New Perspectives on the Transnational Right

Edited by
Martin Durham and
Margaret Power

PALGRAVE MACMILLAN TRANSNATIONAL HISTORY SERIES

Akira Iriye (Harvard University) and **Rana Mitter** (University of Oxford)
Series Editors

This distinguished series seeks to: develop scholarship on the transnational connections of societies and peoples in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; provide a forum in which work on transnational history from different periods, subjects, and regions of the world can be brought together in fruitful connection; and explore the theoretical and methodological links between transnational and other related approaches such as comparative history and world history.

Editorial board: **Thomas Bender** University Professor of the Humanities, Professor of History, and Director of the International Center for Advanced Studies, New York University **Jane Carruthers** Professor of History, University of South Africa **Mariano Plotkin** Professor, Universidad Nacional de Tres de Febrero, Buenos Aires, and member of the National Council of Scientific and Technological Research, Argentina **Pierre-Yves Saunier** Researcher at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, France **Ian Tyrrell** Professor of History, University of New South Wales.

Published by Palgrave Macmillan:

THE NATION, PSYCHOLOGY AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICS, 1870–1919
By Glenda Sluga

COMPETING VISIONS OF WORLD ORDER: GLOBAL MOMENTS AND MOVEMENTS, 1880s–1930s
Edited by Sebastian Conrad and Dominic Sachsenmaier

PAN-ASIANISM AND JAPAN'S WAR, 1931–1945
By Eri Hotta

THE CHINESE IN BRITAIN, 1800–PRESENT: ECONOMY, TRANSNATIONALISM, IDENTITY
By Gregor Benton and Terence Gomez

1968 IN EUROPE: A HISTORY OF PROTEST AND ACTIVISM, 1957–1977
Edited by Martin Klimke and Joachim Scharloth

RECONSTRUCTING PATRIARCHY AFTER THE GREAT WAR: WOMEN, CHILDREN, AND POSTWAR RECONCILIATION BETWEEN NATIONS
By Erika Kuhlman

THE IDEA OF HUMANITY IN A GLOBAL ERA
Bruce Mazlish

TRANSNATIONAL UNCONSCIOUS
Edited by Joy Damousi and Mariano Ben Plotkin

PALGRAVE DICTIONARY OF TRANSNATIONAL HISTORY
Edited by Akira Iriye and Pierre-Yves Saunier

TRANSNATIONAL LIVES: BIOGRAPHIES OF GLOBAL MODERNITY, 1700–PRESENT
Edited by Angela Woollacott, Desley Deacon, and Penny Russell

TRANSATLANTIC ANTI-CATHOLICISM: FRANCE AND THE UNITED STATES IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY
By Timothy Verhoeven

IRISH TERRORISM IN THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY, 1865–1922
By Jonathan Gantt

New Perspectives on the Transnational Right

Martin Durham

and

Margaret Power

palgrave
macmillan

To our mothers, with love and gratitude

Contents

Series Editors' Foreword

This book makes an important original contribution to the study of transnational history by focusing on the ideologies and activities of the Right as they were shared across national boundaries. The study of the Right in a transnational context has lagged far behind that of the Left. The Left, after all, has been one of the most transnational phenomena in the modern world. From the European revolutionaries in the eighteenth century to the Marxists in the nineteenth, from antiwar activists in the early twentieth century to the student radicals during the 1960s and the 1970s, Leftist movements challenged not just the domestic system of governance but also the international order defined by the establishment. The Left often speaks of solidarity across borders; in its perception, domestic and worldwide developments are closely linked, and so are the tasks it imposes on itself. It seeks to coalesce antiestablishment forces in various countries and regions of the globe so as to create a transnational force capable of restructuring the ways in which people live. As several volumes in the Palgrave Macmillan Transnational History Series have shown, radical and revolutionary movements on the Left have been a major theme of transnational history.

In contrast to the Left, the Right has not been examined systematically as a transnational movement. It would seem that if the ideologies and movements on the Left constitute transnational phenomena, so do those on the Right. After all, if the Left exists all over the world, so does the Right. Just as left-wing forces challenge established order at home and abroad, so do many of their right-wing counterparts. Sometimes they are equally imbued with a religious fervor when they confront the state that they believe has gone astray. At the same time, Left and Right define their positions in relation to each other. If the Left seeks change, the Right resists it and vice versa. When the Left espouses gender or racial equality, the Right seeks to justify the time-honored social order. If the Left speaks of raising people's consciousness, the Right does the same, except in the opposite direction. So often, then, Left and Right have developed in a dialectical relationship to each other.

It is all the more remarkable, then, that hitherto there has been so much more study of the transnational Left than of the transnational Right. This volume will go a long way toward filling the gap. As the editors note, the paucity of scholarly work on the transnational Right may reflect the sense that, unlike the Left, the Right is bound to the nation as the key framework for its ideology. While the Left considers nonnational identities such as class, gender, and race and seeks to promote their transnational connections, the Right is usually understood as rejecting such identities as threatening to the national cohesiveness. Even as the Left espouses the concept of humanity as well as diversity, the Right seems to be beholden to the image of a pure, eternally valid national community. Where the Left espouses internationalism, the Right is often suspicious of it as subversive of the state. When Left and Right speak of historical memory, the former may be less prone than the latter to single out national memory as the uncompromising core of one's being. Under the circumstances, it might be considered extremely difficult, if not impossible, to develop a transnational Right.

Such an understanding of the Right as quintessentially a nation-bound phenomenon is rejected by the contributors to this volume. While recognizing that the ideologies and activities of the Right are closely tied to national entities, the essays here nevertheless show that to ignore its transnational connections is to misread history. As the editors point out, "the Right has practiced a multidirectional transfer of ideas, information, and resources." Similarly oriented ideologies and movements that we associate with the Right have crossed borders—and not just among Western nations but also in South America, Africa, the Middle East, and elsewhere. Of course, not all such transnational connections have borne fruit, but that would be true of their Leftist counterparts.

Ironically, while it engages in transnational activities, the Right usually opposes such typically transnational phenomena as globalization and migration, as some of the essays here demonstrate. The Right in many countries views globalization as tending toward the diluting of national distinctions and, for the same reason, is opposed to the influx of immigrants. It may be that, in the sphere of international affairs, the Right tends to be more geopolitically oriented than the Left because of its stress on national power, prestige, and loyalty. If so, it is not surprising that anti-Communism brought together right-wing movements in many countries during the cold war. In a sense, the cold war was an alliance of the transnational Right against the transnational Left, although in Communist nations such as the

Soviet Union and China, those opposing the domestic political system might have found the non-Communist countries' Right more congenial than their Left.

The picture becomes more complicated when we turn our attention to the last thirty or forty years. With the waning and the eventual ending of the cold war, both Right and Left began searching for new agendas. To the extent that the Right was traditionally more receptive to a geopolitical way of thinking than the Left, the contemporary world in which traditional geopolitics seems to be losing its centrality may induce the Right to strengthen nongeopolitical ties across borders, thus transforming itself into something even more transnational than before.

AKIRA IRIYE
RANA MITTER

Acknowledgments

Martin and Margaret would like to thank the authors of the chapters in this book for their excellent scholarship, hard work, patience, and commitment. Margaret would like to thank Martin for working on this project with her. It took a lot of work, determination, and skill to get this done, and Margaret could not have done it without Martin. Martin will always remember Margaret's suggestion that he join her on a panel on the transnational Right at the American Historical Association Conference, without which the tremendous experience of working so well together to produce this collection would never have come about. For the editors, this has been very much an effort by two colleagues to work across the Atlantic, and finally, we would like to sincerely thank each other.

Introduction

Martin Durham and Margaret Power

This book is a collection of essays on the transnational Right. We define transnationalism as the flow and pattern of relationships across national boundaries. Our use of the term transnationalism denotes those movements, organizations, ideas, or networks that include but move beyond the nation. We distinguish the transnational from the global or the international because both of these terms imply the whole world, while transnational suggests connections among and between forces from various—perhaps many—but not necessarily all nations. Our use of transnationalism recognizes the often scattered and uneven nature of connections between and among peoples, groups, governments, and networks.

Although we use the term the Right, we do not see the Right as a monolithic force; indeed, we explore multiple and diverse expressions of it in this book. A book on historical expressions of the transnational Right may come as a surprise to some for at least three reasons. First, one of the most common assumptions about the Right is that it is nationalistic.[1] While the examples in this book confirm that it often is indeed that, they also show, to adapt Benedict Anderson's oft-cited statement, that if nations are imagined communities, the Right is just as capable of imagining a transnational political community as it is a national one.[2] Second, scholars have generally used the notion of "transnationalism" to examine progressive movements such as feminism, environmentalism, or labor—or developments typical of globalization such as migration, trade, the circulation of cultural ideas and productions, or changes in gender relations and expressions of sexuality—but not the Right.[3] Given the importance of the Right, historically and today, this lack of attention has resulted in an obvious lacuna in the literature that this book will begin to fill. Third, since much of the work on transnationalism focuses on current or recent phenomena, it might be assumed that transnationalism is

1

a development only of recent decades. Yet, as this series illustrates, transnational history concerns the period since the emergence of nation-states.

The term Right has been used in different ways; when we refer to the Right, however, we are focusing on forces that ideologically defend inequality. Since its inception during the French Revolution, the Right has been shaped not only by the national but also by relationships beyond the nation. As Sandra McGee Deutsch suggests, "one must relate the right to the immediate setting."[4] Who it sees as its primary enemy has varied; and while some expressions of the Right continued to aim their fire at liberalism, others drew on liberals' language of rights and liberty to oppose a new foe, Socialism. In the twentieth century, the greatest enemy for much of the Right became Communism, and the international nature of the movement led by Lenin and his successors made the transnational organization of the Right even more pressing. Transnational organizing was always difficult—nation-states remained of massive importance, and much of the Right was partly defined by identification with its country. Cooperation across borders proved difficult because both nationalism and political differences generated division. Thus, the possibilities of international cooperation proved both highly alluring and deeply problematic.

The fall of the Berlin Wall, the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the crisis of the Left globally have made the situation more complex still. The Right has reacted to this in different ways, but for much of the Right, new enemies have emerged. The list of enemies varies but has included feminists; immigrants; gays and lesbians; the liberal state; and recently in the West, Muslims. New issues, or at least newly salient ones, have thrown up fresh challenges: from disputes over globalization to fears of the collapse of community, to perceived threats to religion, and the loss of national identity.

This book examines right-wing politics in different forms, from conservatism to Fascism and the groupings that lie between them. While the chapters vary in their range, the book looks at the Right in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Americas. In looking at the Right across the continents, we have not restricted ourselves to a rigid definition that works in some domains but not in others. As we have suggested, in its different forms, the Right has been concerned with a defense of inequality, and this can take economic, political, social, racial, or sexual forms. In constructing its imagined community, it has often sought to combat what it sees as the corrosive acids of modernity, from secularism to the emancipation of women to the demands of

left-wing labor movements. This has not ruled out its ability to appeal to women or to workers or to selectively champion facets of modernity. As we have emphasized, the Right is a diverse phenomenon, and how it constructs and responds to alleged dangers is part of that diversity. In the last century, that response has frequently involved the prioritization of anti-Communism, while in other contexts, it has focused on the fight against the ethnic Other. Studying the Right transnationally both illuminates significant and unexplored aspects of the Right and offers a more complete picture of the larger context of which it is part.

This book examines when, where, why, and how different right-wing organizations in diverse countries and periods have been active transnationally and the consequences these transnational connections have had on these groups' politics, ideology, practices, successes, and failures. It discusses how different right-wing groups situate themselves in relation to each other, the extent to which the various forms of the Right take similar or contrary stances on pressing issues, and how or if these organizations square their often nationalist politics with their transnational affiliations. It examines what the Right gains and loses as a result of its transnational ties to determine under what conditions transnationalism strengthens or weakens it. It further discusses to what extent transnational ties have affected political outcomes on a local, national, and global level.

This study counters the tendency to study the Right at a purely national level. It endeavors to see it in a wider context and to better answer questions of how the Right sees, for instance, gender or religion. It challenges the common assumption that knowledge flows from the developed world to the developing world. Instead, it seeks to demonstrate that the Right has practiced a multidirectional transfer of ideas, information, and resources. This approach offers new insights into power relations among diverse global actors and not only sheds fresh light on the Right but also helps us to develop a more nuanced understanding of transnationalism both from above and below, from the North to the South, the South to the South, and the South to the North.

As the case studies presented in this book show, throughout the twentieth century different right-wing movements, organizations, and parties have moved beyond the formal boundaries of the nation to embrace the transnational. They have done so for a variety of reasons. Their efforts reflect the often changing ideological definition of who they are, who their allies/enemies or potential allies/enemies are, what their goals are; or they reveal an expanded understanding of

what space is appropriate for them to operate in. They also correspond to, in some cases, a politically expedient determination of what their strengths and weaknesses are and how they can best utilize transnational connections and resources to achieve their ends. As Marilyn Lake wrote in reference to her work on aboriginal rights in Australia, "It is clear that groups subordinated by national political processes have often felt empowered through engagement in transnational political movements."[5] Although Lake refers to people oppressed in their nation due to their racial and ethnic makeup, the basic idea also applies to the political Right, which has established relations abroad to fortify itself and exert pressure at home, as Kristin Blakely illustrates in her chapter, "Transnational Anti-Feminist Networks." In it, she discusses the work of REAL Women, "the largest, national right-wing women's organization in Canada" to build connections with like-minded NGOs, movements, and governments through the United Nations and international women's conferences.

Although the various expressions of the Right profiled in this book embrace the transnational, this does not negate their origins and roots in the nation. In fact, one of the central tensions that emerges from this study of the transnational Right are the various challenges, conflicts, and, indeed, failures that confront the different right-wing movements when they attempt to work transnationally. Markku Routsila's chapter, "International Anti-Communism before the Cold War," offers a clear example of the attempts that conservative forces on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean undertook to forge a united front against the victorious Bolsheviks, efforts that ultimately proved to be unsuccessful. Equally, Martin Durham's chapter, "White Hands across the Atlantic," chronicles the work of various extreme right-wing organizations in the United States and Europe to build a movement beyond the nation in order to confront and defeat their enemies. However, their efforts founder on the rocky shoals of rivalry, different definitions as to who the enemy is, and nationalism.

What do we learn about the Right by studying it transnationally, and what do we learn about transnationalism by studying the different expressions of the Right profiled in this book? First, while the different right-wing movements or organizations discussed in this book are all deeply rooted in their respective nations, they are not limited to or by them. As all the examples show, they are willing and able to move beyond the local and the national to attempt to build—some successfully, others less so—connections and alliances with their like-minded counterparts in other national settings. Arnd Bauerkämper's chapter, "Interwar Fascism in Europe

and Beyond," details the "cross-border bonds" that existed among Fascist forces in Europe and the efforts by the hypernationalists who ruled Italy and Germany to build a Fascist International. As Patrick Furlong shows in his chapter, "The National Party of South Africa," Afrikaners looked first to Fascist Europeans, particularly Nazis, for theories regarding race as they constructed the apartheid state; later they built ties with segregationists in the U.S. South. During the cold war, they built alliances with like-minded anti-Communists around the world, such as General Augusto Pinochet in Chile and the Christian Right in the United States. Second, the willingness of the various right-wing forces profiled in this book to move beyond their nations and their attempts to work with other right-wing governments, movements, or organizations argues for a degree of flexibility and pragmatism that people do not often associate with the Right. A correlation of this flexibility is the Right's capacity to redefine the boundaries of the nation in order to meet their political needs. As Gokhan Bacik illustrates in his chapter, "The Nationalist Action Party: The Transformation of the Transnational Right in Turkey," this grouping exemplifies this tendency. Third, the shift of focus from the nation to the transnational offers a different perspective from which to study the Right. This, in turn, allows us to analyze their strengths and weaknesses on a different scale, in a different arena, so that what might have been less obvious on the national level becomes more apparent when viewed transnationally. Fourth, learning with whom they seek alliances; when and why these alliances work; or, as is more common, when and why they fail, helps us to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the Right. Margaret Power's chapter, "Transnational, Conservative, Catholic, and Anti-Communist," explores the successful efforts of Tradition, Family, and Property, a conservative male Catholic group that started in Brazil in the 1960s to organize "sister" groups throughout much of the Western Hemisphere and Europe, many of which continue to function today. The economic conservatives that Martin Durham and Margaret Power's chapter, "The New Right, Neoconservativism, and Cold War Anti-Communism," examines have also been able to convince individuals, organizations, and governments across multiple borders that neoliberal economics will both undo the "wrongs" of Keynesian economics and will also guarantee them and their nations economic stability and prosperity. Finally, as all the chapters illustrate, in order to work on the transnational level, the Right needs to adapt to different national contexts and realities. Analyzing what they are willing to change, what ideas or programs they cling

to, and which they are willing to discard, also affords us new insight into the inner workings and most deeply held beliefs and practices of the Right. In sum, looking at the Right transnationally helps to define the Right on the national level as well.

We recognize that this book represents the first effort to discuss the Right transnationally. As editors, we attempted to obtain chapters that both reflect the range of the Right and cover different parts of the world and time periods. Despite our best efforts, there are gaps. However, we do believe that this book makes a forceful argument that the Right sees itself and operates on a transnational level. Not only that, the book as a whole reveals that the Right's ability to build successful and effective transnational networks—ones that allowed it to advance its political agenda and secure more of its goals tended to steadily improve, in most cases, during the twentieth century. Although interwar conservative forces in Europe and the United States and Fascist forces in Europe prior to and during the Second World War were unable to build durable relationships, religious forces such as Tradition, Family, and Property as well as the conservative Canadian-based group REAL Women have been able to build durable connections and organizational links. Clearly, the economic right discussed in chapter 6 has had a profound impact on the global economy. Thus, although we do not believe that history can be used to predict the future, we do think that this book could signal the Right's increased potential to build and maintain durable and effective transnational ties and organization.

The Chapters

The chapters in this book may be read individually by those interested in a particular expression of the Right or a particular nation's history. But it is intended to be read as a whole—as a distinct contribution to the study of right-wing politics and transnationalism. After considerable discussion, we have organized the chapters chronologically. The organization of the book also reflects our concern that different forms of the Right and different regions of the world are represented within each time period.

Chapter 1, "International Anti-Communism before the Cold War: Success and Failure in the Building of a Transnational Right," by Markku Ruotsila first explores the ideological themes that linked forces on the Right in Europe and the United States. He then examines the transnational work of conservatives against what they saw as their principal foe: Communism. Galvanized by the 1917 victory

of the Bolsheviks in Russia, anti-Communist forces attempted to build a transatlantic movement capable of preventing the spread of Communism and defeating the new Bolshevik government in Russia. Their efforts to do so and their ultimate inability to sustain a united force reveal both the possibility and difficulties of right-wing transnational unity.

We then shift to another form of the right. In chapter 2, "Interwar Fascism in Europe and Beyond: Toward a Transnational Radical Right," Arnd Bauerkämper examines the attempts undertaken by the extreme Right to link Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany with these nations' admirers elsewhere. He explores to what extent a Fascist International existed, a concept that many scholars have rejected since they assume that Fascist hypernationalism would prevent the formation of such a unified project. Through a close study of the "cross-border exchange, interaction, and cooperation between Fascists in Europe," Bauerkämper brings to light the shared ideology, mutual trust and respect, and joint programs that united them as well as the political and ideological differences, sharp clashes, and disjointed plans that prevented a more fruitful relationship.

The next three chapters examine the Right in other parts of the world. Patrick J. Furlong in chapter 3, "The National Party of South Africa: A Transnational Perspective," rejects the "simplistic Fascist analogy" that seamlessly links the National Party to European Fascism. Instead, he explores both the shared ideas that linked Afrikaner rightists to Fascists as well as the specific differences that separated them. He also explores the alliances between apartheid South Africa and anti-Communist forces around the world, such as the Christian Right in the United States or "pariahs" like General Pinochet in Chile and General Stroessner in Paraguay.

Chapter 3 moves from the interwar to the postwar. In chapter 4, "Transnational, Conservative, Catholic, and Anti-Communist: Tradition, Family, and Property (TFP)" Margaret Power traces the transnational influences, politics, and connections of the post–Second World War Tradition, Family, and Property (TFP). This conservative Catholic group began in Brazil in the 1960s to oppose land reform and the progressive changes then taking place in the Catholic Church. From Brazil, it spread throughout South America, then to Europe and the United States. The story of TFP reverses the more standard transnational flow of information and organization, since it goes from South to South, then from South to North.

The next chapter covers roughly the same time period as the previous chapter, while analyzing the work of one right-wing party in

Turkey and beyond. Chapter 5, "The Nationalist Action Party: The Transformation of the Transnational Right in Turkey" by Gokhan Bacik illustrates how the Nationalist Action Party's (NAP) fluctuating definition of the Turkish nation accommodates the organization's assessment of what is politically expedient and most likely to increase its political power. In order to build its base and sphere of influence, the NAP initially included the "outer Turks" (all those peoples of Turkish ancestry who lived outside the borders of the Republic of Turkey) in its definition of the nation. However, once the cold war ended and the Soviet Union collapsed, the NAP retreated from its transnational politics, dropped its calls for Turkish unification, and developed a more pragmatic agenda that focused on the well-being of the Turkish population living inside the Turkish Republic.

Chapter 6, "Transnational Conservatism: The New Right, Neoconservatism, and Cold War Anti-Communism," is initially concerned with developments in the late 1930s but primarily focuses on economic connections after the Second World War. Martin Durham and Margaret Power look at the transnational origins and impact of the free-market Right, conservative anti-Communism, and neoconservatism. This chapter describes the Mont Pelerin Society as a significant group that has been instrumental in advancing free-market economics, examines how and why these policies were implemented in Chile, and considers both a diverse range of other anti-Communists, and the more recent turn of neoconservatives against new enemies.

In chapter 7, Martin Durham explores the efforts of different strands of the extreme Right to forge transnational links. In "White Hands across the Atlantic: The Extreme Right in Europe and the United States, 1958–," he examines the spread of racist rock music, racist religions, and Holocaust revisionism and considers both organizations that characterize themselves as National Socialist and those that reject the term. This chapter explores the nature of European and U.S. racists' transnational relationships and the effect their concern with race has on links beyond the nation. Rival groups, Durham observes, share the self-definition of "nationalist," but while this has made transnational co-operation difficult, it has not made it impossible.

In the final chapter, "Transnational Anti-Feminist Networks: Canadian Right-Wing Women and the Global Stage," Kristin Blakely discusses the challenges faced by REAL Women, a conservative women's group in the progressive nation of Canada. Believing that

decisions made on a global level, such as Canada's endorsement of the U.N.-backed Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) affects Canadians, REAL Women has built transnational networks with other conservative "pro family" organizations around the world and in international forums.

Conclusion

In this collection, we have focused on different forms of the Right. We have given particular attention to arguments over Communism, race, and the free market and sought to raise issues of religion, gender, and sexuality. How exactly we might define the Right remains a matter of great controversy, in large part because there are so many different expressions of it, and, as we pointed out above, it changes and evolves as does the world around it. While we have been successful in giving attention to much of the world, we were unfortunately unable to obtain chapters on significant forces such as the Hindu Right in India and the disapora or make more than the most minimal reference to Australasia. We have made several references to Islam, and would like to have made more, but have resisted any temptation to present Jihadism (or opposition to it) as necessarily right wing. Whether Hamas or Fatah can be defined as on the Right, for example, is by no means obvious. We are confident, however, that this collection has pioneered an examination of the Right transnationally and hope that readers will not only gain from reading the chapters but will consider opening up questions of Islam and other ones concerning the transnational Right to further study.

Notes

1. For a critique of this view, see Roger Eatwell, "The Nature of the Right: Is There an 'Essentialist' Philosophical Core?" in Roger Eatwell and Noel O'Sullivan (eds.), *The Nature of the Right* (London, England: Pinter, 1989), pp. 55–56.
2. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London, England: Verso Press, 1983), p. 15.
3. For a clear illustration of this point, see Sanjeev Khagram and Peggy Levitt's excellent book *The Transnational Studies Reader* (New York and London: Routledge, 2008). On sexuality, see the collection of articles in the recent "AHR Forum: Transnational Sexualities," *American Historical Review*, Vol. 114, No. 5, December 2009.

4. Sandra McGee Deutsch, *Las Derechas*. *The Extreme Right in Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, 1890–1939* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).
5. Marilyn Lake, "Nationalist Historiography, Feminist Scholarship, and the Promise and Perils of New Transnational Histories: The Australian Case," *Journal of Women's History*, Vol. 19, No. 1, 2007, p. 183.

1

International Anti-Communism before the Cold War: Success and Failure in the Building of a Transnational Right

Markku Ruotsila

Usually narrated in terms of a self-contained cold war epoch, the history of modern anti-Communism has become inextricably associated with the superpower rivalry of the United States and the Soviet Union in the forty-year period following the mid-1940s. Representations of conservative anti-Communism, in particular, have been linked with the "liberation" and "roll-back" campaigns waged during the cold war and with the domestic countersubversive efforts under the rubric of McCarthyism. Few studies have examined the anti-Communism of the Right outside the United States, while many have narrated it as a peculiarly American phenomenon that was intricately tied in with national security considerations and notions of American exceptionalism and mission.[1] Until very recently, even the investigations that have seen anti-Communism as, above all, an ideological construct or a popular movement, rather than as a mere aspect of superpower rivalry, have tended to concentrate on the extreme Right and to exclude from consideration the broad conservative mainstream.[2] Comparative historical studies that conceptualize the anti-Communism of the Right as an international phenomenon remain quite rare.[3]

Yet the historical fact remains that there was a broad, energetic, and engaged anti-Communist movement (or several such movements) in existence throughout the world from the very moment that Russian Bolsheviks seized power in October 1917. This pre–cold war

anti-Communism of the political Right had philosophical roots deep in the soil of late nineteenth-century debates about Democratic Socialism and progressive liberalism, major organizational vehicles both in the print media and the field of civil society, and a coherent set of ideological positions and counterprograms. In the three decades before the onset of the cold war, anti-Communism was already a core element in the public doctrine of the political Right in the United States as well as in Europe. Throughout the period, conservative anti-Communists competed just as actively for opportunities to shape policy and public opinion as they did during the cold war, and public discussion was just as permeated by their anti-Communist rhetoric as it was after the late 1940s. Moreover, the pre–cold war anti-Communism of the Right was already a worldwide movement (or movements), active across national borders, and searching for global solutions to a problem that its different constituencies regarded as worldwide.[4]

The following inquiry into transnational anti-Communism before the cold war (in particular, in the crucial foundational decade of the 1920s) will concentrate on the British and American constituents of the transnational Right. For historical, cultural, and linguistic reasons, these two were the closest to each other of all the peoples involved, their public philosophies the most alike, and their international collaboration the easiest to organize. Great Britain and the United States were also the two countries without whose resources and global reach no proposed anti-Communist program could be implemented effectively. On this basis, this chapter will first sketch the ideological content of conservative interpretations of Bolshevism in the immediate aftermath of the Bolshevik seizure of power, and then it will explore the political Right's ultimately unsuccessful transnational campaigns in 1918–1921 for a military intervention to destroy the Bolshevik regime. Finally, this chapter will examine the anti-Communist Right's attempts after 1921 and before the mid-1940s to forge a common front for an alternative, primarily nonforce-based pursuit of their enemy. The national interest calculations and geostrategic considerations that were exposed in this latter period worked at cross-purposes with the transnational Right's anti-Communist mission and severely complicated its efforts.

The Ideology of the Anti-Communist Right

Ideologically, it was relatively easy for conservatives of widely different national and cultural traditions to unify against the Bolsheviks, the Socialists, and the liberals. By the time they had their encounter

with the twentieth-century Left, the fundamentals of conservative public doctrine were fixed and essentially the same throughout most of the Western world. To develop a transnational ideology of conservative anti-Communism, conservatives needed only to relate their core philosophical principles to the new apparition arising out of Russia. Since they had very little concrete factual information available on Russian events, conservatives fell back on philosophical generalities and orientating presuppositions that had been extrapolated from their earlier struggles against Socialism and modern liberalism. From the very beginning of their encounter with Bolshevism, conservatives consulted with and learned from each other on how this extrapolation ought to be done.

All conservatives substantively agreed on what Russell Kirk later called the six core canons of conservative thought: belief in a "transcendent order...which rules society as well as conscience"; affirmation of the virtue in human variety; preference for order; belief in private property as the basis of freedom; distrust of abstractions and faith in custom, tradition, and prescription; and a prudential opposition to hasty reform.[5] There were, of course, significant differences on any number of specifics, as well as ideological disagreements between those to whom economic *laissez-faire* was primary, those who accepted a paternalistic state in the name of social stability, and those who combined elements of both approaches under the guise of the interwar radical Right. But with these differences taken into account, the guiding presuppositions that distinguished a generic conservative philosophy from modern liberalism and from all versions of Socialism were still shared by most of the Right's different factions throughout the Western world.[6]

Almost all of the anti-Communists of the Right saw themselves, first of all, as the defenders of the "Christian religion," of "Christendom," and of "Christian civilization." To them, the Bolsheviks were "wicked and depraved" because they represented the forces of the "Anti-Christ" and were engaged in a "war against Christianity"; Bolshevism itself was but a "new religion...primarily directed against Christ."[7] They "make war against their own Creator," thundered one U.S. senator and "blaspheme God and religion"; another said that Bolshevism "stands condemned by God, man and even by Hell itself" because it was about "atheism and denunciation of God, of religion, of all spiritual factors" and because its principal goal was the destruction of "Christianity and all other sorts of religion."[8] In their view of Christianity, conservatives tended, moreover, to be traditionalist in ways that shut out the liberal theological movements of their time

that they identified with the threat to the faith that they believed the Bolsheviks posed. On this crucial issue, anti-Bolshevism perforce became antiliberalism, as well.[9]

Second, conservatives objected to Bolshevism (and to liberalism and Socialism) because they claimed it propagated ideas that were fundamentally destructive of the free-market and private property rights system that to them was the best arrangement for the well-being of all. Almost all conservatives swore by the "system of private enterprise, private ownership and private property under which," according to the Anti-Socialist and Anti-Communist Union of Great Britain, "the nation has flourished for over a hundred years."[10] A creed of this kind was, of course, predicated on the underlying philosophical assumption that humans everywhere were the same, imbued with "the acquisitive instinct" and the desire for "personal physical freedom," and that "all economic progress" could be traced to the mostly free operations of the market.[11] This assumption, too, ranged conservatives initially against the newer, increasingly collectivist currents of late nineteenth-century liberalism and Socialism, a stance that they later transposed onto the Bolsheviks.[12]

If Bolshevik atheism violated the conservatives' belief in a divinely set natural order and the Bolsheviks' challenge to capitalism their affirmation of private property and human variety, then the Bolshevik incitement of class struggle and world revolution threatened their belief in custom, tradition, and prescription—and also their denial of hasty change based on philosophical abstractions. From the French Revolution onward, conservatives had been opposed to basing policy on abstractions such as "the equality of man," and after the Bolshevik seizure of power, they were equally opposed to basing it on the abstractions of the "labor theory of value" or "the materialist view of history." Procedurally, conservatives stood for the tried and settled constitutional arrangements that existed in their respective countries, and they feared greatly all attempts at destabilizing these arrangements, whether this was done by liberals at home or by Bolsheviks abroad.

This procedural or constitutional basis for anti-Communism contained the greatest variety from country to country, even between those equally rooted in the common-law tradition. To U.S. conservatives, the separation and limitation of powers that was decreed in the U.S. Constitution was essential and as was shown in their often virulent opposition, first to Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom and later to Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal, they tended to object to all concentrations of political power. On the other hand, the most anti-collectivist of British conservatives, being monarchists and operating

without a written constitution as they did, could hardly affirm the principles expressed in the U.S. Constitution or in any similar text. For them, parliamentary supremacy was unquestioned, and fearful though they were of the ways in which the Left was using it, they did insist that Parliament could "make any laws it wishes," even laws that "violated the laws of nature and of human nature."[13]

Nevertheless, both kinds of conservatives (as well as those rooted in the still different constitutional practices of continental Europe) acknowledged the primacy of tradition and were opposed, on that basis alone, on principle—to *any* wholesale alterations of their nation's given constitutional arrangements. "Desire to move forward and try what is new must be harnessed with distrust of the untried and fear of the dangers that may be lurking in the unknown," insisted Lord Hugh Cecil, an influential British conservative intellectual. There was a fundamental "necessity of keeping continuity with the past and making changes as gradually and with as slight a dislocation as possible."[14] This transnationally accepted presupposition was couched in more typically American terms by the Republican U.S. Senator Miles Poindexter from Washington when he insisted, "the prime essential for any state of human existence" was "order and law—the government of lives and property by settled rule and not by the whims, caprices and delusions of individuals." In his view, the inevitable result of wholesale tinkering with tradition would be "the arbitrary and tyrannical rule by the will of strong men subject to no law."[15]

Ideologically, then, conservatives regarded Russian Bolshevism as an immediate, unique, and dire threat because it represented a set of doctrines and ideas—an ideology or a substitute religion—that challenged each of their core beliefs. Bolshevism was threatening because it spread *ideas* that were deemed profoundly destabilizing of the right ordering of societies. However, what was unique to the anti-Communism of the Right was the insistence that these ideas had to be combated and overcome not only through counterpropaganda and education in their own societies, nor just through such preemptive social reforms as were championed by the non-Bolshevik Left and Center that tried to limit the appeal of the Bolsheviks' ideas among the dispossessed of their own countries. All this was necessary, British and U.S. conservatives acknowledged, but unlike the liberal and social-democratic opponents of the Bolsheviks, conservatives insisted that the coordinated transnational use of their nations' combined military force at the specific geographic locations from which the threatening ideas were being spread was *also and equally* necessary.[16]

"All fight only against Bolshevik individuals outside Russia is use-less," they insisted. "It is necessary to hit at the root of anarchy and propaganda."[17] Bolshevism had to be fought "at its centre, at its source," that is, in Russia, with military force.[18] "The only way you can deal with a man who says that you encumber the earth and the only way to have happiness on the earth is to kill you," as former U.S. President William Howard Taft put it, "is to kill him. That is all there is to it."[19]

Finally, crucial to the ideology of conservative anti-Communism was its principled opposition to most forms of internationalism. This severely complicated (but did not undo) their own inherently inter-national efforts at combating Bolshevism. The president of Columbia University, Nicholas Murray Butler, cogently summarized the general approach when he differentiated between "colloidal" and "crystal-line internationalism." By "colloidal internationalism," he meant the "hopelessly impractical...and unsound and unstable" notions of the Left (liberal, Socialist, and Bolshevik alike) that sought "a world-wide community without national ties or national ambitions" predi-cated on a spurious "brotherhood of man." Conservatives, on the other hand, could consent at the most to a "crystalline internation-alism" that sought the strengthening of "nationalistic and patriotic sentiments and aims, in order that when so strengthened they may be used without impairment or weakening as elements in a larger human undertaking of which each nation should be an independent and integral part." In this conception, internationalism (or transna-tionalism) would "depend upon and reflect the strength and beauty of its national elements," all of them working together on a volun-tary basis and contributing their unique perspectives.[20] Butler and many another conservatives saw all diversions from such a "crys-talline internationalism" as but that many alternate and "indirect" roads to Bolshevism, and they set themselves against them as much as they set themselves against Bolshevism per se.[21]

With acceptable internationalism so narrowly defined and with all diversions from the definition branded as alternate roads to Bolshevism, it was clear that in the very presuppositions of the con-servative worldview, a major *a priori* impediment existed to effective coordination of anti-Communist activities across national borders. Since anti-Communists of the Right were nationalists first of all, they were highly reticent about subjecting their shared anti-Communist effort to any kind of international control or coordination, lest any form or approximation of Bolshevism be the result.

This meant that the earliest anti-Communist organizations of the Right tended to be active only within a given country's borders and to

emphasize the defense of national interests only. The names of some of these organizations illustrate this, but by 1918–1919, most of the groups in question had, in fact, evolved into accepting more coordinated transnational approaches. In the United States, these included the National Security League (1914), the National Civic Federation (1900), and the American Defense Society (1915)[22]; in Great Britain, the British Empire Union (1915), the British Constitution Association (1905), and the Anti-Socialist and Anti-Communist Union (1908).[23] The National Security League was typical of these groups' highly nationalist starting assumptions when it insisted (in 1918) that "our attack is to be made on the bolshevist opposition to American government, American ideals" by way of a "campaign for the Americanization of America."[24]

Notwithstanding their overtly nationalist identities and politics, specific transnational networks nurtured the early anti-Communist organizations of the Right. These were purely informal arrangements by the respective organizations' top leadership but important, nevertheless, for sustaining and facilitating the kinds of effort that anti-Communists of the Right came to engage in after 1917. Especially the British and American politicians, academicians, and publicists who were active in their respective countries' patriotic and anti-Communist organizations forged links with each other, read each others' publications, corresponded and met privately, and generally consulted each other on how to pursue their shared work. There were occasional contacts with some continental Europeans as well, and through the institutions of the British Empire (above all the Imperial War Cabinet), rather more sustained exchanges of views between the decision makers of the rest of the English-speaking world. Together with the overarching agreement on the fundamentals of conservative public philosophy, these informal networks assured the emergence of a specifically conservative form of anti-Communist activism across national borders, the anti-Communism of the twentieth-century transnational Right.

The Campaign for a Military Intervention in Russia

As soon as they had the facts about the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia, conservatives on both sides of the Atlantic settled on a comprehensive counterprogram of force-based anti-Communism. The emergence of the Bolshevik regime prompted a number of parallel mutually reinforcing campaigns for a major military intervention in Russia that was designed, as their principal British protagonist Winston Churchill reputedly put it, to strangle the beast in the cradle. These campaigns

were but one aspect in a more comprehensive shared strategy that included economic, diplomatic, and propagandistic elements and was as much anti-Socialist and antiliberal as it was anti-Bolshevik. However, given the presuppositions guiding the transatlantic conservatism, force-based anti-Communism was accepted as the fundamental *sine qua non* of all effective counteraction.[25] As European and American conservatives went about their intervention campaign, they were both sustained by and working to empower the preexisting informal transnational networks of the political Right that had been forged around the patriotic and anti-Communist societies.

Chronologically, there were two distinct campaigns for intervention. The first campaign in the summer of 1918 was prompted by the British and French governments' interest in forming a second front against the Central Powers together with the United States, Japan, and other powers. These governments' official stated aims were purely war related and specifically anti-German, not yet openly anti-Communist. However, the conservatives who seized on these plans and started their own transnational push for a joint wartime intervention were already steeped in anti-Communism, and *their* campaign's anti-Communist purposes were clear to all who read about their argumentation. In the second push for military intervention that took place after the Armistice in the summer and autumn of 1919, force-based notions of anti-Communism were at the very core of the effort.

In the United States, the charge was led by former Presidents William Howard Taft and Theodore Roosevelt and by former Secretary of War Elihu Root, the latter two representing, respectively, the American Defense Society and the National Security League.[26] These men were assisted by a number of congressional Republicans (and some Democrats) and the *New York Times*, as well as all the leading right-wing newspapers that constantly advertised their efforts.[27] On the other side of the Atlantic, activists included influential backbenchers in the British Conservative party such as Sir Henry Page Croft and Sir Samuel Hoare (a leader of the Anti-Socialist Union and Anti-Communist Union[28]), all the major conservative periodicals, and key British and French military leaders.[29] While the timing and substance of interventionist arguments was in no formal way coordinated across the Atlantic, privately, many of the participants were in touch with each other. For example, the influential U.S. Senator Henry Cabot Lodge corresponded extensively with Leo Maxse of the *National Review*, a principal British advocate of military intervention, trying to find ways to keep the reading public informed of the transatlantic aspects of their work.[30]

On both sides of the Atlantic, the call went out for some 200,000 American intervention troops and for a varying number of British, French, and other Allied contingents.[31] The core arguments used in both continents were the same, as well. They were cogently summarized by Senator William H. King of Utah, who proposed the first U.S. congressional bill for funding a joint military intervention in July 1918, when he insisted on "financial and military aid" to all those Russians who "desire to be emancipated from the tyranny of bolshevikism [*sic*]." This was the only way to "overthrow Bolshevist tyranny and anarchy" once and for all.[32]

So pronounced, indeed, were the conservatives' appeals to the anti-Bolshevik purposes in their calls for intervention that Lord Balfour, the British foreign secretary (himself a conservative but unenthusiastic about using military force against the Bolsheviks[33]), felt compelled at one point to assure President Wilson that the official plans for a second front in the war against Germany for which his cooperation was being asked did not aim at the destruction of the Bolshevik regime and were unrelated to the ongoing campaigns by conservatives outside of Allied governments.[34]

Many conservatives thought differently about this, as was shown in William Howard Taft's summation once President Wilson had finally agreed to take part in the intervention. "We are now at war with the Bolsheviki, and I am glad of it," Taft noted, knowing full well that Wilson had issued specific instructions for American troops not to engage the Bolsheviks while on Russian soil. As Wilson envisioned the American intervention, it was meant only to deny Russian resources to the Central Powers and to sustain local nuclei of Russian anti-Bolsheviks through humanitarian aid provided under protection of the U.S. military.[35] But Taft was one of those on the transnational Right who seems to have been confident that since the start of the intervention was in large part the result of their transatlantic campaign, they could in coming months use their combined strength to force their countries' reluctant leaders to make that intervention into a fully fledged anti-Communist military operation. Once on Russian soil, American troops would be under constant Bolshevik attack: in Taft's view, even a "fool" such as Woodrow Wilson would in such circumstances recognize before long that "the force which will be sent must be followed by larger forces" and used "to stamp out Bolshevism." Conservatives had to keep him under constant pressure by advertising the facts on the ground.[36]

In the months immediately preceding and following the Armistice, much of the anti-Bolshevik effort of the transnational Right centered

on forwarding new plans to this effect that were drawn up by Winston Churchill, the new British secretary of state for war, and by French military leaders. Both had concluded that in the post-Armistice situation, when great numbers of enlisted soldiers were in a state of mutiny, demanding immediate mustering out, and the resurgent Left was constantly attempting to tap into their discontent, it was impossible to continue with a full-scale intervention by conscript Allied forces. Churchill and his French allies settled instead on a new plan for a proxy intervention by which the Allies and the United States would fund, supply, and coordinate the activities of existing "White" Russian and Border States' anti-Bolshevik armies. They would also offer all possible assistance from their own intervention troops while these remained on the ground. To convert the highly reticent President Wilson and Prime Minister Lloyd George, conservatives launched a massive press and parliamentary campaign that lasted for much of 1919.[37]

This 1919 campaign to make force-based anti-Communism the pivot of the Allied and Associated Powers' Russian policy was more transnational in nature than the wartime one to which it was a sequel. The public and behind-the-scenes pressurizing that the Right unleashed on both sides of the Atlantic during this year (especially in the crucial months in midyear when "White" forces appeared to be on the verge of victory), was no more synchronized in a formal sense than had been the wartime effort, but as will be seen, mutual borrowing and reinforcing of each others' arguments was very much in evidence. In this campaign, conservatives hoped to wrest from their governments formal recognition of the "White" government of Admiral A. V. Kolchak in Siberia[38] and promises of major financial and munitions assistance to that government, as well as direct support for a planned Finnish attack on St. Petersburg that would be coordinated with the Kolchak and other "White" forces.[39]

Unlike in the summer of 1918, participants of this second major push for military intervention included all the key anti-Bolshevik Russian émigré leaders then residing in Western Europe, as well as key officials of the Kolchak regime. The campaign was, thus, the first truly international manifestation of the anti-Communism of the Right. Churchill was in direct touch with Kolchak, encouraging him to move forward on the ground and to give the diplomatic assurances as to his democratic aspirations that Wilson and Lloyd George were thought to require before they would sign up on the new plan. The parliamentary anti-Communists in Sir Samuel Hoare's newly created Coalition Group for Foreign Affairs were in constant communication

with émigré anti-Bolsheviks, as well, feeding their input back to Churchill, into the press, and into parliamentary debates.[40] At the same time, various representatives of the Finnish government of General C. G. E. Mannerheim, the principal Finnish protagonist for the St. Petersburg campaign who was said to be "dying to attack," were in touch with Churchill and his representatives and with Polish and French leaders.[41] Finally, all of this feverish activity was supported, advertised, and encouraged by right-wing newspapers in all the relevant countries, by conservative politicians, and by the publicists of anti-Communist organizations.[42]

The St. Petersburg plan and Churchill's larger scheme for coordinated proxy intervention of which it was part failed for a number reasons. Woodrow Wilson's and David Lloyd George's persistent vacillation was a factor, as was the public countercampaign by the Left in most Allied countries and in the United States. The "White" forces themselves could not in the end deliver the hoped-for victories on the ground. But it mattered also that the transatlantic Right in the end could not overcome the national differences of opinion and interest that pushed its varied constituents (especially the Finnish) to demand special rewards from the Allies and guarantees on future relations from the Russian "Whites" that simply could not be granted.[43] National interest calculation and deep suspicions about the motives of other members of the *ad hoc* coalition for intervention exposed the bane of the transnational anti-Communist Right, the often overwhelming nationalist aspirations of its disparate constituents that prevented for any length of time truly international cooperation even for shared ends.

By late 1919 and early 1920, most of the Allied and Associated troops that had been sent to Russia during the world war had been withdrawn and could no longer, even in theory, assist the Russian anti-Bolsheviks who were rapidly being decimated. On both sides of the Atlantic, conservative anti-Communists had regretfully to concur with Churchill's conclusion: "for Russia we can do nothing—too late."[44] This conclusion by no means meant that the Right had lost faith in the appropriateness and necessity of force-based anti-Communism, only that realistic chances had for now been lost. Still, it is indicative of the Right's faith in force-based solutions to the Bolshevik menace that even as late as 1928, Winston Churchill would still talk about his hopes of renewing at some opportune future point an international force-based attack on Soviet Russia.[45] It is clear, then, that their manifest lack of concrete success notwithstanding, after 1921 conservative campaigners for an anti-Communist military

intervention were only biding their time, waiting for another opportunity at some later date, in different circumstances, to resume their attack. The early cold war campaigns for "roll-back" and "liberation" must be understood in this historical context.

Anti-Communism Divided against Itself

Once the prolonged campaign for military intervention was finally over, the national and ideological tensions within the transnational anticommunist movement that were first exposed in the failure of the St. Petersburg plan came to complicate the shared work in significant ways. In the 1920s, anti-Communists of the Right began, on the one hand, to turn inward and start to tackle domestic threats of subversion. On the other hand, national interest calculations unrelated to the threat of Communism arose to the fore as never before and increased mutual recriminations and suspicions in ways that made effective cooperation across borders more difficult. The history of international anti-Communism after the ending of the intervention in Russia in 1921 and before the onset of the cold war is, in fact, the story of a creed that never could negotiate the multiple geostrategic, nationalist, and ideological fissures within itself that this very turbulent period threw up.

The growing estrangement between British and American anti-Communists that began soon after 1920 was of prime importance for the relative disempowerment of conservative anti-Communism in these decades. In retrospect, the beginnings of this estrangement can be traced to two events in 1920–1921: to the successful summer 1920 effort in Great Britain by the Council of Action, a pro-Russian pressure group created by some of the labor unions, to prevent the shipment of arms to the Polish side in the Russo-Polish War; and to Prime Minister Lloyd George's prior decision to start trade negotiations with Soviet Russia. Because of these actions, conservatives on both sides of the Atlantic felt validated in their complaints about the liberal elite's complicity in the spread of Bolshevism. On both sides of the Atlantic, they insisted that by these two decisions, the prime minister was, unsurprisingly, giving "great encouragement to Bolshevism," having always been "temperamentally sympathetic to Bolshevism" and at least a "pseudo-Bolshevik" in his own political philosophy.[46]

American conservatives were encouraged by their British correspondents to relate these conclusions to liberals in general, but from press and congressional commentary, it is clear that more

particular suspicions about British perfidy and backsliding started to gain ground.[47] Earlier in the encounter with Bolshevism, Americans would undoubtedly have followed the advice of their British friends, their own discourse on Wilsonian liberalism having been pegged for years on the accusation that Wilson had "a great deal of sympathy for the Bolsheviki" and was fast becoming "the world's chief 'Red.'"[48] Instead of continuing with this line of attack, however, American anti-Communists were encouraged by Wilson's belated, apparent change of heart in the so-called Colby Note[49] of August 1920, in which he condemned the Bolsheviks in clear moral terms, announced the principles of nonrecognition, nonintercourse, and containment and called all nations to join him in working for the eventual overthrow of the Bolshevik regime.[50]

British and American conservatives alike applauded this decision and contrasted it with Lloyd George's new line that favored trade and diplomacy.[51] But mindful as they were of the imminent ending of the Wilson era and a likely Republican return to the White House, only Americans had reason to suppose that the Colby principles now formed the new anti-Communist consensus in their country. Despite the efforts of the recently reconstituted die-hard faction in the British Conservative party (composed of some of the staunchest anti-Communists around),[52] the British Right seemed unable to effectively challenge Lloyd George either from within the Coalition government or from the outside. They failed to move Britain behind the Colby Note's key principles, and their reputation as loyal anti-Communist allies suffered as a consequence.

The parting of the ways in American and British Russia policies followed a series of major transportation, police, and miners' strikes on both sides of the Atlantic and was nearly simultaneous with a major miners' strike in Butte, Montana, in which pro-Bolshevik activists from the syndicalist labor union I.W.W. were believed to have had a key role. When all of this was followed by the Council of Action's success in blocking the shipment of munitions to Poland, many conservatives concluded that the working class had now conclusively been shown to have "general sympathy for the Bolsheviks and the Soviet government" and to be "deliberately playing the Bolshevik game."[53] This was an alarming development that bespoke the need to start concentrating on securing one's own territory against subversion. On both sides of the Atlantic, a great number of new antisubversive organizations were promptly created on the model provided by the U.S. Justice Department during the so-called Red Scare of late 1919 and the early 1920.[54]

The turn toward antisubversion, however, only added to mutual suspicions within the transnational anti-Communist networks. In Great Britain, there were those like Lord Sydenham of Combe, founder of the new antisubversive groups–Liberty League and National Unity Movement–who told their American contacts how subversion in the British Empire was being orchestrated by an "anti-British movement in America supported by German names mostly Semitic." Sydenham was certain that the "center of activities is in New York," and he took his American conservative friends to task for not putting a stop to the believed center's activities.[55] Increasingly inward looking (which in the British context meant empire minded), many a conservative in Britain concluded at the same time that the Bolsheviks had to be defeated in Ireland, India, Egypt, and Palestine where "alien and anti-British influences" were lending support for purported independence struggles that actually were part of the Bolshevik master plan for world revolution.[56] That many a conservative American anti-Communist was also a supporter of Irish independence and an anti-imperialist in principle did not tend to ease the gathering suspicions, nor did the tendency of American anti-Communists to equate the Bolshevization of America, as the National Civic Federation put it in 1919, with its "Europeanization."[57]

The rapid spreading of conspiracist interpretations of the Bolshevik movement that took place among antisubversive anti-Communists in the 1920s further fractured the transatlantic Right. The conspiracist framework that spread the most rapidly in the 1920s through the 1940s was itself very much a transnational product, first developed in *fin d'siecle* Russia by monarchist anti-Semites, then transferred to Britain by émigré Russian anti-Bolshevik allies of the military interventionists. An especially important figure in this regard was Colonel Boris Brasol, once an official at the infamous Beilis trial,[58] who after the First World War came to advise British and American anti-Communists. At the same time, he worked tirelessly to popularize the fraudulent *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* as a new conspiracist explanation for the Bolshevik menace.[59] The *Protocols'* claims about a worldwide Jewish cabal as the root of Bolshevism were then taken up by British conservatives such as H. A. Gwynne of the *Morning Post* and his associate, Nesta Webster. Her highly influential *World Revolution: The Plot Against Civilization* (1921) linked the purported conspiracy to the mythical Illuminati secret society and to international finance.[60]

For Gwynne and Webster, the purported conspiracy was above all directed against the Empire, and both of them saw Woodrow Wilson as one of its principal but perhaps unwitting tools.[61] However, when

imported to the United States, the thesis took on a clearly anti-imperialist and, often specifically, anti-British slant. This was clear during the congressional debates over the ratification of the League of Nations Covenant in 1919 and 1920 when some conservative opponents of the league depicted the world organization as a British imperialist agency working to destroy U.S. sovereignty on behalf of an Illuminati-type, Bolshevik-tainted world conspiracy.[62] Many a British conservative suspected the league just as much and saw it as part of the Bolshevik menace, but linking Wilson with the purported conspiracy as many of them did, to them its origins lay with "Washington and Moscow," not London and Paris.[63] In Britain, radical and moderate conservatives alike saw the Empire as a solvent and alternative, not as a part of the problem.[64]

In addition to sowing seeds of doubt on both sides of the transatlantic Right, this fundamental disagreement over the suspected Communist conspiracy's Western accomplices had at least one major long-lasting result for transatlantic cooperation once fundamentalist and evangelical Christians in the United States had taken up Webster's and Gwynne's conspiracy theories. This took place in the 1920s and the early 1930s. Filtered through their theological and confessional traditions, these theories proved an abiding and highly influential support to a more general aversion to international cooperation among the U.S. Right. As a result, throughout the interwar and beyond, there persisted in the background of U.S. foreign policy debates a distinct undercurrent of Christian anti-internationalism, shaped in part by conspiracy theory that refused to engage in multilateral cooperation with suspect foreign peoples, even for projects otherwise deemed as worthwhile.[65]

For those conservatives who did not partake of conspiracy theory, geostrategic and national interest considerations provided additional complications and hindrances to transnational cooperation. Winston Churchill is a case in point. As convinced as he was about the absolute necessity of transatlantic cooperation, he believed that Great Britain and France ought to have made "a real fight" against American demands for the repayment of their war debts to the Americans in the 1920s, no matter how this impacted on anti-Communist cooperation, and when no such fight had come, he felt that "very deep injury has been sustained by the British nation."[66] Churchill's attempt at balancing shared anti-Communist objectives and Britain's particular national interests was shown again in the late 1920s when naval disarmament arose as a major complication. The nadir in Anglo-American relations that the war debt and navy issues created in the late 1920s

arose between two countries that were just then being led by conservative anti-Communists with long records of involvement in transatlantic collaboration. Yet, even as pro-American an anti-Communist as Winston Churchill was, he chose not to privilege the anti-Communist dimension in his statecraft when forced to make a choice between it and his country's specific imperial interests.[67]

When one adds to the list the resurgent philosophical differences between the Right's factions (e.g., *laissez-faire* economic conservatives, paternalistic traditionalists, and the conspiracist Far Right),[68] one begins to appreciate the breadth of the factors that gradually disempowered the interwar transatlantic anti-Communist Right.

The International Anti-Communist Entente

The first and most important attempt between the two world wars at overcoming the anti-Communist Right's internal divisions and coordinating its activities across national borders, the Geneva-based *Entente International contre la IIIe Internationale* (also known as the Geneva International or the International Anticommunist Entente, IAE) was beset throughout its existence by the severe internal tensions and rivalries of the transnational Right. The mere existence of such an organization is an indication of the desire of many on the Right for coordinated international action and the message that emanated from its agencies a testimonial to the remarkable stability and coherence of the Right's anti-Communist ideology. At the same time, the trajectory of this largely forgotten organization highlights the severe, ultimately nonnegotiable complications that nationalistically minded conservatives encountered when attempting to pool their strengths and to create a truly transnational common front.

Founded in 1924 on the initiative of the Swiss lawyer and politician Theodore Aubert and the émigré Russian Red Cross leader Georges Lodygensky, the IAE eventually became the principal coordinating agency for major anti-Communist groups in at least eighteen European countries. While less important outside continental Europe, it had affiliates, too, in the United States, in Australia and New Zealand, in Egypt, and in several Latin American countries. Officially dedicated "to combating the [Third] International and to defending the principles of order, family, property and nationality" in "all countries,"[69] the IAE's ideological positions spanned the spectrum of right-wing anti-Communist opinion but tended to prioritize its religious and spiritual dimensions and the defense of the free-market system.[70]

Most of the IAE's work took place behind the scenes, and it was coordinated by a permanent central office in Geneva with a staff of fourteen and sustained by an international network of informants and correspondents. The central office organized international conferences, published books and information bulletins for a range of periodicals and key political and business leaders, produced anti-Communist films, and conducted research into communist activities. In the 1930s, it maintained, a separate "Pro Deo" commission for anti-Communist religious groups, a colonial bureau, and an "International League of Women Against Bolshevism and War."[71]

Especially in some of the smaller European countries, IAE affiliates were led by very well-connected and highly powerful men in the corporate and political worlds who had open to them major outlets in the press and in national parliaments. The most powerful of all of its patrons was General Francisco Franco of Spain, whose interest in anti-Communism, according to some accounts, actually originated in his reading of IAE bulletins. One account has Franco recalling that his first meeting with Theodore Aubert was as important to him emotionally as had been the birth of his first son.[72] Other supporters and sympathizers equally influential in their respective countries included Marshal Pétain of France, Chancellor Franz von Papen of Germany, Grand Prince Jean of Lichtenstein, General C. G. E. Mannerheim, and President Pehr Evind Svinhufvud of Finland.[73]

In Britain, the IAE's affiliate was the Central Council of Economic Leagues.[74] This was a network of fifteen regional associations that had merged after the First World War with the National Propaganda, a major antisubversive group led by the former director of naval intelligence, Sir Reginald Hall; with the British Empire Union; and with a number of other similar patriotic groups. These evolved into a major clearinghouse and coordinating agency for the blacklisting and surveillance of British radicals that had close links with the intelligence services and, according to some accounts, with the nascent British Fascist movement.[75] That the IAE appealed to those who had at least some sympathies toward British Fascism was further attested to by the fact that the IAE received support from the eighth Duke of Northumberland's *The Patriot*, the principal proto-Fascist periodical of the era that was published by the far-right Boswell Publishing Company. *The Patriot* also printed IAE statements and sold IAE publications to subscribers.[76]

In the United States, the IAE's reach was much more limited. It did manage to recruit affiliates from all the major population centers where preexisting patriotic and anti-Communist organizations were

active.[77] Yet the one nationwide organization that worked with it—the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies—was not actually a formal member. This was an umbrella group composed of 100 fraternal and civic associations (including the Daughters and Sons of the American Revolution), whose hard core consisted of a small anti-immigration and antisubversive publicity agency by one John B. Trevor of New York, a man distinctly susceptible to the most lurid conspiracist interpretations of the Bolshevik menace.[78] Importantly, neither the National Security League nor the American Defense Society (both of which started to decline after the ending of the intervention period) decided to join in the IAE's work. The National Civic Federation did cooperate with some of its activities, but internationally, it decided to affiliate instead with the IAE's less well-known and less influential rival, the International Committee to Combat the World Menace of Communism.[79]

From this brief survey, it is clear that in continental Europe especially, the IAE had major support. It played a significant role in coordinating and sustaining the anti-Communist activities of the transnational Right on the continent and, to a lesser extent, in Great Britain. In the United States, however, it found most of its support from the fringes of the anti-Communist movement and never could reach influential policy makers. More importantly, even among its core constituency, many activists had serious doubts about the IAE approach to anti-Communism. Some of them faulted the IAE with being too centralized in structure and having a leadership culture that bore an unfortunate resemblance to Bolshevism.[80] Others complained of an "almost fatal" lack of interest in the very notion of international coordination of anti-Communist work by conservatives devoted to the particular interests of their own country.[81] These two points of contention—one ideological, the other geopolitical—became major hindrances to the IAE's work in the 1930s.

The internal fissures became acute after the rise of Fascist movements in Italy, Germany, and Spain. From early on, IAE leaders showed marked sympathies toward Mussolini in Italy and Hitler in Germany, and they saw to it that their organization started to cooperate with the Italian *Centro di Studi Internatioli sul Fascismo* and with the Nazi *Antikomintern*. They received funding from the Mussolini government, and delegates from the IAE participated at the *Antikomintern*'s 1936 conference at Feldafing in Germany.[82] This was a definite red flag for many of the anti-Communists of the Anglo-American Right that helped to turn them off the IAE. As E. H. H. Green and Brian Girvin have noted, most British and American

conservatives of the period differed from continental Europeans in that they still retained their faith in the parliamentary system as the proper institutional framework for their activities. This applied to many of those, as well, who did move toward the radical Right in the course of the 1920s and the 1930s.[83] For the IAE's core leadership and many of its continental European affiliates, this was not the case. Here lay a fundamental philosophical and ideological difference of opinion that severely complicated the organization's activities. It could fairly be said that overarching philosophical disagreements over Fascism helped to break the back of the interwar transnational anti-Communist Right.

Conflicting assessments of national and imperial interests compounded the ideological disagreements. As has been seen, though they profoundly agreed on the nature of the Russian Bolshevik menace and operated from the same philosophical traditions, British and American conservatives increasingly turned against each other, once the ending of the military intervention campaign against the Bolsheviks deprived them of a concrete shared project and exposed the geopolitical rivalries that existed between their two countries. For the continental European members of the IAE, similar divisions formed in the 1920s and the early 1930s over the desirability of the Rapallo Treaty[84] versus Franco-German *rapprochement* and later over the position to be taken on the Nazi conquest of Czechoslovakia.[85]

The IAE did not ever become the unquestioned leader of the Right's anti-Communist effort that its founders had envisioned. What it did do for a significant part of the political Right in the interwar years was to facilitate their publicity and propaganda work by providing a steady stream of information from a worldwide network of correspondents. It also helped to nurture a sense of community among activists, at least until its linkages with Italian Fascists and German Nazis became known and started to break its ranks. Notwithstanding, the organization did survive, much weakened, into the early cold war. Its leaders then concluded that in the drastically changed world situation, it served no purpose for Europeans to pretend to any kind of leadership in combating world Communism. The IAE had lost a great number of its correspondents in member states, and some key member states were altogether prostrate, so it decided to scale down its activities considerably. By the late 1940s, Aubert and Lodygensky had concluded that the center for all anti-Communist activities had now been moved to the United States, and it was time to defer to the Americans and to cease European efforts at coordination.[86]

Conclusion

The fate of the IAE underlines the persistent difficulties that the political Right had in their continuous worldwide effort throughout the interwar period to forge effective mechanisms for transnational collaboration in pursuit of the utter destruction of the Bolshevik regime and the complete discrediting of Bolshevik, Socialist, and liberal politics. In their ideological opposition to each of these three rivals, those conservatives who forged collaborative transatlantic networks during the late 1910s and into the 1920s were in substantive agreement throughout the period. For the most part, they agreed that Communism and Socialism were but two parts of the same existential threat to the correct ordering of societies and that newer, increasingly collectivist liberalism was well on the way toward joining these two in an unholy trinity of worldwide menace. The interwar years did, indeed, witness the forging of a coherent, remarkably consistent conservative anti-Communist ideology predicated on these suppositions. But when they tried to unite across national borders and engage in concrete collaboration for specific policy outcomes, the transnational Right repeatedly fell victim to the national, imperial, and geostrategical rivalries that animated its varied constituents. Anti-Communism proved insufficient as a venue for truly multilateral cooperation by the Right, also, because at the very core of the philosophy of conservatism that drove the Right, there lay a principled and deep-seated aversion to international cooperation.

Notes

1. See Stephen J. Whitfield, *The Culture of the Cold War* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996); Thomas G. Paterson, *Meeting the Communist Threat: From Truman to Reagan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988); Gregory Mitrovitch, *Undermining the Kremlin: America's Strategy to Subvert the Soviet Bloc, 1947–1956* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000); David Foglesong, *The American Mission and the "Evil Empire": The Crusade for a Free Russia since 1881* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
2. For recent exceptions, see Richard Gid Powers, *Not Without Honor: The History of American Anticommunism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998); Markku Ruotsila, *British and American Anticommunism before the Cold War* (London: Routledge, 2001); John Earl Haynes, *Red Scare or Red Menace? American Communism and Anticommunism in the Cold War Era* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1996); Michael J. Heale, *American Anticommunism: Combating the Enemy Within, 1830–1970* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990).

3. For exceptions, see Ruotsila, *British and American Anticommunism*; Abbot Gleason, *Totalitarianism: The Inner History of the Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

4. For a survey, see Ruotsila, *British and American Anticommunism*.

5. Russell Kirk, *The Conservative Mind: From Burke to Eliot*, seventh revised edition (Chicago: Regnery Books, 1986), 8–11.

6. On the differences between Anglo-American and continental European forms of conservatism, see Brian Girvin, "The Party in Comparative and International Context," 695–725, in Anthony Seldon and Stuart Ball (eds.), *Conservative Century: The Conservative Party since 1900* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994); and on the internal factions, Ruotsila, *British and American Anticommunism*, Chapter 1.

7. Sir Henry Page Croft, "The Russian Peril," *Bournemouth Echo*, November 13, 1919; Duke of Northumberland, "Where Are We Going?," *National Review* (January 1925), 692–97; Duke of Northumberland, "The Assault of Heaven," *The Patriot*, March 12, 1925, 393–94; Elihu Root, *The United States and the War: The Mission to Russia, Political Addresses* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918, ed. By Robert Bacon and James Brown Scott), 172–73; Elihu Root to William H. Burnham, October 26, 1917, Elihu Root papers, box 136, Library of Congress, Washington DC.

8. *Congressional Record* [hereafter CR], 65th Cong., 2nd Sess. (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1918), 5398–5400; CR, 65th Cong., 3rd Sess., 1971; CR, 66th Cong., 1st Sess., 3490; U.S. Senate, *Brewing and Liquor Interests and German and Bolshevik Propaganda, Report and Proceedings of the Subcommittee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, 65th Congress* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1919), 136, 139.

9. Ruotsila, *British and American Anticommunism*, 9–11.

10. R. D. Blumenfeld, *Twenty-Five Years Ago, 1908–1933: The Record of the Anti-Socialist and Anti-Communist Union* (London: Anti-Socialist Union, 1933), 5.

11. William H. Doughty, "The Human Factor in Popular Government," *Constitutional Review* 3 (April 1919), 80–95.

12. Ruotsila, *British and American Anticommunism*, 4–17.

13. Ruotsila, *British and American Anticommunism*, 10–12. The quote is from William H. Mallock, *A Critical Examination of Socialism* (London: John Murray, 1908), 134.

14. Lord Hugh Cecil, *Conservatism* (London: Williams & Norgate, nd [1912]), 13–14, 48.

15. CR, 65th Cong., 2nd Sess., 5397–98.

16. Ruotsila, *British and American Anticommunism*, 95–96, 106–8.

17. Sir Samuel Hoare memorandum, March 22, 1919, Viscount Templewood papers, 2/3/2, Cambridge University Library.

18. Elihu Root cited in David Foglesong, *America's Secret War against Bolshevism: U.S. Intervention in the Russian Civil War, 1917–1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 39.

19. William H. Taft address, December 6, 1918, reel 574, William Howard Taft papers, Library of Congress Manuscripts Division, Washington, DC.

20. Nicholas Murray Butler, *A World in Ferment: Interpretations of the War for a New World* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918), 7–8.

21. "America Not Safe, Says Butler," *New York Times*, April 20, 1919, 12; William H. Taft address, September 15, 1918, Taft papers, reel 574; David Jayne Hill, "International Law and International Policy," *North American Review* (March 1919), 320–29; John Briton, *The League of Nations* (London: Boswell Publishing Company, nd), 5–15; Lord Sydenham of Combe, *Studies of an Imperialist* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1928), xii, 330–40.

22. See Robert D. Ward, "The Origin and Activities of the National Security League," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 47 (September 1960), 51–65; Robert K. Murray, *Red Scare: A Study in National Hysteria, 1919–1920* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1955), 84–94.

23. See Frans Coetzee, *For Party or Country: Nationalism and Dilemmas of Popular Conservatism in Edwardian England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 38–42, 99–105; Kenneth D. Brown, "The Anti-Socialist Union, 1908–49," 234–61, in Kenneth D. Brown (ed.), *Essays in Anti-Labour History: Responses to the Rise of Labour in Britain* (London: Macmillan, 1974).

24. "To Fight Bolshevism," *New York Times*, December 16, 1918, 3; *The National Security League: Before the War, During the War, After the War* (New York: National Security League, 1918), 12.

25. Ruotsila, *British and American Anticommunism*, 106–8.

26. The American Defense Society (1915) and the National Security League (1914) were publicity and propaganda organizations originally created to manufacture public support for military preparedness and universal military training. After the United States joined the First World War, they launched patriotic education campaigns to sustain morale and to combat internal subversion by German and Russian Bolshevik agents. See Ward, "The Origin and Activities of the National Security League."

27. See Markku Ruotsila, "Senator William H. King of Utah and His Campaigns Against Russian Communism, 1917–1933," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 74 (Spring 2006), 152–53. In the conservative press, the most engaged were the three papers under the direction of George Harvey—the *North American Review*, the *North American Review's War Weekly,* and *Harvey's Weekly*.

28. Originally called simply the Anti-Socialist Union (1908), this organization was an umbrella group of some 200 distinct local associations engaged in training speakers and providing anti-Socialist literature for public education campaigns. Closely linked to the Conservative Party (which funded its initial work), it evolved gradually into the leading British anti-Communist organization of the interwar years. See Brown, "The Anti-Socialist Union, 1908–49"; Coetzee, *For Party or Country*, 103–5.

29. Ruotsila, *British and American Anticommunism*, 92–97.

30. See the correspondence in the Henry Cabot Lodge papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, reel 55.

31. Sir Henry Page Croft memorandum, May 4, 1918, Sir Henry Page Croft papers, CRFT 1/16, Churchill College, Cambridge; William H. Taft to Albert J. Galen, November 19, 1918, reel 551, Taft papers.

32. CR, 65th Cong., 2nd Sess., 8481, 11609.

33. See Jason Tomes, *Balfour and Foreign Policy: The International Thought of a Conservative Statesman* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 217–32.

34. Lord Balfour to David Lloyd George, July 16, 1918, Arthur Balfour papers, Add. Mss. 49692, British Library, London; David Lloyd George to Lord Reading, July 18, 1918, in Arthur S. Link (ed.), *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, vol. 49 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985), 9–11.

35. William H. Taft to N. B. Ells, August 27, 1918, Taft papers, reel 553; William H. Taft to Gus Karger, August 10, 1918, Taft papers, reel 552. On Wilson's carefully limited aims, see Foglesong, *America's Secret War Against Bolshevism*, 162–71.

36. William H. Taft address, December 6, 1918, Taft papers, reel 574; William H. Taft to Boris Brasol, December 24, 1918, Taft papers, reel 553; "Allied Intervention," *Morning Post*, July 9, 1918, 5; "The Situation in Russia," *Morning Post*, August 20, 1918, 4.

37. See Markku Ruotsila, "The Origins of Anglo-American Anti-Bolshevism, 1917–21," University of Cambridge Ph.D. thesis (1999), 146–222; Michael Kettle, *Churchill and the Archangel Fiasco, November 1918–July 1919* (London: Routledge, 1992).

38. The origins of Kolchak's regime lay in the so-called Omsk government by Socialist and other Russian anti-Bolsheviks who had fled to Siberia in the early stages of the Russian civil war. In November 1918, Admiral Kolchak seized power from them and then gradually built a major anti-Bolshevik army around their erstwhile government. See N.G.O. Pereira, *White Siberia: The Politics of Civil War* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996).

39. Ruotsila, "The Origins of Anglo-American Anti-Bolshevism," 203–22; Markku Ruotsila, *John Spargo and American Socialism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 103–7.

40. See correspondence between P. Struve, S. D. Sazonov, N. N. Golovin and Sir Samuel Hoare, February–April, 1919, Templewood papers, 2/3/2; Sir Samuel Hoare to Winston Churchill, October 16, 1919, CHAR 16/12, Winston Churchill papers, Churchill College, Cambridge; Winston Churchill to Alfred Knox, April 25, May 5, May 22, May 26, and May 28, 1919, CHAR 16/22, Churchill papers.

41. See Markku Ruotsila, "The Churchill-Mannerheim Collaboration in the Russian Intervention, 1919–1920," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 80 (January 2002), 1–20.

42. In the conservative press, among the most active propagandists for the Kolchak plan were the *Morning Post*, the *National Review,* and *Harvey's Weekly*. In the debates of the British Houses of Parliament and in the U.S. Senate, a great many conservatives spoke up repeatedly, as well, as did William Howard Taft in his editorials and Elihu Root in public statements. See Ruotsila, "The Origins of Anglo-American Anti-Bolshevism," 205–22; Ruotsila, *British and American Anticommunism Before the Cold War*, 94–98,

141–42. William H. Taft, *William Howard Taft, Collected Editorials, 1917–1921* (New York: Praeger, 1990, ed. James F. Vivian), 195–96.

43. The Finns, in particular, were a major complication, given that they demanded major Allied funding for their planned operations, as well as binding Russian guarantees for the recognition of Finnish independence, which the Kolchak regime simply would not give. See Ruotsila, "The Churchill-Mannerheim Collaboration," 19–20.

44. Winston Churchill's notes, October 16, 1920, CHAR 9/62, Churchill papers.

45. Sir Robert Rhodes James (ed.)*, Churchill: His Complete Speeches*, Vol. 5 (New York: Chelsea House, 1983), 36.

46. Ruotsila, *British and American Anticommunism*, 182–84. Quotes taken from Lord Sydenham of Combe to John St. Loe Strachey, August 21, 1920, John St. Loe Strachey papers, S/13/18/6, House of Lords Record Office, London; "Episodes of the Month," *National Review* (August 1919), 752–53; "The Offensive in War," *Morning Post*, May 30, 1918, 4.

47. See "To Conquer Russia with Kindness," *Literary Digest*, January 31, 1920, 15–16; "Morality of Trading with Lenine," *Literary Digest*, May 15, 1920, 28; CR, 66th Cong., 3rd Sess., 1862–65, 2202, 2207.

48. William H. Taft to Gus Karger February 25, 1918, Taft papers, reel 548; "Poindexter Calls Wilson Chief 'Red'," *New York Times*, September 28, 1919, 2.

49. The Colby Note was given out in the name of the U.S. Secretary of State in 1920–1921, Bainbridge Colby, Daniel M. Smith, *Aftermath of War: Bainbridge Colby and Wilsonian Diplomacy, 1920–1921* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1970).

50. Norman E. Saul, *War and Revolution: The United States and Russia, 1914–1921* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2001), 437–39.

51. "Approve Stand of State Department," *National Civic Federation Review* 10 (July 1920), 12; "A United Front," *Morning Post*, August 13, 1920, 4; "Episodes of the Month," *National Review* (September 1920), 7–12; "America and the Soviets," *Harvey's Weekly*, August 21, 1920, 2; CR, 66th Cong., 3rd Sess., 2202.

52. See G. C. Webber, *The Ideology of the British Right, 1918–1939* (London: Croom Helm, 1986), esp. 4–29.

53. Henry Cabot Lodge to Lord Charnwood, September 16, 1920, reel 67, Lodge papers (quote); "News of the Week," *Spectator*, March 6, 1920, 294; CR, 66th Cong., 2nd Sess., 5531–34, 6206–14; Sir Henry Page Croft, "Democracy or Tyranny. No. I. The Cause of Unrest," *Bournemouth Echo*, September 4, 1920; Sir Henry Page Croft, "Democracy or Tyranny. No. II. Soviet or Parliament," *Bournemouth Echo*, September 7, 1920.

54. Powers, *Not Without Honor*, 39–42, 70–90; "An Anti-Bolshevist Crusade," *Morning Post*, June 2, 1920, 5; "British Empire Union," *Morning Post*, April 13, 1920, 4; "News of the Week," *The Spectator*, March 6, 1920, 294; "Action Should Not Be Met With Inaction," *The Spectator*, September 4, 1920, 294–96.

55. Lord Sydenham to Nicholas Murray Butler, November 26, 1921, April 14, 1922, and May 16, 1922, Butler papers.

56. "The Irish Peril," *Morning Post*, July 8, 1920, 7; "Palestine," *The Patriot*, June 17, 1926, 540; "The Bolshevisation of Palestine," *The Patriot*, July 17, 1930, 57; Lord Sydenham, "The General Election, the Empire, and the World Situation," *The Patriot*, October 23, 1924, 182–83; Sir Henry Page Croft, "Democracy or Tyranny. No. I. The Cause of the Unrest," *Bournemouth Echo*, September 4, 1920.

57. "The Enemy Within Our Gates," *National Civic Federation Review* (December 1919), 736–38. For conservative support for Irish independence and self-determination of other subject peoples, see Ralph Stone, *The Irreconcilables: The Fight against the League of Nations* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1970), 166–67; David Jayne Hill, "Americanizing the Treaty," *North American Review* (August 1919), 163–70.

58. The Beilis trial of 1913 was the last major manifestation of the Czarist regime's anti-Semitism. In it, the death of a thirteen-year-old boy in Kiev was blamed on Jews seeking Gentile blood for their religious rituals. The trial prompted major Western campaigns against Russian anti-Semitism and led to the cancellation of the U.S.-Russia trade agreement. See Leon Poliakov, *The History of Anti-Semitism, Volume IV* (London: Oxford University Press, 1985), 128–34.

59. Poliakov, *The History of Anti-Semitism, Volume IV*, 230–36. Even a man as opposed to anti-Semitism as former President Taft was in correspondence with Brasol: William H. Taft to Boris Brasol, December 24, 1918, reel 553, Taft papers.

60. H. A. Gwynne, *The Cause of World Unrest* (London: Grant Richards, 1920); Nesta Webster, *World Revolution: The Plot against Civilization* (London: Constable, 1921).

61. Gwynne (ed.), *The Cause of the World Unrest*, 173–78, 201–18; Nesta Webster, *The Surrender of an Empire* (London: Boswell Publishing Company, 1933), 54–65.

62. *The League of Nations, Speech of Senator James A. Reed of Missouri in the United States Senate, September 22, 1919* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1919), 4–7, 9, 17–18; CR, 66th Cong., 2nd Sess., 3510–13.

63. Gwynne (ed.), *The Cause of World Unrest*, 173; Webster, *The Surrender of an Empire*, 54–65; *Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons*, 5th Ser. (London, 1919), vol. 118, 1069–71.

64. Philip Williamson, *Stanley Baldwin: Conservative Leadership and National Values* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 275–305; Duke of Northumberland, "Introduction," 2–4, in John Briton, *The League of Nations* (London: Boswell Publishing Company, nd); Sir Henry Page Croft, "Democracy or Tyranny. No. I," *Bournemouth Echo*, September 4, 1920.

65. Markku Ruotsila, *The Origins of Christian Anti-Internationalism: Conservative Evangelicals and the League of Nations* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2008), 40–41, 134, 171–92.

66. Winston Churchill's notes, December 17, 1920, CHAR 16/53B, Churchill papers.
67. Brian McKercher, "Churchill, the European Balance of Power and the USA," 42–64, in RAC Parker (ed.), *Winston Churchill: Studies in Statesmanship* (London: Brassey's, 1995); D. Cameron Watt, *Succeeding John Bull: America in Britain's Place, 1900–1975* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), Chapter 3.
68. See Ruotsila, *British and American Anticommunism*, Chapters 9–12.
69. Théodore Aubert, "L'Entente Internationale contre la IIIe Internationale," *Bibliothèque Universelle et Revue de Genève* (Septembre 1925), 8–10.
70. See Theodore Aubert, *Bolshevism's Terrible Record: An Indictment* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1924); *Vade-Mecum Bolchevique* (Geneva: L'Entente Internationale contre la IIIe Internationale, 1926); *Neuf Ans de Lutte Contre le Bolchevisme: L'Activité de l'Entente Internationale contre la IIIe Internationale* (Geneva: Imp. Du Journale de Geneve, 1933).
71. See Michel Caillat, "L'Entente internationale anticommuniste (EIA): l'impact sur la formation d'un anticommunisme helvétique de l'action internationale d'un groupe de bourgeois genevois," in Michel Caillat, Mauro Cerrutti, Jean-Francois Fayet, and Stephanie Roulin (eds.), *Histoire(s) de l'anticommunisme en Suisse* (Bern: Chronos Verlag, 2008); Michel Caillat, Mauro Cerrutti, Jean-Francois Fayet and Jorge Gajardo, "Le point sur le depouillement en cours d'un fords prive inedit: les archives de l'Entente internationale anticommuniste (EIA) de Theodore Aubert (1924–1950)," *Materiaux pour l'histoire de notre temps* 73 (Janvier-Mars 2004), 25–31.
72. Michel Caillat, "Le role de l'Entente internationale anticommuniste' de Theodore Aubert face à la Guerre civile espagnole," 421–37, in Mauro Cerrutti, Sébastien Guex and Peter Huber (eds.), *La Suisse et l'Espagne de la République à Franco (1936–1946)* (Lausanne: Editions Antipodes, 2001).
73. Markku Ruotsila, "Suojeluskunta-aatteen vastineet englantia puhuvissa maissa," *Historiallinen aikakauskirja* 98:4 (2000), 321; Franck Tison, "L'entente internationale anticommuniste et la France (1924–1939)," *Cahiers d'Histoire sociale* 16 (hiver 2000–1), 75–92; Caillat, Cerrutti, Fayet and Gajardo, "Le point sur le depouillement."
74. Michel Caillat, "L'Entente internationale anticommuniste de Theodore Aubert et ses archives," *Traverse* 2 (2006), 15.
75. Arthur McIvor, "'A Crusade for Capitalism': The Economic League, 1919–39," *Journal of Contemporary History* 23 (1988), 631–55; Thomas Linehan, *British Fascism 1918–39: Parties, Ideology and Culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 44–45.
76. *The Patriot*, June 19, 1924, 409, and June 17, 1926, 544.
77. Finnish Defense League press release, September 11, 1927, Finnish Defense League Archives, folder 7, National Library of Finland, Helsinki.
78. Powers, *Not Without Honor*, 79–80; Sara Diamond, *Roads to Dominion: Right-Wing Movements and Political Power in the United States* (New York: Guilford Press, 1995), 51.

79. Theodore Aubert to John Trevor, November 21, 1933, International Anticommunist Entente archives, The Public and University Library of Geneva, Switzerland, folder "E.I.A. Etats-Unis 1932–1934"; Ralph M. Easley to the Duchess of Atholl, February 17, 1934, International Anticommunist Entente archives, folder "E.I.A. Etats-Unis 1932–1934." I am thankful to Michel Caillat for providing these references.

80. Nesta Webster, "Anti-Revolutionary Organization—VII," *The Patriot*, February 11, 1926, 140–42.

81. Suomen Suojelusliitto, *Suomen Suojelusliitto ja Lapuan liike* (Helsinki: Suomen Suojelusliitto, 1931), 6.

82. Caillat, "L'Entente internationale," 15.

83. Green, *The Crisis of Conservatism*, 332–33; Girvin, "The Party in Comparative and International Context," 695–725; Webber, *The Ideology of the British Right*, 42–48.

84. Officially known as the Treaty of Mutual Friendship, the Rapallo Treaty was concluded between Germany and Soviet Russia in 1922.

85. Caillat, Cerrutti, Fayet, and Gajardo, "Le point sur le depouillement"; Caillat, "Le role de l'Entente internationale," 421–37.

86. Caillat, "L'Entente internationale," 16.

2

Interwar Fascism in Europe and Beyond: Toward a Transnational Radical Right

Arnd Bauerkämper

On September 28, 1937, millions of Germans listened to the Italian *Duce* Mussolini when he declared at a mass rally in Berlin: "Comrades!...The rallies which have been held for my reception have deeply moved me....I have not only come to you as head of the Italian government but also as leader of a national revolution who would like to give evidence of the overt and firm bonds [I have with] your revolution. Though the development of the two revolutions might have been different, the aim that we wish to achieve is the same: the unity and greatness of the people. Fascism and National Socialism are expressions of the sameness of the historical processes in the lives of our nations, which have achieved unity in the same century and as a result of the same events....Tomorrow's Europe will be Fascist as a result of the logical successions of events, not as a result of our propaganda....Germany has woken up. The Third Reich has emerged. I do not know when Europe will wake up....It is important, however, that our two great peoples, which encompass a vast and growing mass of 115 million people, are united in unshakable determination. Today's gigantic rally conveys this to the world."[1] Although he had by no means abandoned his claims of Italian superiority in the alliance with Germany, Mussolini clearly conceived Fascism as a political challenge that was to transcend national borders.[2]

But did a Fascist International exist in Europe or even beyond its confines between the two world wars? To what extent were Fascist movements and regimes in interwar Europe interrelated? Which

forms of interaction between Fascists can we discern? To what extent, and how did their radical nationalism obstruct cross-border cooperation? These are highly controversial questions. Since radical nationalism was an integral component of Fascism between the two world wars, it is easy to deny or dismiss cross-border cooperation between its members and leaders. In fact, the hypernationalism of Fascist movements and their Social Darwinist doctrines, as well as the expansionist and racist policies of the Third Reich and Fascist Italy, have led most historians to argue that Fascist internationalism was merely a camouflage and a sham. The interpretation that "international fascism is unthinkable, a contradiction in terms" has received broad support from historians and has practically achieved a consensus.[3] As a result, cross-border interactions between Fascists have been largely dismissed in historical scholarship.

Yet these transnational communications and transfers merit serious analysis, as this chapter indicates. Taking recent historiographical debates on comparison, transfers, and entanglements in modern history as a starting point, we will trace and explain communications and interactions between European Fascists. Undeniably, the political project of the *Comitati d'azione per l'universalità di Roma* (CAUR; Combat Committees for the Universality of Rome), which Mussolini's lieutenants set up in Rome in 1933, foundered in the following two years.[4] The considerable obstacles and barriers to transnational cooperation must not be ignored. Fascists from different European states met on innumerable occasions and different levels, not only to exchange views on ideological questions but also to agree on policies and common initiatives. Cross-border exchange and cooperation were therefore by no means completely alien to Fascism, which was most definitely a transnational movement in interwar Europe.

The seemingly successful Fascist regime in Italy and then the rising National Socialists of Germany attracted many followers, who were thus drawn into the orbit of transnational Fascism. At the highest level, meetings between Fascist leaders epitomized these cross-border aspirations. These encounters demonstrate, however, that transnational Fascism was not only an ensemble of political and social practices. Indeed, it also had as its objective the deliberate and sophisticated strategies of staging its comprehensive political claims of renewal. Representations of these innovative, future-oriented visions of a fundamental transformation of politics and society were therefore essential in staging transnational Fascism. Official visits of Fascist leaders, as well as meetings between members of ancillary organizations like the Hitler Youth and its Italian counterpart, the *Opera*

Nazionale Balilla, demonstrate that public displays of friendship and mutual sympathy were significant and cannot be easily dismissed as mere window dressing.[5]

Strong cross-border bonds between Fascists emanated from the regimes established in Italy in 1922 and in Germany, eleven years later. Far beyond high politics, interchanges between leaders and members of Fascist groups, movements, and regimes extended to fields like the organization of leisure and public relations.[6] Yet Fascist movements and regimes appropriated foreign doctrines and policies *selectively*, in large part in order to avert the potentially damaging charge of pale imitation or treason. Thus, Fascists made sure not to publicly announce their transnational cooperation, which was neither restricted to wartime collaboration, as noted above, nor to the abortive attempts to institutionalize high-level cooperation between Fascist leaders. In order to evade political stigmatization, Fascists strenuously posed as unwavering patriots and emphasized their nationalism. It is therefore easy to exaggerate their nationalist doctrines and policies and overlook their transnational connections.[7]

Despite its undisputedly strong nationalism, Fascism needs to be understood as a transnational political and social practice. Clearly, Fascists entertained mutual relations and accentuated their bonds. After the March on Rome in late October 1922, the Italian capital galvanized Fascists throughout Europe. It seemed to demonstrate that the detested parliamentary rule and social conflict that were held responsible for all the problems in postwar Europe could be overcome. Although he shared his generals' disappointment about the military failures of his Italian alliance partners who had suffered humiliating defeats in Greece and Africa as early as 1940–1941, Hitler cherished Mussolini as an ally and a friend as late as April 1945, when Nazi Germany lay in ruins. Interchange and communication between Fascists in Europe not only related to overtly political issues such as mutual assistance in war and propaganda but also to the seemingly nonpolitical fields of cultural and aesthetic representations. Many Fascists were aware of their affinity, as reflected in Fascist political staging, especially its symbolism and rituals. For instance, they not only wore uniforms in order to impress their opponents in domestic politics but also to demonstrate their claim to represent a transnational movement of warriors. In fact, Fascists shared a commitment to action (instead of discussion) and to political practice (instead of mere ideology) across political borders and cultural boundaries.[8] By no means accidentally, the adversaries of Fascist movements and regimes, too, emphasized the cross-border interchange and universal

claims of Fascism as much as did many of its leaders, members, and supporters in the 1920s and 1930s. Thus, George Orwell stated in 1937: "Fascism is now an international movement, which means not only that the Fascist nations can combine for purposes of loot, but that they are groping, perhaps only half-consciously as yet, towards a world system."[9]

After an overview of the impact of Italian Fascism in Europe in the 1920s and early 1930s, this chapter will highlight the increasing competition between the Italian Fascists and the National Socialists that characterized their relationship from 1933 to 1935. By the latter half of the 1930s, the Third Reich increasingly prevailed over Fascist Italy. Nevertheless, cooperation between the two regimes persisted, as did ties between them and smaller Fascist groups and movements in Europe. However, I will only touch briefly upon the Fascist collaboration that occurred during the Second World War since this complex issue has generated comprehensive and detailed historical research and merits a more detailed study.[10]

The Mesmerizing Power of Italian Fascism

In the 1920s, Mussolini's rule appeared to overcome the national frustration about the "mutilated victory" (*vittoria mutilata*) that seemed to have deprived Italy of major territorial gains, in particular at the northeastern border of the state. In a similar vein, Mussolini tapped the widespread anxiety over the intense social dislocation and political turmoil of the immediate postwar years in Italy. Yet the impact of Mussolini's much-hailed March on Rome and the *Duce's* regime, which had become a full-fledged dictatorship by 1925, transcended the confines of the Italian peninsula. Shocked by the hitherto unknown mass killings of the First World War, which had resulted from massive artillery fire and machine-guns, and dismayed by the postwar settlements and the economic slump of the early 1920s, many Europeans perceived Italian Fascism as a promising alternative to liberal democracies struck by party strife and social dislocation.[11] After Mussolini had successfully set up a full-fledged dictatorship in 1925, the *Duce* found an increasing number of admirers in European states as different as Britain, France, Germany, and Croatia. Thus, Rotha Lintorn Orman founded the *British Fascisti* in 1923, and Pierre Taittinger set up his *Jeunesses Patriotes* in France two years later. These groups and their leaders were attracted by Mussolini's promise to overcome the perennial party strife by strong leadership, ban class

conflicts in favor of corporate cooperation between the employers and workers, and eliminate ceaseless economic competition by protectionist policies. The vision of a "new era" and the ideal of the "new man" seemed to compare favorably to the performance of democratic governments. As these vague utopias were never clearly defined, they became nodal points for different and contradictory hopes for a better future. Appalled by the contradictions and frictions of liberal and capitalist modernity, the Fascist leaders strove for comprehensive renewal, which was to be achieved by instilling heroic vitality, imposing military order, and subordinating individuals to the community and state. Their hope for a fundamental reinvigoration of mankind was based on the cultural avant-garde, for instance, Filippo Marinetti's futurist movement. The ambivalent relationship of Fascism to modernity nourished different or contrary projections and lent the Italian Blackshirts their particular attractiveness across national and cultural borders.[12]

Even in seemingly strong parliamentary democracies like Britain, where the monarchical prerogative had been undermined as early as the seventeenth century, Italian Fascism met support and sympathy, not only among like-minded followers but also among more mainstream politicians, high officials, and journalists. In the 1920s, prominent Conservative politicians applauded Mussolini's anti-Socialist and anti-Communist stance and policies. Winston Churchill, for example, was clearly impressed by the Fascist regime, as he emphasized in his statement to the press during a visit to Italy in 1927:

> I could not help being charmed, like so many other people have been, by Signor Mussolini's gentle and simple bearing and by his calm and detached pose in spite of so many burdens and dangers....If I had been an Italian I should have been wholeheartedly with you from start to finish in your triumphant struggle against the bestial appetites and passions of Leninism.[13]

Frightened by the Bolshevik Revolution and appalled at the internationalist claims and policies of the Soviet rulers, conservatives hailed Italian Fascism as a bulwark against the Communist Third International that existed in various European states. However, support for the corporate state propagated by the *Duce* transcended the confines of the conservative establishment. Even to some Labour politicians, a corporate system of government promised to tame capitalism, shield Britons from economic disruption, and ensure

social stability. To some high-ranking officials in the British Foreign Office, Mussolini's adulation of the state and his emphasis on national strength seemed to compare favorably to liberalism and parliamentary democracy. They perceived Italian Fascism as a daring attempt to overcome the contradictions and obstructions on the road to Italy's political, economic, and social advancement. In 1926, Oliver Harvey of the Central Department of the British Foreign Office praised Mussolini's new labor legislation as the "most momentous experiment in industrial affairs in modern times." The British ambassador to Rome, Sir Ronald Graham, also attributed considerable achievements to the Fascist regime in the 1930s. Nevertheless, these officials did not propose to directly transfer and apply Italian Fascism to Britain, as they clearly recognized that the tradition of parliamentary rule was more deeply ingrained in that country than in Italy. Instead of discrediting the British Fascists by open support, Italian officials therefore pursued a more subtle strategy of increasing the influence of authoritarian and Fascist ideology on the British Isles.[14]

Despite some sympathy among members of the political and social establishment, unreserved enthusiasm for Italian Fascism was largely restricted to more like-minded rebels such as Oswald Mosley, who felt repelled and sidelined by the traditional elites. In the view of these marginal politicians, Fascist manliness and militaristic posture seemed to represent the transnational appeal of an activist force of renewal, a new vitality, and the promise of a dawning civilization. Thus, the new political style of a plebiscitary dictatorship and marching Italian Blackshirts aroused particular admiration. The adulation of violence and militarism, the glorification of heroic virility, and the cult of the *Duce* shaped propagandistic claims and public postures as much as the cult of Ancient Rome (*romanità*).[15] The myth of Roman civilization was designed to instill virtues like valor, justice, law, order, and dedication to collective rather than vested interests in its followers. Yet the propaganda for *romanità* exclusively served to enhance the political legitimacy of the new regime. Fascist Italy was to become the "new Rome." Italy's rulers integrated the legacy of Ancient Rome with their staging of the Fascist regime, for instance, by marches, warlike postures, and the cult of the *Duce*.[16] Unsurprisingly, the *Partizio Nazionale Fascista* (PNF), which had been officially founded in November 1921, became a model inspiring the foundation of Fascist groups and parties throughout Europe and beyond. Although Mussolini had officially declared that Fascism was not for export, he used Italian embassies as well as bogus companies in order to extend it beyond the confines of Italy. He sent his Blackshirts to places as far away as Hyderabad

in order to spread the ideas of Italian Fascism. The militant political style of the Fascists, which was to represent order and stability in the hierarchically structured corporate state proved to be especially attractive, as it symbolized the fundamental challenge to the "old" liberal world. According to a contemporary estimate, parties which designated themselves as Fascist had been founded in forty states by April 1925. Thus, Italy had become the center of a network of like-minded groups by the late 1920s. Although the relations between the Italian center and the minor or even miniscule Fascist groups were mostly unequal, they lent the project of Fascist Pan-Europeanism legitimacy by increasing cross-border exchange. This interaction was fostered by deliberate representations of Italian Fascism as a modern force of cross-border cultural renewal that appeared to pave the way to modernity without the pain and insecurity of destructive conflicts and ambiguities.[17]

Although Mussolini and his lieutenants initially emphasized the national character of Italian Fascism, their political ambitions clearly transcended the borders of Italy as early as the 1920s. They busily propagated the model of a new transnational European Fascist civilization purportedly embodied by their dictatorship. The *Duce,* therefore, encouraged Italian Fascists in Europe to support the new regime. Thus, organizations like the *Fasci Italiani all'Estero* that had been set up by the prominent Fascist Giuseppe Bastianini as early as 1923, not only integrated Italians living in foreign states into Italian Fascism but also represented and spread the regime's claim of a renewal of civilization. The central office of the ancillary organization in Rome was to promote Fascism in Europe, Asia, and Africa as well as in North and South America. Although they refrained from direct intervention into the politics of their host countries, the *Fasci* unequivocally espoused Mussolini's regime and propagated it as a model. However, because the Italian Foreign Ministry jealously opposed the activity of the organization, Mussolini decided to disband it in 1927. Only the ascendency of the National Socialists in Germany revitalized Mussolini's transnational initiative. Even before the *Duce* had openly committed himself to a "political and spiritual renewal of the world"[18] in 1932, Italian Blackshirts were delegated to foreign countries in order to mobilize support for the Fascist regime. In China, 400 out of the 430 Italian residents belonged to the branch of the *Fasci Italiani all'Estero* in Beijing. In Paris and New York, the activities of this organization were mainly pursued by blue-collar workers in the mid-1920s. Italian Fascists in foreign countries not only worked together to support Mussolini's dictatorships and thereby closed their

ranks against the liberals and democrats but also attempted to appeal to the indigenous populations.[19]

Not surprisingly, Rotha Lintorn Orman and Pierre Taittinger established organizations modeled on, but not identical to, the PNF. These groups borrowed those elements from Italian Fascism that suited their specific needs, which varied according to specific temporal and spatial conditions as well as particular contexts and constellations. Thus, the *British Fascisti* emphasized Fascist militancy on the brink of the General Strike of 1926, whereas Taittinger was mainly attracted by the concept of the corporate state in response to the turbulences of the economic crisis that shook France in the early 1920s. Italian Fascism was clearly appropriated according to the specific needs and conditions in the receiving societies. It also served as a political tool in the feud between competing Fascist groups in European countries. Thus, the *Action Française* (AF) embraced Italian Fascism and denounced its rival Fascist movements in France as deviations.[20]

On the Iberian Peninsula, too, Italian Fascism furthered the formation of Fascist groups. After Miguel Primo de Rivera had established his authoritarian dictatorship in Spain in 1923, Mussolini expressed his pride, as he claimed that Italian Fascism had served as a model to Spain. In fact, de Rivera's regime was seen as the first step to expand *fascismo* beyond the confines of Italy's borders. Yet the role of ideological bonds and political companionship did not remain uncontested in Italian politics. Whereas Arnaldo Mussolini, the *Duce*'s brother, espoused the virtues of Fascist camaraderie, Foreign Minister Dino Grandi emphasized the need to cooperate with Fascist and non-Fascist states and parties alike, as shown in his statement to the Fascist Grand Council on October 2, 1930. Benito Mussolini therefore refrained from directly intruding into Spanish politics in the 1920s, and he did not convey concrete political advice to Miguel Primo de Rivera. Yet the collapse of his dictatorship in January 1930, the ensuing abdication of King Alphons XIII in April 1931, and the proclamation of the Spanish Republic strengthened the proponents of Fascist Internationalism in Italy. In their determination to spread Fascism across national borders, they were to pave the way to Italy's intervention in the Spanish civil war five years later.[21]

Even before this decision was taken, Fascists in Italy and Spain had reinvigorated their friendship. In 1933, José Antonio Primo de Rivera, Miguel's son, had set up the *Falange Española* (FE). Although denying any connections to Italian Fascism, he visited Italy in May 1935 and accepted subsidies from the Fascist regime soon after the meeting. The *Falange* defended Italy's aggression in Abyssinia and fought for

the Nationalists in the Spanish civil war. The Spanish Fascists hoped to participate in the new world order, which they expected to establish alongside victorious Italy and Germany and through which Spain was to reemerge as a world power. But the high-flying hopes of the *Falangists* were dashed by Franco, who submerged them in his military regime (*Junta de defensa nacional*), in April 1937.[22]

Italian Fascism had struck a particularly strong chord among German nationalist conservatives and *völkisch* groups that hoped to bring about antiparliamentarian authoritarian rule in a strong state. Thus, members of the *Nationalsozialistische Arbeiterpartei* (National Socialist Workers' Party) who were asked to name great personalities of history in an opinion poll in 1929 placed Mussolini third, behind Bismarck and Hitler.[23] However, the *Führer*'s movement only aroused considerable attention among leading Italian Fascists after it had won 36.9 percent of the vote in the *Reichstag* elections of July 31, 1932.[24]

As he felt challenged by the ascending rival movement, *Duce* openly committed himself to intensified cross-border propaganda for the Italian model in 1932. To buttress his claim to political leadership in Europe, Mussolini started to subsidize Fascists in foreign countries. In 1933–1934, for instance, Italian Ambassador Dino Grandi passed considerable funds to the British Union of Fascists (BUF), which had been officially founded by former Conservative and Labour politician Sir Oswald Mosley after his visit to Rome in October 1932. The British Fascists initially received considerable support from sections of the establishment that were disenchanted by Stanley Baldwin's uninspiring leadership of the Conservative Party. Thus, Lord Rothermere's *Daily Mail* glorified the British Blackshirts in 1934 as a force of comprehensive renewal. As a sympathizer of the National Socialist rulers of Germany, Rothermere was joined by Lord Beaverbrook, the owner of the *Daily Express* and its reporter in Berlin, Sefton Delmer, who apparently viewed the German "Fascists" as a vanguard of an international movement. Beaverbrook and his rising journalist, who had met Hitler and entertained a personal friendship with leading National Socialists like Ernst Röhm, only abandoned their support after the Night of the Long Knives, which practically coincided with Mosley's violent Olympia Hall meeting in June 1934. These appalling events led conservatives in Britain and many other European states to gradually distance themselves from the BUF and Fascism in general. Nevertheless, the *Duce* continued to subsidize some other Fascist groups and parties in Europe like the Austrian *Heimwehr* and the Belgian *Rexists* of Léon Degrelle.[25]

As these examples show, Italian Fascism was not exclusively perceived as a national movement but as a transnational Pan-European force of renewal. Thus, even ardent proponents of a European federation like Austrian Count Richard Nikolaus Graf Coudenhove-Kalergi were seduced by Mussolini's regime, which seemed to open up the prospect of political, cultural, and spiritual renewal.[26]

The Unexpected Rival in the Fascist Universe: National Socialism

In 1933–1934, Hitler managed to gain almost total political control over Germany within a few months. Unexpectedly faced by a mighty rival, Mussolini therefore attempted to strengthen ties to the anti-Semites of the Romanian Iron Guard; Ferenc Szálasi's Hungarian Arrow Cross Party; and the Croat *Ustaša* movement of Ante Pavelić, who had found refuge in Italy after King Alexandar had set up his royal dictatorship in Yugoslavia in 1929. In fact, the Fascist regime in Rome financially supported the *Ustaša,* which participated in the assassination of Yugoslav King Alexandar in Marseille in October 1934. Sponsoring the Fascists of South Eastern Europe allowed the Italian regime to claim cultural and political superiority vis-à-vis Nazi Germany. Indeed, as Mussolini's prestige as the "founding father" of Fascism declined in the 1930s, he resorted to glorifying Italian culture and the legacy of ancient Rome in order to support his claims of political predominance.[27]

The *Duce* also ordered the intensification of a propaganda campaign to strengthen support for the Italian model of Fascism throughout Europe.[28] According to the doctrine of spiritual renewal (*Novismo*), the Fascists were to establish the global order of the "new man." Although important episodes of Italy's history such as national unification were glorified in celebrations like the adulation of Giuseppe Garibaldi, fifty years after his death (1932), Fascism was represented as a unique event in Italian and world history. In fact, the Fascist regime continued to arouse interest and enthusiasm in the early 1930s, as demonstrated by the visits of European Fascists who came to Italy in order to see the Exposition of the Fascist Revolution, which opened exactly ten years after the March on Rome. Before entering the rooms of the *Mostra della rivoluzione fascista* (Exhibition on the Fascist Revolution), which attracted over 2.8 million visitors from 1932 to 1934, visitors were confronted with a huge façade decorated with *fasci*. These symbols represented the regime as a modern force

but also symbolized Fascism's identification with the past. According to the weekly magazine *Il Popolo d'Italia*, the façade represented "the enormous weight of Fascism which throws itself on the paths of history to influence all." Media-like newsreels usually shown in cinemas but also in public places further disseminated the image of Italian Fascism as a force of transnational resurrection. Linking his pride in the power of the exhibit with his vision of the strength of Italian Fascism, Mussolini reportedly boasted that Europe "will be fascist or fascistized" in ten years as he terminated his inaugural visit to the *Mostra* on October 29, 1932.[29]

Mussolini continued to claim predominance in the political camp of the European Fascists, in particular in competition with the ascending National Socialism. Despite their rivalry, considerable mutual acrimony, and the failure to institutionalize top-level Fascist collaboration in the CAUR in 1934, however, collaboration between Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy continued and intensified in specific fields. Thus, the National Socialist leisure organization *Kraft durch Freude* (Strength Through Joy) was largely modeled on the Fascist leisure organization, the *Dopolavoro*, which had been established in May 1925 as a state agency that was to unify and run the recreational clubs of the Fascist syndicates. The Italian Fascists promoted the social policies pursued after their seizure of power in the International Labor Organization (*Internationale Arbeitsorganisation*), which had been installed according to the terms of the Versailles Peace Treaty of 1919 in Geneva. As an agency of knowledge transfer, the organization advocated the combination of state policies in order to transform leisure activities without abandoning individual freedom. In this institutional framework of cross-border cooperation, Italian experts had succeeded in impressing their German colleagues with the *Dopolavoro*. It was only in 1933–1934 that the National Socialists clearly disentangled their *Deutsche Arbeitsfront* (DAF, Nazi Work Organization) from the model of Italian social policies. After the rapprochement between Italy and Germany that culminated in the formation of the Berlin-Rome Axis on October 25, 1936, political rivalry coincided with increasing cross-border exchange between Italy's Fascists and German National Socialists.[30]

The Way to War and Collaboration

The rapprochement between Fascist Italy and the Third Reich in 1935 and 1936 promised new possibilities for collaboration between the

two major powers and seemed to promote the project of a Fascist universal. Italy's invasion of Abyssinia had completely isolated Italy in international politics, as the unequivocal indictment of the League of Nations and the ensuing embargo of the Italian peninsula clearly demonstrated. Italy's isolation encouraged the Fascist nation to seek a closer relationship with Nazi Germany. As a result, from 1935 onward, major democratic European statesmen had to face the prospect of an Italo-German alliance. Hitler and Mussolini increasingly portrayed themselves as allies and, later, even friends. The common support for the Nationalist insurrection of General Francisco Franco against the Republican government in Spain strengthened ties between the Italian Fascists and German Nazis. Indeed, the Spanish civil war became an important arena of transnational collaboration between European Fascists from diverse countries. Thus, Eion O'Duffy sent 700 Irish "Blueshirts" to Spain in order to beat the Republicans. The Rumanian Iron Guard also provided soldiers for the Spanish Nationalists and their backbone, the *Falangists*. The influential Legionaries Ion Moţa and Vasile Marin, who were killed in combat near Majadahonda in December 1936, became martyrs in Francoist Spain and Rumania. By and large, Fascist support for the Spanish Nationalists was encouraged by the strong sentiments of anti-Communism existing in Western democracies and the indifference of the French and British governments to the conflict.[31]

Yet the German-Italian friendship was marred by power politics. The increasing dependency of Fascist Italy on Nazi Germany directly affected the development of the minor Fascist groups in Europe. Despite their initial reservations about the expansionist program espoused by the National Socialists, many European Fascists had enthusiastically applauded Hitler's seizure of power. Directed by Ernst Bohle, the *Auslandsorganisation* (AO) of the NSDAP nourished and controlled the activities of its branches in many foreign countries. The leaders of the Fascist movements of France and the Netherlands, therefore, did not hesitate to approach the new rulers of Germany in 1933. After they had rapidly established their undisputed dictatorship in 1933–1934, the Nazis managed to increase their influence among European Fascists. The seemingly unbeatable Third Reich assumed the status of the dominant model, increasingly surpassing Italian Fascism. The turn to anti-Semitism and racism was largely due to the growing attractiveness of National Socialism to the radical Right throughout Europe. In the Netherlands, for instance, Anton Mussert's *Nationaal Socialistische Beweging* (NSB), which had initially been inspired by Italian Fascism, launched a propaganda campaign

against the Jews in 1935. Anti-Semitism was particularly promoted among Dutch Fascists by Rost van Tonningen, who was received by Hitler in Berlin in August 1936.[32]

In a similar vein, the BUF was renamed the British Union of Fascists and National Socialists in 1936. Mosley's party had openly adopted anti-Semitism and increasingly abandoned the ideal of the corporate state that the British Fascists had initially espoused. In the summer of 1936, the party was granted a subvention of 10,000 pounds by Hitler who was also involved in Mosley's secret marriage to Diana Mosley in Berlin in October 1936. The Belgian *Rexists* of Leon Dégrelle, who had initially been supported by Mussolini, also received German subventions in the mid-1930s.[33]

Altogether, personal contacts, financial subventions, visits to Germany as well as cultural events organized by friendship societies like the Anglo-German Fellowship, and bilateral associations like the German-French Society and the German-Dutch Society tied European Fascists ever more firmly to the Third Reich. The increasing rivalry between the Fascist and Nazi regimes by no means excluded pragmatic cooperation. In fact, close interaction between the two nations continued in a number of policy fields. Not coincidentally, German Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels complained about the flurry of visits of high-ranking Fascists and National Socialists between Italy and Germany in 1937. Apparently, he felt excluded by the exchange and reacted with envy and scorn to the increasing exchange between high-ranking leaders and members of the state parties that ruled the two countries.[34]

As the Second World War approached, Fascist calls for European "unity," and "peace" became more urgent. Thus, Oswald Mosley, who had pleaded for a "European synthesis within the universalism of Fascism and National Socialism," as early as 1936, demanded that his fellow Fascists in the BUF supersede political divisions in Europe, yet on the terms of Italy and the Third Reich. According to Mosley, the Nazi and Fascist rulers were to be allowed to expand in Eastern and Southern Europe, whereas Britain was to maintain its Empire.[35] Following the German occupation of Norway, the Netherlands, Belgium, and France and Italy's entry into the war, high-level exchange between Fascists was increasingly reduced to military cooperation and open support for the collaboration. Exchange between the indigenous Fascists and the German or Italian occupiers increasingly bordered on national treason, at least according to the exiled monarchs and governments of Norway and the Netherlands in London and politicians like Charles de Gaulle. In 1940, scares of subversion led to

the internment of Fascists in states like Britain. In occupied Europe, volunteers were recruited to the German Army and to the armed SS in different European states, and many Fascists consented to defend the European "fortress" against "Bolshevism." As early as 1941–1942, 43,000 foreign volunteers joined German military forces in their fight against the Soviet Union. Even from nonbelligerent, and then neutral, Spain, a "Blue Division" of volunteers flocked to the German army in order support its soldiers in their military crusade against the Soviet troops from 1941 to 1944. In late 1944, 763,000 soldiers had been recruited in the territories annexed by Germany alone. Clearly, Pan-Europeanism was not only espoused by liberals and democrats but also exploited by the Fascists.[36]

The Shock Waves of the Interwar Right: Europe and Beyond

In the global confrontation of the Second World War, Fascist transnationalism increasingly transcended the confines of Europe. Yet movements and groups that were inspired by Hitler's and Mussolini's regimes appropriated Fascist doctrines more selectively than their European counterparts. In organizational terms, too, they were mostly only loosely connected to European Fascist parties. Nevertheless, some political ideas and the political style of the Fascists were adopted in the non-European world. The collaboration of Subhas Chandra Bose, in India, for instance, highlighted the intricacies of nationalism and the pitfalls of misguided anti-colonialism. Bose, who had initially espoused a doctrine that was to fuse Communist and Fascist ideas (*Samyavada*), turned to Mussolini in the 1930s, set up the Indian Legion in Berlin in 1941, and finally reconstituted the Indian National Army under Japanese tutelage in Burma. Hindu nationalists like the leader of the pro-Nazi, militant Mahasabha party, V. D. Savarkar (1883–1966); K. B. Hedgewar (1889–1940); B. S. Moonje (1872–1948); and M. S. Golwalkar (1906–1973), too, showed strong leanings toward European Fascism. In particular, they were deeply impressed by the seemingly irresistible advance of Fascist Italy and National Socialist Germany. These Hindu nationalists appropriated features of these regimes that seemed to be amenable and adaptable to the prevailing preconditions in India and corresponded to their overriding political aim to free India from the shackles of Britain's colonial domination.[37]

Mohammed Amin el-Husseini, the Mufti of Jerusalem who had strongly opposed Jewish immigration into Palestine, met Hitler and Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop on November 28, 1941,

and thus allied himself even closer to the Third Reich. The Mufti of Jerusalem was particularly susceptible to the anti-imperialist propaganda of the Nazi regime, which made plans to instigate an insurrection against British rule in Palestine. Although he still rejected Husseini's demands for an official German declaration in support of Arab independence from Britain in late 1941, he explained his plans for a two-pronged attack on the British forces in the Middle East following a German victory in Egypt and the Caucasus. As the *Führer* also made clear to the Mufti, this would immediately lead to the annihilation of the Jews in Palestine. The Mufti shared the fanatical anti-Semitism of the Nazis and the objective to exterminate the Jews. He also supported German interventions against plans for the deportation of Bulgarian, Rumanian, and Hungarian Jews to Palestine. Not least, el-Husseini seized the opportunity to recruit Muslims for special units of the *Waffen-SS*. Altogether, the Nazis succeeded in establishing strong bonds to the official Palestinian leaders by appealing to the traditions of Islam, selectively appropriating and thus suggesting their compatibility with Nazi ideology and policies.[38]

Although German National Socialism had become the predominant model by the late 1930s, Italian Fascism continued to be attractive to political systems beyond the realm of Fascism. In particular, authoritarian rulers in Europe and beyond proved susceptible to some claims, ideas, and concepts of Fascist leaders. In South European states as well as in Latin America, Fascist ideology, militant action, and the political style of fighting squads inspired military dictatorships that strove to combat Marxism and Communism, secure national cohesion, and restore social accommodation. As they did not aim at large-scale political mobilization, the extermination of minorities, and the occupation of vast territories, National Socialism was less amenable to these dictators than Italian Fascism.

Because Mussolini's regime refrained from totalitarian policies, it served as a model for regimes that imposed authoritarian rule supplemented by Fascist policies. Thus, the Brazilian Integralists, who converged with the nationalists in the 1930s, espoused a strong state and corporatism. The Brazilian Integralist Action (AIB), in particular, did not conceal their sympathy with Mussolini's Fascist regime. The AIB was supported by the middle and working classes that had been hit hard by the political, social, and cultural crisis that occurred in Brazil after the end of the First World War. Although the AIB never came to power, the disaffection that had promoted the movement finally enabled General Getúlio Vargas to establish his "New State" (*Estado Novo*) in November 1937. He banned all political parties,

including the AIB, which was repressed after its leaders' attempts to topple Vargas had failed. The Brazilian dictator finally abolished the oligarchic Republic altogether in favor of a military dictatorship, in order to integrate the Brazilian people into a "strong nation-state" and a corporative system. The populist alliance between the state, the proletariat, and the bourgeoisie aimed to restrict regionalism and secure national integration as well as social cohesion. Sharing the strong nationalism of European fascists, their anti-Communism, anti-liberalism, rejection of capitalism and plutocratic rule, as well as their myth of social transformation, Vargas also emphasized his allegiance to traditional Brazilian values. Yet the liberal opposition succeeded in ousting Vargas from power in 1945. Altogether, the *Estado Novo* showed distinct traits of "Fascist internationalism."[39]

In a similar vein, Juan Perón, who served as a military attaché in Italy from 1938 to 1940, strongly admired many aspects of Mussolini's Fascist dictatorship. Before he established his regime in 1946, he had allegedly emphasized, "Mussolini was the greatest man of our times, but he made some disastrous mistakes. I shall follow in his steps, while avoiding his pitfalls." Perón was particularly impressed by the "national socialism" of "revolutionary" Fascism, which was to secure "social justice" and give birth to a "new society."[40] Workers were to be given rights and mobilized in order to legitimize the military dictatorship that had been set up in Argentina in 1943. Elected to office in 1946, Péron drew upon the extreme right-wing doctrines of the *Nacionalista* movement. He adopted policies pursued by Franco in Spain and Vargas in Brazil and fused foreign influences from Fascist Italy and Franco's Spain with Argentine beliefs such as Catholic social ideas of "harmony" and "distributive justice." His regime was based on a strong populist movement and officially strove for an organic society, a "third way" between capitalism and Communism, the expansion of the military forces, and national unity. Perón's espousal of authoritarian rule was triggered and responded to an unprecedented nationalist and populist mobilization of the working classes. Like Vargas, Péron established an authoritarian regime that adopted some policies of Fascism.[41]

Apart from direct transnational collaboration between Fascists, Fascist Italy and the Reich aroused admiration, awe, and occasionally even sympathy among non-Fascists. Apart from their unequivocal anti-Communism, the social policies pursued by these regimes, their seemingly unshakable political stability, and the quest for national regeneration met strong support in parliamentary democracies. Occasionally, liberal elites were anxious to "learn from the enemy."[42]

These more indirect influences transcended Europe. In the United States, for instance, Italian Fascism seemed to contrast favorably to the economic turmoil and social dislocation that had resulted from the devastating economic slump in the early 1930s. Anti-Bolshevism, in particular, fueled support for Fascist Italy and General Francisco Franco's Spanish Nationalists in their fight against the Republicans (1936–1939). Against the backdrop of the Great Depression, magazines like the *Atlantic Monthly* demanded order and security. Its editor, Ellery Sedgwick, "recognized Fascism as a proven antidote to Communist infection, and admired what he saw as the vigorous order of a corporatist dictatorship in contrast to the failing chaos of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal." Similarly, not only openly pro-Nazi organizations like the Friends of New Germany (later renamed the German-American Bund) and the German-American Protective Alliance—but also anti-Communist movements such as the National Civic Federation—sympathized with key objectives of the Nazis. Ultimately, they were to pave the way to the anti-totalitarianism of the cold war.[43] Not least, the anti-Komintern that Nazi Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels had established in 1933 propagated anti-Bolshevism in Spain, Scandinavia, Western Europe, and South America. By contrast, semi-independent organizations like Ulrich Fleischhauer's anti-Semitic news bulletin *Weltdienst*, which was founded in 1933, had fallen into disrepute in the Third Reich by the late 1930s. Fleischhauer had rejected demands from an official of the Propaganda Ministry to subordinate his agency to official policies. His organization was ultimately taken over by Alfred Rosenberg's *Außenpolitisches Amt* of the NSDAP.[44]

Fascist and Nazi schemes to reduce unemployment proved to be a particularly fertile field of interest beyond Germany's borders. President Roosevelt asked the U.S. Embassy in Berlin to produce a detailed report of the activities of the (obligatory) Nazi labor organization in 1938. Although the Civilian Conservation Corps, which he had founded in 1933, was a voluntary organization and thus starkly contrasted with the *Reichsarbeitsdienst* (RAD), the Nazi work schemes impressed Roosevelt. Selective borrowing rather than learning or imitation also motivated Swedish liberals like Bertil Ohlin to study the RAD.[45] Influential British visitors to the Third Reich, like former Liberal leader David Lloyd George (1936) and the Duke of Windsor (1937), were also strongly interested in the Nazi labor camps, as well. Journalists such as the correspondent of the *Daily Express* in Berlin, Sefton Delmer, too, praised the labor camps that had been established in the Third Reich. Not least, British observers attributed the physical

strength and enthusiasm of young Germans to the training programs that the Hitler Youth pursued in the Nazi state.[46]

In a similar vein, the Nazis did achieve some success in their propaganda for the DAF. In March 1939, British Foreign Secretary Lord Halifax wrote a preface to the organization's international journal *Freude und Arbeit*. In their efforts to replace the International Labour Organization, DAF functionaries employed their social policies as a political weapon that they directed against the Western democracies. During the Second World War, the rulers of the Third Reich reinforced their appeals to like-minded Europeans in order to recruit willing collaborators in the occupied countries. They thereby challenged their adversaries. Some social policy initiatives taken by the Western Allies, such as the Beveridge Plan of November 1942, at least partially reflected the need to counter Nazi propaganda. Altogether, the wide-ranging claims of the DAF seem to have had a bee sting effect.[47]

Conclusion

Fascists in Europe oscillated between Pan-Europeanism on the one hand and hypernationalism on the other. After Mussolini's spectacular March on Rome, Italian Fascism served as a model for like-minded Fascists in Europe. From the mid-1930s onward, however, the minor Fascist movements and groups accommodated themselves to the seemingly superior National Socialist regime. Cross-border interaction between Fascists remained significant, thus preparing and facilitating wartime collaboration. The Fascists not only regarded and portrayed themselves as the vanguard of a new universal creed, but they also developed a sense of common destiny. Again, more on this could be said earlier, too. Even beyond Europe, they fused foreign influences with indigenous traditions. Moreover, the populist military dictatorships of Latin America not only demonstrated the complex and flexible profile of "Fascism" but also the attractiveness that Italian Fascism and National Socialism exerted around the world. The impact of the two regimes materialized in direct, though selected, transfers and inspired various attempts to coordinate their policies among themselves.[48]

Although power politics and hypernationalism marginalized the universalistic aspirations of Fascists and cross-border exchange, it would be too easy to write the transnational history of the radical Right from 1918 to 1945 exclusively from hindsight. Thus, a tight analytical separation of Fascist movements and regimes in the various nation-states is misleading. Instead of reiterating the national

paradigm in historiography, scholars should highlight the cross-border exchange, interaction, and cooperation between Fascists in Europe. Apart from comparison, the more recent approaches to the investigation of interconnectedness and entanglements in modern history are particularly apt to analytically grasp this dimension of Fascism, which has been largely neglected in historiography.[49]

This approach also highlights the ambivalent and even ambiguous nature of ideas, concepts, and ideologies of European unity, which have served different political purposes in the course of the twentieth century. They have been employed by democratic governments and dictatorial rulers alike. Although the gulf between the political systems should not be ignored, historians need to realize the multifaceted nature of claims to promote the project of European unity. By no means coincidentally, some concepts that the Nazis had been able to spread beyond Germany's borders and beyond the confines of their sphere of power in the Second World War were taken up by some mainstream politicians in Europe as late as the 1950s. For instance, the concepts of economic planning, autarky, and social regulation that were important roots of the European Economic Community had also been proposed by the German National Socialists as well as the Italian Fascists. Although these continuities should not be overstated, and Europeans cherished their national independence in the immediate postwar years, a tight separation between a "democratic" and a "dictatorial" Europe would be misplaced. All in all, the transnational dimension of Fascism merits serious consideration in historical scholarship.[50]

Studies of the transnational radical Right in interwar Europe, and beyond, are a healthy warning of the possible pitfalls of Europeanism, transnationalism, and globalism. As the findings of this chapter demonstrate, these concepts are normatively ambivalent. Fascists not only interacted within the frameworks of their own nation-states but also worked beyond their borders. Concepts and ideas of transnational cooperation were not only embraced by liberals in democratic states but also by Fascist regimes and movements. Contrary to dominant strands of historical research and historiography, "transnationalism" is therefore to be conceived as a politically polyvalent concept and includes those on the Right. Moreover, this chapter has demonstrated the crucial role of Fascist political practice and style, which were at least as significant as ideology and programmatic statements in advancing the doctrine. Notwithstanding their hypernationalistic doctrines, Fascists did interact across national borders and cultural boundaries. The performance of the Fascists themselves therefore

merit more detailed studies if historians are to grasp the contours of the transnational Right in Europe and beyond, in the interwar years.

Notes

1. *Ursachen und Folgen: Vom deutschen Zusammenbruch 1918 und 1945 bis zur staatlichen Neuordnung Deutschlands in der Gegenwart* (Berlin: Wendler, 1966), pp. 507–12.

2. In October 1936, Italy and Germany had agreed on the terms of an alliance. This Berlin-Rome Axis was to be followed by the "Pact of Steel," which was concluded in 1939. Japan joined the alliance between Italy and Germany in 1940. See MacGregor Knox, *Common Destiny: Dictatorship, Foreign Policy, and War in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Jens Petersen, *Hitler-Mussolini. Die Entstehung der Achse-Rom 1933–1936* (Tübingen: Niemeyer Max Verlag, 1973); Paul Baxa, "Capturing the Fascist Moment: Hitler's Visit to Italy in 1938 and the Radicalization of Fascist Italy," *Journal of Contemporary History* 42 (2007), pp. 227–42. For overviews, see MacGregor Knox, "Fascism: Ideology, Foreign Policy, and War," Adrian Lyttelton (ed.), *Liberal and Fascist Italy 1900–1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 105–38, at pp. 123–33; Philip Morgan, *Fascism in Europe, 1919–1945* (London: Routledge, 2003), pp. 144–58. For a review, see Robert Mallett, "The Fascist Challenge Dissected," *Historical Journal* 44 (2001), pp. 859–62.

3. Walter Laqueur, *Fascism. Past, Present, Future* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 218. For similar interpretations, see Wolfgang Schieder, "Einleitung," idem, *Faschistische Diktaturen. Studien zu Italien und Deutschland* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2008), pp. 7–28, at p. 16; Jerzy Borejsza, "Die Rivalität zwischen Faschismus und Nationalsozialismus in Ostmitteleuropa," *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 29 (1981), pp. 579–614, esp. p. 607; Radu Ioanid, *The Sword of the Archangel: Fascist Ideology in Romania* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1990), p. 190; Hans Woller, *Rom, 28. Oktober 1922. Die faschistische Herausforderung* (Munich: Dtv, 1999), pp. 172–73; Jerzy W. Borejsza, *Schulen des Hasses. Faschistische Systeme in Europa* (Frankfurt/Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1999), p. 267; Morgan, *Fascism*, p. 159.

4. The CAUR had been initiated by Fascist functionary Asvero Gravelli, who edited the journal *Ottobre*. Gravelli spearheaded a group of Fascist leaders who aspired to redefine Italian Fascism as a youthful movement that was to mobilize support throughout Europe. Directed against the new National Socialist regime, the CAUR was to spread Fascist Italy's claim to represent a universal force of *cultural* renewal. Yet a conference of Fascist leaders (including Vidkun Quisling, Oswald Mosley, General Eion O'Duffy, and Marcel Bucard) in Montreux in December 1934 failed to achieve unity, largely due to different views on the importance of anti-Semitism. Neither did another meeting of Fascist leaders in Amsterdam in April 1935 arrive at

binding decisions. On the CAUR, see Michael A. Ledeen, *Universal Fascism. The Theory and Practice of the Fascist International, 1928–1936* (New York: Howard Fertig, 1972), esp. 104–32; idem, Italian Fascism and Youth, in *Journal of Contemporary History* 4 (1969), pp. 137–54.

5. For methodological considerations on historical comparison and transfer studies, see Hartmut Kaelble and Jürgen Schriewer (eds.), *Vergleich und Transfer. Komparatistik in den Sozial-, Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften* (Frankfurt/Main: Campus Verlag, 2003), pp. 469–93; Jürgen Kocka, "Comparison and Beyond," *History and Theory* 42 (2003), pp. 39–44. Also see Deborah Cohen and Maura O'Connor, "Introduction: Comparative History, Cross-National History, Transnational History–Definitions," idem (eds.), *Comparison and History. Europe in Cross-National Perspective* (New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. IX–XXIV; Jürgen Kocka, "Comparison and Beyond," *History and Theory* 42 (2003), pp. 39–44; Shalini Randeria, "Entangled Histories of Uneven Modernities: Civil Society, Caste Solidarities and Legal Pluralism in Post-Colonial India," Yehuda Elkana et al. (eds.), *Unraveling Ties. From Social Cohesion to New Practices of Connectedness* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2002), pp. 284–311; Philipp Ther, Beyond the Nation: The Relational Basis of a Comparative History of Germany and Europe," *Central European History* 36 (2003), pp. 45–73; Michael Werner/Bénédicte Zimmermann, "Beyond Comparison: *Histoire Croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity," *History and Theory* 45 (2006), pp. 30–50; idem (eds.), *De la comparaison à l'histoire croisée* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 2004).

6. For a contrary view, cf. Roger Eatwell, "Introduction: New Styles of Dictatorship and Leadership in Interwar Europe," *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 7 (2006), No. 2, pp. 127–37, p. 128.

7. Gary Love, "What's the Big Idea?' Oswald Mosley, the British Union of Fascists and Generic Fascism," *Journal of Contemporary History* 42 (2007), pp. 447–68, at pp. 449, 455, 460, 467. For an overview, cf. Arnd Bauerkämper, A New Consensus? Recent Research on Fascism in Europe, 1918–1945, in *History Compass* 4 (2006), pp. 1–31. Transfers not systematically dealt with by Roger Eatwell, *Fascism. A History* (London: Allen Lane, 1995); Kevin Passmore, *Fascism. A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); Robert Paxton, *The Anatomy of Fascism* (New York: Knopf, 2004); Martin Blinkhorn, *Fascism and the Right in Europe 1919–1945* (Harlow: Longman, 2000); Stanley Payne, *A History of Fascism 1914–1945* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995); Peter Davies and Derek Lynch, *The Routledge Companion to Fascism and the Far Right* (London: Routledge, 2002). See, however, the chapters in Philipp Morgan, *Fascism in Europe, 1919–1945* (London: Routledge, 2003), pp. 159–89; Arnd Bauerkämper, *Faschismus in Europa, 1918–1945* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2006), pp. 166–82; Woller, 28. Oktober 1922, pp. 148–90; Borejsza, Schulen, pp. 166–82. For more explicit comparisons and transfer studies, cf. the contributions to Armin Nolzen and Sven Reichardt (eds.), *Faschismus in Deutschland und Italien. Studien zu Transfer und Vergleich* (Göttingen 2005).

8. See, for instance, Oswald Mosley, Fascism in Britain, Westminster [1935], p. 11: "We have had enough talk; we will act!"

9. George Orwell, *The Road to Wigan Pier* (London: Penguin Books, 2001 [1937]), p. 200. Also see Dietrich Orlow, "Fascists among Themselves: Some Observations on West European Politics in the 1930s," *European Review* 11 (2003), pp. 245–66, at pp. 245, 247, 250.

10. See, for instance, David Littlejohn, *The Patriotic Traitors. A History of Collaboration in German-Occupied Europe, 1940–45* (London: Heinemann, 1972); Hans Frederic Dahl, *Quisling. A Study in Treachery* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). Apart from its moralistic connotations, "collaboration" subsumes a multitude of motivations, political initiatives, and adaptations. As a concept of historical investigations, it is therefore of limited value. See Tatjana Tönsmeyer, "Kollaboration als handlungsleitendes Motiv? Die slowakische Elite und das NS-Regime," in Christoph Dieckmann/Babette Quinkert/Tatjana Tönsmeyer (eds.), *Kooperation und Verbrechen. Formen der „Kollaboration" im östlichen Europa 1939–1945* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2003), pp. 169–84, at pp. 27, 53.

11. Italy had suffered a humiliating defeat against Austrian and German troops at Caporetto in October 1917. At the Versailles Peace Conference, Prime Minister Vittorio Emanuele Orlando secured only minor territorial gains for Italy. By contrast, Italian revisionists like poet Gabriele D'Annunzio called for the annexation of the city of Trieste (Fiume), in particular. In 1919–1920, strikes and unrest had also been due to rising unemployment and inflation. Altogether, the political social and economic transition from war to peace largely foundered in Italy. See H. James Burgwyn, *The Legend of the Mutilated Victory. Italy, the Great War and the Paris Peace Conference, 1915–1919* (Westport/Conn.: Greenwood Pub Group, 1993); Adrian Lyttelton, *The Seizure of Power. Fascism in Italy 1919–1929*, second edition (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987), pp. 42–76.

12. Roger Griffin, Roger, *Modernism and Fascism. The Sense of a Beginning under Mussolini and Hitler* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), esp. p. 215–16; Roger Eatwell, *Fascism. A History* (London: Chatto Windus, 1995), pp. 5, 11; Wolfgang Schieder, "Die Geburt des Faschismus aus der Krise der Moderne," Christof Dipper (ed.), *Deutschland und Italien 1860–1960. Politische und kulturelle Aspekte im Vergleich* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2005), pp. 159–79.

13. Richard J. B. Bosworth, "The British Press, the Conservatives, and Mussolini, 1920–34," *Journal of Contemporary History* 5 (1970), pp. 163–82, at p. 173.

14. Peter G. Edwards, "The Foreign Office and Fascism 1924–1929," *Journal of Contemporary History* 5 (1970), pp. 153–61, at p. 154 (quote).

15. Mussolini also funded excavations in Rome and staged huge exhibitions like the *Mostra Augustea della Romanità*, which commemorated the 2,000th birthday of Emperor Augustus in 1937. Occasionally, Mussolini was even hailed as a "second Caesar." See Romke Visser, "Fascist Doctrine and the Cult of the *Romanità*," *Journal of Contemporary History* 27 (1992), pp. 5–22, esp. pp. 6, 10, 13, 17; Wolfgang Schieder, "Rom—die Repräsentation der

Antike im Faschismus," idem (ed.), *Diktaturen*, pp. 125–46, 492–93. On the *Mostra Augustea*, see Friedemann Scriba, *Augustus im Schwarzhemd? Die Mostra Augustea della Romnità in Rom 1937/38* (Frankfurt/Main: P. Lang, 1995), esp. pp. 383–97, 516. For a survey of historical exhibitions in Fascist Italy, cf. Hans-Ulrich Thamer, Die Repräsentation der Diktatur. Geschichts- und Propagandaausstellungen im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland und im faschistischen Italien, Christof Dipper/Rainer Hudemann (eds.), Faschismus und Faschismen im Vergleich. Wolfgang Schieder zum 60. Geburtstag (Cologne: SH-Verlag, 1998), pp. 229–47.

16. Piero Melograni, "The Cult of the Duce in Mussolini's Italy," *Journal of Contemporary History* 11 (1976), pp. 221–37; Maria Fraddosio, "The Fallen Hero: The Myth of Mussolini and Fascist Women in the Italian Social Republic," *Journal of Contemporary History* 31 (1996), pp. 99–124; Romke Visser, "Fascist Doctrine and the Cult of the *Romanità*," *Journal of Contemporary History* 27 (1992), pp. 5–22; Davies / Lynch, *Campanion*, p. 102. For an example, see Friedemann Scriba, *Augustus im Schwarzhemd? Die Mostra Augustea della Romanità in Rom 1937/38* (Frankfurt/Main: P. Lang, 1995).

17. Roger Griffin, *Modernism and Fascism. The Sense of a Beginning under Mussolini and Hitler* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), esp. pp. 15–42, 347–60. Also see Denis Mack Smith, *Mussolini* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1981), p. 108: Morgan, *Fascism*, p. 162; Woller, *Rom*, pp. 59–60, 97. Corporativism as a basis of a "Fascist International" was particularly highlighted by Ugo Spirito. See Roger Griffin (ed.), *Fascism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 68–69.

18. Griffin (ed.), *Fascism*, p. 73.

19. Luca de Caprariis, " 'Fascism for Export'? The Rise and Eclipse of the Fasci Italiani all'Estero," *Journal of Contemporary History* 35 (2000), pp. 151–83, pp. 152–54, 159–60, 177. For a case study, see Claudia Baldoni*, Exporting Fascism: Italian Fascists and Britain's Italians in the 1930s* (Oxford: Berg, 2003), pp. 9, 27, 25, 187, idem, "Anglo-Italian Fascist Solidarity? The Shift from Italophilia to Naziphilia in the BUF," Julie V. Gottlieb and Thomas P. Lineham (eds.), *The Culture of Fascism: Visions of the Far Right in Britain* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2004), pp. 147–61, p. 148.

20. Kevin Passmore, *From Liberalism to Fascism. The Right in a French Province, 1928–1939* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 306 (quote); Joel Blatt, "Relatives and Rival: The Response of the Action Française to Italian Fascism, 1919–26," *European Studies Review* 11 (1981), pp.263–92. Also see Robert Soucy, *French Fascism: The First Wave, 1924–1933* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), pp.65–66, 109; idem, *French Fascism: The Second Wave 1933–1939* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), pp.19, 140, 148. On the *British Fascisti*, see Richard Thurlow, *Fascism in Britain. A History, 1919–1985* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987), pp. 51–57; Blinkhorn, *Fascism*, p. 60.

21. Thies Schulze, "Die Zukunft der Diktaturen: Der Niedergang der Diktatur Miguel Primo de Riveras aus der Perspektive des Mussolini-Regimes,"

Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft 57 (2009), pp. 134–56, esp. pp. 138, 144, 153–55.

22. Shellagh Ellwood, *Spanish Fascism in the Franco Era. Falange Española de las JONS, 1936–76* (Houndmills: St. Martin's Press, 1987), pp. 19–21, 78–79; Paul Preston, *The Politics of Revenge. Fascism and the Military in Twentieth-Century Spain* (London: Routledge, 1990), p. 115; Stanley Payne, "Franco, the Spanish Falange and the Institutionalisation of Mission," *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 7 (2006), No. 2, pp. 191–201, p. 196; Hans-Jürgen Puhle, "Autoritäre Regime in Spanien und Portugal. Zum Legitimationsbedarf der Herrschaft Francos und Salazars," Richard Saage (ed.), *Das Scheitern diktatorischer Legitimationsmuster und die Zukunftsfähigkeit der Demokratie. Festschrift Walter Euchner* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1995), pp. 191–205, p. 193. For an overview, see Stanley Payne, *Fascism in Spain 1923–1977* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999), esp. pp. 469–79.

23. See Wolfgang Schieder,"Das italienische Experiment. Der Faschismus als Vorbild in der Krise der Weimarer Republik," *Historische Zeitschrift* 262 (1996), pp. 73–125, p. 84.

24. Wolfgang Schieder, "Faschismus im politischen Transfer. Giuseppe Renzetti als faschistischer Propagandist und Geheimagent in Berlin 1922–1941," Reichardt / Nolzen (eds.), *Faschismus*, pp. 28–58, esp. pp. 37–53.

25. Martin Pugh, *"Hurrah for the Blackshirts!" Fascists and Fascism between the Wars* (London 2005); Karen Bayer, *"How Dead is Hitler?" Der britische Starreporter Sefton Delmer und die Deutschen* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2008), pp. 46–47, 51, 61–62, 285–86.

26. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, "Die Geschichte Europas als vergleichende Geschichtsschreibung," *Comparativ* 14 (2004), No. 3, pp. 83–97, p. 90; Jürgen Elvert, *Die europäische Integration* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006), p. 31; Ulrich Wyrwa, "Richard Nikolaus Graf Coudenhove-Kalergi (1894–1972) und die Paneuropa-Bewegung in den zwanziger Jahren," *Historische Zeitschrift* 283 (2006), pp. 103–122, pp. 112, 118; Ina Ulrike Paul, "In Kontinenten denken, paneuropäisch handeln. Die Zeitschrift *Paneuropa* 1924–1938," *Jahrbuch für Europäische Geschichte* 5 (2004), pp. 161–92, pp. 184–85.

27. John R. Lampe, *Balkans into Southeastern Europe. A Century of War and Transition* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), p. 113; Laqueur, *Fascism*, p. 63.

28. As Education Minister (1936–1943), Bottai was responsible for the expulsion of Jewish scholars from Italian universities. Nevertheless, he was widely regarded as almost an "anti-Fascist Fascist." See Donald Sassoon, "Italy after Fascism. The Predicament of Dominant Narratives," Richard Bessel and Dirk Schumann (eds.), *Life after Death. Approaches to a Cultural and Social History of Europe During the 1940s and 1950s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 259–90, p. 287.

29. On the *Mostra della Rivoluzione Fascista*, cf. Marla Stone, "Staging Fascism: The Exhibition of the Fascist Revolution," *Journal of Contemporary History* 28 (1993), pp. 215–43. Also see Claudio Fogu, *The Historic Imaginary.*

Politics of History in Fascist Italy (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003), esp. pp. 165–206, 250–59 (quote p. 165); idem, "Fascism and Historic Representation: The 1932 Garibaldian Celebrations," *Journal of Contemporary History* 31 (1996), pp. 317–45.

30. Waltraud Sennebogen, "Propaganda als Populärkultur? Werbestrategien und Werbepraxis im faschistischen Italien und in NS-Deutschland," Reichardt /Nolzen (eds.), *Faschismus*, pp. 119–47; Daniela Liebscher, "Faschismus als Modell: Die faschistische Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro und die NS-Gemeinschaft „Kraft durch Freude" in der Zwischenkriegszeit," *ibid.*, pp. 94–118.

31. Z. Ornea, *The Romanian Extreme Right. The Nineteen Thirties* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1999), 288–90; Linehan, *East London*, p. 285. On the role of European fascists in the Spanish civil war, see Carlos Collado Seidel, *Der Spanische Bürgerkrieg. Geschichte eines europäischen* Konflikts (Munich: Beck, 2006), pp. 97–98, 197. For an account of British policies, cf. Jill Edwards, *The British Government and the Spanish Civil War, 1936–1939* (London: Macmillan, 1979); Douglas Little, "Red Scare, 1936: Anti-Bolshevism and the Origins of British Non-Intervention in the Spanish Civil War," *Journal of Contemporary History* 23 (1988), pp. 291–31; Donald Lammers, "Fascism, Communism, and the Foreign Office, 1937–39," *Journal of Contemporary History* 6 (1971), No. 3, pp. 66–86.

32. Bob Moore, "Nazism and German Nationals in the Netherlands, 1933–40," *Journal of Contemporary History* 22 (1987), pp. 45–70; John Perkins, "The Swastika Down Under: Nazi Activities in Australia, 1933–39," *Journal of Contemporary History* 26 (1991), pp. 111–29. On Bohle's AO, see Hans-Jürgen Döscher, *Das Auswärtige Amt im Dritten Reich. Diplomatie im Schatten der "Endlösung"* (Berlin: Siedler, 1987), pp. 166–74. On the strongly pro-German *Link* in 1939 and 1940, cf. Richard Griffiths, *Patriotism Perverted. Captain Ramsay, the Right Club and British Anti-Semitism 1939–40* (London: Constable, 1998), pp. 170–71, 219–24; Thurlow, *Fascism*, pp. 179–83. On the NSB, see H. van der Wusten / R.E. Smit, "Dynamics of the Dutch National Socialist Movement (the NSB): 1931–35," in Stein U. Larsen, Bernt Hagtvet, and Jan P. Myklebust (eds.), *Who Were the Fascists? Social Roots of European Fascism* (Bergen: Universitetsforlaget, 1980), pp. 524–41; Blinkhorn, *Fascism*, p. 62.

33. Elke Fröhlich (ed.), *Die Tagebücher von Joseph Goebbels. Sämtliche Fragmente I: Aufzeichnungen 1924–1941, Bd. 2: 1.1.1931–31.12.1936* (Munich: K. G. Saur, 1987), pp. 629–30, 632, 649; Richard Griffiths, *Fellow Travellers of the Right. British Enthusiasts for Nazi Germany 1933–39* (London: Constable, 1980), pp. 104–07, 173; Bauerkämper, *Die „radikale Rechte" in Großbritannien*, p. 232. On the change in the programmatic orientation of the BUF, see Claudia Baldoni, "Anglo-Italian Fascist Solidarity? The Shift from Italophilia to Naziphilia in the BUF," Gottlieb/Lineham (eds.), *Culture*, pp. 147–61, 236–39.

34. Woller, *Rom*, pp. 192–93; Sennebogen, "Propaganda als Populärkultur?," pp. 127–30, 144, 146.

35. Oswald Mosley, *Tomorrow We Live* (London: Steven Books, 1938), pp. 72, 75; idem., "The World Alternative: European Synthesis within the Universalism of Fascism and National Socialism," *Fascist Quarterly* 2 (1936), pp. 377–95.

36. Rolf-Dieter Müller, *An der Seite der Wehrmacht. Hitlers ausländische Helfer beim "Kreuzzug gegen den Bolschewismus" 1941–1945* (Berlin: Ch. Links Verlag, 2007), pp. 243–44. More generally, see Wolfgang Schmale, "Visualisierungen Europas. Ein historischer Überblick," Vrääth Öhner et al. (eds.), *Europa-Bilder* (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2005), pp. 13–34, pp. 17–18; Max Bonacker, " 'Europa den Europäern!' Europapropaganda im NS-Rundfunk (19411944)," *Rundfunk und Geschichte. Mitteilungen des Studienkreises Rundfunk und Geschichte* 28 (2001), pp. 121–27. On the "Blue Division," see Xosé-Manoel Núñez, "Als die spanischen Faschisten (Ost) Europa entdeckten—Zur Russlanderfahrung der 'Blauen Division' (1941–1944), *Totalitarismus und Demokratie* 3 (2006), pp. 323–44.

37. Tobias Delfs, *Hindu-Nationalismus und europäischer Faschismus. Vergleich, Transfer- und Beziehungsgeschichte* (Hamburg: Eb-Verlag, 2008), esp. p. 143. On Bose and the Indian Legion, see Milan Hauner, *India in Axis Strategy. Germany, Japan, and Indian Nationalists in the Second World War* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981), esp. pp. 56–70, 237–58, 357–76, 592–619, 620–31.

38. Jeffrey Herf, *The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda for the Arab World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), idem., "Nazi Germany's Propaganda Aimed at Arabs and Muslims During the Second World War and the Holocaust," *Central European History* 42 (2009), pp. 709–36, esp. pp. 709, 711, 721, 726, 735. Also see Klaus Gensicke, *Der Mufti von Jerusalem und die Nationalsozialisten. Eine politische Biographie Amin el-Husseinis* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 2007); Klaus-Michael Mallmann/ Martin Cüppers, *Halbmond und Hakenkreuz. Das Dritte Reich, die Araber und Palästina*, second edition (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2007). In the last few months of the Second World War, the number of foreign soldiers in the German military units (army and *Waffen-SS*) amounted to as much as one-fifth. See Müller, *Wehrmacht*, p. 244.

39. Sandra McGee Deutsch, *Las Derechas, The Extreme Right in Argentina, Brazil and Chile* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999); Helgio Trindade, "Fascism and Authoritarianism in Brazil under Vargas (1930–1945)," Stein Ugelvik Larsen (ed.), *Fascism Outside Europe? The European Impulse against Domestic Conditions in the Diffusion of Global Fascism* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 2001), pp. 469–528, esp. p. 519.

40. Quoted from David Rock, *Authoritarian Argentina: The Nationalist Movement, Its History and Its Impact* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), pp. 145.

41. Alberto Spektorowski, "The Fascist and Populist Syndromes in the Argentine Revolution of the Right," Larsen (ed.), *Fascism Outside Europe?*, pp. 529–60, at p. 530. Also see Rock, *Argentina*, pp. 138–49.

42. For conceptual remarks, see Martin Aust/Daniel Schönpflug, "Vom Gegner lernen. Feindschaften und Kulturtransfers im Europa des 19.

und 20. Jahrhunderts," idem (eds.), *Vom Gegner lernen. Feindschaften und Kulturtransfers im Europa des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt/Main: Campus Verlag, 2007), pp. 9–35, at pp. 24–35.

43. Michael E. Chapman, "Pro-Franco Anti-communism: Ellery Sedgwick and the *Atlantic Monthly*," *Journal of Contemporary History* 41 (2006), pp. 641–62, at p. 642 (quote); Alex Goodall, "Diverging Paths: Nazism, the National Civic Federation, and American Anticommunism, 1933–39," *Journal of Contemporary History* 44 (2009), pp. 49–69, at pp. 49, 57, 68–69. As foreign Marxism and Communism seemed to contradict core values of "American civilization," their unequivocal refutation ultimately paved the way to Joseph McCarthy's campaign against "un-American activities" in the early 1950s.

44. Eckart Schörle, "Internationale der Antisemiten. Ulrich Fleischhauer und der, Eine Weltdienst," WerkstattGeschichte 51 (2009), No. 1, pp. 57–72, at pp. 68, 70; Lorna L. Waddington, "The Anti-Comintern and Nazi Anti-Bolshevik Propaganda in the 1930s," *Journal of Contemporary History* 42 (2007), pp. 573–94, at p. 590.

45. Norbert Götz and Kiran Klaus Patel, "Facing the Fascist Model: Discourse and the Construction of Labour Services in the USA and Sweden in the 1930s and 1940s," *Journal of Contemporary History* 41 (2006), pp. 53–73; Kiran Klaus Patel, "'All of This Helps Us in Planning.' Der New Deal und die NS-Sozialpolitik," Aust/Schönpflug (eds.), Gegner, pp. 234–52. For an overview of some other fields of selective transfer, see Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *Entfernte Verwandtschaft. Faschismus, Nationalsozialismus, New Deal 1933–1939* (Frankfurt/Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 2008).

46. Mike Tydesley, "The German Youth Movement and National Socialism: Some Views from Britain," *Journal of Contemporary History* 41 (2006), S. 21–34; Arnd Bauerkämper, "The Denigration of British Fascism: Traditional Anti-British Stereotypes and Claims of Superiority in Nazi Germany," Arnd Bauerkämper and Christiane Eisenberg (eds.), *Britain as a Model of Modern Society? German Views* (Augsburg: Wißner-Verlag, 2006), pp. 147–67. In 1934, Lloyd George had declared that Hitler was the "best thing that had happened to Germany since Bismarck, nay since Frederic II." Cf. Laqueur, *Fascism*, p. 71, Griffiths, *Fellow Travellers*, pp. 222–24. Also see Schwarz, *Reise*, pp. 100–06, 381–92. On the Duke of Windsor's stay in Germany, which included a visit to a concentration camp, see Charles Higham, *Mrs. Simpson. Secret Lives of the Duchess of Windsor* (London: Macmillan Publishers, 2005), pp. 249–62. For remarks on Delmer's admiration, cf. Bayer, "How Dead Is Hitler?" p. 62.

47. Karsten Linne, "Sozialpropaganda—Die Auslandspublizistik der Deutschen Arbeitsfront 1936–1944," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 57 (2009), pp. 237–54, esp. pp. 237, 243, 253–54.

48. Trindade, "Fascism," p. 519.

49. On the resilience and persistence of national paradigms in historiography, see Stefan Berger, "A Return to the National Paradigm? National History

Writing in Germany, Italy, France, and Britain from 1945 to the Present," *Journal of Modern History* 77 (2005), pp. 629–78; idem / Mark Donovan and Kevin Passmore (eds.), *Writing National Histories. Western Europe since 1800* (London: Routledge, 1999).

50. Mark Mazower, *Hitler's Empire. Nazi Rule in Occupied Europe* (London: Allen Lane, 2008), pp. 563–4, 566, 570–71, 574–75; Kiran Klaus Patel, "In Search of a Transnational Historicization: National Socialism and its Place in History," Konrad H. Jarausch/Thomas Lindenberger (eds.), *Conflicted Memories. Europeanizing Contemporary History* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), pp. 96–116, at p. 97, 108, 112. On the continuities of economic planning, also see Dieter Gosewinkel, "Zwischen Diktatur und Demokratie. Wirtschaftliches Planungsdenken in Deutschland und Frankreich: Vom Ersten Weltkrieg bis zur Mitte der 1970er Jahre," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 3 (2008), pp. 327–59, esp. pp. 337, 356–58.

3
The National Party of South Africa: A Transnational Perspective

Patrick J. Furlong

The National Party (NP) dominated South Africa's modern Right. Founded in 1914 to defend the interests of Afrikaners (descendants of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Dutch, German, and French colonists), it ruled from 1924 to 1934 and 1948 to 1994. In the years it was not in power, it led the opposition in an all-white parliament. In this period, its embrace of hard Right ideas peaked. From 1948 on, it moderated its stance on, for example, anti-Semitism but increased repression and segregation ("apartheid"). The NP distanced itself from "foreign ideologies," claiming roots in the nineteenth-century Afrikaner "Boer" republics[1] yet had a complex relationship with the international Right.

Afrikaner nationalists shared broader right-wing anxieties about liberalism and Communism associated with the egalitarianism, secularism, and urbanization unleashed by the Enlightenment and the French and Industrial Revolutions, which threatened South Africa's quasi-feudal racial hierarchy. They looked to a European Right confronting similar issues, especially in "ancestral" lands such as Germany or to American segregationists, also seeking to tighten the color bar.

Influences forged by such ties were largely unidirectional. South Africa was too remote and atypical to be a model for Europe or other settler societies: unlike in Quebec, where minority whites were also deeply split or countries with many settlers such as the United States or South America's southern cone, indigenous people remained more numerous. The NP ruled without English-speaking partners only

from 1948, but by then, outside a diminishing neo-Fascist and segregationist fringe, the apartheid model grew increasingly unacceptable internationally. Still, tactical alliances were possible with cold war Western conservatives, especially the American Christian Right, who saw the NP regime as an anti-Communist bastion and other "pariah" states such as Pinochet's Chile.

The German Connection

Analysts of Afrikaner nationalism have frequently defined the NP regime as an extension of the European Right, a "Fascist" outpost.[2] Other scholars have rejected this model. They claim that it overlooks complex influences, such as Afrikaner conflicts with British imperialism, descendants of English-speaking settlers, and the black majority; divisions between moderate Afrikaner nationalists (especially in the southern Cape Province); and radicals more open to the European hard Right.[3]

Those who emphasize the NP's "Fascist" or "Nazi" links point to historic ties to Germany. Many Afrikaners, including NP leaders J. B. M. Hertzog and P. W. Botha,[4] were descended from German settlers;[5] in 1937, in Pretoria's pro-Nazi German newspaper, *Der Deutsch-Afrikaner*, Werner Schmidt lauded how German blood had affected Afrikaners' "Nordic" character. After Hitler invaded the Netherlands in 1940, despite long-time Afrikaner nationalist ties to that country—especially to antisecular neo-Calvinists,[6] columnists and readers insisted in the NP newspaper *Die Burger* that this mixed ancestry justified neutrality.[7]

Such sympathies predated the Third Reich. Germany gave diplomatic support and sold arms to the Afrikaner (Boer) Transvaal Republic before the 1899–1902 Second Anglo-Boer (South African) War.[8] After the defeated Transvaal and Orange Free State republics merged with the Cape and Natal Colonies in 1910 as the "Union of South Africa," this record contributed to nationalists such as Hertzog and Daniel Malan (Cape provincial NP leader from 1915 and prime minister 1948–1954) opposing fighting against Germany when the Union backed Britain in the First World War.

Hertzog's antipathy to Britain mellowed after it granted virtually sovereign status to South Africa; as prime minister in 1934, responding to the Depression, he joined the more pro-British Jan Smuts in a broader-based "United Party." NP hardliners under Malan formed the "Purified" NP, favoring a republic without ties to Britain, expanded racial segregation, and ending Jewish immigration.

Since Hertzog remained friendly toward Germany and opposed criticism of the Nazi regime, and the Malanites also seemed well-disposed, Berlin regarded South Africa as promising.[9] Hitler's top economist, Hjalmar Schacht, noted that Germany was South Africa's second-best customer.[10] When Oswald Pirow, the son of German immigrants and Hertzog's Fascist-leaning lieutenant, was Minister of Transport and Defence, South Africa bought more German than British railway stock and the state-owned airlines used mainly German Junkers planes.[11] The desire to reduce British influence was one factor, but there was more to this. When the Union Parliament debated whether to support Smuts in declaring war after Hitler invaded Poland, Malan retorted that Germany wanted only to unite those of the same language and race.[12] Hertzog likened German humiliation after the First World War to Afrikaner sufferings.[13] German diplomats' cables warmly noted Hertzog's and Malan's denials of German aggression.[14]

When a narrow parliamentary majority, nevertheless, voted to support Smuts and the governor-general asked him to form a new government, Hertzog's antiwar followers joined the pro-neutral "Reunited" NP led by Malan, once Hertzog departed active politics in late 1940. The professedly democratic NP competed, especially early in the war, with groups closer to Axis "foreign ideologies," such as the paramilitary *Ossewabrandwag* (Ox-wagon Guard or OB). The NP gradually distanced itself from them and, as Axis defeat loomed, marginalized them. Still, after 1948, some ultra-Rightist leaders (all of German extraction) had complex links with the NP. Louis Weichardt, who had led the Greyshirts (which local Nazi Party leaders called "the South African Sister Movement")[15] became a NP senator; Johannes von Strauss von Moltke, who had led a Greyshirt offshoot, became NP leader in Namibia. Oswald Pirow led the wartime pro-Axis NP faction, the New Order (NO); in 1942, he broke with the NP but was named chief prosecutor in the 1950s "Treason Trial" of anti-apartheid activists.[16]

Afrikaner nationalists who studied in interwar Germany suggest another link. Among such nationalists were Pirow; Hendrik Verwoerd, wartime editor of the NP newspaper *Die Transvaler* and prime minister (1958–1966); apartheid theorist Geoffrey Cronjé; and Hertzog's son, Albert, later an NP cabinet minister. Reading German nationalist works perhaps influenced students more than did professors (many not Nazis),[17] but other evidence is less murky. The *Afrikaans-Duitse Kultuur-Unie* (Afrikaner-German Cultural Union) and Nazi cultural bodies in Germany organized many tours of Germany. The *Unie* offered lectures, social evenings, and *Kultuurskakel*, a magazine in

Afrikaans and German.[18] Top Nazis feted guests such as Piet Meyer, later head of the secret nationalist organization, the *Afrikaner Broederbond* (Brothers' Union/AB) and the state broadcasting corporation; Nico Diederichs, wartime AB chief, later NP finance minister, and state president; right-wing Hertzog cabinet ministers Pirow, J. G. Kemp, and Piet Grobler; and Hans van Rensburg, Hertzog's justice secretary, and later OB chief.[19] Rudolf Hess invited Meyer's party to ski and see Hitler up close.[20] Pirow sent his daughter to a Nazi youth camp in Germany.[21] German diplomats noted how the Nazi "revolution" impressed Afrikaner visitors, Malanite Nationalists' growing *volk* (ethnic people) awareness, and support of anti-Semitism among the Fascist "shirt movements," right-wing Hertzogites, and Malan's Purified NP.[22]

Within South Africa and Union-ruled Namibia, a Nazi Party network among ethnic Germans was so extensive that it disturbed even Pirow.[23] In 1934, Hertzog's government banned the party in Namibia, after local Nazis agitated for returning the territory. In an effort to maintain good relations with South Africa, Berlin recalled the Nazi Party leader in South Africa, Hermann Bohle, because he was implicated in the agitation. The debacle produced by this agitation led Berlin to reduce the role in Nazi foreign policy of the Party *Auslandsorganisation* (Foreign Organization/AO), headed by Hermann's son, Ernst.[24] After war began, seized German diplomatic records showed how much propaganda Nazi agencies had sent, also using on-site vehicles like *Der Deutsch-Afrikaner* to forge German-Afrikaner nationalist solidarity and anti-British feeling.[25] Nazi propaganda continued in the war: their Zeesen station broadcast music, news, and anti-British and anti-Jewish talks in Afrikaans by South African schoolteacher Erik Holm.[26]

Yet, the prewar focus on the few ethnic Germans in South Africa, subversive organizing among them in Namibia, and failure to grasp that Afrikaners opposed replacing British with German domination show how little the Nazis understood them, much less were open to their ideas.[27] AO chief Bohle, raised in Cape Town, expressed contempt for South Africans.[28] Van Rensburg impressed Nazi officials precisely due to his explicit support for National Socialism,[29] but few Afrikaners agreed with him. Nazi racial policies, projected for a postwar Africa, show similarities to apartheid, especially ones such as strict segregation. A Nazi Party racial policy office member was commissioned to study South African racial laws, but, as Nazi colonial policy barred large-scale German settlement,[30] such similarities

suggest more pre-1914 German colonial rule and Nazi emphasis on African racial inferiority than Afrikaner ideas, which stressed racial differences.

Revisiting the Afrikaner Nationalist-Fascist Nexus

Critics rightly dismiss simplistic claims of "NP fascism" but miss subtler European Right influences.[31] It is not enough to "prove" Afrikaner nationalists were not "Nazis"; Fascism is hard to define; indigenized forms were often more successful, and Hitler told Pirow he only wanted to export anti-Semitism.[32] Extreme nationalist ideas in South Africa, such as those of Nico Diederichs or Piet Meyer, shared Nazi concepts such as the organic national unity of classes and grew out of the same Romantic European nationalism.[33] Pirow, despite advocacy of "National Socialism" by his NO, drew on varied sources, having met Hitler (who deeply impressed him); Mussolini; Spain's Franco; and Antonio Salazar, whose Portuguese authoritarian *Estado Novo* attracted him.[34]

The OB and its *Stormjaer* (Stormtrooper) militia more clearly blended European Fascism with indigenous influences. This hybrid was expressed in the OB symbol, a Nazi-like eagle on a Boer ox-wagon wheel; the slogan "My God, My Land, My People"; the quasi-Nazi salute, a half-extended arm bent at the elbow; or Van Rensburg's inaugural oath as OB chief, promising to struggle for an independent "Afrikaner-*Diets volk*," linking Afrikaner ancestral loyalties to the concept of a Pan-Netherlandic *Diets* nation, popular among wartime Dutch and Flemish ultra-Rightists.[35] Under Van Rensburg, the OB, hitherto more right-wing populist than Fascist, adopted other Fascistic features: charismatic leadership; stress on authority, discipline,and obedience; a paramilitary structure; an integral nationalist, corporatist, anti-democratic ideology; extreme anti-Communism; fear of decadence; and nostalgia for past glory.[36]

The anti-liberal democratic milieu in interwar Europe affected even leading NP figures. By 1940, many of the latter had joined the OB[37] Although many among these NP members left the OB once Van Rensburg's push for a "nonparty state" threatened NP leadership of the Afrikaner nationalist movement, they had until then accepted the OB model of officers, military commands, and discipline.[38] In June 1939, *Die Burger* reported that Weichardt (whose Greyshirts used the swastika, Nazi salute, and motto "Heil Suid-Afrika") urged supporters to join the NP[39] Even in the "moderate" Cape party, in late

1933, junior NP leader Frans Erasmus outflanked Weichardt, forming the uniformed junior NP "Orange Shirts."[40] In June 1941, the NP federal congress elected Malan *Volksleier* (People's Leader), with power to act for any NP congress or executive and passed a reorganization scheme drafted by Malan and Cape NP lieutenants Erasmus, Paul Sauer, and P. W. Botha, replacing branches and committees with cells, wards, and districts headed by "leaders"—who, unlike in the OB, were elected, not appointed.[41]

After the Nazi-like shirt movements appeared, following Hitler's coming to power, the NP embraced explicitly anti-Jewish policies.[42] The NP did not switch course as the economy improved in the mid-1930s: Afrikaner nationalists, like the European Right, loathed liberalism, Marxism, and *laissez-faire* capitalism—the latter seen by Afrikaners as imperialist, English-speaking, and Jewish.[43] The 1937 Transvaal NP congress voted to bar Jewish members.[44] By 1938, the federal NP favored ending Jewish immigration, supporting quotas on Jews in key occupations, and banning Jews changing surnames;[45] even Malan used European Right rhetoric, telling the 1938 federal congress that behind the "racial equality idea" was organized Jewry, backing liberalism and communism.[46] He relented after the Holocaust was revealed, but the Transvaal NP ended its ban on Jewish members only in 1951.[47]

The Nazis chiefly viewed the NP as merely tactically useful. AO chief Bohle belittled Malan as a democrat.[48] Zeesen radio soon mocked Malan, preferring Van Rensburg, although Berlin lost enthusiasm for him, opting for Robey Leibbrandt, a pro-Nazi Afrikaner agent who landed in South Africa in June 1941 in a plot to kill Smuts and set up a puppet state, a plan that was forestalled by his arrest on Christmas Eve.[49] By late 1941, the NP was feuding with the NO and OB.[50] Malan opposed an OB revolt scheme, condemning *Stormjaer* violence.[51] The eventual break between the OB and NP reflected the party's refusal to be ousted as the political vehicle of Afrikaner nationalism and its increasing recognition, as Nazi defeat grew more likely—that an Afrikaner-ruled South Africa would come about through elections—not German bayonets.

Nevertheless, Roger Griffin's definition of Fascism as inspired by belief in national rebirth through revolutionary integral nationalism fits both the Afrikaner far Right, and, in part, the pre-1948 NP, with its nostalgia for a Boer "golden age" even if Malan's old guard, at least, were less drawn to a philosophy based on national revolution.[52] Marx, in the chief study of the OB and radical Afrikaner nationalism, argues that the NP differed from the OB only in its "half-hearted" loyalty to parliamentarism, and that after 1948, ex-OB members

were influential precisely due to the OB's reinforcing their own anti-democratic views, especially in promoting the apartheid state's anti-Communist and security ideology.[53] The European far Right had a lasting influence, via ultra-rightist Afrikaner nationalists on the NP apartheid regime, even if the impact is not as straightforward as is sometimes suggested.

After 1948: Persistent Connections with the Radical Right

Despite past disputes with the NP, the far Right prospered in post-1948 South Africa. Greyshirt leader Weichardt and NO leader Pirow gained high office, as did Meyer, Diederichs, and OB generals B. J. Vorster and Hendrik van den Bergh, who headed the Bureau of State Security.[54] When Van Rensburg died in 1966, soon after Vorster succeeded Verwoerd as Prime Minister, flags in Pretoria flew at half-mast, a military guard of honor was at the service, Van den Bergh and two judges were pallbearers, ex-OB members gave their semi-Fascist salute, and Vorster and his wife sent a wreath.[55]

Apartheid South Africa also attracted foreign far rightists. In 1948, British Union of Fascists leader Oswald Mosley, a frequent visitor, endorsed Pirow's proposal to divide Africa into white and black states, which Mosley interpreted as full-blown partition, avoiding use of cheap black labor.[56] Pirow often hosted Mosley, who met cabinet members; at the end of his 1964 final trip, he urged British immigrants to join the NP.[57] When SS veteran Otto Skorzeny, a leader in the ex-Nazi network, visited on business, he stayed with Weichardt, also working with Pirow, who stayed in contact with Salazar, Franco, and Argentine leader Juan Perón.[58] German far rightists such as *National Demokratische Partei* leader Adolf von Thadden made speeches in South Africa on their racial views and sometimes met prominent NP members.[59]

The right-wing Portuguese dictatorship was a firm ally: from the 1960s to the 1974 military coup, Pretoria provided arms to defend Portuguese African colonies against rebels. Official visits were frequent; both parties feared the rising "Communist threat" in Africa.[60] Especially from the mid-1970s on, Pretoria was also close to right-wing Latin American dictators, including Augusto Pinochet in Chile and Alfredo Stroessner in Paraguay and conducted many official visits, information exchanges, and cooperation agreements. P. W. Botha supplied Pinochet with arms, including surface-to-air missiles,[61] South African funds paid for a supreme court building

in Paraguay.[62] Such ties partly reflected a pariahs' alliance, but there was also a shared "right-wing" focus on anti-Communism, crushing dissent, and preserving control by a conservative privileged minority. As the NP regime, while backing limited apartheid reforms, grew increasingly militarized, closeness to praetorian rightist regimes increased. In 1981, President P. W. Botha appointed Jack Dutton, second-highest Defence Force officer and advocate of Botha's anti-Communist "Total Strategy," first resident ambassador in Chile.[63] Such links chilled ties with Margaret Thatcher's new British Conservative government when in the 1982 Falklands War, the press reported that Pretoria was selling Exocet missiles to military-ruled Argentina.[64]

The apartheid regime had become associated with prominent far rightists and Right-authoritarian regimes. The development of alliances as a pragmatic response to increasing isolation, not just ideological common ground, also explains growing links from the 1970s to Taiwan, the Shah's Iran, and Israel. However, the Taiwan nexus, rooted also in anti-Communism, came late; the 1979 revolution ended the Iran connection.[65]

The Post-1948 NP Regime and Western Conservatives

With the onset of the cold war and the Soviets and Chinese backing the Southern African liberation movements' turn to armed struggle, Verwoerd believed anti-Communism and "separate development" (autonomy for rural African reserves) would restore South Africa's status among Western countries.[66] During the cold war, new bodies backed by the NP, AB, Afrikaans churches, the *Anti-Kommunistiese Aksiekommissie* (Anti-Communist Action Commission/Antikom) and the National Council Against Communism reached out to conservatives in the United States such as the Hoover Institution's Stefan Possony, later instrumental in the "Star Wars" Strategic Defense Initiative and the Church League of America's Edgar Bundy. Both were major speakers at a 1966 Pretoria "International Symposium on Anti-Communism," chaired by B. J. Vorster's brother, J. D. Vorster, an Afrikaner cleric and ex-OB leader. Bundy's Illinois-based, McCarthyite-linked, prosegregationist group collected information on "Red"-tainted Americans, and on several visits promoted claims of Communist infiltration of mainstream churches. In the United States, J. D. Vorster denounced Western complacency at a 1967 Church League-sponsored anti-Communist symposium. Many Afrikaner

works on the "Communist threat" appeared in South Africa, including Antikom pamphlets and scholarly studies.[67]

Anti-Communism also gave some cover for segregationist American politicians such as Alabama governor George Wallace, who in 1968 declared South Africa a good friend, and Mississippi Senator James Eastland, who at a 1969 Johannesburg press conference, stated that he supported apartheid.[68] After a 1963 visit, Louisiana Senator Allen Ellender, one of many prominent segregationists whose trips Pretoria funded, issued a report defending apartheid. For many Southern right-wingers, South Africa was an island of stability in Africa and under similar pressure to undermine civilization.[69]

Afrikaner segregationists, in turn, borrowed from American models. After visiting the American South in 1937, Afrikaner churchman J. G. Strydom, an early apartheid advocate, had urged similar segregation at home.[70] In the late 1930s, a commission appointed by Hertzog's government to consider banning interracial marriage addressed at length similar American laws in thirty states, recommended such a step,[71] and became in 1949 the first apartheid bill. Interior Minister Eben Dönges partly justified it by noting how many American states had such laws.[72] Positivist American social science and optimism about social engineering likely also influenced Verwoerd's "separate development" program.[73]

As segregation became taboo in the United States, anti-Communism displaced overt endorsements of apartheid. Conservative American press magnate John McGoff channeled funds from Pretoria's Department of Information to Reverend Fred Shaw's "Christian League of Southern Africa," formed in 1974 to discredit the anti-apartheid World and South African Councils of Churches,[74] which gave aid to liberation movements such as the African National Congress (ANC). The department also helped finance election campaigns against anti-apartheid members of Congress and unsuccessfully tried to help McGoff buy *The Washington Star*.[75] In the 1980s, anti-Communist, religious Right-aligned conservatives like Jerry Falwell, Patrick Buchanan, and ex-segregationist Senator Jesse Helms remained among Pretoria's strongest defenders.[76] In 1986, television evangelist Pat Robertson aired a feature on alleged ANC atrocities, part of a sympathetic media campaign involving conservative American preachers.[77]

The NP regime forged other ties with Western conservatives. Despite a voluntary United Nations arms embargo, Charles de Gaulle's France was Pretoria's chief arms supplier; the less conservative Pompidou and Giscard D'Estaing limited what they would sell,

but this relationship ended only with the 1980 Socialist victory.[78] In the 1970s, French General André Beaufré's and American Lieutenant Colonel John McCuen's ideas on coordinating military force with a civilian "hearts and minds" program inspired P. W. Botha's "Total Strategy" against the "Soviet-backed" "Total Onslaught"; conservative American political scientist Samuel Huntington inspired Botha's "managed reform" strategy.[79] Although in the 1980s, Botha fared better with Christian Democrat Helmut Kohl than Social Democrat Helmut Schmidt, ties were warmest with Kohl's ultra-conservative Bavarian partner, Franz Josef Strauss.[80] While the American Democrats Kennedy and Johnson adopted military sanctions, under Republicans Nixon and Ford, the arms embargo was interpreted more loosely; Nixon's administration sought "détente" with Pretoria to avoid violent change that might advance "Communism."[81] The 1980's Reagan and Thatcher governments resisted more sanctions, viewing South Africa as strategically essential in the cold war. Like Thatcher, Reagan's openness to Botha's reforms was soured by the latter's refusal to move faster, U.S.-Soviet rapprochement, and revelations of Pretoria-backed atrocities.[82] By then, however, time was running out for the apartheid regime, in the throes of violent upheaval.

Contemporary Afrikaner Nationalism and the Transnational Right

Opposition to Botha's limited reforms led to his successor F. W. de Klerk negotiating a settlement with the liberation movements; after 1994 nonracial elections, the NP joined Nelson Mandela's ANC-led government as a junior partner, but dwindling voter support led to the dissolution of the NP and, most amazingly, most remaining leaders joining the ANC.[83]

As mainstream Afrikaner nationalists, especially the NP, discarded their former policies, extremists outside the party forged links with the global far Right. In the late 1970s, Britain's National Front sent Ray Hill to help create a local branch; he discussed strategy with the far Right *Herstigte Nasionale Party* (Refounded National Party) and pro-Mussolini Italian immigrants in Johannesburg seeking to unite the HNP, OB-like *Afrikaner Weerstandsbeweging* (Afrikaner Resistance Movement), and a Ku Klux Klan chapter. In 1988, Swedish Neo-Nazi leader Tommy Rydén met with the AWB, the anti-Botha Conservative Party, and a Christian Identity congregation (racist

American-linked ultra-rightists).[84] The German Pan-Fascist maga-zine *Nation Europa* devoted its May/June 1989 issue to South Africa.[85] In the early 1990s, Koos Vermeulen's World Apartheid Movement, with some 800 members—including British and Belgian citizens— was suspected of planning to use biological and chemical weapons to kill blacks and "sell out" NP cabinet ministers. There were also links to rightists such as the Klan and the violent anti-immigrant Francophone Belgian neo-Nazi movement *L'Assaut*.[86] Since then, despite scares due to violent far rightists such as the *Boeremag* (Boer Power),[87] the realities of the new South Africa have marginalized such groups.

Other Afrikaner rightists have built on linguistic and cultural links, especially Pan-Netherlandic nationalism. *Volkstaat* (Afrikaner home-land) advocate Dan Roodt favors ties with Flanders and Quebec, where language and land divisions are also linked. "Boer heritage" activist Henk van de Graaf has headed a branch of *Voorpost*, a *Diets* Dutch/Flemish nationalist group; in 2003, he addressed the Flemish nationalist annual Yzerwake gathering. He and his Paardekraal branch of the *Verkenners*, a militant Afrikaner nationalist organi-zation, offered to host far-Right Dutch politician Geert Wilders to show a controversial film on Islam. Interest is mutual: the Flemish Right-nationalist party *Vlaams Belang* has raised Afrikaner farmers' murders in the Belgian and the Flemish Parliaments, also champi-oning saving Pretoria's name and preserving Afrikaans. Dutch cul-tural nationalist Marcel Bas edits the Dutch/Afrikaans Web site *De Roepstem* "for Great-Netherlandic and Afrikaner identity," has ties to conservative Afrikaner activists, promotes the common Dutch-Flemish-Afrikaner struggle for language and culture, and com-ments favorably on authoritarian Right leaders such as Salazar and Dollfuss. Such connections show that a vibrant network survives, linking remaining Afrikaner ultra-nationalists to like-minded right-wingers abroad.

Conclusion

The NP does not fit a simplistic Fascist analogy, but it and the wider Afrikaner nationalist movement drew from the global right for allies, ideas, and support, although such links were more overt on the Afrikaner far right. The overseas Right showed keen inter-est, but South Africa's remoteness and unusual demography limited Afrikaner nationalist influence on them. Only after Hitler's defeat

was the new NP regime any kind of model for far-Right admirers, but in a world disenchanted with fascism, racism, and colonialism, they were a fringe element. They also misunderstood the apartheid state, which mixed liberal features (parliament, multiparty elections, a semifree press) with racial authoritarianism. Later partnerships with right-wing regimes such as in Chile or Portugal, based on shared anti-Communism, were largely utilitarian. Much as Afrikaner nationalists formerly had ties to Dutch Calvinists and shared the same religious tradition, the apartheid-era NP regime often had more mainstream allies, including Western cold war conservatives and Israel, as growing isolation joined strange bedfellows.

Yet, Afrikaner nationalism shared many features of the overseas—especially European—hard Right, including anti-liberal, anti-Communist, anti-egalitarian attachment to a premodern "Golden Age." Most Afrikaner nationalists were never "Nazis," but many embraced the Romantic nationalism that fed National Socialism, sharing interwar European rightists' disenchantment with liberal capitalism and democracy, peaking in the early years of the Second World War, while the Holocaust ended a short-lived romance with anti-Semitism fueled by the 1930s European Right.

When the NP gained power in 1948, it became the bastion of white minority rule and segregation, even as these waned elsewhere. No updating or limited reforms could increase acceptance of the regime. Sanctions and internal revolution produced a crisis that no alliance with right-wing dictatorships and other pariah states could offset; as the cold war ended, even Western conservatives could not justify propping up so despised a regime. The NP abandoned minority rule, but it was too late. The NP disappeared; only an ultra-nationalist fringe survived.

Notes

1. "Boer" (farmer) usually denotes Afrikaners who, in the 1830s, left the Cape Colony to settle in the South African interior, after the British ousted the Dutch, who had ruled the Colony since its foundation in 1652.
2. See Brian Bunting, *The Rise of the South African Reich* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1969); Sipho Mzimela, *Apartheid: South African Nazism* (New York: Vantage Press, 1983); Howard Simson, *The Social Origins of Afrikaner Fascism and Its Apartheid Policy* (Uppsala: Uppsala Studies in Economic History 21, 1980); and William Henry Vatcher, *White Laager: The Rise of Afrikaner Nationalism* (New York: Frederick Praeger, 1965), 58–75.

3. See Frederik Jacobus van Heerden, "Nasionaal-Sosialisme as Faktor in die Suid-Afrikaanse Politiek, 1933–1948" (D. Phil. dissertation, University of the Orange Free State, 1972), 357; Hermann Giliomee, *The Afrikaners: Biography of a People* (Cape Town: Tafelberg, 2003), xviii–ix, 649–50, 663; and "The Making of the Apartheid Plan, 1929–1948," *Journal of Southern African Studies* 29, no. 2 (June 2003), 373–92; P. Eric Louw, *The Rise, Fall, and Legacy of Apartheid* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004), viii–xi; Dan Roodt, "Die Nuwe Regs," in *Aweregs: Politieke Essays* (Dainfern, SA: PRAAG, 2006), 17–18.

4. J. H. Le Roux, P. W. Coetzer, and A. H. Marais, eds., *Generaal J. B. M. Hertzog: Sy Strewe en Stryd—Deel I* (Johannesburg: Perskor, 1987), 2–3; Daan Prinsloo, *Stem Uit die Wilderness: 'n Biografie Oor Oud-President P. W. Botha* (Mossel Bay: Vaandel Uitgewers, 1997), 20.

5. Giliomee, *The Afrikaners*, 4–5, 11–12.

6. Most Afrikaners belonged to one of three Reformed denominations, all rooted in Dutch Calvinism and with close ties to the Netherlands. These churches provided religious legitimation for Afrikaner nationalist policies, especially on racial segregation; several nationalist politicians, most notably Daniel Malan, were former Reformed pastors. Afrikaner Calvinists retained close ties with the Netherlands: many studied at Dutch universities, especially the Calvinist Free University of Amsterdam, founded by the conservative theologian and politician Abraham Kuyper.

    His "neo-Calvinist" model for preserving Reformed political culture within secularizing Dutch society attracted many Afrikaner intellectuals. See Irving Hexham, *The Irony of Apartheid: The Struggle for National Independence of Afrikaner Calvinism Against British Imperialism* (New York and Toronto: Edwin Mellen, 1981), 1–64, 147–64, and 176–99; Gerrit J. Schutte, "The Netherlands, Cradle of Apartheid?" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 10, no. 4 (October 1987): 392–414.

7. University of Cape Town Libraries, Manuscripts and Archives Department, Harry Lawrence Papers, E5.44.2, transcript. White Book "Nazi Activities and Nazi Propaganda in the Union of South Africa from the Year 1933 until the Outbreak of War in September 1939," Vol. III, 316–17.

8. Johannes Stephanus Marais, *The Fall of Kruger's Republic* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), 47, 99, 291.

9. Patrick Furlong, *Between Crown and Swastika: The Impact of the Radical Right on the Afrikaner Nationalist Movement in the Fascist Era* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1991), 62–66, 85; Editorial "Der Union von Südafrika zum 31.Mai 1935," *Afrika-Rundschau* 1, no. 2 (June 1935): 31.

10. Lawrence Papers, E5.44.1, transcript, White Book "Nazi Activities and Nazi Propaganda in the Union of South Africa from the Year 1933 until the Outbreak of War in September 1939," Vol. II, 185.

11. William Russell Kienzle, "German-South African Trade Relations in the Nazi Era," *African Affairs* 78, no. 310 (January 1979): 81–90.

12. Union of South Africa, House of Assembly Debates, September 4, 1939, cols. 49–50.

13. Union of South Africa, House of Assembly Debates, September 4, 1939, cols. 22–23.

14. Hoover Institution for War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford, California, German Foreign Office Collection, File 540, 240565–240567, telegrams, Werz to Berlin, November 9, 1939 and 240568–240569, November 14, 1939.

15. University of Cape Town Libraries, Manuscripts and Archives Department, Morris Alexander Papers, Jewish Materials List IV: File 14, "Who Is Weichardt? Who Are the Greyshirts?" ca. 1935 and "Afrikaners, Greyshirts, and Nazis: What the South West African Commission Has Revealed," ca. 1935.

16. Stephen Clingman, *Bram Fischer: Afrikaner Revolutionary* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998), 239, 242–45.

17. Christoph Marx, *Oxwagon Sentinel: Radical Afrikaner Nationalism and the History of the Ossewabrandwag* (Berlin: Lit Verlag, English tr. ed. 2008; Pretoria: University of South Africa Press, 2008), 222–23.

18. Lawrence Papers, E5.44.2, transcript, White Book "Nazi Activities and Nazi Propaganda in the Union of South Africa from the Year 1933 until the Outbreak of War in September 1939," Vol. III, 291–98.

19. Furlong, *Between Crown and Swastika*, esp. 70–96; Jeff Guy, "Fascism, Nazism and the Foundation of Apartheid Ideology," in *Fascism Outside Europe: The European Impulse against Domestic Conditions in the Diffusion of Global Fascism*, ed. Stein Ugelvik Larsen (Boulder, CO: Social Science Monographs, 2001), 438–49; and Robert Citino, *Germany and the Union of South Africa in the Nazi Period* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1991), 166–70.

20. Piet Meyer, *Nog Nie Ver Genoeg Nie: 'n Persoonlike Rekenskap van Vyftig Jaar Georganiseerde Afrikanerskap* (Johannesburg and Cape Town: Perskor, 1984), 11–12.

21. Marx, *Oxwagon Sentinel*, 264.

22. Citino, *Germany and the Union of South Africa*, 70, 86–87, 107–108, 137, 163, 166–70.

23. Citino*, Germany and the Union of South Africa*, 129.

24. Albrecht Hagemann, "The Diffusion of German Nazism" in *Fascism Outside Europe*, ed. Stein Ugelvik Larsen, 88–92; Donald M. McKale, *The Swastika Outside Germany* (Oxford, OH: Kent State University Press, 1977), 94–97.

25. See Lawrence Papers, E5.44.4, transcript, White Book "Nazi Activities and Nazi Propaganda in the Union of South Africa from the Year 1933 until the Outbreak of War in September 1939," Vol. V, 477–81, 544–558, 567–578, and 598–602.

26. De Wet Potgieter and Janine Lazarus, "Nazi Radio Man Took Part in Hess Service," *The Sunday Times* (Johannesburg), August 30, 1987.

27. Citino, *Germany and the Union of South Africa*, 198, 207, and 229–30.

28. U.S. National Archives Research Administration (hereafter NARA) microfilm T-120, Captured German Foreign Office Records, Reel 317/241190, "Bemerkungen von H. Bohle," May 30, 1939.

29. NA.A, T-120, Captured German Foreign Office Records, Reel 3017/ E491148, Dieckhoff to Smuts, August 20, 1936 and Reel 3017/E491215, Nazi Party (South Africa) leader Bruno Stiller to Foreign Office, April 28, 1937.

30. See Richard Lakowski, "The Second World War" in *German Imperialism in Africa: From the Beginnings Until the Second World War,* ed. Helmuth Stoecker (London: C. Hurst/Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International, 1986), 403, 407, 410–14.

31. See Patrick Furlong, "Apartheid, Afrikaner Nationalism and the Radical Right: Historical Revisionism in Hermann Giliomee's *The Afrikaners*," *South African Historical Journal* 49 (November 2003): 207–22.

32. Werner Schellack, "Links Between Apartheid and National Socialism," *Kleio* 23 (1991): 101.

33. Jeff J. Guy, "South Africa" in *Fascism Outside Europe*, ed. Stein Ugelvik Larsen, 459.

34. See Marx, *Oxwagon Sentinel*, 264, 497; Werner van der Merwe (Schellack), "Suid-Afrika en 'Appeasement': Oswald Pirow se 'Vredesending' na Nazi-Duitsland in November 1938," *Kleio* 20 (1988): 34, 37.

35. See OB pamphlet *Leier van die Gedissiplineerde Afrikanerdom: Dr. J. F. J. van Rensburg—Lewensbeskrywing en Drie Toesprake* (Johannesburg: Voortrekkerpers, n. d.), 3. "Diets" is the Afrikaans or modern Dutch form of "Dietsch," an antiquated term for "Dutch," popular in nationalist circles in South Africa and the Low Countries in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

36. Marx, *Oxwagon Sentinel*, 511–12; P. J. J. Prinsloo, "Kultuuraktiwiteite van die Ossewa-Brandwag," in *Die Ossewabrandwag: Vuurtjie in Droë Gras*, ed. P.F. van der Schyff (Potchefstroom: Department of History, Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education, 1991), 370.

37. P. W. Coetzer, Maritz Broodryk and Louis Johannes van der Westhuizen, *Die Nasionale Party Deel 5: Van Oorlog tot Oorwinning 1940–1948* (Bloemfontein: Instituut vir Eietydse Geskiedenis, 1994), 82.

38. Dirk and Johanna de Villiers, *P.W.* (Cape Town; Tafelberg, 1984), 27–28.

39. "Mnr. Weichardt Gaan Oor See: Na Konferensie in Switserland," *Die Burger*, June 19, 1939.

40. See Van Heerden, "Nasionaal-Sosialisme as Faktor in die Suid-Afrikaanse Politiek, 1933–1948," 46–47; Cape Town, Cape Archives Depot, Senator D. H. van Zyl Papers, Vol. 6, Frans Erasmus, *Junior Nasionaliste: Oranjehemp-Drag* (Cape Town: n. pub., n. d.).

41. Furlong, *Between Crown and Swastika*, 197–98; Eric Louw, "Voorligting aan Ampsdraers," in Frans Erasmus and Eric Louw, *Handleiding van die Herenigde Nasionale Party* (Cape Town; National Party, ca. 1942), 13–25; see also Michael Roberts and A. E. G. Trollip, *The South African Opposition 1939–1945: An Essay in Contemporary History* (London: Longmans and Green, 1947), 80–89.

42. Gideon Shimoni, *Jews and Zionism: The South African Experience 1910–1967* (Cape Town: Oxford University Press, 1967), 104–08.

43. See Milton Shain, *The Roots of Antisemitism in South Africa* (Charlottesville, VA and London: University Press of Virginia, 1994), 148.
44. Van Heerden, "Nasionaal-Sosialisme as Faktor in die Suid-Afrikaanse Politiek," 378.
45. Transvaal Archives Depot, Pretoria, Mrs. S. Kieser Collection, "Die Nasionale Party se Verkiesingsmanifes: Algemene Verkiesing," Art. 4.
46. Daniel Malan, "Die Groot Beslissing" (The Great Decision), speech to federal NP Congress, Bloemfontein, November 8, 1938, in S. W. Pienaar, ed., *Glo in U Volk: D. F. Malan as Redenaar 1908–1954* (Cape Town: Tafelberg, 1964), 116.
47. Furlong, *Between Crown and Swastika*, 236.
48. NARA, T-120, Captured German Foreign Office Records, Reel 317/241190, "Bemerkungen von H. Bohle," May 30, 1939.
49. Hendrik Bernardus Thom, *D. F. Malan* (Cape Town: Tafelberg, 1980), 17; Furlong, *Between Crown and Swastika*, 145–47.
50. Coetzer et al, *Die Nasionale Party Deel 5*, 75–94.
51. Daniel Malan, *Afrikaner-Volkseenheid en My Ervarings op die Pad Daarheen* (Cape Town, Bloemfontein, and Johannesburg: Nasionale Boekhandel, 1959), 194–95.
52. Roger Griffin, "Fascism," in *International Fascism: Theories, Causes and the New Consensus*, ed. Roger Griffin (London, Sydney, and Auckland: Arnold, 1998), 35.
53. Marx, *Oxwagon Sentinel*, 18, 554.
54. See Furlong, *Between Crown and Swastika*, 244–48.
55. John D'Oliveira, *Vorster—The Man* (Johannesburg: Ernest Stanton Publishers, 1977), 207–08.
56. Robert Skidelsky, *Oswald Mosley* (London: Macmillan, 1975, paper reprint ed. 1990), 486.
57. Marx, *Oxwagon Sentinel*, 557; Bunting, *Rise of the South African Reich*, 70–71; Skidelsky, *Oswald Mosley*, 492.
58. Martin Lee, *The Beast Reawakens* (Boston, New York, Toronto, and London: Little and Brown, 1997), n56, 431; Marx, *Oxwagon Sentinel*, n106, 496.
59. Bunting, *Rise of the South African Reich*, 72; Francis Ludwig Carsten, *The Rise of Fascism* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2nd ed., 1980), 248–50.
60. Dirk and Johanna de Villiers, *P.W.*, 229–30, 238–40.
61. Rafael Garcia Breto, "South Africa-Chile-Israel Connection," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 13, no. 3 (Spring 1984): 188–90; *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report: Volume 2* (Cape Town: distributed for T.R.C. by Juta, 1998), 28; David Fig, "South Africa's Interests in Latin America," in *South African Review II* (Johannesburg: Ravan, 1984), 251.
62. John Vinocur, "A Republic of Fear," *New York Times*, September 23, 1984, *Sunday Magazine*, 20.
63. Fig, "South Africa's Interests in Latin America," 251.
64. Prinsloo, *Stem Uit die Wilderness*, 152.

65. Military cooperation with Israel did not represent a "transnational Right" link, NP anti-Semitic rhetoric resurfaced whenever Israel criticized apartheid. Shimoni, *Jews and Zionism*, 310–311, 332, 341, and 354–355.

66. Henry Kenney, *Architect of Apartheid: H.F. Verwoerd—An Appraisal* (Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball, 1980), 246.

67. See Wessel Visser, "Afrikaner Anti-Communist History Production in South African Historiography" in *History Making and Present Day Politics: The Meaning of Collective Memory in South Africa*, ed. Hans Erik Stolten (Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, 2007), 306–33. On Possony's and Bundy's visits, see "Anti-Communist U.S. Churchman Stirs up Controversy in South Africa," *New York Times*, November 13, 1966; and Bunting, *Rise of the South African Reich*, 75–77. On the Church League, see Sara Diamond, *Spiritual Warfare: The Politics of the Christian Right* (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1989), 47; on J. D. Vorster's OB past and the 1966 meeting, see also Marx, *Oxwagon Sentinel*, 560. On the League's segregationist tilt, see Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance" in *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights and Foreign Affairs, 1945–1988*, ed. Brenda Gayle Plummer (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 145–46.

68. Robert Kinloch Massie, *Loosing the Bonds: The United States and South Africa in the Apartheid Years* (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 238.

69. Noer, "Segregationists and the World," 145.

70. Giliomee, *The Afrikaners*, 460. Rev. Strydom should not be confused with J. G. Strijdom, NP prime minister from 1954 to 1958.

71. See Union of South Africa, *U.G. 30/1939: Report of the Commission on Mixed Marriages in South Africa*, 28–30, articles 108–117; *Die Burger*, "Verbod op Huwelike in Ander Lande: Wat Amerika Doen," *Die Burger*, August 23, 1939.

72. Giliomee, *The Afrikaners*, 495–96.

73. See Giliomee, "The Making of the Apartheid Plan," 379; Roberta Balstad Miller, "Science and Sociology in the Early Career of H. F. Verwoerd," *Journal of Southern African Studies* 19, no. 4 (December 1993): 637–62.

74. Diamond, *Spiritual Warfare*, 195.

75. Peter Walshe, *Church Versus State in South Africa: The Case of the Christian Institute* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1983), 181–82; Massie, *Loosing the Bonds*, 450–53; Diamond, *Spiritual Warfare*, 194–95; James Sanders, *South Africa and the International Media 1972–1979: A Struggle for Representation* (London: Frank Cass, 2000), 60, 67–68; Elaine Windrich, South Africa's Propaganda War," *Africa Today* 36, no. 1(1989): 51–54.

76. See Massie, *Loosing the Bonds*, 489–90, 588–89, 614–16, 619, and 633.

77. Diamond, *Spiritual Warfare*, 192–94, 196–97.

78. Dirk and Johanna de Villiers, *P.W.*, 282–84.

79. Chris Alden, *Apartheid's Last Stand: The Rise and Fall of the South African Security State* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 41–46; Massie, *Loosing the Bonds*, 454; O'Meara, *Forty Lost Years*, 263–64, 267, and 278.

80. Prinsloo, *Stem uit die Wilderness*, 155–56.

81. Prinsloo, *Stem uit die Wilderness*, 64; James Barber and John Barratt, *South Africa's Foreign Policy: The Search for Status and Security* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 161–63; Adam Ashforth, *The Politics of Official Discourse in Twentieth-Century South Africa* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 197.

82. Margaret Thatcher, *The Downing Street Years* (New York: HarperCollins, 1993), 512–16, 522, 529–35; Dirk and Johanna de Villiers, *P.W.*, 331–34; Alden, *Apartheid's Last Stand*, 189; Dan O'Meara, *Forty Lost Years: The Apartheid State and the Politics of the National Party 1948–1994* (Johannnesburg: Ravan, 1996), 378–79.

83. In 2004, the renamed "New" NP announced it would cease operations. For the last years of the NP, see Christi van der Westhuizen, *White Power & the Rise and Fall of the National Party* (Cape Town: Zebra Press, 2007), 247–27 and Inus Aucamp and Johan Swanepoel, *Einde van 'n Groot Party: 'n Vrystaatse Perspektief op die(N.)NP* (Allensnek: Morrison Befonds, 2007). Traditionalist nationalists survived in Parliament as Freedom Front Plus, which advocated Afrikaner cultural rights and allied with groups such as the Tibetans and Lakota, rather than the far Right. See Pieter Mulder, *Kan Afrikaners Toyi-Toyi*? (Pretoria: Protea Boekhuis, 2008), 115–26, 203–05.

84. Jeffrey Kaplan and Leonard Weinberg, *The Emergence of a Euro-American Radical Right* (New Brunswick, NJ and London: Rutgers University Press, 1998), 180–82.

85. Roger Griffin, "Caught in Its Own Net: Neo-Fascism Outside Europe," in *Fascism Outside Europe*, ed. Stein Ugelvik Larsen, 61–62.

86. Johann van Rooyen, *Hard Right: The New White Power in South Africa* (London and New York: Tauris, 1994), 96–97; on L'Assaut, see Glyn Ford, ed., *Fascist Europe: The Rise of Racism and Xenophobia* (London and Boulder, CO: Pluto Press, 1992), 10.

87. On groups such as the *Boeremag*, see Martin Schönteich and Henri Boshoff, *"Volk," Faith and Fatherland: The Security Threat Posed by the White Right* (Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, Monograph No. 81, March 2003).

4
Transnational, Conservative, Catholic, and Anti-Communist: Tradition, Family, and Property (TFP)

Margaret Power

On June 5, 2009, a two-page ad titled "Battling for America's Soul, How Homosexual 'Marriage' Threatens Our Nation and Faith" appeared in The *New York Times*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and The *Washington Post*. The American Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property (TFP) sponsored the ads in response to (and in support of) the Supreme Court of California's ruling opposing gay marriage. Most Americans who looked at these ads might well have asked themselves, "What is TFP?"[1] This chapter addresses that question and explores the history, beliefs, activities, and transnational practices and influences of TFP.

TFP began in began in Brazil in 1960, under the leadership of Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira and other conservative Catholics to oppose reforms taking place or threatening to occur in the Catholic Church, society, and the economy, particularly in the realm of agrarian reform. From Brazil, it spread to Chile, Argentina, and Uruguay—then to Colombia, Venezuela, the United States, Canada, and France—along with numerous other countries where it is still active today.[2] According to TFP publications, by 1993, the organization had twenty-four "sister Societies...on six continents, [and was] the largest network of anti-Communist organizations of Catholic inspiration in the world today."[3]

TFP is a transnational right-wing organization that is simultaneously located in specific nations and extends beyond any individual

country, to include the world as its base of operations. Group leaders and members simultaneously recognize the varying realities of each organization and believe that TFP's goals and vision transcend the nation and involve, at least potentially, all those who define themselves as Catholics. They recognize distinct realities, conflicts, challenges, and conditions: and, as a result, the legitimacy and need for diverse national organizations to exist. This approach stems from its members' belief that Christians confront a common set of enemies; from the 1960s to the 1990s, they identified Communism, secularism, and antifamily policies as the primary offenders. Although they still view Communism as a danger, they have increasingly focused on secularism, liberalism, hedonism, and general social decay. Thus, TFP members share the same purpose and goal whether they are in Brazil, Chile, Argentina, the United States, Canada, France, or South Africa.

Much of the literature on Catholicism and Latin America emphasizes the rise and importance of Liberation Theology, one of the most significant religious movements to emerge in the twentieth century.[4] However, this focus obscures the fact that conservative forces such as TFP developed and gained strength in the Catholic Church at the same time, generally in opposition to the progressive changes introduced by Vatican II and preached by liberation theologians.

The importance of TFP does not lie in numbers, since membership in the organization has never been large.[5] Rather, as is discussed below, it stems from the group's ability to influence public debate, leaders and members of the Catholic Church, conservative forces, and political officials. TFP draws on its rigid interpretation of Christianity to offer the faithful an all-encompassing ideological justification for what are, in essence, very conservative politics. As an organization that combines religiosity with activism, TFP has developed a very dedicated membership that is willing to take their message to meetings, demonstrations, churches, and the streets, despite the often-hostile reception they receive. This same zeal and belief in the righteousness of its beliefs has also encouraged TFP to work with a variety of national and transnational forces to achieve its end, ranging from the New Right in the United States, to military dictatorships in South America, to the World Anti Communist League. Finally, TFP is a model right-wing transnational organization that simultaneously locates itself in the national and successfully builds itself transnationally. It also reverses the direction of the transnational flow of political ideas and movement with which we are more familiar since its trajectory went from South-South to South-North.

Background, Origin, and Ideological Beliefs of TFP or the Name Says It All!

The Societies for the Defense of Tradition, Family, and Property, known more simply as Tradition, Family, and Property (TFP) is an extreme right-wing Catholic organization, a group to which the name reactionary truly applies. The group "espouse[s] positions associated with traditional Catholicism: authoritarianism, the sacredness of private property, and the necessity for a staunch rejection of all forms of dialogue and cooperation with Marxism."[6] TFP members view Communism as a threat to elite rule, private property, the status quo, and Catholicism. They also oppose modernity, which they equate with secularism because they consider it anti-Christian and dangerous. They not only reject all tenets of the French Revolution, they rue the end of the Middle Ages, for them the apogee of Christendom, which the centuries that have followed have weakened and undermined. As Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira wrote, there has been "a five-century old process which has been destroying Christendom [dating] from the decline of the Middle Ages to our days."[7]

TFP supports social inequality and upholds hierarchy, in the Church and in society. In political relationships, it supports monarchism. Restoration of monarchical rule and public recognition of the blessings of elite governance are so central to TFP that Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira wrote a book arguing for them. In it, he combined quotes from Pope Pius XII (1939–1958) on the topic of nobility, with his own ideas on the importance of elite rule. For TFP, the nobility and tradition are linked, and "the former is the natural guardian of the latter." Rejecting the idea that the nobility "is constantly turned toward the past and [that nobles] have their backs to the future, where true progress lies," Corrêa asserts that "societies avoid stagnation, as well as chaos and revolt, through tradition. The guardianship of tradition…is a specific mission of the nobility and the analogous elites."[8]

Both because they support the monarchy and, one suspects, to assert their own organizational claims to legitimacy through their connection with it, Brazilian members of TFP maintain a close relationship with the Braganca family, the descendents of the Portuguese royal family that ruled Brazil until 1889. They financially supported Luiz Gastao de Orleans e Braganca, head of the Imperial House in Brazil, for decades.[9] Both he and his brother, Bertrand de Orleans e Braganca, in turn, work with the Brazilian TFP and travel to different countries to promote the organization. For example, in 1992,

"His Imperial and Royal Highness," Dom Bertrand of Orleans and Braganca visited Chile to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the group's founding in that country. While in Chile, Prince Bertrand spoke about TFP, attended a luncheon in his honor at the Polo Club, and witnessed an equestrian performance put on by the Chilean Carabineros (police).[10]

TFP worked against the liturgical reforms introduced by the Second Vatican Council between 1962 and 1965. For centuries, the Catholic Church had "stressed eternal, unchanging aspects of belief, structure, and hierarchy." In the 1960s, it "elaborated a vision of the Church as 'Pilgrim People of God,' a living changing community of the faithful making its way through history." This new interpretation of the role and structure of the Church meant "accepting the importance of temporal, historical change, both as a fact in itself and as a powerful source of changing values."[11] TFP fiercely opposed these reforms, which they characterized as "the result of a misguided effort by Marxist-inspired clergy to mix religion and politics and to alter the faith of the masses by making them more concerned with social and political progress."[12] In addition to opposing reforms within the church, TFP was also sharply critical of progressive clergy and reform Catholic parties, such as the Christian Democrats, that called for them.

TFP is a male organization, primarily made up of conservative Catholic men from the upper and middle classes. As a leader of TFP in the United States explained to me, members, who refer to themselves as "volunteers" (volunteers are the equivalent of members) do not marry, or, at least by implication, engage in sexual relations, since they want to dedicate themselves full time, without any distractions, to the promotion of Catholic ideals and beliefs and TFP.[13] As another member of the American TFP explained,

> the full-time volunteers are single. [It's] just a desire to follow[ ] in our founder's [Corrêa de Oliveira] footsteps. He dedicated his whole life to the Catholic cause to serving the church. We live very much like a community, it's a very specific calling.[14]

Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira, a Brazilian lawyer and professor with a long history of activism in conservative Catholic movements, was central to the foundation of TFP.[15] Indeed, he was the group's chief ideologue and most prolific author. In 1959, he published *Revolucão e Contra-Revolucão* (Revolution and Counter-Revolution*)*, a book

that presented his basic vision of the world and serves as a foundational text for the organization.[16] The book offers insight into the ideology that guides the group and permeates much of TFP's writings, pronouncements, campaigns, and public projections.[17] It is an impassioned outcry against revolution, "that terrible enemy," and an equally forceful testament of Corrêa's belief that Catholicism is superior to all other religions. Corrêa de Oliveira opposed the three major revolutions of the Western world: "the pseudo Reformation, the French Revolution, and Communism" that originated in "an explosion of pride and sensuality that inspired not a system but a chain of ideological systems" that began to manifest in the fifteenth century. At that time, "Hearts gradually turned away from the love of sacrifice, true devotion to the Cross, and the goals of sainthood and eternal life." Chivalry, "which in other times had been the highest expression of Christian austerity, now revolved around love and feeling."[18] The attendant feelings of pride and sensuality, feelings that led to the demise of chivalry and stimulated the revolutionary trends that replaced it, also engendered both paganism and Protestantism. "Pride and sensuality, the satisfaction of which is the source of pleasure for pagans, gave rise to Protestantism." Pride also instigated "the spirit of doubt, questioning and the naturalist interpretation of the Scriptures." And, finally, "Protestant sensuality led to the suppression of ecclesiastical celibacy and to the introduction of divorce."[19]

Although the book strongly defends monarchical rule and the nobility as a natural elite, it acknowledges and accepts that there are those who, for "concrete and local reasons, prefer democracy to the aristocracy or monarchy." However, it sharply condemns those who "carried away by the egalitarian spirit of Revolution, hate on principle and characterize as essentially unjust or inhuman, the aristocracy or monarchy."[20] In opposition to Revolution, the book proposes "the ideal of counterrevolution, which is the restoration and promotion of Catholic culture and civilization."[21] As Ben Cowan points out, the TFP's "nostalgia extends into a longing for an idealized, mythical, medieval past in which spirituality and subordination were the hallmarks of an organic social order."[22] Indeed, as Corrêa de Oliveira writes, "it is easy to infer [that] Catholic culture and civilization are the culture and civilization par excellence," and therefore, it is the duty of Christians to struggle to restore their rule.[23] And this was precisely the mission that the Sociedade Brasileira de Defesa da Tradicão, Família e Propiedade staked out for itself.

The Founding of TFP

In 1959, revolutionary forces in Cuba toppled the dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista and proceeded to construct a Socialist society in the island nation. The victory of the Cuban revolutionary forces thrilled progressive and leftist forces throughout the Americas but shocked, angered, and scared many conservative sectors in the region, including much of the political and economic elite. It represented either the specter or the promise of socialism; agrarian reform; the nationalization of foreign, principally U.S. economic interests; and a radical transference of power from the elites who had long ruled the continent to those sectors of society who, long excluded from political power, now clamored for their share of it.[24]

Brazil, too, witnessed growing popular demands for change, although most Brazilians attempted to achieve these transformations through elections. In 1960, they elected Jânio Quadros, an exceedingly moderate reformist whose principal campaign promise was to address government corruption.[25] When he resigned in 1961, his vice president, João Goulart, a progressive nationalist, became president. Goulart was a reformist who called for agrarian reform, a demand that angered landowners and contributed to the formation of TFP in Brazil. In 1964, the Brazilian military overthrew Goulart, ushering in decades of military rule and presaging the harsh changes that would soon dominate much of the Southern Cone of South America.

The Brazilian TFP began in 1960, one year after the Cuban revolution and the same year that Quadros was elected president. TFP denounced the calls for agrarian reform (which they labeled "agro-socialismo") then making their way through the continent and in Brazil.[26] Charging that the "Catholic Left" was the "central nerve of the propaganda in favor of the agrarian reform," TFP combined its campaign against agrarian reform with its attacks on progressive forces in the Catholic Church.[27]

To combat both foes, Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira wrote *Reforma Agrária-Questão de Consciência* (Agrarian Reform—A Question of Conscience), along with two bishops and an economist. The book criticized the "egalitarian and anti-Christian character of agrarian reform," a message that received support from landowners and, according to TFP, generated debate in Brazilian society.[28] TFP supporters worked hard to get the message of the book out to their targeted audience. They traveled throughout the countryside, the seat of the large landowners, "equipped with a jeep pulling a trailer full of promotional material" and a petition opposing agrarian reform.

Their efforts paid off: they obtained 27,000 signatures from "farmers and ranchers, joined by mayors and city councilmen." The authors subsequently presented the petition to the Brazilian Congress, which received it but did not act upon it.[29]

Translated into Spanish and distributed throughout Latin America and Spain, the book offered conservative Catholics religious-based reasons to defend the property rights of landowners and the social order. The book distinguishes between a "healthy agrarian reform, which represents true progress and is in harmony with our Christian tradition" and a "leftist, unhealthy agrarian reform, which is in conflict with our tradition."[30] The text defends the *fazendeiro* (landowner) because when,

> he promoted his own well-being, he consciously favored, due to a deep and natural interlocking of interests, the well-being of the workers, promoted progress and the economic development of other sectors of the Patria, and contributed to the elevation of our general level of culture and civilization.[31]

TFP linked its defense of Christianity, private property, and the family into one seamless whole and declared that an attack on one was an attack on the other. Just as they opposed agrarian reform as a threat to private property and elite rule, they also argued against divorce, which they believed endangered the family. In 1966, the Brazilian TFP carried out its "First Campaign to Prevent the Destruction of the Family," a campaign against divorce. TFP opposed divorce since "matrimony is by its nature an indissoluble contract." Furthermore, "Christian Civilization was born and has prospered on the basis of the indissoluble Christian family."[32] Opposition to divorce has been a mainstay of the different TFP organizations around the world, although since divorce is now legal in almost all countries, it is no longer the organizing focus it once was.

Transnational Organizing, Contacts, and the Spread of TFP

Since TFP believed that the enemies it was up against—Communism, modernity, secularism, and liberalism were transnational forces—it prioritized a transnational strategy to confront and defeat its foes. For this reason, TFP leaders in Brazil implemented a conscious plan to extend the organization beyond the national borders. According to the Brazilian TFP, "Plínio and [TFP] members carried out trips outside

of Brazil to Europe and other South American countries" in order to expand their network and establish Sister Societies. From these contacts, they broadened out and later developed a "'Commission of Contacts in the Exterior' to coordinate these relations." In 1961, [they organized] "the Latin American Congress of Catholicism. [There were] 350 Brazilian participants [in the Congress], along with Hispanic Americans from various nations. This was the seed of a vast flourishing of TFPs which, beginning in 1967, were born beyond our borders."[33] Affiliated organizations developed in several South American countries in 1967, "united by ties of mutual friendship. Although autonomous, they are united around a single ideal and common struggle. Their ideal is the restoration of Christian Civilization in today's world."[34]

The Brazilian TFP used personal contacts, social and political networks, and its writings to organize like-minded groups in other countries. The formation of the Chilean TFP offers one example of how a "sister" organization developed and connected to other TFP organizations. Young members of the Conservative Party of Chile began publishing the journal *Fiducia* (Trust) in the early 1960s. Hailing from the landowning class, they used their own money to publish the journal, which attacked the agrarian reform policies of Eduardo Frei (1964–1970), the Christian Democratic president of Chile. Conflating their economic interests with their social ideals, they claimed that Socialist ideas lay behind agrarian reform and that the "confiscation" of land was inherently "anti-Christian." Quoting from the Brazilian text, but failing to offer a fuller explanation as to why this was the case, the Chilean journal linked agrarian reform to the destruction of "property, family, and tradition." "Not only does agrarian reform socialize the mentality of a people, it also attempts to—and this is its goal—attack and undermine: 1) private property, which is a natural right, and subordinate it to the will of the state; 2) the family, which is a logical outcome of the attack against property."[35] The group established relations with other conservative Catholic organizations such as those that published *Catolicismo* in Brazil and *Cruzada* in Argentina.[36] These connections, combined with the writings of Correa de Oliveira, convinced members of *Fiducia* to form a chapter of TFP in 1967. The group also took up more activist tactics against agrarian reform. When the Christian Democratic government of Eduardo Frei took over the lands of TFP leader Patricio Larraín Bustamente, TFP members organized a procession, led by the image of the Virgin Mary, to protest the seizure.[37]

The 1966 visit of Fabio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira, a director of the Brazilian TFP, helped to solidify the relationship between right-wing Chilean and Brazilian Catholics. Vidigal traveled to the southern Chile town of Temuco, where he met with farmers and spoke with them about the land reform policies that had occurred in Brazil during the João Goulart government. His public denunciations of the Christian Democrats' land reform policies led President Frei to expel him from Chile. Prior to being expelled, Vidigal had conducted interviews and gathered information about the agrarian reform policies of the Christian Democratic government. He then published his observations in the 1967 book, *Frei, o Kerensky Chileno*, which *Cruzada*, the Argentine affiliate of TFP translated into Spanish; the book was sold throughout South America and in Italy.[38] The book argues that Christian Democrat Eduardo Frei and his agrarian reform policies were preparing the path for the Left's ascension to power, just as Alexander Kerensky had done in Russia for Lenin and the Bolsheviks. The Frei government was so infuriated by the book that it banned TFP and arrested members distributing the book, while customs officials confiscated incoming TFP pamphlets.[39]

The book illustrates the transnational operations of TFP. A Brazilian member of the TFP wrote the book about Chile, which was then published in Argentina by *Cruzada* (Crusade), the conservative Catholic organization that worked closely with TFP, and the book was subsequently distributed throughout South America. In the preface the Argentine director of *Cruzada*, José Antonio Tost Torres, argues that Latin America must unite to confront the dangers posed by revolutionary Cuba as well as the threat posed by the Christian Democratic Party in Chile.

> The unity of religion, history, and blood shared by all the Latin American countries makes our continent a vast cultural unit within which any event that happens to one of its members has repercussions for all the rest. It is clear that the communist regime that Cuba is currently suffering under is not a purely local phenomenon; rather it has plans to reproduce itself in all of Latin America. The same thing is happening with the Christian Democratic experience in Chile.

Then, getting to the heart of the book's message, "the Christian Democratic Party [PDC] is one of the best tools for the campaign to socialize Latin American currently being conducted by communism."[40]

TFP Campaigns and Political Involvement

In addition to publishing and distributing each other's writings, TFP chapters in Latin America carried out similar campaigns, usually under the leadership of the Brazilian TFP. In 1968, the Brazilian TFP organized a petition campaign to denounce Communist infiltration of the Catholic Church, one of their major themes in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. TFP chapters in Argentina, Uruguay, and Chile joined the effort and, according to a TFP publication, the four groups gathered over two million signatures: 1,600,368 of which were from Brazil.[41] For over a year, the groups petitioned in their respective countries, calling for "a purge of the church."[42] As reported in The *New York Times*, "More than 1.5 million Brazilian Roman Catholics, including several top military officers and the wife of President Arthur da Costa e Silva have signed a letter to Pope Paul VI asking him to act against priests—[the] charges [against them] were [that they] were sympathetic to Communism."[43] As part of the same campaign, the Chilean TFP announced that it had carried out a "Victorious Campaign" gathering the signatures of 120,000 Chileans who "rejected the communist infiltration of the Church."[44] Revealing the friendly relationship that the group enjoyed with the Argentine military despite (or because of?) its declaration of a state of siege, the Argentine TFP "took to the streets of Buenos Aires unmolested by the police, calling for a purge of the Roman Catholic Church." They claimed they were "opening a new campaign to fight leftist subversion of the church."[45]

TFPs in other nations also initiated campaigns and called upon their sister societies to support them. In 1982, war broke out between Argentina and Great Britain when the Argentine military dictatorship attempted to end British colonialism in the Malvinas (Falklands) by invading the islands. The Argentine TFP published a statement urging Argentines not to get so swept up in the issue of "territorial sovereignty" that they forgot the issue of "communism-anti-communism [which] is infinitely greater than the issue of the Malvinas." TFP warned that Russia was attempting to use the situation to supply the Argentine military with arms, which could lead to an alliance with Russia, which would "sooner or later set up a puppet government in our country." TFP concluded, "Argentine Catholics should oppose such an alliance by all licit means. Argentina will either be Catholic or not, with or without the Malvinas."[46]

The American TFP translated and published the Argentine TFP's statement so that the American public could have "an in-depth knowledge of what is happening in Argentina." The same ad also

announced that Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira had written to both the president and minister of foreign relations of Brazil asking them to take the Argentine TFP's concerns into account "in shaping Brazil's policy in regards to the crisis."[47]

Despite its criticism of Reformist elements in the Catholic Church for their involvement in politics, TFP clearly had an activist agenda. In the days and weeks leading up to and following the military over-throw of Brazilian President João Goulart in April 1964, conservative Catholics and anti-Communist forces organized first against the demo-cratically elected president and then in support of the military take-over. TFP joined the large street protests, the Marches of the Family with God for Freedom, and worked with the anti-democratic organiza-tions that opposed Goulart and his reformist policies.[48] In TFP's words, after the coup they "rejoiced at having made a singular contribution to the creation of the ideological and psychological climate that was fully expressed in such demonstrations of patriotic inconformity [*sic*]."[49]

TFP's relationship with the military continued after the coup in Brazil.[50] In 1974, General Humberto de Souza Mello, who had been the chief of staff of the Brazilian Armed Forces, "inaugurated the new TFP auditorium in São Paulo."[51] At least one member of the TFP held a diplomatic position in the Brazilian military government, which the 1972 film *State of Siege* by Costas Gavras dramatically illustrates. The film recounts the story of the Tupamaros, an urban guerrilla organization in Uruguay. In 1971, members of the organization kid-napped the Brazilian consul to Uruguay and interrogated him. When asked him if he was a member of TFP, he replied, "Yes, in Brazil, but not here."[52] This question and the consul's admission are not merely cinematic flourishes, since after his release, Aloysio Gomide, the Brazilian consul, went to the TFP headquarters in São Paulo, where Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira warmly welcomed him.[53]

The Chilean TFP has a similar history of support for conservative and anti-democratic movements. In the 1970 presidential election, members of the group campaigned for Jorge Alessandri, the candidate of the political Right and the landowning class. They opposed Salvador Allende, the candidate of the Left, and eventual victor.[54] During the Popular Unity government of Salvador Allende (1970–1973), some members of TFP exiled themselves to Brazil and Argentina but con-tinued to send copies of *Fiducia* back to Chile.[55] Those who remained "maintained a relatively low profile" but, according to credible sources, worked with right-wing movements to remove Allende.[56] Like their co-religionists in Brazil, they welcomed the 1973 military coup that overthrew the Popular Unity and enjoyed a friendly and

mutually supportive relationship with the military dictatorship that ruled Chile for the next seventeen years. Instead of decrying the gross violation of human rights that took place during the rule of General Pinochet, the group criticized the Catholic Church and called on Catholics to disobey the bishops and to protest the church's criticism of the brutal repression practiced by the dictatorship and its support for the victims of that repression. At a time when the dictatorship censored any writings that it disagreed with, TFP published *La Iglesia del Silencio* (The Church of Silence) which proclaimed that the faithful "have the right and, based on the circumstances, the duty, to resist those pastors and clergy who support" the hierarchy and most particularly Cardenal Silva Henriquez, a leading defender of human rights. According to a leader of TFP, Alfredo MacHale, "Monsignor Raul Silva Henriquez, and a large part of the Chilean church, collaborate overtly with the implementation and maintenance of Marxism in our nation and are working in order to help this country eventually fall back into the hands of communism."[57] This attack on the Catholic Church, from a Catholic organization, served the needs and goals of the Pinochet dictatorship to undermine and delegitimize the Chilean Catholic Church, which was one of its sharpest critics.

The American TFP

Although the American TFP started in 1974, connections between conservative Catholics in Brazil and the United States began earlier.[58] According to John W. Horvat II, the American TFP vice president in 2009 and a member since 1977, the American TFP "was started by five Catholic Americans concerned about the multiple crises shaking every aspect of American life. Each of them had come to know the Brazilian TFP and its efforts to defend Christian civilization in Brazil."[59] Members of "the Brazilian TFP made very short trips to the United States and visited different organizations here . . . to see if there were some grounds to start something. There had to be Americans who were interested [in forming TFP in the United States]."[60] One of the first U.S.-based conservative Catholic groups that TFP established a relationship with was *The Wanderer*. *The Wanderer* is a self-described National Catholic Weekly that "has been providing its readers with news and commentary from an orthodox Catholic perspective for over 135 years."[61] In 1966, members of TFP participated in a forum sponsored by *The Wanderer*.[62] At the forum, Julio C.F. Ubbelohde, a member of the Argentine TFP, read a speech by Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira.[63] TFP members showed "an audiovisual about TFP activities

in Argentina, Brazil, and Chile" and later participated in Wanderer forums in Buffalo, Minnesota, in August 1966 and again in 1968.[64]

TFP built connections with the political Right in the United States. As Horvat explained,

> we definitely had contacts with conservative organizations like the Wanderer Forum, Eagle Forum (Phyllis Schlafly) and Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation (Eleanor Schlafly) and usually attended or rented a table or stand at their seminars. We also had contact with congressmen and senators over the years. Senator Helms and Congressman Bob Dornan are names that come to mind.[65]

TFP worked directly with leading veterans of the New Right such as Paul Weyrich, one of the founders of the Heritage Foundation and the Moral Majority, as well as the chairman of the Coalitions for America, and Morton Blackwell, who in addition to his prominent role in the conservative movement was the executive director of the College Republican National Committee from 1965 to 1970 and special assistant to President Reagan from 1981 to 1984. Blackwell, who has had a long and close relationship with TFP, first came into contact with them in 1977 when "a member of the American TFP met with me when I worked with the Richard Viguerie Company...editing a newsletter called *New Right Report.* I was [also] editor of *Conservative Digest.* My main concern has been to build a healthy conservative movement, and I guess that's why they sought me out."[66] The organization impressed the Republican leader, who had been hoping to meet "likeminded people in other countries." As Blackwell describes his meeting with the TFP, "for the first time, we encountered a foreign group solidly committed to our core values but which had developed impressive skills in organization and communication."[67] In the 1980s, when Blackwell was on President Reagan's staff,"it was part of my job to be liaison to conservative and religious groups and TFP happened to qualify in both [categories]." In the early 1980s, Mario Navarro da Costa, the U.S.-based representative of TFP, invited Blackwell and his wife to Brazil. By this time, the TFP "had been coming to me for advice on various things [such as political technology, organizing, and communication]" and some TFP members had probably "attended the youth leadership schools that I was conducting separately for my Leadership Institute, which I founded in 1979 and have been president of ever since." Blackwell, in turn, wanted to learn more about TFP's organizing

techniques so he "went to all their facilities [in Brazil]." However, he did not adopt any of the TFP's techniques, since they "just didn't seem the practical thing here."[68]

Blackwell did, however, contribute to building the TFP. When Blackwell traveled to different countries, he carried TFP's message with him. He met with TFP supporters in "England, Scotland, France, Spain, South Africa, and Argentina."[69] In 1982, Plínio Corrêa wrote an attack on French President Francois Mitterand's "self-managing Socialism."[70] Blackwell encouraged the TFP to include a coupon when they published the ad so that people could get in touch with the group and donate funds. The group published the ad in newspapers around the world and in the *International Reader's Digest*, paid for— Blackwell is sure—by "money raised entirely in Brazil." According to Blackwell, the ad and the coupon were a success since "they got lots and lots and lots of people to contact them, which facilitated the organization of TFP activities in other countries." In 1984, Blackwell and Paul Weyrich traveled to Brazil to give a seminar for the TFP to which, Blackwell recalls, "more than a thousand people" came. They were not the only U.S. supporters of TFP to visit Brazil. Fred Schlafly, at the time president of the World Anti-Communist League (and husband of Phyllis Schlafly) visited TFP in Brazil in 1974 and delivered a lecture on "the present weaknesses of the world Communist movement."[71]

The American TFP's relationship with the New Right continued through the 1980s. In 1986, during the height of revolutionary warfare in Central America and a year after the military dictatorship in Brazil ended, the American TFP published *Is Brazil Sliding Toward the Extreme Left*? Paul Weyrich, then president of the Coalitions for America, and Morton Blackwell joined John Spann, president of the North American TFP, to launch the book in Washington in October 1986.[72]

In addition to working with the U.S. Right, TFP had an ongoing relationship with the World Anti-Communist League (WACL). WACL started in 1966 in South Korea and "its chief organizers were the Taiwanese and South Korean governments and an organization called the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations." By the mid-1980s, WACL had expanded to ninety chapters on six continents and included some very powerful members.[73] For example, in 1971, the Brazilian and Argentina TFPs attended the 5th annual conference of the World Anti-Communist League held in Manila. Philippine Dictator Ferdinand Marcos "was the guest of honor at the opening" and later "hosted 350 delegates from fifty-three countries at a farewell banquet."[74]

   The American TFP is a small organization, with access to substantial financial resources, as its ability to simultaneously publish two-page ads in three leading U.S. newspapers indicates.[75] Given its size, it frequently works in coalition with other conservative Catholic organizations. For example, it joined with other anti-choice organizations to protest the granting of an honorary degree to President Barak Obama at the May 2009 commencement ceremony at Notre Dame, claiming that he "favor[s] abortion and embryonic stem research."[76] It is very active in the America Needs Fatima Campaign, which, according to the organization's Web site, held rallies at over 3,500 sites on October 2008 and over 4,000 in October 2009. In the rallies, the faithful "pray for American's conversion" to Catholicism.[77]

   The American TFP developed the St. Luis de Monfort Academy in Herndon, PA. The Academy educates about twenty young boys using "a home-schooling curriculum."[78] It hosts a Call to Chivalry summer camp, the 2009 theme of which focused on "the heroic deeds of the Cristeros, Catholic Mexicans who resisted Communist persecution under the presidency of Plutarco Elías Calles" in the 1920s. The TFP's article on the summer camp notes, "The most significant event of the camp was the arrival of the International Pilgrim Virgin Statue of Our Lady of Fatima." Reflecting their longing for the imagined glories of the feudal past, "the camp ended with Medieval games and a grueling obstacle course, followed by a beautiful rosary procession with Our Lady of Fatima's statue and a fine dinner, featuring a whole roasted pig."[79]

Conclusion

I first heard of TFP in 1993 when I was doing research on right-wing women in Chile. Jaime Guzmán, one of the principal ideologues of the Pinochet military dictatorship, had been an early contributor to *Fiducia*. Over the years, I have learned what I could about this rather mysterious organization. In 2003, I went back to Chile to conduct more research on TFP. Much to my shock, I came across a picture of myself at a 1994 pro-gay rally in Santiago in *Fiducia*. The caption read, "The cultural revolution is the principal arm of revolutionary psychological warfare."[80] I was obviously destined to write about this group!

   With its longing for the medieval past; its desire to restore the world of chivalry and Catholic domination; its anti-Communist, anti-gay, anti-divorce, and pro- heterosexual marriage politics (ardently professed, despite the fact that its members are celibate men); its rejection of the modern, although as a visit to their multiple web pages

reveals, they freely avail themselves of the most modern means of communication; and its unapologetic embrace of military dictators in Latin America, groups such as the World Anti Communist League, and leading ideologues of the U.S. New Right, TFP is a poster child for reactionary politics.

TFP's transnationalism is rooted in shared beliefs: the need to actively oppose secularism, modernity, Communism, and revolution and to work for the restoration of the imagined past: medieval Europe in which Catholicism and men ruled supreme. These ideals, which coincide with the group's fierce defense of property and opposition to any policy, idea, or program that threatens its definition of the family, spurred its growth from Brazil in 1960 throughout much of the Americas and Europe. To further its expansion, TFP sponsored a continual flow of publications, individuals, ideas, and campaigns between and among its various sister organizations. And it had powerful allies in its efforts. At a time when military dictatorships ruled the Southern Cone, TFP freely published its writing, gathered names on its petitions, and marched in public to uphold its beliefs. In the United States, its relationship with such Republican luminaries as Morton Blackwell and Paul Weyrich provided the group access to important circles and networks of the New Right.

Even though each group is rooted in and responds to the local realities of its particular nation, members share fundamental beliefs and goals, as demonstrated by their joint campaigns, shared readings, and support of each other. They publish and read what other members write, conduct joint campaigns, attend each others' conferences, and share speakers and tours. Transnationalism is central to the TFP and helps to explain the organization's ability to exist and continue its work some fifty years after it was founded.

Notes

1. For comments on the *Los Angeles Times* article, see http://latimesblogs. latimes.com/readers/2008/06/battling-for-am.html. According to a TFP leader, the ads cost $400,000 and "a small number of people gave donations for that specific project and one person, a working man, saved his money" and donated it. Anonymous TFP leader, interview with author, tape recorded, September 1, 2009.

2. Similar organizations in other countries are the Covadonga Cultural Society in Spain, Young Bolivians for a Christian Civilization, and Young Canadians for a Christian Civilization. See Tradition Family Property, *Half a Century of Epic Anticommunism* (Mount Kisco, NY: The Foundation for a Christian Civilization, 1981), p. 113.

3. Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira, *Nobility and Analogous Traditional Elites in the Allocutions of Pius XII* (York, PA: Hamilton Press, 1993), p. xvii.

4. Liberation Theology emerged in Latin America following the 1968 Latin American Bishop's Conference in Medellín, Colombia. This interpretation of Catholicism rejects the close association that the Catholic Church had with the elite and instead argues for a preferential option for the poor. See Roger N. Lancaster, *Thanks to God and the Revolution* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988); and Penny Lernoux, *Cry of the People* (New York: Doubleday, 1980).

5. I have not been able to obtain precise TFP membership figures, since the organization does not make its membership lists or numbers public.

6. Brian H. Smith, *The Church and Politics in Chile* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982), pp. 136–37.

7. Tradition Family Property, *Half a Century*, pp. 406–8.

8. Corrêa de Oliveira, *Nobility and Analogous*, p. 51. The text defines analogous elites as "the families of the bourgeoisie in whose bosom . . . flourished a genuine family tradition, rich in moral, cultural, and social values."

9. This support may very well continue today. James Brooke, "Tired of Presidents? Brazil Can Vote for King," *New York Times*, March 29, 1993.

10. *Tradición, Familia Propiedad*, No. 88, Santiago, Chile, 1992, p. 11.

11. Daniel H. Levine, *Religion and Politics in Latin America. The Catholic Church in Venezuela and Colombia* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981), p. 35.

12. Thomas A. Kselmaqn, "Ambivalence and Assumption in the Concept of Popular Religion," in *Religion and Political Conflict in Latin America*, ed. Daniel H. Levine (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), p. 32.

13. Anonymous TFP leader, interview with author, Chicago, tape recorded, September 1, 2009.

14. Anonymous instructor at the St. Louis de Monfort Academy, interview with author, tape recorded, August 6, 2009. He added that the American TFP has "between forty and fifty full-time volunteers."

15. In the 1930s, Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira had been a member of Sociedad de Estudios Políticos (Society for Political Studies, SEP), which "was dedicated to a new order grounded in authority, national unity, class conciliation, and knowledge of Brazilian conditions." Sandra McGee Deutsch, *Las Derechas*: *The Extreme Right in Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, 1890–1939.* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), p. 252. As director of *Legionário*, the publication of the Marianne Congregation of Saint Cecilia, he worked with other conservative Catholic men who would later join with him to found TFP. See Sociedade Brasileira de Defesa da Tradicão, Família e

Propiedade, *Un Homen Uma Obra Uma Gesta. Homenagem das TFP a Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira* (São Paulo: Edicões Brasil de Amanhã, n.d.), p. 30.

16. The TFP commemorated the fiftieth anniversary of the publication of the book as part of its "2009 International Student Conference" held in the "stately eighteenth-century Lowenstein Castle in the wooded Bavarian hills in Kleinheubach, Germany." See John Horvat II, "Preparing For the Fight," Tradition, Family and Property, accessed August 8, 2009, http://www.tfp.org/.

17. One highly critical article on TFP referred to the book as "The Bible of the TFP." See Thomas Case, "TFP: Catholic or Cult?," *Fidelity*, May 1989, p. 23.

18. Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira, *Revolución y Contra-Revolución* (Santiago, Chile: Ediciones Paulinas, 1961), pp. 10, 24.

19. Ibid., pp. 25–26.

20. Ibid., pp. 29–30.

21. Ibid., pp. 58.

22. Ben Cowan, written communication to author, September 21, 2009.

23. Corrêa de Oliveira, *Revolución y Contra-Revolución*, p. 60.

24. Thomas C. Wright, *Latin America in the Era of the Cuban Revolution* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001), especially Chapter 3.

25. My thanks to Ben Cowan for this identification of Quadros.

26. Sociedade Brasileira de Defesa, *Um Homen*, 63.

27. Ibid., 69.

28. Antonio De Castro Mayer, Geraldo de Proenca Sigaud, Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira, and Luis Mendonca de Freitas, *Reforma agraria. Problema de conciencia* (Buenos Aires: Club de Lectores, 1963). According to the TFP, the book became a "best-seller" in Brazil and was translated into Spanish and published in Argentina (1963), Spain (1969), and Colombia (1971). Ibid., p. 67.

29. Tradition Family Property*, Half a Century*, pp. 45–48.

30. De Castro Mayeret al., *Reforma agraria*, p. ix.

31. Ibid., p. 17. Indeed, the book is written for "members of the liberal professions, ecclesiastics, politicians, the military, and, especially, agriculturalists, agrarian engineers, and economists; and in general all those men of culture and action who maintain faith in and love for our civilization and for whom private property is legitimate and deserved and whose responsibility it is, in different ways, to defend the basic pillars of the Nation," p. 6.

32. Tradition Family Property, *Half a Century*, p. 100. Translated from the Portuguese by John Russell Spann and José Aloisio A. Schelini, *Meio século de epopéia anticomunista*.

33. Sociedade Brasileira de Defesa, p. 45.

34. Tradition Family Property, *Half a Century*, pp. 112–13.

35. Javier Polanco Silva, "La 'Reforma Agraria': un ataque a la propiedad, la familia y la tradición," *Fiducia*, August 1964, pp. 8, 10. Unfortunately, this article fails to spell out the precise connection between agrarian reform and the family. However, in another text, TFP links "prejudice against ownership" with "loosen[ing] the bonds holding the family together" as

part of the plan "favoring a collective conception of society." See Tradition Family Property, *Half a Century*, p. 182.

36. *Catolicismo* was the "cultural monthly edited under the aegis of His Excellency Antonio de Castro Mayer, Bishop of Campos." Tradition Family Property, *Half a Century*, p. 6.

37. Elena Vial, "Al fiduciano desconocido," *¿Qué Pasa?*, April 29-–May 4, 1983, pp. 12–13.

38. Fabio Vidigal Xavier Da Silveira, *Frei, el Kerensky Chileno* (Buenos Aires: Cruzada, 1967). According to TFP, four editions of the book were published in Brazil, six in Argentina, three in Venezuela, and one each in Colombia, Ecuador, and Italy for a total of 120,000 copies. See Tradition Family Property, *Half a Century*, p. 118. The TFP's characterization of Eduardo Frei as the handmaiden of the Communists registered with many in the Chilean right. In 1993 and 1994, I interviewed right-wing Chilean women about the 1960s and the Frei government, and quite a few of them referred to the former president, who they detested, as the Chilean Kerensky. See Margaret Power, *Right-Wing Women in Chile. Feminine Power and the Struggle against Allende, 1964–1973* (University Park: Pennsylvannia State University Press, 2002).

39. "Church Liberals in Argentina Target of Rightists," *New York Times*, July 12, 1969, 8. According to the TFP, Chilean tourists in Argentina bought the book and "returned home carrying it in their luggage." Tradition Family Property, *Half a Century*, p. 119.

40. Xavier Da Silveira, *Frei, el Kerensky chileno*, pp. 7–8.

41. Tradition Family Property, *Half a Century*, pp. 129–32.

42. "Church in Latin America Develops Leftward Trend," *New York Times*, July 16, 1969.

43. "Letter to Pope Says Church Harbors Pro-Communists," *New York Times*, September 15, 1968, 5. The article continues, "the letter contends some clerics and laymen want to turn the church into a weapon 'for extensive Communist agitation to bring down the Government, abolish the armed forces and create an iron-handed dictatorship.'"

44. "Victoriosa Campaña de la TFP," *Fiducia*, January–February 1969, No. 26, Year vii, p. 8.

45. "Church Liberals in Argentina Target of Rightists," *New York Times*, July 12, 1969, p. 8.

46. "Russian Influence in the Falkland Crisis," *New York Times*, April 30, 1982. This advertisement paid for by the American TFP was a translation of the ad that the Argentine TFP had published in Buenos Aires on April 12, 1982.

47. Ibid.

48. Solange de Deus Simoes, *Deus, Patria e Familia* (Petropolis, Brazil: Vozes, 1985), p. 122.

49. Tradition Family Property, *Half a Century*, p. 69.

50. The relationship was not tension free. In 1966 the military government proposed a new Civil Code that "virtually legaliz[ed] divorce." The TFP

opposed this change and launched the campaign against it discussed above, in the process gathering over a million signatures. For a discussion of the TFP's "outrage and mystification" at General Castello Branco's "initial failure to quash any and all divorce measures" see Ben Cowan, "'Why hasn't this teacher been shot?': Moral Panic, the Religious Right, and Sexualized Students during Brazil's *Anos de Chumbo*," Paper presented at the Latin American Studies Association, Rio de Janeiro, June 2009. It is important to point out that no member of the TFP was arrested let alone tortured for their challenge to the military ruler's proposals, unlike members of the opposition.

51. Tradition Family Property, *Half a Century*, p. 321.
52. Costas-Gavras, Director, *State of Siege*, 1972.
53. Tradition Family Property, *Half a Century*, pp. 303–04.
54. Smith, *The Church and Politics*, p. 137.
55. "Como Opera el Integrismo Catolico Fascista contra la Iglesia Catolica en Chile: El Rol de Fiducia," *Chile-America* (Rome), no. 16–17-18 (March–April–May 1976), 121. Just why they left Chile is not clear, since the Allende government did not repress the organization.
56. Ibid., p. 338.
57. *¿Qué Pasa?*, February 26, 1976, quoted in "Como Opera el Integrismo Católico Fascista contra la Iglesia Católica en Chile: El Rol de Fiducia," *Chile-America* (Rome),no. 16–17-18 (March–April–May 1976), p. 122.
58. Tradition Family Property, *Half a Century*, p. 113.
59. John W. Horvat II, written communication, October 15, 2009.
60. Anonymous instructor at the St. Louis de Monfort Academy, interview with author, August 6, 2009.
61. The Wanderer Web site, accessed September 7, 2009, http://www.thewandererpress.com/ee/wandererpress/index.php?pSetup=wandererpress&pageToLoad=e_aboutus.php&nav=aboutus&curDate=20090910.
62. Tradition Family Property, *Half a Century*, p. 292.
63. Horvat, written communication.
64. Tradition Family Property, *Half a Century*, p. 293.
65. Horvat, written communication.
66. Morton Blackwell, interview with author, tape recorded, August 7, 2009.
67. Blackwell wrote the Foreword to *Nobility and Analogous Traditional Elites*. See Corrêa, *Revolución y Contra-Revolución*, pp. xxiv–xxv.
68. Blackwell, interview with author.
69. Ibid.
70. For a copy of the ad and coupon see *New York Times*, February 26, 1982.
71. Ibid., pp. 323–24. The TFP contacted Phyllis Schlafly because she was a well-known figure in the conservative movement and a Catholic. Anonymous leader of the American TFP, interview with author, September 1, 2009.
72. *Sociedade Brasileira de Defesa*, pp. 176–79.
73. Scott Anderson and Jon Lee Anderson, *Inside the League* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1986), p. xvii.
74. Tradition Family Property, *Half a Century*, p. 303.

75. According to John Horvat, in 2009, the TFP had a network of "some 130,000 active supporters and donors," however I have not been able to verify that figure.

76. See Luis Sergio Solimeo, "Dialogue at Notre Dame: Undermining the Abortion Debate," June 3, 2009, http://www.tfp.org/tfp-home/catholic-perspective/dialogue-at-notre-dame-undermining-the-abortion-debate.html

77. See "America Needs Fatima," http://www.americaneedsfatima.org/current-campaigns-public-square-rosary.html. Fatima is the place in Portugal where some Catholics believe that the Virgin Mary appeared to three children tending sheep in 1917. She urged them to pray to the rosary and join with others to restore Catholicism to its rightful place as the world's moral guiding light. TFP draws on the image and words of "Our Lady of Fatima" to decry "the ominous threat of communism." See Antonio A. Borelli and John R. Spann, *Our Lady of Fatima: Prophecies of Tragedy or Hope for America and the World* (n.p.): United States of America: The American Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property, 1985), p. 8. See http://www.americaneedsfatima.org/Public-Square-Rosary-Central/send-your-rose-to-fatima.html

78. Anonymous instructor at the St. Louis de Monfort Academy, interview with author, August 6, 2009.

79. Joseph Gallagher, "Boys Inspired by Chivalry and Blessed by Our Lady," August, 27, 2009, http://www.tfp.org/frontpage-news/frontpage-news/boys-inspired-by-chivalry-and-blessed-by-our-lady.html.

80. *Tradición Familia y Propiedad*, "Revolución Cultural," Año 33, No. 94, 1995, p. 6.

5

The Nationalist Action Party: The Transformation of the Transnational Right in Turkey

Gokhan Bacik

Transnationalism is not a new phenomenon in Turkish politics. Many Islamists and nationalist groups have promoted transnationalist agendas. Islam-linked transnationalist movements in particular were successful at creating transnational networks. There is, however, an obvious conceptual departure between the configurations of transnationalist and nationalist thought. Ernest Gellner defined nationalism as the creed that political and national units are, or should be, congruent.[1] Consistent with this definition, typical nationalist thought is premised on the idea of the territorial state that contains the nation. However, as we will see, a transnational understanding of the nation can encompass not only those who live within a current state but also conationals who live beyond it.

   This chapter analyzes the Nationalist Action Party (NAP), the leading nationalist party since its creation in the 1960s, as an example of the Turkish transnational Right's stance. Obviously, transnationalism was the paradoxical element of the NAP credo, the nub of which was the exaltation of the nation-state. The NAP's transnationalism is located on the axis of nation/political state congruence. Its analysis therefore necessitates the relational approach, in Ella Shohat's sense of the term, which allows a consideration of the national roots of politics.[2] In the relational approach, how political actors locate themselves and act between national and transnational levels are analyzed. Thus, the interaction between the national and the transnational is not thought of as two completely independent areas.

The original NAP's transnationalism owed its existence to the Turkish people's presence in lands from Germany to China. Before the advent of the NAP, Turkish nationalism tended to be formulated with reference to those living outside Turkey; thus, a certain level of transnationalism has long been a characteristic of it. Perfectly consistent with this thought is that the NAP's nationalism was always formulated to blend in the transnational factor. Certain successfully realized projects by Turkish groups, notably the transnational spaces they created in Azerbaijan and Germany, have served to justify this. However, for reasons that will be discussed below, the NAP's transnationalist agenda gradually dropped away in the post–cold war era. At that point, the NAP became known as a mainstream party almost exclusively concentrated on a nationalist agenda that prioritizes domestic problems such as employment, education, and terrorism.

The subject matter of this chapter is transnationalism as manifested in the NAP's ideological stance. This party's historical origins, evolution, and major turning points, and the dynamics that determined the whole process are also examined. Attention centers, also, on the equally important fact that in the post–cold war era, the party gradually abandoned the transnationalist component of its platform. The chapter proceeds on the assumption that it is important to observe how a nationalist party negotiates a transnational agenda, since insight into how this happens also offers insight into the general contours of Turkish politics.

The Pan-Turkist Origin and Its Legacy

The historical development of the Turkish nationalism in which the NAP's creed was rooted was driven by a complex transnational intellectual movement of the late nineteenth century. The chaotic political environments of Russia, Central Asia, and the Balkans prompted many intellectuals to leave their homelands and head to Istanbul to settle in this city's relative security. Paradoxically, the political chaos of the period created a vibrant intellectual environment in Istanbul where those intellectuals speculated on Islamism, Turkism, or Socialism to find an ideological remedy for their problems. Yusuf Akçura, a prominent Turkist, summarized the major contending ideas in 1897 as Ottomanism, Pan-Islamism, and Turkism.[3]

Turkism began as Diaspora nationalism in Czarist Russia, late in the nineteenth century.[4] The immigrant intellectuals brought it to Istanbul.[5] Azeri and Tatar intellectuals were among the first

key propagators of this ideology. Ismail Gasprinisky of Crimea, Ali Hüseyinzade of Azerbaijan, Yusuf Akçura of Kazan, and Mustafa Çokay of Hive stood as the leading figures among them, the basic architects of early Turkism. These renowned intellectuals left their homelands after 1906, upon the deterioration of political conditions in Russia. Turkism became a more prominent ideology in the Ottoman Empire, especially after the declaration of the Second Meşrutiyet (the Second Constitution) in 1908. Istanbul's relatively free atmosphere helped these intellectuals disseminate their ideas. Some of them soon became influential actors in the governing Progress and Union Party, to the point that they were able to influence Ottoman policies.

Turkism in its early period had the major purpose of uniting all Turks. Despite the failure of this ambitious agenda, its legacy was a powerful influence on the formation of modern Turkish nationalism. The historical evolution of Turkish nationalism had always incorporated the outer Turks, even though it had left a fuzzy definition of territorial boundaries. Outer Turks are those people who live out of the territorial boundaries of the Turkish Republic. As there is no clear and common definition of what is meant by a Turk, the cluster of outer Turks changes according to who is doing the defining. The radical Turkists argue that all people who have a Turkic origin, even the Hungarians, should be seen as part of the outer Turks. The moderate perspective, however, includes only the Turkic people in Central Asia, various parts such as Europe, and Cyprus. In the writings of the early nationalists, ideas such as "the Turks" and "the Turkish nation" were left basically unspecified. Meanwhile, the definition of Turk has always generated an ongoing intellectual debate. Turks are believed to originate from Central Asia. Large Turkish tribes left the region and headed to Anatolia in the eleventh century. But since then, they have created significant multiethnic states such as the Ottomans in which different groups were mixed. Thus, modern Turkey is a post-imperial multiethnic society where it is difficult to define who is a Turk. The nationalist thesis argues that except for some minor groups such as Roma, all people in Turkey are ethnic Turks. This same thesis labels other groups, including the Kurds, as various tribes of the greater Turkish family. In general, the NAP recognizes this nationalist argument as historically correct. The liberal thesis argues that due to the legacy of multiethnic states in Anatolia, ethnic categories are no longer meaningful and correct. Thus, they define Turk as a civic category without referring to any ethnic origin.

The foundation of the Turkish nation-state in 1923 confused the nationalists, who had certain ideas and plans regarding the outer Turks. Since many of them were committed to the idea of uniting all

Turks around the globe to create a Pan-Turkist, imperialistic Turkish state to include all Turks—an idea that had dominated their thinking since the 1920s—the creation of a territorial Turkish nation-state took them by surprise. Multiplying their existing problems, the newly created Turkish Republic, wary of losing Soviet political and financial support, distanced itself from the Turkist agenda. The chief ideologue of nationalism, Ziya Gökalp (1876–1924), who inspired Ataturk, declared Pan-Turkism a romantic idea of the past without hope of realization.[6] Consequently, the Pan-Turkist legacy gave Turkish nationalist ideology a Janus-like face. On the one hand, there was the territorial Turkish nationalism that posited the Turkish nation-state as the central point of departure. On the other hand, the outer Turks, mainly those under Russian control, remained a significant concern.

Turkish nationalism, therefore, has a complex domestic and international resonance. It is territorial and, to that extent, national, but it is also extraterritorial and thus transnational. It embraces not only the Turks within the borders of the nation-state but also the Turks outside those borders. This resonance can be construed also as the oscillation between the territorial concept of nationalism and the important Pan-Turkist legacy. These two conceptions of nationalism remain the constructive ideas of Turkish nationalism as it is defined and redefined. The mechanism that powers the oscillation has captured the Turkish concept of nationalism as a context-dependent, or power-laden, idea that mutates as actors interpret it to suit their political goals. In this model, the agenda of nationalism is regularly updated according to the pragmatic preferences of political actors. Defined and redefined according to both nationalist and transnationalist sources, nationalism evolves according to what the political actors prioritize.

Alparslan Türkeş and the Revival of Transnational Turkism

Alparslan Türkeş, the founder of the NAP, was the key actor in the history of the shaping of Turkish nationalist thought. Türkeş always defended a transnationalist agenda. Under his leadership, the NAP became the leading voice of Turkish transnationalism.

Born in 1917 in Cyprus (*not* in Turkey), Türkeş was enrolled in a military high school in 1933, where he was socialized in a Turkist environment. He started his military career in 1939 as a lieutenant. As his first political experience, he took part in the various nationalist protests of the 1940s. In 1944, the government purged several

famous generals, including Fevzi Çakmak, known for their Turkist sentiments. Nihal Atsız (1905–1975), a prominent Pan-Turkist, wrote an open letter to the prime minister to condemn the purge. He also took the government to task for favoring Communism. The government's reaction was not lenient. More than twenty leading nationalists, including famous intellectuals such as Zeki Velidi Togan, Reha Oğuz Türkkan, and Nihal Atsız were arrested. Most of them were tried and punished by government-influenced courts. Breaking military rules, Türkeş participated in Turkist meetings. This resulted in his arrest—then imprisonment—in 1944. He returned to the army in 1945, when the military court freed him.

The 1944 Turkist movement had a transnationalist vision that focused mainly on the outer Turks. As was true for all other nationalists involved in these movements, for Türkeş, the political unit of analysis was not only the Turkish citizen but also the whole of the Turkish people, including those in China. This movement also had a strong anti-Communist bent. Anti-Communism and nationalism were the core tenets of the ideology. Thus, the transnationalist Right in Turkey is anti-Communist in origin. The founding fathers of Turkish nationalism, including those involved in the 1944 events, were born before the rise of the modern Turkish nation-state. The major institutions of the nation-state, even the concept of citizenship, were new ideas to them. Türkeş himself was not born a Turkish citizen; he acquired this status in 1933. Such personal backgrounds strengthen the transnationalist character of the nationalist Right.

The Nationalist Action Party: A Historical Analysis and Some Notes on Its Ideology

Türkeş attained nationwide fame in the 1960 military coup as a leading colonel of the junta.[7] For a while, he was the de facto prime minister. He was also the leader of the intrajunta faction known as The Fourteen. The members of The Fourteen, including Türkeş, were appointed to various diplomatic missions abroad, a move thought expedient because of an intragroup conflict among the junta members.[8] Türkeş was sent to India. He returned in 1963, but he and the other members of The Fourteen had stayed in contact with each other to develop their political strategy. In 1965, on Türkeş's advice, important members of The Fourteen joined the Republican Peasant Farmer's Party (CKMP), which was founded in 1948 by Fevzi Çakmak. (As already noted, Çakmak was a well-known Turkist soldier who was purged from the army by the government in 1944.)

The CKMP's program contained "a corporatist, developmental-modernist ideology primarily underlined by a Kemalist restoration agenda" until the 1960s.[9] Landau described this party as the "militant party of the Turkish Right."[10] A coalition of proto-fascists formed the social basis of it.[11] Osman Bölükbaşı, the deputy leader of the party, reorganized the CKMP as a "conservative nationalist party" to gain the support of the peasants and middle class.[12] However, despite its institutional dynamism, the party was always unpopular. It was not because of its popularity or ideological stance that Türkeş took the party over but for its already-established infrastructure. As creating and organizing a new party was both politically and financially difficult, an already existing party organization would be a great advantage to Türkeş. Although the CKMP was a little party, it had an official party organization with provincial branches all over Turkey. More than the ideology, it was the organizational opportunity that made the CKMP more desirable for Türkeş.

Türkeş's intervention amplified the nationalist and anti-Communist sentiments in the CKMP's political discourse. He soon became the inspector general of the party, and this influential position gave him the opportunity to reshape it according to his vision. Despite its relatively impressive electoral success in the 1961 election in which it took around 14 percent of the national vote, the CKMP was very weak, and many of its supporters gave up all hope of better success in future elections. Türkeş visited nearly all of the local branches of the party on his inspection tours, intent on giving the party new impetus and inspiration. This secured his election as its new chairman in the congress held on August 1, 1965. His close friends, too, were elected to important positions within the party.

Even more important transformations took place in the 1967 congress when a new program, devised almost wholly on Türkeş's ideological preferences, was adopted. His Dokuz Işık Doktrini (Nine Lights Doctrine) was adopted as the new party doctrine. It was touted as the national "third way" alternative to Communism and capitalism. Türkeş presented it as the peculiarly Turkish communitarian and statist national ideology.[13] That ideology, he proposed, emphasized the group identity of the Turkish nation and distinguished it from the class-centered concerns of Communism and the individual-centered concerns of capitalism.[14] Hakan Yavuz described Türkeş's doctrine as an anti-individual, anti-intellectual, heavily communitarian and statist model for leading the Turkish world.[15] In the same congress, Türkeş was declared the Başbuğ, the Grand Leader of Turkish peoples.

Two years later, the party's name was changed to the Nationalist Action Party to symbolize the complete take over of it by Türkeş and his nationalist ideology.

In the early 1970s, the NAP, recognizing the potential power of religion over the Turkish people, amplified its Islamic tune but set it in a carefully anti-Communist logic. As part of this new strategy, the NAP decided to use Islam to activate the conservative masses against the communist threat. Aware that Islam is hugely influential among the people, the NAP made a pragmatic decision to harness the potential power of religion as party ideology. Gradually, Islam and Turkism became equal components of the NAP ideology, carefully formulated in the famous Turkish-Islamic synthesis. The beginnings of the party's Islamization can be traced also to the 1969 congress, where Türkeş purged many who opposed the Turkish-Islamic synthesis. The competition between the Pan-Turkists' Grey Wolf and the Islam-leaning groups' three crescents was won by the latter, which symbolically displayed the victory of the Turkish-Islamic synthesis.[16]

Nevertheless, the NAP failed to become a popular party, mainly because of its intraparty reform agenda and debates. In its early period, the party expended most of its energy on intraparty efforts such as ideological debates and the creation of new provincial branches. Thus, more than its public campaigns, it was the intraparty activities that hijacked the NAP, making it less popular. Although Türkeş was elected as a deputy in his constituency, the NAP won only 3.03 percent of the vote in the 1969 elections. In the elections of 1973, it won 3.4 percent of the vote and sent three deputies to parliament. In the 1977 elections, it gathered 6.4 percent of the vote.

Following the military coup of 1980, the military junta closed down the NAP in 1981. As a result, a great fragmentation occurred in the party base, and many important members left it to join newly formed parties. While this was happening, Türkeş was serving a detention that lasted almost five years. To arrest the further fragmentation of the party base by gathering all nationalists under a common party flag, several important nationalists established the Conservative Party (CP) with the permission of Türkeş. The junta, however, prevented its participation in any elections. In 1985, the CP changed its name to the Nationalist Workers' Party (NWP). While Türkeş was banned from politics, he ruled this party through a proxy leader, which is a very typical arrangement in Turkish politics.

After he was freed from detention on October 4, 1987, Türkeş joined the NWP and was elected its new chairman. In its first foray into the electoral realm during the elections of November 1987, the

party won 2.91 percent of the national vote. This was well below the 6.4 percent it had garnered in the 1977 elections.

Before the elections of October 1991, Türkeş formed an electoral alliance with the Islamist Welfare Party (WP) in order to be able to break the national electoral threshold of 10 percent. In this tactical alliance, the NWP candidates were listed as WP members, and eighteen of them were elected. In 1992, when the parliament adopted a bill that lifted the ban on the use of political party names that predated the 1980 military coup, the NAP was reestablished to replace the NWP.

The NAP's ideology emphasized patriarchical family values, which inevitably reduced individual freedom in the name of communal values. Consistent with this stance, the NAP was critical of ideologies such as liberalism, faulting them for their breach of harmony between the community and the individual.[17] In this sense, the NAP had a community-first ideology that commended the sacrifice of individual freedoms when that is in the interest of protecting communal values. For the NAP, the Western respect for unconstrained individualism entails a potential threat to the established communal values regarding the homeland, the state, and law and order. A party member or follower is asked to be ready for sacrifice in the name of homeland and party. Military service and fighting for the homeland are sacred concepts in the party vocabulary. The NAP's ethos is communal harmony; and that harmony, it posits, obtains between the citizenry and the state.

In NAP ideology, Turkey has a special role. It considers that nationalists should create an advanced and civilized Turkey that will be the leader of all the Turks.[18] The NAP's approach to globalization and privatization was directed by this view of Turkey's role. Accordingly, it argued that the privatization of major state-owned companies weakens the state and therefore works against the realization of Turkey's role. The NAP was a major opponent of privatization programs. It defended its opposition with the argument that a strong Turkey can be created only on a state-based model, for the state is more than a political apparatus; it is a sacred and transcendental entity. The NAP always criticizes governments but never the state: the state, according to its perception, is infallible. No project that weakens the state's role is welcomed by the NAP.

Nationalism, the most important component of the NAP's ideology, is defined as "love of the Turkish nation and loyalty and service for the Turkish state."[19] For the NAP, all people in Turkey are Turks; thus, a political discourse that presents Turkey as a multiethnic

society is strongly rejected. Similarly, the NAP is very critical of ethnic communal rights. Since the 1980s, the party has held that military methods are the only legitimate means of overcoming the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) problem and has rejected any political agenda that proposes negotiation with the Kurds.

The Transnationalist Agenda

Under Türkeş's leadership, the NAP had a complex transnational agenda. The party presented itself as the transnational actor charged with taking care of the problems of all Turks. To signal that he was more than the leader of a national party, Türkeş developed a transnational narrative and program for the whole Turkish world. In party programs, outer Turks were always underlined as the objects of major concern. In Türkeş's Temel Görüşler *(Basic Ideas)*, a short pamphlet in which he explained his ideas to the followers, he noted that it is the sacred duty of every nationalist to deal with the problems of other Turks.[20] The party made strong connections with other transnationalist Right organizations such as the Pan-Turkist Association. It published many pamphlets, brochures, and other materials to articulate the Turkist cause in its transnational dimension. In this narrative, nationalism is presented as strongly linked to the outer Turks. The subject of nationalism was thus not the Turks in Turkey but all Turks everywhere.

When Türkeş formulated the theory of the transnationalist agenda, he treated the delicate balance between Turkey and other Turks carefully. He was aware that the transnationalist Turkist program was to be promoted tactfully so it would not seem to harm the Turkish Republic. He made it known that the protection of Turkey, the only independent Turkish state, was a very important principle of nationalism. But he also stressed that the Turks in Turkey had no moral way of subtracting themselves from the problems of the outer Turks.[21]

The balance between Turkey and the outer Turks forced Türkeş to develop a model-country thesis in which Turkey had a special responsibility. Thus, a strategy was needed to create the Turkish nation as an advanced, civilized, and powerful world leader.[22] The NAP, departing from its former Pan-Turkist stance, began to support the idea of independence for all Turkic groups, particularly for those under Soviet dominance. Once independent, these Turkic peoples would federate under Turkey's leadership. During the congress convened in 1969, the NAP elite made serious contributions to the discussion of the problems of Turkish nationalism. Foreign policy, particularly toward

the outer Turks, was made the main focus of a special committee that argued in its final report that there are more than sixty million Turks living outside Turkey.[23]

To realize its transnational program, the NAP opened its first foreign branches in 1975, mainly in Cyprus, but also in several European states such as Germany and France. However, the Soviet reality made the transnationalist agenda a lame-duck strategy. As major Turkic states such as Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, and Kirghizstan were part of the Soviet system, the NAP had no field of maneuver in these areas, due to the Soviet's authoritarian control over these countries. All of the NAP's links with the Turks on Soviet territory were forged secretly. Worse, in the summer of 1977, the NAP had to disband its foreign organizations, following the decision by the Turkish Constitutional Court that prohibited Turkish political parties from organizing activities abroad.[24] This decision was a typical statist reflex action to allay any danger that great powers like the USSR might express concern about Turkey's activities on their soils. In response, the nationalists founded the Greater Ideal Club, which, without official link to the party, was free to strive to realize its transnationalist agenda.

As already noted, the NAP's transnationalist activity among the Turkic peoples in the USSR was seriously crippled by the Soviet regime. The totalitarian Soviet regime disallowed all approaches to the Turkic people with a view to their creating transnational spaces. The NAP therefore deployed two major tactics: One was the smuggling into the Soviet republics of documents and brochures prepared by the NAP; the other, the arranging of meetings in different European cities between the NAP elite, including Türkeş, and the Turkic leaders of states such as Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan. These activities of the NAP were insignificant in face of the Soviet hindrance. The NAP nevertheless kept faith with its transnationalist agenda and magnified its anti-Communist attitude. As part of this agenda, the NAP organized meetings in Istanbul and Ankara to protest various Soviet policies in different countries like Azerbaijan. For example, when the Azeri nationalist leader Ebulfeyz Elcibey was arrested, the NAP organized a big meeting to protest this event. Several other similar protests were also organized in different Turkish cities to protest the Soviet policies. After analyzing the political discourse in such meetings or in the printed brochures, the NAP described the Soviet system as following an anti-Turk agenda that aimed at the annihilation of the Turkish culture, mainly in the Central Asia. According to the NAP, the Soviet system's main fear was a Turkist insurgence against Moscow.

Although limited, the NAP's activities were influential among nationalist groups in certain Soviet Republics, such as Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan. So the leadership of the various clandestine nationalist organizations followed developments in Turkey closely. Despite strict regulations, the NAP was relatively successful both in keeping contact with those elites and smuggling its printed material to them, particularly into Azerbaijan. Thus, the NAP's activities were particularly significant for the elites who led the various clandestine nationalist organizations in the Soviet republics.

The NAP reactivated its transnationalist agenda, particularly in the newly created Turkic states in Central Asia, after the end of the cold war. The party first encouraged Turkish officials to recognize the independence of the newly created Turkic states. Despite it being a relatively small party, the NAP was influential in this process, mainly thanks to its former members who were in different ruling parties at that time. Many of the NAP's members left the party after the 1980 coup and joined other parties. Several former NAP members became ministers in various governments. Then, renewing his old contacts, Türkeş, organized meetings that delegates from the various Turkic states attended. A large number of delegates from the newly independent Turkic states joined in the Convention of the Turkic World. The Foundation for the Co-operation of Turkish States and Communities also organized several big events to discuss cooperation among Turks. Turks were treated as a politically homogenous group during such meetings, despite the fact that English or Russian was used as the conference language. However, the newly independent Turkic states launched radical nation-building policies to create national identities such as Azeri, Uzbek, or Kazakh, rather than head to the melting pot imagined by the Turkish nationalists.

When the NAP became a coalition partner in 1999, the party occupied the government ministry responsible for relations with the Turkic communities. The NAP's government ministers quickly erected official platforms for their transnational agenda. Various grand ambitions, such as a Turkish common market, became a part of their official discourse. The Grand Convention of Turkic States and Peoples, backed by the state through the NAP's government ministers, played a key role, inviting more than thirty delegates of the different Turkic communities to each of its conventions.

Azerbaijan occupied a special position in the NAP's transnational agenda. Upon the end of the cold war era, Türkeş set out on a complex trip that made good use of the strong connections between the Azeri elite and the NAP, where the party already had a network of contacts.

The most dramatic of his visits was to the guerrilla camp in Azerbaijan that was used to fight against the Armenians who had occupied more than 15 percent of Azeri territory. After secret negotiations with Ebulfeyz Elçibey, the Azeri president, Türkeş sent several experienced men to this country to organize a military training camp. The purpose of the camp, to which at least 500 ülkücü (nationalists) were to be sent from Turkey, was to train 2,500 guerrillas. It was reported that some of those nationalists lost their lives in the war against Armenia.[25] (In 1988, Armenia declared war on Azerbaijan demanding that Karabagh should not be part of Azerbaijan. Soon, the Armenian army occupied Karabagh and declared that this land was part of Armenia. The military conflict continued until 1992, but Azerbaijan failed to retake Karabagh. Still under Armenian control, the Karabagh problem is one of the most sensitive issues of the region's politics.) Some of the people trained in these guerrilla camps were later accused of organizing a failed coup d'état against Haydar Aliyev, the new Azeri president after Elçibey.[26] Obviously, the official permission given by Elçibey, at the time the head of state, to the NAP leadership displayed the strong transnational networks created by nationalists on both sides. Despite its weak political power in the early 1990s, the NAP was a capable actor in such circumstances for two major reasons: First, the transnational networks of the NAP were still useful. Second, these mechanisms protected the Turkish political elites from potential public pressure. It is normally risky to negotiate on the Armenian issue in Turkey. As any official process would face a serious nationalist reaction, it was pragmatic to conduct such strategies through relatively less visible corridors.

Türkeş also attempted to play a key role in the Azeri-Armenian negotiations. In 1993, Armenia faced a serious economic crisis, which worsened when the usual Russia financial aid was suspended, due to instability in Russian politics. Armenia officially asked help from Turkey, and indeed, demanded Turkish food delivery. In 1993, Turkey decided to help Armenia by sending basic foodstuffs. To avert a negative nationalist reaction within Turkey, the Armenian side decided to speak to Türkeş. Samson Özararat, a leading Armenian public figure who also led several influential organizations, demanded a rendezvous with him. In February 1994, Özararat met Türkeş in Ankara. At this meeting, Özararat was able to arrange a meeting between Türkeş and Levon Ter Petrosyan, the president of Armenia. In 1994, Petrosyan and Türkeş met in Paris. Turkey's ambassador to Paris accompanied Türkeş to this historic meeting. The Armenian side attempted to arrange a second meeting with Türkeş. Özararat urged the Armenian president to attend it, reminding him

of Türkeş's worsening health due to age. According to Özararat, it was going to be difficult to find a substitute for Türkeş', given his acceptability among the Azeris.[27]

Germany was an equally important target of the NAP's transnational agenda. The rise in the size of the Turkish population in Germany in the 1960s attracted certain nationalist and Islamist movements in Turkey. The NAP also acted very quickly to bring its transnational network to the Turks in the various German cities. Since the Turkish Constitutional Court prohibited its establishing of missions abroad, the NAP employed mainly its youth organizations and nationalist associations that had no official connection to the party. In the 1970s, the NAP started sending envoys to the Turks living in Europe. Accordingly, the party decided to send several party delegates to various European cities with a Turkish population. Their mission was basically to indoctrinate and educate party members in those places, as well as to lead the organizational efforts. Türkeş visited Germany in 1970 and participated in a party conference there. In December 1975, the NAP European General Assembly was founded.[28] And in 1978, Turkish citizens formed the Federation of European Democratic Idealist Foundations in Frankfurt. Among the founders were more than sixty delegates from various European countries such as Austria, the Netherlands, France, England, and Germany.[29] This body was designed as an umbrella organization to cover similar associations all over Europe. The major motive behind creating such an umbrella organization was to gain control of all Turkish nationalist activities on the continent. Similar associations were soon founded in other states, like Belgium, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, and they became part of the Turkish Federation. The federation has members even in non-European states such as the United States, Canada, and Australia.[30] It has a complex bureaucratic organizational framework, with regional and provincial missions in German cities with Turkish populations.

The NAP established its Ülkü Ocakları (Hearts of Idealists) in many major European cities. These organizations, which work in a communal setting, mobilize a wide range of people behind the movement and forge a sense of social solidarity among members.[31] The Ocaks were important also in terms of indoctrination and recruitment. Ülkü Ocakları activists not only propagated a transnational ideology but also aimed to construct Turkish environments for their members. They were the organic parts of the NAP's transnational agenda in Europe. The NAP regularly sent party members to supervise and educate the Ocaks. Members of the Ülkü Ocakları in Europe were led by the NAP, which influenced their political and electoral behaviors.

The NAP in the Post–Cold War Era:
The Erosion of the Transnational Agenda

Unsurprisingly, the NAP put more emphasis on its transnational agenda when the Soviet system collapsed. First, the party presented the collapse of the Soviet system as proof of the consistency of its nationalist doctrine. Second, the party argued that the NAP was the only political actor that was ready to realize the needed strategy toward the outer Turks. In short, the party believed that the collapse of the Soviet system offered it significant opportunity, even in the domestic realm. The early 1990s witnessed a Turkist euphoria not only in Turkey but also in the newly independent Turkic states. However, this bubble burst for complicated social and political reasons, among them the fall from power of the early idealist leaders such as Elçibey of Azerbaijan and the indifference of the masses in many Turkic states. The euphoria subsiding, most Turkic states adopted more realistic policies, based on their own interest. Also, unlike a relatively small group of intellectuals and activists, the masses were unaware of the transnationalist agendas of several actors, including the NAP's. The NAP's early expectation that the masses would embrace the idea of Turkish unification was dashed.

   The NAP's leadership was well aware of this turn of events. The party recognized that a more realistic agenda was needed for facing the new international circumstances. In his speech delivered to the Sixth Party Congress, Devlet Bahçeli, the new leader after Türkeş, confirmed that relations within the Turkic world had become more difficult in the post–cold war era. Bahçeli had by this time come to think that Turkey's leverage in the new geopolitical setting had decreased.[32] And several developments, including the death in 1997 of Alparslan Türkeş, also interrupted the transnationalist agenda. After the brief heyday of the Turkist agenda in the immediate post–cold war era, the NAP lowered its transnational tone and became a mainstream party in Turkish politics. The several major developments that forced the NAP to abandon its formerly ardent transnationalist agenda are analyzed below.

The Post-Türkeş Leadership and
the Rise of Moderate Policies

The NAP was ruled by one leader between 1969 and 1997, except during extraordinary periods such as the 1980 military regime, when it was left in the care of proxy leaders. The change of leadership in this

leader-centric party affected the NAP profoundly. Therefore, the erosion of its transnationalist agenda since the late 1990s should be read in considerable part as the result of the death of Türkeş.

Türkeş was not an ordinary party leader. His personality had shaped the NAP since 1965. To use Edinger's categories of leadership, Türkeş's leadership emanated from his status as the leader of the nationalist movement.[33] Rather than wear the demeanor of an official leader of a political party, Türkeş behaved as the Başbuğ of all Turks. Thus, despite the weakness of his party in terms of its parliamentary representation, Türkeş always behaved as if he were an internationally recognized leader of the Turks. The source of his legitimacy was certainly not the NAP bureaucracy or its politics but the mission he led in the wider Turkic world. Moreover, his near-spiritual aura was respected without demur by the NAP followers. After his death, everyone knew why the leader of the Ülkü Ocakları said that "Türkeş was the last Başbuğ, and there will not be another Başbuğ. From now on, the NAP will not have a new Başbuğ, but a president."[34]

Türkeş was born in a dramatic era in which empires were in the process of dissolution. Like his contemporaries, he adopted a somewhat fuzzy nationalist ideology that had no clear positions on the definitions of boundaries or even of nationhood. It was this worldview that had kept vibrant in Türkeş's mind the transnational idea of the Turkish world and its primacy. Filling the gap left by a charismatic leader is not an easy task. As expected, the death of Türkeş shocked his followers, despite the fact that at eighty years of age, his death was hardly an unexpected event. At the Party Congress of 1997, Devlet Bahçeli was elected the new leader of the NAP, which obviously marked the beginning of a new era for the Turkish nationalist movement.

Although socialized in the nationalist movement since the late 1960s, Bahçeli's background is totally different from that of Türkeş. With a doctorate in economics, Bahçeli is more a bureaucratic leader. Türkeş was socialized mainly in the Pan-Turkist activism against the Soviets, unlike Bahçeli, for whom the 1980s—the transitory years of global politics—were crucial. Bahçeli obviously does not have the same charismatic effect on his followers that Türkeş had. It is therefore logical that his agenda for consolidating his leadership is more secular. Under his leadership, the NAP's governance is managed by bureaucratic and organizational mechanisms and principles. Consistent with this, Bahçeli traveled through Turkey to listen, on an almost one-to-one basis, to the electorate's demands and ideas.[35] This grassroots level of reorganization was the most important early sign

that Bahçeli's leadership would be different. In the past, the almost-spiritual Başbuğ directed the party in the "from the top down" style. The party's followers were expected to obey the rules that the leadership devised. The Başbuğ on this model is a historical personality. In sharp contrast, Bahçeli aimed to reshape the party radically, seeking to define its legitimacy in a more popular formula. For Bahçeli, legitimacy, including the leader's, is derived from the NAP members, rather than from the historic mission of the leader.

Bahçeli completed his reformist agenda in NAP's Sixth Congress, in 2000. Despite harsh criticism, he severed ties with the Ülkü Ocakları. In so doing, he pushed the NAP's institutional body up against the informal nationalist movement, which weakened the NAP's capacity to realize certain transnational agendas. As political parties are bounded by official codes, it was mainly through organizations such as the Ülkü Ocakları that the NAP had been active abroad. Bahçeli's severing ties with Ülkü Ocakları was thus a critical decision in the turning of the NAP into a more national organization. Behind Bahçeli's turn, there were two major reasons: First, Bahçeli saw the Ülkü Ocakları as an obstacle to his leadership. Second, as a new leader who lacked the charisma of Türkeş, he was fully aware that electoral success was the only criterion of success that would guarantee his long-term leadership. Thus, he tried to form a less ideological party mechanism that would focus more on the domestic problems of Turkey.

Bahçeli presented himself also as a responsible politician who is aware of Turkey's social, economic, and other problems. Under his leadership, the NAP took to propagating its opinions on Turkey's current problems, on everything from inflation to terrorism. Bahçeli was clearly transforming the NAP into a party that concerns itself primarily with Turkey's current problems. Unlike Türkeş's paternalistic approach, Bahçeli projects the image of a political leader contending with his country's problems. Not ideologically driven like Türkeş, he prioritizes economic and social issues.

Bahçeli champions Turkey, not Türkeş's borderless Turk. Having consolidated his status and vision, he changed his party's political agenda by subtly leaving the transnational issues to trail behind the domestic ones. Attending to the expectations of the NAP electorate in the countryside and the urban centers became a top priority: "The Party core rapidly concentrated its energy on the re-establishment of links with the conservative electorate in Central Anatolia,"[36] a relatively less-developed geographic area with an agricultural economy, where nationalist parties have traditionally been successful. Central Anatolia covers several provinces such as Yozgat, Çankırı, and Çorum,

located in the middle of Anatolia. The major purpose of these policies was to reorganize the NAP as a mainstream party.

The traditionalist radicals who opposed this shift were quickly purged from the scene. With these developments, Bahçeli's leadership was consolidated, and the NAP had toned down its ideological program and thereby enlarged its electoral basis to include new urban voters.[37] In a relatively short time, the NAP had redefined its program and taken a more moderate centrist direction. Obviously, it was the need to create a party with mass appeal that motivated the NAP's new leadership in this direction.[38] Öniş summarizes this transformation thus:

> Bahçeli's leadership was instrumental in setting the Party on a more moderate course, shedding its violent and extremist image in the process. Undoubtedly, Bahçeli's new-style leadership of a Party that had had a tradition of a hierarchical organization and leader domination helped transform the NAP, in the space of a few years, from a relatively minor to a significant central actor in Turkish politics.[39]

As expected, Bahçeli was strongly criticized by some old nationalists for not following Türkeş's line. For example, Ramazan Mirzaoğlu, who served as a minister in government in the late 1990s, argued that the party had been derailed from its traditional way. According to him, the new leadership has excluded the old, "real" nationalists.[40] Thus, unlike at the party congresses of Türkeş's time, Bahçeli was challenged at almost every congress by several rival leaders. Despite this, he has succeeded in retaining his leadership position to the present time, thanks mainly to the unprecedented success of the NAP in elections. The more the NAP pushed aside the old transnationalist agenda to become a mainstream party, the more electoral support it gained. Under Bahçeli, the NAP is an important actor that has passed beyond its former marginal position in Turkish politics. Its political success and the opportunities attendant upon this success satisfied and silenced in-party opposition. A short analysis of the NAP's electoral record easily displays the positive consequences of becoming a mainstream party. As table 5.1 shows, with Bahçeli, the NAP secured an unprecedented level of electoral support, gaining almost 18 percent of the vote in the 1999 elections, which gave it 128 seats in parliament and made it the second largest block there. Its worst electoral result, 8 percent in 2002, was better than the best success of Türkeş's period. In short, Bahçeli successfully transformed the NAP from an almost marginal to a mainstream party, with a relatively moderate agenda.[41]

Table 5.1 The NAP's Electoral Record

Year	Vote (%)
1965	2,24
1969	3,03
1973	3,38
1977	6,42
1987	2,93
1991 (Unspecified, due to the electoral alliance with other parties)	
1995	8,18
1999	17,98
2002	8,35
2007	14,27

De-Islamization of the NAP

A second factor that contributed to the erosion of its transnational agenda was the NAP's distancing of itself from Islam. Islam had always been an important component of the NAP's ideology, particularly since the 1970s. However, the NAP needed to distance itself from Islam because of the rise of political Islam in the 1990s. De-Islamization had begun under Türkeş, and Bahçeli continued it. Since Communism was "the other" of nationalist thought during the cold war, Islam was used to good effect to consolidate the nationalist movement. It is a peculiarity of Turkish politics that political actors of quite different ideological hues all make use of Islam. They do so because they are cognizant of Islam's influence among the masses. The NAP used Islam to underline that Communism is at ideological odds with it, and with that, to encourage the religious masses to align themselves with the NAP. Yet this use of religion differed from the Islamist's way of using it. The NAP never referred to Islam as a political model. Instead, it relied on triggering the masses' susceptibility to what they would recognize as Islam's cultural and psychological

effect. However, the collapse of Soviet Communism persuaded the Türkeş-led NAP to redefine its position on Islam.

De-Islamization pushed the NAP to the center. Admittedly, the malevolent relationship between the Kemalist establishment and the Islamist movement encouraged the NAP's maneuvers in this matter. Actually, the tension between the Welfare Party (WP) led government and the military in the 1990s, and the consequent collapse of the government under military pressure was read carefully by the NAP elite. Realizing that many people were disillusioned with the WP, the NAP purposely distanced itself from Islam to present itself as a pro-system mainstream party.[42] As indicated above, discontented groups in the NAP strongly disapproved of the new policy of de-Islamization. The upshot was that a group led by Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu, a leading NAP figure, left the party and established a new nationalist party in 1992, the Grand Union Party, that was more positive on Islam. Those discontented members' main argument was that the NAP did not embrace Islam in a coherent way.

De-Islamization contributed to the erosion of the transnational agenda in two ways: First, the traditional links between some religious orders and the NAP loosened, which weakened the party's capacity for using the complex informal networks that those links had enabled, particularly in transnational spaces. Religious orders and movements have long been known for their missionary zeal for engaging in the various transnational activities in different parts of the globe. The Gülen movement has schools in more than 100 countries, including all major Turkic states: an interesting specific example is the Süleymancı group's boarding school and the Gülen movement's several schools in Kabul.[43] The Gülen movement, led by Fethullah Gülen, is the largest Islamic movement in Turkey and the most effective and widely recognized one internationally.[44] Obviously, the NAP's de-Islamization deprived the party of the support of the religious transnationals, and in some ways, of the nationalist movements. Secondly, its de-Islamization transformed the NAP into a more pro-state party, which had certain effects on party agenda. The new parallelism between the party and the state forced the NAP to configure a more nationalistic program.

The Rise of the PKK as the New "Other"

The identity of the "other" has always played a key role in determining the NAP's interpretation of nationalism. A deep fear of the "other "has been a major component of nationalist thought. "The

NAP ideology is predicated on a defensive reflex based on the existence of an enemy, fictitious or real, which has to be challenged and destroyed."[45] Türkeş's Temel Görüşler confirms this view: "Today, the whole globe has intentions towards our beloved homeland. All states from east to west have some plans for this beautiful country. If there is a state with no plans for Turkey, that state is yet to come into existence."[46]

Communism was quickly stipulated as the "other" by Türkeş and the prominent nationalists of the 1940s. He attributed the foundation of the NAP to the rise of Marxism:

> After 1968, an extremely active Marxist and separatist youth movement began. In an evaluation meeting of the Party, we decided that only a more attractive ideology could overcome this separatist movement. Then we discussed which ideology we could use. We decided that Turkish nationalism could be the counter-ideology and that we should espouse this ideology.[47]

Türkeş again wrote that it is a major duty of the nationalist to struggle against Communism.[48] Thus, anti-Communism played a key role in Türkeş's and his followers' political socialization. Anti-Communism was a major legacy of the first generation of Turkists who had come from Russia. Popular anti-Communist organizations such as Türkiye Milliyetçiler Birliği (Turkish Nationalist Union) and Vatansever Türk Teşkilatı (Native-Country Lovers' Turkish Organization), along with Komünizmle Mücadele Dernekleri (Struggle against Communism Clubs), were the NAP's major allies in the early period.[49] It was also logical that 81.5 percent of the nationalists confirmed that the fear of Communism had strongly influenced their affiliation with the nationalist movement.[50]

The designation of Communism as the "other" was a major tenet of the NAP's transnational stance. Basically, Communism was the global threat that directed the NAP's attention so far beyond national borders as to include Central Asia. Its perception of the serious threat of Communism forced the NAP to do without a rigorous domestic agenda and thus to deem domestic problems a secondary concern. The Communist threat was therefore the major theme of party pamphlets, books, and brochures for decades. Paradoxically then, the Communist threat was the motor of the NAP's transnationalism.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, however, the NAP's "other" became the PKK, the Kurdish insurgent movement with a Marxist ideology. PKK terrorism and the Kurdish problem quickly became

the number one issue of the NAP. Communism was forgotten, and no anti-Russian sentiment was substituted for it. The PKK issue occupied the NAP agenda from its electoral campaign to its parliamentary business. Effectively, the NAP became the party specifically concerned with the PKK threat. Further, the party reorganized its relations with other parties, according to their stances on the PKK. The Kurdish problem now defines the NAP's approach even to other issues.

Intolerant of any moderate stance on the Kurdish issue, the NAP advocates a military solution to the Kurdish problem. It condemns other solutions, such as the acceptance of Kurdish cultural rights and other political strategies, as divisive policies. The party's concentration since the 1990s on the Kurdish issue has affected the political socialization of the new cadres. The struggle with the PKK since the early 1980s has molded the worldview of the NAP's new voters, who were socialized in that tense political environment.[51] The NAP declared the PKK as the number one threat to the Turkish state. Equally, it started emphasizing the PKK threat as an important aspect of its recruitment, in party training, and all other activities. New members of the NAP were thus subjected to an intense anti-PKK propaganda. Consequently, the new generation of nationalists became more sensitive on the Kurdish issue.

The replacement of the Communist threat with the PKK threat quickly contributed to the erosion of the NAP's transnationalist agenda. For the NAP, Kurdish separatism is a life-and-death threat to Turkey's survival. The endless political fight with Kurdish activism transformed the NAP into a Turkey-bounded party. It has declared other traditional issues, such as the problems of the Turks in the various part of the world, as secondary to the PKK threat. More, the struggle with the PKK has put the NAP into an antiglobalist stance that is hostile to liberalization, privatization, and human rights. This amounts to a radical departure from this party's traditional transnational idealism.

The Rise of New Competitors

In Turkish politics, the NAP had almost monopolized the issue of the outer Turks during the cold war era. However, this monopoly was challenged in the 1990s by two new actors: the Turkish state and the Gülen movement. Obviously, the rise of other strong actors tempered the social energy with which the NAP had positioned itself as the only corridor that can lead to the creation of transnational spaces for the outer Turks.

As a result of certain political calculations and fears, the Turkish state had shown no interest in the Turkic peoples under Soviet rule. That placed the NAP's transnational agenda regarding the outer Turks in a kind of conflict with the state. However, after the collapse of the USSR, the Turkic peoples of the former Soviet republics became the direct targets of the official state elite, which, in the long run, made the NAP a secondary actor in the region. The state initiated complex projects in the interest of the Turkic peoples in the several parts of the globe, such as the opening of universities, hospitals, and cultural centers. The government also constructed substantive diplomatic platforms on which the heads of Turkic states meet regularly. As expected, these state-led complex projects virtually ended the monopoly of the NAP. The transnational spaces of the outer Turks are no longer the only interest of the nationalists in Turkey.

Equally important development are the transnational spaces created by the Gülen movement in the last two decades. Organized in many states and having established its own schools, the movement deserves to be recognized as a successful actor in the creation of transnational spaces. As part of its agenda, this movement has opened many schools and universities in Kazakhstan, Crimea, Azerbaijan, Kirghizstan, Turkmenistan, and even in Northern Iraq. It has enhanced its transnational activities with economic and cultural policies as well. As early as 1997, Türkeş wrote a letter to Gülen that openly expressed his appreciation for his movement's activities among Turkic people.[52] In short, the social potential in Turkey to create transnational spaces for the outer Turks has been taken over by the Gülen movement, which reduced the traditional role of the NAP in this area.

Conclusion

The weakening of the NAP's transnational character in a global era, in which transnationalism is well on the way to becoming an influential dynamic of cross-border human relations, is the result of the multiple factors that also transformed Turkish politics in the post–cold war era. Dramatic changes were not peculiar to the NAP, as other parties also experienced changes of similar magnitude, such as the Islamists' new pro-European stance and the Kemalists' new Euro-skeptic orientation. In line with global developments, the new dynamics of Turkish politics forced actors to recalculate and redefine their major strategies, which paved the way for new domestic and international coalitions. The NAP, having succeeded in carrying out a limited transnationalist agenda during the cold war, increased the volume

of its transnationalism in the immediate aftermath of the cold war. However, the dynamism that achieved this was then replaced by moderate policies designed to bring the NAP into the political main-stream and to power, if possible. The fruits of moderation, which reg-istered as unprecedented electoral success, also silenced the sporadic criticisms of in-party opponents who rail against the NAP's aban-doning its transnationalist agenda. Thus, the NAP's new pragmatic agenda caused this transformation and declining emphasis on the transnational. The new leadership of the NAP, who read carefully the new conditions, concluded that the former transnationalist agenda was no longer a successful strategy in domestic politics. Instead, they have pushed forward a new party agenda, which prioritizes Turkey's major problems such as economic issues.

During the cold war period, the NAP had a clear transnationalist platform. It then retreated from transnationalism, mostly because the new party elites that emerged were not socialized in a Pan-Turkish environment; they preferred a domestic agenda. A further factor that explains this retreat was the NAP's own recognition that aban-doning transnationalism for a domestic agenda would give it bet-ter access to the new opportunity structures in the electoral process. The NAP's distancing of itself from its old transnationalist platform makes the future of transnationalism in Turkish politics uncertain. So long as the present leadership controls the NAP, this party's return to transnationalism is unlikely. Although the NAP elites continue to acknowledge the symbolic significance of the "outer Turks," they do not welcome the idea of giving them prominence in the party pro-gram. Furthermore, there is no dynamic in Turkish politics that could propel a variant of transnationalism into the political mainstream in a way that would enable political elites to generate political capital from it. Thus, it can be assumed that no political actor, not even the NAP, will be eager to introduce a new transnationalist discourse.

Notes

1. Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), p. 1.
2. Cited in Sedef Arat-Koç, "Some Turkish Transnationalism(s) in an age of Capitalist Globalization and Empire," *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies* 3(1), Winter, 2007, p. 36.
3. Yusuf Akçura, 'Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset', Türkiye Günlüğü 31, 1994, pp. 9–18.
4. Jacob M. Landau, *Pan-Turkism from Irredentism to Cooperation* (London: C. Hurst, 1981), p. 182.
5. Yusuf Akçura, *Türkçülük Türkçülüğün Tarihi Gelişimi* (İstanbul: İlgi, 2007), pp. 59–72.

6. Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (İstanbul: Eflatun, 2004), p. 36.
7. In writing this section, I followed the framework in Gokhan Bacik and Bulent Aras, "The Rise of Nationalist Action Party and Turkish Politics," *Nationalism & Ethnic Politics* 6(4), Winter, 2000, pp. 48–64.
8. Jacob M. Landau, "The Nationalist Action Party in Turkey," *Journal of Contemporary History* 17, 1982, p. 589.
9. E. Burak Arıkan, "Turkish Ultra-nationalists under Review: A Study of the Nationalist Action Party," *Nations and Nationalism* 8(1), 2002, p. 358.
10. Jacob M. Landau, *Radical Politics in Modern Turkey* (Amsterdam: Brill, 1974), p. 205.
11. Alev Çınar and Burak Arıkan, "The Nationalist Action Party: Representing the State, the Nation, or the Nationalists?" *Turkish Studies* 3(1), Spring 2002, p. 26.
12. Ibid.
13. Alparslan Türkeş, *Millî Doktrin Dokuz Işık* (İstanbul: Hamle Basın Yayın), p. 15.
14. Filiz Başkan, "Globalization and Nationalism: The Nationalist Action Party of Turkey," *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 12(1), Spring 2006, p. 91.
15. Hakan Yavuz, "The Politics of Fear: The Rise of the Nationalist Action Party (NAP) in Turkey," *The Middle East Journal* 56 (Spring 2002), p. 206.
16. Landau, "The Nationalist Action Party," p. 594.
17. Yavuz, "The Politics of Fear," p. 206.
18. Ibid., p. 208.
19. Alpaslan Türkeş, *Milliyetçilik* (Istanbul: Hamle, 1996), p. 16.
20. Alpaslan Türkeş, *Temel Görüşler* (Ankara: Bizim Ocak Kitap Kulubü, 1977), p. 21.
21. Türkeş, *Temel Görüşler*, p. 21 and p. 234.
22. Yavuz, "The Politics of Fear," p. 208.
23. Landau, *Radical Politics*, p. 202.
24. Emre Arslan, "Turkish Ultra-nationalism in Germany: Its Transnational Dimension," in Thomas Faist and Eyüp Ozveren (eds.), *Transnational Social Spaces: Agents, Networks and Institutions* (London: Ashgate, 2004), p. 124.
25. Yenişafak, July 12, 2003.
26. Hürriyet, September 21, 2000.
27. Can Dündar, "Türkeş Ermeni Sınırına Anıt Dikmeyi Düşünmüştü," *Milliyet*, October 17, 2009, p. 5.
28. Arslan, "Turkish Ultra-nationalism in Germany," p. 126.
29. Eva Ostergaard-Nielsen, *Transnational Politics: Turks and Kurds in Germany* (London: Routledge, 2003) p. 51.
30. For detailed information see: http://www.turkfederasyon.com/index.php.
31. Sultan Tepe, "Kemalist-Islamist Movement? The Nationalist Action Party," *Turkish Studies* 1(2), Autumn 2000, pp. 67–68.
32. MHP 6, *Olağan Büyük Kurultay Açılış Konuşması* (Ankara: MHP, 2000), p. 69.
33. L. J. Edinger, "The Comparative Analysis of Political Leadership," *Comparative Politics* 7(2), 1975, pp. 253–69.
34. *Milliyet*, April 6, 1997.

35. Çınar and Arıkan, "The Nationalist Action Party," p. 30.
36. Ibid., p. 30.
37. Ibid.
38. Ziya Öniş, "Globalization, Democratization and the Far Right: Turkey's Nationalist Action Party in Critical Perspective," *Democratization* 10(1), Spring 2003, p. 38.
39. Ibid., p. 35.
40. Yeniçağ, July 14, 2008.
41. Öniş, "Globalization, Democratization," p. 39.
42. Başkan, "Globalization and Nationalism," p. 93.
43. Gokhan Bacik, Field Study in Kabul, December 18, 2008.
44. Berna Turam, "The Politics of Engagement between Islam and the Secular State: Ambivalences of Civil Society," *British Journal of Sociology* 55(2), 2004, p. 265.
45. Burak Arıkan, "The Programme of the Nationalist Action Party: An Iron Hand in a Velvet Glove?" *Middle Eastern Studies* 34(4), October 1998, p. 121.
46. Türkeş, Temel Görüşler, p. 9.
47. Cited in Arslan, "Turkish Ultra-nationalism in Germany," p. 114.
48. Türkeş, Temel Görüşler, p. 43.
49. Arıkan, "The Program of the Nationalist Action Party," p. 123.
50. Cited in Arslan, "Turkish Ultra-nationalism in Germany," p. 114.
51. Yavuz, "The Politics of Fear," p. 213.
52. Zaman, August 15, 2000.

6

Transnational Conservatism: The New Right, Neoconservatism, and Cold War Anti-Communism

Martin Durham and Margaret Power

In discussing transnational developments among conservatives since the Second World War, we will be examining a number of strands. Our first concern will be the rise of the modern free-market right. Our second will be conservative anti-Communism. Finally, we will discuss neoconservatism, concentrating on its recent years but in the context of its rise from the late 1960s.

For the first current, we have decided to use the term "the New Right." We recognize that this expression has a number of problems. It is a term that was first coined in Britain in the late 1960s to describe the rise of a free market grouping that, at the time, had begun to have an impact on elements of the Conservative party and, a decade later, would be central to the Conservative governments of Margaret Thatcher.[1] It was used in the United States, however, to describe a constellation of groups that sought to revitalize conservatism in the mid-1970s. It opposed the level of government spending; was anti-Communist; and promoted a new emphasis on social issues, most notably a championing of "family values" against abortion, feminism, and homosexuality.[2] If we focus on the term as used in these contexts, we can already detect both commonalities and differences, and one development after the emergence of the New Right in America was the extension of the term's meaning in Britain. By the time Thatcherism was being used as a

description of a particularly combative Conservative party in power, much of its focus was on free-market economics, but other elements were in sight, from anti-Communism to a critique of sexual permissiveness; and, in some usages, all of these were seen as symptomatic of the British New Right. In America, Ronald Reagan achieved the presidency in approximately the same period, but Britain did not witness the same "culture wars," and in particular, neither the Thatcher administration nor the British New Right gave the same import to social issues as the American New Right did.[3] We will not be examining social issues in this chapter nor will we use the term New Right in Britain to refer to groupings that do not prioritize the free market. It is as champions of the free market that we will be considering the British New Right. In contrast, our particular discussion of the American New Right will be in relation to transnational anti-Communism.

Whether we are looking at the New Right in the United States or Britain, there are problems with both halves of the term. First, was it new? In Britain, if we started with the key free-market grouping, the Institute of Economic Affairs, it was established in 1955; groups with such beliefs had existed earlier but were often described not as conservative but as economic liberals. In the United States, however, the New Right emerged as a manifestation of an older conservatism. If free-market advocates sometimes defined themselves as liberals in the United States, we have the problem of what is meant by the Right in a different form. In the 1950s, American conservatism brought together those who believed that the expansion of government represented a threat to freedom (libertarians), those who feared that society was increasingly unsympathetic to the rightful claim of authority (traditionalists), and those who had been drawn to conservatism by their dread of Communism. Whether all those described as being on the right are best characterized in that way is not an easy question to resolve. We need, however, a way of examining the rise of a politics that promoted market forces and which has been described both as conservative and neo-liberal. This has been a diverse force that has not always been united or willing to describe itself as right wing. But those it identifies as its enemies help us locate it, just as does its defense of liberty over equality. With some hesitation, then, the term we will use to describe it is right wing.

In looking first at the free-market right, we need to go back before the Second World War to the 1930s, when such figures as Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Lloyd George, and—above all, John Maynard Keynes—both championed opposition to Socialism and

supported state intervention. Resistance to their policies came from a beleaguered group of free-market economists in Europe and the United States who, in the summer of 1938, organized an international conference in Paris that sought to revitalize liberalism as "the only alternative…to totalitarianism." But the world war that soon followed made it impossible to organize against the dangers they saw, and it was not until after the defeat of the Nazis that they could meet again. At the end of 1946, the free-market economist Friedrich Hayek wrote to potential participants that "an army of fighters for freedom" had to be raised; and the following year, thirty-eight people gathered in a hotel on Mont Pelerin in Switzerland. After an extensive discussion, they adopted a statement of aims, which held that "the central values of civilization are in danger" and that unless the "decline of belief in private property and the competitive market" was reversed, the preservation of a free society was in jeopardy.[4]

In the years that followed, the society continued to meet, while in Britain, a group to propagate its principles—the Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA)—was established. This group arose among dissident members of the Liberal party (both Lloyd George and Keynes had been Liberals), but in both countries, free-market arguments were most attractive to some on the Right. In the United States, however, while defense of the market was crucial to the rise of conservatism from the 1950s onward, the movement could not avoid dispute over the relative claims of liberty and authority, and those who looked to Christian traditions for guidance tended to clash with those who prioritized freedom. Both sides saw themselves as quintessentially American, yet both showed sympathy to the Mont Pelerin Society. A prominent libertarian, Frank Meyer, edited a collection on the nature of conservatism and included a piece by Hayek on "Why I Am Not a Conservative." In this essay, the Mont Pelerin author defended liberalism and criticized European conservatives as "hostile to internationalism" and champions of a nationalism that often made them prone to collectivism. A traditionalist publication, *Modern Age*, included among its authors a German member of the Mont Pelerin Society, Wilhelm Röpke, writing on "Liberalism and Christianity" while a prominent American traditionalist, Russell Kirk, wrote on the Society in the leading conservative periodical, *National Review*, claiming that while many of its members had formerly been inclined to espouse ''Liberal dogmas'' and ''rationalistic hostility to Christianity,'' the increasing involvement of conservatives demonstrated how "the totalitarian threat produces a meeting of minds among conservative and Liberal bodies of opinion."[5]

In 1996, the libertarian Foundation for Economic Education published a review of a history of the Mont Pelerin Society. Members who had achieved prominence in public policy, it noted, included Chancellor Ludwig Erhard of West Germany, President Luigi Einaudi of Italy, Prime Minister Vaclav Kraus of the Czech Republic, and U.S. Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns. Of the seventy-six economic advisers on Ronald Reagan's 1980 campaign staff, twenty-two were Society members.[6] The following year, a prominent figure in the Institute of Economic Affairs, Ralph Harris, published an article on the foundation of the Society in *National Review*. It had first met exactly fifty years earlier, and while Americans could best judge the impact of members of the Society on Reagan, he had no doubt that Margaret Thatcher's legislation on trade unions and nationalized industries owed much to advisors and MPs "instructed in market analysis" by publications "shaped by Mont Pelerin principles."[7]

Chile offers a clear example of the transnational reach and impact of the economic ideas promulgated by Hayek and the Mont Pelerin Society. Riding the wave of success generated by his book, *The Road to Serfdom*, Hayek accepted a position at the University of Chicago in 1948. There he worked with Milton Friedman, who he introduced to the Mont Pelerin Society. In 1958, the group held its first meeting in the United States, and Friedman presented a paper on inflation.[8] Friedman, like Hayek, promoted the free market as the ultimate guarantee of democracy, and both men opposed state intervention and Keynesian economic theory.

Conservative Chileans had studied the free market economics preached at the University of Chicago School of Economics long before the 1973 military coup overthrew Salvador Allende and the Popular Unity government and imposed the dictatorship that ruled Chile until 1990. Between 1956 and 1961, the U.S. government provided fellowships to 150 Chileans to study economics with Milton Friedman and Arnold Harberger at the University of Chicago.[9] Realizing the need to build a firm base for their ideas in Chile, these same economists also used USAID money to fund programs that taught their conservative approach to economics in the Catholic University in Santiago, Chile.[10]

Their efforts paid off. Many of the Chicago Boys (as these Chilean students of Friedman and Harberger are commonly known) who shaped the dictatorship's economic policies began meeting while the Popular Unity was still in power. They laid their plans for Chile's economic future once, as they hoped, the military overthrew the government.[11] After the impediment of the democratically elected

government of Salvador Allende was removed and a military dictatorship installed, large-scale arrests, torture, and the murder of those who opposed military rule followed. It was in this context that the Chicago Boys worked diligently to convince those members of the military regime who questioned or opposed their methods and goals that they should accept them. They were successful, and within a few years, many of the Chicago Boys occupied important positions in the military government, where they went to work to put into practice in Chile the economic lessons they had learned in Chicago or at the Catholic University. Putting the icing on the cake of his economic coup, in 1975, Milton Friedman went to Chile to support his protégés and gave "a series of high-profile lectures and [held] private meetings with [General Augusto] Pinochet and his aides."[12]

Chile thus became the testing site for the free-market policies promoted by Hayek, Friedman, and the Mont Pelerin Society. Economic "shock treatment" included budget cuts, deregulation, and privatization. The dictatorship cut subsidies to national industry; reoriented the economy to produce goods for export that gave Chile a comparative advantage on the international market; lowered tariffs from 94 percent in 1973 to 10 percent in 1979, which encouraged imports; and cut money for social services. These policies resulted in high unemployment, which rose to 17 percent in 1975 and was still effectively that high in 1980.[13] Nonetheless, in a 1981 interview, Friedrich Hayek declared that "The world shall come to regard the recovery of Chile as one of the greatest miracles of our time."[14]

Teresa Guzmán is one of the Chicago Boys, only she refers to herself as a Chicago Girl. Like many of these economists, she studied at the Catholic University in Santiago, Chile, and then at the University of Chicago. During the military government of General Augusto Pinochet, she worked first in the Ministry of Education; then in Social Security; and finally, in the Ministry of Labor. When one of the authors interviewed her in 1993, she extolled the military regime's economic plan and explained how privatization helped the employer.

> Before [prior to the dictatorship] the government financed everything by taxing the employer, which was an easy way to obtain money. What we [the military government] did was to lower the cost of contracting labor in order to stimulate [the demand] for workers. Chile had had serious employment problems. In the 1960s and 1970s, unemployment reached twenty-eight percent. So we lowered the amount of money the

employer had to pay to social security [thus lowering the cost of labor.] Before the employer paid fifty percent of the worker's salary [which went to] social security and now the amount they pay is not even twenty percent. We also eliminated some absurd costs such as benefits to members of the family [such as children] and school lunches, which had been financed through the taxes paid by the employer. Instead we privatized the social security system.[15]

For many conservatives, Chile was and remains a success story, and the transnational linkages continue. In 1988, the Pinochet dictatorship called for a plebiscite on its rule to be held, mistakenly believing that it would win. The 1989 electoral defeat of the Pinochet dictatorship did not end the transnational connections between conservatives in Chile and the transnational Right. In the early 1990s, Morton Blackwell, a member of the Mont Pelerin Society and a former special assistant to the president on President Reagan's White House Staff 1981–1984, traveled to Chile, along with Grover Norquist, of Americans for Tax Reform.[16] The International Republican Institute sponsored their trip, and they "went up and down the country doing lectures." Blackwell invited their translator, Dario Paya, to attend his Leadership Institute in Virginia for training in political organizing.[17] Paya accepted the invitation; and, when he returned to Chile, ran for and was elected to the Chamber of Deputies as a member of the Unión Demócrata Independiente (UDI, the Independent Democratic Union), the pro-Pinochet political party.[18] Further symbolizing the back-and-forth transnational flow of ideas, in 1991, George W. Bush offered Chile as a model for how the United States should "reform" its social security program. "And, finally, I think some members of Congress could take a good—could take some lessons from Chile—when it comes to how to run our pension plans."[19]

The Chicago Boys and their descendents continue to claim that the neoliberal policies instituted by the military are responsible for Chile becoming "the economic miracle" of Latin America. Far from apologizing for the brutal methods employed by the military and the ending of Chilean democracy, the Chilean neoliberals boasted, "in a democracy we could not have done one-fifth of what we did."[20] And now, with the 2010 presidential victory of Sebastian Piñera, candidate of the Chilean right, these same financiers and businessmen are back in power. Indeed, Piñera became wealthy—he is currently one of the twenty most powerful millionaires in the world—during the Pinochet regime, as a direct result of the economic polices

taught in the University of Chicago and implemented during the dictatorship.[21]

The influence that the ideas of the Mount Pelerin Society exerted on different governments was not the only instance of free-market transnationalism. Anthony Fisher, "the founding father" of the IEA, was crucial in the early development of the free-market Fraser Institute in Canada in the mid-1970s; he then set up the International Center for Economic Policy Studies, subsequently the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, in the late 1970s. He also launched the Pacific Institute for Public Policy in California, assisted in creating Australia's Centre for Independent Studies, and in 1981, created the Atlas Economic Research Foundation "to litter the world with free-market think-tanks." A decade later, the foundation claimed it had helped in the creation of seventy-eight institutes, including thirty-one in Latin America.[22]

A recent essay has discussed the global diffusion of free-market ideas from the United States. In reaction to international networks that advocated and implemented the expansion of government, it argues, American exponents of contracting the state created their own network to spread free-market solutions. In each country, Hayek had argued in 1946, those who worked toward such a development were "comparatively few, but together they could be effective. For example, the idea of the Chilean pension reform inspired economic conservatives in Eastern Europe, while the visits and speeches of American policy makers and intellectuals who trumpeted the economic policies that often originated in the United States were crucial to the spread of these ideas.[23]

More recently, an edited collection on the impact of the Mount Pelerin Society has recognized the organization's importance. The book discusses the problem of building a "transnational network'' of free-market thinkers after the Second World War. While frequently defining free-market thinking as "neoliberalism," the collection recognizes the significant role played by Mont Pelerin on the Right, noting, for instance, the prominent part played in the society by Edward Fuelner, the president of the leading conservative group, the Heritage Foundation. Its chapter on the United States, "Business Conservatives and the Mont Pelerin Society," explicitly discusses the favorable reception of free-market thinking by some early conservatives.[24]

But the free-market right is not the only example of the transnational trajectory of conservatism in modern times. The Heritage Foundation was formed in 1973 and subsequently became an important influence on the Reagan administration. In the late 1970s, it

launched its own magazine, *Policy Review*, and an examination of its early issues draws our eyes to its reach beyond the Atlantic. Its publisher was a member of the Mont Pelerin Society, as was its editor and the chairman of the editorial board. Other members of the board included four British members and another who was a member of the Mont Pelerin Society and who would later become editor of *National Review*. British writers discussed Communism as a threat in Africa and in Europe. Nor were the journal's links solely between Britain and the United States. A collection of articles on "Trends Toward Conservatism in Europe" included one authored by Otto Von Hapsburg, a member of the European Parliament.[25]

Such connections were not restricted to the pages of the magazine, and in 1977, the Heritage Foundation organized a U.S. tour by the leading British conservative, Sir Keith Joseph. The foundation described itself as "dedicated to individual freedom, limited government, and a strong national defense," and as this suggested, anti-Communism was just one of its priorities.[26] Other groups gave anti-Communism greater emphasis. The Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, for instance, dated back to the early 1950s, when its Australian evangelical leader, Fred Schwarz, was brought to the United States by American evangelicals "as a special messenger" raised by God to alert "the nation as to the perils of Communism." In the early 1960s, he funded the distribution of anti-Communist literature in India and the distribution of a comic book in Mexico depicting Communist soldiers threatening a priest with a bayonet and a whip-wielding guard with a hammer and sickle on her uniform, threatening children. In the 1980s, the crusade held seminars "in cooperation with the Defense Ministry of the Philippines" as part of a campaign against the country's Communist guerrillas.[27]

Another noteworthy example of transnational anti-Communism was the Pinay Circle, named after a former French prime minister, Antoine Pinay. Particularly involving French and German representatives, it also included a British cold warrior, Brian Crozier, and equivalents in the United States. Functioning as a forum for confidential discussion, Crozier's involvement is particularly noteworthy. We will encounter him later in relation both to the Freedom Association and other British organizations. He was a central figure in conservative anti-Communism, and both Thatcher and Reagan were recipients of his monthly publication, *Transnational Security*.[28] When conservatives concerned with "the Red threat" organized internationally, they did so most particularly in the context of the World Anti-Communist League (WACL). Originating as an arm of the

Taiwan and South Korean governments in the late 1960s, the league in the 1970s and 1980s was particularly important in Latin America. By the 1980s, WACL had undergone a key shift. Where in the 1970s the continued involvement of conservatives had been endangered by the involvement of extreme rightist members in the Americas and Europe, by the following decade, it had gravitated into a close relationship with the Reagan White House and elements in the American New Right. Parties that used death squads against the Left in countries like Guatemala and El Salvador became increasingly crucial, and during the mid-1980s, WACL and other conservative groups played a key role in aiding the contras, the armed opponents of Nicaragua's Sandinista government.[29] But American conservatives' fight stretched beyond Nicaragua.

In 1984, WACL set up committees to assist anti-Communist guerrillas in eight countries. Two years earlier, Charles Moser, the secretary-treasurer of a key New Right group, the Free Congress and Education Foundation, proposed the creation of committees for Nicaragua, El Salvador, Kampuchea, and Vietnam along the lines of one that had been set up for "a Free Afghanistan." "Only in this way," he held, "can the ground be prepared for a more activist American foreign policy, under which the United States will provide open support to the forces of freedom both in the Free World and in the communist world."[30]

In 1985, a conservative group, Citizens for America, brought together leading "freedom fighters" from Nicaragua, Afghanistan, Laos, and Angola at the latter's headquarters at Jamba, Angola. Speaking at the gathering, the Angolan group's leader, Jonas Savimbi, reported receipt of a message "from the people fighting in Cambodia," and participants signed a Declaration of the Democratic International, which proclaimed "We free peoples fighting for our national independence and human rights . . . declare our solidarity with all freedom movements in the world and state our commitment to cooperate to liberate our nations from the Soviet imperialists." The event, the conservative *Washington Times* claimed, would turn Marxist academics' world upside down.[31]

In the 1980s, too, a flurry of activity on the British Right had marked transnational dimensions. In 1975, a free market anti-Communist group, the National Association for Freedom, later the Freedom Association, was launched. In 1983, a cover story in the association's monthly declared "International Freedom Fighters Unite to Fight Against Marxism." Led by Soviet dissident Vladimir Bukovsky, it reported, "an umbrella movement has been set up to co-ordinate the

activities of millions of anti-Communist exiles from all parts of the world. *Resistance International*, as it is called, was recently launched at a rally in London and is intended to operate on a global scale, organizing resistance against Communist oppression in South East Asia, Africa, and Central America as well as within the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe." Rallies had taken place in Amsterdam, Paris, and Milan, and the organization's first declaration had been adopted by "representatives from Angola, Bulgaria, Cape Verde, Cuba, Laos, Romania, Russia, Ukraine, Vietnam, and Yugoslavia. Negotiations are also under way with representatives from resistance movements in Afghanistan, Algeria, East Germany, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Crimean Tartars, Tibet, and Argentina."[32]

We noted earlier a proposal to create a committee for Nicaragua in the United States. In Britain in 1985, the Campaign for a Free Nicaragua emerged out of a conference addressed by Brian Crozier; by a former advisor to Margaret Thatcher, Alfred Sherman; and three Americans: Lynn Bouchey of the Council on Inter-American Affairs; the chairman of the *International Freedom Review*'s advisory board, Charles Lichenstein; and one of the board's other members, Congressman Charles Dornan. The *Review* was the journal of a key anti-Communist group of the period, the International Freedom Foundation, and the organizer of the London pro-contra meeting, Marc Gordon, also headed the International Freedom Foundation in the United Kingdom. Like Gordon, the central figure in the Committee for a Free Nicaragua, David Hoile, had visited Central America in support of the "freedom fighters." Both groups had first emerged in the United States, and both were linked with the Free Congress and Education Foundation's Charles Moser. It was Moser who had first proposed a committee for Nicaragua, and the International Freedom Foundation (UK) sold *Combat on Communist Territory*, in which contributors brought together by Moser discussed insurgencies against Marxist regimes in Lithuania, the Ukraine, Nicaragua, Mozambique, Angola, Afghanistan, and Cambodia.[33] Hoile was also instrumental in forging links between the Federation of Conservative Students in Britain and the Contras, as well as conservative forces in Chile and South Africa.[34]

Another group, originally from the United States, was to enter into conflict with the International Freedom Foundation. Established in 1985, Western Goals (UK) separated from its original American affiliation following a furor over links with Oliver North's Iran-Contra network and a leading official's conviction for tax fraud. As with

Iran-Contra, early sponsors of Western Goals in Britain were involved with the World Anti-Communist League; and in 1989, the general secretary of WACL's youth wing was reported to be working with figures in the British group toward an "International Conference" on Eastern Europe. The previous year, Western Goals helped organize a meeting in the House of Commons for Joseph Savimbi, but it subsequently was involved in organizing speaking visits for South African Conservative Party foreign affairs spokesman Clive Derby-Lewis and French Front National member of the European Parliament Yvan Blot. This met with criticism elsewhere on the right, and in private correspondence, the International Freedom Foundation's Marc Gordon proposed intensifying activities against a group he described as "increasingly obsessed with the ideas of racial superiority, a strong state, and Jewish conspiracies."[35]

Both the far-reaching nature of Western Goals's links and the conflict between it and the International Freedom Foundation takes us to another less visible actor on the transnational Right: the South African military intelligence. Unbeknownst to much of its membership, the International Freedom Foundation had been a tool of South African military intelligence, seeking to defeat the regime's enemies with the support of right-wingers who did not see themselves as pro-apartheid.[36]

While the American New Right achieved its prominence through its championing of social issues, much of its activity has involved the projection of American power abroad. If in the 1970s or 1980s, this took the form of anti-Communism, the collapse of the Soviet Union and its satellites resulted in the New Right assisting pro-Western forces. Thus, the Free Congress annual report at the beginning of the 1990s included a report of its shipment of food and medicine to Russia and a newspaper report that Free Congress leaders had "played a significant role in President Boris Yeltsin's rise to power." It also included a photograph of the main leader with "long-time friend of the Foundation and democracy supporter Zhelyu Zhelev, president of Bulgaria."[37]

But the New Right has not been the most crucial transnational actor on the American right in recent years. That role has been taken by a grouping that, like much of the free-market right, originated elsewhere on the political spectrum. Just as the free-market argument had initially arisen among liberals, so neoconservatism's roots can be traced to the Congress for Cultural Freedom, the covertly CIA-funded grouping that during the 1950s brought together anti-Communist liberals in countries ranging from the United States and Britain to

West Germany, France, and India. As liberals, many in the Congress sought to oppose both Communism and McCarthyism, although one prominent member and a future founder of neoconservatism, Irving Kristol, achieved notoriety by claiming, "For there is one thing that the American people know about Senator McCarthy: he, like them, is unequivocally anti-Communist. About the spokesmen for American liberalism, they feel they know no such thing."[38]

From the 1960s, neoconservatism can be traced more directly still to arguments among anti-Communist liberals and Social Democrats over what they saw as the appeasement of the Soviet Union first by the Democratic party 1972 presidential candidate George McGovern, then by the Democratic president in the late 1970s, Jimmy Carter.[39] Advocating a fiercely anti-Communist foreign policy, neoconservatives believed Communism's advance had to be stopped. But the passing away of the Soviet Union did not mean that neoconservatism no longer had a mission. At its inception, it had sought to defend Israel against its opponents, and this continued to be a priority. Indeed, along with its declarations of sympathy with earlier anti-Communist liberalism and its opposition to immigration restrictions, the intensity of its support for Israel was among the factors that explain the hostility of some conservatives to neoconservatism. But both as a result of its bringing new recruits into the movement and the considerable overlap of policy positions, it was welcomed by many older conservatives. In the aftermath of the cold war, neoconservatives declared that they were now pursuing America's "benevolent hegemony" and following 9/11 secured considerable influence for their view that terrorism could ultimately be defeated by the extension of democracies throughout the Middle East. Indeed, they had ambitions beyond the Middle East. "Tactics for pursuing democratization may vary," neoconservatives argued. "In some cases, the policy might focus on rebel groups...In other cases, it might mean support for dissidents by either overt or covert means..."[40]

It championed such a development in Cuba, China, and other countries, too. One U.S.-based organization, the Committee on the Present Danger, "dedicated to protecting and expanding democracy" included former Spanish President Jose Maria Aznar and former Czech President Vaclav Havel among its members, while in 2007, one critical blog characterized a gathering in Prague as the work of "A Neo-Conservative International." The "Democracy & Security" conference was hosted by the Czech Foreign Ministry and Prague's municipal government and organized by the Prague Security Studies Institute, the Adelson Institute for Strategic Studies in Jerusalem,

and the Foundation for Social Studies and Analysis headed by Aznar. Its participants included Aznar, Havel, Adelson Institute chairman Natan Sharansky, President George W. Bush, Undersecretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs Karen Hughes, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty President Jeffrey Gedmin, and an array of figures from neoconservative think tanks, including the American Enterprise Institute's Richard Perle, Joshua Muravchik, and Reuel Marc Gerecht; Foundation for the Defense of Democracies President Clifford May; and European Foundation for Democracy Executive Director Roberta Bonazzi. Both Havel and Sharansky were famous dissidents in Communist Eastern Europe, and the impending conference had been publicized by an article, "Dissidents Unite," in the neoconservative *Weekly Standard*. The article had described Sharansky as returning "to his roots" in agitating for "human rights around the globe," noting that like Bush—who he had influenced—he believed that the spread of democracy was the answer to international terrorism. Those who wanted to meet moderate Muslims, he declared, should come to Prague, and the conference would include exiles from North Korea, Egypt, Syria, and Iran.[41]

Conclusion

In what has been a far-reaching discussion, we have attempted to give a sense of the transnational nature of different strands of conservatism. The free-market right developed from its marginal position among liberals in the 1930s to a commanding presence on the political landscape in the late twentieth century. Central to the Thatcher and Reagan administrations, it was important for conservatives in many other countries. As we have seen, it was crucial too for the authoritarian right in Chile. And whereas in the 1930s or the 1940s, much of the right feared that nationalization and planning was the tide of the future, so in recent decades, the Left has feared that privatization is rising; it is in this context that the Mount Pelerin Society has been crucial in shaping the politically possible.

If the free-market Right saw collectivism's challenge to private property as the main danger, anti-Communist conservatives saw a particular kind of collectivism as the overbearing threat. Our final example, neoconservatism, arose in defiance of Communism, but in the aftermath of the end of the cold war, it has seen new enemies: above all, terrorism. All three of the strands we have explored saw themselves as fighting a transnational enemy; all three have organized transnationally. In fact, we believe that in order to understand

both their power and their success, we need to understand their transnational reach, alliances, connections, and impact.

Notes

1. Richard Cockett, *Thinking the Unthinkable: Think-Tanks and the Economic Counter-Revolution, 1931–1983* (London: HarperCollins, 1995), pp. 157–58.
2. Martin Durham, *The Christian Right, the Far Right and the Boundaries of American Conservatism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), p. 9.
3. Martin Durham, *Sex and Politics. The Family and Morality in the Thatcher Years* (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1991), pp. 1–2, 143–60.
4. Cockett, *Thinking the Unthinkable*, pp. 9–12, 103–4, 108–9, 341–33; George H. Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America since 1945* (New York: Basic Books, 1976), pp. 26, 354.
5. Frank S. Meyer (ed.), *What Is Conservatism*? (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), pp. 88–103; Nash, *Conservative Intellectual Movement*, pp. 182, 392.
6. www.fee.org/publications/the-freeman/article.asp?aid=4030.
7. George A. Panichas (ed.), *Modern Age. The First Twenty-Five Years. A Selection* (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Press, 1988), p. 513–20; *National Review* June 16, 1997.
8. Kim Phillips-Fein, *Invisible Hands: The Making of the Conservative Movement from the New Deal to Reagan* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2009), pp. 41–42, 51.
9. Pamela Constable and Arturo Valenzuela, *A Nation of Enemies: Chile under Pinochet* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1991), p. 168.
10. Yves Dezalay and Bryant G. Garth, *The Internationalization of Palace Wars* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), p. 45.
11. Phil O'Brien and Jackie Roddick, *Chile: The Pinochet Decade* (London: Latin American Bureau, 1983), p. 39.
12. Peter Winn, "The Pinochet Era" in Peter. Winn (ed.), *Victims of the Chile Miracle* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004), p. 26.
13. Ibid., pp. 28–29.
14. Karin Fischer, "The Influence of Neoliberals in Chile before, during and after Pinochet," in P. Mirowski and D. Plehwe (eds.), *The Road from Mont Pelerin: The Making of a Neoliberal Thought Collective* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), pp. 319–21, 327.
15. Teresa Guzmán (pseudonym), interview with Margaret Power, Santiago, Chile, December 15, 1993.
16. According to a recent article, Grover Norquist, "a paragon of the D.C. Conservative establishment" and the Americans for Tax Reform co-sponsored the "first nationwide tea parties" in February 2009. Jerry Markon, "News Media Help Conservatives Get Their Anti-Obama Message Out," *Washington Post*, February 1, 2010.

17. Morton Blackwell founded the Leadership Institute in 1979 to "increase the number and effectiveness of conservative activists and leaders in the public policy process." See "About Us. The Leadership Institute," http://www.leadershipinstitute.org/aboutus/. In addition to training Chileans, it also offers programs to conservative Britons. In the summer of 2010, the "Young Britons' Foundation's Reagan-Thatcher Summer Conference Programme" will include a one-week visit to the Leadership Institute, then a week each at the Young America's Foundation and Santa Barbara, where participants can tour the Reagan and Nixon Libraries and receive training at the Ronald Reagan Center. See "YBF in the USA this Summer," http://www.ybf.org.uk/2010/03/05/ybf–in-the-usa-this-summer/.

18. Morton Blackwell, interview with author, August 7, 2009.

19. Sara Diamond, *Roads to Dominion: Right-wing Movements and Political Power in the United States* (New York: Guilford Press, 1995), pp. 348–49; George W. Bush, White House Press Conference, April 16, 2001.

20. As quoted in Winn, "The Pinochet Era," p. 28.

21. Mónica González, "Las redes de amistad y negocio del gabinete de Sebastián Piñera," Piensachile, http://www.piensachile.com/content/view/6655/2/, February 11, 2010.

22. Cockett, *Thinking the Unthinkable*, pp. 306–7.

23. Steven M. Teles and David A. Kenney, "Spreading the Word: The Diffusion of American Conservatism in Europe and Beyond," University of Toronto Institute of European Studies Fourth Transatlantic Security Roundtable, October 7–8, 2005, pp. 2, 12, 18–19.

24. P. Mirowski and D. Plehwe (eds.), *The Road from Mont Pelerin*, pp. 16, 280, 374.

25. *Policy Review* 3, Winter 1978; 4, Spring 1978; 5, Summer 1978; 9, Summer 1979.

26. *Searchlight* 65, November 1980.

27. Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein, *Danger on the Right* (New York: Random House, 1964), pp. 50–51, 63; Sara Diamond, *Spiritual Warfare. The Politics of the Christian Right* (Boston: South End Press, 1989), pp. 189–90.

28. Brian Crozier, *Free Agent. The Unseen War 1941–1991* (London: HarperCollins, 1994), pp. 101, 181, 186, 191–93.

29. Scott Anderson and Jon Lee Anderson, *Inside the League* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1986), pp. 11, 85–86, 97–102, 148–49, 152, 171–95, 263; Russ Bellant, *Old Nazis, the New Right, and the Republican Party* (Boston: South End Press, 1991), pp. 66–67, 76–77, 85.

30. Anderson and Anderson, *Inside the League*, p. 269; Sara Diamond, *Spiritual Warfare: The Politics of the Christian Right* (Boston: South End Press, 1989), pp. 163–64.

31. Diamond, *Roads to Dominion*, pp. 221–22; Thomas Frank, *The Wrecking Crew: The American Right and the Lust for Power* (London: Harvill Secker, 2008), pp. 66–67; Nina J. Easton, *Gang of Five. Leaders at the Center of the Conservative Ascendancy* (New York: Touchstone, 2000), p. 166; Howard

Phillips, *Moscow's Challenge to U.S. Vital Interests in Southern Africa* (Vienna, VA: Policy Analysis, 1987), p. 126.

32. *Free Nation* August 1983.
33. *Lobster* 16 n.d., 1988; *Searchlight* 139, January 1987.
34. *Searchlight* 119, May 1985.
35. *Lobster* 21, n.d., c1991.
36. Frank, *Wrecking Crew*, p. 110–13.
37. *Free Congress Foundation 1991 Annual Report*, pp. 27–29.
38. Diamond, *Roads to Dominion*, pp. 183–84; Richard Gid Powers, *Not Without Honor. The History of American Anticommunism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998), pp. 259–60.
39. Diamond, *Roads to Dominion*, pp. 191–97.
40. Gary Dorien, *Imperial Designs: Neoconservatism and the New Pax Americana* (New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 126–27; Lawrence F. Kaplan and William Kristol, *The War Over Iraq: Saddam's Tyranny and America's Mission* (San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2003), p. 105.
41. Martin Durham, "The American Right and Iran," *Political Quarterly* 79, 4, 2008, p. 511; www.ips.org/blog/jimlobe/?p=27; *Weekly Standard* May 14, 2007.

7
White Hands across the Atlantic: The Extreme Right in Europe and the United States, 1958–

Martin Durham

In 1945, the Third Reich was destroyed. But racialism was not destroyed with it, and in 1959, the American Nazi Party (ANP) was launched. The previous year, the National States Rights Party (NSRP) had been established, and in the years that followed, numerous other racialist groupings have appeared. Emerging in the aftermath of the Supreme Court's *Brown* decision against segregated schooling, American extreme Right groups fought against the rising civil rights movement and declared that white supremacy was under attack from a Jewish conspiracy.

On the other side of the Atlantic, racialism was espoused by a wide array of groupings. This chapter will discuss the postwar European extreme Right but not in terms of the different groupings' relationship with each other. Instead, it will examine the relationship of extreme rightists in Europe with their equivalents in the United States, giving particular attention to the relationship between American and British extreme rightists.

While this chapter discusses different groupings on both the American and European extreme right, it cannot discuss all of them. We will be discussing those who define themselves as National Socialists—some of whom espouse a strategy of political violence— and we will be examining groupings that disavow National Socialism and look toward an electoral path to power. This chapter will also

examine the emergence outside the United States of the Ku Klux Klan, the transnational nature of Holocaust revisionism, the dissemination of racist religions, and the spread of racist rock music across national boundaries. In part, this essay will explore to what degree influence comes from the United States and to what extent it comes from Europe. It will challenge any assumption that for the extreme right to be transnational must mean that it will be unified around a single strategy. But it is also concerned with another question. Extreme rightists on both sides of the Atlantic describe themselves as nationalists, sometimes as racial nationalists. For groups to describe themselves in this way is to suggest that they value nation above all. But when they also characterize themselves as championing the white race, they are simultaneously reaching beyond the nation. This essay will investigate the nature of their transnational relationship and what effect their concern with race has on connections across national boundaries.

In 1961, representatives of America's NSRP crossed the Atlantic to attend a camp hosted by the president of the British National Party (BNP). Others in attendance hailed from Sweden, Germany, Austria, and France.[1] Both the BNP and the NSRP believed they were fighting a Jewish conspiracy but did not define themselves as National Socialist. Some key members, however, were convinced that only National Socialism could save the white race, and in early 1962, they broke away to launch the National Socialist Movement (NSM).[2] They were in contact with the ANP's leader, Lincoln Rockwell, and shortly after the NSM's emergence, he visited Britain to launch a neo-Nazi international. In 1958, he had laid plans for what he then termed the World Union of Free Enterprise National Socialists. Four years later, the group he eventually launched was to be known as the World Union of National Socialists.[3]

Just as the BNP had organized an international camp, so now did the NSM. Participants came from Germany, Austria, France, Sweden, Spain, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands.[4] In the American party's magazine, Rockwell described how for four years he had worked to "build an INTERNATIONAL fighting organization," and its founding document pictured it as a "monolithic, combat efficient, international political apparatus to combat and utterly destroy the International Jewish Communist and Zionist apparatus of treason and subversion." The NSM's leader, Colin Jordan, was temporarily made leader of the World Union of National Socialists (a position subsequently taken

by Rockwell), and sections were established in France, Belgium, and other countries in Europe and beyond.[5]

In 1964, the NSM underwent its own split in which Jordan's key lieutenant, John Tyndall, was among those who broke away. In correspondence with Rockwell, he rejected the view that he should accept direction from the World Union. Now leader of the Greater Britain Movement, he declared that it did not accept Rockwell's "internationalist conceptions," and that it would only affiliate to an international body if it recognized that policies in Britain would be decided in Britain.[6] As we will see, however, this would not mean that Tyndall would be averse to international liaison.

Three years later, the BNP would be amongst the groups that came together to launch the National Front (NF). While Jordan did not join, Tyndall did, and he was able to rapidly rise to prominence in the NF. Indeed, for much of the 1970s, he was its chairman. Jordan would continue for some years as leader of what was to be renamed the British Movement, and as we will see, long played a role in transnational developments on the extreme right. But in the 1970s, it was the NF that was to attract increasing attention and not only within the UK.[7]

In 1975, a leading figure in the NSRP, Edward Fields, visited England, while the other key figure in the organization, J.B. Stoner, visited the following year. Fields returned in 1977, and the visits involved not only addressing NF meetings but also discussing with the leader of the British Movement and speaking to meetings of an extreme right group that specifically sought to link racists in different groups in Britain with their equivalents abroad, the League of St. George. Britain, Fields observed, had more subscribers to the paper he edited than the rest of the world combined. One reason for its popularity in the UK, he suggested, was because it could publish material forbidden under British race relations law.[8] NSRP leaders did not only visit the UK. Every June in Belgium, Flemish nationalists gathered in the town of Diksmuide. They declared not only their wish for independence from the Belgian state but denounced what they saw as the persecution of Flemings who had fought on the German side in the Second World War. The extreme right of other countries sent contingents, and in 1975, Fields described meeting not only the Flemish Militant Order (VMO) and the British Movement but the Austrian Viking Youth and Germany's National Democratic Party (NPD). Fields spoke at the event, emphasizing Flemings's relationship to South Africa's Boers and painting a dire picture of the dangers of immigration. When Stoner spoke at an International Conference Against Communism in

the Flemish city the following year, he noted how he had "met many old and new friends from throughout Western Europe." Fields spoke again at a European Congress in the city in 1977, denouncing "the Jews" as "the common enemy of all the White nations of Europe" and subsequently reported that he had made "valuable contacts" that would "insure mutual cooperation between White racist groups for years to come."[9]

Another veteran extreme rightist, James Warner, was also involved in transatlantic traffic during this period. A former member of the ANP, Warner had achieved a prominent role in promoting a racist religion, Christian Identity, which claimed that whites had been the original inhabitants of biblical Israel and that they, not Jews, were God's chosen people. In the mid-1970s, Warner was visited by a representative of "the largest anti-Jewish organization in Spain" and attended a reunion of "Old Comrades," who had fought for European civilization on the "East Front" during the 1941–1945 war.[10] In the same period, Warner organized a World Nationalist Congress, attended by delegates from the United States, Britain, Germany, Belgium, and elsewhere. Among the resolutions it adopted were declarations of support for South Africa and Rhodesia, a demand for the release of Germans imprisoned for war crimes, and a pledge of support for "all White Nationalists throughout the world."[11]

As well as being a leading advocate of Christian Identity, Warner was a prominent member of the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. There were numerous Klan groupings in the United States of which the most important were the Knights; the United Klans of America; and the Invisible Empire, Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. In 1978, the leaders of two of the rival groups made visits to Britain. The Invisible Empire leader, Bill Wilkinson, held a cross lighting with followers in Kent while David Duke, the leader of the Knights, met supporters in a number of British cities. Duke was the subject of extensive media attention, while the NF explained to its supporters that while it would be interested in talking to "the representative of an American equivalent of the National Front," it saw no purpose in contact with a secret society which most Britons saw as "at best the butt of a joke and at worst the theme of a horror-story." This was not the Klan's view of its potential contribution to the British extreme right. Duke's visit, the Knights paper claimed, "had an impact on Britain that may ultimately be the turning point in her fight to preserve her racial heritage."[12]

While the Klan was seeking recruits abroad, much of the American extreme right was solely concerned with developing links with their

European equivalents: above all, the group they saw as particularly successful. In 1977, the paper connected with the NSRP, the *Thunderbolt*, claimed that in receiving over 100,000 votes in a general election and then the same number in local elections in London, the National Front had "gained the loyalty of the British people." The same year, it characterized the NF as the "largest White racist organization in the world which has the opportunity of achieving national political power in the foreseeable future." In 1979, it reported on Tyndall's visit to America, where his speech to NSRP supporters included the prediction that "the white man" would once more awake and a dismissal of Britain and America's part in the Second World War as dancing "on the end of the Zionist string."[13] Support for the NF also came from a group that would become the most important on the American extreme right, the National Alliance.

In 1967, Rockwell was murdered by a former member of his party. The editor of the World Union of National Socialists magazine, *National Socialist World*, William Pierce, was subsequently expelled from what was now known as the National Socialist White People's Party. In 1974, Pierce became the leader of a group that avoided calling itself National Socialist, the National Alliance; and in 1979, the cover of its paper, *National Vanguard*, proclaimed the "World's Biggest Pro-White Organization is Britain's Militant National Front." A subsequent issue reported that John Tyndall had visited the National Alliance national office and met with Pierce. The two organizations, the report stated, had much in common.[14]

Just as the Klan sought to recruit members in Britain, so did the National Alliance.[15] The World Union of National Socialists continued to be active and in 1975, the National Socialist White People's Party published a report of its leader's visit to Europe in which he met Norwegian, Danish, and German National Socialists, including a crucial figure from the Third Reich, the Luftwaffe air ace Hans-Ulrich Rudel.[16] A new World Union magazine was launched, advertising Danish, Spanish, and British publications as well as a West Virginia-based German language journal. (National Socialism was illegal in Germany, and while other forms of the extreme right existed there, publishing overtly National Socialist material elsewhere and getting it into the country was crucial for any revival of the movement.)[17]

Increasingly, however, the most visible international activity came from a different National Socialist grouping. Founded by Gerhard Lauck, the Nebraska-based NSDAP Auslandsorganisation (NSDAP/AO) used the same name as the original Nazi Party's overseas organization.

In the 1970s, it established underground cells in Austria and Germany, and while from early on it described itself as "international in scope," at that time, it presented its recruitment of supporters outside Germany as being in order to aid the reformation of the NSDAP. In later years, however, in addition to its American and German papers, it launched publications in French, Danish, Hungarian, and other languages. In late 1992, for instance, the Union of Russian Youth wrote to the NSDAP/AO, denouncing Communism and democracy as "jewish inventions for the enslavement and destruction of all White Nations." It called for a National Socialist state in Russia and co-operation "with NS comrades in the West," and Lauck welcomed it as a new ally.[18] But it was Germany where his organization had the most impact, working with the former leader of the banned Aktionsfront Nationaler Sozialisten and others in building an array of organizations that it hoped could revive National Socialism in both West Germany and ex-Communist East Germany.[19]

Divisions in the National Socialist movement had repercussions on both sides of the Atlantic. While Colin Jordan supported the World Union, there were problems with organizing its supporters in Britain. In 1971, the National Socialist White People's Party reported it was working with a new organization in Britain, the United Kingdom National Socialist Party, while in the early 1980s, anti-Fascists reported that British supporters of the World Union had just established a National Socialist Workers' Initiative. The British Movement, meanwhile, had ceased to follow Jordan's leadership, and during the 1970s, it joined with the NSDAP/AO and a cluster of other extreme right groups in the United States and Canada in a collaboration known as the White Confederacy.[20]

Attempts to organize National Socialism internationally were only some of the transnational developments on the extreme right in recent decades. One, which drew extreme rightists into a troubled cooperation with conservatives, was the World Anti-Communist League (WACL). Originating in Asia in the 1960s, it was led during the late 1970s by Roger Pearson, who in the mid-1960s had edited an American-based journal, *Western Destiny*, whose editorial board included members of the extreme right from Britain, Germany, and France. In 1974, *Christian Vanguard* described the League as "an international movement made up of people of many races and religions, all united in opposition to the two ends of the Jewish serpent, Zionism and Communism." WACL affiliates in Britain and America, it claimed, had tried to promote pro-Jewish policies but had been defeated by Asian and Latin American members. Pearson's

leadership of WACL would lead to its recruitment of the neo-Fascist Italian Social Movement and other elements of the European extreme right. Ultimately, however, he would be removed from office, and the extreme right's hopes in the League as an instrument of anti-Semitism would fade.[21]

Western Destiny had been an early project of Willis Carto, a leading figure on the American extreme right, and his later publication, the *Spotlight*, included a number of "international bureaus" in Canada, Britain, and elsewhere.[22] Carto would be best known, however, for his central role in Holocaust revisionism. While it had existed since the 1940s, the claim that gas chambers had not existed and that Hitler had not systematically exterminated Jews became known internationally after Carto organized the California-based Institute for Historical Review in the late 1970s. While he would subsequently split with the institute, he remained central to a transnational effort to undermine acceptance of the Holocaust. Speakers from a number of European countries addressed American revisionist conferences, and speakers from the United States and Europe joined others from Australia and Malaysia at a Holocaust revisionist gathering in 2006 in Iran. As this event suggested, Holocaust denial was sometimes attractive to an Islamist constituency. But it remained centrally identified with the extreme right and particularly with Carto.[23] Other international activity on the extreme right involved those who espoused racial religions. James Warner's paper, *Christian Vanguard*, was published in America but listed foreign bureaus in Britain, South Africa, and elsewhere.[24] But while it was crucial in disseminating Christian Identity, increasingly the leading role in promoting the religion was taken by Aryan Nations whose annual World Congress drew preponderantly on the United States but also included a German extreme rightist, Manfred Roeder and "an Italian representative of Aryan Nations, who spoke of his efforts to promote the Identity faith in Europe."[25] Christian Identity was not the only religious manifestation on the extreme right. Some declared themselves to be pagans, and while a revived Odinism's earliest manifestation can be traced to interwar Australia, many of its modern advocates are to be found in the United States. Wotansvolk, a group based in Idaho, had adherents in Britain, Sweden, and elsewhere, while a group that had emerged in Norway, the Allgermanische Heidnische Front, had members in the United States, Germany, Russia, and other places.[26]

Both Christian Identity and Odinism held that the white race had a divine origin. In the early 1980s, a veteran extreme rightist, Ben Klassen, organized the Church of the Creator, a grouping that

rejected any belief in the supernatural and held that the white race should believe only in itself. Before his death in 1993, the church had spread to Sweden, while one of the different extreme right groupings in France, the Parti Nationaliste Français et Européen (PNFE), encouraged members to join Klassen's organization. (Later in the 1990s, the church was relaunched as the World Church of the Creator, spreading its teachings to Austria, Belgium, and elsewhere. Following the imprisonment of its leader and the collapse of the World Church, believers continued to exist outside the United States in Germany and Russia.)[27]

We have so far been concerned with the links between racial religious or solely political organizations on the European and U.S. extreme right. In the 1980s, however, a different form of transnational exchange began to emerge. In Britain, extreme right skinheads had created a form of rock music whose driving beat was accompanied by blatantly and often brutally racist lyrics. Most associated with Ian Stuart and his band, Skrewdriver, racist rock grew to include other bands (and other musical styles) in Britain, Continental Europe, and North America. American bands played in Europe, European bands in the United States, and enthusiasts from one continent went to musical events on the other.[28]

What became known as white power music was often associated with preexisting political groupings. (Before a bitter break, Skrewdriver had been connected with the National Front while Stuart was interviewed in Willis Carto's paper, *The Spotlight*, and white power music was vigorously promoted by an organization led by former Klansman Tom Metzger, White Aryan Resistance (WAR).)[29] Extreme right skinheads, however, often sought independence, and Skrewdriver was instrumental in the creation of Blood and Honour, an initially British grouping that spread to Europe and the United States. A racist skinhead grouping that had emerged in the late 1980s in Texas, the Hammerskins subsequently spread to Germany, Britain, Poland, etc., while in the mid-1990s, an important white power music magazine, *Resistance*, emerged in North America and another, *Nordland*, was established in Sweden.[30]

Different magazines and CD distributors were responsible for the sale of a wide range of recordings, and for much of the time, racist rock was controlled by skinheads who sought to build a transnational structure specifically based on white power music. Announcing its emergence, Blood and Honour had declared that its publication "will be run by people who really care about the Nationalist music scene, and not by people who are out to…further their own flagging

political case."[31] But alongside, and sometimes interlinked with specifically skinhead groupings, extreme right organizations, including Aryan Nations and Germany's NPD, continued to be involved. In its early years, Resistance Records was run by a Canadian supporter of the Church of the Creator. Subsequently, however, both it and *Nordland*'s label came under the control of National Alliance leader William Pierce.[32]

If extreme right skinheads were linked by racist rock, their publications show other transnational linkages. Odinism, for instance, was promoted by the magazine connected with the British white power band, Skullhead, while women readers of British skinhead publications were encouraged to contact WAR's affiliate, the Aryan Women's League or join a proposed British section of a transnational group, Women for Aryan Unity, which involved chapters in Europe, the United States, and Australia.[33] In turn, Women for Aryan Unity was linked with Volksfront International, a group that emerged in Oregon in 1994 before spreading to Canada, Spain, Portugal, and other places.[34] It was among such elements that arguments over political violence developed as the twentieth century drew to a close.

During the 1980s, a member of the Ku Klux Klan, Louis Beam, had begun to disseminate a distinctive strategy for racial revolution. Where extreme rightists often argued for centralized leadership, Beam held that this would make an organization susceptible to government repression. Instead, guerrilla war should take the form of leaderless resistance, in which an assortment of small cells would launch a decentralized attack on America's rulers.[35]

In the early 1990s, the Swedish extreme rightist Storm Network was allied with Metzger's White Aryan Resistance and shared a belief in a decentralized cell structure, while in the late 1990s, leaderless resistance was championed by the magazine of Scandinavian Blood and Honour, which quoted Louis Beam on the subject before declaring leaderless resistance was "highly recommendable" in the United States, had "become a must" in Germany, and might need to be adopted in Scandinavia.[36] In the early 1990s, British National Socialists formed Combat 18, a group whose use of the first and eighth initial of the alphabet spelt out the initials of Adolf Hitler.[37] Beam's article on leaderless resistance was reprinted in one of the publications supporting that organization, accompanied by a commentary that proposed the electoral road was a failure.[38] But it was not the only American influence on European extreme right thinking on violence.

As well as being the leader of the National Alliance and the owner of both Resistance Records and *Nordland*, William Pierce was the

author of a novel, *The Turner Diaries*, which powerfully described a terrorist campaign which culminated in the seizure of power by the covert organization that had masterminded the violence. It inspired an American group, which in the 1980s, took the name of the fictional guerrilla band Pierce had depicted, The Order. Led by a National Alliance member, Robert Mathews, The Order engaged in a series of robberies intended to finance a racial revolution. Eventually, however, members were arrested and imprisoned, and Mathews himself was killed resisting arrest. Admired by sections of the American and European extreme right, Order prisoners were involved with a Storm Network magazine in Sweden and in correspondence with one of Combat 18's publications in Britain.[39] The most influential Order veteran, however, was David Lane, who, amidst bitter disputes over the British grouping's attempt to take control of white power music, eventually accused Combat 18 of being "the enemy of our cause."[40]

One of Combat 18's publications took the name, *The Order*. It published a eulogy of Mathews by Pierce, and for a period, British supporters of the Alliance were involved with Combat 18. But Pierce did not agree with Beam or Combat 18. He retained his connection with Tyndall (who had broken with the NF at the beginning of the 1980s and launched a new BNP) and came to Britain in 1995 to speak at the conference of Tyndall's organization. Rejecting leaderless resistance, Pierce remained committed to centralized leadership of the racial struggle.[41]

Other U.S. influences on Combat 18 existed. A key role in its emergence had been played by a bitter critic of Pierce on the American extreme right, Harold Covington. Covington travelled to London in late 1991. Claiming that he wanted to "observe, and (to some degree) participate in a crucial phrase in the development of our worldwide racial resistance," he praised the existence of "a low-level guerrilla campaign...by our comrades" in Sweden. He made contact with the embryonic Combat 18 and provided it with an American post office box.[42]

In turn, there were European links with the Klan. James Farrands, the leader of the group once led by Bill Wilkinson, was also seeking links in Britain; and in 1989, the organization reported that "Klansmen and Klansladies from all over the United Kingdom" had attended a ceremony to be initiated into the organization. It thanked two British publications for carrying its address, one of which was *Blood and Honour*. (Ian Stuart was among the new Klan members.)[43] In the early 1990s, one American group, the White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, had already sent an organizer to work with members in

Germany.[44] A Klan group emerged in France, while in Britain, groups were established in Scotland, the Midlands, and the South. (While clandestinity makes it difficult to trace developments in the Klan, the Midlands group subsequently was the subject of an exposé in a sensationalist Sunday newspaper, while the Southern group fell prey to bitter internal conflicts.)[45]

Neither the Klan nor leaderless resistance prospered in Britain, and while the National Alliance saw the future of British racialism in the BNP, there were still problems with this relationship. In 1999, Tyndall lost control of the party to a former leading figure in the NF in the 1980s, Nick Griffin; and after the former leader's death in 2005, the Alliance published a laudatory obituary. Nonetheless, however, Alliance members were among the attendees at the BNP's annual festival in 2003.[46] The Alliance was particularly vigorous in its transnational activities. In 1998, for instance, Pierce joined racists from Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Rumania, and elsewhere at an international gathering organized by the extreme right Greek group, Golden Dawn, while in 1994, a Dutch Alliance member was elected to Rotterdam Municipal Council.[47] The American organization's strongest link, however, lay with the NPD. In 1997, Pierce had joined speakers from Austria, Switzerland, Denmark, Spain, France, Greece, and South Africa at the NPD's European Youth Congress. But the traffic was not only one way. In 1998, a NPD speaker addressed a National Alliance conference, while in 2001 Alliance members joined NPD officials in a demonstration outside the German embassy in Washington, DC The link continued after Pierce's death in 2002, and in 2003, an Alliance officer was among the speakers at the NPD festival.[48]

Other links were being forged across the Atlantic. In the mid-1990s, Edward Fields, now a leading figure in the America First Party, hosted a meeting addressed by prominent figures in the PNFE, noting that one of them was "an international fighter against Communism," who had seen action in Nicaragua, Argentina, and Croatia.[49] Connections were also made by the former leader of the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. David Duke had abandoned the Klan in 1980, and turned to a succession of other groupings. In 2004, John Tyndall visited the United States to address Duke's International European-American Unity and Leadership Conference alongside Willis Carto, Edward Fields, and leading officials in the National Alliance.[50] The following year, Duke organized a conference bringing together Fields, Carto, the secretary of the Swedish National Democratic Party, and the BNP's Nick Griffin.[51] He also forged links with the leading group

on the French extreme right, the Front National. But his strongest European links are in Russia. In 1995, he made his first visit, meeting the controversial Russian extreme rightist Vladimir Zhirinovsky. In 1999, he met the leader of the ultra-nationalist wing of the Russian Communist Party, while in 2000, his visit was to promote his book, *The Jewish Question through the Eyes of an American*, and to meet the deputy director of the People's National Party and the editor of an extreme right paper, *Zavtra*. In 2006, he joined delegates from France, Germany, and elsewhere at a Russian conference on "The White World's Future," which resulted in a number of attendees signing a declaration calling for "a new international union."[52]

Others on the American extreme Right were making links with Russia. During the mid-1990s, Edward Fields spoke at a meeting alongside James Warner and the editor of *Zavtra*. Where Fields had attacked immigration "from the backward Third World," the Russian speaker focused his fire on the "internationalists" who he portrayed as having taken control of his country and destroyed its economy. Where Fields had called for "friendship with Russian anti-Communists," Warner referred to his four visits to Russia, arguing that it was "an all-White nation" that Americans might one day have to flee to if driven from their country by "a doomsday colored takeover."[53]

By the following decade, however, Russian racists were looking to co-thinkers abroad to help resist immigration into Russia. In 2008, the Russian Movement against Illegal Immigration allied with other Russian nationalist groups to organize a protest march "for the benefit of the Motherland." Supported by the NPD and Golden Dawn, speakers included Preston Wiginton, an American who spent part of each year in Russia and was the coordinator of an international movement against "Third world invasion."[54]

In 2007, Wiginton had also organized an American tour for BNP leader Nick Griffin, and it is to that organization to which we shall now turn. In 1999, the BNP set up a support organization in America. According to its mission statement, American Friends of the BNP had been set up to "build bridges of understanding between the British people and their American cousins"; give "political and moral support to the cause of British Nationalism, which is best represented by the British National Party"; and in educating Americans about British Nationalism, "learn how more effectively to promote nationalism in America." Attracting an average of eighty to a hundred attendees to its meetings, American speakers included Edward Fields and William Pierce, while European speakers hailed from the BNP and NPD. In large part, the purpose of the organization was to raise foreign funds

for the BNP, a task which ultimately led to the group's dissolution following allegations that it was breaching British and American law.[55] But the group had another purpose. It was intended to promote the BNP as a success story from which American racialists should learn. During the 2000 presidential election, members of the group were involved in the ill-fated election bid by the anti-immigration conservative journalist, Pat Buchanan, to run as the candidate for Ross Perot's Reform Party. The American Friends' head, Mark Cotterill, declared that while there was as yet no party in America that "even comes close" to the BNP or the Front National, the Reform party could become such a vehicle. This hopeful expectation proved a disappointment (he and other racists were excluded from Buchanan's campaign), and soon after, Cotterill was arguing that seeking to "infiltrate someone else's movement" had been a mistake. What was needed was "an American version of the British National Party," and an American Friends advertisement in a Christian Identity paper declared that a BNP government's first priority would be "to export the White racial nationalist revolution to America." American patriots, it claimed, were "not making any serious headway."[56]

The passing of the American Friends of the BNP did not end the BNP's efforts to raise funds in America. (It subsequently reported, for instance, that in 2005, "several important visits" to the United States had been successful in raising money for the organization.)[57] Nor did the closure of American Friends mark the end of attempts to create a transnational movement. While some contacts are dependent on the ease of long-distance flight, a more rapid communication is offered on the Internet, and in recent years, Web sites have been set up by Emmanuel Brun d'Aubignosc, a figure who is linked with David Duke, the BNP, and the Front National, and on whose American site material can be found promoting both European parties.[58] A particularly striking development has involved Stormfront, the Web site established by the former successor to David Duke as leader of the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, Don Black. Forums exist on this site for France, Ireland, and numerous other countries. But this has not necessarily meant that extreme rightists in those countries have grown together.[59] While the British site, for instance, has given some say to both supporters and opponents of the Griffin leadership of the BNP, complaints that postings have been censored has led to some defection to a British forum on another American extreme Right Web site, Vanguard News Network. This site has also been criticized for excluding certain views and as a striking reminder of the ease with which national boundaries can be crossed, the arguments have raged over

decisions made by moderators on forums located in America for the discussion of developments in Britain, when those very moderators are activists on the British extreme right.[60]

Conclusion

This has not been an easy story to tell, with figures in one decade being in a different group in the next, organizations changing their name, and even the British National Party of the 1960s being crucially different from its namesake established two decades later. We have discussed groups that describe themselves as National Socialist and those that do not, but rival groups have disputed who were the true National Socialists, and groups that reject such a self-description vary greatly in what they would put in its place. We have only touched on some of the many attempts to link extreme rightists in different countries. (Harold Covington, for instance, led a short-lived International Union of National Socialists in the mid-1990s, while more recently an American group, the National Socialist Movement, has launched a new World Union of National Socialists with sections in France, Italy, Romania, Chile, and elsewhere.)[61] But while for National Socialists and others on the extreme right, transnational activity is of real importance, it has a deeply uneasy relationship to racial nationalism.

In the early 1960s, the BNP had declared "We are as much concerned with the fate of our people in Melbourne as those in Manchester, or those in Stockholm and those in Sheffield." By "co-operation and comradeship" with allies in America, South Africa and elsewhere, organizations could eventually "function as national sections of a unified Racial Nationalist world movement."[62]

A different organization, the BNP of decades later has continued in this bid to move beyond the nation-state. "Although we are all nationalists," Mark Cotterill told one American Friends of the BNP meeting, "we are only one nationality—white. It is not an American fight or a British fight or a German fight. It is a white fight…."[63]

For National Socialists, creating a racist international has taken up considerable energy, and the founders of the World Union of National Socialists even criticized Hitler for failing to recognize the importance of Aryan unity. Writing in the early 1960s, George Lincoln Rockwell declared that Hitler had never traveled, was "an incurable…. chauvinist" and had been wrong to build a German movement. Instead, as the World Union was doing, he should have sought to defeat "the international Jewish plotters" by building "a

WHITE MAN'S movement" throughout the world.[64] Writing in the World Union's journal twenty years later, Colin Jordan declared that Germany's National Socialism had been understood by most of its adherents as a narrow nationalism. The leading elements of the SS, however, had been Pan-Aryan in outlook, and what was now needed was "the emergence of Aryan international racism" and the ultimate creation of a "world community of united states."[65]

But while to retrospectively criticize Hitler is a remarkable thing for a National Socialist to do, the urge to organize transnationally should not be exaggerated. As their adoption of the term "nationalist" must remind us, racialists continue to valorize their nation state. Tyndall's organization was the National Front, then the British National Party; Pierce's the National Alliance; and when Colin Jordan spoke for the British Movement at the beginning of the 1970s, he evoked "an outstanding island set in the Western seas" and called for "Britain for the British."[66] Whether they run for election or envisage taking up the gun, it is a national framework that racialists are operating in and a national government they are challenging. There is one important partial exception—the European Parliament—and while a stable alliance between different extreme Right parties has proved elusive in this arena, the advantages of such an arrangement continues to pull parties that have been elected as nationalists into cooperation across national frontiers.[67]

But this has long been problematic, with one alliance, for example, failing over a row between German and Italian extreme rightists concerning the disputed South Tyrol.[68] In addition, if there are particular pressures toward cooperation in Europe, this is not the same as transcending nationalism. Nor is there a corresponding transnational political framework stretching across the Atlantic with which racialists must engage. Furthermore, there is no dominant extreme Right grouping across the different countries that racialists regard as rightly theirs, let alone a white nationalist state to which movements elsewhere look. In the 1930s, many extreme rightists looked to Germany not only for inspiration but for propaganda material and physical assistance. Now the Third Reich is no more, and no other racialist regime has arisen in Europe or the United States in its place. As we have seen with the hopes placed in Britain's NF in the 1970s, or the attempts to point to electoral advances in Europe more recently, European and American racialists need not think that only victory in their country matters—but can believe that a breakthrough elsewhere can be a spark for others—and see aiding a movement in another country and defending any racialist government that results,

as a duty. However, not only does their nationalism tend to pull them away from focusing on a struggle elsewhere, no breakthrough for the racialist cause has taken place in the postwar period on either continent.

The difficulties of transnationalism apply across political tendencies within the extreme Right and affect those who envisage violence as they do those who look to elections. Scandinavian Blood and Honour spoke of an "international white resistance" that would draw its inspiration from the Waffen SS, while during the conflict in the former Yugoslavia, the NSDAP/AO loudly hailed the participation of "volunteers from France, Germany, Austria, Belgium, Hungary, England, Australia and other countries in an openly National Socialist unit in Croatia."[69] But just as with the difficulties of cooperation on the extreme Right in the European Parliament, we should expect a devotion to nation to put into question the effective transnationalism of their more violent siblings.

What of our other question, the lines of influence across national boundaries? Introducing an edited collection, Kaplan and Bjørgo had argued that where in the 1930s, extreme Right influence flowed from Europe to the United States, in recent decades, the influence has gone in the opposite direction. They instanced not only the efforts of the NSDAP/AO and the migration across the Atlantic of both the Ku Klux Klan and the Church of the Creator but widespread use of the phrase, ZOG, Zionist Occupation Government, to portray "Aryans" as totally dispossessed by a Jewish conspiracy.[70] They also referred to Tom Metzger (one of their authors had noted the influence of WAR on extreme rightists in Sweden), and the same year, Kaplan and Weinberg published a study of the "Euro-American Radical Right" in which they reiterated an emphasis on American influences. But this time, they had partly mitigated the argument, drawing attention both to European influences on the U.S. extreme Right (notably Britain's racist skinheads and the continued importance of National Socialism) and an unsuccessful example of American extreme Right influence on Europe (Christian Identity's weakness outside the United States).[71] They have made a compelling case for a flow of influence from the American to the European extreme Right but have opened the question of how far we can take the argument; and a decade later, we are able to make some more modifications. First, not only Christian Identity but also other forms of American extreme rightism, notably the Klan and the Church of the Creator, have found little response in Europe. Second, only some of the extreme Right looks to a physical force strategy. The Front National, or the BNP, are just two examples

of extreme Right organizations that have resisted the approach championed by Combat 18 or the Storm Network. Third, not only are we at risk of overstating the influence of the U.S. extreme right on the Europeans, one development among some American extreme rightists has met with particular resistance in Europe.

Hostility to Islam has played a large part in many examples of extreme Right mobilization in Europe, and one recent article has described this as a "key feature," which has "the potential to create a cross-national reconfiguration of extreme-right ideology." But, as Michael has noted, sections of the American extreme Right have expressed support for radical Islam both against Israel and against the American intervention in the Middle East that they see as serving Zionist interests. While similar views exist on the European extreme Right, the BNP's Nick Griffin has denounced the manifestation of such ideas on the American extreme Right, arguing that Islam is the enemy. Here, American influence has not been the defining feature and has even been at loggerheads with much (but not all) of the European extreme Right.[72]

This chapter has emphasized the interaction between the two continents and a continued diversity of forms of the extreme Right in both. This approach is distinct not only from Zúquete's portrayal of the centrality of Islamophobia for the "cross-national" extreme Right but another discussion that has recently appeared on "the evolving transnational message" of the "racial-nationalist movement in North America and Europe." Stuart Wright has suggested that this has two prongs: first, an indictment of American and Israeli leaders and a concomitant championing of the Palestinians and al-Qaeda; and second, a denunciation of multiracialism and immigration. Yet he cites a claim made by a prominent American racialist, Jared Taylor, that 9/11 came about because of the presence of millions of Muslims within U.S. borders. This is a rejection of multiracialism that does not champion radical Islam, and its originator is not speaking for one homogeneous transnational extreme Right narrative. Indeed, he has been accused by the Carto camp of defaming Muslims when he should be criticizing Israel.[73] Differences here traverse the American extreme Right, and we should recognize divides among racists within a nation, and across the Atlantic.

This essay has sought to make a case that the extreme Right can be conceived transnationally, both in terms of international cooperation and of the influence of individual countries' movements on each other. The cooperation has been both within Europe and across the Atlantic (and even global). The influence has been largely from the United States

to Europe but has only affected some sectors of the extreme Right, and it has involved, in the case of Britain, some influence on racialists in the United States. But it would be a mistake to exaggerate this transnationalism. Not only are there rival tendencies, and, to take one example, sharply differing views on how racists should see radical Islam. But the very movement often described as white nationalism has experienced desperate difficulty in thinking and acting beyond the nation.

Notes

1. *Combat* 12, May–June 1961.
2. Martin Walker, *The National Front*, Fontana, 1977, p.37.
3. William H.Schmaltz, *Hate: George Lincoln Rockwell and the American Nazi Party* (Washington DC: Brassey's 1999), pp. 34–36, 149.
4. Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke, *Hitler's Priestess: Savitri Devi, the Hindu-Aryan Myth, and Neo-Nazism* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), pp. 195–96.
5. *Stormtrooper*, November 3, 1962; F. J. Simonelli, *American Fuehrer: George Lincoln Rockwell and the American Nazi Party* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999), pp. 86, 89–92.
6. *Spearhead,* February 1965.
7. Richard Thurlow, *Fascism in Britain: A History 1918–1985* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987), pp. 278–79, 281–82.
8. *Thunderbolt* 192, July 30, 1975; 208, August 1976; 219, July 1977.
9. Ibid; *Searchlight* 29, n.d., 1977.
10. *Patterns of Prejudice* vol. 9, no. 3, May–June 1975; *League Review* 8, March 18, 1976.
11. *Patterns of Prejudice* vol.10, no. 6, November–December 1976.
12. *League Review* 19, April 1978; *Spearhead* 115, March 1978; Tyler Bridges, *The Rise of David Duke* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1994), pp. 69–71.
13. *Thunderbolt* 217, May 1977; 219, July 1977; 243, July 1979.
14. *National Vanguard* 67, March 1979; 71, August 1979.
15. *National Vanguard* 76, May 1980.
16. *White Power* 66, October 1975.
17. *National Socialist* 3, Winter 1981.
18. *New Order* 39, November–December 1980; 103, March–April 1993.
19. Erik Jensen, "International Nazi Cooperation: A Terrorist-Oriented Network" in Tore Björgo and Rob Witte (eds.), *Racist Violence in Europe* (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1993), pp. 87–90.
20. *White Power* 19, August 1971; *Searchlight* 91, January 1983; *British Patriot* 44, August–September 1976.
21. George Thayer, *The Farther Shores of Politics* (London: Allen Lane The Penguin Press, 1968), pp. 63–68; *Christian Vanguard* 36, November 1974; Scott Anderson and Jon Lee Anderson, *Inside the League* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1986), pp. 92–103.

22. Thayer, *Farther Shores of Politics*, p. 64; *Searchlight* 126, December 1985.
23. George Michael, *Willis Carto and the American Far Right* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008), pp. 4, 124–32; *Searchlight* 379, January 2007.
24. *Christian Vanguard* 69, September 1977.
25. Kevin Flynn and Gary Gerhardt, *The Silent Brotherhood: Inside America's Racist Underground* (New York: Signet, 1990), pp. 84, 88–90; *Resistance* 7, n.d., c1996.
26. Matthias Gardell, *Gods of the Blood: The Pagan Revival and White Separatism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003), pp. 167, 191, 225–26, 307.
27. *Racial Loyalty* 72, August 1991; George Michael, *Theology of Hate. A History of the World Church of the Creator* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2009), pp. 32, 63–65, 105, 120, 132, 184, 189, 192.
28. *Aryan Action Line* 4, Fall 1992; *WAR* vol. 9, no. 3, n.d., c1990; *Intelligence Report* 103, Fall 2001.
29. Nick Lowles and Steve Silver, *White Noise*, Searchlight, London, 1998, pp. 9, 73; J. B. Moore, *Skinheads Shaved for Battle: A Cultural History of American Skinheads* (Bowling Green, OH. Bowling Green University Press, 1993), pp. 58, 76.
30. *Intelligence Report* 96, Fall 1999; 103, Fall 2001; Lowles and Silver, *White Noise*, pp. 9, 62, 78.
31. Ibid., p. 11.
32. Ibid., pp. 52, 74, 78; *Intelligence Report* 103, Fall 2001.
33. *Unity* 6, n.d.; *Last Chance* 10, n.d., c1992; http://wau.rac-usa.org/waufaq.html.
34. www.adl.org/learn/ext-us/volksfront/volksfront_report.pdf; www.volksfrontinternational.com/.
35. Martin Durham, *White Rage: The Extreme Right and American Politics* (London: Routledge, 2007), pp. 99, 103.
36. Ibid., p. 105; H. Lööw, 'The Cult of Violence: The Swedish Racist Subculture' in Björgo and Witte, *Racist Violence in Europe*, p. 66; *Searchlight* 283, January 1999.
37. Nick Lowles, *White Riot: The Violent Story of Combat 18* (Bury: Milo Books, 2001), pp. ix, 33.
38. *Order* 4, n.d., c1993.
39. Durham, *White Rage*, pp. 101–2, 106–8; Helene Lööw, "Racist Violence and Criminal Behaviour in Sweden: Myths and Realities" in Tore Bjørgo (ed.), *Terror from the Extreme Right* (London: Frank Cass, 1995), pp. 123, 154; *Searchlight* 243, September 1995.
40. Lowles, *White Riot*, pp. 191–95.
41. *Searchlight* 235, January 1995; Lowles, *White Riot*, p. 32, 34, 59, 188; Thurlow, *Fascism in Britain*, pp. 281, 285.
42. Lowles, *White Riot*, pp. 33–34; *Searchlight* 205, July 1992.
43. *Searchlight* 176, February 1990; 181, July 1990; *Blood and Honour* 8, 1989.
44. *White Beret* 1–92, December–February (1992).
45. Lowles and Silver, *White Noise*, p. 21; *Order* 20, July–September 1997; Bernard O'Mahony, *Hateland* (Edinburgh: Mainstream Publishing, 2006), pp. 203–24; *Searchlight* 273, March 1998.

46. *Intelligence Report* 103, Fall 2001; *National Vanguard* 121, November–December 2003; 128, September–October 2005.
47. *Intelligence Report* 93, Winter 1999; *National Alliance Bulletin,* March 1994.
48. *National Alliance Bulletin* November 1997; *National Vanguard* 119, January–February 2003; 121, November–December 2003; *Intelligence Report* 103, Fall 2001.
49. *Truth At Last* 369, n.d., 1993.
50. Durham, *White Rage*, pp. 45–46; *Spearhead,* July 2004.
51. www.adl.org/learn/extremism_in_the_news/White_Supremacy/new_orleans_052005.htm.
52. *Intelligence Report* 109, Spring 2003; www.davidduke.com/general/historic-moscow-conference-press-release_581.html.
53. *Truth At Last* 375, n.d., c1994.
54. www.stormfront.org/forum/showthread.php?p=6049831; *Intelligence Report* 130, Summer 2008.
55. Ibid.; *Heritage and Destiny* 6, January–February 2001; *Intelligence Report* 103, Fall 2001; *Searchlight* 317, November 2001.
56. *Searchlight* 303, September 2000; *Intelligence Report* 103, Fall 2001; *Jubilee* January–February 2001.
57. *Identity* 82, September 2005.
58. *Intelligence Report* Spring 2007; http://us.altermedia.info/page/4.
59. Durham, *White Rage*, p. 45; www.boards.ie./vbulletin/showthread.php?s=&threadid=112097.
60. *National Alliance Bulletin* September 1996; http://northwestnationalists.blogspot.com/2006/08/stormfront-uk-in-meltdown-bnp.html; http://vnnforum.com/showthread.php?t=78886; http://82.69.12.18/ lancasteruafblog/index.php?itemid=581; http://northwestnationalists.blogspot.com/.
61. *Searchlight* 242, August 1995; www.nsm88.org/commandersdesk/world_union_of_national_socialists.html.
62. *Combat* 15, January–February 1962.
63. *Intelligence Report* 103, Fall 2001.
64. George Lincoln Rockwell, *This Time The World*, originally published 1961 (York, SC: Liberty Bell Publications, 2004), pp. 434–35; Schmaltz, *Hate*, pp. 129–30.
65. *National Socialist* 3, Winter 1981.
66. Colin Jordan, *White Power for Britain!* (Coventry: British Movement, n.d.), 1971.
67. Cas Mudde, *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 172–83.
68. Ibid., p. 178.
69. Lowles, *White Riot*, p. 272; *New Order* 102, January–February 1993.
70. Jeffrey Kaplan and Tori Bjørgo (eds.), *Nation and Race: The Developing Euro-American Racist Subculture* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998), pp. ix–x.
71. Katrine Fangen, "Living Out Our Ethnic Instincts: Ideological Beliefs among Right-Wing Activists in Norway," in ibid., p. 223; Jeffrey Kaplan

and Leonard Weinberg, *The Emergence of a Euro-American Radical Right* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998), pp. 7–8, 88.

72. José Pedro Zúquete, "The European Extreme-right and Islam: New Directions?" *Journal of Political Ideologies* vol. 13, no.3, 2008, p. 321; George Michael, *The Enemy of My Enemy: The Alarming Convergence of Militant Islam and the Extreme Right* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006), pp.220–22; www.bnp.org.uk/columnists/chairman2.php?ngId=30.

73. Zúquete, "European Extreme-right and Islam," p. 321; Stuart A. Wright, "Strategic Framing of Racial-Nationalism in North America and Europe: An Analysis of a Burgeoning Transnational Framework," *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2009, pp. 189–90, 195–97, 198–99; Durham, *White Rage*, pp. 26, 128.

8
Transnational Anti-Feminist Networks: Canadian Right-Wing Women and the Global Stage

Kristin Blakely

The transnational organizing of right-wing women is a wholly under-explored area of inquiry. While Butler has documented the presence of pro-family organizations at the United Nations (UN) Preparatory Committee for Beijing +5, and Bacchetta and Power have empha-sized the need for the study of transnational connections between and among the Rights, the scholarship on right-wing women's trans-national networks is thin.[1] Feminist scholars have studied how trans-national feminist solidarity networks (TFNs) contribute to women's global activism,[2] but little is known about anti-feminist transnational networks. Using REAL Women of Canada as a national case study and entry point, this chapter will explore how transnational right-wing/anti-feminist networks are formed and operate through this group's global experiences and alliances with other right-wing groups.

Real Women of Canada is the largest national right-wing women's organization in Canada. It has transformed itself from a nationally based and national issued-based group on the Canadian right-wing political scene to one that is active at the UN and in the global right-wing political arena.[3] Motivated by their opposition to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), REAL Women began their foray into the world of global politics in the early 1990s. REAL Women has formed connections with other right-wing groups around the world through the UN. At the UN-sponsored Commission on the Status of Women Meetings (CSW) yearly meetings, they share resources, work with delegates,

and elevate the pro-family voice and agenda in caucus sessions and other meetings.[4] Through networking at the UN and international right-wing conferences, REAL Women has forged significant transnational alliances. These right-wing organizations, as Buss and Herman argue, are united in their belief that the entire international order is becoming an anti-family arena because the voices and lobbying efforts of the extreme Left supposedly dominate international politics. The participation of right-wing nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), like REAL Women at the UN, is actually a "direct path to power" for these conservative forces, allowing them to affect domestic policies by involving themselves in international politics.[5]

REAL Women is the leading anti-feminist voice in Canada, operating with a head office in the capital city of Ottawa and local chapters in most provinces. A board of directors with a rotating national president and a long-standing vice president governs the organization. Guided by a pro-family/anti-abortion/anti-feminist agenda, REAL Women functions more at the federal level than the provincial one, regularly submitting parliamentary briefs on issues ranging from same-sex marriage and abortion to hate-speech laws and stem cell research. They put out a monthly newsletter, have an annual meeting, are frequently quoted in Canadian media, and run an active and comprehensive Web site with position papers and action alerts for members on issues of concern to them.

The questions guiding this chapter are: (i) What connections and/or networks exist between right-wing women's organizing in Canada and that in other nations? (ii) How were these networks formed, what are their functions, and how are they maintained? (iii) What is behind REAL Women's transnational political involvement? and (iv) What are the implications of such networks?

Global Activities of REAL Women

REAL Women's interest in global politics dates back to 1985 when an article on CEDAW was published in their newsletter.[6] The article opposes Canada's ratification of the agreement on the grounds that CEDAW reflects anti-family and pro-abortion positions. Two years later, REAL Women criticized Canada's participation at the UN Women's Conference in Nairobi (1985), which it characterized as being defined by a radical feminist agenda and irresponsible spending.[7] REAL Women's opposition to CEDAW reflects the underlying reasons why they participate in international issues and UN activities: to develop transnational right-wing alliances in order to use international policy

to push their agenda forward in Canada and to monitor and expose the Canadian delegation's "anti-family" activities at the UN. UN decisions and activities have consequences for Canada and the world because the UN sets international standards and law. It is, according to REAL Women, a far-Left institution that has been co-opted by radical ideologues that needs a much stronger right-wing presence in order to protect the world from anti-family policies.

In its 1989 paper on CEDAW, REAL Women describes the text as a "Socialist, radical feminist document"[8] that Canada should never have ratified in 1981. In 1990, they wrote, "The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child: Analysis." The two papers and two newsletter articles herald the group's change in focus from solely national to global issues and concerns.

The shift to the global level is evident in *REALity*, their newsletter. Between 1994 and 1996, 68 percent of the newsletter's content was national, 15 percent was local, 7 percent was global, and 10 percent was other. However, illustrating the increasing trend to heightened global awareness and transnational connections, from 2005 to 2007, 63 percent of the coverage was on national issues, 26 percent global, 4 percent local, and 7 percent other (i.e., book reviews, donation requests, and membership renewal reminders and forms). While the national content has remained about the same, the local content has decreased by 10 percent, and the global content has increased by 19 percent. REAL Women began participating in international events in 1994 as an NGO participant at the UN Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) in Cairo. Fearing that this conference was going to be dominated by feminists who supported the implementation of abortion-on-demand as a worldwide policy, REAL Women saw the opportunity to represent the "pro-family, pro-life" voice. They presented on the issue of "Women's Leadership Role in Population and Development" in Cairo. The next issue of *REALity* in 1994 contained ten pages of articles (half of the newsletter) on the conference, with titles such as "Canadian Government pushing feminism and abortion in Third World Countries," and "Canada Pushes Feminist Policies at the UN."[9] REAL Women has an ambivalent relationship to the UN; their excitement around participating in the meetings is coupled with their disdain for UN policies, particularly on abortion. As REAL Women member Lorraine McNamara stated:

> How do we address these problems at the UN? We must bear in mind that the UN does serve a noble purpose in dealing with

famine relief, health care, peacekeeping and national disasters. Rather than abandoning the UN, we must try to return it to its original purposes, which includes respecting the religion and cultures of each individual state.

We write up articles in the Reality. We write op ed pieces for newspapers. We do our best to publicize what is going on at the UN, but this is not enough. More pro-life, pro-family organizations must be accredited to the UN (this just requires a lot of paper work.) We must insist that pro-family persons be a part of the Canadian delegations. Canadian delegations now include a so-called "gender specialist." Why don't our delegations also include a pro-life/family expert as well?

...Despite the difficulties we face, it has been a great honour and privilege to serve the cause of the family there. We have the opportunity to let people know what is happening—that Canada is a mouthpiece for the world to bring about an anti-family agenda! Our role is to let Canadians know this and to embarrass our disgraceful anti-family delegation.[10]

After attending the UN Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) in Cairo in 1994, REAL Women participated in other major international events, including, but not limited to, the UN Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing (1995); the UN Conference on Human Settlements, Habitat II in Istanbul (1996); and the UN Commission on Human Rights in Geneva (1998). Their involvement at these events enabled REAL Women to acquire consultative status at the UN as an NGO with the UN's Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) in 1998. The status enables REAL Women to attend UN meetings and international conferences convened by the UN, designate UN representatives, consult with officers from the Secretariat on matters of concern to them, circulate written statements, and speak at ECOSOC subsidiary bodies' meetings, and organize "side events" at UN conferences.

To date, REAL Women has participated in over thirty UN conferences and is frequently on record for making statements and issuing briefs during UN proceedings. At the NGO Forum at Beijing +5 in New York in 2000, for instance, REAL Women organized panels and workshops entitled "Ushering in the New Millennium: Women and Men Together as Equal," "The Vital Role of Women in the Twenty-First Century," and "The Family as the Corner Stone of Society."[11] In addition to their involvement at the UN, REAL Women attended and participated in international conferences such as the World Congress

of Families (WCF) in Prague (1997), Geneva (1999), Mexico City (2004), and in Warsaw (2007).

Gwendolyn Landolt, the national vice president, has made all the presentations at WCF conferences. The presence of this one woman is fitting, since the organizational leadership is concentrated in the hands of a select group, for long periods of time. A few individuals, such as Landolt or Cecilia Forsyth, have become the voice of the organization and do its actual work. This record of prominent individuals is consistent with patterns in leadership in other right-wing groups. For example, Mercedes Arzu Wilson has been president of the right-wing Family of the Americas Foundation since its inception in 1977, and Gilles Grondin has been president of the Mouvement en faveur de la vie/Campagne Quebec-Vie since its inception in 1985.[12]

In 2001, a young woman from Lethbridge, Alberta, became REAL Women's official representative to the UN. She now attends CSW annually and reports back to the organization on UN activities and issues of concern to the organization. She has joined the select group of leaders of REAL Women, but more to the point, the organization has prioritized its UN work, which speaks to the importance that the organization is putting on its transnational work.

I interviewed REAL Women's UN representative after she spoke at the 2006 Annual Conference. She told me that she has attended sixteen UN events in total, and that she typically attends the CSW meetings and one other event in which REAL Women has a vested interest, meaning one that deals with women and/or children.

As their UN representative suggests, REAL Women's interests fall into two substantive areas: children's rights and the rights of the family. Their issues of concern include abortion, same-sex marriage, gay and lesbian rights, sexual education, sexual rights of children (i.e., access to birth control and abortion), reproductive technologies (i.e., cloning), and trafficking of women and girls. The group also prioritizes monitoring Canada's activities at the UN and shifting the power at the UN from "left-wing radicals and feminists" to those individuals and parties that uphold traditional family and pro-life values.

Right-Wing Women's Organizing and Pro-Family Transnational Organizing

The presence of a right-wing transnational collective in the global political arena was made undeniably clear at the 1994 UN Population and Development Conference (ICPD) in Cairo. Several Catholic

countries, including the Roman Catholic Holy See (the Vatican) entered into an alliance with conservative Muslim nations, including Sudan, Libya, and Iran to work against the adoption of sexual and reproductive rights.[13] The coalition objected to any language that legitimated or facilitated abortion, gave women or adolescents the right to make independent reproductive decisions (i.e., without the consent of men or parents), and/or condoned alternative or nontraditional forms of the family.[14] By using UN rules and procedures to their advantage, the coalition made frequent oral interventions in an attempt to make known their opposition to sexual and reproductive rights.[15] According to Petchesky, the underlying (or real) issue was the perceived challenge to traditional patriarchal social structures, not the regulation of fertility.[16] The Cairo conference only achieved consensus by finding language that allowed different interpretations of the document to coexist. As a result, the wording on access to safe abortions included the stipulation that abortion not be promoted as a method of family planning.

Throughout the 1990s, sexual and reproductive rights were the subjects of vigorous debates at UN conferences.[17] The current transnational anti-feminist coalition can be traced to the work that took place at the ICPD in 1994, the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995, and Beijing + 5 in New York in 2000.

At Beijing in 1995, the Vatican played a significant opposition role by mobilizing a number of Latin American, African, and Muslim countries as well as conservative Catholic, Muslim, and Protestant NGOs (including REAL Women) to act as a unified conservative voice against abortion and reproductive and sexual rights in general. The Beijing Platform for Action, the document that emerged from the conference, subsequently became an important mobilizing tool for the right-wing coalition. In 1997, Austin Ruse, director of the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute (C-FAM)—an organization that focuses solely on UN work and today coordinates much of the right-wing/pro-family work at the UN[18]—put out a call to pro-family and pro-life advocates to come to the UN to fight against the Beijing Platform for Action. Ruse states: "You will be working alongside Catholics, Evangelicals, Jews, Muslims and Mormons . . . We are the children of Abraham arising to fight for faith and family."[19]

This call to form an interreligious transnational coalition was supported by the World Family Policy Center (WFPC) at Brigham Young University and the Howard Center (a conservative institute dedicated to spreading the values of Western Christendom). Pro-family international representatives subsequently met in Rome, Italy, in 1998

to strategize how to discuss the attacks on the traditional family by UN officials and others. REAL Women's national vice president, Gwendolyn Landolt, was one of a select group who attended this special meeting, and she played an active role in this emerging transnational right-wing network.[20] The World Congress of Families (WCF) also met in 1997 and in 1999, again creating opportunities for pro-family groups to organize. REAL Women attended both conferences. The increasing strength and momentum of the coalition through WCF are evident in the growing numbers of people who attended the meeting: the 1999 conference had double the number of participants as the 1997 one.[21]

At the 2000 Beijing +5 conference, 180 government delegations and over 2,000 women's groups gathered to discuss the implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action. This is the document that 189 countries at Beijing 1995 adopted by consensus; it sets out goals for reforming the multitude of barriers that maintain systems of gender inequality all around the world.[22] Two main factions emerged at the 2000 meeting. One alliance, comprised of Japan, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the European Union (JUSCANZ) had a progressive mandate for broadening and strengthening sexual and reproductive rights. The other group consisted of a coalition of delegates from the Vatican (or Holy See), Poland, Slovakia, Latin America, Libya, Algeria, and Sudan along with right-wing NGOs, including REAL Women, Concerned Women for America, Human Life International, Pro-Life National Committee of Mexico, Family Life Counseling Association of Kenya, and World Christian Life Community of Italy.[23]

The transnational right-wing coalition active during the Beijing +5 activities made its mark in a way similar to the coalition of several Catholic and Muslim countries and the Holy See at the ICPD in Cairo. The right-wing/pro-family coalition at Beijing +5 unsuccessfully objected to the inclusion of such phrases as "sexual rights" and "sexual orientation," which were included in the final agreements. However, it successfully lobbied governments, including the Vatican and several Roman-Catholic and Muslim countries, "to block sections in the final outcome document that touched on women's sexual and reproductive rights."[24] These controversial sections were bracketed, amounting to 40 percent of the text being enclosed in what became known as "the Holy Brackets."[25] As Girard explains, the right-wing presence at Beijing +5:

> . . . sought to insert into the final agreements a vision of women as mothers, to the exclusion of their other roles and aspirations. They also promoted amendments supporting their concept of

the "ideal" family i.e. the nuclear family based on a man and woman united by marriage, and their children. North American right-wing groups actively lobbied for this agenda inside and outside the negotiating rooms.[26]

Right-wing activists at Beijing +5 wore bright red buttons with the words "Family" and "Motherhood" emblazoned on them because "they see the draft document as an attempt to force women out of the home and into the work force."[27] REAL Women obtained passes for thirty Franciscan monks to attend the UN event providing delegates, as Girard suggests "with the curious spectacle of bearded 'REAL Women' in cassocks and sandals." Altogether, it is estimated that thirty to forty right-wing activists were present at Beijing +5 from about fifteen NGOs and representing North American, African, Latin American, European, and Middle Eastern countries.[28]

Both the Right and the Left consider the Beijing +5 conference a success. One headline in the conservative Canadian weekly newsmagazine, *The Alberta Report,* read "Call it Beijing-5: Religious Conservatives Celebrate a Rare Win over the Anti-Family Clique at the UN"[29] while another, put out by the New York-based progressive women's health and human rights advocacy NGO, the International Women's Health Coalition, read "Beijing Plus Five: Sexual and Reproductive Rights are Here to Stay."[30] In fact, both sides can claim successes, but the right-wing coalition, while growing in influence, is still small and has a minority voice in the larger dialogue of women's rights at UN conferences. The coalition did win the removal of direct references to sexual orientation and explicit references to legalized abortion in the document. However, the Beijing Platform for Action is ultimately the most comprehensive document on women's rights ever agreed upon by governments and demonstrates a commitment to social, economic, political, and sexual/reproductive rights for women across the globe. It is an important moment in the global women's movement, providing nations with a blueprint for activism. Despite these setbacks, the various conferences: Cairo (1994), Beijing (1995), and Beijing +5 (2000), did plant the seeds for an active and permanent right-wing transnational coalition at the UN.

In fact, a growing number of pro-family organizations are seeking and getting NGO consultative status; they are also getting members of other right-wing groups accredited to meetings. As Chamberlain writes, "Although the largest NGO presence [at the UN] is progressive, socially conservative forces, often originating in the United

States, are growing in power. The ratio of pro-choice to anti-choice NGOs is now 3:2."[31] The number of panel presentations at the 2007 Commission on the Status of Women's (CSW) annual meeting on gender equality and the advancement of women in New York that were sponsored and organized by right-wing women's NGOs and were pro-family in content were more than they had ever been. For example, Endeavour Forum, an Australian anti-feminist women's NGO, whose mandate is to safeguard the traditional family, hosted a workshop entitled "Womanhood and Motherhood: How to be a World Changer." Similarly, the International Islamic Committee for Women and Child, an Egyptian women's organization that seeks to preserve the Islamic identity of Muslim women and children and uphold Sharia law, hosted "Complete Equality: Gain or Loss?" and the conservative NGO, Worldwide Organization for Women, which is based in Utah, Geneva, and Nigeria and is a proponent of women's traditional roles in the home, hosted "Female Infanticide" at which anti-abortion pamphlets were handed out entitled "A Girl's Right to Live: Female Feticide and Girl Infanticide."[32]

REAL Women is also involved in getting anti-feminist workshops and presentations on the agenda at CSW and other UN meetings. This is part of their work to ensure that a conservative voice is on record at UN events. In my interview with REAL Women's representative at the UN, she explained how their UN work is part of a larger, coordinated force of right-wing NGOs and delegates who refer to themselves as the Pro-Life Coalition.[33]

According to REAL Women's UN representative, the coalition is directed by representatives from other right-wing groups such as REAL Women, Concerned Women for America (CWA), Focus on the Family (US), and the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute (C-FAM). Representatives from other pro-family NGOs, such as the Society for the Protection of Unborn Children from the UK; CARE from the UK; United Families Red Familia, a Mexican NGO that is a coalition of 150 pro-life and pro-family organizations; True Love Waits from Kenya; and the World Youth Alliance, which has chapters all over the world, participate as volunteers of the coalition. The coalition meets periodically when the CSW is in session and keeps in touch throughout the year. They share information and resources and divide up tasks at meetings. Tasks include note taking, talking to delegates, collecting information on issues, examining documents for problematic text such as "sexual rights," and rewriting documents to reflect pro-family positions.[34]

This Pro-life Coalition currently working at the UN continues the crusade against feminists and supposed left-wing radicals on the issue of sexual and reproductive rights it initiated in Cairo (1994), Beijing (1995), and Beijing +5 (2000). Sexual rights, according to REAL Women's UN representative, refer to abortion on demand, sex education that downplays the importance of chastity and abstinence, and the right to contraceptives. For REAL Women, the Canadian delegation at the UN is a particularly egregious offender on the sexual rights issue since it supports access to abortion and contraception for women and adolescents without parental input or consent.[35]

During her speech at the 2006 annual REAL Women conference, REAL Women's UN representative used the issue of sexual rights to describe the coalition's work. She referred to members of the Pro-life Coalition accessing voting delegates, either through flyers or by speaking directly to them, to inform of the implications of "sexual rights" in UN documents and the Pro-Life Coalition's opposition to such text. REAL Women's UN representative has built an alliance with an Egyptian delegate for example, who is "on-side"; together, they help the coalition navigate the UN procedures and get the coalition's voice on record.[36] Other members of the coalition meet with the delegations from their own countries as well as others to discuss the issues raised and to plan their next steps for blocking what they perceive as anti-life and anti-family language from going on record.

Their work has achieved some victories. One success for the Right occurred in the fall of 2009, just two months after the WCF met in Amsterdam. The UN Human Rights Council approved a resolution proposed by Russia promoting "a better understanding of traditional values of humankind." The WCF has a strong base in Russia; in fact, it has focused much time and money in Eastern Europe in general in the hopes of nurturing conservative leadership and developing alliances with right-wing groups and individuals who support their anti-abortion and anti-homosexuality agenda.[37] When asked about their role in the UN resolution, WCF managing director, Larry Jacobs, remarked, "There wasn't any secret conspiracy. The interesting thing about the WCF is that we are just bringing groups together."[38]

Pro-family organizations like the Pro-life Coalition at the UN and the WCF see themselves as coalition builders, as the quote from Larry Jacobs reveals. However, because both WCF and the Pro-Life Coalition at the UN are made of diverse members that cut across nations, differences, and unequal power relations, they represent the very definition of the term transnational.[39] The member organizations of WCF are both Muslim and Christian and from nations of the North and

South. The Pro-Life Coalition at the UN is interreligious and consists of NGOs from multiple nations (Canada, the United States, Mexico, Uganda, and Kenya) from both the global North and South. Austin Ruse, the director of C-FAM, remarks on how the pro-family coalition at the UN works across power differences between nations: "We're a minority here, not only in our numbers but also in the places that want to hear our message. We find that most of our friends are in the developing world within the General Assembly, and we have very few friends in the UN bureaucracy."[40] The UN plays an important role in the development of these right-wing transnational networks that transcend power differences insofar as its structures (from conferences to committees) foster interaction among diverse NGOs and give voice to otherwise weak states and perspectives that are then heard by privileged states and actors. While this feature of transnational organizing at the UN has been advanced by Snyder to account for feminist empowerment opportunities for women from the global South and the development of transnational feminist networks between women from the global North and South, it can also account for the coalition building between like-minded right-wing NGOs and conservative states from both the global North and South.[41] In other words, the structure of representation at the UN has enabled the concerns of right-wing forces to enter mainstream UN dialogue and influence UN policy.

REAL Women's Motivation for Transnational Political Participation

Buss and Herman examine the Christian Right's involvement in international politics and argue that it is motivated by the desire to protect the United States and the world from the anti-family movement. Similarly, Keck and Sikkink refer to international NGO politics as the boomerang pattern or effect in which NGOs bypass their own state and seek out transnational networks, in order to pressure their state from the outside to advance their own agenda. Typically, if an NGO's activities are stifled in their own country either by restrictive political institutions or divergent norms of preferences, NGOs build transnational networks, usually with larger international NGOs, in order to provide their support and resources to places where they can be more effective. Keck and Sikkink describe how progressive NGOs working around human rights, indigenous rights, the environment, and women's rights operating within restrictive or conservative settings seek alliances with international NGOs in more liberal settings

to help them pressure their own state for change.[42] I extend Keck and Sikkink's model of the boomerang effect across the political spectrum to account for the participation of REAL Women as a right-wing NGO, in the liberal country of Canada, that seeks out right-wing transnational networks within an international context to ultimately affect change in Canada.

The Christian Right views the UN as an undemocratic place where anti-family activists such as radical feminists, population control ideologues, and homosexual rights activists can "pursue a social policy agenda through the backdoor of international law and policy that was unsuccessful through the front door of domestic policy."[43] In the United States, the Christian Right's criticism of American activists campaigning for same-sex marriage rights in international law, when it is not a right in the United States (at least not in most states and federally), illustrates this position. In Canada, REAL Women's criticism of the Canadian delegation's position at CSW on decriminalizing prostitution (which is illegal in Canada) is also an example. New rights, such as "reproductive" or "sexual rights" that become accepted as international law through supposedly backdoor negotiating processes at the UN bind domestic states that have ratified the agreement. For instance, Canada is bound to CEDAW and its provisions. Christian Right activists must therefore participate at UN conferences and prevent international agreement on new rights like sexual rights that will, they claim, ultimately undermine the family. Even though the UN is viewed by some, including the Christian Right, as incompetent and "a large, faceless bureaucracy," it is precisely because of this that the Right sees the UN as "susceptible to infiltration by radical NGOs and democratically unaccountable, sympathetic UN bureaucrats."[44]

Buss and Herman also argue that the Christian Right believes that the entire international order is becoming an anti-family arena because the voices and lobbying efforts of the extreme left dominate international politics. As such, the rationale for engaging in international work such as at the UN "is less specifically about protecting the United States than about stopping the global dominance of the 'anti-family' forces."[45] REAL Women's critique of CEDAW, for instance, has not been limited to the Convention's impact on Canada. Rather, they have extended their critique to include CEDAW's impact on countries around the world.

In her 2004 speech at the WCF conference in Mexico City, Landolt provided examples of the CEDAW Monitoring Committee's supposed imposition of its Western, radical feminist agenda on

non-Western countries.[46] She pointed to the cases of China and Kyrgyzstan where the Committee supposedly directed them to liberalize their prostitution laws even though CEDAW condemns prostitution. The committee is criticizing Belarus, according to Landolt, for instituting Mother's Day because it represents the "sexual stereotyping of women." Libya has been directed to reinterpret the Koran "to abide by the Committee's new feminist guidelines." These cases are placed alongside REAL Women's critique of CEDAW as evidence of progressives imposing radical feminism at the UN and around the world.

REAL Women's critique of the UN's Children Fund (UNICEF) also shows the extent to which the group monitors UN policies beyond Canada as part of their desire to protect the world from the supposedly harmful anti-family policies of the UN. REAL Women criticizes UNICEF's funding of "anti-family" programs and organizations. For example, Lovelife, a South African organization, supposedly "encourages children to engage in sexual and homosexual behaviour, and to have abortions without their parents knowledge or consent."[47] According to UNICEF however, Lovelife is a national NGO with whom they have partnered; it promotes and provides counseling on HIV/AIDS awareness and prevention to young people. REAL Women charges UNICEF with deviating from its mission of protecting children from poverty, disease, hunger, and death to programs advancing population control and the sexual and reproductive rights of children. REAL Women, of course, opposes sexual rights programs and policies, including sexual education and counseling, on the basis that they encourage sexual activity among children.

To sum up, REAL Women's motivations for participation at the UN and in the global political arena stem from a desire to use international policy to support their agenda in Canada, to monitor and expose the Canadian delegation's "anti-family" activities at the UN that have implications for Canada and the world, and to monitor and expose the UN itself as a "far-left" institution of "radical ideologies" that needs a much stronger pro-family presence in order to protect both Canada and the world from "harmful anti-family policies."

Nevertheless, REAL Women's primary concern is to effect change in Canada. Working at a time when REAL Women's objectives are not being achieved in Canada, especially with the legalization of same-sex marriage in 2005—a major defeat for the New Right in Canada—the organization can influence policy direction in contexts less progressive than Canada through the UN by working with allied NGOs and delegates from around the world.

Conclusion

This chapter has shown that transnational connections are crucial to REAL Women, which has transformed itself from a nationally based and national issues-based group on the Canadian right-wing political scene to one that is active at the UN and in the global political arena. Through networking at the UN and international right-wing conferences like WCF, REAL Women has forged significant transnational alliances. These are important to REAL Women because working with other NGOs and countries that support their pro-family/anti-feminist agenda at the UN and in the global political arena is a way to insert pro-family politics into Canada in the hopes that international treaties that they have successfully influenced will carry some political weight in the national context. Their work on behalf of women and families to curb the so-called destructive impact of UN anti-family and pro-abortion policies extends beyond Canada as REAL Women becomes ever more engaged in tackling the opponents of the pro-family movement in countries around the world.

Notes

1. Jennifer Butler, "For Faith and Family: Christian Right Advocacy at the United Nations," *Public Eye*, Vol. 14(2/3), 2000: 1–17; Paola Bacchetta and Margaret Power eds., *Right-Wing Women: From Conservatives to Extremists around the World.* (New York: Routledge, 2002).
2. Nancy A. Naples and Manisha Desai eds., *Women's Activism and Globalization* (New York: Routledge, 2002); Myra Marx Ferree and Aili Mari Tripp eds., *Global Feminism: Transnational Women's Activism, Organizing, and Human Rights* (New York: New York University Press, 2006).
3. Kristin Blakely, "Women of the New Right in Canada." PhD Dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago, 2008.
4. REAL Women's UN Representative, Interview with author, June 3, 2006.
5. Doris Buss and Didi Herman, *Globalizing Family Values: The Christian Right in International Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 26.
6. *REALity*, Vol. 111(3), 1985: 2–3.
7. *REALity*, Vol. V(1), 1987: 12.
8. Gwendolyn Landolt, "The U.N. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women: Analysis," Publication of REAL Women of Canada, September 1989, 53.
9. *REALity*, Vol. XIII(5), 1994.
10. REALity, Vol. XIX(3): May/June 2000, "Supporting the Canadian Family at the UN," Available through: http://www.realwomenca.com/newsletter/2000_May_Jun/article_15.html.

11. Anick Druelle, *Right-Wing Anti-Feminist Groups at the United Nations* (Institut de recherches et d'études féministes: Université du Québec a Montréal), May 2000, 26.
12. Ibid.
13. Jutta M. Joachim, *Agenda Setting, the UN, and NGOs: Gender Violence and Reproductive Rights* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2007).
14. Rosalind Petchesky, *Global Prescriptions: Gendering Health and Human Rights* (London: Zed Books, 2003).
15. Joachim, *Agenda Setting*.
16. Petchesky, *Global Prescriptions*.
17. Francoise Girard, "Beijing Plus Five: Sexual and Reproductive Rights Are Here to Stay," *AnAlize Magazine*, 2001, available through: International Women's Health Coalition at http://www.iwhc.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=2627&Itemid=824.
18. Butler, "For Faith and Family."
19. Quote from ibid., 40. While Ruse's 1997 call was issued to "all children of Abraham," Jewish NGOs and activists ignored it. Rabbi Michael Gold, the only Rabbi on the WCF Family Planning for the Mexico City Conference in 2004 claims that the Jewish presence (or lack thereof) in international pro-family politics related to the perception among Jews that "family values" belong solely to the Christian Right. As a result, pro-family Jews are distrustful of events like WCF conferences, which they see as having a strong Christian bias.
20. *REALity*, Vol. XVII(5): September/October 1998, "A Call from the Families of the World." Available through: http://www.realwomenca.com/newsletter/1998_Sept_Oct/article_4.html.
21. Butler, "For Faith and Family," 5.
22. Girard, "Beijing Plus Five."
23. Paul Bunner, "Call It Beijing-5," *The Report* (National Edition), Vol. 27(5), 2000, 13; Jennifer Chan-Tiberghien, "Gender-Skepticism or Gender-Boom?" *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol. 6(3), 2004, 464.
24. Chan-Tiberghien, "Gender-Skepticism."
25. Robin Morgan, "The UN Conference: Out of the Holy Brackets and into the Policy Mainstream," *Women's Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 24(1–2), 1996: 77–83; Lois A. West, "The United Nations Women's Conferences and Feminist Politics," in Meyer, M. and E. Prugl eds., *Gender Politics in Global Governance* (Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999).
26. Girard, "Beijing Plus Five."
27. Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute (C-FAM), "Pro-Family Lobbyists Having Major Impact at Un Beijing+5 Conference," C-Fam. Org. Vol. 3(16), March 10, 2000, Available through: http://www.c-fam.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=429&Itemid=102.
28. Butler, "For Faith and Family," 5, 10; Geoffrey Knox (ed.), "Religion and Public Policy at the UN: A Religion Counts Report" (Washington, DC: Religion Counts, 2002).

The fifteen NGOs included The Catholic Family Institute, the World Family Policy Forum at Brigham Young University, the National Institute of Womanhood, Global HAWC (Helping Advance Women and Children), Couple to Couple League, American Life League,* National Right to Life Committee,* World Life Campaign,* Campaign Life Coalition,* Concerned Women for America,* REAL Women of Canada,* the World Movement of Mothers, United Families International,* True Love Waits of Kenya, and Focus on the Family. (A * denotes that the organization has UN NGO Consultative status.) The coalition also includes delegates from Algeria, Libya, Iran, Pakistan, Sudan, Nigeria, Nicaragua, Argentina, Kenya, the Vatican, Egypt, and Senator Gordon Smith of Oregon.

29. Bunner, "Call It Beijing-5."
30. Girard, "Beijing Plus Five."
31. Pam Chamberlain, "The Globalization of an Agenda: The Right Targets the UN with Its Anti-Choice Politics," *Public Eye* Vol. 20(1), Spring 2006.
32. Elisha Dunn-Georgiou, "Right-wingers at the Commission on the Status of Women," http://www.rhrealitycheck.org/node/2579.
33. REAL Women's UN Representative Interview, June 3, 2006.
34. Ibid.
35. *REALity*, Vol. XVIII(2): March/April 1999, "Canada's Duplicity at the UN," Available through: http://www.realwomenca.com/newsletter/1999_March_April/ma1999.html.
36. REAL Women's UN Representative, Interview, June 3, 2006.
37. Gillian Kane, "Exporting "Traditional Values": The World Congress of Families," *Public Eye*, Vol. 66 (4), 2009.
38. Quoted in ibid.
39. Chandra Talpade Mohanty, *Feminism Without Borders* (London: Duke University Press, 2003).
40. Quoted in Knox, "Religion and Public Policy at the UN," 28.
41. Margaret Snyder, "Unlikely Godmother: The UN and the Global Women's Movement," in Ferree and Tripp, *Global Feminism*.
42. Buss and Herman, *Globalizing Family Values*; Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998).
43. Buss and Herman, *Globalizing Family Values*, 45.
44. Ibid., 47.
45. Ibid., 46.
46. Gwendolyn Landolt, "Keeping the Family in the UN's Agenda," Remarks to the World Congress of Families III, Mexico City, Mexico, March 30, 2004, available through: http://www.worldcongress.org/wcf3_spkrs/wcf3_landolt.htm.
47. *REALity*, Vol. XXII(6): November/December 2003, "UNICEF: A Wolf in Sheep's Clothing," available through: http://www.realwomenca.com/newsletter/2003_nov_dec/article_11.html.

Contributors

Gokhan Bacik is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Zirve University, Turkey. Bacik also taught in different European universities as Erasmus Visiting Professor. He is the author of *September 11 and World Politics* (2004) and *Modern International System: Genealogy, Teleology and the Expansion* (2007). He has also published in *Middle East Policy, International Review of Sociology, The Muslim World, Arab Studies Quarterly, Peace Review, Turkish Studies, Nationalism,* and *Ethnic Politic*. His most recent book is *Hybrid Sovereignty in the Arab Middle East* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

Arnd Bauerkämper, Professor of Modern European History at the *Freie Universität Berlin*, studied History and English at the Universities of Bielefeld, Oxford, and Göttingen. Selected publications include: *Die "radikale Rechte" in Großbritannien. Nationalistische und faschistische Bewegung vom späten 19. Jahrhundert bis 1945* (Göttingen 1991); *Ländliche Gesellschaft in der kommunistischen Diktatur. Zwangsmodernisierung und Tradition in Brandenburg 1945–1963* (Cologne 2002); *Die Sozialgeschichte der DDR* (Munich 2005); *Der Faschismus in Europa 1918–1945* (Stuttgart 2006); (ed., Konrad H. Jarausch / Marcus Payk), *Demokratiewunder. Transatlantische Mittler und die kulturelle Öffnung Westdeutschlands 1945–1970* (Göttingen 2005); (ed., Jürgen Nautz), *Zwischen Fürsorge und Seelsorge. Christliche Kirchen in den europäischen Zivilgesellschaften seit dem 18. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt/Main 2009); (ed., Elise Julien), *Durchhalten! Krieg und Gesellschaft im Vergleich 1914–1918* (Göttingen 2010).

Kristin Blakely obtained her PhD in Sociology with a Graduate Concentration in Women's Studies from Loyola University Chicago in 2008. Her research interests include gender, social movements, and qualitative methods. Blakely has taught courses at Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Canada, and is currently teaching at Glendon College of York University. Blakely is a co-author of *Gendered Worlds* (Oxford 2008) and has published in *Contemporary Sociology*, the *Journal of International Women's Studies*, the *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, and the *Journal of Family Issues*. In addition, Blakely is active in the women's movement and is currently the board president of YWCA Toronto.

Martin Durham is Senior Lecturer in Politics at the University of Wolverhampton, UK. He has written extensively on the Right in Britain and the USA, with publications ranging from *Women and Fascism* (London, UK: Routledge 1998) to *The Christian Right, the Far Right and the Boundaries of American Conservatism* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2000). In recent years, while continuing to work on Fascism, he has particularly been concerned with the American Right and Foreign Policy and published essays on conservative responses to 9/11, Iraq, and Iran.

Patrick J. Furlong is Professor of History at Alma College in Michigan. A native of South Africa, his research has focused on its modern political history. He is the author of *Between Crown and Swastika: The Impact of the Radical Right on the Afrikaner Nationalist Movement in the Fascist Era* and articles in *Ufahamu*, *African Affairs*, the *South African Historical Journal,* and *New Contree*.

Margaret Power is Professor of History at the Illinois Institute of Technology, where she teaches courses on Latin American history, women's history, and world history. She is the author of *Right-Wing Women in Chile: Feminine Power and the Struggle against Allende, 1964–1973* (Penn State University Press, 2002) and co-editor of *Right-Wing Women around the World: From Conservatives to Extremists* (Routledge, 2002). She is also the co-editor of a special issue of *Latin American Perspectives* on U.S. solidarity with Latin America. Currently, she is working on a book on the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party.

Markku Ruotsila is Adjunct Professor of American and British History at the University of Tampere and of American Church History at the University of Helsinki. Since receiving his PhD at the University of Cambridge in 1999, he has taught at several universities in Europe and the United States and been a visiting fellow at New York University and at the University of Oxford. Ruotsila is the author of six books, including *British and American Anticommunism Before the Cold War* (Routledge, 2001); *Churchill and Finland* (Routledge, 2005); *John Spargo and American Socialism* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2006); and *The Origins of Christian Anti-Internationalism: Conservative Evangelicals and the League of Nations* (Georgetown University Press, 2008). His current research focuses on fundamentalist Christian anti-Communism in the United States, religion and U.S. foreign policy, and the comparative history of Socialist Anti-Communism.

Index