wilmont Robertson, author of *The Dispossessed Majority* (1973). For more information on *Instauration*, visit the online magazine at [http://instaurationonline.com/](http://instaurationonline.com/).
17 Quoted in Ferber, *White Man Falling*, 3.
Nietzschean *ressentiment* present, and certainly a sexualized notion of the woman as the jealously guarded object, there is also “love.”

It seems to me that Ferber’s and Nealon’s approaches, though clearly accurate in their own ways, leave this reference to love undertheorized in relation to what is commonly claimed among white nationalists. The quote above is certainly not unique in demonstrating the discourse of racially restricted love in white nationalism. The exhortation to love of one’s race is so common that we could say without a blush of hesitation that every major white supremacist organization in the United States has in its publications or its web based material several references to it. No other codification of the meaning of this love of race is better articulated as it is in David Lane’s “88 Precepts.” We will discuss Lane in chapter four, but we can say at this point that his precepts are predicated on the preservation of one’s race as the highest moral principle, and that principle is transcendentalized as “natural law” and the expression of healthy “instinct” to follow the command—“We must secure the existence of our people and a future for white children.”¹⁸ Now of course we can still find within these “precepts” both deep anxieties over racial intersexuality and certainly expressions of resentment against perceived enemies of the race; but the command to preserve and protect is not based on “hate.” The command to protect one’s supposed kind, to cherish the folk, emerges out of a supposed healthy disposition of love directed toward to one’s race.

Though written in the 1930s and focused on traditional nationalism after WWI, Bergson’s *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion* helps bring attention to “love of

¹⁸ This is, again, a ubiquitous expression that can be found in many places, first articulated by David Lane: “88 Precepts.” *Victory or Valhalla: The Final Compilation of Writings*. Edited by Java and Sissy (Butte, MT: Thorink, 2008), 174-184.
one’s race” and the accompanying command of protectionism as a moral obligation in white nationalism and allows theorization of the social aspects of racism rather than relying on individual psychology. Interest in Bergson’s philosophy has recently revived, in part because of the work of Gilles Deleuze. However his engagement with Bergson’s thought has left his final significant work on moral and social philosophy in *The Two Sources* relatively unaddressed. To this point, however, a recent collection of essays under the title *Bergson, Politics, and Religion*, edited by Alexander Lefebvre and Melanie White, offers some insights into this final work of his. The collection is predicated on the assumption that “Bergson is an extraordinary political philosopher,” and that *The Two Sources* “frames a series of political problems in terms of a treatise on morality and religion.”\(^\text{19}\) I agree with this, of course, but I also think that Bergson’s insights in *The Two Sources* offer much more about the understanding of racial hatred than has been previously discussed. For example, in this new collection of essays the word racism only appears one time. In Philippe Soulez’s essay “Bergson as philosopher of War and Theorist of the Political,” he describes racism in the sense of the exclusion of and violence toward the other, as “the commonest thing in the world”—a point taken in both the prescience and applicability of Bergson’s thought.\(^\text{20}\) However this implication is not developed any further in the essay.


As a part of this project, I will expound upon the applicability of Bergson’s insights in *The Two Sources* in relation to racism by developing his description of the “closed society” and the relationships between this society and what he calls “static religion” and the “myth-making function.” Of particular significance here is Bergson’s description of the closed society, to summarize Parel’s analysis, as one that promotes the values based upon the survival and preservation of one’s group, loyalty to that group with an accompanying hostility to those designated as outside that group, and the desire to expand one’s group, especially through violence; all of which are merged under obligation—a key word for Bergson.\(^\text{21}\) As I mentioned earlier, Bergson describes the closed society as “that whose members hold together, caring nothing for the rest of humanity, on the alert for attack or defense, bound, in fact, to perpetual readiness for battle,” and that the “force of moral obligation” works to ensure “the cohesion of all individual wills to the same end.”\(^\text{22}\) Further still, he argues that this “pressure” of moral obligation along with the “static religion” born “of the myth-making function” is the very substance of the closed society.\(^\text{23}\) Bergson defines “static religion” as that which keeps the subjected individual to the closed society via “myths” produced through the “myth-making function” which “demand[s] compliance.”\(^\text{24}\) In other words, myth-making produces a religious “idio-motor” that defines the moral obligation of the individual in a “closed society” to that society through myths that generate the protective response within the white nationalist subject through the force of obligation. Where does love

\(^{22}\) Bergson, *Two Sources*, 266.  
\(^{23}\) Ibid, 266-67.  
\(^{24}\) Ibid, 210-11.
come into the frame of this discussion? In this case love is part of the moral obligation; that which compels the subject so habituated in the closed society to love the race and demonstrate this love in expressions of protectionism.

I will revisit this theoretical formation in the conclusion in relation to the examples of white nationalist religiosity in the coming chapters. It is sufficient for now to mention that this Bergsonian approach broaches the foci of previous writers on the topic—subject formation and identity and in/out group social psychology in particular. However, I want to draw particular attention to what Bergson can help us understand about why a growing number of white nationalists in America who see Christianity as a problem for white racial survival. I will of course account for the sub-cultural position of white nationalism in America, especially as we are not talking in this case about nation states in the context of post-WWI and the fear of virulent nationalism 1930s, as was Bergson. I therefore do not simply adopt Bergson’s work without contextualized revisions, or without references to later relevant works that compliment my approach.

Through a reading of the white nationalist community as a “closed society,” I argue that white nationalists, obligated to preserve and protect the white race alone as the object of love, have come to see Christianity as an imperiling element to the imagined global community of white Europeans, and therefore must deal with Christianity as such. A mythology of the white racial community emerges in which, in the words of Ben Kalssen, founder of Creativity, “Nature’s greatest creation” is constantly assailed by enemies and under threat of subversion by “alien” ideologies, like Christianity. The obligation of racial protectionism is therefore placed upon all “racially conscious” white
people to defend their race in an ongoing conflict with these perceived enemies and ideologies. In this way we can see the command to hate the enemy as more intimately connected to the obligation to love one’s own than has been emphasized in Nealon’s or Ferber’s work. The insight from Bergson that narrow, objectified love produces hatred and violence is no more fitting than in the case white nationalism. This is clearly exemplified in a quote from White Aryan Resistance’s website that reads, “I fight because I love, not just because I hate… I will not apologize for wanting to protect my race from the rest of the world or from our enemies.”

At the heart of the white nationalist ideology is not just hate as an expression of sexual anxiety or resentment standing alone. Here violence is logical and natural to the white nationalist within a mythical Malthusian world where one is obliged to make their object of love live and prosper over and against perceived outsiders and enemies. This love rationalizes violence, but this form of love also motivates it. To love the race is to hate its enemies; even those enemies that are ideological in nature rather than physical. Christianity has increasingly been seen as one such ideological enemy, and an impediment to the obligation to racial protectionism.

A Note on Studying the Grotesque:

The particular subject matter under consideration in this study requires a certain approach that is conscious of the role of empathy in religious studies as a scholarly tradition and the trap it may lay for those not familiar with the study of racist religion. The consequences of misstatements and poor recognition of the politicized nature of this

---

content can be unexpectedly problematic. How can one understand what is perhaps rightly considered as repulsive without being seen as sympathetic to it or allowing one’s commitments to anti-racism to keep them from understanding the material? Is sympathy a necessary condition for understanding? In his study of persecution of Jews and heretics in mediaeval European society, R.I. Moore draws attention to the problem of sympathy in the study of religious persecution and hatred. He notices that “if sympathy is a necessary condition of understanding, it is not a sufficient one.”

While I find no resolution in this statement, it does open a space for putting sympathy in question while drawing attention to it as a potential problem in the study of such things. In the study of religion in particular it seems that the heritage of empathetic understanding in the field can exert its own pressures as the expectations are often that one studies what one likes. This is of course a false assumption, but it is also bad for the field of religious studies in that the longstanding critique of pseudo-theology in religious studies limits the applicability of the work produced therein.

There are however peculiar traps in a study like this one. The first is to be so anxious to protect oneself from accusations of being sympathetic to the racist subject and therefore spend the entire study distancing oneself from the content without accurately describing what the subjects actually say. From this ambition the straw man argument can emerge in which one simply projects onto the subjects that which one expects to find and dismiss. The second trap is the opposite of the first in that one is not careful in understanding the politics of such a study. In this way one comes close to verifying the

underlying populist racism, always so powerful in the American context, that comprises much of the mainstreaming effort in contemporary white nationalism. Both problems are essentially situated in the central problem of empathy that in most of the history of the study of religion has been seen as a key component of such work.

There is no better example of the latter tendency than what Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke wrote at the conclusion of his otherwise excellent study of Aryan ideology, *Black Sun: Aryan Cults, Esoteric Nazism and the politics of Identity*. He argues that the “institutionalization” of the demands of “black power groups and radical critics” led programs that “favor American blacks,” and that the “gradual transmutation of civil-rights law has led to the reorientation of these programs from equal opportunities toward the equal outcomes of racial quotas,” which has meant the “attribution of special benefits” to specific racial groups and is a “remarkable deviation from the Anglo-American tradition of individual rights.” Goodrick-Clarke then goes on to say that the “discriminatory effects of these policies on whites, both potential and actual, has understandably caused some resentment among whites.”

This of course misrepresents the actuality of affirmative action outcomes and intentions in the law, but it even does worse in parroting the very racialist rhetoric of the American far-Right in the ways described well in Michael Omi’s 1991 essay “Shifting the Blame: Racial Ideology and Politics in the Post-Civil Rights Era.” But worse perhaps is the way he has been read by the white nationalist community. In an obituary

---

article published on the website for Counter-Currents, the “principle publisher in English” of the European New Right, the author points to this exact passage from Black Sun and states that these comments “would certainly not be out-of-place at Counter-Currents or other “New Right” publications, but are surprising coming from the keyboard of an esteemed university professor.”29 This should be read as a failure of Goodrick-Clarke to understand the details of the politicized assumptions he declares with little to no documentation or reflection beyond using the very writings of the subjects he means to study. But perhaps worse is the transference of the scholar’s authority to the white nationalist community’s position when he is read by them, and I think accurately, as having affirmed their positions and justified their “resentment.”

In many ways, as Omi discusses in the afore mentioned essay, the racialized language of the conservative rebuttals to alleged white victimization at the hands of Affirmative Action, and the jealous accusation that “minorities” engage in identity politics is found everywhere in the white conservative milieu, and has been for more than forty years in America. That Goodrick-Clarke uses primary source material from white nationalists to make his own commentary, and thereby affirms some of their conclusions, indicates that there is a serious problem in his understanding racial politics in America. The two references to which I refer were also noticed by John Morgan. They appear as footnotes to comments that Goodrick-Clarke makes in doubting the possibility of assimilation of “such immigrants” that are increasing in number and are not English-speaking, and the way “black crime, drug involvement and welfare dependence” are

blamed on white racism and the way “black on white crime” is allegedly underreported in the media.\[30\] Perhaps when Mr. Morgan says that this is slim evidence to argue that Goodrick-Clarke was a sympathizer he is correct. I certainly do not want to simply level a charge against Goodrick-Clarke. I do however want to point out that his comments demonstrate a stunning lack of awareness of the pernicious influence of racialized discourses that are far from exclusive to the “extreme” racists and still permeate American political discourse. Not only are the claims he makes about Affirmative Action and such easily refuted and have been discussed, but in making these claims he mimics without reflection the very ideology that he is supposedly describing. His error is possibly compounded by the authority that he projects as a scholar that is borrowed for the purposes of authorization Morgan’s article.

The point here is not to defame Prof. Goodrick-Clarke, or display some “politically correct” reaction to “bad thinking.” Rather the point here is to point out how political blind-spots in the scholarship of racialized religions reflect a lack of a rigorous engagement with the available scholarship on racial identity, possibly because of the internalization of very ideologies that are the object of study, and can then be easily used to authorize racist logics. Anyone doing work on race and religion should be aware not just of the history of particular movements and groups, but how the scholar and those within these movements share political spaces as they reflect and react to always-already politicized questions around race in America that are ongoing. It is not a matter of “politicizing” one’s scholarship, but recognizing that on this topic one’s scholarship is always and already politicized.

So, how then should one proceed? Kelly Baker’s introduction to her 2011 book *Gospel According to the Klan*, engages this problem of sympathy in methodology directly, and offers some insight in this regard. Reflecting on the work of James Aho, Shawn Lay, Kathleen Blee, Michael Barkun, and others, she points to the evolving struggle with how exactly to situate one’s self as a scholar when considering hate groups. Referencing Lay’s approach to studying people in the Klan as “ordinary citizens,” an important part of her thesis, and Blee’s warning that describing the “normativity of Klansmen and Klanswomen downplays the Klan’s violence and hatefulness,” presents the scholarly dilemma in describing such movements without either the trap of a problematic sympathy that obscures the worst effects of racist movements or characterizing people in such movements as utterly alien to ourselves. Baker’s Approach is then to “step into the worldview of the Klan” in a blending of historical and ethnographic methodologies.

For Baker there are two poles: empathy and skepticism, embodied respectively in the work of David Chidester’s “structured empathy,” which he emphasizes maintains the recognition of the humanity of others, and Blee’s emphasis on the devastating effects of racial hatred and violence. These approaches inform Baker’s attempt to “find a more interpretive approach… to see with [the subjects] and, more importantly, to recognize that this is only a partial presentation of the story.” However, this approach, partially informed by this representation of the ideas of racist ideologues, presents the problem

---

33 Ibid, 30. Also see David Chidester’s *Salvation and Suicide: Jim Jones, The People’s Temple, and Jonestown* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2003), xv.
that in an attempt to understand these movements and actors we must engage with the ethics of allowing these voices to “speak for themselves.” Baker’s solution calls upon the reflexivity of ethnographic approaches, particularly that of Karen McCarthy Brown, and Ann Burlein’s effort to “see with” without “seeing through” the eyes of the subjects in question.

A couple of points about my approach then follow. First, I will say plainly that I have no sympathy for racism or for those who stratify or delineate society along supposed racial lines. Race, though it has pernicious and continuous real effects, is, though not merely, a social construction. This and that it is a philosophically unsound and misleading way of understanding human difference means that as a scholar I cannot regard racism as viable or understandable in any way. But, while I have no sympathy, morally or intellectually, for their position, it is important to understand white nationalists and how they think, in part at least because they are part of the continuous and sustained effects of the racist history of European colonization of this continent. But as this disposition relates to my choice to do selective deep readings of white nationalist statements with an effort to understand them on their own terms, as Michael Barkun said so well, “My examination of certain odd beliefs does not signify my acceptance of them.”

To a second point about my approach, I agree with Hugh Urban that we ought to strive for “up-frontness and honesty” and submit our views to critical reflection and the

34 Ibid, 31.
scrutiny of our peers to avoid having our “scholarly interests from degenerating into an academic free-for-all of personal opinion and private agendas, which would ride roughshod over the actual religious data that is our subject matter.”37 I am politically and ethically committed to anti-racism and the creation of a society that does not condone or participate in the proliferation of racism, sexism, or homophobia. These are commitments that inform my view of the material as well as why I choose to study these phenomena in the first place. From this disposition I nevertheless maintain the humanness of the racist other while maintaining that the racism that these subjects proliferate in their works is to never be apologized for or excused. Like Baker, I work through this material with the very self-consciousness and openness that Urban calls for in all of our work.

Defining white nationalism:

I have now spent some significant time explaining my approach to religion in white nationalism, but now it is best to briefly define what I mean by white nationalism. White nationalism has specific emic and etic definitions available. One of the most thorough treatments of this term from within white nationalism was written by Michael O’Meara in his book *Toward the White Republic*. O’Meara describes a “terminological change” in the 1990’s when “white Power advocates, segregationists, separatists, supremacists, survivalists, neo-Confederates, biological realists, etc., started calling themselves ‘white nationalists’.”38 For O’Meara this phenomenon emerged out of a realization on the part of these racial activists that the “movement” after 1945 that the

---

effort to “maintain the integrity of America’s racial character and prevent alien races from intruding” had failed and led to the realization in turn that drove these activists to rethink the prospects of either saving America or seceding from it.\(^3^9\) White nationalism is for him “a variant of historic ethnonationalism,” by which he means a nationalism that is defined ultimately in terms of blood and, as others have described it, “integral culture”—a sense of culture that is authentic to one’s biological inheritance.\(^4^0\) This is of course what Francis Parker Yockey, whom I will discuss in a moment, meant when he described race as “the spiritual-biological community of a group.”\(^4^1\)

Much of this has been said previously by scholars examining white nationalism from the outside. In 2003, Carol Swain, a Professor of law at Vanderbilt University, published a lengthy study titled *The New White Nationalism in America*. She defines white nationalism as first and foremost a threat to America’s liberal order rather than simply a response to demographic and political shifts in the latter half of the 20th century. But Swain, like O’Meara, sees this term as descriptive of a phenomena that culminated in the 1990’s.\(^4^2\) For her, white nationalism grows out of “the older white supremacy movement,” and fuels “a new and expanded white consciousness movement on the part of those Americans of European ancestry.”\(^4^3\) I refer to this element of white nationalism, sometimes synonymous with racial nationalism, as pan-Europeanism. A significant component of her description in the early part of the text is about how white nationalists
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\(^3^9\) Ibid.

\(^4^0\) Ibid, 3.

\(^4^1\) Yockey, *Imperium*, 277.


\(^4^3\) Ibid
define themselves by their oppositional stance to what they perceive as racial enemies and a sense of urgency in dealing with what they regard as the existential threat to white racial survival that these enemies are seen as responsible for producing.\textsuperscript{44}

The 1990s marked a point when the new white nationalism emerged into public view, in part because of the Oklahoma City bombing and the attention media paid to the militia movement which was often tied to racism in the media. It is certainly understandable why this would be, but the history of white nationalism goes further back to the decades following WWII. What was seen to have emerged in the 1990s had a deeper construction of its ideology in the post-WWII environment. The most significant property of contemporary white nationalism that differentiates it from previous modes of racial activism in the U.S. is that it does not recognize modern nation states through geographical boundaries as the prime mode of political organization, and is often suspicious of or hostile to the United States as a national entity.

Jeffery Kaplan and Leonard Weinberg have pointed out in their 1998 study \textit{The Emergence of a Euro-American Right}, that trans-national cooperation among white racist organizations is as a post-WWII phenomenon around an ethos that I call pan-Europeanism.\textsuperscript{45} As Kaplan and Weinberg notice, there were attempts in the nineteen-twenties, especially in the wake of WWI, to think on a broader scale about white unity within European supremacist frameworks.\textsuperscript{46} One only need reference the speeches of

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid, 3 & 16-17.
\textsuperscript{45} This is not to be confused with the impetus behind the European Union, but with something quite different and related to what Yockey describes in \textit{Imperium}, and what has been increasingly popular nomenclature among the intellectualist currents in the European and North American New Right.
\textsuperscript{46} Kaplan and Weinberg, \textit{Euro-American Right}, 23.
Charles Lindbergh as a spokesperson for the America First movement, or the writings of Madison Grant and his protégé Lothrop Stoddard to see this trend. The preservation of “European culture” and the continuance of white domination of the world in the face of “rising tide of color” and the desire to avoid another European war can be seen as two influences upon this early pan-European impulse.\textsuperscript{47} However, the beginnings of the kind racial nationalism that defines contemporary white nationalism lay in the work of an American named Francis Parker Yockey.\textsuperscript{48}

Yockey’s activism began as early as 1948 in his activities with the European Liberation Front (ELF), and his authorship of \emph{The Proclamation of London}, which was published in 1949. Further, his book \emph{Imperium}, published in 1948 under the pseudonym Ulick Verange, This book, according to Kaplan and Weinberg, combined the anti-Semitic tropes of The Protocols of the Elders of Zion with a Spenglerian reading of history to become one of the earliest efforts to establish a truly pan-European alliance.\textsuperscript{49} He also became an important influence on such right-wing organizers as Willis Carto, who is also credited with authoring the introduction to the 1962 release of Imperium into the American market, and Else Christensen, whom we will discuss in more detail in chapter four.\textsuperscript{50} As we will see, he also became an important influence for those who were beginning to articulate a message of racial nationalism that specifically and consciously

\textsuperscript{47} The quote mentioned is a partial reference to Stoddard’s seminal work on race titled \emph{The Rising Tide of Color against White World-Supremacy} (1920). The book of his mentor, Madison Grant, which was modified in editions from 1916-1918, \emph{The Passing of the Great Race}, was in fact influential on Adolph Hitler, who, according to Jonathan Spiro in \emph{Defending the Master Race}, wrote to Grant express his admiration for the book and stated, “Your book is my Bible,” 357.
\textsuperscript{48} Kaplan and Weinberg, \emph{Euro-American Right}, 105.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid, 106.
separated itself from conservative politics, anti-Communism of the Birch type, and narrow American patriotism. Yockey has also recently reemerged among white nationalists as a figure worthy of remembrance and discussion in the most recent developments in pan-European ideology, especially among those associated with the North American New Right.\textsuperscript{51}

Yockey’s pan-European opus \textit{Imperium}, which has continued to circulate among white nationalists from the late 1960’s to the present, focuses on a reinterpretation of all of Western history through the lens of race and culture, with the particular end desire of the “imperative integration of Europe” in the form of a “unity of People, Race, Nation, State, Society… and… economy.”\textsuperscript{52} Yockey is clear that this work was meant to present “all the fundamentals of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century outlook necessary as the framework for comprehending and thorough action.”\textsuperscript{53} Dividing the world into “High Cultures” and “Culture distorters” and “parasites” does not stray too far from the anti-Semitic and racist doctrines that preceded it in either the United States or Europe. However it is the specific articulation of a unity described above that would result in a Europe “rendered sacred by the streams of blood which have made it spiritually fertile for a millennium” whole as one unity, that will drive out through force the “barbarians and distorters” and allow the “Western banner” rest on its “home soil from Gibraltar to North Cape, and from the

\textsuperscript{51} This will be discussed in chapter six, but for confirmation one need only look at the large amount of articles on Counter-Currents’ website dedicated to Yockey’s work, life, and ideas, as well as the fact that the first article in volume one of the North American New Right’s journal after the introduction is an article titled “Francis Parker Yockey: In Memorium.”
\textsuperscript{52} Yockey, \textit{Imperium}, xiv.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid, 63-4.
rocky promontories of Galway to the Urals.”54 America, signified here as the “Washington regime,” is regarded as a place split between its European ideals and the machinations of the imagined enemy, the “distorter.”55 America is seen by Yockey as more of a threat to Europe than even Russia. He sees the fear of Russian military power and communism as possible unifying force, whereas America is seen as simply presenting the threat disorder and distortion that will corrupt Europe.56 Yet Yockey nevertheless sees America, though like Russia, as ruled by the “spiritually alien,” America has another stratum of people that are “the true America,” the “America of Alexander Hamilton, George Washington, John Adams, of the frontiersmen, the explorer, the men of the Alamo,” which “belongs to Europe.”57 European unity for Yockey was always trans-Atlantic and trans-national. Contemporary white nationalism is imbued with the same notions, in part, as will discover in coming chapters, because Yockey’s work was a part of racial nationalism from its beginnings in the late 1960s.

Looking at Yockey as the earliest articulator of pan-European racial nationalism after WWII, I therefore understand white nationalism in America as rooted in thought after WWII, pan-European in its outlook and ambition, conspiratorial in its anti-Semitism and racism, and suspicious of American governmental institutions. It is also something that is deeply invested in what I referred to earlier as integral culture—the idea that biology and culture are linked in a significant, and often spiritualized, way. That said there are many people discussed in this study who have not self-identified as white

54 Ibid, 619.
55 Ibid, 591 &595.
56 Ibid, 595.
57 Ibid, 594-5.
nationalists, among them William Pierce and Revilo Oliver, who nevertheless play signature roles in its development in the United States. In this sense then when I describe them as within the realm of white nationalism I am speaking of a mode or style of thinking that has these elements to varying degrees regardless of how one publically professes their white nationalism. This also takes into account their levels of influence within this milieu. This in turn allows me to discuss the levels of influence from those whose racism and anti-Semitism seem quite muted next to other figures, but who have nevertheless expressed the other elements described and have become important within contemporary white nationalism. Therefore the nuances of each person’s connection to the center mass of contemporary white nationalism will be part of the broader contextualization of what they expressed in their published works. In other words, white nationalism is a heuristic used to capture as much of a dynamic that has substance but not always the same expression, or even the same name, from the people involved in its construction and varied articulations.

Significant to this heuristic is what I call racial protectionism. This is properly understood as another important element within white nationalism as both a common notion for all that can be included within the pale of white nationalism and the common impulse that leads to Christianity being regarded as a problem for white nationalists. And like the other elements of white nationalism, it too is found in Imperium. Yockey writes, “the present situation of the West imposes upon it not only a struggle for power… but also—a struggle for the continued biological existence of the population of Europe.”58 Again, the ways this expressed can vary, but the discourse of racial extinction is replete

58Ibid, 616. Italics not added.
in white nationalism. Of course it is certainly present in the discourses of the KKK and other racist movements throughout American history. But that of course is the point for my larger theoretical framework—that the command to defend the “closed society,” however it is defined, means that there is a moral imperative that dictates that society must be defended. What has shifted is that that society is no longer America, or even white America, but white people everywhere. Racial protectionism is the moral code of white nationalism, the thread that passes through all that can be understood as white nationalism, and which has come to turn many against Christianity as an imperiling element.

*Chapter descriptions:*

This study is indeed patterned after a history of ideas approach, but in order to fully treat the materials that are the subject of deep readings I will have to depart from delineating the chapters chronologically. The chapters are constructed more or less topically. In the first chapter I discuss the emergence of contemporary white nationalism in the work and words of a figure who has been forgotten in almost all circles except for white nationalist circles, a co-founder of the John Birch Society (JBS), professor of Classics, and racial nationalist ideological pioneer, Revilo P. Oliver. This chapter describes Oliver’s early conservative writings in *National Review*, his activities in the JBS, and his evolution into a voracious critic of both in favor of a race-focused activism in relation to, among other things, the writings of Francis parker Yockey. Also, and in tandem, this chapter also describes the evolution of his thinking on Christianity, from a firmly established part of Western culture, to a harsh critique of Christianity as a Jewish
ideology.” Therein we find that his critique of both American conservatism and Christianity revolve around his sincerely held belief that Western civilization and Western peoples are deeply imperiled, and nothing short of a clear focus on what he regarded as rational modes of self-defense and the culling away of alien ideologies and distractions from race, namely the defense thereof, as the central issue political activity.

In chapters two and three I discuss and William Pierce and what he called “Cosmotheism,” and Ben Klassen and “Creativity,” the religion he initiated in the mid-1970s. In both cases, though William Pierce has become more well-known, they both were key figures in white nationalism as it really took shape in the 1970’s. Further, Pierce played a significant role in the hyper-visibility of radical right-wing movements in the United States after the Oklahoma City bombing, as his writings were implicated as inspiration for the acts. While Creativity adherents have also been involved in acts of violence, though on a smaller scale, Klassen’s ideology as it was succinctly described in the slogan RaHoWa—Racial Holy War—have become ubiquitous in white power circles in America and elsewhere. In both cases we have persons key to the further development of white nationalist ideology who described new religious movements that would supplant Christianity and all other perceived alien ideologies, and would make primary, in words of Klassen, “the survival, expansion and advancement of the White Race.”

Chapter four leaves the more biographically driven narratives of the first chapters so as to examine the emergence and development of Odinism, or racialist paganism, as one of the most important trends in American white nationalism today. Here I use

59 This phrase can be found in almost all of Klassen’s writings and talks which will be discussed in chapter three.
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Odinism as an umbrella term for large and diverse panoply of racialized pagan ideologies. What is most challenging about this chapter is correctly delineating what is racist in the ways that we understand white nationalism to be, rather than simply ethnicized as a religious option for peoples of Northern European decent. Since practitioners differentiate themselves along these lines, one ought to consider that there may in fact be a difference that for outsiders seems to have no distinction. Further, there have been developments in white nationalists religiosity that reference Odinism in significant ways but nevertheless differentiate themselves in name severity of position; Wotanism, for example. Wotanism was invented by David Lane, who died not long ago in federal prison where he was incarcerated for his part in the activities of The Order, one of the most significant white separatist movements in American history, and was dismantled in the 1980s by the FBI. In the case of the white nationalist variants of racialist paganism Christianity is seen as both an alien ideology in the sense that was articulated by Oliver, Klassen, and Pierce, but even more so in that it is seen as that which was forced upon European peoples who now seek to recover their supposedly true and inherent religion. Through this recovery it is thought that the peoples of Europe can withstand a feared biological extinction by adhering to what they regard as religion of their ancestors.

The following chapter discusses the even more complicated milieu of occult racialism in America. Here we see not simply a rejection of Christianity necessarily in all cases, but a more nuanced and complex redefining of Christian themes, as with esoteric Hitlerism, a term coined by the former Chilean Miguel Serrano, but is equally applicable
with minor alteration in the thought of George Lincoln Rockwell, founder of the American Nazi Party in the 1960s. Further, in the confluence of European neo-Nazism, namely under the influence of Savitri Devi (Maximani Portas, 1905-1982), who believed Hitler to be an avatar of Vishnu, and the emerging American neo-Nazi scene in the World Union of Nationals Socialists (WUNS). In these cases Christianity may be regarded as Jewish, and therefore not a valid perspective for Aryans to adopt, as it is regarded as counter to their spiritual instincts, or as a diversion from the real truths of racial difference and ultimate reality. Here we see not only another way in which the problem that Christianity was thought to present for racial activists was approached in multiple ways, even in terms of reforming or bringing out higher truths in it to better define how the Aryan race may be preserved, but also the trans-Atlantic connections as they start to really emerge in the sixties and seventies as described by Kaplan and Weinberg. Here the pan-Europeanism of Yockey and shifts in religious thought in white nationalism as it emerges in the context of post-Civil Rights in America and changes in Europe in the wake of WWII come together in questioning the place and efficacy of Christian ideologies from previous decades in America.

This line of thought continues into the final chapter on the emergence of the North American New Right (NANR) as both influenced by the European New Right (ENR), specifically the Nouvelle Droite of France that emerged in the 1968. Here the question of the efficacy of Christian ideologies comes to clash with the question of the strategy of rejecting Christianity as a part of a metapolitical project of European cultural renewal and biological survival in the wake of the decreased power of Europe in the shadow of both
the Soviet Union and the United States, and processes of decolonization and migration into Europe from former colonies. As this context in Europe informed the development of ideologies of the ENR that struggled between rejection and reform of Christianity for the purposes of the New Right project, so some of the metapolitical aspects developed in the ENR have been adapted in the United States in the NANR today, namely by Tomislav Sunic, Michael O’Meara, and Gregg Johnson, editor of the journal NANR, and editor in chief of Counter-Currents Publishing. In this case we have both a movement that is developed out of engagement with the ENR, but one that is thoroughly fitted for the contemporary United States; one that is, in the words of Greg Johnson, “motivated by consciousness of an existential threat,” and perceived to be engaged in saving “European peoples” from “a cultural and economic system that has set our race on the path to cultural decadence and demographic decline.” The place of Christianity is here still debated. Though the doyen of the ENR, Alain de Benoist, has argued for the rejection of Christianity—and has been argued against by Nouvelle Droite co-founder, Guillaume Faye, those in the NANR have argued mainly for a racial reformation of Christianity or for a sort of tolerance for the time being for those white nationalists who wish to keep their Christianity, arguing that they will abandon it later when the “White republic” is instituted. In any case the Christianity is a problem to be solved, and the solution to this problem is deeply connected to the moral imperative for the white nationalist in America—racial survival.

At the conclusion I will reflect back over the data accumulated in the preceding chapters and offer a more theoretical reading of that data through the Bergsonian lens I have already described. Here the interests are not to simply restate the conclusions of each chapter, but to offer analysis of the general field we have surveyed by then. Here the argument latent in the project throughout will be made more explicit and the implications for understanding “hatred” will be stated more clearly. Again, it my firm belief that through the study of how Christianity became a problem in American white nationalism we not only get a better sense of the role of racial protectionism as concept in that milieu, but we also can see the larger point Bergson was making when he said that “Hitler proved the truth of *The Two Sources*”—that the love of closed society, objectified and violent in nature, is always at home with hatred.

I have already discussed to some degree why I think this study matters in what it may offer for understanding racial and religious violence. Answering the question relevancy in the study of “fringe” subjects is an important part of presenting one’s work to publishers, reviewers, and the community of scholars more broadly. The awareness of why this subject matter is important is not immediately apparent. I have three responses to this question, which I will state in brief here. First, with the developments of mass communication in globalization, one has to be aware that even the most fringe ideas can be accessed by almost anyone to often unknown effects, or only in hindsight after an event. Second, as I have mentioned already, this study offers insights into the creation of what Appadurai calls “predatory identities” in globalization that produce violence, often in large scales. And finally, one should note that since 2000, hate groups and membership
in hate groups have been on a steady incline.\textsuperscript{61} I would stipulate that one can longer afford the luxury of turning the gaze from the seemingly absurd and the obviously repulsive racist discourse in America, especially as racism in America is far from an antiquated ideology. As I will discuss more in the conclusion, the space between mainstream conservative discourses on multiculturalism and that of the white nationalist milieu may be slimmer than one may assume.

As we know from the largest terrorist attack in American history other than the one that occurred on September 11\textsuperscript{th}, 2001, the Oklahoma City bombing, just because an ideology is fringe does not mean that it can't have tremendous and devastating impacts. Even those white nationalists who shun violence as means of change, like Greg Johnson, whom we will discuss in the final chapter, are deeply invested in enacted their ideologies through political and cultural means. In other words, though they may be fringe from a certain perspective, white nationalist ideologies matter and should be studied as if they do.

Chapter 1: Revilo Oliver and the Emerging Racialist Critique of Christianity

Introduction:

I have already defined white nationalism in the introduction as a movement that no longer recognizes traditional borders of the nation-state, but re-imagines belonging along the lines of race. In The Emergence of a Euro-American Right, Jeffrey Kaplan and Leonard Weinberg trace the trans-Atlantic connections among the American and the European Right as essential for understanding the “emergence of the Euro-American radical right at the end of the twentieth century.”¹ This is important to keep in mind as we begin our discussion with the emergence of contemporary white nationalism and the beginnings of the critique Christianity among American racialists. As we will see in this chapter, the development of white nationalism in America had always had a trans-Atlantic ideological component. Further, we will see that the perception that Christianity presented a problem for the preservation of the white race alone emerges in relation to shifts among the American far-Right in the 1950’s and 60’s. In particular, Revilo Oliver, the subject of this chapter, transformed from a staunch proponent of American conservatism to a virulent critic of both conservative politics and the “Judeo-Christianity” it proposed as the basis for ethics and as the definition of American civilization.

¹ Kaplan and Weinberg, The Euro-American Right, i.
As Kaplan and Weinberg point out, in the wake of the military defeats of Fascism and Nazism the flow of right-wing ideas and political influence was no longer limited to the national or ethnic boundaries of former fascisms. Along with this trend of transnationalization came a shift in the center of gravity for organization. The extreme right was no longer gathered around state dictatorships, but around individuals and groups.\(^2\) The racist right was not only trans-Atlantic, it was increasingly focused on a pan-European dream of, as the phrase goes in the white nationalist community today, “white pride, world wide.”

Revilo Oliver sits at the very emergence of what eventually came to be known as contemporary white nationalism, but he also came from the more traditional American right in the late 1950s and early 60s. He was an early contributor to William F. Buckley’s *National Review* and a co-founder of The John Birch Society, both of which he later denounces as he transforms his message from one of Americentric anti-communism to the preservation of the white race as the only issue worthy of activism. It is also important to notice is that as Oliver begins to critique American conservative politics and anti-communism, and as this critique became increasingly harsh over time, so his critique of Christianity followed suit. When one reads his published work, one reaches an inescapable conclusion that Oliver’s critiques of American conservatism and Christianity mirror one another, anchored as they were in the firm conviction that neither conservatism nor Christianity could secure the survival of the white race; and worse, that they were actively contributing to the weakening of the very instincts necessary for survival. In his estimation they both led to a liberalizing attitude toward other races, and,

\(^2\) Ibid, 43-44.
especially Christianity’s case, taught universal brotherhood rather than the primacy of ones race in determining all political and social activity.

The reciprocal and evolving critiques of both conservative politics and Christianity reflect a basic racial protectionist logic here at the beginning of racial nationalism in America and that continues through to the present. This chapter will of course describe the twin critiques of conservative politics and of Christianity as articulated by Oliver as they grew over time into an outright rejection of both. But it is also meant to be a window into the place of the critique of Christianity within contemporary American white nationalism in its very emergence in the latter half of the twentieth century. I argue that Oliver’s focus on white racial survival compelled him to turn against conservatism and to eventually reject Christianity, even in its racialist forms. And though his particular rejection took the form of an atheistic alternative that emerged from his particular attachment to notions of rationality, the rejection of Christianity and conservative politics are common to white nationalists.

I begin this chapter with a brief biographical introduction to Oliver, describing his intellectual and professional activities. I discuss his evolution from an anti-Communist, Buckley conservative and founding member of the John Birch Society to a staunch critic of American conservatism. This is of course not going to be a thorough biography. The biographical data here is simply meant to provide some context for Oliver’s writings that are the bulk of the material of interest in this chapter. In reading Oliver’s work we will see his growing disillusionment with conservative politics and his development into an early spokesman for a racial politics focused on the preservation of the white race alone.
We will also see his perspective on Christianity change from a position that it was the glue of Western civilization under threat by liberalism to a conviction that it was itself a problem for the survival of the West and of the white race. Finally, I will discuss Oliver’s legacy in the full bloom of the racial nationalist ideology that he contrasted with the old right in America. As we will see, though he is not well known outside white nationalist circles and his works have not been widely discussed in scholarship on racism in America, he is considered one of the luminaries of white nationalism in America with a dedicated readership accessing his work on a website bearing his name and a dedicated thread on Stormfront, one of the most significant white supremacist websites in the world.³ Oliver is now considered a leading ideologue of the racial nationalist movement that has increasingly seen his criticism of the American conservative mainstream and Christianity as accurate, and for the reason he identified: that neither can save the white race and Western culture from its present decline and eventual extinction.

Oliver’s Education:

Revilo P. Oliver was born in 1908 in Corpus Christi, Texas.⁴ He developed an interest in Sanskrit early in his youth, beginning with readings in Max Müller’s handbooks. He later took his interests to the University of Illinois to pursue graduate studies and eventually published a translation of Mrçchkatikā, The Little Clay Cart in 1938. He then received his PhD in 1940 under the eminent American classicist William

³ The Revilo Oliver website, started and administered by Kevin Alfred Strom, is linked here: http://www.revilo-oliver.com/news/about/. The site on Stormfront can be found here: http://www.stormfront.org/rpo/.
⁴ This date is given by Oliver, but George Michael as 1911 in Willis Carto and the American Far Right.
Abbott Oldfather. He was granted a professorship in the Classics Department at Illinois, from which he retired in 1977. Though he stayed long in academics, his true passion was politics. Early in his tenure at the university as a teacher and scholar, Oliver began his political activities in earnest.

Oliver’s most public endeavors in this regard were his contributions to National Review and his co-founding of the John Birch Society (JBS). Oliver became officially affiliated with National Review as an associate and contributor in 1956, but Buckley and Oliver later broke company over Oliver’s publicly racist statements. But before this break, Oliver met Robert Welch through William F. Buckley. Not long after this Welch and Oliver founded JBS. Named after an American Baptist missionary killed by communist Chinese in 1945, as the story goes, and which included such members as Tim LaHey of Left Behind fame, the JBS combined anti-Communism and ultra-conservatism with a particular understanding of Christianity. As Barbra Stone argues about the character of the JBS, “Religious fundamentalism has been a corollary of the John Birch Society from the beginning.” Oliver contributed consistently to American Opinion, the Societies publication, writing a section called “A Review of Reviews.” His contributions to JBS publications and National Review demonstrate Oliver’s then commitment to
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American conservatism and a passion for polemics as he attacked liberalism as all too close to communism.

These relationships were however not to last as Oliver would soon turn against both Buckley’s conservative fusionist politics and the JBS as ineffectual in the cause of white racial survival, and then as enemies of the white race, even pawns of a Jewish plot. In retrospect he says of American conservatives that “there was no significant intellectual difference between the American bourgeoisie and the cattle one sees… on their way to the abattoir.”

He comes to describe his departure from the JBS and the conservative movement in terms of utter disillusionment and disgust, apparent in the previous quote. But he also looked back on this departure as a positive move to be able to “write with utter frankness on the dire plight of our race and civilization we created.”

Oliver slowly came to regard both Christianity and conservatism as impractical for the cause of white racial survival, illogical, and hopelessly tainted by “alien,” which is to say “Jewish”, sentimentalities.

Changes in American conservatism during the 1950s and 60s led by Buckleyites like Will Herberg, and in particular the deployment of the concept of “Judeo-Christian civilization” meant to define American democracy in opposition to totalitarianism, communist and Nazi, were likely responsible for much of Oliver’s disillusionment. As we will see in a moment, he always cited the presence of Jews and a softening attitude toward race in favor of anti-communism, which he theorized as a Jewish tactic of distraction, as reasons for his break with the conservative movement. However certain
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elements of his thought remained constant from his conservative polemics against liberalism, particularly his emphasis on rationality and his obsession with narratives of civilizational imperilment. And as we will see in chapters two and three, this was common to his fellow JBS members William Pierce, the founder of National Alliance and author of the *Turner Diaries*, and Ben Klassen, founder of the Church of the Creator, who also went on to define contemporary white nationalism in their own right. For Oliver, and as we will see in the following chapters for Pierce and Klassen as well, organizations like the JBS and all of conservative politics was a dead end for any meaningful action to save the white race from biological extinction. It is important to note that all three also came to criticize Christianity along the same lines of logic that they used to attack conservative politics.

The best view of Oliver’s thought during this shift from American arch-conservative to anti-conservative, anti-Christian racial nationalist comes from a talk produced and filmed for the National Youth Alliance, the predecessor of the infamous National Alliance, in 1969.\(^\text{10}\) The talk opens with a deep critique of anti-communist and conservative political efforts of which he had intimate knowledge from his involvement with *National Review* and the John Birch Society, which he had only quit three years prior. Oliver’s argument in the talk is that conservative organizations, while seemingly sincere in their efforts to “awaken the American people,” have utterly failed, and finally reached “the end of the road.” Targeting his contemporary Christianity in America, he says “pulpit-pinks and pulpit-punks deny the divinity of Christ, spout poisonous rant

about social justice, and … incite rape and murder,” while the American Constitution had been already successfully “undermined by aliens.” Oliver therefore condemns conservatives for their inability to preserve what he regards as a purely white nation and targets “liberal” Christianity as communist in its outlook. “What is left,” he asks. He answers with a formula that would since define white nationalist ideology:

Only the biological fact of race, the yet discernible vestiges of our culture, and the yet fresh memories of what we were not long ago. Those are all that we have left from which to create, if we can, a new nation to replace what we lost.

In this talk Oliver also introduces Francis Parker Yockey’s magnum opus Imperium as “primary instruction for the new Alliance,” and as a book that “does not tell them about the economic advantages of ‘free enterprise’,” or “dilate on the blessings of freedom to buy a mortgage in the suburbs, run faster in the rat-race, and raise children to be taught that paradise is a place where hominoids with full bellies live in perpetual rut,” but one that “speaks to them of honor, loyalty, race, and Western man’s will to conquer or die” and “summons them…to a struggle against great odds.” He states further that this book and the National Youth Alliance warns that the activist “not that lady-like conservatives must be careful to love everybody, but that the treason of the slimy Ganelon can be defeated only if the Men of the West are still willing to die in the pass at Roncesvalles.” Closing with a reference to The Song of Roland, Oliver clearly contrasts the emerging racialist movement to what he describes as the soft, ineffectual, and blind conservative movement that insists, in his view, on liberal inclusion of all peoples rather than focusing exclusively on the survival of the white race and Western civilization over and against perceived enemies.
This talk demonstrates both Oliver’s presence as an important spokesman for far-right causes as well as the shift in his thinking at a crucial moment in the post-Civil Rights era—after the assassination of Dr. King and the riots of ‘68. It is significant that Oliver marks the failure of the conservative movement as one tied to the liberalization of attitudes, as he sees it, toward race and a liberal Christianity. Further, his anti-communism at this time, certainly tied to his previous JBS activities, is inflected on what he sees as a racially liberal Christianity that is complicit in his view with the destruction of Western values in America and endangering to the white race. Early in his transformation from arch-conservative to ardent racial nationalist, Oliver linked criticism of American conservatism to religiosity that he came to despise. In an essay titled “After the Holy War,” Oliver described National Review as a “basically ‘Liberal’ periodical… under the cover of devotion to Catholicism, subject to strict Jewish censorship, so that it purveyed a kosher ‘conservatism’.”

After his filmed address to the National Youth Alliance, Oliver continued his political activism on this racialist path. He quickly found affiliations and outlets for his racialist politics in America and abroad. His later associations included a continued friendship with William Pierce, who was the leader of the National Youth Alliance in 1969, when Oliver made his address, and correspondence with Alain de Benoist, the founder of GRECE (Groupement de recherche et d'études pour la civilisation européenne; or, The Group for the Study and Research of European Civilization), which later became the heart of the “French New Right,” and the predecessor and catalyst for the European
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New Right. The letters between Oliver and Benoist reveal not only amity for one another, but a deep mutual interest in the respective right-wing scenes in America and France. As early as June of 1970, de Benoist began to write to Oliver to discuss the National Youth Alliance, as well as issues of *Attack*, a periodical edited by William Pierce, and to congratulate Oliver for his “fine work” in making known Francis Parker Yockey’s *Imperium*. In one letter, de Benoist also apprises Oliver of the coming publication of his own periodical *Nouvelle Ecole* and other projects, such as the translation of W.C. George’s pro-segregationist book *Biology of the Racial Problem* into French.

In another letter from Oliver to de Benoist dated 6 April 1971 we learn, in spite of all of Oliver’s optimism for the organization, that the National Youth Alliance had failed amid leadership and money problems, but that the wake of its demise, the beginning of a “successor organization… headed by Dr. William Pierce”—what became National Alliance, though Oliver stated at that time that he had no connections with it. Pierce’s biographer, Robert S. Griffin, however, draws these associations between Pierce and

14 Alain de Benoist, letter to Revilo Oliver, 6-15-1970, http://www.revilo-oliver.com/papers/De%20Benoist,%20Alain/19700615_from_DeBenoist.jpg. This letter introduces Benoist to Oliver as the man behind the pen name for his “political studies,” and under which he states he had sent Oliver materials before this time. This of course pushes the contact, though it may have been unidirectional at first, between the French New Right and American Rightists to likely the very naissance of GRECE. This letter also demonstrates the overtures by Benoist to establish an alliance, as he states clearly in the letter, “In… general point of view, we are very [close] to what is expressed in the American-review, WESTERN DESTINY, published some years ago by Noontide Press,” the publisher of *Imperium* in the United States, and which was used by the National Youth Alliance.
Oliver more closely than the 1971 letter implies. Griffin certainly thinks Oliver to be a significant figure in the white nationalist milieu shared by Pierce. “If a history of white nationalism is ever written,” Griffin writes, “Oliver will certainly be prominent in it.”

But what is more significant for Griffin is the personal relationship between these two men and the role that Oliver played in Pierce’s work. Griffin reports that Pierce met Oliver through the then leader of the National Youth Alliance, Lou T. Byers (who also founded the Francis Parker Yockey Society), in 1970 or 71, and that Oliver and Pierce continued to correspond thereafter. And, according to Griffin, Pierce relayed to him that the inspiration for his fiction writing resulted from conversations with Oliver on the subject of recruitment for National Alliance. Further, Pierce received from Oliver a photocopy of a book *The John Franklin Letters*, described as a template for *The Turner Diaries*. Pierce indeed told Griffin that he went so far as to “buy into Oliver’s idea,” situating Oliver as the main inspiration for his works *The Turner Diaries* and *Hunter*.

As we can see here, Oliver’s activism had clearly shifted in the 1970’s in to the currents of the extreme right in the United States and, at least through the correspondence with de Benoist, in Europe as well. We can see that even in 1969 he was interested no longer in conservative politics, but the survival of the white race and the preservation of the West. Not only did he move away from the conservative movement, but put it firmly
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in the enemy camp. As the title suggests *America’s Decline: The Education of a Conservative*, a collection of essays published in 1981, affords Oliver the opportunity to tell the more completely his story of disengagement with the American conservative movement, specifically in the chapters titled “The Great Deceit” and “Aftermath.” In brief, Oliver’s narrative is that the JBS was revealed to him to be fraudulent and, more to the point for him, controlled by Jews.\(^{20}\) In his typical derogatory language, Oliver refers to the JBS as “the B’nai Birch”; insinuating of course that the ultra-conservative organization was simply an arm of Jewish interests.\(^{21}\) Like Pierce and Klassen, both of whom we will discuss in detail in the forthcoming chapters, Oliver sees the organization and the conservatism it promotes as itself a diversion from racial issues for “otherwise well-meaning American Aryans” and therefore operating as a “Jewish auxiliary.”\(^{22}\)

However, Oliver’s problems with the JBS were not just, although perhaps primarily, that the organization was imagined to infiltrated by Jews and propagating Jewish interests. He felt, referring to race, that the members and leadership “failed to regard the racial bond that was the one thing they had in common.”\(^{23}\)

Oliver does not however exclusively locate these perceived shortcomings as specific only to the JBS. He merges his critique of the JBS with a critique of American conservatism more generally. He writes that the “dangerously antiquarian delusions” perpetuated by those who would “still hope to restore the decent society and strictly restricted government of that tradition,” who wish to “regain what they have lost when

\(^{20}\) Oliver, *Education*, 329
\(^{21}\) Ibid, 333
\(^{22}\) Ibid, 334 & 337
\(^{23}\) Ibid, 335
they thoughtlessly allowed their country to be invaded, their government to be captured, and their society to be debauched by whining aliens,” have neglected the “only fundamental question,” which is of course for him the issue of racial survival. 24 He concludes his essay “The Great Deceit” by stating that “American Conservatism is finished, and its remaining adherents are, whether they know it or not, merely ghosts wandering, mazed, in the daylight.” 25

Oliver’s motivation for critiquing what he described as “quaint” patriotism and American conservatism was essentially pragmatic in relation to race and the preservation of Western civilization. He was clearly upset by the abject presence of persons he perceived to be dangerous racial enemies in conservative organizations and the perceived impotencies of conservative ideology and praxis. And as we will see, he repeated these critiques for Christianity. Oliver even goes so far as to describe Christianity in a review of Simpson’s *Which Way Western Man*, as nothing more than a collection “Jewish superstitions” that have “paralyzed” the “vital instincts” of the white race as well as its “rationality.” 26 In what follows I explore in more detail Oliver’s critique of Christianity in relation to the elements identified in his rejection of conservatism: a specific relation to rationality and racial protectionism, and deep racism and anti-Semitism. And like his critique of conservative politics, his perspective on Christianity changed from his time at *National Review* to his eventual rejection of it.

*Oliver on Christianity Part I—A Westernized Religion Perverted:*

24 Ibid, 338.
As we have seen, Oliver initiated his break with the JBS and American conservatism over what he perceived as capitulation with, infiltration by, and ineffectiveness in confronting Jews, as well as for what he regarded as an abandonment of race as a central issue for activism. This rejection of the JBS and conservatism is paralleled by a rejection of the Christianity that was so important to the American right in general. It is important to note that it was only a decade prior to Oliver’s quitting the movement and close to the time that he stopped contributing to *National Review* that Will Herberg, a contributor and religion editor for *National Review*, wrote about America’s “triple melting pot” and its “culture-religion” in his seminal work *Protestant, Catholic, Jew*, first published in 1955. Herberg’s thesis was that America was both profoundly secular and religious at the same time, and that Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism were the “three great branches” of one “American religion,” as they were “three culturally diverse representations of the same ‘spiritual values’.”

Referencing President Eisenhower’s appeal to “recognition of the Supreme Being,” Herberg notes that what we may call Judeo-Christianity had become the “religious creed of Americanism;” that which could “be taken as the civic religion of the American people.”

According to Mark Silk in “Notes on the Judeo-Christian Tradition in America,” Judeo-Christian as a referent served prior to the Twentieth Century only to “designate connections between Judaism and Christianity in antiquity,” but that it had come to mean
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in America a shared “western religious outlook.” Later references to the Judeo-Christian tradition became a means to define American democracy in relation to the revelations of Hitler’s Camps and in contrast to Soviet atheism, which came to be known under the newly established term, totalitarianism. In 1952 this concept was strengthened by President-elect Eisenhower who spoke before the Four Freedoms Foundation and argued that “our form of government… has no sense unless it is founded on a deeply felt religious faith, and I don’t care what it is. With us of course it is the Judeo-Christian concept but it must be a religion that all men are created equal.” The concept of a Judeo-Christian tradition that served as the only appropriate foundation for American democracy quickly became powerful anti-Communist rhetorical tool in the American Right. As Silk remarks, “Having proved itself against the Nazis, the Judeo-Christian tradition now did duty among the watchfires of the Cold War.”

The point here is of course to demonstrate that “Judeo-Christian,” which involved a dense set of relations between religiosity and the mission of Cold War activists and conservatives, came to hold a particular importance among those in the American right after WWII. Anti-Semitism was also becoming one of the cardinal sins in American political discourse at the same time that adherence to the dualism of democracy and totalitarianism meant a particular notion of Western civilization as one emergent from the teachings of Moses as well as Jefferson. Oliver, committed to Anti-Semitism and the exclusive preservation of the white race, not one committed to democracy over
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totalitarianism as American politics was increasingly described, could simply no longer see a place for himself in the political mainstream in spite of the racism that is known to have continued therein. Further, the Judeo-Christian concept linked Christianity in an explicit way to the failed conservative politics that Oliver grew to loath.

In some ways Oliver’s rejection of Christianity is simple to understand. In a letter to Alain de Benoist dated 20 September 1970 he discusses the thesis by the former communist turned contributor to National Review Whittaker Chambers that a “return to Medieval Christianity” was “the only force capable of preserving our civilization,” an opinion not far from his own at one time, and retorts, “I placed my hope in the power of reason possessed by a small elite and in the instinct of self-preservation that I believe to be residual even in the masses of our race.”

By this time in the development of his critique of Christianity, and especially that of American conservatives, Oliver was convinced that there could be little space for any biblical mythologies. It will be important to keep this particular ideation in mind in the subsequent two chapters, as it is very similar to statements made by Pierce and Klassen. But for now, Oliver’s specific focus on rationality and racial survival gives particular insight into the twin critiques he offers to Judeo-Christianity and political conservatism.

In another letter to de Benoist dated 14 May 1975 Oliver laments the nearly total abandonment of the “Hauptproblem of our time,” which he identifies as the “preservation of our race,” by most Americans. But he holds out thin hope. He makes a tentative
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reference to those who “are or claim to be Christians, many of whom have elaborated a mythology (‘British Israël’ etc.) to justify themselves”; but he clearly is suspicious of what he regards as their abandonment of rationality in cleaving unto what he describes as a self-deluding mythology. Making Christianity explicitly racialist was not enough for Oliver. One had to be rational, and not beholden to “myths,” to be effective in defending the white race. This contrast in Oliver’s thought is demonstrated a moment later in this letter Oliver praises one exception to this trend in American thought; one that he regarded as rightly rational and therefore beneficial. *The Dispossessed Majority* by Wilmont Robertson, a work that is referred to by its author as meant to “supply members of this discomforted and threatened group [white Americans]… with a systematic diagnosis of the diseases and debilities that have laid them low and some suggestions for their recovery.”

The fault Oliver finds in conservative politics and Christianity, even racist Christianity, is revealed even more in this comparison to what he sees as a rational approach to the race problem.

But Oliver’s disposition toward Christianity was not always so skeptical. This is easily demonstrated in his article published in *National Review* on March 15, 1958 titled “Superstitious Materialism.” This essay was mostly a review of career of Methodist Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam and Zoltan Sztankay’s 1957 book *Christianity, Democracy and Technology*. This review however quickly reveals itself to be a conservative polemic against the socialism that Oliver sees latent in liberal Christianity. In this article, far from
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decrying Christianity in general, Oliver defends a certain understanding of traditionalist orthodoxy. He defines the Christianity of Bishop Oxnam and Sztankay as only differing from Communism “only by an impudent claim to divine sanction,” and then defines their “schemes of social reform” as being far from “historical” Christianity. 37 On this last point Oliver goes further in stating that, “There is not even the slightest indication that [historical] Christianity, a religion of spirit and hence exclusively concerned with moral choices that individuals freely make in their own minds, promised or desired to change the structure of society.” 38 Oliver argues that Christianity “sought converts to religion, not adherents drugged with dreams of universal comfort or bribed with promises of loot.” 39 Oliver does not despise all Christianity, but what he regards as a liberal distortion of it.

After a brief diversion into a commentary of the collapse of the Roman Empire, which he argues was “doomed… by socialism” long before Christians came to have political influence, Oliver closes his commentary on Oxnam’s book by stating:

Logically and historically, Christianity must be the antithesis of the “universal love” that is currently peddled by men who find their country a ‘concept’ too small to deserve loyalty. And a crude counterfeit of religion, whether manufactured by folly or cunning, must not be used as a narcotic to blunt our perception of danger with romantic visions of a ‘world community’ and ‘enduring peace.’ Those are the hallucinations that precede disaster. 40

These statements of course do not stray too far from Cold-War era, conservative critiques of the liberal Christianity and the Social Gospel. But I will draw attention to two themes
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in the text: an appeal to reason and protectionism. The themes that are latent in Oliver’s writing would eventually move from arguing for a conservative position in defense of a certain kind of European cultural Christianity to be set against both conservatism and Christianity, and his motive of protectionism came to focus not on America but on the European peoples and so-called Western civilization at large.

The beginning of Oliver’s shift in attitude toward Christianity can be observed in his essay “Christianity and the Survival of the West” originally written in 1969, the same year he recorded his address to The National Youth Alliance. Oliver begins the essay by stating, “If we would salvage and restore our civilization—the Occidental culture that is peculiarly our own and that now seems to be disintegrating and rotting before our very eyes—we must do so as Western men, by observing reality objectively and by reasoning from it dispassionately.” Here reason again plays a huge role in his protectionism, the object of which is “Occidental culture.” However he does not yet attack all Christianity. In this essay he argues that “Christianity is a religion of the West, and for all practical purposes, only of the West.” He argues that what begins in the “sacred books” dealing with the “activities of Israelites and Jews,” and the “events of the New Testament… [which] took place in a Roman province in Asia Minor” had since become imbued with elements which Oliver regards as “peculiar” to “Aryans,” or “Indo-Europeans.” For Oliver this meant that Occidental Christianity, qualified as exclusive from Byzantine and other forms not belonging to “Indo-Europeans,” is neither a “Semitic cult” nor a
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“universal religion,” but a tradition that “embodied all the moral instincts of [his] race, such as … concepts of honor, of personal self-respect and integrity, of fair play, of pity for the unfortunate, of loyalty—all of which seem preposterous to other races.”\textsuperscript{45}

At this stage in his thought, Oliver describes Christianity as the exclusive heritage of the West and Western peoples and the glue of Western civilization. This is of course why in this essay he regards the loss of the Christian faith as the “West’s bond of union” as a “disaster,” resulting in “spiritual vacuum” and “catastrophe” that he traces to the Eighteenth Century intellectuals who in his view undermined traditional Western Christianity and propagated “weird superstitions of the self-styled philosophe,” as well as “Rousseau’s fantasies” of democracy.”\textsuperscript{46} For Oliver this transition merely “replaced faith in the unseen and empirically unverifiable with faith in the visibly and demonstrably false.”\textsuperscript{47}

Oliver can be read thus far as a defender of a certain traditionalism regarding a Western orthodoxy, as in the piece from \textit{National Review}, but there is something else to notice. Christianity was at one time a uniting force for the West, but is now diminished under corruption and can therefore no longer perform this vital function of uniting Western people under the common goal of European survival. After the initial description of a once useful Christianity of the West, Oliver immediately develops a critique of modern Christianity that mimics his assessment of Bishop Oxnam and Sztankay. The attack here is that modern universal and liberal Christianity has overcome the

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid, 6 & 17.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid, 51.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid, 58 & 60.
“traditional” Christianity of the West. Therefore he writes, “the Western world is no longer Christendom.”

The unreason he saw in the philosophes has become the “grotesque caricature of religion… now the dominant cult in the United States.” That is to say, the only Christianity left is the very Christianity he despises. He closes this essay by arguing that both “the God of Christendom and the reasoning mind of our race have been virtually obliterated by the peculiar system of voodoo called ‘Liberalism’.” He does not though give up on Christians. Oliver hopes that the “Christian minority that has thus far been the only defender of our race” will realize, as he puts it, that the West had protected itself “at Châlons, and at Tours, and at Vienna… not by book, bell, and candle, but by grace of the shining sword in a mailed fist directed by a dauntless heart.” Here the hope is not a return to faith in the sense he had described in the essay from National Review as definitive of so-called historical Christianity, but to a bellicose disposition toward non-Western peoples. Here Oliver’s references mark the violence inherent in how he imagines the defense of the West and of the white race, but it also marks the place of Christianity within what he regards as the higher moral calling of all “Western” peoples. Christianity can only be assessed positively by Oliver insofar as it serves the goal of white racial survival and the preservation of Western civilization through motivating violent defense thereof.
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This optimism about the chances for Christianity to again act as a unifying force for European peoples was however soon to be in serious doubt in Oliver’s estimation. In the postscript to this essay written in 1978, Oliver argues that in spite of the “small enclaves of Christians” who still hold to racialist ideals, the Church “is finished.”52 He decries how “leading holy men began slyly to substitute ‘Judeo-Christian’ for ‘Christian’,” causing what he describes as a regression away from the Christianity of the West to a “primitive ‘Christianity’ of the Nazarenes and Ebonites.”53 The numbers claiming salvation under the guidance of “Billy Graham and the many other big time salvation hucksters” are for him nothing other than evidence of decline, as people are called to “Jesus and the Jews”; a phenomenon he describes as “a particularly insidious and irrational form of occultism.”54

This acrimony for modern American Christianity is mingled with the harsh treatment of conservative and anti-Communist organizations that have in Oliver’s view abandoned race as the “only really crucial issue.” All the other concerns that these groups variously centralize, he argues, are simply “secondary, tertiary—mere epiphenomena.”55 Though he still clings in this postscript to a notion of a “historical Christianity” that was a benefit to the West, he has written off all modern Christianity as simply hucksterism, and even one that compels sympathy to Jews. His attachment to what he describes as rationality and the ‘Hauptmoral’ of racial protectionism is firmly established. In time, as we will see, this full rejection of modern Christianity will be projected back onto all
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Christianity as ultimately alien to all that the white race stands for and needs for its survival.

Oliver on Christianity Part II—From a Western Faith to an Alien Influence:

Oliver’s focused critique of a certain, recent, liberal Christianity demonstrated in the essays discussed above soon metastasizes into a full critique of Christianity as alien to the “instincts” of Western man. For Oliver the noble traits of “the Aryan” such as imagination and deep religious sentiment come into conflict with the “hard rationality”; something that he regards as peculiar to the white race. Even in his earlier essay “Christianity and the Survival of the West,” where we saw a sympathy for a form of mediaeval European Christianity, Oliver claims that the “thought-processes” which he says are peculiar to the “Indo-European,’ which he describes as “Western man’s innate need to know and master the physical world” that compel him to “demand that all the elements of a doctrine be logically consistent,” conflicted with the “alien elements” which Christianity had “latent in its sacred books and dogmas” imported from Asia Minor.\(^{56}\) However, at this stage in his thinking Christianity had been converted to the Aryan perspective, allowing it to make accommodations that transformed it into a European religion. It would not be long, however, before this position too would be reversed, and as he did with conservative thought Oliver would come to regard Christianity as an enemy of the white race.

In 1979, just one year after the postscript to “Christianity and the Survival of the West,” Oliver wrote an extensive review and response to Francis Parker Yockey’s *The Enemies of Europe*, the original manuscript produced in 1953, titled *The Enemies of Our*...  

\(^{56}\) Ibid, 27-8.
Enemies. In this essay his critique of Christianity sharpens significantly as he describes the Christianization of Europe as nothing less “the imposition of a Magian religion on a Faustian people” and that “modern Europe was, at its very beginning, infected by a Levantine religion.”\(^57\) This language of course comes from Oliver’s reading of both Oswald Spengler and F.P. Yockey, to whom he constantly refers throughout the essay. But in particular he marvels that neither Spengler nor Yockey say much about what he describes as a “startling pseudomorphosis, the imposition of a Magian religion on a Faustian people.”\(^58\) The basic point here, using Spengler’s language to describe how foreign elements that inhibit so-called natural development of a culture, is that Christianity had been the most significant factor inhibiting the might of the West and the full development of Western man’s racial instincts. According to Oliver, only Lawrence R. Brown, author of the neo-Spenglerian text *The Might of the West*, had remarked properly on what Oliver describes as an infection resulting from the infusion of Jewish thought via Christianity. Quoting directly from Brown’s text, Oliver argues that because of this infection and imposition the West had become “a society whose inward convictions have been at hopeless variance with the outward professions the events of history have forced it to make.”\(^59\)

Oliver also uses Brown’s conclusions to bolster his own that Christianity is at odds with the rational instincts of the Aryan. This “spiritual tension,” as Oliver calls it, has, as he quotes from Brown again, “destroyed the peace of mind of every able man in
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the West for a thousand years.” In a sense Oliver revisits his own thesis from 1969 and states that while “the Christianity of the West differed drastically from all the early Christian cults” it was nevertheless at complete odds with “the Faustian soul” as expressed in the classic literature of the West. Oliver argues, “even at its best… Christianity powerfully and, indeed, immeasurably distorted our culture.” Here, even historical Christianity, as he previously called it, is nothing but a distortion, an infection that inhibited the full flower of the West and therefore endangered the white race through alien ideological pollution.

By the time he writes *The Enemy of Our Enemies* in 1979 it is apparent that the anti-Semitism which drove Oliver’s rejection of American Conservatism is now informing his rejection of Christianity. This is most apparent in his 1980 essay “The Jews Love Christianity,” first published in the August edition of *Liberty Bell* under the pseudonym Ralph Perier. Oliver in his anonymity mounts his harshest critique of Christianity yet. “Our contemporaries,” he writes, “are coming to a radically new understanding of the Jewish problem” and “the forces that are today driving our race to suicide.” Referencing Nietzsche’s *Genealogy of Morals*, Oliver claims that key to this developing racial consciousness is the recognition that “Christianity was a Jewish invention, devised for the specific purpose of enfeebling and paralyzing the civilized peoples of the world, on whom the Jews were preying in antiquity and have preyed ever
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Christianity as described here is no longer the great unifier of the Occident adapted for the West by Indo-Europeans, nor is it an option for resistance in racial activism. Christianity is now for Oliver simply a “mental virus,” a “confusing and incoherent mythology.”

Oliver states that he does not try in this essay to summarize what he calls “the scandalous and scabrous history of Christianity,” which he says would “take a volume” to accomplish. He saves that task his posthumously published and incomplete work The Origins of Christianity. We will look at this work in a moment. Rather the present essay was designed to make a statement about Christianity as irredeemably Jewish and therefore detrimental to racial survival. A reading of Christian Identity appears again in the essay, but does not fare well under Oliver’s attack. Anti-Semitism in Christianity, in Oliver’s view, did not inoculate the race from the perceived infection of Jewishness. He confesses a “considerable sympathy” of the present manifestation of Christian anti-Semitism, calling such believers the “best of Christians,” as they “candidly recognize that the Jews as the eternal enemies of [the] race.” He compares them to the Marcionites, whom he argues “believed that the Jews were ‘the synagogue of Satan’,” and denied that Jesus was a Jew. He admires this in them, but this anti-Semitism did not recue them from what Oliver contends is a hopelessly flawed belief system that distorts their worldview.

He argues that “their doctrine is historically preposterous and, what is even worse,
In Oliver’s view, such a doctrine, with all its racialist intent and anti-Semitism, nevertheless makes these people “the accomplices and beneficiaries of the ferocious god, Yahweh.”

In this essay and hereafter in Oliver’s writing Christianity is signified as laden with the taint of Jewish origins that are imagined to have corrupted the European mind. He describes the “Church Fathers” curtly as a “knavish lot” of suspicious racial heritage, “probably Semites or descendants of one of the other Oriental peoples that swarmed into mongrelized Roman Empire and displaced or replaced the Romans.” For Oliver the Church history that he had previously defended as one that tells us how the Christianity became Western Christianity and in some sense redeemed from its Semitic history is rewritten as hopelessly tainted; an invention of “a motley crew of shysters, psychopaths, and other misfits.” The result in Oliver’s analysis was that the Church, as opposed to his former treatment of Christianity as the pillar of Occidental civilization transformed into something noble by the Faustian character, was that which “dominated and distorted the mind of [his] race for fifteen centuries—and continues to do so.”

It is noteworthy that Oliver wrote this essay under a pseudonym. One wonders if this signifies an unwillingness to openly disavow his former thesis and to possibly alienate those who might be allies in all respects apart from his perspective on Christianity, or perhaps he was concerned that he would face such criticism from other racialists that he would hurt the movement. As we will see in the final chapter, this
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concern is revisited in earnest by those in the North American New Right today. In fact “The Jews Love Christianity” elicited a critical response from a self-described leader of the Euro-American Alliance “Major” Donald V. Clerkin. In the August issue of Liberty Bell from the same year, Clerkin wrote an essay titled “A White Christian Defends his Faith,” Clerkin’s thesis is similar to Oliver’s in “Christianity and the Survival of the West”; that the Christianity, though “Magian-Semitic at its birth,” in the end “took on a Gothic physiognomy.” Oliver then replied, again under his nom de plume, in the November issue of Liberty Bell in an essay titled “Religion and Race,” retorting that “the question is a practical one,” that “we must ask what policy will best serve [the white] race.” Again the issue of efficacy in relation to white racial survival emerges in full. Oliver ends with a critique of what he regards as the universal love extended to non-whites compelled by Christianity as part and parcel of the danger inherent in Christianity. He then closes with the argument that while “the average Aryan flinches when he hears the word ‘Aryan’,” he “gabbles endlessly about ‘Christian charity’ and a ‘Christian duty’ to toil endlessly for the rest of the world”; a “madness” gotten by the “cancer of Christianity” that “has at last eaten into their brains.”

In Liberty Bell once again, one month after his reply to Clerkin, Oliver, under the byline “By an Observer in Hollywood,” wrote an article titled “The Old Actor and the
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Jews.”77 This essay is a critique of President Reagan, whom Oliver, as he did in the case of Buckley in retrospect, called a “kosher conservative.”78 At the beginning of this article, Oliver even draws a direct parallel between the older conservatism about which he initially became disillusioned to the Reagan election rhetoric as echoing “the same, tire old John Birch Society Slogans.”79 For Oliver, Reagan’s affiliations in Hollywood as an actor and his pro-Israel position was enough to condemn him, but the Republican convention spectacle where one could see, in Oliver’s words, “a nearly all-white crowd” clapping to the “rhythm of six negroes and negresses” playing “African blues,” and Benjamin Hooks of the NAACP, and the “Arch-Jew Henry Kissinger” were in attendance to speak to this crowd, was too much for him to countenance.80 As Oliver describes it, “this packaged product of Hollywood’s Jewish Moguls” was set to take the White House in thrall to Jewish interests, supported by Christian conservatives.81 He awaited the official inauguration with trepidation and alarm as “the Elders of Zion” now had “a Trojan Horse who (while mouthing patriotic clichés)” would “finish off” the freedoms and “take us into a nuclear Armageddon on behalf of the bastard state [Israel] to which [Reagan’s] maters owe their allegiance.”82 For Oliver, the “dream of resuscitating an etiolated religion” was just as illusory as that of holding onto patriotism or anti-Communism by voting for a conservative.83 In Reagan’s success with the help of the
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emerging Christian Right was further evidence of the failure of conservative politics and
the corruption of the Aryan mind wrought by Christianity.

In the posthumously published and unfinished manuscript titled *The Origins of
Christianity* Oliver tried to more completely develop his history of Christianity that he
alluded to in “The Jews Love Christianity.” This represents inn many ways Oliver’s final
word on the subject of Christianity and racial survival. In this work Oliver comes to the
point of his previously articulated attachment to rationality in his claim that the
“indisputable proof of the innately superior power of the European mind today is
atheism.”\(^{84}\) Here Oliver proposes to offer an “objective and dispassionate summary of the
problem” of the “relation of Christianity to Western Civilization” and the “internecine
hostility between members of the race which created that civilization,” which he
describes as the most vexing of the issues facing the race today.\(^{85}\) Oliver’s treatment
follows these lines, but does not offer much more than he did in “Why the Jews Love
Christianity” other than more historical data in the effort to support his conclusions about
Christianity’s detrimental impact on the white race. However, there are points that add to
our understanding of his acrimony toward what he formerly described as the glue of
Western civilization.

There are two points made in this later text that are only implied elsewhere in
Oliver’s work, and each of these relate directly to how Oliver imagines Christianity, and
in some sense all religions, as a threat to white racial survival. In chapter five, he argues
that the “spiritual mongrelization” that was the result of alien religious ideologies

\(^{84}\) Revilo P. Oliver, *The Origins of Christianity* (Earlysville, VA: Kevin Alfred Strom,
2002), 15.
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encountering the unique and superior Aryan peoples that “largely preceded and certainly facilitated the biological mongrelization.”

In this particular passage Oliver is not directly discussing Christianity but Dumézil’s hypothesis and the work of the race theorist and eugenicist Hans Friedrich Karl Günther to draw conclusions about the effects of such ideological mixtures. Oliver is clear that biological racial destruction through “miscegenation” has its roots in the influence of alien ideologies. It is clear that though he is talking about ancient India in this particular chapter, his ultimate target is the alien influence of Christianity and the biological threat it represents to the white race, as such histories offer for him insight into the “puzzling episodes” in the history of the white race.

Later in this unfinished work, Oliver goes on to describe religion as a “corrosive acid,” mostly referring to Christianity, that has come to dissolve “all the natural bonds of society, kinship, family, social status, race, and even government, and replaces them with the fractious and unnatural bond of unanimity and superstition.” For him though the cardinal sin of what he calls here the “Zoroastrian cult,” an obvious reference to Christianity, is that those who follow it “replace race with a church,” resulting in its becoming a “deadly racial poison,” the “bubonic plague of the mind and spirit” that has “sapped the vitality of our race for centuries and has now brought it to the point of death.” The point here is related of course to the previous one—Christianity is a biological threat to the white race. However in this case the threat has to do with the
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weakening of the instincts that provide the race with the adequate will to power to fight alien enemies and their ideologies. For Oliver these two threats ultimately point to a singular concern and an ultimate cause. The concern is racial survival and the cause is the alien influence of Christianity that serves as an ideological precedent for racial destruction through miscegenation and the weakening of the will to survive as a race, unmixed, because of the introduction to the European mind the alien fanaticisms and superstition that Oliver saw as inherent in Semitic religious thought. Christianity was now nothing more than ideological poison; a pathogenic threat to the survival of the white race.

Conclusion—Oliver’s Legacy:

After a long evolution of thought on religion Oliver concludes that the white race will only survive if it turns back to what he regards as a rationality that re-centers racial survival as the most important issue and highest ethic. This means for him that the race should become more inclined to atheism to get out of the rut of irrationality in which he thinks it is currently mired. This conclusion is found elsewhere, as with Tom Metzger, the founder of White Aryan Resistance or WAR, but most find religion of some kind or another, if it is so re-centered on race, to be useful, even necessary for white racial survival. The majority of the white nationalists discussed hereafter will take the later position, but Oliver nonetheless remains significant to the movement.

Apart from Robert Griffin’s testimony about Oliver’s place in the history of white nationalism, there is much else to establish Oliver as an important figure. His place in American Conservatism in the 1950s and 60s, however neglected, is established with
credentials possessed by few other individuals in the white nationalist milieu. His associations ran deep and broad, from Buckley and Welch, to Willis Carto and William Pierce. But the greatest indication of how important Oliver is for white nationalism today are the testimonies of his admirers and recent interest in publishing his works by Historical Review Press and Kevin Alfred Strom, formerly of National Alliance.

A testament to Oliver’s place in the birth of contemporary white nationalism comes from the introduction to America’s Decline, written by Sam G. Dickenson, a director of the Council of Conservative Citizens, an extension of the White Citizens Councils, and contributor to the periodical Occidental Quarterly. Dickenson refers to Oliver here as a “philosopher, leader, and participant” in “the racial nationalist movement.” In particular, Dickenson lauds Oliver for his description of nationhood as “an historical, cultural and racial community, not merely an agglomeration of individuals.” Here nationalism so defined transcends the state in a way that is certainly reflective of the shifts described by Kaplan and Weinberg, but is also an implicit critique of notions of America as an inclusive national entity comprised of a multitude of peoples. Here Oliver is both a source for racial nationalist thought and a symbol for anti-liberalism.

Oliver has also been lionized in presses and websites that still make available his work. Among the presses are Counter-Currents Publishing and, as mentioned, Historical Review Press, both of which facilitate of distribution of the works from neofascist and racialist works, holocaust denial, and so-called “radical Traditionalist” texts. Among the
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most significant of these is Counter-Currents Publications, which publishes North American New Right journal. In the final chapter I will discuss the North American New Right in much more detail, but here it is important to note that the most recent manifestation of racial nationalism in America—one that in many ways revisits Oliver’s earlier thinking about Christianity as a Western religion—has served as medium for some of Oliver’s essays and books. Greg Johnson, in a 2011 article that was meant to remember Oliver’s life and work, described him as a man of extraordinary erudition and “an avowed racial nationalist.”92 This is significant as it comes from not only the editor in chief of Counter-Currents Publishing, but the person who coined the term North American New Right.

Kevin Alfred Strom, who defines himself on his website as “a friend of the eminent American classicist and writer Revilo P. Oliver,” has developed an archive of Oliver’s works as well, including his correspondences.93 Strom also wrote the preface to the 2001 publication of The Origins of Christianity, in which he summarizes Oliver’s career and lists some of his important publications and associations. But more directly for our purposes here, Strom lauded Oliver as one who rightly judged that “one of the weaknesses of our nation and civilization was its religion,” and authorizes this unfinished work as Oliver’s “most important work.”94
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By the time Oliver took his own life in 1994, the racial nationalism that he was so significant in articulating in the late 1960s and 70s had been established as a complex movement comprising many separate groups and individual writers and ideologues. He had influenced William Pierce and corresponded with the doyen of the European New Right, Alain de Benoist. This, along with Oliver’s continued engagement with Yockey’s pan-Europeanism, as well as the later admiration of Oliver’s work, demonstrate both the trans-Atlantic influence on Oliver and early racial nationalism, but also his importance to the movement.

Oliver’s criticism of Christianity and conservative politics had become popular sentiment in the emerging white nationalist milieu during his lifetime. Like him, later racial nationalists saw conservatives as weak and ineffectual. Many would also see Christianity as a source of pollution to the racial psyche and therefore a threat to the future of the white race. Much about his views were shared by white nationalists after him, but where Oliver saw atheism as the only means to counter the infection of alien and anti-race ideology, others still held that religious alternatives to Christianity, ones that situated racial survival as the central ethical command and raison d’être, had a place in racial nationalism. In any case, as we will see in the coming chapters, Oliver’s position that Christianity was a problem for white racial survival continued to be a point of discussion for white nationalists. And as with Oliver, these white nationalists placed the survival of the race as the highest moral calling. All other concerns are subordinate; all that inhibits this calling is considered anathema.
Chapter 2: William Pierce and the Cosmotheist Critique of Christianity

These were no soft bellied conservative, business men assembled for some Masonic mumbojumbo;... no pious, frightened churchgoers whining for the guidance or protection of some anthropomorphic deity. These were real men, White men, men who were now one with me in spirit and consciousness as well as in blood... They are the vanguard of the coming New Era. – From The Turner Diaries

Introduction:

In the previous chapter we saw that Revilo Oliver’s rejection of Christianity emerged from the position that white racial survival is the central ethical cause and the highest calling of any Western man. For him this was expressed as a supposed rationality of racism as a biological and civilizational imperative and the only means for group survival. In his attachment to this particular ethical formulation Oliver was convinced of the inability of his former associates in conservative, anti-communist organizations to confront what he imagined as a the internal and external racialized threats. He likewise became convinced that Christianity was at least ineffectual, if not a direct danger. Finally Oliver condemned it, following Lawrence R. Brown’s argument, as an alien ideology that
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had perverted the racial instincts of Aryan man for the last 1,500 hundred years. Oliver wanted to emphasize what he considered the unique and superior rational capacities of the white race in a form of racist atheism to counter the devastating influence of Christianity on the white racial psyche and save it from biological extinction.

I also mentioned the connections between Revilo Oliver and William Pierce, the subject of this present chapter. As founder of the National Alliance and the author of the infamous *Turner Diaries*, Pierce was and continues to be one of the most important voices in white nationalism even after his death and the recent dissolution of his organization. The Southern poverty Law Center website describes him in its profile as “America’s most important neo-Nazi for some three decades until his death in 2002.”¹ Even across the Atlantic, racialist organizations like Juene Nation (Young Nation), based in France, have posted approving material discussing Pierce and his work, and his relationships with the Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands (the German National Democratic Party, or NDP) and other racial nationalist organizations abroad are well known.² And like Oliver, Pierce was memorialized on the Counter-Currents website by Greg Johnson who described him as an activist who gave up his academic career to
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“work full time on white racial preservation.”³ Further, there are numerous websites that make available Pierce’s writings and speeches. There is really no way to overstate Pierce’s importance to contemporary white nationalism.

Though Pierce is much better known, there were many similarities between him and Oliver. They were both of course singularly committed to white racial survival, and agreed that conservative politics and Christianity inhibited that goal. Oliver was more established in mainstream politics than Pierce ever was, but they held exactly the same opinion about the John Birch Society, of which Pierce was a one-time member. But on the issue of religion there was some daylight between their positions. While Oliver thought any form of religious “hocus pocus” was nothing more than a distraction, Pierce ventured into a mystical philosophical direction with what he called Cosmotheism. In Cosmotheism, William Pierce sought to articulate a specific religious alternative to Christianity for the purpose of white racial survival with accompanying claims of timeless authenticity for his new religion. Unlike Oliver, Pierce thought that there was some purpose yet in using religiosity in racialist activism.

In this chapter I will outline in brief William Pierce’s journey from the American Nazi Party and a brief membership in the John Birch Society to his founding of the National Alliance out of the ashes of the National Youth Alliance. As with the previous discussion of Oliver’s career, this is intended to contextualize Pierce’s thoughts on religion and his rejection of Christianity within a broader appreciation of his racial protectionist ideology. And as with my treatment of Oliver, I will discuss this through

close readings of Pierce’s writings to elucidate the content of his new religion as well as his specific critique of Christianity. In this chapter I argue that the rejection of Christianity as situated in Pierce’s description of Cosmotheism emerges from what I call an ideation of metaphysical racial embodiment, or the presumption of the embodiment of metaphysical evolutionary racial progress. In Cosmotheism, the struggle between races is not simply a biological fact, as it was with Oliver. It is transcendental meta-principle from which all reality must be interpreted and acted upon. Racial survival and advancement is a transcendent principle of the whole cosmos for the eventual elevation of the superior man to deity.

_Pierce’s Racial Activist Career:_

For Pierce, unlike Oliver, there is a comparative glut of information about him, the National Alliance, and especially about his writings. There is also some scholarship available on Cosmotheism in articles published mainly through journals on political science. The existence of such scholarship is not strange given the violence that surrounds his name, especially in relation to the bombing of the federal building in Oklahoma in 1995 and the activities of a terrorist organization known as The Order, or the Brüders Schweigen, founded by an admirer of Pierce named Robert Matthews.\(^4\)

Further, much of his biographical data is easily found.

Dr. William Luther Pierce obtained a Ph.D. from the University of Colorado and taken the position of assistant professor at Oregon State University teaching Physics from
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1962-1965, and he also worked for a time in aerospace at Pratt and Whitney.⁵ But at each turn his interests were directed toward racial activism. While at Oregon State he joined the John Birch Society, originally, as he tells Robert Griffin, he joined the JBS because he felt that they were “at least anticommunist.”⁶ But like Oliver he soon left because, according to Brad Whitsel, he came to feel it was “too passive” to appropriately deal with the race problem.⁷ Griffin, Pierce’s biographer, records Pierce’s comments as follows:

I found they weren’t really willing to deal with some of the issues I saw as important. They were against the civil rights revolution, but they weren’t willing to deal with it on a racial basis… It’s true that communism was an important part of the civil rights movement; the communists did latch onto it. But the fundamental significance of the civil rights activity was racial not political.⁸

Pierce’s main objections to the JBS were that they were too passive and that they would not centralize race in a way that he wanted, much like Oliver’s. We also see here the common refrain against conservatives by white nationalists that they were shown to be impotent in the face of desegregation. Pierce would later address both of these perceived shortcomings in founding the National Alliance where passivity was certainly not entertained and race was the primary organizational principle.

Oliver soon left Oregon and his academic career and moved to Connecticut where he took a job in the aerospace industry. While working there he became associated with the American Nazi Party (ANP) under “Commander” George Lincoln Rockwell, and
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became in short order the editor of the party’s periodical *National Socialist World.*

During his time with Rockwell’s organization, Pierce came to be one of Rockwell’s closest advisors. Pierce found in Rockwell a fellow traveler in the opinion that the central issues around which to form organizational activism were race and so-called Jewish communism. Rockwell sought to not only expose communism and liberalism as thoroughly Jewish, but to argue that any society was only rationally founded on the assumed biological realities of race. There is no doubt the ANP and Rockwell appealed to Pierce because of this focus on race and that they were not given to passivity. Rockwell wrote in his autobiography, *This Time the World:*

> Finally, we declare our intention of utterly destroying all individuals, OF WHATEVER RACE [*sic*], who are guilty of organizing, planning, or carrying out the criminal Communist conspiracy and mutiny against humanity and the laws of Nature. We recognize a great proportion of Jews have been, and are the leaders of this criminal Bolshevik mutiny and conspiracy against the race of humanity and will not shrink from the task of utterly destroying such poisonous human bacteria.

Pierce’s affiliation with Rockwell however came to a definitive end with Rockwell’s assassination by a disgruntled member of the American Nazi Party at an Arlington, Virginia strip mall on August 25, 1967. But things were tending toward a break in the organization even before this event. The night before the his assignation, according to Rockwell biographer Fredrick Simonelli, Pierce and Matt Koehl had an “acrimonious showdown” with Rockwell, which led to early suspicions that they had
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something to do with the assassination. That of course was not the case. 29 year old John Palter was eventually convicted in a Virginia commonwealth court for the murder. Pierce then found his way to the National Youth Alliance after a brief affiliation with Koehl’s National Socialist White People’s Party (NSWP).

However, during his time with the ANP Pierce became very active in publishing, something that would remain a mainstay of his activities. In *National Socialist World*, as Pierce recalls to Griffin, there was cooperation between Pierce’s academic pursuit of writings on race and the political mission of the ANP. In connection with these interests Pierce sought to publish a condensed version of Savitri Devi’s *The Lighting and the Sun* in the party’s paper. This was a significant work by one of the most important articulators of occult National Socialism in the post-war period, and it is significant that Pierce took the initiative to distribute it. Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke summarizes Devi’s work as “an elaborated and extraordinary synthesis of Hindu religion and Nordic racial ideology” wherein Devi identifies Adolf Hitler as an “avatar of Vishnu” and an Aryan savior. Goodrick-Clarke goes on to notice that her position as a “leading light of the international neo-Nazi underground” and had become influential in the racial activism of Rockwell and Pierce. But it was Pierce who would become more interested in Devi’s ideas.
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In the pages of *National Socialist World*, in addition to reproducing her work, Devi was described as possessing “mysterious and unfailing wisdom” which was the “basis of a practical regeneration policy of worldwide scope.” Such a basis for racial activism was indeed what Pierce had been looking for, and he claims not only to have made editorial decisions regarding these printings, but to have hatched the idea on his own and proposed it to Rockwell. We will discuss Devi and her writings in more detail in chapter five, but is enough now to say that she was a great influence on Pierce and other white nationalists in America. The significance of her publication under Pierce’s charge according to Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke was that it “represented [Devi’s] literary debut in international neo-Nazi circles” and brought to a broader readership her ideas about “National Socialism as a religion of nature, the Hindu cycle of the ages, and Hitler’s world significance as an avatar.” Apart from the fact that Pierce played a significant role in making Devi’s works available in the U.S., this early concentration by Pierce points to his long-held interest in the kind of racial metaphysics that came to distinguish his position on religion from Oliver’s and undoubtedly help him formulate Cosmotheist doctrines.

After his involvement with ANP, Pierce became an advisor for the National Youth Alliance (NYA) and a close associate of another disaffected racialist defector from the John Birch Society and founder of the Francis parker Yockey Society, Lou Byers.

The NYA had begun in 1968 as a specific response to leftist campus activities and
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perceived communist agitation.\textsuperscript{23} The organization grew from the Youth for Wallace organization that was headed by Willis Carto, described by George Michael as “the central figure in the post-World War II American far right.”\textsuperscript{24} Within the group, however, there were tensions between various interested parties, some of whom wanted to take the NYA in a more Yockey inspired direction, namely Byers, and Carto. During this time Pierce borrowed 2,000 dollars from Lou Byers to start the periodical called \textit{Attack!}.\textsuperscript{25} This was the official publication of the National Youth Alliance, and therefore not exclusively the expression of Pierce’s opinions. However, \textit{Attack!} later became the outlet for the first publications of the serialization of \textit{The Turner Diaries} and foundation for his own publication called \textit{National Vanguard}.\textsuperscript{26}

Pierce’s bid at leadership among the extreme right in America began as the NYA was failing. The disruptions and infighting within the NYA lead to serious dysfunction, and Pierce was able to steer the remnants into his control. According to Leonard Zeskind in his history of the white nationalism, \textit{Blood and Politics}, Pierce had sought to put himself in leadership and that his rise was no mere happenstance.\textsuperscript{27} By the time the dust had settled from the skirmishes, William Pierce was firmly established as the leader of the NYA.\textsuperscript{28} Finally, in 1974 Pierce confirmed the demise of the National Youth Alliance and announced the beginning of National Alliance, modeling the entire structure of this
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new organization on his own ideas adapted from his previous associations among the American right. 29 More often than not, however, this meant taking his criticisms of these movements and forming one that he felt would not have the same vulnerabilities. What is more, his organization had a spiritual message.

Clearly affected by his previous experience in failed right-wing organizations, Pierce argued for the need for “a new revolutionary force, with the spiritual basis that conservatism lacks, and advancing with even more boldness and determination than the forces of the Left.” 30 The goals of the newly formed National Alliance were broader than its predecessor. While the National Youth Alliance was, as the title suggests, a youth organization primarily founded to counter left-wing activities on college campuses, National Alliance’s scope was truly global and was meant to reach anyone of European descent, anywhere they might live. 31 National Alliance’s goals were formulated in relation to Pierce’s experiences with conservative, anti-communist, and right-wing organizations and what described as their failures and oversights. 32

In an important talk given in 1976 titled “Our Cause,” Pierce distinguishes his organization in contrast to the “mental pigeon holes” so important to the JBS and other anti-Communist groups. Pierce stated in this that the National Alliance “is either a conservative or right-wing group,” here drawing a clear distinction between his new
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organization and the conservatives that he, like Oliver, despised. According to Pierce in this talk, National Alliance would be something new in America and far more effective for the purposes of racial survival. For Pierce, as for Oliver, the problem with the John Birch Society and American conservatism at large was that it ignored race in favor of anticomunism, touted individualism over collective racial survival, and ignored what Pierce and Oliver imagined to be a Jewish conspiracy against the white race. And, also like Oliver, Pierce did not regard the restoration of the American Constitution as a positive goal. “The Constitution… served a certain purpose well for a time,” argues Pierce, “[b]ut that time has now passed.”

Pierce regularly described National Alliance as a vanguard organization. In his inaugural talk he spoke of National Alliance as “the beginning… of a mighty army whose task is… to conquer an entire world.” National Alliance, as he says in another place, was designed to recruit the best of the white race into an elite organization and to mobilize them for the task of “freeing” them “from the alien influences” that he thought were destroying the white race, and to provide “healthy and constructive influences” with the goal of providing for the “survival and progress” of European peoples. According to Robert Griffin, Pierce had intimated to him that National Alliance was analogous in some ways to the British National Party or the National Democratic Party in Germany, focusing on racial nationalism as a political platform and shunning populism,
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libertarianism, or other platforms. However, the main activity of National Alliance according to Pierce was educational in nature, focusing on “communication with the public” to counter the “controlled news and entertainment media,” political parties and government, public schools and universities, labor and trade unions, and “virtually every mainstream Christian church.” Nearly everything in the mainstream of American culture, even Christian right and the more libertarian and Laissez-faire right, was considered counter to everything Pierce and his new organization stood for.

Pierce wasted no time in promoting his organization through print and by other means. He immediately took to publishing, and in 1975 began the serialization of what eventually became The Turner Diaries. In that same year Pierce began to hold weekly Sunday night meetings for Alliance members during which he would show films and give talks. He subsequently began to publish National Vanguard, which took the place of Attack! in 1978. In 1987 Pierce advanced his publishing activities when he formed Vanguard Books through which he publish and distribute materials such as Devi’s translated works and William Gayley Simpson’s anti-Semitic Spenglerian reflection, Which Way Western Man. In 1991 Pierce took another step in marketing National Alliance and his ideas when he started American Dissident Voices to broadcast his
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messages on a weekly radio show. In due time National Alliance made an appearance on the web with natvan.com.

In addition to these publishing and speaking engagements and internet radio broadcasts, National Alliance set itself to purchase a music label called Resistance Records to further its outreach agenda. The label first emerged out of the skinhead music scene in the early 1990s, but a raid on the Michigan headquarters on tax charges in 1997 the properties were sold off. After passing through the hands of Pierce’s one-time opponent in the NYA, Willis Carto, and former Republican official and Reagan White House staffer, Todd Blodgett, William Pierce picked up the label. Pierce later described the music promoted through Resistance Records as a counter to both the alien influences of mainstream music as well as what he called the “satanic” and “nihilistic music” of Black Metal and Death Metal. The music from Pierce’s label would in his estimation play an “important role in [a] quest for roots, community, and meaning.” And as has been done through the National Alliance website, which was at one time available in 15 European languages, Pierce through Resistance Records obtained an international reach. According to a 2001 Time article, Resistance Records acquired a Swedish label, Nordland Records in 1999 and was able to establish markets in Greece, France, Italy, Poland and even Serbia, and bringing in revenue of $1.5 million annually.
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These various activities emerged from the self-imposed imperative to recruit quality people who Pierce imagined lead the resistance to preserve the white race. Now, while there can be no doubt that organization was highly important for what Pierce wanted to do. But the principles that guided his vision and rationalized his efforts in recruitment were articulated through his metaphysical racial philosophy described in Cosmotheism. Robert Griffin states that Pierce’s motivation for the creating Cosmotheism was to provide “the spiritual basis” for the direction National Alliance that Pierce always felt should be at the heart of any racialist organization.\(^{49}\) It is therefore not too much to say that the survival of the white race for Pierce was hinged not just on rational action as with Oliver, but on the apprehension of the concepts articulated in his religion that should be enacted through rightly guided, organized activism.

**Cosmotheism—Engendering a Racial Consciousness:**

Pierce had disclosed the first basic doctrines of his religion in the 1977 pamphlet called *The Path*, and in a talk titled “Cosmotheism—Wave of the Future” given that same year. Later Pierce produced the second and third pamphlets in the trilogy: *On Living Things* in 1979, and *On Society* in 1984.\(^{50}\) But this focus on spirituality, to use a term that approximates his own, was not new for Pierce. Since the 1960’s, during his brief involvement with the National Socialist White People’s Party, Pierce wrote about the importance of a spiritual basis of National Socialism.\(^{51}\) When Pierce formed National Alliance he said that it was his “first and foremost task” to help the white race “make …
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As early as 1976, two years after the founding of National Alliance, Pierce mentions one of the foundational elements of Cosmotheism in relation to the political activity of National Alliance—that the white race was imbued with an “upward surge, [a] divine spark” in an evolutionary scheme that forms the “spiritual basis for [his] political work.”

Cosmotheism must not be imagined as simply an addendum to the political program of National Alliance, but the central and essential formative ideology for Pierce as he molded National Alliance. Further, the importance of the Cosmotheist Community is delineated in an August, 1984 article in *National Vanguard*, titled “A Program for Our Survival.” In this article Pierce describes a three-part plan in which appealing to people on a “spiritual level” is significantly important. Additionally, “community building” is identified as important as it is to provide a “reservoir” for the “physical and spiritual basis for a rebirth of civilization” from which will emerge the men and women to “act when the time comes.”

Grounded in the principles of Cosmotheism, National Alliance was to be the group that would “create an environment more under our control… [to] live with people who share our values and raise our kids in that sort of setting.” And the Cosmotheist Community within National Alliance was to become the “concrete embodiment” of the ideas formulated in these meetings and described in the pamphlets, as well as a place of spiritual support for the political and educational activities of
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National Alliance.\textsuperscript{56} As Brad Whitsel has rightly noticed, the beliefs of the Cosmotheist Community and National Alliance are composed around a “single, great truth” which provides “the community with a spiritual understanding of its mission.”\textsuperscript{57} It is therefore impossible to understand Pierce’s vision without understanding Cosmotheism.\textsuperscript{58}

To understand the content of Cosmotheism and the accompanying critique of Christianity articulated by Pierce one must engage with a long career of public speaking and writing. Such works include of course the \textit{Cosmotheism Trilogy}, sometimes referred to by later adherents as “The Holy Books of Cosmotheism,” which is simply a compilation of the three tracts written from 1977 to 1984. Additionally, Pierce’s fictional works, \textit{The Turner Diaries} and \textit{Hunter}, contain significant insights into Cosmotheist teachings as well. There are other essays that reveal other detail of Pierce’s thought on religion and on Christianity more particularly. For example, a 1982 article from \textit{National Vanguard} titled “On Christianity” directly confronts Christianity in a way that Pierce had previously avoided. We will see that there is some overlap with Oliver’s reasons for rejecting Christianity—its foreignness, its enfeebling effects on the mind of Aryan man, its inability to provide a platform for racial survival. However, as Pierce articulated his critique through Cosmotheist principles, there are some elements particular to him. We will return to this in a moment, but it is prudent to proceed first by describing Cosmotheism.
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The best place to begin is the 1977 talk titled “Cosmotheism—Wave of the Future.” Here Pierce summarizes the content of and forthcoming publications related to Cosmotheism and how his doctrine relates to various specific issues in race and politics. He had already printed his first pamphlet in the Cosmotheism series, The Path, and refers to it in the talk. From this talk we get a thorough summary of this new religion. The first point to mention about Cosmotheism is that Pierce understands it as communitarian in nature. He states in the beginning of this talk that The Path exists as a guide for the community and as a recruitment tool, and that it represents the most fundamental “essence” of Cosmotheism. He further delineates the strategy of incremental disclosure of Cosmotheist doctrine based on assessments of individual capacity to appreciate and apprehend the message. Pierce here presents Cosmotheist thought within a dichotomy between what he describes as “fundamental” versus that which is “derived.” The first point obviously addresses much of what has already been discussed in relation to the place of Cosmotheism in the organizational strategy of National Alliance. But the second point of this division of principles begins to refocus our attention to the metaphysics of Pierce’s thought as well as why he ultimately finds conflict with Christianity.

Cosmotheists, argues Pierce in this talk, are not people who are “primarily” concerned with race, politics, culture, or economics, but with “fulfilling their mission as bearers of the Creator’s purpose; as agents of the universal Will.” Pierce continually affirms the primacy of spiritual principles over politics and race as a first principle. He tells the audience that this distinguishes his attitude from others in racial activist milieu as
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he and his organization doesn’t “put the cart before the horse.” Referring to his new organization, Pierce states, “we alone are working for ultimate things, for eternal things, for infinite things; and we must never forget that.” This demonstrates a general elitism inherent in Pierce’s thought, though complicated by his later acquisition and activities through Resistance Records; but also emphasizes the often overlooked primacy of metaphysics in Pierce’s approach.

Pierce goes on to lament that *The Path*, in spite of its central importance in describing the basic truths of Cosmotheist teachings, was too esoteric for many people to understand it properly. As we will see in the next chapter this is a source of contention between Pierce and his contemporary and fellow racialist organizer, Ben Klassen. For Klassen Pierce’s doctrine was too esoteric, while Pierce felt that Klassen’s organization attracted too many unintelligent people who shamed the broader movement. While Pierce is certain that much more explanation would be needed for his teachings to be clear, he felt the message for Cosmotheism was for everyone, and that its principles are universally applicable. But still he also worried about the danger of misinterpretation of this doctrine. In particular Pierce is concerned to not allow what is essentially a hierarchical pantheism to be defined as egalitarian in any way. That is to say that Cosmotheist pantheism does not indicate co-equality among races of men, for which he is deeply critical of Christianity. While he affirms that “we are all parts of the whole,” and that each particular thing “plays in the creator’s purpose” and all things “share in the creator’s divine nature,” Pierce clearly qualifies this belonging along a racially stratified scheme. He goes on to say, “we are brothers to the blacks, but in the same sense we are brothers to
the rattlesnakes, the sea urchins, to crabgrass, and even to every stone and clump of dirt.” For Pierce these differences, though ignored in other interpretations of pantheism in his estimation, “are as essential a part of the one reality as is the unity of all things, because it is a dynamic reality, an evolving reality.” But for him relation does not obviate hierarchy and order, of which he esteems the best of the white race as the supreme representatives of that ordered hierarchy.

Pierce’s pantheism is therefore qualified by difference in “things” within a metaphysical hierarchy of embodied states of being. This situates the importance of race in Cosmotheist thought as both a “derived” concept and one that positions derivation along the lines of a governing order metaphysical principle. One can see certainly that there are some commonalities between Christian Identity teachings in which race is imagined as part of God’s plan, but there are some significant differences. The first and perhaps most obvious is that in Cosmotheism there is no personal god, but rather a metaphysical principle that is constantly generating and evolving. Only in this sense is there a creator.

Second, Pierce goes on to argue that Cosmotheism is not a teaching that is passed down via tradition as much as it is imagined to be a racial impulse within the consciousness of European man. Pierce claims that one can find “partial expression” of Cosmotheist truth in the “writing of the ancients, twenty-five centuries ago,” among the “pagan philosophers of northern Europe,” and among “certain outstanding Christian thinkers of the Middle Ages, despite the fundamental contradictions of Cosmotheism with the teachings of the Church.” He even recognizes this tendency in the works of some
modern philosophers such as Fichte and Hegel. And for Pierce the romanticism of the 19th Century and scientific discoveries in the 20th Century signaled a return of these principles in the face of the diminishment of Christianity in public life, which he thought demonstrated that a “Cosmotheist thread that runs through the spiritual and intellectual history” of the white race.

The unique giftedness of the white race according to Pierce is also demonstrated in the aesthetics of romanticist art, as it was thought to typify the Cosmotheist notion of beauty and feeling, as well as the supposedly unique emotive capacity of European peoples. Of course this part is not at all far from what Oliver proposed in his writings, but rather than seeing this feeling as a detriment in a cold modern world of Malthusian conflict, as Oliver did, it was for Pierce a sign of the innate spiritual superiority of the white race that could be tapped into for racial advancement and survival. For Pierce the rationality of so-called Western science and romanticism potentially live harmoniously in the “race-soul” of the European, further demonstrating that Cosmotheist truth is always present within the racial social body.

In this way Cosmotheist truth is constructed as timeless, yet dormant in the face of suppression, but now allowed to emerge in the face of the advancement of scientific discoveries that both challenge Christianity and make more accessible physical truths that are alleged to point racialized metaphysical principles. Cosmotheism, Pierce proclaimed, “is an idea whose time has come” in the “confluence” of events that has produced such supposed evidence and conditions. Signal for him was the shift from what he describes as a “static of the universe to a dynamic view” most importantly influenced by Charles
Darwin; the shift from the “Medieval view of the world as a finished creation” to one that sees the world undergoing a “continuous, and unfinished process of creation.” This of course already juxtaposes Cosmotheism with Christian teaching, but the differences become more pronounced as he continues in this talk.

The pantheism of past thinkers, argues Pierce, was hindered by a static view of the universe, the blame for which Pierce locates especially in the teachings of the Christian church. Pierce argues that “Church doctrine… is fundamentally opposed to our [Cosmotheist] truth.” For him this meant that the domination of Christianity over the “intellectual life of the West” was a detriment form the start and could be nothing else. For Pierce Christianity’s presence in the West did not lead to enlightenment, but rather held creative spiritual capacities of Western man captive to a corrupting and alien ideology. Pierce illustrates this last point in a brief engagement with Meister Eckhart. Since the Church was “opposed to Cosmotheism on fundamental grounds,” argues Pierce, people like him were the object of persecution. In Pierce’s narrative the opposition to Eckhart by the Church, the charges of heresy were not leveled at him because he had denied the virgin birth or the divinity of Christ but because of his “deepest philosophical writings” that expounded Cosmotheist principles. That is to say, in this narrative when the Church recognized the general pantheism and therefore the thread of Cosmotheism in his work Eckhart was attacked by this inhibitive institution. However, in the wake of the decline of the Church, however, another enemy has taken its place: liberalism. Unlike Christianity, “liberalism” for Pierce is not “derived from any fundamental philosophy,” but is simply a “disease of the soul.” What now stands in
opposition to Cosmotheist truth is “peer pressure” from spiritually diseased liberals. He does not specify a lineage of liberalism from Christianity, as Oliver did, but it is clear that he sees them both as opposed to and inhibitive of Cosmotheism, and therefore dangerous.

Immediately after this delineation of the two historical enemies of Cosmotheism in his talk, Pierce then does a comparative analysis on how it differs from other religions, including what he calls the “purely subjective religions of the East.” But he also sets it in opposition to “the pure rationalism” in the uses of science uninformed by Cosmotheism. Pierce highlights a significant difference between “revealed religions” that are subject to radical departures from previous understandings by the word of a prophet or visionary and his eternal principle. Contrasted to the “Maharaji [sic]” and other “Yogas [sic]” the Cosmotheist cannot “get away with babbling whatever nonsense enters one’s head.” And unlike the “purely rational” sciences, one’s “observations of the universe” do not dominate the conclusions a Cosmotheist comes to. Knowledge for this person also “comes from the soul.” Because of this, argues Pierce, “everyone who shares the same race-soul, the same genes” will “naturally gravitate” toward a “similar truth.” This is why Pierce argues one “can find a Cosmotheist thread running the entire length of Western European spiritual history.” And referencing language from The Path he describes this knowledge as “the perfect union of the Creator’s imminent consciousness in man with man’s reason,” as truth “comes to us through a blending of the universal consciousness and our race-soul, in our genes, with our reason.”

Cosmotheism is described in this talk as immanent and powerful, residing in the genes and race-consciousness of western man. But it is also imperiled by the presence of
Christianity and liberalism, which inhibit its expression. Pierce reiterates the danger of the pressures of “going along with the herd” which he related to his understanding of liberalism. But he also mentions an additional threat coming from “the Jew,” whom he imagines sets out to deliberately subvert the Cosmotheist message. As we saw with Brown and Oliver, Pierce also regards “the Jew” as having “a different race-soul” than those of the white race. The danger he sees from this imagined agent is one of infiltration in that Jews have played a “significant role” in the “intellectual history of the West” and in modern science. Pierce argues that “the Talmud is the typical expression of the Jewish race-soul,” but that some have “seen the Cosmotheist truth underlying modern science” and then proceeded to corrupt this truth and provide a perverse interpretation. The prime example Pierce constructs for this narrative is Baruch Spinoza, whom he describes as “one of the foremost founders of pantheism in the 17th Century.” Pierce emphasizes however that “because Spinoza was a Jew he couldn’t help but give [his pantheism] a Jewish flavor.” For Pierce, race determined one’s interpretation of everything, even when one could glimpse the Cosmotheist truth that Pierce proclaims in this talk.

Pierce ends this talk with a way to avoid the dangers and abounding “ulterior motives” of others—clearly a reference to his general conspiratorial narrative of Jewish machinations that threaten to corrupt and destroy the white race. He states that the only way to avoid these dangers is to “give concrete form to our truth.” For him this concretization of the principles of Cosmotheism is carried out in the pamphleteering and talks, but also, and perhaps more importantly for him at this point, to make an effort to “embody [the] particulars—ethics, racial policy, social policy, and all the rest—in a
living, growing community of consciousness and blood.” Again, the Cosmotheist Community must be thought of as more than an afterthought or a cover for the ‘real’ political agenda of National Alliance. Rather we must see National Alliance as the embodiment in political form of the spiritual agenda defined in Cosmotheism and opposed to liberalism and Christianity.

This line of reasoning continues from the 1977 talk to the pamphlets. In *The Path* he called for the reader to put their “life into the service of Cosmic Truth”, and to “cast off alien ways,” which we know from the talk includes Christianity. In *On Living Things* he emphasizes again the evolutionary metaphysical hierarchy of being with an emphasis on distinction between races and within them. Pierce writes that this leads us “to an understanding of the significance and value of all living things: of the variety of animals, of the races of men, and the varying qualities of individual men.” In this schema, men are “ranked in value” in that there are those “with Divine Consciousness… those who walk the Path of Life with sure foresight” and those who do not. This divine consciousness according to Pierce marks the superiority of the white race above all other species of being is therefore the characteristic that defines the divisions within the white race marking out those whom he regards as fit for his vanguard organization.

*The Path* concludes with the specifics of the “stock from which arise the awakened ones,” but Pierce then turns to the principles that relate to society. Here the embodiment principle takes its most specific articulation as Pierce’s focus begins to shift
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to the organization of the Cosmotheist Community discussed in the final pamphlet in the series, *On Society*. Pierce identifies four qualities that “serve the Creator’s Purpose, combining true reason with immanent consciousness in the advancement of his stock along The Path of Life.” These are the “Divine Spark,” “the strength of his true reason,” the “strength of his true character,” and the “constitution of his body” which allows one to “act in accord with the urgings of his race-soul.”64 The person thus guided is imagined by Pierce as one who “shall guide the progress of his stock from generation to generation,” one who “shall do all these things in full consciousness of his identity as the substance of the Creator and the agent of the Creator’s Purpose.”65 Along with the impetus to preserve the white race here we have the added measure of authenticity in relation to an imagined “race-soul” as an element of how that preservation would be accomplished and what it would be to be preserved.

In *On Society*, this notion of communal embodiment of metaphysical principles militates against the “other-worldliness” of other doctrines, a principle emphasized also in the *Membership Manual* of National Alliance.66 This meant that Cosmotheism could not abide Christian doctrines, even ones emerging from Christian Identity circles. This was certainly apparent in the 1977 talk, but is also expressed in Pierce’s well-known work of fiction, *The Turner Diaries*. Though there is no clear reference to Pierce’s religion in the book by name, one can easily see Cosmotheist principles spoken through the novel’s protagonist. For example, when discussing the recruits for the “Order,” the
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guerilla warfare unit to which the narrator belongs, Earl Turner laments that although that new recruits come from a “great deal of basically sound human stock left in this country,” while most were corrupted by “the instilling of an alien ideology and an alien set of values in a people disoriented by an unnatural and spiritually unhealthy lifestyle.”  

While these lines may be regarded as descriptive of liberalism, and certainly liberalism is implicated; but I think the main target is Christianity given the reference to spirituality. This seems a particularly strong reading of the passage if we read it with an earlier one in which Earl Turner describes the “Jewish takeover of the Christian churches” and the now “virtually complete” corruption of the ministry which resulted from it.  

The assault is indirect here, though the implication is clear—Christianity is vulnerable to Jewish influence and ultimately detrimental to the white race in its struggle against the Jew.  

At the conclusion of the text we get the starkest contrast between the Cosmotheist Übermensch of Pierce’s imagination and all others, including Christians. This passage reads:

Knowing full what was demanded in character and commitment of each man who stood before me, my chest swelled with pride. These were no soft bellied conservative, business men assembled for some Masonic mumbo-jumbo; no loudmouthed, beery red-necks letting of a little ritualized steam about ‘goddam niggers’: no pious, frightened churchgoers whining for the guidance or protection of some anthropomorphic deity. These were real men, White men, men who were now one with me in spirit and consciousness as well as in blood… They are the vanguard of the coming New Era.  

The Cosmotheism described in 1977 and in the pamphlets is presented in its most revolutionary form in the passage above. This is a literary expression of the Cosmotheist
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ideal of white manhood as it is juxtaposed to liberalism, conservatism, and Christian doctrines. Here the metaphysical embodiment principle takes its form in the fantasy of white racial revolution in the face of the destruction of the white race. The only way that the race survives in this tale is the full embodiment and implementation of the very principles that defined Pierce’s religion and organization.

In *Hunter*, the second novel written by Pierce, the basic teachings of Cosmotheism are discussed very early in the book in narration of Oscar Yeager’s formative experiences with black soldiers and Vietnamese he knew while serving in Vietnam. The narrator tells us that Oscar “did not hate” them but came to realize that they were “races apart,” that there were “innate differences” between the races that were “products of race-souls totally alien to his own,” which realization then “gave him a greater sense of racial self-awareness.” Awareness of the so-called truth of the racial order of things brings an awareness of his true self from which he may properly act in the world. Like Earl Turner, Oscar Yeager sought to take on the “System” through violence; in this case through targeted shootings in a lone-wolf fashion of alleged racial enemies. It is significant that Pierce, again under the pseudonym Andrew MacDonald, approvingly fictionalized the actual crimes of the recently executed killer Joseph Paul Franklin in this novel. In spite of his numerous protests that his fiction is simply that, there are numerous ties to real acts of racial terrorism and violence that he describes in his novels as expressions of racial awareness and a means to fight the powers that subvert the cause of white racial survival.
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As in The Turner Diaries, the Christian churches are imagined in Hunter as “easily the most vociferous boosters of race-mixing,” the primary sin of Cosmotheist doctrines.\footnote{Ibid, 31.} And, perhaps more sternly than in The Turner Diaries, Christianity is denounced as corrupt and insufficient for racial survival. It is described as “a religion of equality, weakness, of regression and decay, of surrender and submission, of oblivion.”\footnote{Ibid, 75.} Pierce therefore writes, “If our race survives the next century it will only be because we have gotten the monkey of Christianity off our backs and have found our way back to a genuinely Western spirituality again.”\footnote{Ibid.} Of course in this case the author intends to point to something more authentic than medieval Christianity. Pierce means to point past this perceived layer of alien ideology to that more fundamental and authentic spirituality that he defines in Cosmotheism; a spirituality that will enable the white race to preserve itself. As we will see in more detail in a moment, this is the basis for Pierce’s critique of Christianity.

**Summarizing the Cosmotheist Critique of Christianity:**

The Cosmotheist critique of Christianity is easy to understand at this point. Christianity is for Pierce inhibitive of the goal of white racial survival, which he imagines as the primary purpose of all truly aware and rational white people. This is of course expressed in the excerpts from his novels described above. In this sense Pierce’s critique is not too dissimilar to Oliver’s. Christianity is too soft, too complicit in “race-mixing,” and too infiltrated by Jews and their interests to save the white race. However Pierce was firmly committed to a racialist form of spirituality that Oliver rejected outright. While
Oliver always avoided anything that smacked of “hocus-pocus,” as he was fond of saying. Pierce, inspired as he was by the racial occultism of Devi re-imagined the key to racial survival as embedded in a metaphysics of racial chauvinism. Pierce attempted to organize all racially conscious people into a “Community of Divine Consciousness is the Community of the Awakened, the Community of the Climbers of the Path, the Community of the People of the Rune of Life, the Community of the Ordained Ones.” And this community would apply discipline to “serve the Creator’s purpose.” These “Ordained Ones” are placed in stark contrast to those who serve “in the old way… the way of the sub-man,” those in the Cosmotheist Community serve “the way of the higher man, the way of true reason.” In this way they, through service, “resume the never-ending ascent toward their destiny, which is Godhood.”

We can see clearly from the quote above that quite unlike Oliver, Pierce placed Christianity in opposition to not only a materialistic view of race as a supposed biological fact with social consequences, but more importantly to a metaphysical principle that he thought governed the bio-social realities of race. That is to say, as I proposed at the beginning of this chapter, that for Pierce the rejection of any kind of Christianity was tied to his new religion. Cosmotheism then is both the articulation against Christianity and ultimately the solution to the problem of white racial survival. Here, however, I will focus on the Cosmotheist critique of Christianity as it was most succinctly expressed in the 1982 article “On Christianity.”
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In this article first published in for National Vanguard, Pierce replies to the “complaints” directed at him by those who had detected an anti-Christian perspective in Pierce’s paper. He identifies three positions in the criticism he and National Alliance had gotten in this regard: “I am a Christian. Why are you attacking my religion?,” and “I am not a Christian, but many White people are…to attack Christianity is divisive.” Much of this should be reminiscent of the response to Oliver’s first attack on Christianity under the name Perier. The last objection will, as we will see in the final chapter, keep coming up for white nationalists of all religious persuasions. The issue of pragmatics with regard to racial survival is something that keeps coming up both in the rejection of Christianity by many and the retort that others give regarding this rejection as divisive and possibly detrimental to united white opposition to the destruction of the race.

Here Pierce responds in way that does not fully reference Cosmotheist principles in the way we find in other writings, but there is still the insistence here on “the feelings” that emerge from “deep within the White race-soul [that] existed long before the advent of the Christian church,” and the importance of following those feelings and not alien ideologies to ensure white racial survival. Pierce here reminds the reader that he had avoided this contentious issue to that date, but that he and National Alliance had an “obligation to deal forthrightly with all issues of vital concern to the welfare and progress of our race.” Here he remarks that National Alliance “is not a primarily a religious organization… in the usual sense of the word,” but he quickly follows with a veiled reference to Cosmotheism in stating that nevertheless it had a “strong spiritual element”

in its message. Therefore Pierce assert the responsibility to address Christianity, especially with “the growing strength of the Moral Majority and other right-wing Christian groups and their active participation in political matters,” and that “the leader of that organization, the Reverend Jerry Falwell, has been outspoken in his support of Zionism, and he was recently given a Zionist award by Jewish leaders.” Like Oliver, Pierce believes that “all the major Christian churches, Catholic and Protestant, liberal and fundamentalist,” as having “openly aligned themselves with the enemies of the White race” and “vigorously supporting racial mixing” and Zionism.” For Pierce and the NA these “alignments will become increasingly important factors in our struggle in the years ahead, as the churches become more and more involved in social and political issues,” which means that the churches are not only inhibitive of the goals of the organization but actively in the enemy’s camp.

While Pierce is willing to admit that in some sense there are racial Christians who have maintained the instincts emergent from the “race-soul,” Christianity is alien to whites and the teachings, especially the sermon on the mount, which he singles out, “conflict with White spirituality and the needs for White survival.” He is clear that Christianity, with its “Jewish mythology,” and its alien teachings, not to mention how it has been, in his estimation, used to teach race-mixing and sympathy with Zionism, is totally at odds with NA, and therefore racial survival. Pierce asserts that the white race “must look to [their] racial roots, and… must rid [themselves] of alien influences, including those from the Levant… [and] govern [themselves] by White values and ethical doctrines, and by no others; and ... must concern [themselves] with truth alone.” Of
course, as we have seen, this means an adherence to the principles of Cosmotheism as defined by Pierce. In this way we can see clearly, though Cosmotheism is not mentioned by name, and that Pierce is still trying to in some sense be conciliatory to racial Christians, he is clearly critiquing Christianity on similar grounds as Oliver, but is also drawing the reader to understand the spiritual taint within it. That is to say that Pierce is critical of Christianity primarily because it is at odds with the true doctrine of racial survival—Cosmotheism. So we can say here that he rejects Christianity, and admonishes other white nationalists to so, because it is antithetical to his new religion; but that is to say that he rejects Christianity because it is antithetical to white racial survival as he understands it. Again we see, as we saw with Oliver and as we will in the coming chapters as well, Christianity is a problem because it is at odds with the primary ethic of white nationalism.

Conclusion—The Cosmotheist Vision after Pierce:

Since Pierce’s death, National Alliance has faded from its former respected position in the white nationalist community. Mark Potok of the Southern Poverty Law Center reported in July of 2012 that the once “radical-right powerhouse” has been transformed into “a tiny band of small-time propagandists, criminal thugs and attention-seeking losers.” 79 Since then the websites for the organization have gone off-line. There are still some who wish to revive National Alliance, but it seems unlikely that it will ever really recover. But the legacy of William Luther Pierce will likely always have a place in

white nationalism. He is still considered of the most important voices of the movement and one of the signal interpreters of its meaning. Pierce’s writings are widely circulated on the Internet, and his books can be downloaded from a number websites, or bought on Amazon; and the doctrines of Cosmotheism still circulate on the website solargeneral.com, self-described as most censored site in the world.

Adherence to Cosmotheism by name is still quite uncommon, but the central ideas that Pierce propagated through National Alliance and his writings are commonly held; namely that the highest principle is race and that principle is more than a material reality. And white nationalists look for, as did Pierce, a revival of racial instincts that would lift the white race to a supreme and indomitable position of on the planet that would ensure its survival. As Martin Durham noticed in his article “The Upward Path: Palingenesis, Political Religion and the National Alliance,” Pierce never sought an exclusively “American palingenesis,” but one “spanning whole continents,” touching all European peoples wherever they might be.80 That is to say that he was looking for a rebirth or re-creation of the white race which was not either politically or geographically bounded by any nation-state, even the United States. He imagined someday that his Cosmotheist principles would both direct the racial vanguard to accomplish this in time, but also that these ideals would form the new racial state and guide it into the future.81 However fantastic this is, it nevertheless offers significant insight into Pierce’s ideology as one of the most significant figures in white nationalism, but it also demonstrates the role of such religious ideology to the movement. Even more it shows how significant the problem of
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Christianity in white nationalism has been well before many began to take notice of the number of white nationalists who have regarded Christianity in this manner.

In the previous chapter we saw Oliver’s transformation from conservative spokesman to radical racialist critic of conservatism and Christianity as the emergence of a new discourse against Christianity in what would come to be called white nationalism. In this chapter we saw the development of an attack on Christianity by Pierce that resembled in many ways Oliver’s, but this time this critique emerged from a mystical evolutionary metaphysics that sought to provide—or to remind and educate, from its point of view—the white race with a more proper spiritual basis for protecting and preserving the white race. In the next chapter we turn to another contemporary of Oliver and Pierce who likewise came from the John Birch Society, and like Oliver had some connections with conservative politics before turning his back on it to pursue racial nationalism. His name was Ben Klassen, and in much the same way as Pierce he devised an alternative religion that was for him completely antithetical to Christianity as it was to provide the spiritual and ideological basis for the expansion and advancement of the white race alone. He would also through this religious ideology provide the slogan RaHoWa, or Racial Holy War, which has become a rallying cry for many white nationalists today.
Chapter 3: Anti-Christianity in Ben Klassen’s Racial Holy War to Preserve the White Race.

The right of the state to safeguard the character and integrity of the race or races on which its future depends is, to my mind, as incontestable as the right of the state to safeguard the health and morals of its peoples. – Henry F. Osborn, Opening Address of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, 1921.¹

I do not admit... that a great wrong has been done to the Red Indians of America, or the black people of Australia. I do not admit that a wrong has been done to those people by the fact that a stronger race, a higher race... has come in and taken its place. — Winston Churchill to the Palestine Royal Commission, 1937.²

Introduction:

There is a risk that discussion of the racism among the extreme right, intentionally or not, diverts attention from the centrality of racism in Western thought. As we have seen already with Oliver and Pierce, those among the racist right have often sought out and used precedents for their racialist activism, often lamenting the abandonment of racist ideals. This disposition is more obvious in Oliver’s writings, especially in his

² Quoted in Martin Gilbert, Churchill and the Jews: A Lifelong Friendship (New York: Henry Holt, 2007), 120.
collection of essays in *America’s Decline*, but many racial nationalists reference a broader one-time awareness of and adherence to racist ideology among whites in America that since the 1960’s has been reversed. There is some truth in this. The ideas that gave birth to white nationalist idiom were not born in the subterranean currents of the most extreme right in the mid to late twentieth century, but in the colonial project that began 500 years ago. As Europeans colonized the Americas and elsewhere, to quote from Charles Long, “the notion of race became the theatre of the entire European myth of conquest.”

Racism, to use shorthand for a complex network of ideas, became a doctrine of science and social organization, and was often corroborated by religious institutions. In the United States race was written not just into the codes that regulated slavery, but also in de facto and de jure modes of racial segregation and in the immigration laws. In this way race had formed not only notions of belonging within the nation, but the very meaning of American-ness as an individual identity. Eugenics, the so-called science of heredity as the basis of social organization, was used to uphold anti-miscegenation laws, and was applied to immigration policy in 1917, 1921, and finally in 1924 with the Immigration Restriction Act, or the “Johnson-Reed Act.” The motive of course was to control perceived contamination and devolution of Anglo-American racial stock. In the words of President Coolidge, who supported and signed the 1924 legislation, “America

---

must be kept American,” which meant that its racial status must be preserved as dominantly Northern European.²

People like Henry F. Osborne, whose quote is in the epigraph, were instrumental in both the passing of the 1924 immigration legislation and in the popularization of eugenics in America and abroad. Such policies meant among other things selective institutionalization and often sterilization of social undesirables who were deemed as threats to society if they were to breed. For many leading social and scientific thinkers in American at the this time, having hereditarily deficient persons give up—or, rather, have taken from them—the ability to reproduce was a small price to ask them to pay for the betterment of society as a whole. As Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes famously wrote for the majority in the 1925 Buck v. Bell case, which decision upheld that institutions could sterilize “feeble minded” persons, “It is better for all the world, if instead of waiting to execute degenerate offspring for crime or to let them starve for their imbecility, society can prevent those who are manifestly unfit from continuing their kind…Three generations of imbeciles are enough.”³ These kinds of policies, made out of a deep sense of national and racial imperilment and supported by some of the most significant legal and scientific authorities in America, sought to protect the Anglo-American stock from infiltration from without and degeneration from within.⁴

The history of racism in America is one that is more complex and deeply engrained in the national fabric than is usually admitted. And with the Buckley conservative movement taking its full toll by the 1960’s, the Southern Strategy of the Nixon campaign, the Reagan revolution, and subsequent conservative rhetorical strategies, much of the racist discourse of the earlier part of the century was re-coded under new slogans such as “tough on crime” and “real America.” Those who could not be subsumed into the Buckley model were exiled to the extremities of the right, willingly or not. For racial nationalists such as Oliver, Pierce, and Ben Klassen this was not a political strategy but signs of the failure of conservatives to keep central the ideals of racism.

Shifts in ideology during and after Civil Rights produced the conditions for the emergence of contemporary white nationalism as an anti-conservative movement, and one that is increasingly suspicious of Christianity. But as David Theo Goldberg so astutely noticed, race is “one of the central conceptual inventions of modernity,” though “the significance of race transforms theoretically and materially as modernity is renewed, refined, and redefined.” I see Oliver, Pierce, and Klassen as engaged in a redefinition and refining of the social meaning of notions of race that are rooted in the earlier expressions of racist thought. In this chapter I discuss Ben Klassen and the religion he called Creativity to point out a religious movement that emerged from the very milieu of the extreme right as Oliver and Pierce, but which articulated a different alternative to

---

5 More complete treatments of racism in Buckley’s thought and in his conservative movement may be found in Carl Bogus’ biograhpy of William F. Buckley and Robert Smith’s *Conservatism and Racism, and Why in America They are the Same* (2010).

Christianity than either Oliver or Pierce. Klassen articulated a critique of Christianity that does not rely upon spirituality and within a religion that rejects any form of divinity, but one that still held onto the perceived power in evoking religion. In Creativity, Klassen emphasizes a naturalistic perspective through which he argues that “Nature has bestowed upon [the white race] the manifest calling to expand [their] own kind;” and further, in a statement that resonates with Churchill’s from 1937, “Nature not only grants us every right to expand our own kind to the limit of our abilities, but tells us that this is the very essence of our mission in being here upon this earth.”

As Martin Durham remarks in White Rage, the core of Creativity was “a fiery rejection” what Klassen called the “spooks in the sky” narrative. From this perspective Klassen articulated a bold and vigorous rejection of Christianity and any other model of thought, even if that model was likewise focused on white racial survival. Referencing the Reconquista in Spain and Manifest Destiny, and even the eugenics movement, Klassen wanted to re-instill a sense of racial survivalism that came to be described through what he called “Racial Holy War,” or “RaHoWa.” The logic of racial warfare that permeates Creativity cuts not just between racial allies and enemies, but within the white race itself as Klassen calls for, not just a vigorous defense of the race from external enemies, but also religious regulation of breeding and child rearing practices. This in some ways maps onto Foucault’s analysis in Society must be Defended and Security, Territory, Population, especially in that he remarks that war rages through society and

---

7 George Michael, Theology of Hate: A History of the World Church of the Creator (Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 2009), viii.
9 Durham, White Rage, 75.
that this involves not just produces separations between, but also regimes of discipline within. But more importantly it states in blunt terms the condition of the closed society as defined by Bergson; a condition that is endemic to white nationalism.

I intend to accomplish two goals in the present chapter. Initially I seek here to describe the emergence of Creativity as a racial religion through a historical contextualization similar to what was done for Cosmotheism in chapter two. Second, I will describe Creativity to explicate Klassen’s critique of Christianity. My main argument is that Klassen’s critique is more explicit in expressing the inherent logic of race-war in white nationalism as a closed society. In his first book, *Nature’s Eternal Religion*, Klassen explained that his religion was to be one that was “designed for the survival, expansion and advancement of the White Race,” and that the “overriding purpose” of his writing was to “lay the groundwork” for a religion that would make central the duty to conduct a preemptive war to protect the white race.\(^{10}\) As Klassen wrote in the first issue of his periodical *Racial Loyalty*, Creativity was to the first racial religion that would “build a such a movement into a powerful battering ram that will sweep all enemies of the White Race before us—be they Jews, Christians, or mud peoples.”\(^{11}\)

In this way it is not so different than Cosmotheism, but Creativity centers race-war in a way that is more implied in Pierce’s ideology. Creativity is therefore best understood as a religion that advocates racial survival in its most necropolitical form. That is to say, adapting Achille Mbembe’s argument, Creativity and its central doctrine of Racial Holy War more directly states the desire for white racial imperium that is


simultaneously an expression racial preservation and domination and of murderous intent to those deemed a threat to the community.\textsuperscript{12}

\textit{Creativity—A History of Violence:}

As I have already stated, Creativity is a more explicit disclosure of the murderous aspects of the obligation within white nationalism to love the white race alone, and out of that love to fight for its continuance against all perceived enemies. As we will see, it also more explicitly draws on a history of white supremacy, especially from race science and eugenics. When Bernhard “Ben” Klassen founded the Church of the Creator it was to provide a clear ideology to properly conduct race-war so as to preserve and expand the white race alone against any enemies. He first formulated Creativity and established the Church of the Creator in 1973 as a new religious vision for those concerned with white racial survival. His religion would, as he saw it, follow the laws of nature as he saw it to provide for the “survival, expansion, and advancement of the White Race,” and outline a “Total Program, the Final Solution, the Ultimate Creed.”\textsuperscript{13}

This project began with the publication of Klassen’s first book, \textit{Nature’s Eternal Religion} in that same year. He then followed this book with \textit{The White Man’s Bible} in 1981 to illuminate what he called the “fundamental part” of his “creed and program,” and to explicate the specific “building blocks of [his] religious dogma.”\textsuperscript{14} He then published \textit{Salubrious Living} in 1982 to emphasize and develop the Church’s program of “Natural

\textsuperscript{12} Like my approach to Foucault’s biopolitics here I am not directly applying Mbembe’s “necropolitics,” but using the language to discuss the war mentality in racial protectionist logic, which is much more apparent in Klassen’s writing.


\textsuperscript{14} Klassen, White Man’s Bible, 4
Hygiene” that he explicitly described as a program of “Eugenics” meant to improve the stock of the white race in its efforts to survive, expand, and advance across the planet.\(^\text{15}\) These works, along with several articles in his publication called *Racial Loyalty*, came define the creed of Creativity and to define all aspects of a program for racial survival that articulated struggle against enemies from without and degeneration within. But the ideas that Klassen invested in Creativity were formed during his previous years of involvement in racial activism.

Much of the data about Klassen’s life and the development of the Church of the Creator are amply covered in George Michael’s book *Theology of Hate: A History of the World Church of the Creator*. Drawing on this combined with independent research, I will offer a brief history of the same but with an emphasis on the centrality of race-war therein, as well as how this informed his rejection of Christianity. Ben Klassen was born into a Mennonite family in Southern Ukraine in 1918.\(^\text{16}\) In his infancy, his family experienced the turmoil of the Bolshevik Revolution. In 1924, his family fled Russia for Mexico where they stayed only until 1925 when they moved to Canada. Klassen later enrolled in the University of Saskatchewan in 1935, where he developed an acute interest in religion and history. As events in Europe began to catch his attention, Klassen, who was fluent in German, read *Mein Kampf* and was inspired. Through World War II, Klassen remained sympathetic to Germany for what he felt was the cause of national self-determination and anti-communism. This was likely inspired to some degree because of his memory of the protection that his family was said to receive in Ukraine by German

---


\(^{16}\) Michael, *Theology of Hate*, 1.
troops. But it should be noted that his Germanophilia was much more influenced by what he described as the compelling ideas of Hitler. Even as he joined the Canadian Officers Training Corps, he remained sympathetic to Nazi Germany and longed to help establish the “New Order” it which it aspired.\footnote{George Michael, “RAHOWA! A History of the Church of the Creator.” \textit{Terror and Political Violence}. 18: 561-583 (2006), 562.}

After the defeat of the Axis in Europe, Klassen moved to California and distanced himself from political activity entirely. There he started a real estate firm and did quite well in his business. With his relative wealth he travelled throughout Europe, Egypt, and Mexico. However, the rising tensions of the era of burgeoning Civil Rights movement and the specter of Communism rekindled his interest in right-wing politics. Klassen later made his home in Florida, relocating his political ambitions and family there in the 1950’s.\footnote{Ibid} There he was elected to a brief service in the Florida State legislature in 1966, and became the state chairman for segregationist Governor George Wallace’s 1968 presidential campaign. He also established a Florida chapter of the Citizen’s Council of America in 1967 and was a high-profile member of the John Birch Society, until he resigned in 1969.\footnote{Michael, \textit{Theology of Hate}, p. 7-8.} However, like Oliver and Pierce, Klassen had abandoned the JBS after having become suspicious of their anti-communism as a distraction from race and a similar suspicion as Pierce that Jews were controlling the organization.\footnote{Ibid, p.8-9. Klassen is often quoted in various internet sites as having described the JBS and its anti-communist activities as a “smoke screen for Jews.”} As Michael has recorded in his book, Klassen flirted for a time with Nazi organizations like The
Nationals Socialist White People’s Party and the World Union of National Socialists. Finally, in some ways reflecting a similar diassallusionment that Oliver and Pierce experienced about this time, Klassen initiated the Church of the Creator and named himself Pontifex Maximus of his new racialist Church, and released his first book.

In *Nature’s Eternal Religion*, Klassen explicates the foundational principles of Creativity, the most important of which is an appeal to nature’s laws, which are regarded as are fixed and definitive. The presumed divisions among the races as well as the assumed Malthusian dynamic of racial struggle are described as naturalized facts. Referencing Madison Grant’s *Passing of the Great Race*, Klassen asserts that personal and communal life is one of constant struggle with other biological groups. In this religion there is no god, just the “eternal laws of Nature” which have acted to produce the “white race,” considered to be the “greatest miracle” of Nature. In *Nature’s Eternal Religion* Klassen writes:

Anyone who is for the promotion and advancement of civilization and culture, peace, plenty and prosperity, must of necessity be for the advancement and expansion of the White Race. Our religion, Creativity, is for both of these goals, namely the shrinking of the colored races and the expansion of the White Race, not only because it is highly desirable, which it is; we are overwhelmingly dedicated to these goals because Nature has bestowed upon us the manifest calling to expand our kind to the limit of our abilities and to populate the world with our own.

I will discuss this more as we go along, but here we see the summation of everything that Creativity stood for as Klassen saw it.

21 Ibid, 9.
23 Ibid, 15.
24 Ibid, 315.
The birth of Creativity was clearly a reaction to the successes of the Civil Rights Movement and the shifts in American society immediately after. In the mid 1960’s what remained of the racially restricted legislation that was established in 1924 was repealed, compounding the threat presented by integration as Klassen saw it. In Nature’s Eternal Religion once again Klassen wrote, “Today, more than ever before, with ever increasing rapidity the choice is being presented to us in cold and stark outline, namely, the continuation of our present human level and also the possibility of further evolution to even higher planes, or, on the other hand, devolution, retrogression, mongrelization, and finally, utter decay.”25 Echoing the testimony of eugenicists in the 1920s, Klassen identifies immigration of other “races,” not just desegregation as a threat as he imagines the white race being “submerged and diluted”—that is both outbred and interbred, and thereby losing its identity, culture, and civilization.26 Creativity then was a reaction to changing laws in the United States and what he perceived as changing attitudes about race and the composition of full American-ness.

Following the publication of his major works, Klassen began the publication of a monthly magazine called Racial Loyalty in 1983 to further disseminate and explain his ideas. In this he detailed further the ideas developed in his previous works. The most significant of these ideas was racial holy war, discussed in detail in segments of Racial Loyalty, which segments were collected into a book titled Rahowa! This Planet is All Ours. This text was released originally in 1987, and is now easily found today on the Internet on such sites as www.rahowa.us and www.creativitymovement.org, among

26 Ibid.
others. RaHoWa, signified a hardening of the Malthusian logic in Creativity at its most militant. Klassen’s understanding of the “Laws of Nature” formed the rhetorical background of this expression, and reified this race-war as necessary for continued biological existence. He says about RaHoWa in issue number 32 of Racial Loyalty, “The mud races have foisted war on us. There is no escaping it. We therefore are forced to pick up the challenge, wage it fiercely, no quarter given, until victory is ours.”27 In Klassen’s logic, race-war is articulated as the “natural” product of relations, the impossibility of cohabitation of supposed kinds, and is to be continued into the retreating horizon of the immanent victory of the forces of civilization or otherwise civilization itself will fall into ruin. That is to say that the stakes are total as they are rooted in absolute biological survivability.

Klassen’ approach, and especially his reproachment of Christianity, was controversial among some racialists, but attractive others. He was able to get the support of many, especially young people, in the emerging skin-head movement and made connections early on with Tom Metzger, the founder and leader of White Aryan Resistance, or WAR. And it was among this emerging skinhead movement that Klassen received his most ardent praise and many of his followers. Klassen also enjoyed a relationship with William Pierce, though they were often in disagreement over tactics of recruitment. Pierce stated that he thought that Klassen’s “whole approach was flawed,” in that Klassen’s approach was “fairly crude” and “was guaranteed to appeal to mostly

rednecks and skinheads and other people at the bottom of the socio-economic ladder."\(^{28}\)

Whereas Pierce, however unsuccessful he may have been, wanted an elite, Klassen wanted only the most committed regardless of education or station of life.

In spite of their differences, Pierce provided real assistance to Klassen during times of significant financial and legal troubles. In 1991, one of the “reverends” of the Church, a man by the name of George Loeb, was convicted of murdering Harold Mansfield Jr., an African-American Gulf War veteran. With the aid of the Southern Poverty Law Center, Mansfield’s family filed civil litigation against Klassen and the Church and were successful in pursuing restitution and the assets, in particular the North Carolina headquarters, were to be sold for the settlement. Pierce then intervened, bought the property, and later sold it for a profit. The proceeds from the sale of the North Carolina property were finally recovered and the Mansfield family received the $85,000 that was earned from the resale of the property under Pierce through a 1996 court order.\(^{29}\)

Klassen spent the remainder of his days divesting himself of the assets tied to the Church and searching for a successor to the legacy he had established. His first choice to succeed him was unable to take the position as he was serving a six year sentence for selling tainted food to Florida public schools. So Klassen settled for a Baltimore pizza delivery man by the name of Charles Alvetar. Klassen was soon disappointed by his chosen successor and appointed a rather volatile Milwaukee skinhead named Mark Wilson to the position. Wilson ran the organization until January, 1993, when he had to leave the position after he was convicted for wreckless endangerment for placing a bomb on the

\(^{28}\) Quoted in *Theology of Hate*, 94.

doorstep of the home of a Baltimore County police officer. Richard McCarty, a man well known in racist circles at the time, was then promoted to full leadership.\(^{30}\) Finally, in August of 1993, at the age of 75, Klassen took his own life by swallowing four bottles of sleeping pills.\(^{31}\) Klassen was remembered well among his comrades, and leadership of the organization passed to McCarty alone, precipitating a split of the group and a succession of leaders that saw the Church into its worse crises.\(^{32}\)

Under McCarty the COTC found itself in even more legal trouble. Some members of the Church, along with some members of a local skinhead group called The Fourth Reich Skins, were arrested in California under suspicion of planning to bomb the largest African-American church in Los Angeles and to assassinate the 1991 police beating victim Rodney King.\(^{33}\) Some days later, members of the COTC were arrested in Solinas, California for shoplifting. Later investigations of one of the men, Jerimiah Knesal, revealed several plots against Jewish and African American targets, as well as against military installations, gay bars, and radio and television stations. Under questioning, Knesal confessed to the July 20, 1993 fire-bombing of a N.A.A.C.P. office in Tacoma, Washington. Under subsequent legal pressures from the F.B.I. and the Southern Poverty Law Center, which had not given up its initial lawsuit, McCarty gave in to demands for the liquidation of the group’s assets.\(^{34}\)

\(^{31}\) Michael, *Theology of Hate*, 120.
\(^{32}\) Ibid, 120-1.
\(^{33}\) Michael, “RAHOWA!,” 573.
The Church of The Creator stagnated under such leadership, but found inspiration for recovery under the leadership of a twenty four year old Law Student from Illinois named Matthew Hale. Hale became a member of the Church in the early 90’s while attending Bradley University, and on July 27, 1996, the elders of the Church, known as the “Guardians of the Faith Committee” named him “Pontifex Maximus.”35 In his youth, Hale had experimented with various forms of racial activism, including dailiances with David Duke’s National Association for the Advancement of White People and even founding his own group called the American White Supremacist Party.36 However, after reading a copy of Racial Loyalty and borrowing a copy of Nature’s Eternal Religion he became facisnated with Klassen’s ideas and joing the Church of the Creator.37 In 1995, Hale dedicated himself to the Church and quickly rose to become the leader, establishing a new headquarters in Peoria, Illinois.38

Hale played a vital role in popularizing the Movement on the newest field of competition—the Internet. But notoriety came to the group as the result of even more instances of violence. In April, 1999, Matt Hale, who had graduated with a law degree, was turned down for an application for a license to practice law by the Illinois State Bar Association. He quickly appealed this decision on July of that same year. It was announced shortly after that Hale’s application had been rejected once again. Within hours of this announcement, a 21 year old member of the WCOTC named Benjamin Smith, a personal friend of Hale’s, began a string of shootings of minorities across two

35 Michael, *Theology of Hate*, 120.
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states, killing two people and wounding several others. When capture seemed inevitable, Smith turned his gun on himself and committed suicide. The link between Smith and the Church was immediately made in spite of Hale’s repeated denials that his refusals by the State Bar Association were the cause for the shootings. Hale responded that this was the result of a young white man frustrated with a world that worked against him his whole life-- a “white warrior” that will be missed.\(^{39}\)

Other violent acts committed by Church members followed this, including stabbings and beatings. A 20 year old member named Joseph Ferguson killed five people and wounded a California Highway Patrol officer before he killed himself. When his residence was searched, literature from the Church of the Creator as well as other racist material was found.\(^{40}\) Such violence and other incidents of criminality, usually involving weapons, became the hallmark for the Church in the years leading to an incident that got the attention of Federal authorities and caused another moment of crisis for the group. In 2000, an Oregon based religious organization filed a law suit over the group’s copyrighted phrase “Church of the Creator” with the TE-TA-MA Truth Foundation over copyright infringement. Hale unsuccessfully argued that his organization was using the phrase long before the plaintiffs, and should therefore be allowed to use it still.\(^{41}\) Presiding judge Joan Humphrey Lefkow originally sided with Hale, but here decision was reversed in 2002 by the Seventh U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Hale was then


\(^{40}\) Michael, Theology of Hate, 159-60.
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ordered by Judge Lefkow, who acted under the superior court’s ruling, to cease the use of the name immediately. Hale responded by a suit filed against Judge Lefkow challenging the ruling. The Judge’s name and address appeared on websites alongside assertions that she was “a probable Jew” and a “nigger loving traitor.”

Things escalated when on January 8, 2003 Hale was arrested for soliciting Judge Lefkow’s murder by asking Tony Evola, an undercover FBI agent who had infiltrated the Church, to kill her in exchange for a total of $72,000. In April, 2004, Hale was found guilty of charges of soliciting violence and three counts of obstruction of justice. But after this, on February 28, 2005, Judge Lefkow’s husband and mother were found murdered in a seeming execution in the basement of their home. It appeared at first, against Hale’s protests, that the World Church of the Creator was responsible. Unexpectedly, the perpetrator was actually an unaffiliated person named Bart Allen Ross who was disgruntled after Judge Lefkow had dismissed his medical malpractice complaint. Mr. Ross, when pulled over for a traffic violation in Wisconsin, shot himself. For the counts against him, Hale was sentenced to forty years imprisonment in 2005.

In spite of Klassen’s suicide, the succession of failed leadership, and Hale’s imprisonment, the websites of the formerly named World Church of the Creator, now called the Creativity Movement, or simply Creativity, are still available and the movement is still visible in the larger white power subculture. The acronym RaHoWa has

42 Ibid, 174.
43 Ibid, 175 & 177.
44 Ibid, 182.
46 Ibid, 184.
been co-opted by many white racialists as a logo for those who want to show themselves as the most committed to “white survival,” and is often displayed on t-shirts, bumper stickers, and the like. It has come to be for many in white nationalism as was for Klassen the “ultimate solution” in a “holy war to the finish.”

As George Michael has noted, the violence associated with Creativity made it a special target of law enforcement and watchdog groups. This had indeed made it a byword even among some white nationalists that thought this sort of tact was counterproductive to the cause. As we will see in the final chapter, much of the effort now is to mainstream racialist positions, and many still worry that overt acts of violence detract from that mission. It is important to remember nevertheless that racist violence in America is hardly unusual. However the point I want to make with this historical outline is that violence in the COTC was relate to the overt proclamation of Racial Holy War against all enemies. Further, as we will see in the next section, the doctrines of the Creativity wove war into the very fabric of life, even to the point of looking within its own ranks for weakness to cull it out—all for the protection of the white race. No aspect of the Creator’s life was left unaddressed. These doctrines were meant to colonize every aspect of life with the moral obligation of the individual to wage war on behalf of the group. And as with Cosmotheism for Pierce, Creativity’s teachings were Klassen’s definitive replacement for the weakening and alien doctrines of Christianity.

47 Klassen, RAHOWA!, Ours, 3 & 4.
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War and Breeding in Creativity:

Discovering the teachings of Creativity is relatively easy to do as Klassen always viewed his religion as textual, and worked tirelessly to spread his message. At the conclusion of *The White Man’s Bible* he commands his followers to read, study, and spread “the White Man’s sacred books,” which are of course his own writings. The texts of Creativity, including editions of *Racial Loyalty* and Klassen’s letters, are now spread in PDF format throughout the Internet, and can even be found at Amazon.com and other sellers. I will proceed here with select readings from the major texts, beginning with *Nature’s Eternal Religion*, through *The White Man’s Bible* and *Salubrious Living*, and finally I will close with *RaHoWa, The World is All Ours!*. In this way I proceed chronologically through the main teachings of Creativity to elucidate the concerns Klassen built into the religion: protection of the white race from its enemies through race-war, and the protection of the white race from degeneration from breeding and rearing practices that comprise a program of eugenics in Creativity. Here, as we will see in Klassen’s own words, race-war becomes a religious obligation that shapes the rejection of Christianity in Creativity.

Klassen begins his first book *Nature’s Eternal Religion* in much the same way that Hitler mused in chapter 11 of *Mein Kampf*. The “immutable laws of Nature” are for Klassen as they were for Hitler instructive in shaping their exclusionary utopias, especially the idea that “races” should not interbreed and that struggle among races is an expression of the “strong urge” for each to ensure the “survival and perpetuation of its

---

Klassen immediately comments about the “mixing” among human kinds, stating, “Much to our disgust and detriment, something unnatural like this has been going on amongst the human races in recent years,” and warns that “[i]f it is not stopped, we, the White Race, will be paying a heavy price for our criminal perversion of Nature’s laws.”

It is therefore important to understand the centrality of this perspective on nature to Klassen’s thought as it shapes his racial protectionist agenda in imagining race-war as natural and inevitable, and race-mixing a cardinal sin against natural law. In Creativity there is no deity that describes law and righteousness, only the laws of nature, as Klassen understands it, and “one immutable law: the Law of Survival.” Creativity was for Klassen the way to reorient the white race toward a proper relation to these supposed laws for the very survival of the race within a Malthusian schema in which the strong survive without divine aid.

In Nature’s Eternal Religion, Klassen then provides several uncited studies of wildlife such as the sockeye salmon and the timber wolf to both substantiate his claims about natural law and to provide metaphors for racial survival that he thinks the white race should learn. Chief among these lessons are that the “Laws of Nature are fixed, rigid, and eternal,” and they govern the universe, including human beings who are a part of nature. The consequences of such a truth are for him, most significantly, are that “Nature” always “upgrades” species through “survival of the fittest,” which processes have produced the white race as the pinnacle of evolution, and that “[e]ach species is

---
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completely indifferent to the survival of any other species, and Nature tells each species to expand and multiply to the limit of its abilities.”\(^{54}\) Nature is impersonal and all-pervading with its laws, and chief among them is the struggle for survival between species. “Eternal struggle,” Klassen writes near the end of the bullet pointed lessons, “is the price of existence.”\(^{55}\)

These statements form the core teachings of Creativity. The remainder of the text is expectedly narcissistic in its descriptions of the “White Race,” which he always capitalizes, as the most perfect expression of evolutionary development and the sole purveyors of civilization as it has been defined in its most modernist terms. There are however three things to notice in this regard. First, many of the accomplishments that he regards as evidence of white racial superiority come from colonialism. He writes,

These European White Men, then, with civilization in their blood and in their destiny, crossed the Atlantic and set up a new civilization on a bleak and rock bound coast. It was the White Men who drove north to Alaska and west to California; the men who opened up the tropics and subdued the Arctics; the men who mastered the African Veldts; the men who peopled Australia and seized the gates of the world at Suez, Gibraltar and Panama.\(^{56}\)

Like Churchill in the quote from the epigraph, Klassen thought the bloody history of colonial conquest by Europeans not as something to be lamented, but evidence of inherent superiority that justified world-wide rule over so-called lesser races.

The second thing to notice is that Klassen regards the abandonment of the cold logic of racial struggle, as he sees the history of European colonization, in favor of “humanitarian garbage” and “religious double-talk” as a mistake of epic proportions as,
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in his estimation, the “White Race has the most to lose” if race-mixing and the shrinking of the white gene pool occurs. That is to say, Klassen imagines the loss of the white race as the gain for its enemies. To preserve civilization and all that he imagines the white race to have provided, the white race must prevail. The narcissism that accompanies racial chauvinism plays closely with the notion of racial survivalism here. That the “White Race” is the pinnacle of evolutionary development in a scheme of Malthusian racial struggle does not eliminate its precarity in ongoing struggle for global domination. Further, as will be more explicit as we continue, the assertion is that humanitarianism and forms of religion have actually squelched racial instincts for survival and increased the exposure of the white race to that precarity. Creativity therefore operates within the self-imposed paradox in the description of the “White Race” as immanently strong and powerful and simultaneously imperiled and at risk of extinction.

Finally, Klassen’s racialist narcissism attempts to break through the Spenglerian pessimism that often accompanies discourses of white racial imperilment elsewhere in white nationalism. In the final chapter of *Nature’s Eternal Religion* titled “Our Brilliant Future” Klassen claims that social problems like poverty will disappear because of the absence of so-called lesser races as the “White Race” moves to inhabit “all the worthwhile land.” He sees in the future a secure existence for the white race in the absence of racial enemies and degenerated racial stock. He also sees the increase in aesthetic beauty and intelligence because of better breeding that produces a healthier and
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fitter individual. This highlights again the two sides of what one might describe in some
sense as Klassen’s biopolitical project in Creativity—the security of the population in its
territory and the improvement of the population through better breeding that will lead to
the diminishment of inferior stock and a better world. Of course implied in this is the
necropolitical aspect of such fantasies. Klassen’s racial utopia requires a dystopia of
racial genocidal warfare that cuts between alleged human kinds and within the white race
as the future is attained. The racial narcissistic fantasy is laden with the will to kill
sublimated as the will to survive.

Most of Nature’s Eternal Religion is written as bio-history in the tradition of
Madison Grant’s The Passing of the Great Race and Lothrop Stoddard’s Rising Tide of
Color against White World-Supremacy, both of which were published after WWI and
before the passing of the 1924 immigration legislation. Both also argued that racial
mixing would lead to the destruction of the United States as so-called inferior stocks had
negative effects of the population. Klassen, though he does not cite any of these texts
makes almost identical claims. This historical narrative is meant to show in history, first,
how white men founded all civilizations. This is of course a dubious claim to say the
least, but this is in keeping with Klassen’s extreme racial chauvinism. Second, he means
to establish, as Grant and Stoddard had attempted to do, that civilizational decline always
follows racial mixing. Now Klassen is clear even in hindsight that this text describes the
core of Creativity, but while much is laid out in this initiatory text, more details about
Creativity came later with the subsequent publication of The White Man’s Bible and
Salubrious Living. However, the fullest message of Creativity permeates all three of these
texts, and is finally encapsulated in a series of essays in *Racial Loyalty* that are eventually compiled in *RaHoWa! This World is All Ours*.

It is proper to read these texts together, especially *The White Man’s Bible* and *Salubrious Living* as they both focus on further articulation of the message Creativity as one that provides what Klassen called a “four dimensional religion”—“A Sound Mind in A Sound Body in a Sound Society in a Sound Environment.” The main focus of *The White Man’s Bible* is how to achieve living in such a way as to make this a reality while *Salubrious Living* expounds “on the subject of health in greater detail.” However both texts bring into focus the way in which the race-war regime in Creativity sought to permeate every aspect of life.

In *The White Man’s Bible*, Klassen reiterates much of what he wrote in *Nature’s Eternal Religion*, but rather than composing a bio-history much more space is dedicated to integrating the general philosophy about “Natures Eternal Laws” into a specific analysis of racial socialism as he calls it, often through analogy of personal racial body with the racial social body. In a section of *The White Man’s Bible* titled “Lessons for the White Race,” for example, Klassen argues that in “building a better White Society for the future” whites should see the some “fundamental lessons” about “Nature and how its laws operate in our own body as a unit organism.” The “crux of the lesson,” as Klassen describes it, is that which he gleans from the immune system of the body as it seeks out and destroys “alien bodies” as a part of the processes that allow for healthy cellular
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reproduction. From this analogy Klassen then goes on to describe the efforts of the Church of the Creator to construct a “Racial Socialism” that seeks to advance and “multiply” the white race. Described in terms of what a “healthy organism,” Klassen draws an explicit analogy between the individual racial body and the corporate racial body as both are imagined as “well organized” and seeking “to keep out alien invaders.” But he also makes mention of the way the body “excretes its wastes” in preserving itself.

Here in The White Man’s Bible we have the three components that comprise the total program of Creativity, and which come to inform Klassen’s later notion of Racial Holy War—racial organization, militant exclusion of all that is alien, and internal purges of “wastes.” This last point is of course direct reference to the program of eugenics that Klassen devised for the Church under the title Salubrious Living. This text is an expansion of what Klassen called “Creator Credo #5,” a “systematic program for the upgrading of the health and vigor” of the white race. In this portion of The White Man’s Bible Klassen describes everything from proper farming and care for soil, to his critique of modern medicine and healthy eating habits. However it is the program of eugenics which he most pronouncedly describes later in this text that divulges the meaning of his analogy of bodily excretion. In “Credo # 28” he mourns the fact that “fifty years ago” this term would have required no explanation, and that such activity had come under attack because, he opines, it is “contrary to the fiendish Jewish program of race-mixing, of
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mongrelizing the White Race into oblivion.”67 In calling upon the older tradition of eugenics in America he demands that those deemed superior of the white race reproduce via thoughtful breeding practices and that those who are ill-bred among his race, and especially those who are of other races, be restricted from breeding all together, and further he calls for the “sterilization of the incurable misfits, idiots, and genetically diseased.”68 And as with the other “credos” of Creativity that Klassen writes down, he imagines eugenics as “a tremendously important part of [his] religion.”69 Racial improvement is as much an obligation as anything else, for it too is a means of securing the future of the race.

It is in Salubrious Living that Klassen’s ideas of health and the colonization of everyday life is more apparent. This text, however, apart from the introduction and the final chapter on eugenics, was written by Arnold DeVries. Mr. DeVries himself had written on the topic of natural nutrition in his 1952 book, Primitive Man and His Foods, and had styled himself a researcher in nutrition and human betterment.70 In the 1990’s, a Swedish Creativity adherent named Tommy Rydén founded an organization dedicated to self-healing and vegetarianism called the DeVries Institute in honor of Klassen’s coauthor.71 Though DeVries, as Klassen noted himself, was not “racially minded” his ideas were nevertheless found by Klassen, especially his 1948 book The Fountain of
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Youth, so “logical” and closely aligned with the “Eternal Laws of Nature” that they were adopted as part the program of the Church of the Creator.\textsuperscript{72}

The selection written by DeVries emphasizes what Klassen had only referenced in The White Man’s Bible in terms of health practices. There is virtually no aspect of life not covered; from diet and weightlifting, to eye and foot exercises. Every ailment, including senility and cancer, is thought to stem from poor diet or poor breeding; that is, attributed to living contrary to supposed natural conditions. But even more significant, the text places a command upon the reader to institute a regime of practice for diet and exercise that in the context of Creativity focuses attention to the white racial body as part of the obligation of the individual racialist who attends to the health of the corporate white racial body. “That is why,” Klassen argues, “we called ours a FOUR DIMENSIONAL RELIGION in which we set about to put in healthy order all aspects of what is necessary for the survival, expansion and advancement of the White Race — the most precious value on the face of this planet.”\textsuperscript{73}

But even more to the point, Klassen brings racial war to the ranks of the white race in the final chapter that he wrote himself on eugenics. For Klassen this simply means “racial health” in that the dysgenic individual threatens the total health of the supposed genetic community.\textsuperscript{74} Like the eugenicists in the early part of the twentieth century who thought if the “misfit” and the “feeble-minded” individual were allowed to outbreed the genetically superior, and if racial mixing was not prohibited the world would eventually sink into civilizational decline and ruin, so Klassen repeated these fears in his final
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chapter. For him then the only solution is to ruthlessly apply the laws of nature as he saw them in culling practices that encouraged the genetically superior to live while allowing the dysgenic to die. In this way, again, the race-war cuts between enemy lines, between the “inferior races” and the white race, but also within the camp of the white race in the name of improvement to make it fit for survival. The individual white racial body is the fundamental site of the colonization of every aspect of life through Creativity as it seeks to make the white race live in perpetuity while killing or letting die all that endangers it.

Even more specific in the doctrine of race-war that is so fundamental to Creativity, collected in *RaHoWa! This planet is All Ours*. Here Klassen succinctly formulates what race-war means. Klassen defines RaHoWa as the “sum total of the program” for the Church of the Creator and “for the White Race,” and the “most sacred credo of all,” to take up “total war against the Jews and the rest of the goddam mud races” as “a holy war to the finish.”  

As I have claimed, this is the starkest statement of the violence inherent in racial protectionsism. But Klassen also reveals here a sense of envy of what he perceives as the racial religion of Judaism in that he perceives it provides both a protective ideology for Jews the world over and strengthens them as a group. George Michael has also noticed that Klassen had in fact “credited the Jews with creating a powerful racial religion that worked wonders for them.”  

This envy has another side in the paranoid fantasy of an ongoing war waged by Jews against the white race. Klassen writes acerbically that RaHoWa is the “answer to the Jewish war of extermination against
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the White Race,” which in Klassen’s historiography in this work has been ongoing since the days of the Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{77}

In these later articles, written in the mid-1980’s, some years after his major works, Klassen refers back to \textit{Nature’s Eternal Religion} and \textit{The White Man’s Bible}, arguing that what he offers in RaHoWa is, again, an encapsulation of the creed he established first in 1974. In this way Klassen is explicit in describing racial war as the primary mode of action and the core duty of every Creator. The genocidal impulse inherent in this is clearly seen in the closing words of \textit{RaHoWa! This World is All Ours} in which Klassen fantasizes to get “the Jews, niggers and mud races off our backs” and “to expand the White Man’s territory slowly and gradually, similar to the historic ‘Winning of the West’ in early America, until the White Man inhabits all the good lands of this Planet Earth.”\textsuperscript{78}

But what is perhaps most significant to our Bergsonian analysis is that Klassen defines this genocidal response in terms of defense when he says that this war had been “foisted” upon the white race by its enemies.\textsuperscript{79} Region as Klassen understood it could either awaken the racial instincts of the white race and thereby ensure its survival or degenerate its will to survive and bring it to destruction. Religion therefore served a very significant function in Klassen’s racial socialist ideation; one that was either right or wrong.

Religion in a Durkheimian sense, as Michael has also recognized, was central to Klassen’s thinking.\textsuperscript{80} As we will see in the next section, Klassen was concerned with not only formulating a racial religion but also with demonstrating his racial religion’s

\textsuperscript{77} Ibid, 11.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid, 126.
\textsuperscript{79} Ibid, 60.
\textsuperscript{80} Michael, \textit{Theology of Hate}, p. 24.
superiority above all other ideas. In particular he was interested in not only showing how Creativity was superior to Christianity, but also how it could offer a corrective to what he perceived as the “sick and morbid Christian religion.”\textsuperscript{81} But even more pointedly, RaHoWa was imagined as a definitive response to what Klassen called “Jewish Christianity,” which he imagined was “concocted for the very purpose for mongrelizing and destroying the White Race.”\textsuperscript{82} In this section I sought to discuss how racial holy war constructs the morale of the Creativity adherent and thus passes through all social relations in Creativity. In the next section I discuss more specifically how this has informed Klassen’s rejection of Christianity as alien and polluting to the white race.

\textit{Creativity in Comparative Religions:}

As was the case for Cosmotheism, Klassen’s rejection of Christianity is articulated through his new religion. But, as I have maintained in other aspects of Creativity, Klassen’s rejection of Christianity as expressed in terms of Racial Holy War is more explicitly violent. Klassen always expressed antipathy in his writing toward what he deemed illogical, but religions other than Creativity always received the harshest indictments. This critique is also embedded in a broader comparative religions approach carried out in the pages of \textit{Racial Loyalty}. In comparing Creativity to other religions Klassen wanted to demonstrate that he “finally achieved a genuine, bona fide, comprehensive racial religion for the White Race that is the equal of, or superior to, any
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religion in history,” and that his new religion was in fact the racial religion around which all “White racial groups and leaders” should rally to save the white race.83

Even other racialist religions such as Odinism and what Klassen calls Rosenberg’s Germanic religion, and especially Christian Identity do not compare favorably with Creativity. Klassen is sympathetic with the efforts of the German people, as he saw it, who sought a replacement religion for Christianity, but he was critical of their narrow focused on German ethnicity rather than the white race more broadly, and Rosenberg’s mysticism was too closely drawn from Christian mystics such as Meister Eckhart.84 As for Odinism the critique reflects again Klassen’s attachment to a certain understanding of logic that the rhetoric in Odinism that seeks meaning in Nordic mythology seems to offend.85 Klassen remarks that “outside of promoting racial awareness, the goals of Odinism are as nebulous as is its religious creed.”86 Christian Identity is treated by Klassen as simply silly, primarily because of the application of what he calls “Jewish myths” to Anglo-Americans.87 But non-racialist Christianity is the most specific religious target of Klassen’s comparisons and attacks. Klassen above all other objectives in his discussion of religions wanted to overcome Christianity, or what he referred to as “a Jewish hoax.”88

In many ways, again, Klassen’s rejection of Christianity mirrors much of what we saw from Oliver and Pierce, but in more direct terms. Like Oliver, Klassen often resorts
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to a historiography of Western decline to demonstrate the damage done by Christianity. But Klassen made a specific analogy that elucidates his peculiar perspective. In *The White Man’s Bible* in which Klassen compares the “hoax” of Christianity to “the Federal Reserve,” which he describes in keeping with traditional American anti-Semitism as “a private organization of Jewish bankers.”*89 For Klassen both were created as part of the alleged parasitical activity of “the Jews” who survive and conquer other peoples through manipulation. For Klassen then Christianity manipulates through fear to “enslave” the otherwise stronger white race.”*90

Later in this same text, after “debunking” Christianity as a fraud, Klassen directly addresses the same problem that Oliver and Pierce did in recognizing the long history in Europe of Christianity and the role it played in Western civilization. Unlike Oliver and Pierce however, Klassen did not seek accommodation for the feelings of Christian racialists, only an explanation of his strong rejection thereof.91 Klassen then goes on to describe in several bullet points specifically why he rejects Christianity in such uncompromising terms, but these points can easily be synthesized into the original point that Christianity is a damaging falsehood perpetrated upon the white race. In a line reminiscent of Lawrence R. Brown, Klassen writes that Creators “indict Christianity for shackling the mind and intellect of the White man for at least 1300 years” and for “inflicting mental anguish” upon the white race.92
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But even more to the point Klassen sees this “hoax” as having not only imposed an existential problem for the white race, but to have actually set it up for destruction by “laying the philosophical groundwork for communism” and “softening up the White Race for accepting the idea of race mixing” by preaching what Klassen calls the “suicidal teachings” of universal equality.\(^93\) Further, earlier in this book Klassen describes the importance of “instinct” and how the so-called instincts for racial survival are subverted by “the poisonous advice contained in the Sermon On The Mount, namely to ‘love your enemies’, ‘turn the other cheek’, “resist not evil’.”\(^94\) That is to say that Christianity in Klassen’s reading of it has encouraged a level of openness to what he regarded as other races that have put the white race in peril through dysgenic breeding and ideological universalism. But since for Klassen all races are in constant struggle, Christianity imperils the white race and is therefore ill suited for waging racial holy war to conquer the planet to secure the future of the white race. To put it more in clear Bergsonian terms, Christianity is not compatible with the means or the end of the closed racial society that Klassen wanted to construct.

**Conclusion—Creativity and the Closed Society:**

Oliver, Pierce, and now Klassen, as we have seen, rejected Christianity on similar grounds in that they each see it as contrary to natural law. However, as I have argued, Klassen’s rejection was more pronounced, especially when it comes to declarations of violence. That is to say that in each of these three articulations there are times when the violent implications, perhaps the genocidal implications, in the white nationalism are
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articulated. Oliver had at moments embraced a violent outlook, but always somewhat veiled his racialized intellectualism. Pierce was always at his most violent in expressing his white nationalism, especially against Christianity, in his novels. However he claimed that this was never an actual call to violence, but simply fiction. Klassen however had embraced the eliminationist logic in white nationalism by declaring outright a racial holy war to protect the white race. In this way the inherent violence in white nationalism as a closed system—that is, one that owes its existence to systematic exclusions to form identity—becomes the heart of a religious creed that makes war against all others to preserve the white race the highest moral virtue. Further, in drawing a specific contrast with Christianity, Klassen says that Creativity teaches that one should “hate your enemies and love those that are near and dear to you—your family, your friends, your own race.” This is almost exactly how Bergson describes the closed society as one that is always prepared for war against those that are outside who are always imagined as enemies, and how the religion of the closed society can condone and even praise killing.

It is also true that Klassen is also more explicit in his longing for the more overtly racist, colonialist, and eugenicist past, though tainted as it was in his estimation by Christianity. Though Oliver and Pierce also looked favorably on the scientific racism of the 19th century, Klassen was adamant that these findings and their applications in immigration and race laws were to be revived in his religious community. In a sense then we can see the examples we have examined so far in this study as demonstrative of a certain resentment of the relatively openness of American society after the successes of
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the Civil Rights movement in overturning, at least de jure, the racist policies that ordered American society to that time. That is to say, the attempt at a more open society in America provoked Oliver, Pierce, and Klassen to reimagine a closed racist society, one that blamed American politics and Christianity for the present imperilment of the white race.

In the next chapter we will take a different approach to discuss one of the most popular religious movements in white nationalism today—Odinism. First, though there is definitely an originator of this trend in the United States, I will take an approach that focuses on Odinism as a development within white nationalist religiosity rather than a single person. Here we will find a rejection of Christianity that is much closer to a general claim to a recovery of something that was lost that is imagined as white ethnic property. Here the resentment goes much deeper for the Odinist than Civil Rights or immigration poles, but to a more remote past when so-called Jewish Christianity was imposed upon the Germanic tribes and thus deprived them of their essential identity and racial instincts. Once again the closed racial society is not only imagined as contrary to the present political moment, but to the universalism of Christianity that has put the white race in a state of spiritual and existential crisis by tearing it away from its allegedly true religious roots.
Chapter 4: Authentic Whiteness and the Protectionist Politics of Racialist Odinism in America

We have made a promise—to ourselves and to our kin—that we will... fight all things which we, after mature considerations, find detrimental to the good of our people, and work ceaselessly for the preservation of our cultural and biological heritage. — “Bjorn,” “Why We Are Odinists”

Introduction:

In the previous three chapters I sought to explicate the reasons for the rejection of Christianity by three major leaders in American white nationalism, Oliver, Pierce, and Klassen, as it emerged from the far-right in America in the late 1960s and 70s. By focusing on these individuals I sought entrée into the logics that construct racial nationalism as closed society and that influenced their rejection of Christianity as danger to that imagined community. It was proper to do this because each of these men were and continue to be important influences in contemporary white nationalism, even among those among whom their racialist atheism, Cosmotheism, or Creativity did not take hold. In this chapter, as well as the two following, I will change my approach slightly in emphasizing trends of thought within white nationalism more than individual founders. I
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do this because in some ways racialist Odinism, esoteric racialism, and the North American New Right, while certainly not devoid of significant contributors, some of whom we will discuss, are better understood as broader trends with various expressions. That is to say that a singular figure, like Else Christensen, certainly played a significant role in establishing racialist Odinism in the U.S., for example, but even her singular influence in introducing it to American racialists exists within a larger terrain of how racialist Odinism is understood in white nationalism.

Since first emerging in the early 1970s, racialist Odinism has become one of the most popular religious alternatives in the white nationalist milieu. The attraction to Norse myth as an articulation of original and untainted European-ness and the imagery of berserker Vikings and runes is ubiquitous in the white nationalist milieu. Even William Pierce used the “life rune,” or ᚫ, as a symbol for National Alliance. Odinism and the imagery of Vikings and so forth seemed to speak to white men after the 1960s who longed for a sense of authenticity and strength, as well as community. As Betty Dobratz in her 2001 article has noticed, the construction of identity through religions is of central importance to white nationalists. Odinism in particular provides such a religious identity that allows for certain expressions that accommodate the need for the individual to construct a collective identity. As Mattias Gardell remarks in the conclusion of his landmark study Gods of the Blood, racialist Odinists “mobilize history to further
strengthen the separateness of the imagined community, tracing the racial or ethnic nation back to Europe and beyond Christianity to the perceived point of cultural origin.”¹

Gardell also noticed that in this regard “the tide of racist and ethnic paganism in the United States is linked with the processes of globalization and with the mainstream redefinition of the American ‘nation’ to include as co-nationals all people in its territory irrespective [of] race, ethnicity, or religious preference.”² This certainly fits with my analysis from the previous chapter wherein I placed Klassen’s Racial Holy War in the context of disillusionment among racial-rightists after Civil Rights legislation and the liberalization of immigration policy. But, as Gardell also notices, the pluralization of Americanness raises the issue of identity for white Americans who, though not always in separatist terms, sought answers to complex questions about identity by exploring their ethnic past.

This brings to the fore another aspect of the historical context in which contemporary white nationalism in America emerged; one that relates to the shifts in understandings of ethnic whiteness and the place of an identity politics after the mid-1960s. As Omi and Winant point out in *Racial Formation in the United States*, the “revitalized presence” of white supremacist groups after the 1960s was not simply an economically driven response but “also a political response to the liberal state and reflected a crisis of identity” in which the far-right sought “to develop a new white identity, to reassert the very meaning of whiteness, which had been rendered unstable and
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unclear by the minority challenges of the 1960s.” Mathew Frye Jacobson discusses this change in attitudes toward ethnic whiteness further in *Roots Too*, wherein he addresses the “surge in popular ‘ethnic’ concerns in the 1960s and after” and its political significance, particularly the “white ethnic revival,” that had blunted the charges of the racist history of America and “eased the conscience of a nation that had just barely begun to reckon with the harshest contours of its history forged in white supremacy.” All of this is to say that the historical moment in which racialist Odinism emerges and becomes popular in the United States is a moment in which white identity is shifting and the politics of ethnic and racial identity is at stake. In this moment, as Gardell remarks, “Odinism’s tribal mode of social organization” was able to provide a sense of community that takes as its core an ethnisized, racio-religious identity. Odinism creates an ideological and identitarian center for some racialists who feel thrown about in a time of flux through a sense of an authentic, timelessly essential, religiously anchored whiteness that was once, as the narrative goes, stolen by Christianization.

This once again draws attention to the historical and cultural conditions related to the emergence of a new racial nationalist consciousness that mutated existing forms of racism in America to adapt them to perceived threats to “the white race” in post-Civil Rights society. It is no mere coincidence that racialist Odinism first manifests in the United States in the early 1970s. In general, white nationalism represents a re-articulation of whiteness and should be seen as a part of this general trend that Omi and Winant
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notice; but racialist Odinism, I argue, should further be seen as a clearer example of how important imagining allegedly more authentic forms of whiteness are among the racist right, and how religion facilitates this reimagining. This is especially noticeable in the discourse among racialist Odinists who speak of Northern European civilization having been colonized and subjugated by Christianity. As we have seen, racial nationalists often made the claim that Christianity was foisted upon them and that it had corrupted the so-called racial instincts of European peoples. But, as we had an intensification of the rhetoric of race-war in Creativity, so in Odinism we have an intensification of the rhetoric of a stolen identity by processes of Christianization. More particular to this chapter, I argue that the rejection of Christianity in white nationalist forms of Odinism is an expression of the re-imagining of white racial community that takes as its central project the reclamation of an imagined essential racio-religious white identity over and against “Jewish Christianity,” which it must do, or see the white race perish.

I proceed in this chapter first to discuss the complexities of how racialist Odinism is signified. This is particularly important as the field of Germanic Neopaganism is a complicated one that continues to deal internally with its relationship to racialism. Further, most readers are not familiar with the various manifestations Northern Tradition, and probably less familiar with the particular discussion about racism within it. To discuss the rejection of Christianity within what I have called racialist Odinism I must define it for the reader. After this I will discuss the emergence of racialist Odinism in the United States through Else Christensen, whom I mentioned a moment ago, and the influences she had in formulating her Odinism as a raci0-religious identitarian project
with political consequences. Then we will look at the Wotanism of David Lane as an example of how militarized this trend of thought has become. In particular this will touch on the role of gender and anxieties about interracial sexuality in the obligation, transcendentalized in “authentic” religiosity, to protect the white race from extinction. I suggest that this shows yet another aspect of how Christianity is regarded as a problem in contemporary white nationalism more generally.

The Heuristics of Racialist Odinism:

Before we continue with the discussion of racialist Odinism, we must define it, especially since there are Odinisms to consider; some of which are in fact non-racialist. Further complicating the picture, there are other terms for revivals or articulations of the pre-Christian religions of Northern Europe. Odinism refers of course to the reverence of the chief deity of the ancient Norse pantheon, Odin. Another term is Ásatrú, meaning faith of the Aesir—the gods of Norse mythology, and Heathenry, which is a more general term. Finally there is Theodism, which is described as the “pre-Christian folk religion” of the “Anglo-Teutonic” peoples. These need to be understood as close cognates in some cases, but sometimes refer to distinct ideals of the Northern Tradition, as it may also be called, which forms are not always sympathetic to racism as they see it. When discussing the religions that call for a revival or recovery of ancient Germanic religions, however understood, one must take caution as there is no monolithic Odinism/Ásatrú/Heathenry to be considered. Self-described Pagans are often, but not always, eclectic in their approach.
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in any case, and often shun centralized authority. Further, given that Pagans of all
persuasions have faced ridicule, unwarranted media scrutiny, and sometimes outright
hostility and persecution, one must be extra cautious to not mistakenly label them or
allow the assumption that they are all racists, especially as this very discussion is ongoing
within the communities of Pagans and Heathens.

Of course much of this complicated and ongoing debate is beyond the aims of this
chapter. Such work would in itself require a separate project. In my treatment of the
rejection of Christianity among white nationalists I am not concerned with non-racialist
Odinists. I am not necessarily interested in “folkish” practitioners, apart from making
certain that the reader understands that the communities regard themselves as distinct
communities. Further, for the most part I will use the term Odinism because of the
particular history that I will discuss in the forthcoming section. It is the majority term that
is self-applied, and is itself historically significant. This will shift slightly when we
finally discuss the Wotanism of David Lane, which is a more militant position than
Christensen’s Odinism. Here we have another variation in name, taking an alternative
Wodan, and in this case using the acronym, WOTAN—Will Of The Aryan Nation. 8

Odinism in its most general terms has been used to name the revival of the
ancient, pre-Christian religions of the Germanic speaking peoples of northern Europe.
References to this revival go as far back as 1848 in Orestes A. Brownson’s “Letter to the

8 David Lane, “Wotanism (Odinism)” *Victory or Valhalla* (butte, MT: THORINK, 2008),
195.
Protestants,” in which he referred to a “revival” of “odinism” in Norway and Denmark.9 In some ways the contest over whether this is a revival of an old tradition or based on surviving traditions from pre-Christian times is of debate still within the Odinist milieu. This reflects much of the similar debate within neo-Paganism in general, and especially in Wicca in relation to its development by Gerald Gardner.10 But, as Margot Adler notices in Drawing Down the Moon, Odinism/ Ásatrú /Heathenry, tends to be different than many other Neopaganisms in that it tends to be “more conservative in its values and ideas…, stressing concepts like family, courage, and warrior virtues.”11 With this generality in place, however, we must draw further distinctions. As Matthias Gardell writes in Gods of the Blood, “Far from being a monolithic entity, the world of Norse paganism in the United States is extremely diverse.”12 So at this point it is best to describe how divisions among these groups are made and what they mean for this chapter.

The first division is among those described as universalist, who do not regard Odinism to be a racially specific tradition but a path available to anyone who wishes to engage with it without regard to one’s ethnic or racial origin. It is not unusual find pagans in America working with Ásatrú and other traditions together, including Native American traditions, and other forms of Neopagan practice. For many Pagans, one’s gods or

goddesses are chosen in ways that are often highly complex and deeply personal. This of course stands in contrast to “folkish” and racist Odinists who place a high value on one’s ancestral religion, though in different terms. These are in agreement that Ásatrú/Odinism is exclusively the religion of the Northern European peoples to the exclusion of all other gods or traditions, and to them it should be exclusive to the Germanic peoples. But there is often much less comradeship or agreement between them otherwise. This discord is discussed well, though the work is a bit dated now, in Jeffery Kaplan’s article “The Reconstruction of the Ásatrú and Odinist Traditions.” I cannot here develop everything that Kaplan notes and the subsequent history since the article’s publication, but I can in broad strokes offer some helpful outlines.

While both “folkish” and racist Odinists define Odinism as a biologically inherited spiritual inclination, they often distinguish between themselves. Folkish Odinists describe themselves as eschewing notions of white supremacy, favoring a sort of multiculturalist tolerance position without recourse to what they regard as hurtful bigotry, while racist Odinists openly espouse racist ideologies and anti-Semitism. But this distinction quickly becomes complex as one engages with the discourses of those who seem firmly within the racist Odinist camp. For example, both David Lane, who was a member of the white nationalist terrorist organization The Order, and his associate Ron McVan, a former member of the Church of the Creator before coming to Odinism, do not think of themselves as white supremacists in those terms. Further, as Matthias Gardell

---

points out, antiracist pagans have criticized folkish Odinists of “racializing Ásatrú.”

However, as Gardell also points out, Stephen McNallen, who by any measure would be described as a “folkish” Odinist, has in particular made great efforts to keep National Socialist elements and skinheads away from his organization. Gardell concludes that we therefore should not consider all folkish organizations, and in particular the AA (Ásatrú Alliance) and the AFA (Ásatrú Free Assembly), as white supremacist hate groups. However we should considered what the distinction here actually means when we are looking at racialized religions or religions that regard their spiritual power and access to that power as genetically predetermined. Can we then say we are dealing with what may be regarded as virulence in the expression of racialism as the distinguishing characteristic between folkish and racialist Odinists?

In Adler discusses Heathenry in some detail, with special attention to the debate over the place of racism and Nazism in Odinism. She notes that even within the “Pagan movement” the general assumption was that “Norse Paganism was filled with such people”—meaning Nazis and racists. Because of what Adler described as the confusion around this issue for her and many Pagans, she avoided the issue for some time. In later editions of the book, she decided to give “folkish” Odinists a fair hearing vis-à-vis these assumptions. She too addresses Ásatrú Alliance and Ásatrú Free Assembly, and specific spokespersons, including a number of quotes from McNallen, and found repeated emphasis on “a belief in the primacy of genetics, as well as a belief that certain aspects of

---
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the soul are transmitted down the family line, that reincarnation comes within race, tribe, and family.”

Further, she discovered that political discourse in The Odinist Fellowship, which was started by Else Christensen, was in her assessment “frankly racist.” So then are we again dealing with degrees of frankness in the expression of what can be recognized as racist language?

Adler’s findings, far from settling the issue, further complicate the picture. From what is recounted in her interviews with Ben Waggoner of the Troth, another Odinist organization, we find emerging developments in the basic categories I have laid out in that he describes some Odinists as “folkishuniversalists.” By this he means those who see significance in one’s ethnicity, and may regard that as a reason for being drawn to Heathenry, but would not exclude people for reasons of race or ethnicity. Adler then leaves us with a very complicated picture of Odinism; especially as she goes on to describe the varied practices of different groups, or kindreds, of Odinists. From what she offers we can however see that within this complexity notions of race and ethnicity are at stake for many Odinists, though not equally at stake, or for identical reasons. The question is then left to us to yet determine how race is implicated in individual articulations of Odinism case by case. This helps in some ways as I do not intend on giving an exhaustive account of Odinism in any form, but only intend to come to terms with why some whom we will describe as racialist Odinists reject Christianity.

It is perhaps productive then to establish a sort of racist minimum so that we can distinguish between Odinists in the white nationalist milieu and those outside of it. For
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Gardell, the “racist pagans” are defined by the way they “biologize spirituality.” Of course as we have seen from Cosmotheism and Creativity this biologization of spirituality trend is not exclusive to Odinism. More to the point however we can see how this biologization of spirituality as the minimum for understanding “racist paganism” troubles the boundary that folkish Odinists try to establish. While Gardell argues that McNallen and Christensen “represent two spate tendencies within contemporary Norse paganism,” and contrasts the “the more racial and political interpretation” by Christensen and the “more religious and ‘ethnic’ interpretation” of McNallen, both biologize Odinist spirituality. Though “folkish” Odinists do not regard themselves as white nationalists, and try to separate themselves from national socialists and skinheads, they are still implicated in discussions of racialized religiosity that articulate a critique of Christianity on the grounds of racial incompatibility. As Odinism, as Gardell and Dobratz recognize, is one of the most significant religious trends in white nationalism today, which cannot be said of many other Neopaganisms, there seems to be more space for this kind of inquiry. As Jeffery Kaplan noted, there are internal tensions that Odinism must confront in relation to racialism. Therefore to effectively discuss the complexities and differences that do exist among so-called “folkish” and “racist” Odinists one cannot simply repeat the distinctions that some Odinists wish to establish between themselves.

When one thinks in terms of the biologization of spirituality, or the racialization of religion, one implicates the folkish and racist categories together. Therefore one must apply a heuristic distinction that highlights the differences in ways that are useful, though

perhaps fraught with tensions that are ongoing in emic and etic distinctions. As I discuss the writings of McNallen and Christensen, and then David Lane, with some reference to others, I will apply the terms folkish and racialist for reasons of distinguishing those who are operating in terms of a white nationalist project in the way I have defined it in the introduction and those who are not. Whatever troubling biologizing of religion McNallen is doing in his folkish Odinism, he is not a white nationalist. In this way my heuristic is meant to capture the white nationalism in certain Odinisms to then explain the reasons certain Odinsist have rejected Christianity. However, to do this I will employ a comparative historical strategy in discussing the emergence of McNallen’s folkish Odinism and Christensen’s racist Odinsim.

*Odinism in America:*

The previous section is meant to serve as a primer to understand the internal contests over racialization in Odinism, but it also serves as a primer to understand the history of Odinism in the U.S. and its import to the American white nationalist scene. Temporally speaking, both Christensen and McNallen formulated their Odinisms at nearly the same time. Christensen began to be active in Odinism in America when she established Odinist Fellowship with her husband Alex in 1969.\(^{25}\) Stephen McNallen quite independently from Christensen’s influence, as he maintains, began to “follow the gods of the Vikings in either 1968 or 1969” while in college.\(^{26}\) For McNallen the devotion to the Northern gods in the early years was out of “romanticism” and his “desire to do great
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deeds.” However, after some solitary practice he began to organize for the reverence of the gods. As I have mentioned, this historical moment in America was marked by European Americans seeking their roots in projects that mimicked other identity movements that were going on at the time. McNallen in particular makes mention repeatedly of the similarities as he sees them between what he was doing in recovering the ways of his ancient Germanic ancestors and what Native Americans and African Americans investigating and practicing their indigenous traditions. He says on his new blog, as he has stated elsewhere as well numerous times, “Just as there is Native American religion and native African religion, so there is native European religion.”

McNallen argues in his video “Asatru/Odinism—A Native European Religion” that “beneath” the newer labels of American, German, or Dane there “lurks an older and more essential identity” that he seeks to recover by returning to the ways of his European ancestors. He then immediately compares this to the efforts of Native Americans and African Americans “in the 1960s and 70s” to return to the “ways of their ancestors” to “express their innate spirituality.” In this context he proclaims, “Now it is time for people of European descent… to harken back to this older identity.” For McNallen, Odinism is about the recovery of essential, ethnic identities that operate in tandem with other such projects.

This of course coincides with the general shifts, realignments and backlashes that followed the passing of Civil Rights legislation in the mid-nineteen sixties, and the repeal

27 Ibid, 206.
of immigration restriction in 1965. As Mark Noll notes in *God and Race in American Politics*, “the quarter century from 1955 to 1980 witnessed unusually complex connections for the nexus of race, religion, and politics.”\(^{30}\) Noll’s observations are focused on the “mobilization of white evangelicals,” but I think we can see that these shifts affected other kinds of reactions, such as McNallen’s search for authenticity in his racio-religious expressions of Odinism.\(^{31}\) McNallen however did not see the empowerment of Native Americans and African Americans to turn to their ethnic roots as a threat to America or to white people, but as an opportunity for European Americans to likewise throw off the impositions of Christianity and return likewise to their roots. His Odinism therefore relies not on notions of racial supremacy, but on a certain understanding of multiculturalism in biologically determined religiosities.

McNallen’s folkish Odinism reflects a certain liberalized notion of racial identity, relativized into a schema of tolerance. And although he deeply biologizes his Odinism, he does not think of it as a will to superiority or violence against others. On the contrary, McNallen regards aggressive racisms as foreign to his project. As Gardell notices, McNallen and other “folkish” Odinists, “characterize national socialism as an unwanted totalitarian philosophy incompatible with freedom-loving Norse paganism.”\(^{32}\) When McNallen formed the Viking Brotherhood in 1969/70, and then began publishing his periodical *Runestone* in 1971-72, his interests were in expressing the romantic notions of

---


\(^{31}\) Ibid, 156.

Viking lore rather than pushing for revolution or political action for the white race.\textsuperscript{33} McNallen’s stance against those he thought were white supremacist or sympathetic to neo-Nazism in Ásatrú Free Assembly, which he formed after Viking Brotherhood, alienated some Odinists in the organization, notably Wyatt Kaldenberg, who left the because of what he saw as McNallen’s “soft stance on race.”\textsuperscript{34} One could then describe McNallen’s Odinism as essentialist-multiculturalist, meaning that he regards religiosity or spirituality as racially designated, but does not necessarily place these prescriptions in an order of hierarchy. In this way one can see the reasons for the claims from “folkish” Odinists that they are not “racists,” and the comments against them by racialist Odinists that they are soft on the issue of race.

Else Christensen’s racist Odinism however has been otherwise perceived by practicing Odinists and scholars alike. Gardell describes her Odinism as political as well as racial in a way that McNallen’s wasn’t. It is telling, as I have mentioned, that McNallen directly refutes the claims from an otherwise unnamed “Marxist critic” that he was somehow influenced by Christensen or Alexander Rud Mills, whom we will discuss more in a moment.\textsuperscript{35} This difference in approach between Christensen and McNallen is accounted for in part because of the influences she took into her Odinism that McNallen did not embrace. One particular influence on Christensen was A.R. Mills, an Australian fascist and founder of the Anglecyn Church of Odin. He is still memorialized on the website for Odinic Rite Australia as the one who inspired those who introduced Odinism

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid, 259.
\textsuperscript{34} Quoted in Gardell, \textit{Gods of the Blood}, 178.
\textsuperscript{35} McNallen, “Three Decades of Asatru Revival,” 206.

The affinities between Mills, Christensen and contemporary racialized Odinsim are demonstrated in the publication of Mills’s 1957 essay, \textit{The Call of our Ancient Nordic Religion}, which was reprinted by The Odinic Rite after Christensen’s death in 2005 in honor of her and Mills.\footnote{Ibid.} In this essay, Mills writes that “[c]ontemporary religion has tended to restrict our religious and philosophical thought to that of ancient Judea, two thousand years ago.”\footnote{Odinic Rite is a significant Odinist organization that describes itself this way, “The Odinic Rite is an organization whose aims are to promote all aspects of our ancestral religion today called Odinism, the organic spiritual beliefs and way of life of the indigenous peoples of Northern Europe.” The “watch-words,” which appear as part of their logo on the website are “Faith, Folk, Family,” which they say summarizes “their ideals” well. See link: \url{http://www.odinic-rite.org/main/faq/}} For Mills the goal of the Odinist in light of this is to return to the
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authentic religion of the Germanic peoples, to address the lack of awareness of his people’s “racial origins,” and to overcome the teachings that he blames on Christianity that “race and breeding are of no value so far as mankind is concerned.”\textsuperscript{42} For Mills the stakes of such a venture are much like that articulated by Pierce in Cosmotheism—lack of integral awareness has, he says, “destroyed our connection with our own Father Spirit in God, our creator and our source of strength and life.”\textsuperscript{43}

Christensen likewise thinks of Odinism as that which “will replace the alien Christian creed with a religious philosophy based on [the Aryan’s] inherent mentality and … folkish traditions and culture, in keeping with [their] folk soul.”\textsuperscript{44} For her, Odinism was, as it was for Mills, the authentic expression of the Aryan race and directly counters both secularism in the form of Marxism and alien religion in the form of Christianity. And, as was the case with Mills, her idea of Odinism is set deep in a foundation of racial theory. One of the references that she makes in \textit{An Introduction to Odinism} is to Hans F.K. Günther’s \textit{Religious Attitudes of the Indo-Europeans}, the thesis of which is, as it is repeated in her text, that “Indo-European religiosity is always linked with the conviction of the value of birth and pride in heredity, and that man has an unalterable hereditary nature and an inborn nobility which it is his duty to society to maintain.”\textsuperscript{45} In other words, her Odinism was tied to racial identity in the form of recovery that placed a primacy on heredity.
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Christensen recommends Günther’s book along with Ernest Sevier Cox’s White America, A New Theory of Evolution by Sir Arthur Keith, and The Importance of Race in Civilization by Wayne McLeod as books that “every Odinist should read,” as they “express Odinist sentiments and form a solid basis for further reading.”46 Each of these texts is paradigmatic expressions of race theory, and support both racial separation and white racial supremacy. It is important to note that Günther himself wrote mostly books of “racial habits,” which titles include Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes [A Racialiology of the German Folk] (1930) and Rassenkunde des judische Volkes [A Racialogy of the Jewish Folk] (1930), and is himself described as “the most widely read theoretician of race in Nazi Germany,” and “an exponent of Nordic superiority and Heinrich Himmler’s mentor.”47 He also held important positions within the university system of the Third Reich, establishing, along with Eugen Fischer, Alfred Rosenberg’s Frankfurt Institute for Research into the Jewish Question. He even received from Rosenberg the Goethe Medal in 1941, whereupon Rosenberg told him, “Your work has been of utmost importance for the safeguarding and development of the National Socialist Weltanschauung.”48

This connection between Christensen and Rassenkunde advocates is no mere guilt by association. She bases many of her ideology on this sort of work as she decries equality and argues for the “close physical and spiritual similarities” of “all Aryan
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peoples.”49 In Christensen’s Odinism, racial differences are spiritually important, political relevant, and determinative of the proper course of action for racial activists. But it is important to notice that while Mills was for most of his early career a nationalist in the traditional sense, concerned with the English nation and British Empire, Christensen’s was always more transnationally racial. As we continue in exploring deeply political, racist Odinisms we must to keep in mind their very different contexts in which they emerge and the ways in which American racialized Odinism under Christiansen came to be at once trans-national and racial nationalist. But what Mills and Christensen share is a deep racial essentialism and anti-Semitism that informs their anti-Judeo-Christianity.

Mills, as Michael Moynihan recognizes in his entry in the Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature, never directly enjoyed much influence, and he “never found any significant support for his efforts… his work has largely faded into obscurity.”50 But he did have significant influence on Else Christensen and her Odinist Fellowship, which went on to have significant impact on the development of racialist Odinism in America. Through her publications, namely her essay An Introduction to Odinism and the periodical The Odinist, she was able to articulate a vision of a politicized, racialist Odinism that was very close to that of Mills, and similarly sought to return to pre-Christian and therefore more authentic religion of the white race. But she was not herself working in a vacuum.

Else Oscher was born in 1913 on the West coast of Denmark. She later married Aage Alex Christensen in 1937, who had served for a time as a lieutenant in the small

49 Christensen, An Introduction to Odinism, 3 & 7.
Danish National Socialist Workers’ Party during the 1930s and early 40s.\textsuperscript{51} When the couple emigrated to the U.S. they established Odinist Fellowship, as I mentioned; but Else Christensen didn’t become very active herself until 1971 after Alex’s death.\textsuperscript{52} She would become known eventually as the “Folk Mother,” and epithet that was put on her gravestone after her death in 2005.\textsuperscript{53}

It is clear from the biographical work done on Christensen, primarily by Matthias Gardell and Jeffrey Kaplan, that she had three main influences: Mills, of course, but also her husband Alex with whom she helped establish Odinist Fellowship in 1969, and the American Far-Right scene, especially Willis Carto. Both Gardell and Kaplan also point out that Christensen was also particularly influenced by that singular document of the pan-European, Post War document—Francis Parker Yockey’s \textit{Imperium}.\textsuperscript{54} Christensen’s Odinism therefore must be seen as a nexus of religio-racism that solidified multiple notions of the emerging racial nationalist scene directed through a particular religious lens.

In her essay \textit{An Introduction to Odinism}, Christensen repeats many themes that should be familiar—racial essentialism as the most apparent them, but also a notion of racial imperilment. “The struggle unfolding before our eyes,” writes Christensen, “is the age-old fight between opposite, racially-conditioned inner values, reflecting the endless conflict of race vs. race, people vs. people, nation vs. nation: a conflict between alien Asiatic credos… and Western Aryan tribalism with its ideals of personal responsibility
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\textsuperscript{54} Kaplan and Weinberg, \textit{The Emergence of the Euro-American Right}, 106.
and folk identity.”\textsuperscript{55} For Christensen racial essentialism means an absolute division between peoples, of course; but more so that mixing religions is analogous to mixing races in that it leads to confusion and conflict. Moreover, like Klassen, she views these discrete racial entities and their essentialized ideologies as mutually exclusive and always in conflict.

Like Oliver, who took much of what he says about Christianity’s debilitating effects on a culture from Yockey, Spengler, and Lawrence R. Brown, Christensen writes a brief historical outline of the collapse of the Roman Empire in the wake of the popularization of Christianity. She says of the origin of Christianity that it developed “from an obscure set of universalist-minded Hebrews called Essenes.”\textsuperscript{56} She further describes Christianity as “the illegitimate offspring” of Judaism, and was like its parent religion, made up of “stolen” concepts from more ancient traditions, such as Egyptian and Babylonian religions, and the “ideas of the Judaic Hebrews” were “grafted” onto Christianity; among the most pernicious of which in her view were “the well-nigh paranoid belief that [the Jews] were the ‘Chosen People’… and were destined to rule the world,” and its “advocacy for equality.”\textsuperscript{57} Her verdict as to the history of the contact between Rome and this “Jewish” religion is that the Empire was “riddled with decadence and universalism,” and was eventually overcome by the “Christian plague” that it was “too weak to repel.”\textsuperscript{58} Her judgment is further that the same fate awaited the “Teutonic tribes” who first bowed to Rome and then, after coalescing into “recognized nations,”
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submitted to the Church, which was able to “marshal the might of the State for its own purposes” to “convert or crush Aryan heathens and ‘heretics’.” ⁵⁹ In her telling, through the Church that had overcome the Empire, Christianity was able to “effectively spread spiritual subversion and gain political sway among its less well-organized Teutonic hosts.” ⁶⁰

Of course this should ring familiar with the previous chapters and with the history of anti-Semitic discourses in general. Christensen further restates Lawrence R. Brown’s thesis Christianity had a debilitating effect on Europeans resulting from the imposition of a Jewish ideology on the Aryan mind. Christensen states that this “act of violence” resulted in a “spiritual schizophrenia” that today manifests itself “in the complete breakdown of our native spirituality.” ⁶¹ She further repeats the frequent accusation that Marxism and Christianity are related in their supposed common Jewish origin. She refers to “Christian and Marxist concepts” spread by their respective “missionaries” that are “against our inborn, folkish grain.” ⁶² Prime among these concepts for her are “moth-eaten doctrines of universal-brotherhood, the dissolution of family ties and the social equality of all humans.” ⁶³ Christianity is for her, like Marxism, a purveyor of alien ideologies that imperils the white race via mental and spiritual subversion.

There is very little here that we are not already familiar with in Christensen’s rejection of Christianity from Oliver, Pierce, and Klassen. However there are ways in which her Odinism, even though it put forth common arguments, was not accepted by
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everyone in the emerging white nationalist milieu. In his collection of articles on “Comparative Religion,” Klassen incorporates a comparison of Odinism and Creativity, and in this, the letter he wrote to Christensen and her reply. There are several points of disagreement that are a bit semantic, and some still that are more substantive; disagreements over the use of the phrase “Aryan-soul” to describe the white race, and in particular the shunning of any notions of deity from Klassen’s point view. Klassen is at his most strident against Odinism in this last point. While he praises Odinists as fine, intelligent people, whose stance on racial issues is properly “pro-White,” he is nevertheless concerned for their obsession with “spooks in the sky,” and implores them to join him in the Church of the Creator. His conclusion against Odinism is quite harsh: “If Odinism did not have the intellectual and spiritual strength to hold its own against Jewish Christianity a thousand years ago when the Vikings had Europe at its mercy,” he writes, “what would lead any reasonable person to believe it can now reverse the situation under conditions that are a thousand times more unfavorable than they were then?”

Odinism is problematic for Klassen because, of course, there are “spooks in the sky” in its belief system, but more importantly he regards it as inefficacious in the defense of the white race against “Jewish Christianity.”

Christensen replied to Klassen’s statements against Odinism, which he put as questions to her in a letter her. After cordialities, she explains her position vis-à-vis the belief in the gods. She states that she does not believe in the gods in the same way that she thinks of a Christian who believes in god. For example, when speaking of Thor she

---

does not think “that the god is traveling across the heavens in the goat-drawn chariot,”
she says “to us Thor at that point is a reminder of the terrific powerful forces of
Nature.” 66 So she sets out in part to correct a false assumption about what Odinists believe
about the gods, but more important is her reply to his question about the efficacy of
Odinism. For her, one must consider that “most people are driven by their emotions, and
not by their logic.” 67 The efficacy in Odinism is then in the way it inspires the kinship
and unity. For her, racial activists should “fight on all fronts,” including in the realm of
emotion. 68 One must feel “racial solidarity and have an emotional basis for their inborn
inclination,” she argues, “then political action will follow.” 69

Christensen was of course concerned with efficacy, but that efficacy meant that
one had to consider emotive attachments to one’s imagined community in a common
spiritual past. To return again to An Introduction to Odinism, Christensen is clear that the
goal of her Odinism is to “replace the alien Christian creed” with one that she regards as
the “inherent mentality” and “folkish traditions and culture, in keeping with [the] folk-
soul” of the white race. 70 This reclamation is central to fending off the continual
onslaught, so regarded by her, of the “decadence and universalism” of the “Christian
plague.” 71 From here she believes that the Aryan folk can then find their way back to full
being of what they were intended to be and that which will preserve them in the future.
For her though, as she told Klassen, this was a necessary move to the greater ambitions of
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political solidarity. To establish a political program for the preservation of the white race “Western Aryan tribalism” with its “folk identity” must be restored.\textsuperscript{72}

In the next section we will see where racialist Odinism and Klassen’s thought come closer together, particularly the notion of race-war and its centrality to white nationalist ideology and a particular understanding of Natural Law. In particular, notions of gender, which are common to white nationalist groups, become more apparent. Certainly, as Abbey Ferber in particular has discussed, gender and the fear of interracial sexuality are important to racist discourse, but I don’t simply wish to repeat this point that she makes so well. To demonstrate how in Wotanism in particular the masculinist narratives of the protection of white women and children become an ideo-motor that is meant to compel one to defend the white race. This ethical command is also linked with the racio-religious identitarian recovery of not only an efficacious ideology, but one that is imagined as authentic as well. I see this as central to the rejection of Christianity in Wotanism, but also within the larger milieu of racialist Odinism.

\textit{Wotansvolk and the “14 Words”:}

Christensen certainly was concerned with the perpetuation of the white race, but one can be forgiven for not seeing it clearly, as this aspect of her activities was only stated as an outcome of the more privileged project of recovery of the imagined pre-Christian identity. With other, later forms of racialist Odinism, particularly David Lane’s Wotanism, the message of racial survival is not in any way muted. Wotansvolk was established by David Lane, his wife Katja, and Ron McVan in 1995, and was

\textsuperscript{72} Ibid, 1.
headquartered in northern Idaho.\textsuperscript{73} In “Wotansvolk: A Revolution in Thought,” McVan describes the “effort” of Wotansvolk to “recharge the folk consciousness of Aryan man, to think with our blood and unite under our common heritage, mythos and indigenous folk religion.”\textsuperscript{74} This is quite close to the stated goal of Christensen’s Odinism, but David Lane further described Wotanism as not simply a recovery of the pre-Christian religion, but as a “vehicle” to “expound [their] message of racial survival.”\textsuperscript{75} Wotansfolk’s mission was not only to recover the indigenous religion of the European, long suppressed by the vial forces of Jewish Christianity, but to prepare for a racial revolution to preserve the white race. “Be a berserker until the day you depart for Valhalla,” writes David Lane. He goes on in the next sentence to argue, “Only out of anarchy and revolution can a new White nation arise.”\textsuperscript{76} The fetishization of the imagined Viking past, tied directly to the desire for full race-war is for Lane the only way white race can preserve itself.

David Lane is now remembered as among the most significant ideologues of the most revolutionary form of white nationalism, and racialist Odinism in particular. David Lane, born in Colorado in 1951, was, as Gardell describes him, a longtime racist activist who subsequently down played his former Christian Identity affiliations as a younger man.\textsuperscript{77} Lane in fact died in federal prison in 2007, having been convicted in 1985 for his

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{75} David Lane, “Wotansvolk,” \textit{Victory or Valhalla}, edited by Java and Sissy (Butte, MT: THORINK, 2008), 208.

\textsuperscript{76} David Lane, “Open Letter to a Dead Race,” \textit{Victory or Valhalla: The Final Compilation of Writings}. Edited by Java and Sissy (Butte, MT: Thorink, 2008), 327.

criminal activities in the terrorist organization called The Order.\textsuperscript{78} It is difficult to overstate the importance of The Order, or the Brüders Schweigen (Silent Brotherhood), to the white nationalist community. It has been memorialized in song, prose, and poetry, and its leader, Robert J. Matthews himself has gained martyr status in the global racist context, notably in a song by Saga, a Swedish song writer and performer, titled “Gone with the Breeze.”\textsuperscript{79} The Order and Bob Matthews were even the subjects of a documentary on ABC’s Turning Point in 1995 and a movie titled Brotherhood of Murder, based on the memoir written by one of the members, Tom Martinez, who turned informant for the FBI. For scholars of domestic criminal terrorism, like Mark Hamm, “The Order wrote the book on living in the white underground.”\textsuperscript{80}

The Order’s criminal activity—or revolutionary action, if one adopts their point of view—included counterfeiting to undermine the U.S. economy, armed robbery of three armored cars to fund operations, the bombing of a synagogue that killed two people, and the assassination of radio talk-show host Alan berg; and they even had an assassination list that included the names of various “racial enemies,” such as Henry Kissinger and members of the Rockefeller and Rothschild families.\textsuperscript{81} However, The Order’s revolution was put to an end by federal authorities in 1985 with indictments of key members such as

\textsuperscript{79} A fan video, which compiles scenes from Brotherhood of Murder and an iconic photograph of Matthews confronting anti-racist activists, can be found through this link: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3cHadfUoFbI. For more on Saga, one may see here website at http://www.thisissaga.com/. Saga also made a tribute song for David Lane called “Goodbye David Lane,” done in the tune of “Candle in the Wind” by Elton John (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A9TmfSwntOg)
\textsuperscript{80} Mark S. Hamm, Terrorism as Crime: From Oklahoma City to Al-Qaeda and Beyond (New York: New York University Press, 2007), 144.
\textsuperscript{81} Durham, White Rage, 101-102.
David Lane, and most spectacularly by the death of Robert J. Mathews in a shoot-out at Whidbey Island off the coast of Washington in December of 1984.\(^2\)

Religion in The Order was a complex affair, as Michael Barkun and Matthias Gardell have noticed already in their work. According to Barkun, Matthews left behind a “blurred picture of his own religious convictions and loyalties.”\(^3\) Matthews’s former wife portrayed him as not having any particular religious affiliation, while Zillah Craig, the young girl by whom he fathered a child, maintained that Matthews was a strict Identity believer, while others still affirmed that he was an Odinist.\(^4\) Barkun notes however that though the record may confused be in describing what connections Matthews had to Christian Identity, many members of The Order were Identity followers. But it is also true that the organization had those who did not identify as Christian or affiliate themselves with Aryan Nations, and that this lead later to “tensions… between committed Identity believers and others in the organization.”\(^5\) Eventually, Barkun notes, this lead to different wings of the organization emerging among the forty members, though never a split or clear dissociation between the “Identity and non-Identity wings.”\(^6\) Of course there were members, as both Gardell and Barkun note, devout Identity Christians. But others, like Richard Scutari, Frank Silva (aka, Frank L. DeSilva), and David Lane, took a different path in racialist Odinism. Silva, Lane and Scutari in particular received attention outside the United States by racialist Odinists.\(^7\) Magnus


\(^4\) Ibid.

\(^5\) Ibid, 231.

\(^6\) Ibid.

\(^7\) Ibid, 228.
Söderman, contributor to and editor of the far-right Swedish nationalist magazine *Nationellt Motstånd* (National Resistance), and Henrik Holappa of Suomen Vastarintaliike (Finnish Resistance Movement) published letters exchanged with Richard Scutari in a volume titled *Unbroken Warrior* in 2011. This text was in fact published by Fredrik Vejdeland, a notorious far-right Swedish nationalist, through Nationellt Motstånd Förlag (National Resistance Press).  

The point here is that influences and experiences that no doubt shaped Lane’s Wotanism were complex, but certainly always revolutionary, and the outflows always pan-European.

Lane’s own writings, collected in the posthumously published volume *Victory or Valhalla*, a title that speaks volumes about how his life and work were seen by his admirers, provide material to understand Lane’s white nationalist, revolutionary religiosity. Apart from his “14 Words,” one of the clearest descriptions of Lane’s ideology is in his delineation of what he called the “88 precepts.” Much of the content of his bullet-pointed theses seems to blend Klassen’s notion of “Natural Law” and Christensen’s belief in the need for a return to the spiritual roots of pre-Christian Europe. In the introduction to these points, Lane writes, “The white peoples of the earth must collectively understand that they are equally subject to the iron-hard Laws of Nature with every other creature of the Universe, or they will not secure peace, safety, or even their existence.”

Further, in precept number three, Lane writes that religion is “the creation of
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88 Magnus Söderman and Henrick Holappa, *Unbroken Warrior: The Richard Scutari Letters* (Estonia: Fredrick Vejdeland, 2011). This text has also been featured on the website for Nordfront, linked here: [http://www.nordfront.se/motstandsrorelsen/nordfront-forlag](http://www.nordfront.se/motstandsrorelsen/nordfront-forlag), the editor in chief of which is Fredrik Vejdeland. Linked here is his statement about the site (in Swedish): [http://www.nordfront.se/rekordmanaden.smr](http://www.nordfront.se/rekordmanaden.smr)

mortals” and must be checked against the “natural world,” but in precept number seven that religion “in its most beneficial form is the symbology of a People and their culture,” and that a “multi-racial religion destroys the senses of uniqueness, exclusivity and value necessary to the survival of a race.”

The Jungian elements to his thought statement notwithstanding, what is clear is that Lane expresses a particular blending of the race-war logic of Creativity and the sense of ethno-religious identity that Christen was so concerned about. In particular this need for an authentic identity is most clear perhaps in precept number 62 in which Lane states that the “organic founding Law of any Nation,” referring of course to racial nationalism, “must state with unmistakable and irrevocable specificity the identity of the homogenous racial, cultural group for whose welfare it was formed.” This need for identitarian rootedness is probably more succinctly expressed through Wotanism in another essay titled “Valhalla—Fact or Fiction,” in which Lane argues that “as the descendants of the north folk, the offspring of Vikings, face extinction… perhaps nothing is more important than to look at our roots, including our ingenious religion.” It is clear here that Lane’s sense of religio-racial identity in and the protection and perpetuation of the white race are linked in Wotanism, not simply as a political project but also and ethical demand in keeping with the “intent of the Allfather” and the “Laws of Nature” that he allegedly established.
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The focus on racial survival is no more evident than in the David Lane’s “fourteen words”—“We Must Secure the Existence of Our People and a Future for White Children,” coined by him during his time in prison.\(^94\) This phrase has become one of the most significant white nationalist slogans shared across religious and organizational affiliations, and for Lane encapsulated everything Wotanism was about. In the words of McVan that echo his previous involvement with the Church of the Creator, “with Wotansvolk and the 14 Words we can rebuild the foundation towards our highest potential and our destiny as Nature’s finest.”\(^95\) At the center of Wotanism was therefore the obligation to secure white racial perpetuity, but also, at least for David Lane, white womanhood. “I fight to this day for my personal Fourteen Words,” writes Lane from prison, “BECAUSE THE BEAUTY OF THE WHITE ARYAN WOMAN MUST NOT PERISH FROM THE EARTH.”\(^96\) He goes on to argue, in the context of fears of “inter-racial mating” and the scarcity of young white females in the world, “sexual lust is the mother of battle and battle lust is the mother of nations.”\(^97\)

In keeping with my Bergsonian analysis, we can see in Wotanism the imagined community of the white race hemmed about with obligation transcendentalized in a religio-identitarian project that has as its stakes the survival of the closed racial society. But I would be remiss if I did not address the gendered and sexualized anxieties in Lane’s work that Abbey Ferber so ably identifies more broadly in white supremacy.

\(^{94}\) Ibid.
\(^{95}\) Quoted in Durham, *White Rage*, 73.
\(^{96}\) David Lane, “Open Letter to All Christians,” *Victory or Valhalla: The Final Compilation of Writings*. Edited by Java and Sissy (Butte MT: Thorink, 2008), 217.
\(^{97}\) Ibid.
In *White Man Falling* Ferber argues that “white supremacist discourse is about redefining masculinity,” and that gender “is clearly integral to white supremacist ideology.” Further, she argues that “key to comprehending the white supremacist worldview” is “interracial sexuality.” As she notices so succinctly, “interracial sexuality is the convenient threat to guard against intrusions upon white male… dominance.” To guard the white woman is to instantiate masculine control over the white racial body and thereby secure his identity. Policing intersexuality is policing the boundaries of white male identity. Her claim is broadly applicable to the white nationalist milieu, but it is clearly at work in Wotanism in particular. Ferber even uses Lane’s 14 Words as an epigraph to chapter nine of her book and argues that faced with “tenuous and vulnerable borders,” racial and gender borders, “the white supremacist goal is to secure these boundaries and guarantee white male domination.” This effort to assert raced and gendered boundaries in the maintenance of white male supremacy is clearly expressed in Lane’s “White Genocide Manifesto.”

Lane prefaces this list of fourteen points with the statement that “the term ‘racial integration’ is a euphemism for genocide.” This discourse is of course not new in America, as especially in segregationist discourses like the then Governor of Mississippi Ross, who in 1962 told the press that Mississippians would not “drink from the cup of
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genocide” in reference to integration. In particular, as is so common with white supremacist discourses of so-called white genocide, Lane explicitly references interracial mating. “The inevitable result of racial integration,” argues Lane, “is a percentage of inter-racial matings [sic] each year each year, leading to extinction, as has happened to the White race in numerous areas in the past.”

In the fourteen points themselves one sees clearly again confirmation of Ferber’s thesis as Lane argues that the “life of the race is in the wombs of its women.” Further, he transcendentalizes this claim as a biological and moral imperative, arguing that “the instinct of White men to preserve the beauty of their women and a future for White children on this earth is ordained by Nature and Nature’s God.”

From the above excerpts one can certainly affirm Ferber’s thesis about the centrality of gender and anxieties about interracial sexuality in white supremacist discourse. Certainly Lane sees the stakes of his project in terms of defending the race and protecting white womanhood together. The meshing of the life of the race and the reproductive capacities of the white woman as evidenced in the future white child, though ubiquitous in white supremacist discourse, is pronounced in Wotanism. But of course there is more to consider. In point four, where Lane proclaims that the “life of the race is in the wombs of its women,” he completes that thought with saying “today approximately 2% of the earth’s population is White female of childbearing age, this being the essential

104 Lane, White Genocide,” 321.
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demographic statistic relative to survival.”\textsuperscript{107} This seems to bend the discourse in the direction of the demographic anxieties that Appadurai discusses in \textit{Fear of Small Numbers} in which these anxieties about population numbering are entangled with other notions of insecurity, particular the material uncertainties in the growth of inequality in the latter 20\textsuperscript{th} and 21\textsuperscript{st} centuries, as well as identitarian uncertainty at work in such anxieties.\textsuperscript{108}

This of course does not disqualify Ferber’s argument, but it brings focus to the contours of racial protectionism drawn in the imbrication of race and gender, both of which indicate the presence of identity insecurity. It is not enough however to identify the gendered aspect of the discourse. It is important to understand that the gendered discourse in the context of racial protectionism is meant to exert pressure via moral force in the form of obligation to protect women and children with who lies the futurity of the white race. From this logic comes the rejection of Christianity. Lane argues that “Judeo-Christianity is dedicated to the concept of racial leveling the oneness of mankind and, therefore, genocide.”\textsuperscript{109} Therefore we can read the rejection of Christianity articulated here as the result of the gendered, sexed, and raced narratives of defense of the white race. To reject “Judeo-Christianity” is to move away from white genocide.

\textit{Conclusion—Toward the Re-Coding of Race as Culture:}

In this chapter I have tried to call attention to the identitarian contours of racialist Odinism and how they shaped the rejection of Christianity for some white nationalists. At the conclusion of \textit{Gods of the Blood}, Gardell writes that the “dual attraction” of the Norse
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mythos and outlaw mystique to contemporary racists “resembles the German national socialist fascination with Norse paganism that appealed to the… respective romances with the earth-based yeoman and the barbarian warrior-mystic.”\textsuperscript{110} For Bergson this would be no surprise. “Obligation, which we look upon as a bond between men, he writes, “first binds us to ourselves.”\textsuperscript{111} The moral force of the command to defend the race, in the terms Ferber provides, is also “the production of whiteness.”\textsuperscript{112}

It is significant that Goodrick-Clarke echoes some of this similarity between the conditions that produced historical fascisms in Germany and the present condition in the U.S. and Europe. In the introduction to \textit{Black Sun}, he writes, in a sense calling to mind Appadurai’s argument, that the U.S. and European countries are “facing a demographic shift against their historic native stocks,” and that the “resulting issue of white identity recapitulates the dilemma of Austrians and Germans fearing a loss of influence in the old Hapsburg Empire.”\textsuperscript{113} In keeping with the historical narrative I have established so far, Goodrick-Clarke states that “from the 1970s onward, right-wing extremists began to repackage the old ideology of Aryan racism, elitism and force in new cultic guises involving esotericism and Eastern religions.”\textsuperscript{114} In the coming chapter I will explore this entwining of fascists thought and esotericism among American racialists, both that which was indigenous to the American context and that which came from abroad, and in particular what this meant for perspectives on Christianity.
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\textsuperscript{113} Goodrick-Clarke, \textit{Black Sun}, 2.
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Chapter 5: Cultural Racism and Racial Esoteric Critiques of Christianity

The intrinsic ability to fit every individual within his proper niche in the structure of an Aryan State, to safeguard his mental and economic wellbeing through group effort towards a common National and Racial Destiny, the importance of the family as the building block of the pyramid of state power, the capacity to give every single individual a sense of ‘belonging,’ a source of purpose, a reason for living and working toward a higher goal in which every member of the Racial Nationalist State is involved—these are the accomplishments of Aryan Statecraft. –James Madole, “‘The New Atlantis’: A Blueprint for an Aryan ‘Garden of Eden in North America! (Part IX)”

There is not merely a single invariant racism but a number of racisms, forming a broad, open spectrum of situations... a determinate racist configuration has no fixed frontiers; it is a stage in a development which its own latent possibilities, as well as historical circumstances and the relations of force within the social formation, will shunt around within the spectrum of possible racisms. –Etienne Balibar, “Racism and Nationalism.”

Introduction:

In the previous chapter we had to navigate complicated internal distinctions among some Neopagan white nationalists, including the various signifiers for the Northern Tradition, to discuss the role of Odinist identitarian projects in the rejection of “Jewish-Christianity.” This is the challenge of coming to terms with a milieu within white nationalism rather than a singular figure. The challenge is increased in this chapter, both because of the variety of esoteric racialisms and because of the frequent exchanges between avowed racial activists and those who claim not to be. Of course it is not my goal here to assess all that may be included in what I call esoteric racialism. Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke in his works Hitler’s Priestess, a biography of Savitri Devi, and Black Sun, which is a more general discussion of the topic have done this already. My goal is not to repeat the work of Goodrick-Clarke or others, but rather to discuss the place of esoteric racialism in attitudes toward Christianity among American white nationalists.3

This chapter presents the most challenges by way of categorization. This pressure comes both from how we understand the term esotericism, and by way of determining who is a white nationalist and who may not so identify, but still has had an impact on white nationalist thought. Some aspects of this dual tension will be addressed in the first section of this chapter as I set out to define my term esoteric racialism. Others will be dealt with as we come upon them as the chapter unfolds. After a discussion of what I mean by esoteric racialism we will discuss William Dudley Pelley and his home-grown

3 There are at least two other works, both in German, that have to some degree influenced how I discuss what I call esoteric racialism: Vril: Eine okkulte Urkraft in Theosophie und esoterischem Neonazismus by Julian Straube (2013), and Religion als Kulturkritik: Neugermanisches Heidentum im 20. Jahrhundert by Stephanie von Schnurbein (1992). Of course, Goodricke-Clarke’s early work, The Occult Roots of Nazism: The Ariosophists of Austria and Germany, 1890-1935 (1985), though it offers more historical background for our interest here than it does a discussion post-WWII racialism.
fascist organization, beginning in the 1930s, and how this related to his esoteric thought. This sets up the more specific discussion of the ties between racism, esotericism, and the allure of uniformed fascism in America. From there I take a more detailed look at James Madole’s esotericism and his uniformed National Renaissance Party that began in the 1950s, and had a much more direct influence on contemporary white nationalism. Next we briefly look at George Lincoln Rockwell’s “esoteric Hitlerism” and the American Nazi Party, and the international exchanges in the World Union of National Socialists, or WUNS, that he and others began to establish in 1959. Here the confluence of esotericism, particularly of Savitri Devi, and post-WWII global political racialism come more into focus as a significant force.4

From this point we are able to look at American white nationalist engagements with esoteric interpretations of Charles Manson and racialist interpretations of Satanism in the repeated appearance of Nicholas Schreck, described as “multi-media magician, musician, author, film-maker, and religious teacher,” on Tom Metzger’s television program Race and Reason.5 Here we will see again a militant and politicized racist project that calls upon esoteric sources of identity to describe a means to confront what is described as an assault of Western culture by the forces of Judeo-Christian ideologies of equality. This comes indeed quite close to Creativity, especially with the continued references to a supposed natural order, and the social Darwinism that Schreck, Metzger,
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4 Fredrick Simonelli, American Fuehrer: George Lincoln Rockwell and the American Nazi Party (Urbana, IL: Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois, 1999) pp. 81-2.
5 More about Schreck can be found at http://www.nikolasschreck.eu/, though no mention of the interviews with Metzger are made on this, his “official” website.
and Klassen share. The point here is not to define Schreck as a white nationalist, but to point to the allure of esoterica to some in white nationalism.

In the final section, the picture becomes even more complex as we bridge both the “folkish,” and in some case approaching racist, interpretations of the Northern Tradition, so-called “radical traditionalism,” and the introduction of European New Right thought to the context of American white nationalism that we will cover more completely in the following chapter. In particular I will address the publication *TYR: Myth, Culture, Tradition* and the ways it, and a major contributor, Stephen “Edred” Flowers, who never claimed to be a white nationalist and shuns the label racist, blend deeply racialized Western esoteric thought and notions of “tribal community versus the nation-state” into a project that aims to create “an organic, homogenous community.”  

Here the common argument that Christianity is alien to the European soul and destructive to the supposed natural relationships cultivated in “traditional” European, pre-Christian societies emerges in the context of more recent developments in racial nationalist thought.

In this last section as we segue into the final chapter we find variations of dependency on the biological narrative of race and what Balibar called a “cultural racism” to articulate a political vision of white nationalism; one that relies more on narratives of insurmountable cultural difference to argue for, in the end, racial separation.  

Frankly notions of biological and cultural difference in this sense are always tangled, one informing the other in matters of degree. The narratives of biological racial
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incompatibility in America, especially during the era of segregation, informed fears about “miscegenation,” which informed notions of sociality; notions which were in that case instantiated as legal and political constructions for the maintenance of white supremacy under the guise of protection of the races. Even here the discourse of difference was not simply one of hierarchy, but also at times of preservation of the supposed natural order and of the alleged uniqueness of the so-called races. The point for the last section of this chapter is to argue that though individuals may protest their implication in racial nationalist politics and defend themselves against charges of racism, they may nonetheless propose a racial nationalism, in this case based in esoteric racialism that proposes a bio-cultural sociality. Form this disposition of the racial delineation of spirituality, not unlike what we saw from Lawrence R. Brown, Revilo Oliver, and others, we find many in the esoteric racialist milieu proposing a rejection of Christianity for the preservation of authentic Europeanness which is understood as the primordial expression of a bio-cultural identity.

Coming to terms with esoteric racialism:

In 2005 then pope Benedict XVI spoke at a synagogue in Germany destroyed by Nazis and said, "In the 20th century, in the darkest period of German and European history, an insane racist ideology, born of neo-paganism, gave rise to the attempt, planned
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8 I understand this term in the way that Long and Moore describe in their introduction to Sociality: New Directions (2013), as “a matrix within which subjects are constantly interacting in ways that are co-productive, and continually plastic and malleable,” page 4. This is particularly interesting given that the subjects of this study reject that malleability in favor of an imagined sociality anchored in “race.”
and systematically carried out by the regime, to exterminate European Jewry."9 This of course obscures the deadly history of Christian Anti-Semitism that informed the logic of the death camps in Europe and ties all Nazi abominations to “the occult,” and “neopaganism.” These distancing discourses are readily seen even earlier in the United States in a report released in 1954 by The House Un-American Activities Committee titled “Preliminary Report on Neo-Fascist and Hate Groups.”10 Nazism and Communism are situated at the table of “totalitarianism” as the twin enemies to democracy and the United States, and the provocation of racial hatred is described as un-American. This obscures the history of institutionalized white supremacy in America. But these two examples also demonstrate how the meanings of the words fascism and occult have been used to hide institutional racisms in national and religious institutions, contributing to the words occult and fascist becoming floating signifiers in rhetorical strategies rather than descriptors of phenomena. I therefore prefer to use a term native to the white nationalist community, but unfamiliar to most, esoteric racialism.

It still falls to me to describe my use of this term. It is best to begin with the term esoteric. In the introduction to Western Esotericism: A Concise History, Antoine Faivre and Christine Rhone comment that it is less productive to haggle over correct definitions of the term esoteric than to “inventory the various meanings that it takes according to
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various speakers.”

I agree, but I will say something of what I mean in the broad sense by my use of the term. I use the term esotericism to signify a diverse group of ideas about accessing sometimes hidden and transcendent knowledge that are often regarded as related to some sense of a primordial tradition. Where the people I seek to address here differ from others who may be described as part of Western esoteric tradition is that they have adapted and innovated esoteric teachings and traditions for the specific purposes of discovering some authentic European or white identity that touches on some indigenous and elusive truth about the white racial self, and then develop this assumed authenticity to articulate political activism aimed at protecting European culture from the degradation of institutional religion (code for Christianity in most cases) and modernity.

In their introduction, Faivre and Rhone come close to addressing the topic at hand when they briefly discuss “Nazi or near Nazi theoreticians” who “have made use of” Western esotericism in what they describe as a “very limited manner” in distorting esoteric teachings. Faivre and Rhone even go on to describe an “amalgamation” of esotericism proper and “far right” appropriations in “the minds of some,” exemplified for them in Goodrick-Clarke’s The Occult Roots of Nazism. The main point here is to distance esoteric traditions from what they regard as politicized appropriations; and further, to point out that esotericism can be bent in other political directions as well, and therefore cannot be regarded as tied to right-wing extremism and racism. I am sympathetic to the desire to address errors of conflation by not giving authority to the

---

12 Ibid, 2-6.
14 Ibid.
“extremists” to define the tradition. But this does not mean that I necessarily agree that the “amalgam” is simply in the mind of some scholars. I contend that some right-wing ideologues adapted esoteric ideas to work with their political positions, but that is not the same as saying they “distorted” the tradition. My position is therefore fairly value neutral.

The comments by Faivre and Rhone reveal their assumption of an orthodoxy that naturalizes dispositions either as true or false in the application and adaptation of esotericism by racialists. For me the goal is neither to defend the tradition of Western esotericism, nor condemn it as an essentially compatible with Nazism, as the former Pope would have us believe. For me the term esoteric, here further qualified by racialism, is used as a descriptor for a milieu in Western thought, not a solid tradition whose boundaries I must police.

In keeping with this heuristic, esoteric racialism is my general term for a trend within the history of white nationalism in America. Within that generalization are various movements that may be specified further by both their influences and self-designations. William Pelley’s esotericism adapted a certain Christian mysticism and Theosophical motifs. James Madole also adapted a reading of Theosophy and narratives of Atlantis and the ancient homelands of the Aryan race. Others, especially Seth Kippoth and the group called the Order of the Black Ram, were influenced by Satanism in their racialism. But as Jesper Petersen, Kennet Granholm, and others have pointed out, Satanism as a term is more complex and fraught with difficulties than many assume, and is not accepted by everyone as a part of the esoteric tradition. Granholm, for example, argues for the use of the term “Left-Hand Path to denote the milieu of ‘dark spirituality’ that includes many
forms of modern Satanism.”\textsuperscript{15} For him, those “dark spiritualties” comprise a “distinct esoteric current” that tend to emphasize individuality, self-deification, and an “antinomian stance.”\textsuperscript{16} Left-Hand Path is therefore a useful term to use to think about the eclectic borrowings between white nationalists and those in the Satanism in the late 1960’s onward, and as a subcategory for this chapter under esoteric racialism. Again, to look for some orthodox definition of esotericism or Satanism in these cases is to be less exegetical concerning the ideas that migrate through American white nationalism than it is to begin looking for a center where none exists.

Still later we will see this complexity begin to push on how I understand racialism. As we discuss TYR and the work of Stephen “Edred” Flowers, we will see, very much reflective of my references to Balibar already, that racialism does not always simply mean notions of biology, nor does it always mean arguments for superiority. Often this racialism is put in terms of cultural incompatibility delineated along existing essentialized notions of biological race. That does not always mean that the persons in question describe themselves as white nationalists, but that does not mean they are not racializing esotericism either. And it certainly does not mean they are not implicated in the racial nationalist project in America, as we will see. Hermeneutic flexibility is what is needed to understand esoteric racialism, not a rigid order imposed by the scholar. In what follows I offer an outline of the relationships between various esoteric racialisms and racial activism in America.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid, 212-13.
William Pelley and “Occult Fascism” in the 1930’s:

In *The Western Esoteric Traditions*, Goodrick-Clarke states, “it is notable that esoteric ideas often attend the breakdown of settled religious orthodoxies and socioeconomic orders.”\(^{17}\) This is no less true for the esoteric racialist ideas that emerged in the early-middle twentieth century in the United States. William Pelley’s esoteric racialism and his Silver Shirts emerged at a moment of social and economic crisis in the nineteen-twenties and thirties. Arthur Schlesinger Jr. in his classic political history of the Roosevelt years, *The Politics of Upheaval*, certainly confirms that this period was rife with religious and political demagoguery, from the continuation of yellow journalism and Red-scarring under Hearst, to the popularity of such racist and anti-Semitic demagogues as Father Caughlin, Gerald Winrod, and Gerald L.K. Smith, and the political machinations of Huey P. Long.\(^ {18}\) Schlesinger notes that in these cases the “followers of the demagogues mostly came from the old lower-middle classes, now in an unprecedented stage of frustration and fear, menaced by humiliation, dispossession, and poverty.”\(^ {19}\) It seemed that the world was not working and that there was no future in hoping that any established programs could set right what was wrong. It is in this context that fascisms abroad seemed to offer solutions for some, like Ezra Pound, who sought in Mussolini’s example a remedy to “usury” and the “cultural degeneracy” in America.\(^ {20}\)


\(^{19}\) Ibid, 69.

Leo Ribuffo confirms Schlesinger, and states further that “by the mid-1930’s, visions of literal or metaphorical apocalypse had become commonplace.”

One figure that is agreed by both Schlesinger and Ribuffo to be of importance in this moment was William Dudley Pelley. Much is already known about Pelley’s life, from his childhood in a religiously puritanical home, to his early successes as a screenwriter in Hollywood, to his efforts as a novelist. But it is his populist political activism developed from his spiritual assessment of the Christian church and American society that is our focus here.

Though Pelley had been deeply influenced by the progressive politics of Edward Bellamy and what he regarded as Christian virtue, the story of his mystical politics begins with an experience that Ribuffo and Scott Beekman, Pelley’s more recent biographer, describe through William James’s description of a “sick soul” who finds solace through “self-surrender.”

Pelley’s mystical experience is recorded in a tract called *Seven Minutes in Eternity*, published in 1926. In this he describes being taken from his physical body and transported to a wondrous place of white and luminous marble, where he was tended by two male beings of exceptional persona that Pelley accredited to their “virility” and “strong and friendly personalities.” Among the things revealed to him during this experience is the “need of experiences” in a “mortal life” that creates the necessity for

21 Ibid, 3.
24 William Dudley Pelley, *Seven Minutes in Eternity, with Their Aftermath*, (1930),13. This was adapted from his 1929 article titled “My Seven Minutes in Eternity—The Amazing Experience that Made Me Over,” published in *American Magazine* in the March 1929 issue.
one to live many lives. He then immediately describes how he comes to understand the “races” on Earth and how reincarnation is implicated in these divisions. He writes, “They’re great classifications of humanity epitomizing gradations of spiritual development, starting with the black man and proceeding upward in cycles to the white.” He learns that this is part of “Earthly classroom” wherein the soul is perfected throughout multiple lives in a spiritual evolution as one is embodied in different races. Race is therefore not only a biological fact for Pelley, but a spiritual reality that contributes to the development of the soul through multiple lives in racial embodiment.

As has been noticed by Pelley’s biographers, he had always rejected the assertion that he acquired his ideas through previous contact with esoteric movements, it is known that Pelley had already a deep interest in esoteric thought before his experience. Beekman argues specifically that there was a similarity between Pelley’s thought and the teachings of Steiner and Alice Bailey, though Pelley never mentioned either in his writings. “Given Pelley’s voluminous appetite for metaphysical books,” Beekman further notes, “it seems unlikely that he did not possess at least a rudimentary knowledge of these groups.” Ribuffo also writes that Pelley was aware of the popularity of the occult and spiritualism in the late twenties and thirties and “built his own eclectic theology” from a bricolage of spiritualism, Christian Science, Rosicrucianism, and elements of theosophical speculations. But most significantly, Pelley’s vision of a spiritual hierarchy and evolution in a scheme of rebirth through a stratified scheme of “races” was synthesized

26 Ibid.
27 Beekman, William Dudley Pelly, 75.
28 Ribuffo, Old Christian Right, 53.
with his populism in a political program and an organization that he called the Silver Shirt Legion of America.

In 1933, Pelley announced the beginning of his Silver Shirts and published his political tract, *No More Tears*. He had dissolved his former association, The League for the Liberation, and the organization’s paper, *Liberation*, subtitled “A Journal of Prophecy and Higher Fraternity,” became the organ for the new Silver Shirts organization.\(^{29}\) In his manifesto, *No More Hunger*, Pelley argues for a “Christian Commonwealth” that would create a utopian state in America, patterned quite closely to Bellamy’s vision in his futuristic romance, *Looking Backward, 2000-1887* published in 1888.\(^{30}\) But Pelley’s utopianism was enmeshed with a deep anti-Semitism that had developed in his writing since the 1920’s. In *Liberation*, Pelley’s vilification of the Jews was obvious, especially as he blamed them for the sorrows of America now in the depths of the Depression. In *No More Hunger*, originally published in 1933, Pelley describes his utopian economic system in contrast to the present mode of commerce “introduced by Levantines and Orientals.”\(^{31}\) Further, he expressed more than sympathy for Hitler’s chancellorship of Germany, which began in the same year Pelley started his Silver Shirts. Pelley had, in his

\(^{29}\) Beekman writes more in depth than I can in the space of this section both on the previous efforts of Pelley to organize and the changes that came from his re-organization with the Silver Shirts, as well as his school, Galahad College, and the role it served in his new endeavor. See especially page 81.

\(^{30}\) This novel can be summarized as a tale in which a character named Julian West awakes after falling into a deep sleep and finds that the United States had been transformed into a socialist utopia after he awakes in the year 2000. Mainly the economic forces of Capitalism were tamed through rational and enlightened measures and the devastation of the industry had been averted through the development of an “industrial army.” The book not only inspired Pelley, who clearly took the books prophetic tone in a troubling direction, but it also inspired several utopian communities.

words, a “personal admiration, and moral support of, that great and wise man who at the present writing dominates the German nation and has caused it to take the first great step toward the accomplishment of those aims” that appealed to him “strongly as a political philosopher.”32 But Pelly’s ideas and his organization were never explicitly anti-Christian as they were anti-Church. As is common for those who proclaim new revelations, organized religion is both the thing that needs to be reformed and that which stands in the way of the message. Pelley comments that religious orthodoxy and “man-made concepts of the ‘here-after’,” a clear reference to organized religion, and perhaps especially the Christianity of his youth, keeps people from full preparedness to hear such truths.33 His disposition toward Christianity is not one of rejection outright on racialist grounds, but one that sees it as obfuscating the message of spiritual evolution through racial embodiment. His anti-Semitism does not extend to the Christian church in the same as others in this study. The rejection of Christianity was however to become strong among later esoteric racialists, and in particular by James Madole and his National Renaissance Party.

*James Madole and the Aryan Eden:*

Like William Pelley and his Silver Shirts, Madole and the National Renaissance Party, or NRP, also uniformed in the manner of fascist movements in Europe, caught the attention of the public and federal authorities in America in postwar America. This was certainly by design, as the NRP and Madole made frequent appearances in public
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33 Pelley, *Seven Minutes*, 16.
demonstrations on the streets of New York City to protest what they regarded as the corruption of American society and Western civilization by Jews. And like Pelley, Madole’s politics were deeply influenced by a certain approach to and understanding of esoteric traditions; especially Theosophy. The National Renaissance Party under the leadership of Madole is also significant in that it is remembered by some as the first white nationalist organization to emerge after the WWII. Betty Dobratz describes the NRP as “the first neo-Nazi party” to emerge in this period, founded in 1949, preceding the American Nazi Party under George Lincoln Rockwell by nearly a decade. And though Madole is not well known outside of racialist circles, Kaplan and Weinberg noticed in the 1990s that though he had been almost forgotten after his death in 1979, Madole had experienced “something of a renaissance… on both sides of the Atlantic as a visionary whose thought was decades ahead of its time.”

The most thorough treatment of Madole, his esoteric racialism, and his self-described National Socialist politics is in Goodrick-Clarke’s Black Sun. It is not necessary to reproduce everything in this chapter in this section of my own, but it is useful for the reader to be quickly introduced to him and the party before I continue to a close reading of select readings from the party’s paper, National Renaissance Bulletin.

James Madole was born in 1927 in New York City, and was from a relatively early age

34 This assertion is culled from various searches on white nationalist blogs and chatrooms, including Stormfront.org, vnnforum.com, and especially a document compiled from various sources titled “A Brief History of the White Nationalist Movement,” available at http://hammerandanvilmyblog.wordpress.com/2011/05/30/a-brief-history-of-the-white-nationalist-movement/ and liked and commented upon at http://ironmarch.org/index.php?/topic/1863-a-brief-history-of-the-white-nationalist-movement/.


influenced early in his life by science fiction, occultism, and American interpretations of fascism. One of his chief influences was Charles B. Hudson, a science fiction writer, American supporter of Italian Fascism and German National Socialism, and among the defendants, along with William Pelley, in what came to be called “The Great Sedition Trial of 1944.” Goodrick-Clarke notes that Madole was also influenced in significant ways by Francis Parker Yockey and the German émigré, Fredrick Charles Weiss. In short, the milieu of American “third-way” political activity, with its opposition to FDR, WWII, and virulent anti-Semitism in the 1920s through the 1950s formed the background for the birth of the National Renaissance Party and James Madole’s activism. This sits alongside his early interest in the writings of Helena Blavatsky and the story of Atlantis as the homeland of the Aryans, which deeply fascinated Madole throughout his adult life.

The NRP itself was not the brainchild of Madole. Goodrick-Clarke notes that it actually began in 1949 under the leadership of Kurt Mertig, a long-time activist in the milieu of the openly Nazi sympathetic organizations in America in the period leading up to and during WWII. Mertig was noted for his leadership in the Citizens Protective League, headquartered in the Yorkville neighborhood in Manhattan. Later, Mertig began a new organization that he named National Renaissance Party after a line in Hitler’s last “political testament,” in which he had articulated the hope for a

37 Goodrick-Clarke, Black Sun, 72-73. The nomenclature for the sedition trial was officially titled United States v. McWilliams, et al., Cr. 73086, February 28, 1944. The description of it as the “Sedition Trial” came from the description offered by media and a book written by one of the attorneys for the defense, Maximillian St. George, and one the infamous defendants, Lawrence Dennis, titled A Trial on Trial: The Great Sedition Trial of 1944 (1946).
38 Goodrick-Clarke, Black Sun, 75.
39 Ibid, 74.
“renaissance” of National Socialism after the war.\textsuperscript{40} Shortly after he established the NRP, Mertig, who had grown quite old by 1949, saw in the 22 year old James Madole a successor for his as leader the National Renaissance Party. Madole quickly took to the leadership of the NRP and began to make an impression on the general public and the federal government, as the HUAC report demonstrates.

From this point onward the NRP began to evidence Madole’s Theosophical influences, especially in the NRP’s publication, \textit{National Renaissance Bulletin}. This was no more clear than in the series that ran in the paper beginning in 1973 that Madole titled \textit{“The New Atlantis: A Blueprint for an Aryan Garden of Eden.”}\textsuperscript{41} This series amounted to a reading of theosophical works, primarily Blavatsky’s \textit{The Secret Doctrine}, with National Socialism as a program for change in the United States and for the creation of god-like Aryans to then rule the world from America.\textsuperscript{42} I will discuss this series in a moment, but it is important to note that this was not the first time Madole synthesized occult notions of the Aryan with his politics, nor was he the only one to do so in the paper.

\textsuperscript{40} This is discussed by Goodrick-Clarke on page 74 of \textit{Black Sun}. The text in German as well as facsimilie of the letter can be viewed at \url{http://www.ns-archiv.de/personen/hitler/testament/politisches-testament.php} and \url{http://www.ns-archiv.de/personen/hitler/testament/faksimile/polit-02.php}.

\textsuperscript{41} Goodrick-Clarke, \textit{Black Sun}, 81.

\textsuperscript{42} By way of explanation, \textit{The Secret Doctrine}, subtitled \textit{The Synthesis of Science, Religion, and Philosophy}, was originally published in 1888. This followed \textit{Isis Unveiled}, published in 1877. These two works represent the major works by Helena Blavatsky as she sought to articulate what she stated to be the esoteric truth of all life and doctrine transmitted to her by the instruction ancient adepts and masters of this primordial tradition. There are of course other texts written by other people that came to influence what came to be known as Theosophy, but Blavatsky and her work are those most recognized and cited by Madole and others in the NRP.
The NRP, self-described on the banner of its paper as a “political party devoted to the restoration of the American Republic, the preservation of American Sovereignty and the establishment of an American regime based on the principles of racial nationalism and social justice,” regarded itself and its political theory as imbedded in an “Aryan” heritage that stretched back to mythical Atlantis. In a 1970 article titled “The Leadership Principle: A Heritage of Aryan Man,” Madole attacks “Liberal Democrats, apostles of human equality, Jews and the enemies of ARYAN MAN,” and extols dictatorship over democracy in the United States. For him, the denial of race as a reality and political equality had caused the general breakdown of social order in America, typified by illicit drugs and anarchy in the streets. In this article, for example, he points to the “Chicago Seven,” who were on trial at the time, as evidence of a Jewish and Marxist plot to use “Black terrorists” and disaffected youths to destroy America and the white race. Madole then goes on to rhetorically ask what the “democratic form of government” has done to “curb any of these evils” and answers, “absolutely nothing!”

In this context of integration as the result of Civil Rights a few years before and the tumultuous end of the Sixties, and the persistent conspiracy theorizing that Jewish forces were behind general social disorder, Madole proposes national socialist politics as the solution. He holds as examples of the “authoritarian idealists” Léon Degrelle, founder of the Nazi aligned Rexist Party in Belgium in WWII, Vidkun Quisling, co-founder of the Norwegian National Socialist Party, or Nasjonal Samling, and, of course, Hitler as men
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who knew how to rule a nation and instill order in society. Modole then offers a political alternative to democracy in the form of National Socialist dictatorship set in esoteric terms. He writes,

The mission of Aryan man on this Earth is to gain mastery over the human species, to purge HOMO SAPIENS of its more bestial and sub-human elements, and then, to raise the power of the Human will to the point of infinity wherein our highest racial elements will become as Gods among mortal men. These ‘demigods’ are the natural rulers of humanity as depicted in the glorious saga of the Aryan race.  

For Madole, the mission of the NRP was an extension of a longer mission of the “Aryan” race to build civilization; a mission that began in Atlantis, what he argues Christians falsely identified as the Garden of Eden. This mission of building civilizations continued after by the Aryan survivors in Mesoamerica, Egypt, the Iranian plateau, through European history Atlantis was destroyed through. In all of this, he argues, the “Aryan masses followed heroic leadership under Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Charlemagne, Napoleon Bonaparte, Otto von Bismarck, and Adolf Hitler.” This appeal to dictatorial leadership is not only preferred for Madole for pragmatic reasons, but was for him more in harmony with “Natural Law,” to which democracy, communism, parliamentarianism, and other forms of government are alleged to be opposed.

If some of this sounds like Ben Klassen’s statements in Nature’s Eternal Religion it may be because Klassen had a relationship with the NRP, and was described as a supporter by Madole on at least one occasion. In the bulletin from January and February, 1973, Madole praised Klassen’s book as “the new ‘Mein Kampf’ of the NRP,” and lauds

46 Ibid.
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it as the “most vital text on the topic of racial nationalism ever to appear on the North American Continent.” In this same article Madole lists some other influences, naming specifically Plato and Heraclitus, Nietzsche, Fichte, Hegel, During, Spengler, but also Madison Grant, author of *The Passing of the Great Race*, and his protégé Lothrop Stoddard, and of course, Francis Parker Yockey. He then names other influences that he describes as “occultists”—Aleister Crowley, Madame Helena Pertovna Blavatsky, Rasputin, and Anton Szandor LaVey, founder of the Church of Satan. Madole describes those listed as “great thinkers both understood human nature to perfection” and were “exponents of an ‘elitist society’."

Madole was deeply critical of Christianity because of how opposite it was to his “great thinkers” and his political aims as he understood it. In a 1971 article titled “A Stern Rebuке to Critics of The National Renaissance Party,” he responded to those concerned about his position on Christianity. He writes, “knowing that every Christian leader from Pope Paul in Rome to Billy Graham, [Oral] Roberts, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the entire leftist ménage at the Federal Council of Churches of Christ are committed to breaking down all racial barriers between Aryans and Stone Age primitives I have no alternative but to oppose Christianity as ‘a semitic spiritual creed’ and a morality of slaves which subjugated the minds of our healthy pagan ancestors!” For
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50 The relationship between Madole and Anton LaVey is complicated. It is discussed by Goodrick-Clarke in *Black Sun* chapters 4 and 11, and Matthias Gardell discusses the same in *Gods of the Blood* in chapter 7.


him, like the others we have already discussed in the previous chapters, Christianity had “caused Aryan man to abandon his relationship with the immutable Laws of Nature,” while he and the NRP were trying to restore this through a return to their “Aryan heritage.”

Others in the NRP contributed to the organization’s position on religion; in particular, a member named Robert Bayer wrote a series for the NRP bulletin titled “The Aryan Concept of Race, Religion, and History.” In the editorial note at the beginning of the third installment Madole and Bayer are described as “students of the physical and the occult sciences long before they were drawn into political activity.” In the articles, Bayer compares Christianity and the NRP and states, “We National Socialists on the other hand demand of ourselves that we live… in accordance with the laws of life.” Bayer further states that the “heresy of Semitic Judeo-Christianity burned these truths,” but he believes they still reside in “the racial memory of the Aryan Race.” In many ways then, like the racialist Odinists, he sees the mission of the NRP is to rediscover the hidden truths about the ancient Aryan past and apply them to the present political situation.

Much of this argumentation is carried into Madole’s “New Atlantis” project, which he began not long after Bayer publishes the last installment of his series in the May and June, 1973 edition of the NRP’s bulletin. Madole writes repeats himself quite a bit in
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55 Ibid, 8.
this series or quotes other sources at length, so I will not exhaustively reference each essay in the series. It is sufficient for the purposes here to analyze the first article and make some reference to material in the others to discuss how Madole articulated his vision of racial political activism. The first installment opens with Madole contrasting what he calls the “metaphysical heritage” of Atlantis and “that compilation of Hebraic fairy tales known as ‘The Holy Bible’.”

He presents again the dichotomy between the NRP and Christianity like Bayer, but Madole goes a step further in his claims. He claimed that the United States was both the inheritor of an unusually high concentration of esoteric movements and teachings and prophesied by occultists as the land from which the Aryan god-men would emerge to rule the world. He states in the second paragraph of the first article in the series that Madame Blavatsky herself in *The Secret Doctrine* was the first to predict that America would become “the cradle of a new and vastly superior race of human beings.”

He references a quote in which Blavatsky discusses the mixing of races with the Atlanteans, especially with the “Aryans,” whose progeny have since come to populate America where the “pure Anglo-Saxon stock” had mixed with others of the Aryan caste, and since its settlement by Aryans has become the home of “a race apart, and strongly separated from all other now existing races.”

Madole argues that “inter-racial sexual affiliations” at the time Blavatsky’s master work was released in 1888 were

---

58 Ibid.
59 Ibid, 5.

198
unimaginable, so for him this reading of Blavatsky could only mean that America had become the “melting pot” of the “various Aryan strains from Europe.”

Madole’s “New Atlantis” is the United States, which allows us to see that while he is a self-described racial nationalist, he is not quite a pan-European in the way Yockey was. But Madole’s vision was still as global as was Klassen’s and Pierce’s. At the end of this first article Madole sets out to describe the NRP’s conception of “the earthly paradise” that he thinks their “Racial Nationalist philosophy will create in America,” and from America Aryans will rule the world and save the white race imperiled by “Jewish” plots and racial integration. “A rebellion of Aryan Man upon the North American continent,” writes Madole, “will save the New Race from destruction and bring about the glorious fulfillment of Madame Blavatsky’s prophecy.”

The best summary of “New Atlantis” and its relationship to the political mission of the National Renaissance Party under Madole comes from part five of the series. Madole writes, “The goal of the NRP is not merely to vividly describe the devastatingly harmful effects of the Afro-Semitic impact on Western Aryan Civilization but to remind the great masses of both European and Asian Aryan peoples of the glorious racial heritage which they inherited from common ancestors.” The whole project of the NRP was inspired by Madole’s interpretation of esoteric sources, especially the writings of Blavatsky, and reading them into his racial nationalist politics. The rejection of Christianity was for him an obvious first step for anyone so committed to begin to grasp

60 Ibid, 4 & 5.
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what he thought was the true heritage of the Aryan race in America. So long as Christianity was accepted by the Aryans in America, he contends, the emergence of the god-like figures that were destined to rule the world could not happen.

By the time Madole died, National Socialist activism had diffused through several organizations. During his leadership of the NRP, Madole had seen the rise of the American Nazi Party and its transformation into the World Union of National Socialists, as well as the introduction of other esoteric interpretations of Hitler and National Socialism from abroad become important in the American scene. But, as Jeffrey Kaplan noted, though “National Socialist occultism is not for everyone” Madole’s thought and activism indicated that he was “simply ahead of his time.”

_Racial Esotericism and Activism beyond Madole:_

Almost a decade after Mertig founded the National Renaissance Party and Madole took over its leadership, George Lincoln Rockwell founded the American Nazi Party. Rockwell’s desire to form this new party came in part from his frustration with the John Birch Society and _National Review_, for which he did some contract work in the early days of the publication, as well as parties that were further right of them, including The National States Rights Party, which he had a hand in founding. However, according to Fredrick Simonelli, Rockwell regarded these organizations as “too tame.” In much the same spirit of Oliver, Klassen, and Pierce who abandoned their membership in the John Birch Society and began their racial activism, so Rockwell abandoned conservative
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politics in the 1960’s. Rockwell is rightly known for his aggressive racist politics, but Rockwell’s activism was not simply pragmatic. His politics grew out of an admiration and discipleship of Hitler, and what he described in in terms of spiritual conversion upon reading *Mein Kampf*.

In his autobiography, *This Time the World*, Rockwell describes reading *Mein Kampf* as providing him with “mental sunshine” as “word after word, sentence after sentence stabbed into the darkness like thunderclaps and lightning bolts of revelation…” brilliantly illuminating the ‘mysteries’ of the heretofore impenetrable murk in a world gone mad.”66 “In 1951,” writes Rockwell, “I felt alone with my Book and my inspiration,” and had become an “Apostle of Adolph Hitler,” whom Rockwell describes as “the greatest world savior in two thousand years.”67 From this inspiration, in 1958 he founded the ANP, and, in the style of Madole’s NRP, took to the streets surrounded by uniformed troopers to agitate for National Socialism as the salvation of white America and of white people everywhere. Though, like Madole, Rockwell’s ANP was mostly concerned about the American context, his ambitions for National Socialism were global. As early as 1959, Rockwell sought to internationalize his American Nazi Party. He formulated a movement that he originally called the World Union of Free Enterprise National Socialists, which he then shortened to the World Union of National Socialists, or WUNS.68 Some of his contacts abroad included Colin Jordan, a revivalist of Oswald Mosley’s war-time British Union of Fascists in England, and Maximani Portas, otherwise known as Savitri Devi, a significant force in post-WWII admiration of Hitler as an
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“Avatar” or “world savior” of the Aryan people. But while Rockwell never abandoned Christin rhetoric, Devi offered a racial vision through a particular interpretation of Hinduism.

Portas/Devi was born in September, 1905 in Lyons, France to an English mother and Greek and Italian father. Goodrick-Clarke describes her as “a leading light of the neo-Nazi underground from the 1960’s onward” through her influential teachings on the admiration of National Socialism and her “divinization of Adolph Hitler.” Devi was convinced by her early journeys to India that, in Goodrick-Clarke’s words, “Hinduism was the only living Aryan heritage in the modern world,” and that Germany under Hitler would revive this heritage. Devi’s own words do well in helping us understand exactly what she taught in this regard. In particular her words from her post-war work, Defiance, published in 1951, she remarks on Germany’s loss of WWII as evidence of the “Kali Yuga” described in “the Sanskrit Scriptures — in which we live, and earlier still, from the beginning of the decay of man.” She writes later,

It is the superior man’s business to feel happy in the service of the highest purpose of Nature which is the return to original perfection, — to supermanhood. It is the business of every man to be happy to serve that purpose, directly or indirectly, from his natural place, which is the place his race gives him in the scheme of creation. And if he cannot be? Let him not be. Who cares? Time rolls on, just the same, marked by the great Individuals who have understood the true meaning of history, and striven to remold the earth according to the standards of the eternal Order, against the downward rush of decay, result of life in falsehood; — the Men against Time.
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Like Madole, Devi regarded the real goal of National Socialism was and should be to provide for the emergence of Aryan god-men. And like Madole, she too regarded National Socialism and Christianity as incompatible, as Hitler’s teachings defied everything she had learned in her “Judeo-Christian democratic education.”

Another enigmatic figure named Miguel Serrano (1917-2009), a former Chilean diplomat and friend of Hermann Hesse and Carl Jung, developed a similar synthesis of a certain reading of “Aryan” Hinduism and National Socialism. He also described Hitler also as “el ultimo Avatara,” or the final Avatar. The influence of Devi, Serrano, and other post-WWI National Socialists was quite obvious. The writings of Devi and Serrano are easily found on white nationalist websites, and are often referred to by contemporary white nationalists. Their esoteric racialism also had a significant impact on how WUNS and other organizations developed after Rockwell’s murder in 1967. In particular WUNS had established global connections for the growing white nationalist movement as a pan-European rather than narrowly nationalist and provided space for esoteric teachings about race.

The Left-Hand Milieu and Racialist Activism in the 1980s and 90s:

The most logical place to begin this inquiry into contacts between Left-Hand practitioners and racialist activists is to discuss first those contacts between James Madole and Anton LaVey in the 1970s. Madole had referenced LaVey in his list of
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75 This is phrase, el ultimo Avatara, is the subtitle of one of Serrano’s significant works on the topic of “esoteric Hitlerism,” a term he has been credited for coining, titled Adolph Hitler, el Ultimo Avatâra, published in 1987. Serrano is discussed in more detail in Goodrick-Clarke’s Black Sun, chapter nine.
people who have been inspirational for him, and even suggested the *Satanic Bible* and *Satanic Rituals* for reading in the back of some of the editions of *National Renaissance Bulletin*. Madole thought LaVey offered important occult insights into the “Laws of Nature” and the human psyche. LaVey however seemed to not care too much for Madole.

In the biography written by LaVey’s longtime companion, Blanche Barton, LaVey’s attitude toward racial “extremists” is described as one of disdain for anything as lazy as race prejudice. Further, in an interview with Gavin Baddeley, LaVey specifically rejected racism, stating, “My own prejudices are not ethnic but ethical—somebody’s race or background really has nothing to do with it.” And in the *Satanic Scriptures*, a compilation of essays by LaVey’s successor in The Church of Satan, Peter Gilmore, the question of racism and fascism is addressed by stating that the Church was in no way compatible with racist thinking or “political fascism” on the grounds of the strong emphasis on individuality in the teachings of LaVey.

It is true that Madole and LaVey corresponded, and even met, but these exchanges were never fully collaborative. However for the part of some of the members
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76 Madole’s suggestion of The Satanic Bible and Satanic Rituals was not evident in all the Bulletins, but these did appear in the issues from 1973. Other works on Satanism appear with LaVey’s writings, like *The Second Coming: Satanism in America*, by Arthur Lyons (1970). With LaVey’s works is also listed Kenneth Grant’s *The Magical Revival* (1972), which is misnamed *The Mystical Revival*. It is also significant that the *National Renaissance Bulletin* often included a suggested reading section for “pre-Christian Aryan occult and metaphysical heritage.”


80 For more about these contacts see *Black Sun*, 83 & 214-16.
of the National Renaissance Party the connection between Satanism and white nationalist activism was more significant, even if LaVey did protest. Seth Kipoth, a NRP Michigan state organizer, founded the The Order of the Black Ram with some other members of the NRP and a former member of the Church of Satan. Goodrick-Clarke further argues that these early contacts between LaVey and the NRP and the founding The Order of The Black Ram “anticipated” the “alliances of neo-Nazis and satanists in the 1990’s.” I would argue that what these figures shared in common, even with the rejection of overt racialism by LaVey, was an anti-egalitarian ideation and social Darwinism that manifested as a common rejection of Christianity as the source of all liberal humanist values.

It is also known that Manson and his “Family” were linked to all manner of occult conspiracies by the various books and articles that came out of the maelstrom of media attention the resulted from the grotesque and public murders, much of which amounts to guilt by association or approximation. Anton LaVey had employed Susan Adkins, one of the Manson Family members, to play the role of a topless female vampire in a performance in San Francisco before these crimes, but this hardly counts as proof of complicity. The degrees of separation between an associate of LaVey’s, the avant-garde filmmaker Kenneth Anger, and Bobby Beausoleil, who was reputed to have run off and buried in the desert film which included scenes including Anton LaVey, added to the suspicion that the Manson Family murders were a part of a satanic conspiracy. None of these rumors were more powerful or as oft repeated as that Manson was inspired by or

---

81 Goodrick-Clarke, Black Sun, 83 & 215.
82 Ibid.
83 Interview with LaVey in Baddley’s Lucifer Rising, 66.
even directed by an organization, mistakenly dubbed a satanic cult, called The Process Church of the Final Judgment. Therefore one has to be careful when discussing Manson and esoteric movements in the same breath. However, emerging trends in the late nineteen eighties, especially with Nicholas Schreck, spouse to LaVey’s daughter Zeena LaVey-Schreck, both of who became involved in the group that separated from the Church of Satan in the seventies under Michael Aquino, The Temple of Set, warrants discussion.

The most notable intersection of the Satanic and white nationalist trends in regard to a reverence for Charles Manson is when Nicholas Schreck appeared on Tom Metzger’s television show *Race and Reason* to discuss his book, *The Manson File*. The book is described by Schreck in this instance as a revisionist history of Charles Manson as a creator of a “white colony… akin to National Socialism.” For him, Manson serves as a teacher of esoteric wisdom that defies the Judeo-Christian weakness he sees engulfing the Western world. Schreck then immediately describes his own projects as an effort to conduct a “cultural war on every front” to bring about a “resurgence of the Western European tradition… to awaken the wolf in man.” Schreck goes on to describe his project of “awakening the beast” in European man is directly opposed to the “Judeo-Christian values” that have “repressed and tamed” this beast. He describes the releasing of the wolf in man as synonymous with the release of Fenris, which he describes as “the ancient wolf god” in Norse mythology, and in his words the “Gotterdammerung.” He states in clear

84 This interview is available in full at [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eS47cjbZkGM](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eS47cjbZkGM). Last accessed on 3-22-2013. The remainder of the quotes for the discussion of Schreck with Metzger comes from this interview, which was originally aired on public access in California in 1988.
terms that this is how he imagines his occult project and that it is meant to bring about a “new order.” When asked by Metzger how this project relates to race, Schreck goes on to affirm that race holds a significant place in his project. Moments later, after quoting Hitler to describe his project to create a “youth without pity” opposed to a humanistic and “Judeo-Christian values;” and praising the skinhead movement, he identifies “race-mixing” as “genetic suicide” and describes it as “inimical to the natural order.”

Schreck clearly adopts the language of white nationalism, especially esoteric racialists like Madole, to describe his project to create what he describes as a superior human species in terms of directly opposing, in his words, the values of the 1960’s—“the drug culture, race mixing, equality,” and “everything that Judeo-Christianity has succored.” Schreck in this interview is clear that he and his collaborators are “strictly concerned with the Western European tradition” and what he regards as essential to that “culture” as it is counterpoised to “the African culture, the Asian culture that is dominating the Western world” that traps Western peoples in “a nightmare of racial confusion.” And, referencing Francis Parker Yockey, Schreck professes a firm belief in an “Imperium” as “the Western man, the Faustian man seeks to dominate the world.” In keeping with the repeated thesis that this superman is imperiled, Schreck states that “we are losing right now… we can no longer let our culture and our entire history die out in the face of this dysgenic ocean of mud that has swept the world.” Near the conclusion the esoteric interpretation of Manson appears as Schreck describes him as a “shaman, a spiritual spokesman, like Adolf Hitler was in the thirties.”
In this interaction between Schreck and Metzger we have one of the most succinct readings of Satanism in the context of white racial activism. But what does that tell us? Jesper Petersen argues that the use of “Nazi aesthetics” by Schreck and others seems “more in tune with a general program of situationist ‘culture jamming’… than a political statement.”\footnote{Jesper Aa. Petersen, “The Carnival of Dr. LaVey: Articulations of Transgression in Modern Satanism,” \textit{The Devil’s Party: Satanism in Modernity} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 177.} It is possible that this sort of activity on the part of Left-Hand Path practitioners is a “radicalization of LaVey’s tongue-in-cheek cultural critique rather than an ideological investment in the Far Right as a political project.”\footnote{Ibid, 178.} I have my doubts about Schreck given the vociferousness of his racialist language and concern for “the movement” in his interviews with Metzger. But this discussion was not meant to decide on this point. The point for me here is not whether or not Schreck is white nationalists, but that his Left-Hand approaches were listened to and taken seriously by white nationalists like Metzger. What seems significant to me is that they share the critique of Judeo-Christianity along Social Darwinist lines, and for Schreck this is embedded in the mystical truth of the European soul.

\textit{TYR and the Project for a European Cultural Renaissance:}

In this final section I will offer less of a conclusion than a bridge for the discussion in the next chapter on the North American New Right and the adaptation of ideas from the European New Right to the American white nationalist scene. The point of this section, as will be emphasized again in the following chapter, is that racialism in the milieu of New Right ideation, to quote Balibar, “\textit{culture can function like a nature}, and it
can in particular function as a way of locking individuals and groups a priori into a
genealogy, into a determination that is immutable and intangible in origin.”
That is to say that racialization can take the form of a cultural essentialism that is imagine to
determine sociality along the contours of racial identification where the assumed soul of a
people is determined in advance to prescribe all social arrangements within the imagined
community which must be kept free of presumed alien ideation and influences.

For many associated with TYR the accusation of racism and fascism is expected,
and often answered in advance in their writing. I do not claim that all affiliated with TYR
are white nationalists, and I certainly do not use the term fascism to describe their
ideology. My claim is that TYR articulates a deeply racialized notion of culture through
which they offer a critique of the modern world—and with it Christianity—tied to
notions of what the editors called in the first issue “the European (Indo-European)
tradition” and the “idea of integral culture.” As Bruce Lincoln, Stephan Arvidsson, and
even Léon Poliakov in Le Mythe Aryen have noticed these discourses have often been
implicated with racially essentializing projects. The editors of TYR offer a pan-European
ideation that delineates a mystical community of biologically and therefore culturally
distinct peoples who have, along with the rest of the world, been ruined by Christianity
and modernity, the only solution to which problem is a reintegration of the primordial
tradition that lays still dormant in one’s racial memory.

87 Balibar, “Is There a ‘Neo-Racism’,” 22.
The first volume of *TYR: Myth-Culture-Tradition* was published in 2002 by ULTRA, and was edited by Joshua Buckley, Michael Moynihan, and Collin Cleary. In volumes two and three Colin Cleary ceased to be an editor, likely because of his work on an independent project, *Summoning the Gods*, his collection of essays, some of which were published in *TYR*. The further careers of Buckley, about whom little is public knowledge, and Moynihan, who has a complex history with publishing and in the band Blood Axis, cannot be easily discussed in so short a space here. What is of importance though is how they, along with Cleary, in the first volume define their project.

In the editorial preface to volume one, the editors describe their “ideals” as a “resacralization of the world… Folk/traditional culture versus mass culture… Natural hierarchy (based, perhaps, on Dumézil’s ‘three functions’… the tribal community versus the nation-state… stewardship of the earth… a harmonious relationship between men and women versus the ‘war between the sexes’… Handicrafts and artisanship versus industrial mass culture.” They notice affinity between these ideals and some aspects of the environmental movement and Neopaganism, but it is the first three listed that are of most significance here. In particular these ideals, as the editors notice, share a close relationship with what Stephen Edred Flowers has called “integral culture,” which he describes in full in the first article in volume one. Further, the editors describe themselves as “radical traditionalists” in volume two, which they specifically identify as not

---

89 ULTRA is a small press with only these titles. Its domain is [http://www.radicaltraditionalist.com/titles.htm](http://www.radicaltraditionalist.com/titles.htm), but there is little to no information about the press available.

90 Short bios of Buckley and Moynihan can be found at [http://www.radicaltraditionalist.com/tyr.htm](http://www.radicaltraditionalist.com/tyr.htm).

Guenonian or “strictly” Evolian, though Evola’s work appears in the journal.\(^\text{92}\) Rather they define their traditionalism, as this explanation appears on the back cover of the issue, a rejection of the modern world and a yearning for “the small, homogeneous tribal societies that flourished before Christianity—societies in which every aspect of life was integrated into a holistic system.” The editors of \textit{TYR} then look for “a return to origins” in the recovery of social and metaphysical authentic Europeanness.\(^\text{93}\)

A more complete treatment of what this means, as mentioned a moment ago, is in the essay by Stephen Flowers, “The Idea of Integral Culture: A Model for a Revolt Against the Modern World.” Flowers argues here for a reintegration of culture, which he understands as “ethnic,” ethical, symbolic, and material.\(^\text{94}\) For him tradition follows these “pathways,” through “genetic, mythic, linguistic, and material,” means.\(^\text{95}\) The proper cultural expression is rooted deep in the integration of the four elements, as Flowers paraphrases Fichte, to “become who we are.”\(^\text{96}\) For Flowers, and for the editors of the journal, Christianity has interrupted that, and later was replaced by modernity.\(^\text{97}\) Integral culture then is about the mystical connection to one’s ancestors, living in a fashion that is imagined as more authentic; more specifically more authentically European.

\(^{92}\) Joshua Buckley and Michael Moynihan, “Editorial Preface,” \textit{TYR: Myth-Culture-Tradition, Vol. 2} (Atlanta, GA: Ultra, 2004), 7. Here the editors are talking about the work of René Guénon and Julius Evola. It is beyond this study to go into too much depth on these men and their traditionalism. A good source for a full explanation of Traditionalism and its variants see \textit{Against the Modern World: Traditionalism and the Secret Intellectual History of the Twentieth Century}, by Mark Sedgwick.


\(^{95}\) Ibid, 19.

\(^{96}\) Ibid, 20.

\(^{97}\) Ibid, 18.
This vision of an authentic European identity as the basis for a revolt against the modern world, and by common logic among those involved with TYR and New Right ideology against Christianity as well as both alien and alienating. The fact that TYR includes the work of Alain de Benoist points to association, but the prefaces written by Flowers to the English translations of de Benoist’s *On Being a Pagan* and the *Manifesto for a European Renaissance* by de Benoist and Charles Champetier point to something more. The European New Right will be discussed more thoroughly in the next chapter, but it is important to notice that it has become a significant influence on white nationalism in America, as well as a significant example in Balibar’s essay for cultural racism.

Again, the content of New Right thought will be discussed later, but it is significant that Flowers gives his reading of these works, and published de Benoist’s and Champetier’s manifesto through his now defunct Runa-Raven Press. This also shows the intersection of his “folkish” Odinism, his interest in Western esotericism, and cultural politics. In his preface to *On Being a Pagan*, Flowers agrees with de Benoist that “anything less than the rejection of Judeo-Christian monotheism, and the redevelopment of our Indo-European ideology, would simply treat the symptoms of our Western dis-ease [sic], rather than cure it.”98 In other works Flowers is clear that part of this Indo-European tradition is composed in part by esoteric practices, including what he calls the Left-Hand path. But here the focus is on the efficacy of de Benoist’s paganism in reviving an authentic European identity. This is further evident the *Manifesto for a European Renaissance* where much of repeated again from his words in *On Being a Pagan*. But

98 Flowers, Preface to *On Being a Pagan*, i.
here there is something else to consider in his comments. Not only does he look to the philosophies of the European New Right in an affirmative light, but even suggests that much can be gleaned and adapted for European cultural revival in America. This adaptation of the European New Right is much more explicit in the North American New Right, as we will see in the next chapter. What matters here, once more, is that Flowers and the editors of *TYR* seek a resuscitation of an authentic European identity that is biological and cultural; indeed, one could say it is bio-cultural.

In the second edition of *TYR* the editors rebuff any accusation of fascism. Flowers also defends himself from this accusation in his other works, as well as charges of racism—which, I must add he means only notions of supremacy. This is no refutation of one being a racialist ideologue, as it will be noted that many self-described white nationalists do not articulate their racialism through discourses of supremacy, but of separatism. But again I do not accuse them of fascism, nor did I infer that they are “white supremacists.” I do however say that they advocate a cultural racism in that they essentialize culture as a heritable trait. They fear mixing, ideological and otherwise, of what they imagine to be racially discrete essences. On the grounds of an esoteric truth, the connection of all peoples within racially specific groupings to their respective folk, they articulate the need to reject Christianity as a foreign, Jewish imposition that destroyed what they imagine to be the natural order. To do so in favor of the pre-Christian European past is to provide a future for the racio-ideologically pure folk to exists, or otherwise leave them in a state of alienation and corruption and the prey of the forces of monotheism and modernity.
In the next chapter we will see in more detail how these notions have been adopted in the avowedly white nationalist North American New Right. In particular we will see how de Beniost and his culturalism have informed the latest shifts in racial nationalism. Here the interaction between Flowers, those involved with *TYR*, and American white nationalism come closest together in informing a metapolitical project for the preservation and enrichment of European culture in the face of what is regarded as an existential threat posed by multiculturalism and modernity, all of which is used to describe Christianity as imperiling to the future of the white race.
Chapter 6: The North American New Right and the Question of Christianity

Our entire project is motivated by consciousness of an existential threat. European peoples... now live under a cultural and economic system that has set our race on the path to cultural decadence and demographic decline.—Greg Johnson, “Toward a North American New Right.”

Introduction:

This project began by describing Revilo Oliver’s evolving criticism of Christianity related to an evolving sense of racial nationalist politics. In the late 1950s through the 1970s, as Oliver’s critique of Christianity sharpened to eventual rejection, Else Christensen began preaching her brand of Odinism, and groups like Madole’s National Renaissance Party, the Church of the Creator, and National Alliance were active in constructing sometimes differing views about how and with what ideology they would “save the white race” from some imagined peril. This was in many ways the beginning of contemporary white nationalism, and the trend within this movement typified by a critical response to Christianity and America. Patriotic Americanism and Christianity were seen by Oliver, Pierce, Klassen, and others in this emergent trend as at best horrid distractions from the task of preserving the white race, and at worse a plot in themselves to weaken

---

the racial instincts of the white race. We also discovered that there was an exchange of ideas between Oliver and Alain de Benoist in the early 1970s, which put this vanguard figure of the new racial nationalism in contact with one of the founding figures of the European New Right. In this exchange, however brief, Yockeyist pan-Europeanism inspired much of this early contact between the American and European right. As Kaplan and Weinberg have pointed out in their discussion of the emergence of a Euro-American Right, there were some efforts by fascist movements prior to WWII to establish relationships across national lines, only after WWII did that transnational cooperation intensified.\(^2\) These trans-Atlantic connections are no more apparent in the more recent developments in white nationalism in America that explicitly engage with and seek to adapt European New Right (ENR) ideas and strategies to the North American context.

We have already touched upon this in the prefaces written by Stephen Flowers for *On Being a Pagan* and *Manifesto for a European Renaissance*, there was a sincere effort to bring to English speakers the ideas of the ENR. In this final chapter I describe the latest manifestation of this cooperation in what is best described as both a trend within contemporary white nationalism and a specific intellectual outlet called the North American New Right (NANR).\(^3\) The NANR represents one of the more intellectual movements in American white nationalism today, often drawing university trained racialists among its participants. It is an intellectual trend and more specifically exists in Counter-Currents Publishing, established in 2010, and the *North American New Right*

---

\(^2\) Kaplan and Weinberg, *The Emergence of a Euro-American Radical Right*, 2

\(^3\) It is important to note here that in keeping with the pan-Europeanist ideology of contemporary white nationalism that those in the NANR do include Canada in their general claims about making a white homeland in North America. Most of these theorists are themselves Americans or European émigrés to America, as in the case of Tom Sunic.
journal, released in 2012, both of which are under the editorial leadership of Greg Johnson, who edited Cleary’s *Summoning the Gods* and the translation of *On Being a Pagan*, and is specifically thanked in volumes one and two of *TYR* for his contributions.

According to him, the North American New Right indeed draws on the work of European rightists like de Benoist, but it is nevertheless “a new movement,” unique in its orientation to the American context. He writes further, “The primary metapolitical project of the North American New Right is to challenge and replace the hegemony of anti-white ideas throughout our culture and political system.”\(^4\) This is, as is clear from the quote in the epigraph in response to what he qualifies as an imminent threat to the very existence of the white race. This is common enough to everything we have discussed so far in the white nationalism and the rejection of Christianity as an alien and enfeebling ideology. However, responses to Christianity are complex in the NANR. Outright rejection of Christianity is not a consistent response. This is in part a continuation of the kinds of tensions resulting from the both the debates among American white nationalists about pragmatic approaches to white racial survival and the kind of approaches specific to the adaptations of the ENR in America.

Because the NANR heavily references the European New Right, indeed defines itself by it, we must start with an exposition of the ENR. Some of this exposition will be historical, focusing on the emergence and later influence of these ideas in America. Later my analysis turns to readings of select texts that are significant for understanding of theorists’ positions on religion in general, and on Christianity in particular. After

establishing this background for the NANR, I discuss the emergence of a New Right in America, first with Tomislav Sunic’s efforts to describe the ENR to an American audience in the 1990s, to more recent efforts by Michael O’Meara and Greg Johnson. In the NANR we find both one of the most recent intellectual movements in American white nationalism, but one that complicates the picture of how white nationalists conceptualize religion in relation to the perennial obsession with white racial survival. This points to the possible future developments in white nationalism as theorists continue to engage with discussion of Christianity as a problem to be solved.

The Emergence of the Trans-Atlantic New Right:

When discussing the history of the New Right one has to keep in mind, as Tamir Bar-On has written, “that the ENR [European New Right] is a coherent “cultural school of thought” with historical origins in ultra-nationalism, the revolutionary right and fascism,” and yet “ENR theorists consciously separate themselves from both the parliamentary and extra-parliamentary wings of the revolutionary right milieu.”

Nevertheless, it is appropriate to say that the New Right in Western Europe and elsewhere has a common origin and entwined history, the touchstone of which is the Groupement de recherche et d’études pour la civilisation européenne (Group for the Research and Study of European Civilization), or GRECE.

---

6 There is certainly more written on the ENR than I can discuss in this section. See the work by Tamir Bar-On that I already referenced, as well as the works of Anne-Marie Duranton-Crabol, especially Visages de la Nouvelle droite : le GRECE et son histoire (1988), and Pierre-Andre Taguieff, especially Sur la Nouvelle Droite: Jalons d’une analyse critique (1994). GRECE is still operational, though it has undergone
Founded in 1968 “not as a political movement, but as a school of thought,” GRECE has become synonymous with Nouvelle Droite, or the French New Right, and since has become the nexus for intellectual activity that spread New Right thought through Europe, and then came to influence New Rightists in North America. Among the founding members were Alain de Benoist, known sometimes as Fabrice Laroche, Guillaume Faye, and Pierre Vial. Those involved with GRECE were, in the words from the title of Vial’s 1979 work, looking “for a cultural renaissance.” The French New Right, as it came to be called in the French press, was characterized by its anti-egalitarianism, anti-liberalism, and an “overwhelming fixation on cultural identity and ‘rootedness’.” They came to distinguish themselves from the more well-known nationalist movements in Europe, like Front National. In particular, where ultranationalist parties in Western Europe tend to be both pro-Christian and pro-Capitalism, the New Right was critical of both Christianity and capitalism as sources of cultural decline in Europe. The New Right also came to associate itself with thinking of the New Left of the 1960’s, and in particular theorists like Herbert Marcuse and Antonio Gramsci. In fact, transformations in its history. One may still visit the organization’s website here:

http://grece-fr.com/

7 The quote is my translation from GRECE’s manifesto, “Manifeste du GRECE” found at http://grece-fr.com/?page_id=64
9 Bar-On, Where, 169.
10 René Rénard’s preface to Duranton-Crabol’s Visages de la nouvelle droite (1988) states the common conclusion that on page 11 that the New Right’s animosity toward Christianity and its “exaltation of ancient paganism” has set it quite apart from other right-wing movements in France.
the thought that emerged out of GRECE, and in particular that of de Benoist, came to be called the “gramscism of the right.”

In his book on the New Right, *Against Democracy and Equality: The European New Right*, Tomislav Sunic, former Croatian diplomat and one of the more significant interpreters of the European New Right from the inside, argues that Gramscian among the New Right emerged from the position that reverses the “Marxian theorem” and argues that “ideas, and not economic infrastructure, constitute the base of each polity.” In an effort to decrease the political influence of socialism and liberalism,” writes Sunic, “the New Right proposes a scheme for cultural battle by simply readapting the message of Antonio Gramsci to communist intellectuals.” Michael O’Meara, another significant interpreter of the ENR, and now a contributor to the journal *North American New Right*, concurs with Sunic in his sympathetic treatment of the GRECE and the Nouvelle Droite in *New Culture New Right: Anti-Liberalism in Postmodern Europe* (2004). O’Meara credits Benoist as having “reversed the relationship” between ideas and economics a la Gramsci by asserting that “ideology dictates politics.” This focus on “culture” in the adaptation of Gramsci’s approach to the politics of ideology is important to understand how the New Right distinguished itself from the old Right, but is also important for understanding how New Rightists articulate their metapolitical project, as well as the importance of myth in working to produce a “renaissance culturelle.”

---

13 Ibid, 30.
The two main events that contributed to this new political formulation in France were the events of May 1968 and the war in, and eventual loss of, Algérie française. Bar-On comments that many of the New Right thinkers “have their origins in the anti-Enlightenment, revolutionary right and ultra-nationalist milieu of the 1950’s and 1960’s, especially the struggle for French Algeria,” and that they have been “shaped” by the legacies of French politics in this period, including the student and worker revolts in 1968. Bar-On goes on to argue that “while during the events of 1968 most of the French nouvelle droite intellectuals were firmly rooted in the ultra-nationalist, anticommmunist camp, the events of May 1968 still represented a critical turning point in the school of thought’s cultural and political evolution and appraisal of modernity.”

While hostile to the “hedonism” of the Leftists of ’68, Nouvelle Droite thinkers admired their revolutionary spirit and shared their dislike for Gaullism and capitalism, but the ND eventually came to regard itself as the bearer of the true “revolutionary spirit of May 1968,” regarding “liberals, socialist and the New Left” as having become “bourgeois socialists that have joined the status quo they once vehemently rejected.” Though it cannot be said that the events in Algeria were the cause for the creation of the French New Right, they, along with the May ’68 revolts, together provided an opportunity for GRECE to be recognized as offering an alternative to both the New Left and the Gaullist establishment. More specifically, as Bar-On argues, the failure to maintain French Algeria presented thinkers associated with the Nouvelle Droite an opportunity to interject an alternative to traditional French nationalism in the form of a
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15 Bar-On, Where, 23.
16 Ibid, 57.
17 Ibid, 60.
pan-European nationalism that was critical of the “fallacy of colonialism.” For Benoist, “the decolonization process and the ascent to international power of the Third World was clear evidence of the irreconcilable differences between world cultures.”

Race and Religion in the European New Right:

In the development of the European New Right’s metapolitics, a strategy that focuses on “cultural” changes through a Gramscian approach to ideology and a pan-European formulation of nationalism, arguments about the roles of race and religion are at once important and difficult to understand. The theorists of the ENR were painfully aware of the obvious accusations of racism, fascism, and anti-Semitism that their opposition would level against them. I am inclined to avoid the accusations of fascism as a matter of taking seriously the differences between early and mid-twentieth century movements that are lumped together under that signifier and the ENR. Also, scholars are not completely settled on what exactly constitutes fascism in the generic, nor are they in agreement that the ENR is fascist by most definitions. However, like I began to argue in the previous chapter about more recent forms of esoteric racialism, race in the ENR is better described in terms of a “cultural racism” as articulated by Etienne Balibar.

The emphasis on a “cultural renaissance” by ENR theorists blends discussions about race and religion in complicated ways, particularly when they formulate essentialist notions of Europeanness. They most commonly blend a Nietzschean critique of Christian morality and a Dumézilian Indo-Europeanism in a way that articulates religion as
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18 Ibid, 34.
19 Ibid.
20 Balibar, “Neo-Racism.”
properly belonging to a naturalized understanding of the relationship between social structure, biological relations, and supporting myths that define the relationships between the two. Therefore it is common for some in the ENR to imagine their metapolitical project to include a rejection of Christianity in an appeal to imagined pre-Christian European societies. In this way ENR theorists think of race and religion together in both their critique of modern society and how they imagine their construction of a supposedly authentic European identity within an authentic social arrangement.

The ENR therefore offers a “reformulation of nationalism,” referencing Indo-Europeanness as both a story of origin of the peoples of Europe and as a model for the ideal organizational scheme for the “imperial unification of Europe,” composed of “peoples of the same origin.” Alberto Spektorowski terms this ideology in the New Right as a mutual “differentialist ethno-pluralism,” an “ethno-regionalism” that gives insight into how ENR theorists imagine “culture” as both an ideological and biological reality. In keeping with other analyses of the New Right, Spektorowski states that for theorists of the Nouvelle Droite, and de Benoist in particular, “the recovery of Europe’s true sovereignty is cultural rather than economic.” From this emphasis on “culture” and the reformulation of nationalism from a narrow country specific focus to a pan-European one, further distinguishes the New Right from older forms of rightism in France. Further, de Benoist is fond of arguing for the “right to difference,” meaning that cultures have the

23 Ibid, 125.
right to uninhibited expression, and decries the colonial projects of the past. However this form of opposition to colonialism is still set in the context of anti-immigration politics on the basis of an essencalized notion of culture whose contours are drawn in the older narratives of biological race.

To return again to Balibar’s argument touched upon in the previous chapter, we cannot assume because discourses of hierarchy are abandoned for discourses of difference that the discourse is not racialist. To quote Balibar again,

> At the cost of abandoning the hierarchical model (though the abandoning is more apparent than real, as we shall see) **culture can also function like nature**, and it can in particular function as a way of locking individuals and groups a priori into a genealogy, into a determination that is immutable and intangible in origin.²⁴  

Further, as he argues, the “return of the biological theme is permitted and with it the elaboration of new variants of the biological ‘myth’ within the framework of a cultural racism.”²⁵ As I argued about esoteric racialism, religion in the New Right in Europe is one that is deeply tied to anxieties over mixing that compel many of those involved to reject Christianity as both alien and as the predecessor of the universalism and other notions in modernity that imperils European culture. As we will see in more detail in a moment, this approach has found a ready audience in the United States through translations of New Right materials.

*Translating the New Right in America:*

The works of de Benoist seem the most obvious place to begin. The most significant of his works related to religion and the rejection of Christianity is *Comment*

peut-on être païen?, written under the nom de plume Albin Michel in 1981, and translated in 2004 as On Being A Pagan. As I already mentioned, Stephen Edred Flowers wrote the preface to the English edition, and Greg Johnson, editor-in-chief of the North American New Right journal, edited the English edition. So this text is not only an important commentary on “paganism,” described by de Benoist as “the original religion of Europe and as an ever-central component of its present day,” but it is important in that this text was interjected by North American New Right theorists into the American scene to, as Flowers argues in the preface, “serve as a sobering reflection on the true difficulties of undertaking a revival of our [Euro-American] ancient heritage.”

Alain de Benoist situates this text “in opposition to this time and this society,” and says that it “seeks to recall the possibility of a landscape and a spiritual re-presentation that would resonate with the beauty of a painting, a face, a harmony—with the face of a people uplifted by hope and the will to live another beginning.” He describes his argument as fundamentally Nietzschean combined with an Evolian Traditionalism to assess the “history of Western metaphysics” as a “slow unmasking of a Christian aspiration to nothingness.” Form this position de Benoist argues that to “break with this secularization of Judeo-Christian discourse,” de Benoist argues, “is to assert once and for all mas as creator of himself.” For him, as we have seen is a common argument among the right, “the establishment of Christianity in Europe began a slow process of dissociation and shattering of the orders of sociality,” which “eventually crystalized in
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27 Ibid, 4.
28 Ibid, 195.
29 Ibid, 196.
the form of a veritable neurosis, for which the one-dimensional society denounced by Marcuse is only the reverse and relative contradiction, and at the same time it is its derisory corrective.”

In the effort to bring about a transcendence of this secularized Christianity, de Benoist argues for an “abandonment of a metaphysics in which God has created the world *ex nihilo*” and thus opening space to create “truth” out of “a new system of values,” “the founding of a neo-paganism that allows the realization of ‘an authentic lifestyle’. ”

This means “giving birth again to a metaphysics… in which setting down roots, staying in one place, dwelling there and thinking there, go hand in hand and are perceived to be the same.” The fundamental struggle for de Benoist is therefore defined as an effort to “break the language of twenty centuries of Judeo-Christian egalitarianism.”

Though de Benoist argues that his paganism is not a “regression,” he does assert that “paganism today… clearly requires a certain familiarity with ancient Indo-European religions”—a “scholarly familiarity” as well as a “spiritual” and “intuitive familiarity.” Benoist’s paganism is then an imagined return of sorts, even if he denies it. It is in his words a “sacrilization” in the opposite direction of Judeo-Christianity that will reform Europe to its supposedly rightful metaphysical disposition. “Europe is never more pagan,” he writes, “than when it searches for its roots, which are not Judeo-Christian.” His paganism is not the Odinism previously discussed, to be sure. However he never
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quite relinquishes an imagined past either. He does regard his paganism though, in a sense, futurist. But his futurism still looks for input from the past—a Greco-Roman, pagan, imperial past in particular.

In another text translated for the English speaking market, *The Problem of Democracy* (2011)—originally published as *Démocratie: le problème* (1985), the rejection of Judeo-Christianity for a prior, Indo-European society and values is argued for again. Here the contrasts Christian and pre-Christian and argues that they offer “two different conceptions of man, two different views of the world and of social ties.”

Here the focus is on “re-appropriating—and adapting to the modern world—a notion of the people and of community that has been eclipsed by two thousand years of egalitarianism, rationalism and the exaltation of the rootless individual”—all of which problems de Benoist blames, in the final analysis, on the Christianization of Europe. Above all, de Benoist is concerned with what he calls an “organic democracy,” one that is based upon one’s “belonging to a given folk—that is a culture, history and destiny.”

Once again we see the essentialism of the “cultural racism” that reifies all relations along the lines of one’s belonging to “a people.” There is really not too much in his argument in these two texts that is unfamiliar to us at this point—from a culturalist essentialism emerges a critique of Christianity as an ideology that has corrupted the properly “Indo-European” traditions that are regarded as organic to European peoples. Like L.R. Brown, Yockey, Oliver and others, de Benoist, though he is always careful to
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not articulate directly a biological racism, produces a biologized and racialized narrative of cultural difference that is marshalled to confront the perverse universalism and egalitarianism that he finds in Christianity, and to cure the alleged illness of European man through a resurgence of a supposedly authentic European self that has been alienated from him by Christianization.

It is important however to note that not all Grecists agree with an outright rejection of Christianity. Guillaume Faye, a onetime associate of de Benoist’s and a co-founder of GRECE, has been similarly influential among English speaking New Rightists. In particular, his work *Archeofuturism: European Visions of the Post-Catastrophic Age*, released in English in 2010 with a forward written by Michael O’Meara, whom we will discuss later, offers similar critiques of modernity, democracy, and egalitarianism as we have seen from de Benoist.39 Faye’s “archeofuturism” is described as an all-out assault on modernity and egalitarianism and a forward looking replacement of the present order, something like a reconciliation between “Evola and Marinetti”—that is, a reconciliation of Traditionalism and Futurism.40 Faye also argues that nationalism today necessitates the defense of the “native members of a people,” but also “requires a break with the traditional idea of a nation and citizenship” inherited “from the egalitarian philosophy of the Enlightenment”; one that embraces “the notion of

39 Faye, Guillaume, *Archeofuturism: European Visions of the Post-Catastrophic Age* (United Kingdom: Arktos, 2010). This work is complex, as is Faye’s relationship to the ENR and la Nouvelle Droite. There is no space to offer here a complete reading of this text and its critique of the New Right, nor is there time to fully discuss Faye’s career. It is sufficient here to remark that he has been critical of the New Right’s anti-Catholicism on strategic grounds, arguing that such a stance alienates those who may otherwise agree with the agenda of the Nouvelle Droite.

40 Ibid, 14.
a ‘European people,’ which exists and is under threat, but is not yet politically organized for its self-defense.”\textsuperscript{41} To organize for this defense, argues Faye, the “folk—whether in Toulouse, Rennes, Milan, Prague, Munich, Antwerp or Moscow—must revert to and embrace ancestral virility.”\textsuperscript{42}

In almost all ways he is agreement with de Benoist, except in the area of religion. “The Archeofuturist answer might be,” Faye argues, “a neo-medieval, quasi-polytheistic, superstitious and ritualized Christianity for the masses and a pagan agnosticism—a ‘religion of the philosophers’—for the elite.”\textsuperscript{43} The imperiled European “folk” have been overcome by egalitarianism and “monetarianism” that he regards as the legacies of an ineffectual Christianity, and Faye does answer this imperilment with, as O’Meara describes it in his forward, “the re-emergence of archaic configurations” that appeal to “pre-modern, in-egalitarian, and non-humanist” values that would give rise to “a reborn assertion of European being.”\textsuperscript{44} But contrary to de Benoist, Faye does not see the need for the removal of Christianity. Rather, he argues that it can be reformed to perform a function in the future European republic. But moreover, Faye worries that the outright rejection of Christianity is a tactical error, as it is likely to alienate support of Christians otherwise amenable to the ENR program. “I believe that this insistence on paganism,” he argues, “has been a huge propaganda mistake, which has distanced the Nouvelle Droite from many Catholic milieus initially favorable to it.”\textsuperscript{45} This is noteworthy as this debate
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both recalls the earlier arguments by Oliver and the present debates about Christianity in the NANR.

In *Fighting for the Essence: Western Ethnosuicide or European Renaissance?*, by Pierre Krebs—a French born German theorist and described as a major figure Neue Kultur, or the German branch of the ENR—has made significant contributions to the ENR and has been translated into English. His arguments in this book echo much of what de Benoist articulated in the works already discussed. Krebs makes an appeal for an “organic democracy” as opposed to the “cycle of egalitarian madness” of modern liberal democracies. And in keeping with the ENR neo-racist notion of “a right to difference,” Krebs argues that “peoples” are “biologically definable, sociologically identifiable and geographically localizable.” And similarly, he blames the “plague” of humanitarianism and equality on the “monster of Judeo-Christianity.” To address this situation, Krebs argues for a return to “bio-cultural reality” and to refuse “compromise” with anything derived from “the Judeo-Christian root” and to “return to [their] pagan Indo-European tradition.”

There is obviously affinity in all three of these representations of ENR authors whose works have been translated in to English, primarily for the American market. However there are subtle differences on how to go about creating a supposedly bio-
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culturally rational society. In particular there is the difference between the majority of ENR theorists who argue for an outright rejection of Christianity and the minority who feel that Christianity can be reformed and that an outright rejection of it would create too much division in the ranks. This argument is ongoing, and is ongoing as well in the North American New Right to which we now turn.

The New Right in North America:

Tomislav Sunic (b. 1953), a former Croatian diplomat and former professor in the United States, was the first ENR theorist to write about the ENR in English for the English speaking audience. In 1990 he adapted his PhD dissertation on the history of the Nouvelle Droite, into his opus on the topic, Against Democracy and Equality: The European New Right.\(^51\) The stated purpose of the book was to describe the “resurgent conservative movements in Europe and their intellectual heritage,” discussed above.\(^52\) However, Sunic’s treatment here differs from treatments in French to 1990 in that Sunic focuses on the “differences between the European New Right and the American ‘new right’.”\(^53\) Very quickly into the text, Sunic identifies some of these differences, and most significantly that the American right’s liberal heritage and that “some American conservatives view conservatism as inseparable from Roman Catholic

\(^51\) This biographical information is found on Sunic’s website, linked here: [http://www.tomsunic.com/?page_id=13](http://www.tomsunic.com/?page_id=13). The accreditation of having written the first English language book on the ENR is made by Alain de Benoist in his essay “The New Right Forty Years Later,” included in the latest edition of the book (p. 15). In Sunic’s own preface to the third edition, included in the edition used here, he also states that this book grew out of his doctoral thesis presented in 1988, which pushes this original contribution two more years (p. 11).

\(^52\) Sunic, Against Democracy and Equality, 43.

\(^53\) Ibid, 47.
Sunic then goes on to a critique of “neo-conservatives” such as Norman Podhertz and Irving Kristol on the grounds that they are more concerned with the defense of Israel and view a defense of the Israel as a means of defending the United States; a critique that is laden with the suggestion that this is because of their “Jewish ancestry,” as he is careful to make this known to the reader. The insinuation is obviously meant to point to the corrupting effect of supposedly Jewish thought in American conservatism. In a later chapter titled “The Metaphysics of Equality,” in tones strikingly similar to Revilo Oliver, Sunic traces the “genesis and the gradual consolidation of the modern belief system of egalitarianism” to “Judaism and, later on, Christianity.”

Sunic is in this text interpreting the ENR for the American audience, and not necessarily speaking for himself. The text reads as both an introduction to ENR thought, and a comparative political project between the ENR and American conservatism; but it also reads in places as a commentary ENR ideologies in the effort to find places of interaction between the ENR and American rightists. This is apparent in his comments in the conclusion in which he states that the New Right has “made a path-breaking effort in probing the roots of the modern crisis,” and to draw “our attention” to critiques of liberal democratic societies. One can certainly read the “our” in this conclusion as political scientists, but I think one can also say that it means the English speaking audience as
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well. However, to draw attention to both his positions and his place in the white nationalist community in America this I will discuss his website and a talk given in 2011.

The first thing to notice about this talk is that it was given at a meeting organized by the National Policy Institute (NPI), whose banner on their website homepage reads “For Our People, Our Culture, Our Future.” NPI describes itself on its webpage as “an independent research and educational foundation” that represents “White Americans—our country’s historic majority and founding population—the people that bears the unique heritage of Europe, Christianity, cultural excellence, and the scientific awakening,” and works to counter “the dispossession of White Americans,” which they see as both immanent and leading to “catastrophic effects for the entire world, not just our [white] people.” In his talk, Sunic describes himself as a member of the European New Right, a proponent of white nationalism in the tradition of Francis Parker Yockey’s pan-European vision, and a member of the American Third Position Party (often written as American 3rd Position), which has since changed its name to the American Freedom Party (AFP)—an organization that describes itself as a “Nationalist party that shares the customs and heritage of the European American People.”

Sunic sits as a director of the AFP along with other notables such as longtime friend and associate, Kevin MacDonald, a professor at California State University, Long

58 NPI’s homepage is linked here: http://www.npiamerica.org/
59 NPI’s self-description on their website is linked here: http://www.npiamerica.org/about/
60 The “mission statement” of the American Freedom Party from which this language comes is linked on their website linked here: http://american3rdposition.com/?page_id=195
Beach and described on the website as an “expert in evolutionary psychology.”

MacDonald himself has been a significant contributor to the American racial nationalist milieu for some time. In particular he has written several articles and books, the most significant of which was *A People That Shall dwell Alone: Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy, with Diaspora Peoples*. In a review of this book, Sander Gilman wrote, “It is evident that MacDonald recasts all of the hoary old myths about Jewish psychological difference and its presumed link to Jewish superior intelligence in contemporary sociobiological garb.” Indeed, that could be said of the subsequent books he has produced on the “Jewish Question” in America. Sunic is therefore positioned in the center of the white nationalist intelligentsia, not simply by association but affiliation and self-description. That he is a European Rightist come to America as a racial nationalist seeking solutions to white demographic decline and a loss of political self-determination has afforded him a privileged position in the emerging North American New Right.

The title of Sunic’s talk before the NPI, “Prospects for the Nationalist Right in America,” suggests the main point of his talk: that he thinks America offers the best opportunity for a “rebirth and revival” of revolutionary, pan-European nationalism. He argues that while Europe had been plagued with narrow territorial nationalist concerns
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63 The talk, along with his introductory remarks, can be found linked here: [http://reasonradionetwork.com/category/programs/the-sunic-journal 6/24/2013](http://reasonradionetwork.com/category/programs/the-sunic-journal 6/24/2013)
that produced, for example, WWI, WWII, and the Balkan conflict, all of which are
described terms of racially suicidal, fraternal wars, America’s white population has a
sense of identity that mitigates this kind of conflict. He argues further that some white
Americans are therefore already prepared for a pan-Europeanism that assumes a unity in
race that transcends geographical and historical conditions. This certainly points to why
Sunic is so active in the American white nationalist scene, as he seems to regard it as the
germ community from which a transnational Europeanist future might emerge. But Sunic
goes on to describe other elements that define this coming community he imagines.

In this talk and elsewhere in his work, Sunic argues for a “spiritual” essence that
defines the basic identity of every member of that race; one that is, like it is for de
Benoist, inimical to Christianity. In other places he is more confrontational in discussing
what he regards as Christianity’s role in this cultural decline and endangerment through
mixing, but in the talk itself Sunic is guarded about his criticism. He only briefly
mentions that Christianity presents an obstacle to this emerging racial consciousness at
the end of the talk. However, in his introductory remarks before playing the recoded talk
on his website he is more candid. In keeping with the ENR line against capitalism, he
identifies liberal economics as a problem inhibiting the instantiation of racial nationalism,
but he also goes on to discuss the place of his critique of Christianity. He states that he is
not necessarily “anti-Christian,” but discusses at length the support for migrant workers
that Cardinal O’Conner and The Pope displayed for peoples he perceives are “swamping”
European lands that he calls “sentimental double-talk.” Still here his critique of
Christianity is somewhat muted. He states that he didn’t get into this discussion at the
NPI gathering because of limited time allotted, but I think if one looks at the place of Christianity in the National Policy Institute, the host of the conference, we may conclude that he was aware of the political inefficacy of such talk that could highlight the tension between the ENR and the American Right on the religion.

Elsewhere, Sunic’s criticism of Christianity is more apparent. In his forward to Krebs’s *Fighting for the Essence*, Sunic lauds the book as one that “urges the reader to decolonize his mindset, purging it from the images and concepts that have been contaminating White European brains over the last two millennia “which resulted in in a distorted perception of objective reality and a perverse form of White identity,” clearly referencing Christianity. For Sunic, Krebs “correctly traces the problem of White racial decay and cultural decadence not to liberalism and multiculturalism, but to the Judeo-Christian tradition.” Where Sunic had no reason to assume a political consequence for his criticism of Christianity he was more candid about how he sees it.

This appears again in his 2007 book, *Homo Americanus*, in which Sunic is focused on a criticism of “Americanism” from “within” and “without,” referencing his subject position as an immigrant, while offering a redefinition of concepts and providing a “different meaning for those concepts.” In particular he wants here to address the shortcomings in American racialist thought by way of an incorporation of ENR analysis of “Americanism” and the “few American authors, such as Francis P. Yockey and Revilo P. Oliver” who pointed to the “contradictions among American racialists.”
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those contradictions that Sunic targets is what he calls “Judeo-American monotheism.”

The fundamental problem here identified by Sunic is an “absence of a common cultural identity among white Americans,” which seems to him a “fundamental weakness of postmodern American nationalists, racialists, and conservatives.” And like others in the ENR, especially de Benoist, Sunic identifies “Judeo-Christian universalism” practiced in America as that which “set the stage for the rise of postmodern egalitarian aberrations and the complete promiscuity of all values.” Sunic is nevertheless hopeful as he wonders if “the death of communism and the exhaustion of postmodern Americanism” may lead to “the dawn of a new American culture and a return to ancient European heritage,” but it is clear that he does not think Christianity has been or is compatible with that aim.

Another major interpreter of the ENR in North America, Michael O’Meara repeats much of what Sunic’s study of the Nouvelle Droite in his historical interpretation published in 2004, *New Culture, New Right: Anti-Liberalism in Postmodern Europe.* There however are some differences between them that point to the complicated picture of how the NANR discusses Christianity. O’Meara was a student at Berkeley in the 1960’s and later went to France to study at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris. Since the publication of *New Culture, New Right,* O’Meara has come to be
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known as one of the foremost contributors to the emerging New Right in America in writing articles and reviews of books, particularly on the works of Guillaume Faye. He has also become a significant theorist of white nationalism in his own right, contributing to several white nationalist journals and websites. But *New Culture, New Right* and his collection of articles in *Toward the White Republic*, published by Counter-Currents in 2010, have been the most significant of his works to date.

In *New Culture, New Right*, O’Meara outlines a history of the New Right in Europe primarily through an examination of the French scene. But, unlike Sunic’s earlier book, O’Meara’s account is more prescriptive of the American white nationalist scene than Sunic’s mostly descriptive account of the ENR. O’Meara’s commentary further reveals a different interpretation of the role of Christianity in white nationalist vision of metapolitics, which he certainly adopts from the ENR with minor modification. While Sunic sees Christianity as the predecessor of liberalism and egalitarianism, O’Meara seems closer in his analysis to that of Revilo Oliver’s defense of Christianity in the later 1960s before he rejected it outright. O’Meara, like Faye in responding to the anti-

show, linked here: http://reasonradionetwork.com/20110809/the-sunic-journal-dr-greg-johnson-on-the-new-right. One, at this point in time, relies on their self-descriptions and how they are known within the community. This particular background comes from both the description on Counter-Currents website, http://www.counter-currents.com/author/momeara/

73 *The Occidental Quarterly* is both a print journal and a website, linked here: http://www.toqonline.com/. According to the “about” page on the website, “THE OCCIDENTAL QUARTERLY: WESTERN PERSPECTIVES ON MAN, CULTURE, AND POLITICS is published by The Charles Martel Society four times yearly, in the Spring, Summer, Fall, and Winter.” Michael O’Meara is on the print advisory board and Kevin MacDonald sits as editor. National Vanguard, linked here at http://nationalvanguard.org/, was founded by William Pierce and is currently under the administration of Kevin Alfred Strom (see chapter 2 of this dissertation). He has also contributed to Vanguard News Network, http://www.vanguardnewsnetwork.com/, whose byline reads, “No Jews. Just right.”
Christianity of de Benoist, argues that a rejection of Christianity is firstly a tactical mistake. Further, like Oliver at one time did, O’Meara fundamentally argues for two different Christian traditions in the West—one that is liberal and alien, and another that is thoroughly a Europeanized tradition indigenous now to the European consciousness. He therefore argues that ENR anti-Christianity results from the misrecognition of the historical divergence between what he calls “historical Christianity and modern Christianity.”

O’Meara states in clear terms that “Christianity is Europe’s religion.” But he qualifies this very carefully in chapter four of his book. He admits that Christianity did not emerge “as an organic offshoot of the European spirit,” but, drawing from James C. Russell’s book *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity*, he argues that “Catholicism was compelled to make so many concessions to paganism that it ended up transforming itself from a universal salvation religion [into] a Germanic, and eventually European, folk religion.” He contrasts this Christianity with Protestantism, and “particularly its Calvinist wing,” that undid this Europeanization by “re-rooting North Europeans in the Hebraic forms of the early church.” O’Meara argues from this point that not all Christianity is responsible for egalitarianism, but rather only that wing that later came to be “profaned and incorporated into the modernist project” as a result of the “secularizing forces” that it unleashed. O’Meara therefore does not argue that white nationalists should return to paganism in the way that he sees the “Grécistes” hoping for,
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but rather for a racialized, traditionalist Christianity that revives his so-called “historical Christianity” that “preserves all that is enduring in paganism.”79

In spite of these differences between Sunic and O’Meara where Christianity is concerned, they are still both likewise committed to the white nationalist cause. O’Meara later wrote in clear terms that the “threat to white existence is profound, rooted in in the civilizational, ontological, and spiritual disorders undergirding the Judaification” that currently pervade the lives of white Americans, the solution to which is a metapolitical approach in a “return to the ancient practices that formed [white Europeans],” and therefore a more authentic identity.80 Sunic, though he is selective in how he presents his argument, rejects Christianity on almost exactly the same grounds as de Benoist. O’Meara however, as did Oliver at one time, only rejects liberalized Christianity. This points to that tension that Sunic noticed in comparing the American right and the New Right in Europe, but it also points to the way that the debate about religion between Faye and de Benoist is alive and well in the American context. Nonetheless it is important to keep in mind that though prescriptions differ, they all agree that Christianity in some form presents a problem for those concerned with the racial nationalist project.

In discussing so far this milieu that I have called the North American New Right I have only sought to introduce it as a trend of thought. It is also the proper name for a new movement in American white nationalism that takes influence from, and sometimes issue with, all that we have described so far. In this next section I will describe this movement

79 Ibid, 216-17.
and how its founding member, Greg Johnson, discusses the problem of Christianity in American white nationalism.

**The Beginning of the North American New Right Proper:**

While the first, and to date the only, issue of *North American New Right* journal was not released until 2012, the NANR began prior to this with the establishment of Counter-Currents/North American New Right as an online entity on June 11, 2010.\(^{81}\) In fact much of the content in the journal was drawn from the website that predates it. In a 2011 interview with Tomislav Sunic, Greg Johnson discussed his coining of the North American New Right, and his work at Counter-Currents, both as a publisher and administrator of the website, as the base for a metapolitical project that seeks to “get enough of our fellow white people” to begin to believe that an ethnic state can be constructed.\(^{82}\) In the interview Johnson is quite self-deprecating about his role. He shuns the idea that he is a leader of the movement in any official capacity. Nevertheless, it is clear that he sits in a very influential position within this community of white nationalists that are, for lack of a better description, at the cutting edge of this emerging ideological trend. Johnson is then rightly seen not simply as another figure popularizing ENR ideology in American white nationalism, but as someone who is working to develop a distinct intellectual movement in North America.
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First to consider when discussing Johnson’s ambitions for his organization is the relationship between the NANR and the ENR as he describes it. In an article titled “New Right vs. Old Right,” Johnson is clear that the NANR is “indebted to” thinkers such as Alain de Benoist and Guillaume Faye, among others, but he quickly adds that there are three important differences.\(^{83}\) First of these are the differences in racial identity from Europeans and Americans, which he describes in similar terms as he did in the interview with Sunic. Second—and something he also discusses in brief with Sunic in the interview mentioned a moment ago—is what he describes as the need for the NANR to more directly address “the Jewish Question.” He states that “because of the leading role of the organized Jewish community in engineering the destruction of European peoples, and because the United States is the citadel of Jewish power.” In this mimicking of the “ZOG” discourse of the white nationalist community at large in America, he argues that the NANR has this unique and paramount responsibility in a way that his European counterparts do not. This is especially distinctive because of the positions of some Nouvelle Droite thinkers, especially Faye, and in many ways de Benoist, who have avoided putting their positions in those clearly anti-Semitic terms.\(^{84}\) Likely this can be accounted for also, as Johnson remarks, by the legal differences vis-à-vis free speech statutes in the United States versus European countries that have more stern hate speech statutes.

\(^{83}\) Johnson, “New Right vs. Old Right.”

\(^{84}\) Of particular interest in this regard is the work by Faye examined in a recent book by Michael O’Meara, *Guillaume Faye and the Battle of Europe* (2013). In a review of this work by published on [www.counter-currents.com](http://www.counter-currents.com), Greg Johnson this becomes a [particular point of attention as O’Meara challenges Faye’s argument that Islam is greater threat to Europe than “global Jewry.”](http://www.counter-currents.com)
As it concerns religion, in this same introductory article, Johnson argues for the non-doctrinaire position of the NANR. He writes, “We have atheists, and we have representatives of all schools of religion, Christian and pagan, Eastern and Western.” Elsewhere he writes that the NANR does not establish a doctrine for the organization, but that they do not avoid the question of religion either. He yet again asserts the religious diversity of the NANR, but here he goes a bit further. He writes, “I think that most of us agree that at the very least Christianity needs a radical new Reformation to bring in line with the long-term survival and flourishing of [the white] race.” He does not elaborate in this short piece exactly what he means, but he does list other articles for further reading on this issue. Among them is his article titled “The Christian Question and White Nationalism” originally published in 2010 on the The Occidental Observer online.

This article begins with a summarization of the attitude in white nationalism that I have explored throughout this dissertation to this point. He summarizes the white nationalist critique of Christianity in general, and writes,

The argument goes something like this: Christianity is one of the primary causes of the decline of the White race for two reasons. First, it gives the Jews a privileged place in the sacred history of mankind, a role that they have used to gain their enormous power over us today. Second, Christian moral teachings—inborn collective guilt, magical redemption, universalism, altruism, humility, meekness, turning the other cheek, etc.—are the primary cause of the White race’s ongoing suicide and the main impediment to turning the tide… The usual conclusion is that the White race will not be able to save itself unless it rejects Christianity.

85 Johnson, “Frequently Asked Questions.”
He agrees with the first point in the summary; that Christianity is “one of the main causes of White decline,” for the reasons given above. But he disagrees with the idea that this necessarily means that white nationalists need to reject Christianity. There seems to be three main reasons for this position given in the article. First, he regards white nationalism as a “political movement” rather than a religious one. This is truly the most significant reason, motivating an accommodation with Christianity to not alienate potential allies. The goal, Johnson argues, is a “White homeland in North America,” and that this “political goal is shared by Christians and non-Christians alike.” There seems some similarity of opinion between him, O’Meara, and Faye, though he himself is not a Christian by his own admission. This accommodationist stance is one of the key features of Johnson’s placement of religion in his white nationalism.

The second reason given in the article for his not taking an outright anti-Christian position is that though it is in his view culpable for weakening the white race, it is not “the driving force” behind white “racial suicide.” This position is based on Johnson’s understanding of the relationship between the Christian churches and political power. “The church,” he argues, “has long trimmed its sails to the winds of political expediency.” He reasons that since Christian leadership has always reflected the power dynamics of the society in which it existed, it is neither responsible for the present disposition of subservience to the “power structure that is overwhelmingly dominated and defined by Jews and Jewish interests,” nor is it then necessarily precluded from a part in the imagined future white republic. He argues that “the church will resist us less fervently than those whose aims are primarily secular, such as Jewish organizations, non-White
Johnson is certain that when the white republic is established, white Christians will join their efforts to the cause.

His third reason given here for not rejecting all Christianity is certainly related to the first. He is concerned here with the political efficacy of maintaining unity among the diverse community of white nationalists. He argues that a split in the white nationalist community would inhibit the ultimate goal of a white nationalist state, but that the “presence of Christians” within white nationalism will not weaken the movement, but it could “split and weaken resistance” within Christian churches. Johnson’s hope is that white nationalist Christians would be able to bring other Christians “into compliance with the new order.” However, Johnson maintains, this movement needs to remain a political movement that is set toward the goal of a white homeland and makes political decisions based on “secular reason” and not religious dogma. This is a specific recognition of the problem that Christianity may pose for American white nationalists; one that is not solved by an outright rejection. In this case the anxieties of imperilment and the perceived need to preserve the white race via some holistic program that permeate the white nationalist milieu have produced a slightly different take on religion in general that seems to be pointing to the older position of Oliver’s while racial nationalism in America was still young,

*North American New Right* journal certainly reflects Johnson’s eclecticism. The first issue of the journal accumulates translations of the works of Evola, Faye, and others, along with interviews with Alain de Benoist and Harold Covington, who best known for his novels called the “Northwest quartet” that tells a “fictional story of White Nationalists
who consciously and deliberately set out to form an independent homeland for Whites in the American Northwest,” but also for his efforts in his initiative to make this white homeland in the Pacific Northwest a reality in The Northwest Front.  And perhaps most significant, the journal contains a section of five articles dedicated to the memory of Francis Parker Yockey. In short, this first edition of the *North American New Right* brings together some of the most influential voices in contemporary white nationalism with theorists from the ENR, including Julius Evola.

In the introductory essay in the journal, “Toward a North American New Right,” Johnson affirms both a place for diverse opinions and an emphasis on the political solution to an “existential threat” to the white race. The NANR focuses on identity, qualified as the “deep roots” of a “common European identity” that includes notions of “biological race,” “history and prehistory,” and “various diffusions as revealed by comparative linguistics and mythology.” But this is for him a baseline for the white nationalist identity in the generic from which all other opinions, including those of religious preference, are negotiable. And while he personally sees the Traditionalism of Guénon and Evola as key elements to discuss in relation to identity, Johnson still insists that the NANR is a “pluralistic movement” that seeks to bring commonality to bear on the metapolitical project at hand. Anti-Christianity then is not the defining position of
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the NANR according to Johnson. According to Johnson, NANR strives for accommodation of religious difference within white nationalism for the greater goal of white racial survival.

Conclusion—The Discussion Continues:

Here at the conclusion of the final chapter in this study we can notice something of a trend in white nationalism that has, at least in some ways, become deeply reflexive on its position on Christianity. It is incorrect to assume full momentum in favor of Johnson’s religious pluralism, but it is not too much too say that there is still a lively debate from with about the role of Christianity in white nationalism. Racialist Odinism, Creativity, and other positions that define themselves as opposed to Christianity have not ceased to be important influences. Nonetheless we see in the NANR both the most recent and the most intellectually active of responses to what is widely regarded as problem for white nationalism in the historical presence and importance of Christianity in European and American cultures, especially among the right.

This problematization is yet further pushed in NANR as Counter-Currents just released a book by James O’Meara titled The Homo and the Negro: Masculinist Reflections on Politics and Popular Culture. This collection edited by Greg Johnson leads with O’Meara’s article “The Homo and the Negro: A Masculinist view of the Futility of the Right.” Here O’Meara offers a critique of the right in America that finds its fault in basing its ideology in “Judeo-Christianity,” and thereby becoming diluted and
making its “assimilation to the Left… a mathematical inevitability.”\textsuperscript{91} This is familiar enough, but he adds another critique—that the American right has accepted the “Judeo-Christian element [that] leads it to oppose the culture-creating and culture sustaining element of homoeroticism, while ultimately embracing, in the name of equality and multiculturalism, its opposite, the Negro.”\textsuperscript{92} Of course this is not at all the dominant disposition toward homosexuality in American white nationalism; and of course I do not intend on performing an exegesis of this text or the topic of homosexuality in white nationalism at this point. That is another project in itself. I presented it to point out the kinds of topics that intersect in white nationalist discourses of protectionism and how central Christianity as a problem is to them.

With the NANR we have perhaps the meeting point of some of the most intellectual trends in white nationalism, and possibly the ideological vanguard of future transformations of it. However the specific project begun by Greg Johnson progresses, to whatever degree Counter-Currents and the journal \textit{North American New Right} play a role in affecting the white nationalist milieu, it is clear that the trans-nationalism of New Right ideology and its identitarian appeal to an ancient and essential Indo-European past will continue to appeal to American white nationalists. Even more clear from this study is that Christianity continues to be a considered a problem to by a growing number of white nationalists who are concerned about its place in their project to protect the white race. By no means does “Religious Right” refer exclusively Christianity in America anymore.


\textsuperscript{92} Ibid, 2.
Conclusion: Making Whiteness Strange and White Nationalism Familiar

“I will not apologize for wanting to protect my race from the rest of the world or from our enemies. I will continue to love those that deserve it, and I will continue to hate those that deserve it, and no amount of legislation by my enemies can ever stop me, or my race from doing so... How about you?”—“Why We Hate”¹

How About You?

In the preceding chapters I have tried to answer one question—why have a growing number of white nationalists in America come to see Christianity as a problem? As is clear from the last chapter, we cannot simply ask about rejection. The range of responses examined in this study demands that we think about a spectrum of negative reactions to Christianity that continue to develop and shift. In the first chapter we saw that Revilo Oliver’s position on Christianity developed over a long period to an eventual rejection. Even David Lane, who became extremely critical of even racialist Christianity, was at one time involved in Christian Identity theology. And, of course, in the final chapter, we saw both the racial reformist position toward Christianity expressed by Michael O’Meara and the accommodationist position expressed by Greg Johnson in the North American New Right, which further complicates the picture beyond simple rejection. So while the dominant final position for most people in this study has been the rejection of any form of Christianity, we cannot say in the final analysis that the rejection of Christianity is the final word on the matter.

In seeking to answer this question, I looked at the most significant voices in American white nationalism, some of whom—like William Pierce and Ben Klassen—have formulated completely new religious traditions to replace Christianity, while others have turned to revived or reconstructed Norse paganism, and others still have opted either for atheism or taken a position that resembles a pragmatic, almost agnostic religious pluralism. I did so to capture the range of stated reasons why Christianity is a problem. Some emphasized the alien origin of Christianity, while others emphasized the deleterious effects on the white psyche of what they regard as forced conversion or an imposition in any case of this alien ideology. Nonetheless, one answer reoccurs time and again, even where Christianity is not rejected outright—that it imperils the white race by somehow inhibiting the fundamental duty to defend the white race from biological or cultural extinction, notions, which we have seen, are often linked in white nationalist thought.

Finding this answer is, however, not the same as explaining it. As I discussed in the introduction, I find the skeleton for an explanatory framework in Henri Bergson’s *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*, and his diagnosis of the “closed society.” This offers a way to discuss the problem of Christianity in white nationalism, but it certainly does not preclude to my mind other explanations that should perhaps work together to explain particular expressions. I have discussed already, Nealon’s and Ferber’s insights are valuable even if they cannot, in my view, satisfactorily answer the question at hand. Other ways of thinking about racial and religious hatred can be helpful in making visible contrasts between speculative theories and ones developed from empirical study. For
example, Freud offered some insight on Nazi anti-Semitism that is worth consideration for a moment. In *Moses and Monotheism* he wrote that those who “excel in the practice of anti-Semitism became Christians only in relatively recent times, sometimes forced to it by bloody compulsion,” and that they “have not yet overcome their grudge against the new religion which was forced upon them, and they have projected it on the source from which Christianity came to them… The hatred for Judaism is at bottom hatred for Christianity.” In other words, Freud argues that the original trauma of Christianization has produced the negative effect of resentment to their Christianization which is projected onto the imagined course of Judaism and Jews. This diagnosis is interesting, but is the reverse of what I see in contemporary American white nationalist writings where I would say that anti-Semitism informs the hatred of Christianity. Christianity’s alien or Jewish origins are not an occasion for anti-Semitic projections, but an expression of existing anti-Semitism. The textual evidence seems to put Freud’s explanation on its head. Far from simply refuting Freud, I use Freud to highlight something about the operation of anti-Semitism in how white nationalists think about Christianity.

Further, thinking with Bergson here helps us to think in different ways about racism that do not rely on pathologizing individuals, but also consider the construction of the racist subject as one subjected to a racialized social environment. Psychological explanations for racism in general have been the preferred mode in any case. In the introduction I mentioned Abbey Ferber’s focus on the relationships between hateful racist discourses and fears of intersexuality, which she argues constructs and maintains “racial
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and gender boundaries” that the “construction of whiteness requires,”3 and Jeffery Nealon’s argument that “white angry males,” or “WAMs,” engage in “pernicious symbolic economy of othering, creating enemies solely to bolster the WAM’s own sense of inherent goodness.”4 As I discussed in chapter four, Ferber’s thesis is correct in proposing the centrality of gender in white supremacist discourses. Certainly too, as Nealon points out, the discourses of resentfulness and victimization are as prevalent as the gendered discourses expressing anxieties over intersexuality. I think in many ways these discourses are entwined in white nationalism, especially in common discourses like “race-mixing” is genocide, which is always stated as a plot by Jews, communists, or liberals; a discourse that is at least as old as Klan rhetoric from the late 1950s and 60s, and persists especially in Lane’s “White Genocide Manifesto.”5 The claim to victimization of the white race through intersexuality suggests a deep relationship between what Nealon and Ferber emphasize respectively. But, as before, I want to emphasize another aspect of this intersection that suggests not only a merger between intersexual anxieties and discourses of victimization, but also points to how this merged ideation becomes and idio-motor in an ethic of racial preservation. That is to say that perhaps the entwined anxieties of “race mixing” and of victimization are part of a larger

3 Ferber, White Man Falling, 142.
4 Nealon, “Performing Resentment,” 275.
5 This Klan discourse is discussed in chapter five of Race Mixing: Black-White Marriage in Post-War America, by Renee C. Romano (2003). For a photograph of white protestors at the Arkansas state capitol in 1959, holding signs that read “Race Mixing is Communism” see http://thesocietypages.org/socimages/2009/10/10/race-mixing-is-communism/. Lane’s “White Genocide Manifesto” is discussed in chapter four of this project.
dynamic that facilitates the function of producing subjects who act to defend the social organism.

In *Fear of Small Numbers* Arjun Appadurai discusses “vivisectionist and verifications” procedures in ethnic cleansing, in that certainty about the “we” and the “they” is verified in the vivisection of some imagined pernicious other.\(^6\) Here “violence can create a macabre form of certainty” that seeks to eradicate an anxiety related to identitarian and demographic concerns in a “folk discovery procedure.”\(^7\) Appadurai notices also that “globalization exacerbates these uncertainties and produces new incentives for cultural purification.”\(^8\) Matthias Gardell has already noticed this trend in white nationalism in *Gods of the Blood*. He argues that “globalization and American multiculturalism combine to raise the issue of identity anew,” and that racist Pagans in particular seek a more certain identity in the imagined racially pure past of pre-Christian Europe.\(^9\) But more fundamentally across the spectrum of white nationalism there is a sense of imperilment tied to perceived threats in multiculturalism. Further, white nationalists nearly always regard this cultural mixing as a direct threat to the survival of the white race. That is to say that the imbrication of a fear of mixing and a sense of resentment expressed as a claim to victimhood exist as specific elements of insecurity—as an anxiety of incompletion.

This discourse is most clearly seen in discussion of the “White Man March” scheduled for March 15, 2014, described as a “coordinated pro-white activity around the
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world” that is meant to “spread information through activism, but also to make a statement that White people are united in their love for their race and in their opposition to its destruction” which the organizers blame on diversity and affirmative action initiatives in America, and global migration patterns elsewhere that have rendered “whites” a minority.\textsuperscript{10} It is telling that the author of this statement mentions not only the demographic anxiety in a declining white population in America, but also loss of access to social and economic benefits. These are exactly the kinds of anxieties that Appadurai describes as accumulating to the point of intolerability,\textsuperscript{11} and I argue help to construct narratives of victimization that are designed to provoke affective attachment to the imagined racial community and to motivate the individual to act on its behalf. The rhetoric of white genocide that is replete within the white nationalist milieu is accompanied, either explicitly or implicitly, by a call to action to defend the white race, and to ensure its survival. The description of the event ends with David Lane’s ubiquitous phrase, “we \textit{must} prevail, so as to secure the existence of our people and a future for White children.” Again, we see here the call to action to secure white racial survival in the face of an anxiety of insecurity.

That which is at stake in my analysis then is not so much the particular expressions of resentment or fears of interracial sexuality, but the generalized anxiety that Appadurai discusses, and more specifically how this is mobilizes white nationalists through the obligation to preserve the white race. That is to say I seek to theorize the call to love and defend the white race in the “How about you?” in the quote from the

\textsuperscript{11} Appadurai, \textit{Fear of Small Numbers}, 6.
epigraph. My argument then is that this obligation to defend the white race in white
nationalism has produced Christianity as a problem for many white nationalists who see
it as an alien, corrupting, and imperiling ideological element.

*Reading Bergson’s “Closed Society”*: The *Two Sources of Morality and Religion* was originally published in 1932 in
French, and then translated into English in 1935. This is significant as the possibility of a
new war in Europe was emerging in the minds of some and German nationalism was on
the rise. It was an unusual work from a very prominent philosopher at the time, Henri
Bergson, who had gained notoriety in the English-speaking world for his previous work
on time, memory, and evolution. Bergson has since fallen into obscurity for most, except
for a revival of interest in his work through Gilles Deleuze who not only wrote on his
work, but also adapted and advanced it in the series on Capitalism and Schizophrenia
with Felix Guattari and his study of Bergson’s thought in *Bergsonianism*. But these
works do not engage *The Two Sources* or what it offers for thinking about society and
politics. That task however has been taken-up by others, in particular by Frédéric Worms,
Philippe Soulez, whose significant contributions are now collected in a volume edited by
Alexandre Lefebvre and Melanie White for English-speaking audiences titled *Bergson,
Politics, and Religion*. In collecting these essays, and adding their own contributions as
well, Lefebvre and White sought to discuss the continued relevance of Bergson’s social
and political thought for contemporary issues. In their introduction, Lefebvre and White
state that this collection is “dedicated to the political and religious aspects of [Bergson’s]
thought,” in the belief that he is “a philosopher who has had an extraordinary impact on
the political, and, on the other hand, he is an extraordinary philosopher of the political.”12

The editors offer a brief biography of Bergson’s little known political career
during and after World War I. While Bergson was well known for his philosophical
works—Time and Free Will (1889), Matter and Memory (1896), and Creative Evolution
(1907)—and “enjoyed the life of an extremely successful academic,” he was also a
significant political figure.13 In 1916 he was appointed by the French government to a
series of diplomatic missions, including one to the United States in 1917, at which time
he was to strike up a friendship with President Woodrow Wilson and convince him to
commit the U.S. into the war.14 Bergson continued to be a key intermediary between the
American and French governments during the signing of the Treaty at Versailles, and
later worked with the Wilson administration in the establishment of the League of
Nations, and in 1922 he was appointed president of the League’s International
Commission for Intellectual Cooperation, the predecessor of UNESCO.15 Later Einstein
joined this organization, whose ambition it was to foster intellectual cooperation that
would inspire national cooperation and peace.16

So we can see that Bergson’s engagement with the political is more than passing,
even if it is rather ignored when he is discussed. Further, his political engagement was

14 Ibid, 2.
16 Canales, Jimena. “Of Twins and Time: Scientists, Intellectuals, and the League of
Nations.” Neutrality in Twentieth-Century Europe: Intersections of Science, Culture, and
Politics after the First World War, ed. Rebecka Lettevell, et al. (New York: Routledge,
2012), 256.
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always in matters of violence and war—it causes and how to prevent it during and in the aftermath of WWI. Of course the Great War affected many intellectuals, but the effect on Bergson was to make him more aware of how philosophical thought and education may positively affect the global condition. *The Two Sources* was, as Lefebvre and White claim in their introduction, Bergson’s effort to “frame a series of political problems in terms of a treatise on morality and religion,” and in particular the problem of war that was so pressing after the experience of the War and to hopefully prevent another.\(^\text{17}\) In the words of Philippe Soulez, “Bergson, a philosopher in times of war, thereby becomes a philosopher of war.”\(^\text{18}\) In this context Soulez offers a Bergsonian reading of racism and genocide, stating that Bergson was right “to show that the exclusion of the other, which characterizes the political per se, carries the seed of extermination, precisely when the other is seen as a different and of course inferior species or biological race.”\(^\text{19}\) That is to say exclusions and othering is essential to constructing the rational framework for war, which is means killing on an inter-social scale. This reading is my view perfectly compatible with Appadurai’s argument in *Fear of Small Numbers*, especially as both discuss to some degree the violent effects of pernicious othering. That is to say that in thinking about racialized and religious discourses of exclusion and violence a position influenced by these thinkers advances thinking about hate and violence by positioning them within the continuum of war and exclusionary boundary maintenance that is not simply a problem when considering “extremists,” but is far more central to the current condition of national relations.
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There is of course many ways to read Bergson’s thought, even if one simply adheres to the *Two Sources*. The Bergsonian notion that I wish to extend in this case is his diagnosis of the “closed society.” This notion in *The Two Sources* does however encompass the entirety of the book, and shares space throughout with its opposite, the “open society.” There is no need for the purposes of this conclusion to try a full commentary on this concept as I am not interested in simply repeating Bergson or the commentators in *Bergson, Politics, and Religion*. Neither do I wish to delve fully into all the issues that spring forward from such an analysis; least of all his description of the open society, for which there is neither time nor is it relevant for my purposes here. As I stated before, I am interested in reading Bergson’s description of the closed society as a means for defining white nationalist sociality and to offer a reason why Christianity has been seen as a problem therein.

The most succinct description that Bergson gives of the closed society is in the opening lines of the final chapter of the book, which I briefly mentioned in the introduction. He writes, “The closed society is that whose members hold together, caring nothing for the rest of humanity, on the alert for attack or defense, bound, in fact, to a perpetual readiness for battle.” He goes on to say that the “closed society” perpetuates itself “through a religion born of the myth-making function,” a religion which he calls “static religion,” and the “force” of “moral obligation” which is for Bergson “tantamount to a pressure, which is the very substance of closed society.” This is for Bergson a “society fresh from the hands of nature”—one that, when complete, “is… however small,
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prepared for war.”22 There is much to unpack in this abbreviated description: “static religion,” the “myth-making function,” and not least “moral obligation.”

First let us consider “static religion” as Bergson describes it. In The Two Sources everything he discusses is set in the frame of the open and the closed, so every element is either dynamic and open or static and closed. For Bergson everything is either about movement. This focus on movement is consistent in Bergson’s philosophy, and one of the things that attracted Deleuze to Bergson’s thought.23 To put it simply, for Bergson openness is dynamic and mobile, while closedness is static, fixed at a point. This is significant for the notion of obligation within the closed society in that it only cares to preserve itself in stasis—to conserve itself as itself against any dissolving force. Already one can see how this duality sets in place the open society as that which can accommodate while the closed society is fixated with preservation of itself. So when Bergson discusses religion here it is either static or dynamic.

In the very beginning of his text Bergson states plainly that “whether religion be interpreted one way or another… one thing is certain, it has always played a social role,” and that role in effect “in societies such as our own has been to sustain and reinforce the claims of society,” to narrow the gap “between a command of society and a law of nature.”24 That is to say, in slightly modified language, that religion has a social effect in a closed society such that it naturalizes society’s commands. Referencing Durkheim, Bergson admits the “existence of collective representations deposited in institutions,
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24 Bergson, Two Sources, 13.
language, and customs,” which constitutes the “social intelligence which is the compliment of the individual intelligences”—what he calls later the “social sense,” which is so often described as “common sense.”25 In this way we can see that “static religion” functions as a naturalizing agent for the commands of the closed society. This is of course linked with obligation, but it is better first to discuss the “myth-making function,” because for Bergson myth-making within a closed system produces the imaginary repertoire for static-religion.

Like religion for Bergson, myth-making is a name given to a function that aids in the production of sociality. The kind of representations that are deposited in social institutions, language, and culture, mentioned above, are produced through “myth-making” as “the act that produces them”; a production for the sake of religion.26 This relationship comes more into view later in the text when Bergson states,

Static religion, such as we find it when it stands alone, attaches man to life and consequently the individual to society, by telling him tales on par with those with which we lull children to sleep. Of course they are not like other stories. Being produced by the myth-making function in response to an actual need and not for mere pleasure, they counterfeited reality as actually perceived, to the point of making us act accordingly: other creations of the imagination have this same tendency, but they do not demand our compliance; they can remain just ideas, whereas the former are idio-motory.27

One could say that the myth-making function provides productively meaningful and motivational material to the institution of a static religion that naturalizes the command of the closed society. Religion then also sutures the individual actor within the social organism in the production of the individualized social ego that acts in accordance with

25 Ibid, 104 & 106.
27 Ibid, 211.
the naturalized commands of society through what Bergson calls habit aided by religion. This is where the myth-making function, supporting static religion’s function of suture, comes to produce and live in obligation. It produces the stories by which one comes to form the logic of action. It forms the imaginary content of the society to which the individual is obligated.

For Bergson, habit and obligation are linked in the very production of the social subject; or, as one might call it, the social-ego. *The Two Sources* begins with a quick description of the social relations that produced the subject habituated to obeying commands. In the habit of obeying parents and teachers we both learned to discipline ourselves to the demands of society on whose behalf the parents and teachers acted as proxies.  

> “Each of these habits of obedience exerts a pressure on our will,” Bergson writes, and this pressure is felt as “a sense of obligation.”

This obligation is felt, but also functions as the mooring for the individual as it sutures the ego to society forming the social-ego. As Bergson writes, “at the point where [the ego] is attached, it is itself socialized.” This socialization that cultivates the “social ego” is “our first obligation to society.” We owe it to society to construct the social-ego that then becomes the basis for all further obligations to which we have become habituated. Each particular obligation accumulates, creating “pressure” and “exerting the weight of the whole,” creating “the totality of obligation for a simple, elementary, moral conscience” that takes
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the form of a “categorical imperative,” an a priori command that stipulates that “you must because you must.”

In the face of this command Bergson sees the military order of the closed society that molds the social duties of the individual to “aim at social cohesion” and composes for its subjects “an attitude which is that of discipline in the face of the enemy.” Here the “love of country” perpetuates the conditions that produce war wherein it is the duty of every citizen to hate and even kill the enemy, so that even moments of peace are used to prepare for war. Every citizen is enjoined to protect the society which aims at protecting itself in a closed loop of self-concern. The “moral attitude” of the person socialized to the closed society is “self-centered,” as is the closed society, as he is “part and parcel of society; he and it are absorbed together in the same task of individual and social preservation.” The love of the group, the love of the self, motivates all manner of violence and crime in the name of the moral calling of self-preservation. So the bellicosity of the closed society that is indicative of its aims at preservation, a static disposition, instantiated “through a religion born of the myth-making function” and the pressure of “moral obligation,” more than rationalizes war, it makes it a good. All that threatens to dissolve the closed society—or, better, to move it from its static disposition—is nothing else than the enemy given shape in the society’s mythos.

White Nationalism as a Closed Society and the Problem of Christianity:

32 Ibid, 25.
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I previously made the claim that white nationalism was a closed society. There are some issues to resolve between what Bergson describes as a closed society and how I mean this in the case of white nationalism. First, Bergson is mainly concerned in his analysis with territorial nation-states, especially after The Great War and with the view of a possible future war between modern nations. My topic is not specifically territorial in the same way, and certainly does not concern a recognized nation-state. Further, a nation-state has institutions through which it interpolates the young into its social systems, and thereby has the appropriate proxies—teachers and other authorities—to do the work of those institutions. So how do white nationalists institute sociality? The points of seeming dissonance between what Bergson describes and what I aim to establish about white nationalism are mainly institutional. I will address this briefly before moving onto the reading of white nationalism as a closed society.

There are two answers to this seeming disconnection. The first is to point out that internal to Bergson’s argument is the consideration that the closed society need not be a nation-state, but can be, and in fact always existed in manifold forms and scales of human organization. The expansion of the closed society to larger scales does not mean that it is no longer a closed society any more than the technological advancements of modern society mean that war is less devastating. Bergson is clear that in fact such expansions further reveal the danger to humanity posed by the closed society in the modern, technologically advanced nation-state form.37 Further, elsewhere in the text that we can see instances of the kinds of closed sociality in “small societies which form within the big one, when men are drawn together by a distinguishing badge which emphasizes a real or

apparent superiority, separating them from the common herd.”

One could easily see white nationalism as one of these “small societies” in that they have indeed taken for themselves the “badge” of whiteness to assert superiority. But more significantly, Bergson himself never forecloses the description of the closed society to a geographically bounded, modern nation. The closed society can be imagined in other ways than simply geographically contained. More to the point that I would emphasize, thinking of a nation as simply contiguous geographical space misses the fictive nature, to borrow from Bergson here, of the nation itself.

Benedict Anderson famously defined the nation as “an imagined political community—and imagined as both limited and sovereign.” Here the brief form of his definition comes quite close to folding itself into Bergson’s description of the closed society, especially as Anderson states plainly that the imagination of the nation as limited means that no nation “imagines itself as coterminous with mankind.” It is a closed system. To further draw Bergson and Anderson closer together, both of them have centralized the massive number of deaths dealt in the name of this limited, or closed, society. “Ultimately,” Anderson argues, “it is this [imagined] fraternity that makes possible … for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willing to die for such limited imaginings.”

One can see that Bergson and Anderson, though from different angles to be sure, approach the problem of limited fraternity, the “self-sacrificing love” that accompanies
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this particular fabulation, which is expressed in wars of preservation. But even more closely to my subject, Anderson speaks of the “colonial racism” that provided whites with trans-nationally with other whites through centuries of global expansion and colonization of disparate lands. Certainly this was true for Germans who felt German in Africa and other colonials who still knew their fraternal connections even an ocean way. It was also true in fictive global racial solidarity in the Lothrop Stoddard’s anxieties about global white decline in the face of the “rising tide of color.” It is yet still true with the re-imaginings of fraternal solidarity around racial and ethnic significations in contemporary white nationalism. White nationalism, as I have argued elsewhere in this work, is a mutation of existing forms white racial solidarity around the re-signification of whiteness; an imagined community that exists in diverse geographical spaces, but nevertheless imagines itself as a community, limited in nature and sovereign unto itself.

The proxies for this imagined community in the United States are in fact the racial authorities of the past and the racial history of America itself. To refer again to Omi’s and Winant’s study of racial formations in the United States, “the theory of racial formation suggests that society is suffused with racial projects, large and small, to which all are subjected.” As we saw in the previous chapters, so often white nationalists refer to a white supremacist past to describe themselves as truer to the legacy of Western civilization, betrayed in the liberalization of race relations—an expansion as it were of the closed boundaries of American society, if only in law. Some white nationalists have now, as I will discuss in a moment, have found entrée back into the political mainstream
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by the boundary issues in American discourses about multiculturalism, multilingualism, and immigration. And of course the infrastructure of the Internet has provided adequate dissemination of the racialist fabulations that more fully interpolate subjects into the imagined community of white nationalism. One could say that the persistent racialization of American society and political discourse serves as ample initiatory material for the nascent white nationalist.

So then we can say that white nationalism is a closed society. This imagined community, signified through whiteness, girds itself about with the command to protect the racial society even as the call is conflated with imperatives to protect white women and children as they carry the futurity of the imagined community. As is so clearly demonstrated in David Lane’s “14 Words” or Klassen’s “Racial Holy War,” the imperative to preserve the closed society is put in bellicose terms. But moreover, as I said earlier in this conclusion, there is a moral imperative in these statements. They are not simply stating a wish, but an obligation. Within white nationalism the command to see to the survival of the white race is the highest moral calling and the suture that binds all white nationalists together in a common socialility, even where other differences exist.

As both Charles Long and Bruce Lincoln have noticed the signification in the social context of religion, which is the product of human expression—what Bergson called myth-making—produces meaning, but meaning that produces activity. As Bergson stated, it is ideo-motory. In the case of white nationalism the mythos of the white race and its imperilment is not simply the expression of anxiety, nor is it the result of individual pathologies alone. White nationalism is social and productive; it is social
that it forms community, and it is productive in that it produces a social-ego of the white nationalist and activity. As Dobratz argues, “While religion and race can be crucial to the construction of one's individual identity, they can also be used to foster collective identity in various social movements.”

So often the focus on racist organization has looked for individual causes in psychosis, labeled the individual actors as extremists. Sociality is often underplayed in the analysis to the effect that it obscures the social relations that produce the racist subject—conditions that are still operative in American society. But the focus on pathologized individual acts of violence also obscures the social ideation that produced them. In part my analysis is meant to call attention to this sociality of white nationalists thought. In particular it is meant to offer a social explanation for the shifts in religious preference in American white nationalism.

“My race is my religion” is a common phrase in white nationalism. Even among those who proclaim themselves as racialist Odinists, or some other specific articulation, this religification of race is dominant. Creativity and Cosmotheism even articulated the race as central in their new religious orientation. Even those like Revilo Oliver, Tom Metzger, and Greg Johnson who claim no specific religious affiliation centralize race in their discussions of religion. In particular where Christianity is discussed it is problematized along the lines of how it has or continues to affect the white race. In the case of Creativity and Cosmotheism race is elevated through a mythos of “Natural Law” to the prime concern, and which Christianity has been unable to do. For Oliver this was eventually seen as an organized plot by Jews to weaken the racial instincts—to detract from the obligation, as it were, that every white person has to protect the white race.

Racialist Odinists too have seen Christianity as an alien and infectious imposition on the white race that imperils it. Among those who reject Christianity outright it is because it is seen as presenting a danger to the imagined racial community—it threatens to dissolve the racial order that each white person is obliged to protect. Where the rejection is muted, among the North American New Right in particular, Christianity presents a more complicated problem, but the point remains the same—Christianity threatens in some way the closed racial society that must be protected.

Looking again at the quote from White Aryan Resistance’s website that was mentioned in the introduction, “I fight because I love, not just because I hate… I will not apologize for wanting to protect my race from the rest of the world or from our enemies,” we see clearly the logic that produces Christianity as a problem in the minds of a growing number of white nationalists. To love of one’s race in white nationalism means that one must defend one’s race, to keep it safe, closed to the enemy outside, preserved from dissolution. In the imagined community of white nationalism there is no higher calling, no more central guiding moral principle—preservation at all costs. And as one is obligated to defend the white race, one must deal with the threat that “Jewish-Christianity” presents to the future biological and cultural survival of the white race. The logic of racial protectionism has produced Christianity as problem in American white nationalism.

Final Remarks:

The final chapter on transformations in American white nationalism is far from being written. As I tried to point out in the final chapter there is a pragmatist move among
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the some white nationalists in the question of religion. One could say that the categorical imperative in white nationalism to defend the race may yet produce religious tolerance. This is already the case for some in the North American New Right. But as Dobratz also argued in the conclusion of her article on this topic, “Odinist and Creator criticisms of Christianity and vice versa make it extremely difficult to ignore the religious beliefs of others or simply accept them as individual characteristics.”

Like her, I agree that continued study is warranted as the complex relationship between race and religion continues to be a source of debate within the community of white nationalists.

There is yet another reason to study white nationalism in America. The narrative of American white nationalism in chapter one of this project was one of an increasing disillusionment with conservative politics as Buckley’s model came to dominate. American government and conservative politics, like Christianity, came to be seen as threats to white racial survival. However, no it seems we could be witnessing to some degree a return of the white nationalist milieu to the conservative mainstream that they so shunned and that shunned them. The Conservative Political Action Convention, or CPAC, the meeting of American conservatives, has in recent years made room for white nationalists. At the 2012 meeting there was a panel titled “The Failure of Multiculturalism: How the Pursuit of Diversity is Weakening American Identity,” which featured the likes of John Derbyshire and Peter Brimelow.

Debyshire, known for his views problematic views on race, was let go by National Review after publishing deeply

racist remarks in 2012 in an online magazine just after the discussions about the Trayvon Martin shooting in which he discussed the advice he gives to his children about the danger that blacks pose to whites.\textsuperscript{49} He now writes independently, but he has most significantly become quite close to V-Dare.\textsuperscript{50} V-Dare, named for Virginia Dare, “the first English child to be born in the New World, in August 1587,” was established by Peter Brimelow to offer voice to those who wish to battle “multiculturalism.”\textsuperscript{51} Brimelow is also the author of \textit{Alien Nation: Common Sense about America’s Immigration Disaster}, the central thesis of which is that because of liberalized immigration policies the “racial and ethnic balance of America is being radically altered through public policy,” and that this bodes ill for American society.\textsuperscript{52}

Both Brimelow and Derbyshire represent the ways in which racialist discourses still resonate in Conservative circles, and even have been offered a seat at the table of one of the most significant meetings in the Conservative constellation. CPAC has just finished its 2014 meeting as I am finishing this conclusion where National Policy Institute, discussed in chapter six as an organization that describes itself as “an independent think-tank and publishing firm dedicated to the heritage, identity, and future

\textsuperscript{49} The story is discussed most concisely by Benjamin Hart and Jack Merkinson’s article “National Review Fires John Derbyshire, Writer Who Penned Racist Screed,” on \textit{Huffington Post}, linked here: \url{http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/04/07/national-review-fires-john-derbyshire_n_1410273.html}

\textsuperscript{50} On his own webpage Derbyshire has been candid about his relationship with V-Dare—linked here \url{http://www.johnderbyshire.com/}, where a fund has been set up in his name: \url{https://www.vdare.com/contribute/derbyshire}.

\textsuperscript{51} Peter Brimelow, “Why V-Dare? Why the White Doe?” V-Dare, accessed 3-5-2014. \url{http://www.vdare.com/about}

\textsuperscript{52} Peter Brimelow, \textit{Alien Nation: Common Sense about America’s Immigration Disaster} (Harper Perennial, 1996), xix.
of European people in the United States, and around the world.” And though Congressman Ted Cruz said of Richard Spencer, director of NPI, that he was simply "using white angst" for his own "career advancement," though Spencer himself was confident that many at CPAC were supportive of his ideas and the aims of his organization.

Immigration and anxieties over multiculturalism, and especially its perceived (and hoped for) failure are the most significant points of overlap where white nationalists and contemporary conservatives speak almost the same language. This should signal to us the importance of studying the internal logics of white nationalism. And while it is true, as Michael Barkun argues, that the “respectability” of any given system of thought should qualify it for study, that white nationalist thought has sought and in some case been given respect means that scholars should take it seriously as well.

---

53 From the homepage for NPI, linked here: [http://www.npiamerica.org/](http://www.npiamerica.org/)
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