Accumulative Extremism: The Post-war Tradition of Anglo-American Neo-Nazi and Anti-Semitic Networks of Support

In the interwar period, American fascism was very much a minority pursuit. Openly Nazi copycat groups, such as the German-American Bund, were of no great significance, and despite vocal supporters, such as Father Coughlin, there was not a native form of fascism to talk of either. Meanwhile, British fascists such as Oswald Mosley, although more of a reference point on the national stage, were never really able to raise their impact, via groups such as the British Union of Fascists, beyond that of running a fringe, countercultural movement.¹ Since the fall of the Nazi regime, and the discrediting of fascism as a viable ideology in the eyes of the political mainstream across the world,² the myriad post-war reinventions of Nazism, and other variants of fascism, have become far more limited in their political ambitions in the short term. Moreover, relatively speaking, the British and American variants have become more significant to the international milieu. With ‘cultural exports’, such as White Power music from the UK, and new tactics, such as Louis Beam’s ‘Leaderless Resistance’ ideas from the USA, both British and American activists can claim to have had an impact on the wider international milieu. Moreover, if anything they have become more radicalized when compared to their interwar variants. Importantly, Roger Griffin has noted that, in America since 1945, the ‘Nazification of large parts’ of its ultra-nationalist subcultures ‘has turned parts of the country into hot-houses for overtly fascist versions of religious and secular white supremicism’.³ Similarly, drawing on the legacies of fringe interwar Nazis, such as Arnold Leese, multiple generations of postwar British fascists have been radicalized via re-workings of Nazism, and related anti-Semitic conspiracies, too.⁴ Moreover, at least to a degree, pockets of activists within these national trends of reinvention have found a sense of transnationalism, fighting for a common cause as well.

Mapping the emergence of exchanges in such neo-Nazi ideas, and re-workings of similar, anti-Semitic conspiracy theories, and in particular drawing out how a new tradition of exchange has developed between British and American activists, is the focus of this chapter. Yet what follows does not pretend to offer a comprehensive overview of

² For a summary of how post-war identities in Europe gravitated around a profound rejection of fascism, see the Epilogue in Tony Judt, Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945 (London: Pimlico, 2007).
each and every point of interaction between the British and American cultures that have sought to retool Nazi ideas for the post-Hitler era. Indeed, there are already substantial volumes devoted to this topic, and the theme still remains under-documented. A single chapter simply does not offer space for comprehensively mapping this milieu. Instead, it focuses more targeted attention on the ways in which a new transnational tradition has been marked by ideological and tactical innovations, achieving this by examining selections of the cultural production from figures that have developed at least some level of trans-Atlantic exchange. Moreover, it seeks to map this process over a series of generations, to draw out the ways in which a new ‘tradition’ of Anglo-American collaboration has developed within neo-Nazi circles since 1945. Such a concern also raises the question of why it is important to understand such new ‘traditions’ of extremism.

With some regularity, the anti-Semitic and neo-Nazi activists who have forged this tradition have turned to violent extremism to develop their politics, as seen in groups such as The Order in America, and Combat 18 in the UK. Meanwhile, for those integrated into the milieu, but who do not carry out violence, their lives are nevertheless defined by an extreme culture that is often laced with messages that implicitly or explicitly licence violence too. So, despite that fact that, in many ways, post-war groupings have remained as, if not more, isolated from the political mainstream in both countries, these new networks have become potent, aggressive phenomena that do seek to effect political change, often through cultures of fear and even terrorist action.

Mapping this transnational, yet distinctly Anglophone, milieu of neo-Nazi ideologues reveals a multi-faceted culture too. Music, fiction, ‘historical’ philosophies, clandestine online worlds, and even political faiths are all part of the counter-cultures that the Anglo-American neo-Nazi and anti-Semitic milieu has generated for itself. Touring through the contours of such an environment, this chapter will demonstrate the senses of compatibility, and comradeship, felt by British and American activists, and explore how figures on both side of the Atlantic drew from each other’s activism to develop their own version of the ‘cause’. Finally, it will close by addressing the issue of new media technologies that have now been able to collate this tradition into easily accessible, online resources. This development allows for fresh reinvention, allowing the tradition to access a new generation who feel somehow inspired by the legacy of Nazism.
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but for whom Hitler’s regime has become much less a hazy, living memory, and much more a nebulous, historical reference point.

‘Inventing’ Traditions

How should we think of a ‘tradition’ in such a context? Eric Hobsbawm reminds us in his and Terence Ranger’s classic volume, *The Invention of Tradition*, that the vast majority of the mass, mainstream rituals of the modern world are of relatively recent origin, though they are often presented by their adherents as phenomena stretching back into the mists of time. The rituals that developed around the British royal family at the end of the nineteenth century, and into the twentieth, is a classic case in point. These were the creation of people linked to the institution who wanted to couch the flagging monarchy in new, mass rituals, to give it an aura of importance as its direct political influence declined. From the cultures of football clubs to ideas of national identity, the ‘traditions’ that mark contemporary societies can regularly be dated back only a few generations. Such ‘invented’ traditions are regularly produced by the conditions of modernity, and are seen as significant as they help people make sense of a fast-changing world by offering stable points of reference. Yet while the traditions of interest to Hobsbawm et al. were essentially mainstream phenomena, what is under analysis here the emergence of a tradition of cooperation within an essentially clandestine context.

To help frame this approach, this chapter will call such a process of creating the critical mass of reference points to muster such a sense of tradition ‘accumulative extremism’. This term puns on Roger Eatwell’s recent work, which has powerfully developed the idea of ‘cumulative extremism’, highlighting how tit-for-tat responses between opposing ideological groupings, each feeding from the other’s activates, generate a potent ‘us’ verses ‘them’ subculture that fuels processes of radicalisation. This is in some ways similar to what is being examined here. Yet the difference is that, while Eatwell, rightly, stressed the need for analysing the radicalising impact of interactions between discrete, antagonistic grouping, this chapter tries to underscore the radicalising impact that can occur through interactions between discrete, and very broadly, cognate grouping; that is, organisations that tend to see themselves as contributing to a wider
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‘cause’ (though as we will see often these ‘cognate’ groups can also be quite antagonistic towards each other too). As a consequence, individual, radical positions can be given a sense of validity, and so are reinforced, by their ability to fit within a wider culture that over time ‘accumulates’ various reiterations of the general ideology. As such, ‘accumulative extremism’ suggests we need to develop a quite rich description of the multiple layers that have contributed to British and American reworkings of Nazi ideology. We need not merely to scrutinise the ways in which the constituent parts of this trend are important, but also attempt to consider them as possessing a sort of ‘gestalt’ quality too. In a way, this quality has only been amplified in recent years, primarily as a result of the new media, which has allowed so much of this new tradition to be repackaged, and therefore re-imagined, by new sets of, potentially violent, protagonists. Nevertheless, exactly how significant the new Internet era has been remains open for debate.

To fully study this process of ‘accumulation’, then, it is important to capture a sense of process, and of change over time. This longer pattern allows attention to be paid to the shifts in reinterpretation and reconfiguration of the messages within the post-war, neo-Nazi tradition, via phenomena such as intergenerational exchanges, heroisation of leaders, the creation of martyrs, the dissemination of new variants of the ideology, and new tactics and strategies for coordination. Such longer trends can be lost in (equally important) studies that focus on single groupings, or are limited to a shorter time period. It is crucial to at least try to capture the ways in which multiple cohorts of activists have contributed to a fuzzily defined ‘cause’ over a longer stretch of time. The roles of earlier ideologues can also be seen to change as a result, as over and above their own achievements, their later, remembered legacy takes on new forms. Those who died young can ‘live on’ within the tradition, to provide crucial legitimising reference points for later generations, who are then able to set their own political actions within a longer timeframe of mutually reinforcing activism.

But what are the rough parameters to this ‘cause’ when it comes to neo-Nazi cultures? Very broadly put, within many post-war, neo-Nazi settings, we regularly find some variant of a meta-narrative that claims the interwar era represented a period of great opportunity for Nazi ideals, yet these hope were dashed when Nazism was, albeit ultimately temporarily, defeated by the ‘hidden Jewish forces’ that ultimately allowed the Allies to win the Second World War. Consequently, the period from the post-war era to the present represents some form of interregnum, and a liminal time, during which the
revolutionary cause needs to be kept alive by the hard-core, and to an extent promoted more widely too. Moreover, for the faithful, hope can be maintained via the idea of a new crisis providing fresh opportunities for a recast set of Nazi-inspired ideals to succeed where Hitler had failed. So the belief stresses that the future will eventually see a victory for the Nazi revolution. From such a meta-narrative, we can see that Roger Griffin’s stress on palingenesis, or mythical, revolutionary qualities within fascist ideology, is central to such political myth making – but for this chapter, Griffin’s definitional point is taken as a point of departure, not one of narrow terminological wrangling. Moreover, Nicholas Goodrich-Clarke also stresses the deeply mythic qualities that figures within such neo-Nazi cultures can steep themselves in, such as rituals, political faiths, initiations and, as the meta-narrative just summarised suggests, millennial expectations too. These are all crucial aspects of the tradition, as it has emerged. Such re-workings of Nazism, and other, related forms of anti-Semitic, fascist conspiricism, can be found not merely within the Anglo-American milieu, but also within the cultures created and promoted by activist located in the continent, and those spread around the world more widely.

Moreover, despite having some broad features that allow for a ‘family relationship’ to be observed, one must be careful not to homogenise when exploring such processes too. For almost all neo-Nazis, and to a lesser extent to many modern anti-Semitic ultra-nationalists who would reject a Nazi label, the regime headed by Hitler in the 1930s represents a crucial, formative reverence point, from which myriad reinventions of such a politics can stem. Yet clearly there are variants within the culture too. For example, while a British figure such as Colin Jordan idolised Hitler himself, as the exemplar of the ideology, others, such as American activist Tom Metzger, found the ideas of Gregor Strasser more relevant, and the ‘Strassarite’ variant of neo-Nazism decries Hitler as too megalomaniacal, and stresses an alternate strand of National Socialism offers the taproot ideology for the neo-Nazi cause. Meanwhile, non-Nazi national phenomena that, in and of themselves, are not fascist per se, yet are profoundly racist, such as the Ku Klux Klan in America, may also become blurred into reinventions
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8 See Griffin, *The Nature of Fascism*, especially chapters one and two, where he outlines this theory.

9 There is much contestation here, and a range of books criticise this approach. For example, the debate is continued in Daniel Woodley, *Fascism and Political Theory: Critical Perspectives on Fascist Ideology* (London: Routledge, 2009) a book which takes a critical position towards Griffin’s approach. There are many more positions in this debate too, and for a detailed overview of the historiography here see the Introduction to Aristotle Kallis, *The Fascism Reader* (London: Routledge, 2003).

of the ‘cause’, and so can be just as crucial to the views of an individual protagonist as neo-Nazi ideas.

Nevertheless, the transnational ‘tradition’ of Anglo-American activism, constructed through ‘accumulative extremism’, that is being surveyed here is a phenomenon that has a value for activists as it adds a further, enriching layer to the potential activism of protagonists it offers a wider set of comrades to feel allegiance with. It does not form an alternate to the national reference points, but rather can be seen as augmenting national-level activism, a dimension developed by some activists as a mechanism to further reinforce an extreme politics, and develop a wider sense of an imagined comradely community.

The Early Post-War Years

To begin the exploration of this new ‘tradition’ with a figure emblematic of the more general emergence of an Anglo-American reworking of interwar anti-Semitism, we can turn firstly to Francis Parker Yockey. Here, in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War, we already see new synergies developing between American and British activists, and one of the first notable organisations in this emergent ‘tradition’ was Yockey’s European Liberation Front, founded in 1949. Previous to this, Yockey had been a very minor American ideologue in the late 1930s, for example contributing to Father Coughlin’s fascist-friendly journal *Social Justice*. He was also linked to the American-German Bund, as well as William Pelley’s microscopic Silver Shirts organisation. In the aftermath of the war, he moved to Germany and worked for the United States War Department at the Nuremberg Trials as an attorney – though he opposed the Allies’ occupation of the defeated country, and was eventually fired at the end of 1946. He then moved to Ireland, and wrote a Spengler-inspired analysis of the history of the West, and the ways in which a Jewish conspiracy corrupted the post-war order, *Imperium*. This also called for post-war fascists to create a new European super-state that could fend off the emergent ‘outer enemies’ of the USSR and America. Published under the *nom de plume* Ulick Varange, his philosophy of history drew the attention of Oswald Mosley, himself trying to find ways to re-cast fascism for the Cold War era. Yockey started to contribute to Mosley’s new organization, the Union
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Movement, writing for its paper, *Action*, and developed expertise on Eastern European nationalists exiled in the wake of the establishment of the Eastern Bloc countries.\(^{12}\)

Yet while Yockey took a deeply anti-American stance, Mosley himself was developing a softer position towards the USA at this time.\(^{13}\) In his ‘Europe a Nation’ idea, Mosley too recognized the need for Europe to unite in order to re-invent a fascist politics for the Cold War. However, Yockey believed that Mosley’s pragmatism, which suggested the need for some strategic compromises with American power, failed to fully recognize the ‘Jewish’ threat posed by the USA. For Yockey, America had been fundamentally corrupted following the election of Roosevelt, ‘the monster’. Indeed, America had become the country most tainted by Jewish power after 1945, and thus no compromises with it could be tolerated. This precipitated a split between Mosley and Yockey, who then launched his European Liberation Front in 1949. He grounded its goals in a foundational document, The Proclamation of London, which railed against Jewish influence in the modern world. Promoting a transnational fascist politics, The Proclamation of London critiqued the very concept of the discrete European nation, which Yockey claimed was ultimately a product of European Liberalism, and the decadent materialism of the nineteenth century. He stressed that the notion of the Europe of discrete nations had blinded Europeans from seeing the power of continent as a collective, organic entity. Narrow nationalism, and jingoism, had fed into the cultures that allowed two world wars to destroy European dominance within the world. Responding to this, the mission of the European Liberation Front was twofold:

(1) the complete expulsion of everything alien from the soul and from the soil of Europe, the cleansing of the European soul of the dross of 19th century materialism and rationalism with its money-worship, liberal-democracy, social degeneration, parliamentarism, class-war, feminism, vertical nationalism, finance-capitalism, petty statism, chauvinism, the Bolshevism of Moscow and Washington, the ethical syphilis of Hollywood, and the spiritual leprosy of New York; (2) the construction of the Imperium of Europe and the actualizing of the

\(^{12}\) For a detailed history of Yockey, see Kevin Coogan, *Dreamer of the Day: Francis Parker Yockey and the Postwar Fascist International* (New York: Autonomedia, 1999).

divinely-emanated European will to unlimited political Imperialism.\textsuperscript{14}

Despite these bold ambitions, in reality the European Liberation Front was a ineffectual project. It was deeply resented not only by Mosley’s emergent Union Movement, but also by other leading British Nazis who also exerted influence over British fascist politics at this time – especially Arnold Leese, who thought that Yockey became soft on the USSR as he developed his strident critiques of America’s ‘Jewish’ materialism. By the early 1950s, Yockey had even become practically praiseworthy towards the USSR, claiming Stalin had overthrown the original Jewish leadership of the 1917 revolution, and that the Soviet Union now offered an important anti-Jewish force in the contemporary world.\textsuperscript{15}

The ELF itself developed a small support base in Manchester, coordinated by former BUF organiser Tony Gannon. Kevin Coogan has written one of the most comprehensive assessments of the tiny organisation, and describes its activities as follows:

\begin{quote}
... in early 1950 the group began publishing \textit{Frontfighter}, a four-page newsletter, on a rotary duplicator. \textit{Frontfighter}, whose circulation reached 500 copies a month, carried the ELF’s message to far rightists around the world. The ELF tried to pave the way for a new ‘post-Hitler’ form of ‘Eurofascism’ that transcended pre-war fascism’s narrow hyper-nationalism as well as the racialist ‘biopolitics’ at the heart of Nazi ideology.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

Yet by 1954, the movement ceased to exist in any meaningful sense. Yockey himself, meanwhile, travelled in Europe in the early 1950s, including addressing the follow-on fascist party in Italy, the Italian Social Movement. By 1960, Yockey returned to America, where he was arrested having been discovered in possession of false passports. He then committed suicide later that year. Telling of the importance of personal connections within the fostering of a wider tradition of activism, while in custody Yockey met with a figure we will return to later with regard to Holocaust Denial, William Carto, who became a great promoter of Yockey’s ideas, helping cement Yockey’s place in the

emergent tradition of Anglo-American far right ideological exchanges. Indeed, as Coogan’s analysis also stresses, though of limited impact during his lifetime, Yockey’s writings lived on and became influential on Europe’s New Right, an intellectualised variant of fascism crystallised in the work of figures such as the French figure Alain de Benoist, and Britain’s Troy Southgate. The latter even published an edited book on Yockey in 2001. Moreover, indicative of the fetishisation found within the counterculture under analysis here, at the time of writing the Metapedia page for the Proclamation of London offers a link to a website called Blog Rare Books, where an original copy of the text of London is available for purchase, priced £450.

The Yockey case is a curious one, and neatly encapsulates for us the range of problems facing the first generation of postwar fascists. The Second World War had fractured a movement that was already riven with disputes, and making sense of the Cold War through the lens of anti-Semitic conspiracy theories was certainly not a problem-free exercise. Which was the lesser of two evils: the USA or the USSR? Should nationalism, or some form of supra-national ‘Europeanism’, inform re-workings of the movement? How important was the legacy of Nazism when compared to other variants of anti-Semitic conspiracism? These were all potentially divisive issues. Moreover, with Yockey we find an early example of the trans-Atlantic interchange. Here was an American figure who rejected the politics of his own country, and drew on fascist anti-Semitism, including Nazism, to ground his belief that the USA had become irrevocably corrupted. In response, he travelled to Europe, essentially to tell European Nazis and fascists how to reinvent their cause. As a consequence, initially largely through a rejection, and later in a more embracing manner, Yockey has become a major early post-war reference point for subsequent activists who now locate their activity within the tradition.

Nevertheless, the development of early Anglo-American exchange was more complex than simply Yockey, and the trend this chapter is concerned with really started to emerge following the connection made between British and American activists from the end of the 1950s onwards. Before this time, neo-Nazi activism in both countries did emerge, but without much interaction, and so the Anglo-American exchanges that began to coalesce at the end of the decade were not causal for post-war neo-Nazi ideas to
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18 Graham Macklin, ‘Co-opting the counter culture: Troy Southgate and the National Revolutionary Faction’ *Patterns of Prejudice* 39 / 3 (2005), pp. 301 – 326.
develop in either country. Indeed, reinventions of fascist politics took shape spontaneously, both from the on-going energies of interwar activists now acting as senior figures, combined with novel reinterpretations created by a new generation of ideologues that was emerging by this time. So in the 1950s, we see the growth of a variety of new grouping, variously tapping into the legacy of fascism, Nazism and extreme nationalism. This activity saw the coming of age of key ideological lodestars for the post-war neo-Nazi tradition, including in America George Lincoln Rockwell, founder of the American Nazi Party, and in the UK Colin Jordan, alongside John Tyndall, who as we will see were both linked to a number of different groupings. Underscoring Yockey’s relevance to the next generation, one way or the other, Jordan’s first book, published in 1956, *Fraudulent Conversions: The Myth of Moscow’s Change of Heart*, was in part a coded attack on Yockey’s idea that Stalin’s Soviet Union at least was no longer under hidden Jewish control.  

Yockey was also viewed as figure with a profile by American activists trying to find new forms of Nazi-inspired politics too, especially Rockwell, who himself found Yockey’s rejection of America deeply unpatriotic.

Despite his dismissal by these crucial figures, Yockey’s analysis of contemporary affairs was deemed useful to other strands of the emergent, neo-Nazi activities in the United States. In particular, Yockey was a vital point of reference for James Hartung Madole, leader of one of the first openly neo-Nazi groupings in America, the National Renaissance Party. This was founded in 1949, and named after Hitler’s last testament, which talked of a future ‘renaissance’ for Nazism. Madole’s debt to Yockey included turning his Spengler-inspired analysis of the present being at a time of profound liminality in new directions. Madole even reworked Yockey’s analysis into an occultist variant of neo-Nazism. Madole’s National Renaissance Party was interested in forms of internationalism, though was far more focused on developing a transnational politics with Germany, not Britain. Madole included this idea in the party’s nine-point programme, which specifically called for a blend of American ‘technological expertise’ and German ‘scientific and military genius’. Moreover, point one of this programme declared the need for a break with British and French imperial policies. Telling of his critique of European empires, in 1956 Madole was also outspoken on the Suez crisis, criticising Britain and France for joining with Israel, and he was a vocal supporter of the
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22 Ibid, pp. 72 - 85
Arab nationalism of Nasser. A ‘Preliminary Report on Neo-Fascist and Hate Groups’,
carried out by the Committee on Un-American Activates in 1954, focused much
attention on the National Renaissance Party, viewing it as a notable, though very limited
threat. But again, this document does not point to substantial transnational networking
emerging between groups such as National Renaissance Party and international
organisations. Nevertheless, showing some level of borrowing from British fascist
culture, the National Renaissance Party used the British Union of Fascists’ flash and
circle logo, rather than the Nazi swastika, for its own symbol. For sustained culture of
interaction between Britain and America, the crucial development came with the
formation of another neo-Nazi group in America, founded in 1959, Lincoln
Rockwell’s American Nazi Party. Following in a path already trodden by Madole,
Rockwell was also very open about his political identity, and saw himself as a ‘fuhrer’
figure for America.

Nineteen-fifties Britain, meanwhile, also saw the growth of new British-based
groupings, including A. K. Chesterton’s League of Empire Loyalists – with a cause
obviously at odds with that of Madole’s staunch critiques of European imperialism.
Moreover, the perspective of the leader of the League of Empire Loyalists was itself
clearly anti-American. As detailed in the conclusion to his 1965 volume, The New Unhappy
Lords, an anti-American sentiment, as well as anti-Semitism, was at the core of
Chesterton’s critique of the post-war period. Like Yockey, the former leading BUF figure
also saw the USA as corrupted by the forces of ‘Jewish materialism’, which were
destroying the British nation. As he stressed:

The British Empire, the greatest and most beneficent of all, was liquidated stage
by stage, with relentless thoroughness and continuity of purpose. At every such
stage the Soviet Union has obligingly made appropriate menacing noises while
the United States has found the cash and exerted the economic pressure.25

Pace Chesterton, the emergent ultra-nationalist movements in Britain during the 1950s
were also a breeding ground for new ideas, and a younger generation of activists. Central
to this new activity was Jordan, who aligned himself to Leese’s brand of Hitler-
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24 Preliminary Report on Neo-Fascist and Hate Groups, Committee on Un-American Activates
(Washington DC, October 1954), available online at: http://debs.indstate.edu/u588n4_1954.pdf (accessed
31/10/2013).
worshiping, unabashed Nazism. In the interwar period, Leese’s Imperial Fascist League had promoted such a politics agenda, and by the 1950s he was looking for a successor, and so Leese cultivated Jordan to develop this legacy after his death. Following a period in the League of Empire Loyalists, Jordan went on to create the openly Nazi White Defence League in 1957, which was superseded by the formation of the British National Party in 1960. This party also absorbed another cognate grouping, the National Labour Party, co-founded by John Tyndall and John Bean. Jordan and Tyndall then broke away from the British National Party in 1962, and formed the National Socialist Movement, which Jordan led until 1968, when he rebranded the organisation the British Movement.

As with the American activists emerging in the 1950s, such as Madole and Rockwell, in the 1950s and very early 1960s primarily these were small-scale groups, and localised too, with only minimal efforts to network internationally. So while figures such as Yockey had been trying to foster some form of internationalism from the later 1940s, this only really developed after his suicide in 1960.

In particular, this pattern changed with the coming together of a key coterie of internationally-minded activists: Colin Jordan, Bruno Ludtke, Savitri Devi and George Lincoln Rockwell. As we have seen, Jordan and Rockwell were both critics of Yockey’s earlier interventions on the theme of international neo-fascism, and saw themselves as much more faithful followers of Hitler’s legacy. Indeed, Yockey’s compromised position regarding the USSR was crucial to their rejection of him. Jordan had noticed Rockwell via the latter’s call to create something he called a ‘World Union of free Enterprise National Socialists’ in 1959, an ultimately discarded, alternate name for what became the American Nazi Party. This idea caught Jordan’s eye, and led him to introduce Rockwell to Devi and Ludtke, both of whom he knew by this point. Regarding Devi, as Goodrich-Clarke stresses, such figures helped introduce a powerful strand of occultism and mysticism within post-war neo-Nazi circles. Essentially, she was another figure fusing Nazi ideas with mystical themes, promoting a synthesis of Hinduism and Nazism while also claiming Hitler to be a man of providence. Finally, Ludtke was a German former Hitler Youth member who had fought in the Second World War, and who became a close confidant for Rockwell after their introduction. Indeed, Rockwell seemed to need the validation that the German Ludtke could provide, and so he could credibly licence Rockwell’s fantasies that his marginalised American Nazi Party was somehow akin to Hitler’s marginalised NSDAP in the 1920s.

26 In this vein, he has devoted a book to analysing Savitri Devi’s ideas: Goodrich-Clarke, *Hitler’s Priestess*. 
Cementing the transatlantic relationship, Ludtke and Rockwell exchanged many letters. As Frederick J Simonelli has clearly documented, in such exchanges Rockwell was regularly buoyed by the ideas of international cooperation that could develop between Nazi-inspired activists. Typically, one called on Rockwell to ‘Think of our future capital! … Imagine the government centre with Adolf Hitler-Square in the midst of it, at the south side the mighty Lincoln Rockwell-Hall with room for at least 20,000 people’. Boosted by such fantastical visions of what success in the near future would look like, the key meeting that engendered a new era of neo-Nazi internationalism came through the auspices of Jordan, at this time at least working happily with Tyndall – another of the central figures within the new generation of British neo-Nazis. In July of 1962, the pair arranged a neo-Nazi camp in the Cotswolds, designed to bring together for the first time Rockwell, Jordan, Devi and Ludtke. Rockwell even travelled, illegally, into Britain. Together, they founded the World Union of National Socialists, or WUNS.

To ground the ideas of this new movement in a foundational text, this small coterie of activists drafted a set of ideas known as the Cotswold Agreements, and a core statement too, the Cotswold Declaration. Importantly for our theme of ‘accumulative radicalisation’, as with the Proclamation of London here we see another attempt to develop a programmatic statement of action via the coming together of nationalist activists from both sides of the Atlantic. Unlike the often-forgotten Proclamation of London, though, the Cotswold Declaration became more clearly a lasting fixture of Anglo-American neo-Nazism. It is cited on myriad neo-Nazi websites, and contemporary neo-Nazi organisations, including the British People’s Party and the American National Socialist Movement, still claim adherence to it. The World Union of National Socialists is still, to an extent, a going concern. It was re-launched with its own website in 2006, and is currently coordinated by ‘Commander Jeff Schoep’, leader of the American National Socialist Movement.

Rockwell dominated the World Union of National Socialists from its outset, until his death in 1967. Specifically, WUNS was founded on the principle that members had to acknowledge the ‘spiritual leadership of Adolf Hitler’ to join. Yet, even with dedicated
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28 For the reproduction of the Cotswold Declaration on the British People’s Party website, see http://www.bpp.org.uk/cots.html, for the National Socialist Movement’s webpage here, see: http://nationalsocialist.net/cotswold.htm (both last accessed 31/10/2013).
figures such as Lutdke, Devi, Jordan and Rockwell as core activists, its vision of achieving an international National Socialist revolution in the name of the now-dead Fuehrer was unlikely at best. However, the creation of WUNS did mark a notable turn towards internationalism within the activities of such radical neo-Nazis. Among its activists, we find themes of universalism being stressed over narrower nationalism. Jordan, for example, talked of how national identity was part of a continuum that extended into race, and was legitimised by the pagan forces of the wider cosmos too. So as with Yockey, discussion on the theme of the relative importance of the nation and its relationship to the international concept of race, was a notable trope within the milieu.

Following the initial gathering, Rockwell was deported from the UK, and images of the pipe-smoking, chisel-chinned American Nazi helped to create publicity for the new grouping. Rockwell reported back to the American Nazi Party on his trip in the party publication, *The Stormtrooper*. Among other things, his article commented in an ambivalent way on the uniquely British approach to developing a neo-Nazi organisation:

> The British have a different way of going about things than we do, and tend to underplay things so much that it seemed to me they were being far too nonchalant about the business of getting ME into Britain after all the fuss by their ‘Secretary of State’ that I would NOT get into Britain!

> But I learned a tremendous respect for the British, and understood at last why Hitler was so utterly dedicated to these people and so anxious to make an alliance with them, far from wanting to fight them – as the Jews forced him to fight them.30

This myth-making surrounding the Cotswold gathering started a trend that would extend into subsequent generations, as we will see.

Though of limited impact, one should be careful not to fully dismiss WUNS. Frederick J Simonelli’s analysis of its, albeit very partial, successes in creating an international movement highlights that, through the energies of Jordan and Rockwell in particular, the organisation was able to develop chapters in Canada and South America (it was especially active in Chile), as well as in Europe. Scandinavia was a fertile ground for WUNS chapters too, and Simonelli highlights growing coordination of National Socialist
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activities in Sweden, Denmark and Iceland during the 1960s as a result. Moreover, the most active chapters in Europe emerged in Britain, led here by Jordan himself, as well as Spain, Belgium and especially France, headed up by the tenacious Yves Jeanne. Ludtke’s activism in Germany, meanwhile, was far more restricted, largely as the authorities here were much more proactive in curbing the re-emergence of Nazism. Colin Jordan was also hampered by the British state in the 1960s, but had a dynamic support base too, including John Tyndall and Denis Pirie – though they broke away from the WUNS-affiliated National Socialist Movement to form the Greater Britain Movement in 1964. Meanwhile, Rockwell tried to cooperate with the FBI in maintaining a sense of legitimacy for his US operations (indeed, Rockwell even believed that the FBI’s Director, J. Edgar Hoover, secretly sympathised with his cause!). Such internationalism, achieved by a small band with limited resources, could even be viewed as impressive in a pre-internet age. Nevertheless, the sticking point for national neo-Nazi organizations that saw affiliation with WUNS as relevant was often giving up ultimate control to the international structure of the world union. Moreover, the organisation’s configuration straddled the two eras surveyed here: the hierarchical mass party system of the interwar era, and the decentered, groupuscule one that emerge later, and became more akin to ‘brands’ than clearly directed, discrete organizations.31

To get a better sense of the organisation’s dynamics, we can also look at the way in which the formation of Tyndall’s breakaway Greater Britain Movement was reported to WUNS chapters around the world, via the group’s internal publication the WUNS Bulletin. Tyndall’s splinter Greater Britain Movement itself came to publically reject Jordan’s importing of German Nazi ideas, and instead couched its public profile in a much more clearly defined British identity. Tyndall grounded this rejection of international reference points in another notable book within the post-war scene, Six Principles of British Nationalism, which critiqued as follows a growing British ‘interdependence’ on America:

Everyone knows what is meant today when the politicians speak of our ‘interdependence’ with America: it means their cowardly desertion of Britain’s position in the world and their lame surrender to dollar hegemony. Under the guise of this term our national economy, our foreign policy and our means of

31 For more on the idea of groupuscules, see Roger Griffin, ‘From slime mould to rhizome: an introduction to the groupuscule right, Patterns of Prejudice 37 / 1 (2003) pp. 27 – 50.
self-defence have to all practical purposes been taken out of British hands. ‘Interdependence’ thoroughly suits the powers anxious to tighten their control over the nations. It is a much milder term than conquest.\textsuperscript{32}

Such statements marked a turn away from international concerns for Tyndall, and a refocusing on British ideals. Unsurprisingly, then, Tyndall’s new grouping received the outrage of Rockwell, via the printed pages of the \textit{WUNS Bulletin}. In a bid to use the influence of the WUNS to stymie such breakaway groupings, the bulletin declared that:

Lincoln Rockwell, International Commander of WUNS, in a communiqué dated 9\textsuperscript{th} January, 1965, to all sections of WUNS, asserted clause 10 of the ‘Cotswold Agreements’ (the provisional constitution of WUNS) against the tiny group in Britain known as the ‘Greater Britain Movement’, calling on all sections of WUNS to have no contact with and give no support whatsoever to this body … led by John Tyndall who was expelled from the British Section of WUNS for disloyalty and mismanagement culminating in the theft of money and equipment … All European sections of WUNS … are asked to enforce a complete boycott of the Tyndall group, and to help to expose this anti-WUNS body operating behind a pretence of ‘National Socialism’.\textsuperscript{33}

And so Tyndall’ GBM was excluded from an, albeit largely imagined, international network of National Socialists.

Elsewhere too, the publications from WUNS affiliated groups offer a fascinating source of information on attempts to exchange ideas and activism between Britain and America. We can find a supportive exchanges emerging between Jordan and Rockwell in particular – highlighting how personal friendships have been as crucial as ideological affinities to such internationalism. To take an example of American support for Jordan’s activism, the January 1965 edition of Rockwell’s \textit{The Stormtrooper} carried positive reporting of Jordan’s contribution to the debacle of Patrick Gordon Walker’s Leyton by-election campaign of that month. Here, \textit{The Stormtrooper} explained to American readers that Jordan’s stunts, which included Jordan protesting against Walker while standing

\textsuperscript{32} The book is reproduced at the following website: \url{http://www.aryanunity.com/sixprincip.html}. This quote, from chapter one, is taken from the following webpage: \url{http://www.aryanunity.com/sixprincip1.html} (last accessed 31/10/2013).

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{World Union of National Socialists European Bulletin}, no. 5 (1 September 1965) p. 4.
alongside a man with a blacked-up face, were reflective of core British attitudes to race. Alongside a photo of this stunt, the article stressed: ‘The average White Man in England hates that Black plague just as he hates it over here -- both North and South’. With his friend Jordan as its focus, Rockwell’s publication sought to highlight that racists in Britain held common cause with those in America, gathered around his tiny American Nazi Party. *WUNS Bulletins*, meanwhile, reported to the international groups affiliated to the world union details of Jordan’s various interactions with the British criminal justice system during the 1960s too, typically presenting him as a martyr to the international cause. Moreover, the *WUNS Bulletin* gave summaries of activities not only in Britain and America, but also around the world, from Chile to France. Various other neo-Nazi leaders, also dogged by police activity in their home countries, were similarly idealised as international heroes of the movement.

Publications produced by WUNS could become central to the development of new activists too, helping to establish figures who later themselves became central to the Anglo-American neo-Nazi tradition. The year 1965 saw the organisation launch a new journal, *National Socialist World*, which typified an attempt to develop a level of intellectualisation among the global National Socialist community that the WUNS sought to cultivate. The opening editorial of the first edition of *National Socialist World* stressed that it was not ‘a general propaganda organ’, but one designed ‘to alleviate to some extent the intellectual isolation in which National Socialists all too often find themselves today’. This text was written by William Pierce, who became the leader of one of America’s foremost neo-Nazi outfits until its collapse after his death in 2002, the National Alliance. Pierce’s introduction to the first edition of *National Socialist World* also went on to present the various contributors to its opening volume. The names here again underscore the central coterie of activists that drove WUNS forwards: Devi, Jordan and especially Rockwell. In the end, *National Socialist World* ran for just six issues, and folded in 1968. Despite being mailed out to many leading right-wing politicians, journalists and libraries, there was not a market for its brand of intellectualised neo-Nazism.

**From the World Union of National Socialists to National Fronts**

As we move forwards we see that, over time, the World Union of National Socialists had to respond to dramatic changes, especially in 1967. In America, a former American Nazi

---

Party member, John Patler, murdered Rockwell, and so the organisation lost its driving personality. The year of Rockwell’s death also saw many of the various smaller British far right and neo-Nazi groupings, apart from Jordan’s National Socialist Movement, come together to form the National Front – an organisation that tried to hide its inner neo-Nazism to gain a level of popularity.\textsuperscript{35} John Tyndall’s Greater Britain Movement was one of those absorbed into the National Front, and Tyndall later emerged as a central figure within the organisation after its first Chairman, A. K. Chesterton, lost control of the conglomereration. The \emph{WUNS Bulletin}, meanwhile, continued to reflect the activities of the tiny neo-Nazi international as it stumbled on into the 1970s.

Curiously, as we move to the early part of this decade, the attitude of WUNS to a figure like Tyndall changed too, and the earlier boycott of his activities was overturned. Telling of the need to support the emergent National Front – which by the early 1970s was already becoming one of the larger street protesting far right parties of this era – the January / February 1970 edition of \emph{WUNS Bulletin} decried immigration into British cities, claiming: “The Afro-Asian immigration problem remains foremost in the minds of racially conscious Britons … Many English industrial cities have already acquired both the racial complexion and the racial problems of U.S. cities”. Moreover, the bulletin, now edited by William Pierce, continued by citing positively from John Tyndall’s magazine, \emph{Spearhead}, which had by this time become the mouthpiece of the National Front. Reproducing a curiously British sense of humour for the international audience, it continued:

\begin{quote}
\ldots [\emph{Spearhead}] carried the results of an imaginary opinion poll, in which war veterans were asked the question: ‘Would you have fought to keep the Germans out if you had envisaged the present immigration influx?’ the percentage breakdown of answers were as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item ‘Not bloody likely!’ \ldots 60%
  \item ‘Certainly not.’ \ldots 25%
  \item ‘I can’t decide now.’ \ldots 5%
  \item ‘I am emigrating.’ \ldots 10%\textsuperscript{36}
\end{itemize}
\end{quote}

What those reading abroad made of such a combination of racism and British humour is not recorded, but this example also typifies the ways in which national neo-Nazi media could be used to communicate a sense of the ‘cause’ on the international level too.

Meanwhile, marking the tenth anniversary of the movement, the July – September 1972 edition of the *WUNS Bulletin* reflected on the progress achieved a decade after the establishment of the organisation. Steeped in an overwhelmingly positive ‘memory’ of its first ten years, it featured heroic pictures of Rockwell, and even one of Adolf Hitler addressing a small and attentive audience, with the caption ‘In the beginning was the word’. The edition’s Editorial, presumably written by the then General Secretary, Robert Homan, stressed:

> Today the Movement is making significant strides in many Aryan lands around the globe … in Spirit and purpose, WUNS is the creation of Lincoln Rockwell and the small band of National Socialists who assembled in the Cotswolds, England, on that warm August day in 1962. Today WUNS belongs to all National Socialists who share their vision of a global organization striving for cooperation and universal interests of Aryan mankind.37

While this was certainly an overstated assessment, by this time WUNS had helped to establish a language of cooperation, and internationalism, among small bands of American and British activists. Yet, steeped in memories of the Cotswold gathering, these were also people who were regularly prone to wildly inflated assessments of their own importance. Nevertheless, such a culture stressing mutual cooperation would continue in the decades to come, and was crucial to the process of ‘accumulative extremism’ under analysis here.

Moving forwards into the later 1970s, we see that leader of the National Front, Tyndall, continued to cultivate such international links too. In one trip to America in his role as the Chairman of the National Front, in the summer of 1979, he reflected on his experiences in a feature article in *Spearhead*. Here, Tyndall offered a highly respectful account of William Pierce’s neo-Nazi organisation, the National Alliance, stressing that ‘while radical in its philosophy [the National Alliance] certainly does not give the impression of being made up of political tearaways and eccentrics; on the contrary, the people I met … were intelligent and serious men and women’. Moreover, this *Spearhead*

---

article reveals how Britain’s pre-eminent neo-Nazi politician of the 1970s saw the relevance of American activists at this time. He met with another prominent American figure, Dr Edward R. Field, who at that point was linked to the US neo-Nazi grouping, the National States Rights Party. Field helped to introduce Tyndall to the culture of the South, and showed him the importance of the legacy of the American Civil War. For both Field and Tyndall, the most important point here was how this legacy underscored the idea that the ‘melting pot’ concept had failed. As Tyndall stressed to his British readers:

… it is interesting to note that one of the strongest elements making for the Southern secessionist movement is feeling that ‘America’, as a nation founded on the melting-pot theory, has not gelled together as intended and that a new nation based on homogenous ethnic roots of an almost entirely North European, and predominantly British, White population, would function better … non-Americans ought to be concerned with … the lesson that it provides for other nations not yet irrevocably committed to the melting-pot idea.

Finally, while he was content that the towns of the South were steeped a culture where black people were still, in his mind rightly, suppressed, Tyndall was concerned for the fate of larger, metropolitan cities. As he reflected on his visit to Washington, ‘unlike the towns of the American South, where despite a large Black presence one felt the White Man is in control, Washington gave all the impression of a place where the American White had become cowed and depressed.’ 38 This is a typical example of another emergent trope among British neo-Nazis discussing the USA: American multi-racial cities evoked dangerous warnings for the cultural realities that would soon be hitting Britain too.

While Tyndall found the American experience one that offered important lessons for British nationalist such as himself, by the 1980s the British National Front even helped to inspire the formation of an American variant. It was a central reference point to the goals of an American neo-Nazi organization founded in 1987, which, telling of the influence of the British organization, called itself the American Front. This was set up by Robert Heick, and not only took its name from the British grouping, but also drew its root ideology from International Third Position theories. These were also the ideals

being promoted in the mid to late 1980s by British ideologues such as Nick Griffin and Derek Holland, who led one of the rumps of the British National Front that developed in the 1980s, following its electoral failure and implosion in 1979. The American Front, meanwhile, largely based its activities in Sacramento, but also networked with some of the key American activists, including Tom Metzger of White Aryan Resistance, as well as Pierce’s National Alliance. Its activists have also drawn inspiration from The Order, one of the most notable of the post-war neo-Nazi terrorist grouping to emerge either side of the Atlantic.39

Holocaust Deniers and Terrorists
As well as creating political organisations, there have been other forms in which Anglo-American link ups have emerged. One crucial new approach to developing a neo-Nazi agenda that emerged following the Second World War was Holocaust denial, and again here we should see this as an international phenomenon, and also one where the connections that developed between British and American activists helped to shape the wider denial movement. As a form of neo-Nazi activism, Holocaust denial can be viewed as such as it is essentially a mechanism for re-habilitating Nazi ideology by attacking the core narrative that discredited it. The British National Front gained a reputation as a movement promoting Holocaust denial by the mid-1970s, especially following publication of the pamphlet *Did Six Million Really Die?* by one of its leading activists, Richard Verrel, in 1974. Canadian-based denier Ernst Zündel was also involved in publishing this notorious document. Following this controversy, another prominent figure within the National Front also became linked to the Holocaust denial movement, David McCalden. His time in the National Front had included editing the National Front publication *Nationalist News*, but McCalden left the organisation in 1976, as part of the short-lived breakaway party the National Party. After this venture failed, he then moved to America in 1978. Here, he met with William Carto, a figure who was still inspired by Yockey, and who himself had risen to some prominence by this time, especially as a result of his anti-Semitic pressure group Liberty Lobby. Then, in 1979, Carto and

McCalden founded the central organisation of Holocaust Denial in America: the Institute for Historical Review.40

The Institute for Historical Review developed links with British figures in other ways too. While McCalden later broke away from the Institute for Historical Review, other notorious figures, especially David Irving, came to exemplify, and even symbolise, the strategy. Irving’s first publication in the Institute for Historical Review’s house publication, the Journal of Historical Review, came in 1983 – an essay titled ‘On Contemporary History and Historiography’, which was a transcript of a the speech he gave at the Institute for Historical Review’s conference of that year. Reflecting on the need for Europeans and Americans to work together to challenge the historical mainstream, here Irving concluded that ‘It’s not going to be an easy path for us dissident historians to follow … It’s not quite as difficult yet here in America as it is in Europe, where frequently when I arrive to address a meeting in Germany, or in England, I find sticky situations.’41 Subsequently, a later essay for Journal of Historical Review, ‘Battleship Auschwitz’, offered an example of Irving’s ‘full conversion’ to denying the Holocaust, which developed following his prominent role in the legal defense of fellow denier and by this time Institute for Historical Review regular, Zündel. ‘Battleship Auschwitz’ itself is a curious essay in the way it tries to ground its arguments against the occurrence of the Holocaust in an analysis of archival evidence drawn from British records.42 Irving has also addressed other American audiences, including the National Alliance in 1996.43

Indeed, the National Alliance, and its founder William Pierce, is another important group to reflect upon here. Following his work for WUNS, by the early 1970s Pierce had begun to emerge more fully to national, and, by the end of the decade international, prominence. After flirting with other groupings, he established his own neo-Nazi organisation, which he formally founded in 1974 from the remnants of the National Youth Alliance, called the National Alliance. This became a central feature of


neo-Nazi culture in America. The Southern Poverty Law Center offers this summary of Pierce’s later impact on American neo-Nazi activities:

Over the years, the [National Alliance] produced huge amounts of effective propaganda, most famously Pierce’s novel *The Turner Diaries*, which inspired numerous acts of terror including the 1995 bombing of the Oklahoma City federal building that left 168 people, including 19 children, dead. The manuscript, which was first published in 1978 under the pseudonym of Andrew Macdonald, described a future race war in which Jews and others are slaughtered by the thousands, with its hero at one point promising to go ‘to the uttermost ends of the earth to hunt down the last of Satan’s spawn’ – Jews, that is. Over the years, *The Turner Diaries* has become one of the most important pieces of extremist literature ever written in America. In 1983, for instance, Bob Mathews, the Alliance’s Pacific Northwest coordinator, broke away to form a major terrorist group called The Order … that was clearly patterned on The Organization described in *The Turner Diaries*. (The Order carried out several murders and a series of armored car heists before Mathews was killed in a 1984 shootout with the FBI.) Eleven years later, Oklahoma City bomber Timothy McVeigh had photocopies of pages of *The Turner Diaries* sealed in a plastic bag in his car when he was arrested, apparently to explain his motivation in the deadly attack in case he was killed.45

Janet Wilson has provided an excellent textual analysis of the structure and messages found in *The Turner Diaries*.46 But the impact of Pierce’s *The Turner Diaries*, and the American groups who were inspired by it, such as The Order, on Anglo-American exchanges is difficult to underestimate too. The transferability of Pierce’s propaganda material, especially *The Turner Diaries*, has been crucial to cultivating a common, extremist ideology. In terms of inspiring terrorist action in Britain, the book became a major reference point for David Copeland, whose campaign in 1999 led to the explosion of

three devices, alongside the deaths of three people. He had the following to say on the matter in his confession to police: ‘If you’ve read the *Turner Diaries*, you know the year 2000 there’ll be the uprising and all that, racial violence on the streets. My aim was political. It was to cause a racial war in this country.’\(^47\) Meanwhile, taking his inspiration from Pierce’s approach in a more expansive manner, Colin Jordan in his later years followed the strategy of writing neo-Nazi propaganda in the form of pulp fiction, and wrote two such books himself, *Merrie England – 2000* and *The Uprising*.\(^48\) Telling of the common reference points that had emerged by this time, the latter book was dedicated to former National Alliance organiser, and central member of The Order, Bob Matthews. Indeed, one chapter of *The Uprising* was even modelled closely on the death of Matthews during a shootout with the FBI. Moreover, Jordan’s own fictional books are now hosted online, on a US websites linked to Tom Metzger, The Insurgent.

Pierce has developed links with other British groupings too, which were also set within the neo-Nazi tradition being explored here. Most notably, in 1995 John Tyndall persuaded Pierce to travel to Britain to address the British National Party, again a group that at this point Tyndall led. As Nigel Copsey highlights when discussing this interaction, the reasoning was probably a bid to make the BNP look more hard-edged to its internal followers, who were worried that other groups of this period, especially Combat 18, were taking away its relevance as the pre-eminent ultra-nationalist grouping of the era.\(^49\) We will return to Combat 18 later.

Pierce’s impact on the British far right is larger than simply authoring *The Turner Diaries*. As an organisation, the National Alliance was a noted reference point too, and Tyndall described some of the contrasts between this and British parties on Pierce’s death in 2002:

> It was difficult to compare Pierce’s organisation with our own British National Party because the National Alliance was not a party itself and did not engage in elections. Pierce’s view was that an elite force comprising people of high intelligence and character must first be built before any effective political

\(^47\) This quote was taken from the transcript of an episode of the BBC’s flagship investigative journalism programme Panorama that focused on the Copeland case, available online at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/audio_video/programmes/panorama/transcripts/transcript_30_06_00.txt (accessed 31/10/2013).


breakthrough would be possible. As to how that breakthrough would occur, he was a little ambiguous but often spoke as if he couldn’t see it coming except by armed insurgence.50

Indeed, Pierce’s messages were ambiguous, and seen as relevant to a wider international audience, not just British extremists. With regard to Pierce’s coded licencing of violence, we will come back to this theme later, with reference to Combat 18 in the 1990s.

Music and Political Violence
As we move into the 1980s, we find a new vehicle for activism becoming central to the international exchange too: White Power music. While WUNS had waned as a vehicle for developing international cooperation between neo-Nazi groupings during the 1970s, by the late 1980s a new organization emerged that, broadly speaking, developed a similar role: Blood & Honour. Its name, derived from the slogan of the Hitler Youth organization, clearly reveled in its neo-Nazi sympathies. Moreover, its roots give us a sense of why this international network, or at least ‘brand’, has been so widely adopted at a transnational level.

Blood & Honour was founded in 1987, by the lead singer of the White Power band Skrewdriver, Ian Stuart Donaldson. This was also a time when the British neo-Nazi milieu was marked by splits and fissures. The genre of White Power music was itself a British creation, epitomized by bands such as Donaldson’s Skrewdriver, and was a response to the Anti-Nazi League’s Rock Against Racism campaign. By 1987, and the initial founding of Blood & Honour, we find that the British National Party was four years old, and had not yet fully established itself, while the remnants of the National Front were in disarray too. So former National Front supporter Ian Stuart, as he became known, sought to create a movement within a movement, a network that was compatible with other allegiances, and that could act as a unifying force as well as a vehicle for promoting the White Power music that his band exemplified. As such, Blood & Honour was quite different from the much more hierarchical, centralized WUNS. Its development as a ‘brand’ has given it various opportunities for sustaining a counterculture, and here, unlike WUNS, we also do not find the bigger ambition of trying to use

---

such a network to coordinate full-scale, neo-Nazi parties across the globe. Nevertheless, as with WUNS, Blood & Honour was a movement that was held together by the charisma of its central figure, Ian Stuart. Yet it has been more successful in outlasting the death of its founder. Ian Stuart died in a car crash in 1993, and he has subsequently become a central martyr figure for the wider movement, and his image is now used – and abused – on a wide range of international web spaces.51

As with the WUNS a generation earlier, we can also see that other larger than life ideologues were crucial in its development too. In particular, Tom Metzger, who was a TV repairman with a history of neo-Nazi activity by the mid-1980s, was an important early adopter in America. Metzger’s activism to that point had included developing links with Pierce’s National Alliance, and also the Ku Klux Klan. He was an advocate of the concept of Leaderless Resistance, an ideal promoted by Louis Beam, and later picked up by Combat 18 too. Metzger was also the founder of a neo-Nazi grouping called White Aryan Resistance. As Mark S. Hamm suggests, without Metzger becoming a key early promoter of Blood & Honour’s White Power music in America, the whole US skinhead music scene would have remained far more diffuse, and far less drawn to neo-Nazism. So Metzger’s experience of neo-Nazi activism, and later his friendship with Ian Stuart, helped create links between the British Blood & Honour networks and potential American skinhead activists.52

Ultimately, two branches of Blood & Honour eventually developed in America. In part, this was the result of splits within the UK movement. In the mid-1990s, the British neo-Nazi paramilitary group Combat 18 tried to assert dominance over the Blood & Honour network. The division this fostered in Britain helped to divide the emergent, international Blood & Honour movement too. So, as the Southern Poverty Law Center highlights, in America two antagonistic branches of the network developed: Blood & Honour USA, and Blood & Honour American Division. The latter has been linked to various other American groupings, such as Christian Identity, and, until 2009, the American Hammerskins skinhead organization too. Blood & Honour USA, meanwhile, established an anti-Hammerskins stance, which included creating a semi-formalized unit to police this, called Council 28. Space does not permit a fuller exploration of the finer

details of America’s absorption of the British Blood & Honour ‘brand’ within its neo-Nazi, White Power and skinhead milieus, and this topic deserved a chapter in itself. But this development does underscore once again the process of ‘accumulative extremism’, especially as for the 20 years after his death the martyr cult of Ian Stuart has permeated deeply into the counter-cultural spaces of various American networks that promote neo-Nazi attitudes. Moreover, revealing of the transfer the other way, we find there is also a British branch of Hammerskins, again underscoring the theme of cross-fertilization within these extremist counter-cultures.

In Britain, meanwhile, early activists linked to Blood & Honour found the initial American interest in the movement most inspiring. For example, if we look at early Blood & Honour publications in Britain, we find a sustained curiosity in its take-up in America. For example, an edition of the Blood & Honour fanzine from 1988 included an interview with ‘Fran’, singer for the American band New Glory, based in Philadelphia. Fran explained the band’s aims were:

[Firstly] to spread the Nationalist message to the youth of America and the world. Secondly, we want to inspire those who have grown weary of the fight for our race and nation. The odds are stacked against us and if we can keep the spirit alive in one fighting heart then it will all be worthwhile.53

The role of such music in inspiring new activism within a new generation coming of age was central to Ian Stuart’s reasoning for the need for White Power music too.54 Moreover, this entire edition of Blood & Honour was dedicated to the sense of the British-based group breaking through into America. The cover had the strapline ‘America Awakes’, and featured a skinhead activist shaking hands with another figure, dressed in a Ku Klux Klan outfit, both stood in front of a Confederate flag. The fanzine’s Editorial commented: ‘our cover picture … Klans and Aryan Nations in the U.S.A. have welcomed Skinheads to their movement. This is a great breakthrough and we salute our American comrades in their great victory. Forward for the White Man. White Pride, World Wide.’55

Moreover, this interaction between British and American brands of Neo-Nazi

54 For a biography written by neo-Nazi activists themselves called Diamond In The Dust, that makes this point, see the website hosted by the Aryan Strike Force: http://www.skrewdriver.net/diamond.html (accessed 31/10/2013).
activism developed in the 1990s in other ways too. In particular, the rise of the small British group founded by Charlie Sargent in 1992, Combat 18 (the letters are neo-Nazi numeric code for Adolf Hitler), is important to document. Initially, Combat 18 was a section within Tyndall’s BNP, but broke away to become a discrete organization. Here too, we see a further development in the cross-fertilization between British and American activists. Indeed, one key figure within Combat 18 in the 1990s to focus on, to develop this transatlantic connection, is Harold Covington – one-time head of the National Socialist Party of America, until he resigned from this movement in 1981. Notably, while leader of the National Socialist Party of America, in 1980 Covington was a vocal supporter of the Greensboro gunmen, who included Ku Klux Klan members, and who killed five people demonstrating against racist activity in Greensboro, North Carolina, an incident often dubbed the Greensboro Massacre.\(^56\) Covington even boasted in the aftermath of the killings that he ‘did not give a damn about their [those killed] human rights’ and that ‘they got what they deserved’.\(^57\) After leaving the National Socialist Party of America, Covington later moved to Britain, and eventually was linked to the founding of Combat 18.

Covington’s role was important in how the British National Party tried to discredit Combat 18 too. Writing in Spearhead, by this time a BNP publication, John Tyndall was deeply suspicious, stressing in one article critical of Combat 18, and its links with Covington, that:

What is known is that Combat 18 had for a while used an American contact address for some of its literature so as to get around Britain’s draconian race laws. This address, when traced, turned out to be one supplied by Harold Covington. If my American contact’s theory about Covington’s connections are correct, it would mean that large numbers of people in Britain who have written off to his mailing address in response to C18 literature would have had their names and addresses passed on straight away to the FBI, who would in turn have supplied them to the political police in this country, whether MI5, Special Branch

\(^56\) For a selection of local newspaper reports on the massacre, including references to Covington’s comments, see: [http://library.uncg.edu/dp/crg/item.aspx?i=1069#complete](http://library.uncg.edu/dp/crg/item.aspx?i=1069#complete) (accessed 31/10/2013).
\(^57\) Film of this quote by Covington was reproduced in an ITV World In Action documentary on Combat 18, now uploaded to YouTube: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5LOmWD-UHb8](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5LOmWD-UHb8) (accessed 31/10/2013).
Indeed, many theories have developed subsequently regarding the links between the British state and Combat 18, for example suggesting the group was allowed to continue operating in order to function as a sort of honey trap coalescing together the most extreme figures into a single organization, for closer monitoring. For Tyndall’s anti-Combat 18 propaganda, meanwhile, the American ‘Covington link’ allowed him to claim the movement was compromised. Moreover, Tyndall’s description of the use of Covington’s address in Combat 18 literature is certainly correct. For example, one of Combat 18’s key publications, Redwatch, called for its activists to give information of potential targets to a P.O. Box address owned by Covington, which was also used by his Dixie Press publishing operation. To explain the need for sending details of potential targets to this address, Redwatch stressed: ‘Our brothers in America will then redirect any correspondence back to our safe address here in England.’

American activism was a crucial reference point for Combat 18 too in other ways too. Investigative journalist Nick Ryan highlights that its founder, Charlie Sargent, specifically drew on Louis Beam’s theory of Leaderless Resistance, one of the crucial American imports into the Combat 18 worldview, and one clearly compatible with Covington’s ideals for a semi-underground organization committed to violence. Combat 18’s actions reflect this American link too, included making death threats by phone calls to left wing activists, in which an anonymous voice would claim to be from the British Ku Klux Klan. Internal literature such as Redwatch also produced various hit lists. When we look at other Combat 18 related literature of this era, one again immediately sees the importance of American ideological tropes on the radicalized neo-Nazi groupings that developed in Britain during the 1990s. For example, in issue one of the publication titled Combat 18, there is a dedication to Rockwell, which describes his importance as follows: ‘In nine years, Commander Rockwell built a white people’s movement. He made American National Socialists Party [sic] a force in hes [sic] native America, and gave millions of discouraged White Americans the spark and the leadership

---

58 This article, ‘John Tyndall on Harold Covington and Combat 18’, was originally published in the September 1995 edition of Spearhead and is also now reproduced online here: [http://noncounterproductive.blogspot.co.uk/p/john-tyndall-on-harold-covington-and.html](http://noncounterproductive.blogspot.co.uk/p/john-tyndall-on-harold-covington-and.html) (accessed 31/10/2013).
59 Copsey, Contemporary British Fascism pp. 68 – 9.
to stand up for the white race.’ It then went on to reproduce a chapter from Rockwell’s book *White Power*, stressing the analysis ‘spells out an American nightmare soon to become our reality.’ In other forms too, we find an interest in American themes. The Combat 18 publication *Putsch*, which described itself as ‘Combat 18s Monthly hate sheet’, included a reference to the American Creativity movement’s slogan, RAHOWA which stands for Racial Holy War; and also featured a column, presumably written by Covington, called ‘HEBE WATCH by Harry’, alleging various Jewish figures around the world were carrying out aspects of their ‘global conspiracy’.

Elsewhere in this milieu fostered by groups such as Blood & Honour and Combat 18, the underground publication *The Order: Voice of National Socialism* included in its list of books for sale via mail order Pierce’s novels *The Turner Diaries* and its sequel, *Hunter*, as well as Rockwell’s book *White Power*. Moreover, its title alone resonates clearly with the American terrorist group of the same name, which as we saw earlier was inspired by William Pierce’s writings. This edition of *The Order* also included a reproduction of the final address to the jury made by David Lane, another of the activists within the The Order. The heading for the article was his notorious slogan promoting neo-Nazi ideology and white supremacy themes, the ‘14 Words’: ‘We Must Secure the Existence of Our People and a Future for White Children.’ Another edition of *The Order* carried an interview with Bob Heick, updating readers of the activities of the American Front, another movement we have already discussed. Here, Heick distinguished the American Front from Hitler’s variant of Nazism, claiming, ‘we are a Revolutionary Nationalist Organization … in relation to N.S. we agree with the racial ideals 100%, but are not bound by its economic ramifications. We can be considered Third Positionist, or Strasserist, in a way … We want to create a system that will work in today’s world, be true to our European heritage, uniquely American, and TOTALLY ARYAN!!’ Finally, this edition of the underground publication carried a list of ‘Aryan P.O.W’s’, which included David Lane and Richard Scutari of The Order, as well as three ‘Hammerskin P.O.W.’s’, and postal addresses for various American groupings including Pierce’s National Alliance. The point was for British activists to send messages of support.

As mentioned above, the activism of Combat 18 was crucial too in fomenting the

---

64 *The Order: Voice of National Socialism*, no. 5.
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rift that fed into the development America’s two, antagonistic branches of Blood & Honour. As Combat 18 went on to assert control of the British Blood & Honour network after Ian Stuart’s death, certainly by 1996 deep suspicions emerged that its leading activists were now more concerned with making money for themselves, not promoting the wider cause. As the Southern Poverty Law Center underscores, the knock on effect in America was the division between Blood & Honour activists, and from this time the ‘Blood & Honour America Division … specifies that it is not affiliated with Combat 18 and does not allow C-18 members at its events.’ As this also implies, we do also see an uptake of the ‘Combat 18’ brand in America, such as the group led by Josh Steever, who developed a small band of American Combat 18 activists in Spring, Texas around 2005, and then moved to Florida, where another Combat 18 group was active in the later 2000s. Moreover, a blog on the Florida group’s website from 2009 is also revealing of the way the American uptake of phenomena such as Combat 18, have become exported ‘brands’, rather representing a fully networked organizations. Titled ‘Leaderless Resistance Combat 18’, a clear nod to Beam’s ideas, it stresses:

As the names Leaderless Resistance and Faceless Enemy already make quite clear, C18 is indeed leaderless (so also memberless!), and should operate [sic] in a faceless manner. By this I mean that there isn’t even need to claim whatever action you do, the activism is and should always remain faceless. This is proven to be the most successful [sic] way to strike fear into our opponents, and this is the only way we will win this war! 

Even more so than with Blood & Honour, once the network (or lack of it) is construed in such a way by its activists, it is difficult to parse the significance for American activists of specifically British ideas found in Combat 18: many of Combat 18’s core messages were themselves derived from American-conceived elements. Nevertheless, there is also here clearly at least a level of drawing inspiration from the notoriety of the Combat 18 brand, which did emerge from Britain.

While the legacy of Combat 18 bled into such fuzzy transnational activism, the more mainstream neo-Nazi grouping in Britain of this period, the British National Party,

---

67 The web address for this website is: [http://combat18florida.blogspot.co.uk](http://combat18florida.blogspot.co.uk) (accessed 31/10/2013).
also sought the added benefits that American links could bring. At the end of the 1990s, the former International Third Positionist, and Holocaust denier, Nick Griffin took over the leadership of the British National Party from Tyndall. One of the developments in Griffin’s ‘modernizing’ strategy was to cultivate a support base in America, especially important for creating new income streams. A former National Front organizer for the South West of England, Mark Cotterill, was given the task of developing a new organization, the American Friends of the British National Party, founded in January 1999. The AF-BNP developed its own magazine, *Heritage and Destiny*, which set out the mission statement of the AF-BNP. In particular, this stressed:

1. To preserve and foster British culture and heritage among Americans of British or other European descent;
2. To educate Americans of British descent about British Nationalism, so that we may learn how more effectively to promote nationalism in America and to take our country back.  

With such ideals, the AF-BNP developed a range of activities, including networking, fund raising, and holding conferences.

Edition six of *Heritage and Destiny* gives a window into its activities, and shows how the party was trying to develop links with other prominent US figures, such as Pat Buchanan. It also reported on the AF-BNP’s year 2000 conference, which brought together American activists including Victor Gehard of the National Alliance, as well as Dr. Edward Fields, formerly a member of the National States Rights Party, though by this time editor of the racist publication *The Truth At Last*. Elsewhere, *Heritage and Destiny* reflected the tradition of Anglo-American activism in other ways too. The then recently published book by British veteran of the neo-Nazi scene, John Bean, *Many Shades of Black*, was explored via an interview between Bean and Martin Kerr. This look back on past days also allowed for discussion of the 1962 gathering in the Cotswolds, set alongside an accompanying photo of Rockwell with Jordan and Tyndall taken at the, by now much mythologized, gathering. Meanwhile, one of the readers’ letters commented how much its author enjoyed a book review of Kevin Coogan’s book on Francis Parker Yockey in an earlier edition of *Heritage and Destiny*. Engaging with more contemporary

---

matters, there was also a detailed review of Nick Lowles and Greame McLagen’s book on the David Copeland case, *Mr Evil*, again reviewed by Martin Kerr. The assessment of the book was critical, though largely in the form of *ad hominem* comment on the political bias of the authors. But it did stress that, although the BNP was a genuinely revolutionary party, it wanted to distance itself from such terrorist violence. Nevertheless, Kerr also warned:

> The unpleasant reality is that there will be more David Copleands in the future, as the multi-racial society in Britain (and the US) continues to unravel – but the movement as a whole cannot be held responsible for what is done by undisciplined members on its fringes.\(^6^9\)

It is worth stressing that Copeland had been a former member of the BNP, before becoming an organizer for the Hampshire branch of the late 1990s Combat 18 breakaway group, the National Socialist Movement, and was in part at least radicalised by elements of the BNP itself.

Telling of the fostering of a sense of cultural affinity, the Southern Poverty Law Center describes how, at another such meeting, Cotterill stood alongside a picture of Robert E. Lee, the Confederate leader, and read aloud names of ‘martyrs who died for Britain, the Confederacy, and the Racial Nationalist Cause’. Meanwhile, the Southern Poverty Law Center’s website also cites an article from another edition of *Heritage and Destiny*, setting out the long term aims of the group:

> In the very long run, ten thousand years or more perhaps from today, no one will know or care what we said about Northern Ireland or the European Union ... Quite possibly no one will remember us or even Britain. But if the people of that far-off day can look about them and see other white people, some with hair the hue of sunlight on ripe cornfields and some with eyes the blue of midsummer’s heaven, then we will have our fitting memorial.\(^7^0\)

Such statements, couched in Aryan imagery, underscore the highly nebulous way in


which the idea of the nation can also be subsumed by the idea of race in such post-war neo-Nazi milieus. This was a theme we saw much earlier on too, with Yockey’s critique of the discrete nation state. As an organization, the American Friends of the British National Party effectively ceased functioning in 2001, after its dubious fund-raising activities by a foreign political party caught the eye of US authorities, and Cotterill was asked to return to the UK.71

Cotterill himself had also become close to David Duke at this time, and here we find another high profile link developing between British activism and American ideologues. Indeed, perhaps the most notorious aspect of the AF-BNP was a conference held on St George’s Day 1999, where Nick Griffin addressed a private gathering of the new group, and was joined on the platform by Duke, a former Ku Klux Klan leader and veteran American anti-Semitic politician. This session became a notorious episode in the history of the BNP, as two years later a BBC Panorama investigation released footage of the speech given by Griffin. Here, Griffin candidly stressed the need develop ethnic cleansing of Britain, but also stressed the need to hide this policy, and rather to talk about the BNP's agenda via a language of family and identity, ‘saleable words’ that could be seen as compatible with mainstream political discourse.72 When quizzed in 2009 on the nature of this shared platform, again on the BBC, Griffin had to defend being joined on a stage by Duke, and found himself arguing that Duke was acceptable as he had been an ‘almost totally a non-violent’ Ku Klux Klan leader.73 Interestingly, David Duke himself responded to this attack on him in the UK, screened on the flagship TV show Question Time, by claiming that Griffin had been ‘lynched’.74 Duke’s defense on his website also stressed that he was a lesser organizer than Griffin, but there were lessons for the British to learn from him too: ‘I got over 60 percent of White votes in two statewide elections, and that achievement was from a man easily demonized with pictures of KKK robes, swastikas and lit crosses. If I can do that and not compromise everything

---


72 The BBC created a dedicated website to this edition of the programme, including the ability to stream the entire episode, available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/in_depth/programmes/2001/bnp_special/default.stm (accessed 31/10/2013).

73 This notorious episode of Question Time has been uploaded to YouTube in a variety of forms, the quote here can be found at 4 minutes 20 seconds into the following YouTube film: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2NVB43xfBRY (accessed 31/10/2013).

74 For example, see the article by Tom Leonard ‘David Duke: Nick Griffin was “lynched” on Question Time’ in the 23 October 2009 edition of the Daily Telegraph, available online at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/6419715/David-Duke-Nick-Griffin-was-lynched-on-Question-Time.html (accessed 31/10/2013).
away, so can Nick and so can you.\textsuperscript{75} In sum, while the American linkups may have brought in money for the BNP, they also opened the door to some serious public relations disasters too.

Finally on the AF-BNP, it is also worth noting that 2009 also saw a fatal shooting incident at the United States Holocaust Museum, which was carried out by a former AF-BNP associate James von Brunn. Again, much can be made of this link, but as Mark Cotterill told the \textit{Guardian} newspaper after the shooting ‘he is down as “meetings only”, so he was not a major donor, although he may have put some money on the plate when it was passed round.’\textsuperscript{76} More importantly though, Brunn’s neo-Nazi activism ran deep, and he was a veteran figure of American neo-Nazi and anti-Semitic circles. He has helped support the Holocaust denial movement, and revealingly we find supportive references to David Irving in the anti-Semitic political tract that Brunn published in 2002, called \textit{Kill the Best Gentiles!} This ideological statement was clearly important to him with regard to the shooting too, as he made references to it in a note he left in his car immediately before entering the museum. Turing us full circle, reflective of the other influences that fed into \textit{Kill the Best Gentiles!}, the book also contained a number of lengthy quotes from the figure we started our survey with, Francis Parker Yockey. Indeed, Yockey was singled out for ‘special acknowledgement’ in Brunn’s introduction too.\textsuperscript{77} The influences drawn on by violent attackers such as Brunn, who was 88 when he carried out his shooting, helps to expose the many layers of post-war neo-Nazism being surveyed here. His actions also highlight the dangerous nature of ideas that can often simply dismissed as ridiculous when detached from the violence they can help inspire. But how can we characterize the ongoing relevance of this ‘tradition’?

\section*{Looking to the Future}

Political landscapes have certainly changed in the period surveyed here. Cold War politics has come and gone, and European empires have fully declined. Moreover, a raised awareness of the ‘globalized’ nature of the world also now feeds into such milieus; while the forces of globalization, especially online media, also help such organizations develop

\textsuperscript{75} This article from 23 October 2009, ‘David Duke on Nick Griffin — More Comments’, was hosted on David Duke’s website: http://davidduke.com/david-duke-on-nick-griffin-more-comments/ (accessed 31/10/2013).


\textsuperscript{77} The book has been hosted by the Internet Archive, available at: https://archive.org/details/killTheBestGentiles_680 (accessed 31/20/2013).
interactions with each other too. Therefore, it is important for assessing the
contemporary dynamics of this now-established ‘tradition’ – one we have seen has
accrued through the process of ‘accumulative extremism’ – to acknowledge the ways in
which such ideas can now be been disseminated.

Clearly, this is a process that has radically changed over the course of the period
under analysis, and has undoubtedly affected the ways in which protagonists can view
each other's relevance, explore their ideas, and ‘imagine’ their place within the wider
movement. The self-radicalization carried out by David Copeland at the end of the 1990s
helps us date the fuzzy turning point within this milieu. Certainly back in Yockey’s day,
developing funds for the print run for Imperium was a major task in itself. Yet now, the
writings of people like Yockey’s can even be sold as a Kindle downloads. (Currently a
book called The Lost Writings of Francis Parker Yockey is available on the Amazon site for
£3.25.)

Yockey’s periodical, Frontfighter, meanwhile, had to be produced by a rotary
duplicator, and could not be downloaded in an instant. Even in 1990s, the British
homemade fanzines discussed in relation to Blood & Honour and Combat 18 were
regularly still being reproduced in this way, often on photocopiers. Yet operating on the
cusp of the Internet era, Copeland was able to draw both ideological material, and bomb-
making details, from the Internet. How can we think about this turn?

The neo-Nazi milieu has often been an early adopter of new media technologies.
For example, in the 1980s another activist we have already discussed, Tom Metzger, was
using early bulletin board systems to help disseminate his ideas. Building on such
techniques, in 1995 Don Black set up the most significant of the neo-Nazi websites:
www.stormfront.org. This site alone has dramatically increased the availability of
extremist material of all kinds, from esoteric texts such as the American Pioneer Little
Europe, to exchanging information on Blood & Honour events. Indeed, telling of the
interchange that can occur as a result, there is even now a dedicated website for
establishing the American Pioneer Little Europe movement in the UK, an approach
more noted for inspiring white enclaves in places such as Kalispell in Montana. Its UK
followers can get their ideas from the text of the same name written in 2001 by H.
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78 At the time of writing, the following Amazon site offered this book: http://www.amazon.co.uk/Lost-
Writings-Francis-Parker-Yockey-ebook/dp/B00CGAF2JG/ref=sr_1_3?ie=UTF8&qid=1383220580&sr=8-3
&keywords=imperium+yockey (accessed 31/10/2013).
79 See the following thread for the reproduction of the book:
80 A typical example can be found here: http://www.stormfront.org/forum/t796697/ (accessed
31/10/2013).
Michael Barrett, and which is currently hosted on the Stormfront website.\footnote{For this UK website, see: http://ple-uk.tumblr.com (accessed 31/10/2013).} Moreover, www.stormfront.org is merely the tip of the iceberg when it comes to disseminating online material that facilitates the tradition of transatlantic neo-Nazi activism.

We saw previously that John Bean, co-founder with Tyndall of the National Labour Party, found his way into the BNP’s Heritage and Destiny publication. Other ‘historical’ reference points have been cultivated by the new media sources of the 2000s. The current joint Blood & Honour / Combat 18 website, www.skrewdriver.net, for example, carries many essays, including those written by key figures of an earlier generation of neo-Nazi internationalism, such as Rockwell and Jordan. Blogging sites too allow for discussion on the tradition that such figures helped to establish. One small blogging site, www.natsentinal.blogspot.co.uk reviewed William H Schmaltz’s scholarly biography of Rockwell, and deemed it useful. As the blog stresses: the ‘book is well worth reading for all students of politics and especially if you are interested as I am, on agitation and propaganda.’\footnote{See: http://natsentinal.blogspot.co.uk/2013/08/book-review-hate-george-lincoln.html (accessed 31/10/2013).} Meanwhile, copies of Blood & Honour magazines are now hosted online, and set among interviews with White Power bands from around the world are discussions of British historical figures such as Arnold Leese and Oswald Mosley, again making their legacies easily accessible for the wider, transnational Blood & Honour movement.\footnote{An article on Arnold Leese, from issue 18 of Blood & Honour, can be found at the following web address: http://www.bloodandhonourworldwide.co.uk/magazine/issue18/issue18p20,21,22.html; and a similar piece on Mosley anf the british Union of Fascists can be found in Issue 42 of Blood & Honour, http://www.bloodandhonourworldwide.co.uk/magazine/issue42/issue42p_11.html, (accessed 31/10/2013).} Such a discourse helps evoke the tradition of activism stretching back into the interwar period too.

Elsewhere online, one can also find hosted many of the ideas of figures that lived long enough to become elder statesmen of the tradition, such as John Tyndall. Indeed, a wide selection of Tyndall’s writings for his magazine Spearhead are available as downloads.\footnote{See: http://www.spearhead.com/ (accessed 31/10/2013).} YouTube also hosts various recordings of Tyndall’s speeches, such as one taken from a 2004 conference run by David Duke’s European-American Unity and Rights Organization (EURO), held in Louisiana. Interestingly here, David Duke introduces Tyndall and describes him specifically as the ‘leading light of our cause in Britain over the last three decades’ [my emphasis].\footnote{See: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X9Xp_5huGDk (accessed 31/10/2013).} Nick Griffin also developed his links with American racist organizations in the 2000s too, after the collapse of the AF-BNP,
for example addressing the conference of the white supremacist magazine *American Renaissance* in 2006. CD recordings of the speech are available for purchase online.86 Another veteran of the British neo-Nazi milieu, Martin Webster, occasionally contributes his ideas the US-based *Occidental Observer* webzine site, described by the Anti-Defamation League as ‘a primary voice for anti-Semitism from far-right intellectuals’.87 To give an example here, in one article reflecting on the emergence of the English Defense League, Webster declared that in ‘the Jewish-owned sections of the UK media, there is a flood of anti-Muslim, anti-Islam stories. This barrage is so relentless that for the average Briton the words “Muslim” and “Islam” have become hardwired to the word “terrorist”.’ Webster was ambivalent on the EDL itself, and viewed its pro-Zionist position as deeply suspicious. Yet he felt that the trend fuelling the activities of the ‘Jewish-backed English Defence League’ may even be useful if in meant that ‘Muslims return to their homelands – no bad thing, providing other varieties of immigrant followed in their footsteps!’88

The value of the Internet as a mechanism for publishing books and lengthier material too is also a curious development. More specialist websites, such as www.solargeneral.com, help to make much book-length material freely available, as PDF files. This site describes its mission as follows: ‘to build the largest White Internationalist archive in the world. Finally! A Kosher-Free News Media!’. Here, we find another wide array of texts, spanning from Yockey’s *Imperium*, Pierce’s *The Turner Diaries*, to volumes by a much wider range of figures discussed above, including Arnold Leese, A. K. Chesterton, Savitri Devi, David Duke, Harold Covington, Lincoln Rockwell, and the Holocaust denial tract *Did Six Million Really Die?* Indeed, according to its index page, at the time of writing this site alone hosts some 863 separate PDF files of books and pamphlets, each related in some way to neo-Nazi culture. Other American sites also act as repositories for texts too. As with www.stormfront.org, the message board linked to the Christian Identity movement, www.thechristianidentityforum.net, typifies the phenomenon, for example a link hosts a free PDF of David Lane’s collected writings, *Deceived, Damned and Defiant*.

This widely available e-book is a curious publication in itself, summarising the tradition in in other ways too, especially themes of intergenerational exchange and

drawing out a common sense of being persecuted by the state. As discussed earlier, Lane was a prominent activist in The Order, and his collected writings included two essays by leading British figures too, Colin Jordan and Nick Griffin. Aside from these two contributions, the collection of essays, published originally in 1999, are largely written by Lane himself. In his introduction to Griffin’s contribution, Lane describes Griffin’s ‘inspiring’ tangles with the criminal justice system as a result of his Holocaust denial material published in *The Rune* in the late 1990s as being particularly stirring:

As editor and publisher of *The Rune,* a cultural magazine, he [Griffin] is being prosecuted for his beliefs and faces incarceration. Evidence includes a picture of a beautiful Viking princess on a longship and the statement, ‘WANTED: More White Children!’ For this egregious proclamation, he has been charged with publishing material which intends to or might incite ‘racial hatred.’ In typical zoo fashion, his home was raided on December 12, 1996. Concerning his legal battle Mr. Griffin stated, ‘It will be a trial of those REAL race-haters, those who are using propaganda, lies, cultural genocide and mass immigration to destroy the White race.’

So as in Jordan’s day, the trope of state persecution of a fellow activist abroad was seen as rousing for Lane and his American followers. Meanwhile, Jordan provided the book’s Introduction, which idealises his activities with The Order, and describes the then imprisoned Lane as ‘truly a hero’ and a ‘happy warrior’. To underscore a common culture of terrorists inspiring other terrorists, Lane’s impact on more contemporary British activists can also be seen as influential on the ideas of the Aryan Strike Force. This British-based movement again highlights the on-going viability in this tradition, one now several generations old. The Aryan Strike Force itself was a largely web-based grouping, but one that styled itself as the most violent and uncompromising in Britain too. It was closed down in 2008, after its central activists were discovered in possession of a quantity of ricin. The Aryan Strike Force developed online links with American activists, and tellingly referenced Lane specifically, as they included his ‘14 Words’ slogan at the end of their own mission statement.89

Nevertheless, when confronted with such developments, it is also easy to over-

estimate the importance of Internet communication, and online spaces remain primarily mechanism for exchange. They help to foster views in people already likely to be sympathetic to the cause. Websites do not, in and of themselves, cause people to develop a psychology that will allow them to become extremists. Rather, exposure to some of the material discussed here may combine with other factors that allow people who already have pre-disposition to such political sympathies to gather together, and imagine much more fully a wider community of support who think in like-minded ways. The web probably allows neo-Nazis to cast their net a bit wider, and gather in some more supporters, but it is not a phenomenon capable of mainstreaming the revolution they crave. As such, the Internet is important as it acts as a great facilitator for the process of ‘accumulative extremism’, making the tradition much more accessible. The Internet’s ability to provide instant access to a rich body of material, largely developed since 1945, is impressive and gives the tradition explored here new opportunities to develop.

With this fillip from the new media, then, the core observation to take from this survey seems to be that there is no obvious ‘end’ point to the, albeit rather simplified, narrative sketched out here. What has been tentatively summarised here is how a new, post-war tradition has emerged, one that is still very much ‘alive’. The processes of ‘accumulative extremism’ are likely to carry on ‘accumulating’ new reference points for as long as such activists continue to see some form of common ‘cause’, and are part of a wider family of activists, people they can imagine as ‘their’ predecessors, or collaborators abroad. From the early days of clashes between Yockey and Mosley, to the friendship between Jordan and Rockwell, to the linkups between Tyndall and Pierce, to the Holocaust denial of Carto and Irving, to the musical affinities of Donaldson and Metzger, to the activism of Covington and Sargent, and even, despite some tensions, the political campaigning of Duke and Griffin, we can plot various forms of this mutually reinforcing relationship, which has developed over multiple generations. Finally, what is also notable about this tradition is the ways in which British and American innovations have proved influential, and inspirational, on each other too. Protagonists from both sides of the Atlantic have developed a level of respect for each other’s extremism, as they have added new reference points to the processes of ‘accumulation’. Moreover, though there is also certainly a culture of inwardness, and rejection of international networking, within the extreme nationalist milieus in both countries the relationships discussed here have helped to facilitate the ‘export’ of innovations in ideology and culture. In sum, this is a post-war tradition that has genuinely fostered, among some key figures, a powerful
sense of fighting together, in a common battle.