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liberals from fifteen states endorsed Ford for president in November 1923. The movement, however, collapsed the following month when Ford declared he would support Calvin Coolidge, who had succeeded Harding as president on his death in August 1923.30

Ford’s comments on the presidential race revealed his willingness to abandon an electoral system of government. In a 1923 interview he said: “I can’t imagine myself today accepting any nomination. Of course I can’t say what I will do tomorrow. There might be a war or some crisis of the sort, in which legalism and constitutionalism and all that wouldn’t figure, and the nation wanted some person who could do things and do them quickly.” “Shouldn’t wonder,” he told the interviewer, “if industry would eventually absorb the political government.” This from a man who declared elsewhere that industry must be “more or less of a friendly autocracy.”31

With journalists publicizing his views to an eager mass audience during the 1910s and 1920s, Henry Ford expounded his principles of prosperity. High wages and low prices, he declared, were good for business, because they ensured the manufacturer a stable, high-quality workforce and enabled people to buy the products. This was a startling departure from prevailing business practices and marked the rise of the new consumer society. “An underpaid man,” Ford argued, “is a customer reduced in buying power.” Frank Costigliola notes: “Along with such industrial leaders as Owen Young [chair of General Electric and RCA] and Alanson B. Houghton [congressmember and ambassador], Ford urged a consumption ethic. In 1919, Ford advertisements urged: ‘Buy a Ford—SAVE the difference.’ By 1923 the message had changed to: ‘Buy a Ford—SPEND the difference.’32

Ford’s industrial philosophy brought together the antisemitism of the Protocols and the U.S. producerist tradition. This convergence was particularly striking in the 1926 book Today and Tomorrow, which Ford coauthored with journalist and economist Samuel Crowther.33 Although the book countered good manufacturers and bad financiers in terms similar to the Dearborn Independent, and warned that “certain hereditary groups” had manipulated the world’s gold supply for centuries, it contained no overt references to Jews.34 This reticence served several purposes. First, it enabled Ford to keep the charge of antisemite at arm’s length, as he also did the following year when he pretended that the “international Jew” series had been written to Jews intensified the aura of mystery and power surrounding the Jewish conspiracy—here was a plot so dangerous it could only be hinted at. In recent decades the LaRouchites and others have taken such coded antisemitism to elaborate lengths. Third, the absence of overt hatred of Jews highlighted the distinctly homegrown tradition of producerism.

There is a clear American flavor in Ford and Crowther’s praise for the dignity of manual labor and self-advancement, blurring of class boundaries, celebration of the “pioneer spirit” of innovation and industrial progress, and disdain for things and practices European. The Jacksonians would have applauded, the czarist reactionaries who wrote the Protocols would have squirmed. The high wage—low price policy was to Ford and Crowther a uniquely American contribution. In Europe and elsewhere, they saw capital and labor as tragically locked in conflict. Only in the United States, they claimed, was it recognized that “the owner, the employees, and the buying public are all one and the same” and that high wages and low prices were in the interest of all. “The man who possesses health, strength, and skill,” they declared, “is a capitalist”—a definition that placed Henry Ford on the same level as the assembly line worker. Manhood itself was impossible without hard work: “A criminal is a non-producer, but when he has been caught and sentenced, it is very wasteful to continue him as a non-producer. He can surely be turned into a producer and probably into a man” [emphasis added].35

Ford, who considered himself a worker first and foremost, had contempt for the idle rich. Elsewhere he remarked that every manufacturer should be able to go into the shop and with his own hands make the thing that he wants to manufacture. If he cannot do this, he is no manufacturer at all. . . . His workmen are the real manufacturers, and he is but a parasite that lives upon them.36

Ford and Crowther argued that “business—that is, the whole material side of life—is threatened by two classes of people who think they are in opposition, but who actually have a common cause—the professional financier and the professional reformer. . . . The professional financiers wrecked Germany. The professional reformers wrecked Russia.”37 Here was a thinly veiled reference to the Jew as banker and Bolshevik.

“Manufacturing is not to be confused with banking,” insisted Ford and Crowther. The industrialist, they protested, was really an innocent victim caught in the middle of class struggle:

In the violent period of the union labour movement, the employer was always referred to as the capitalist. The whole trouble was that the employer was not a capitalist, but was under the thumb of capitalists. In those years, most business was conducted on borrowed capital, which gave the capitalist a super-control of industry. The manufacturer, standing between hostile labour and rapacious capital, had a hard time getting anything done. Pressed from above for interest and dividends, pushed from the below to grant more money for less work, he had small chance to give service. And all the time he had to bear the abuse that was being heaped upon the capitalist.38

Here Ford and Crowther used “capitalist” to mean banker or speculator, contradicting their equation of capitalist and worker noted above. In both cases, the point was the same: workers should identify with, and be loyal to, the industrialist and direct their class hostility against “the money
can Dwight Eisenhower's election to the White House. And to treat McCarthy simply as a power-hungry opportunist fails to explain the strong resonance his version of conspiracist antielitism has struck for generations of ultraconservatives and right-wing populists. When the John Birch Society attacked the United Nations, when Barry Goldwater's presidential campaign denounced the Rockefellers and free trade, when Lyndon LaRouche attacked the CIA and the British monarchy, and when Patrick Buchanan criticized the "unfettered capitalism" of transnational corporations, they were invoking McCarthy's legacy. And many of them also spoke for the descendants of 1950s business nationalists.

The John Birch Society and the Liberty Lobby are the two pillars of the Hard Right that evolved in the late 1950s and grew in the 1960s. Both groups blend populism, nativism, and conspiracism in the classic model of producerism. Like all producerist movements the Birch Society and the Liberty Lobby consider the "real" patriotic Americans to be hard-working people in the middle class and working class who create goods and wealth while fighting against "parasites" at the top and bottom of society who pick their pockets.

These and other "Americanist" and "Patriot" movements promoted a brand of xenophobic nationalism that implicitly embraced White northern European cultural standards in confronting the ideas of increasingly diverse immigrant groups and increasingly secular liberal voting blocs. Building on earlier antielite conspiracist campaigns, such as McCarthyism, the right-wing populism of the Birch Society and the Liberty Lobby targeted the government and other "insiders," but the two organizations differed in their interpretations of the alleged conspiracy and the steps they advocated to combat it.

Pre-World War II rightist movements were largely discredited in the public mind after the war, so with the emergence of the Cold War, right-wing movements adjusted their style. In addition, during the early 1950s, according to Abby Scher, "a majority of the grassroots anti-Communist activists were women." Women had long played a role in conservative and reactionary movements, justifying their political activism as defending hearth and home, but World War II had expanded opportunities for women in many ways. Scher's analysis of one early 1950s group, the Minute Women of the U.S.A., reveals it to be primarily middle class and concerned with exposing communist subversion, defending constitutional limits, and stopping the internationalists from diluting U.S. sovereignty. These themes set the
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PERMUTATIONS

We have argued that repressive and right-wing populist movements in the...

The Enlightenment themes of equality and liberty undermine respect...

The Antimasonic books by Robison and Barruel both promote three conspiracist conceptions still circulating today, namely, that:

- The Enlightenment themes of equality and liberty undermine respect for private property and the natural social hierarchy;
- There is a secret conspiracy to destroy Christianity, and
- People who encourage free thinking and international cooperation are disloyal cosmopolitans and subversive traitors who are out to destroy national sovereignty, promote moral anarchy, and establish political tyranny.

We discussed in Chapter 2 how the European attack on Freemasonry differed sharply from the Antimasonic movement that flourished in the northern United States in the 1820s and 1830s, although some U.S. Antimasons borrowed ideas from their European counterparts. Only later in the nineteenth century did Robison and Barruel’s Illuminati conspiracy theory come to dominate U.S. anti-Freemasonry circles.

Subsequently, the same conspiracist allegations were adapted for use against progressives, communists, internationalists, and secular humanists. The range of scapegoats that gets demonized is vast. At the same time, the dynamics are complex, involving distinct social, political, cultural, and religious movements that frequently overlap. The result is a continuum of conspiracist theories in the United States that range from those stressing secret elite societies that show little influence of antisemitism to those that palpatate with vicious hatred of Jews.

Is the plot run by Moscow Reds, Wall Street plutocrats, British bankers, or the Jews? Issues could have multiple subtexts. For instance, there was concern over the erosion of national sovereignty by the United Nations because it was seen as favoring communist-style collectivism. Right-wing conspiracists expressed the conviction that the United Nations would erode nation-state sovereignty and facilitate intrusive federal intervention on the local level. The concern over federal violations of states’ rights was promoted in some cases by libertarians, such as the publishers of the periodical The Freeman, but “states’ rights” often provided a veneer that masked underlying segregationist and White supremacist sentiments, even if they were unconscious.

Antisemitic conspiracist allegations can come in a variety of guises. Some conspiracist groups that claim not to be antisemitic appear to be unaware when they stray over the line. Others claim not to be antisemitic as a cover for their real hatred of Jews so as not to attract widespread public scrutiny or scare off potential recruits. Coded rhetoric is a key feature in this milieu, with the term “international bankers” often clearly understood by the witting to mean “Jewish bankers.”

One derivative theme mixes antisemitism with historic U.S. Anglophobia and contends that the British royal family’s intermarriage with Jews resulted in the Rothschild family’s exerting total control over the financial center called the City of London, which in turn is alleged to control world finance. Although Anglophobia can exist without antisemitic overtones, the two are often linked, and Anglophobia is often used as an introductory bait to lure people toward later allegations of Jewish influence.

A U.S. corollary is that British and/or Jewish banking families created the Federal Reserve system to extend Jewish/British control over the U.S. economy. Jews have also been accused of creating a culture of “cosmopolitanism,” with the attendant worldly secular transnational focus undermining patriotism and sovereignty. This theme often emerges in the lore of various far-right movements such as the Christian Patriot movement, and it is employed in a coded manner by neofascist demagogue and perennial presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche and his related organizations. Some of the views expressed by Christian Right leader Pat Robertson contain elements of coded Anglophobic antisemitism similar to (although milder than) the worldview of the LaRouchites and the Liberty Lobby.

Some antisemitic versions of the alleged conspiracy reach beyond Christian circles. LaRouche staff collaborate with Nation of Islam staff to promote the claim of an historic Judeo-Freemasonry conspiracy involving...
Adam Weishaupt (founder of the Illuminati), Civil War Confederate General Albert Pike, the Ku Klux Klan, organized crime, and the B'nai B'rith. This eclectic collection nonetheless mirrors allegations from the book Freemasonry, first published in Arabic in 1980 by the Muslim World League in Saudi Arabia and later in an English translation. The English edition is available in the United States from the Muslim World League offices in New York City or from commercial vendors, including some Islamic and Afrocentric bookstores.

The Freemason conspiracy myth also stretches backward in history, linking the Freemasons to an ancient chain of revealed knowledge secretly provided to chosen followers called adepts. George Johnson charts "the myth of the esoteric tradition" claimed by the Freemasons in this sequence: Egyptian Isis Worshipers, Pythagoreans, Greek Mystery Cults, Gnostics, Cathars, Knights Templar, Rosicrucians, Freemasons. Several critical and uncritical books about Masonic lore cover similar ground. Given this view, it is unsurprising that some fundamentalist Christians see Freemasons as pagans or heretics.

The International Banking Conspiracy

In the United States, theories of an internationalist banking conspiracy may generally be traced back to what is called "The Money Question." Margaret Canovan pointed out that "Between the Civil War and the heyday of Populism in the 1890s, the money question periodically emerged as a political issue. There were, roughly speaking, three distinct views of the subject, those of the Greenbackers, Goldbugs, and Silverites, although all kinds of combinations and qualifications were possible." Should the dollar be linked to the price of gold or silver, or should it be allowed to float without the backing of precious metals? Inflationary Greenback policy in effect reduced loan repayments in terms of the actual value of the payments, so their view was often favored by those with large debts such as farmers. Conversely, persons who held or mined gold or silver had an obvious self-interest, but there were many other factors as well.

Congress demonetized silver in 1873 in what became known as "the Crime of '73" and was "supposedly perpetrated upon the American People by a cabal of English, Jewish, and Wall Street bankers." Thereafter, the three groups of alleged evildoers became the key scapegoats for the conspiracist claim of a struggle between parasitic finance capitalism and productive industrial capitalism. Conspiracist authors that followed developed their own unique versions of the allegations.

Since the creation of the Federal Reserve banking system in 1913, its methods of currency control have been the frequent target of both legitimate criticism and conspiracist theories, inasmuch as these ideas frequently intertwine. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, criticism of the Federal Reserve by Rep. Wright Patman of Texas appeared in both the right-wing populist American Mercury and the liberal populist Texas Observer. In one article appearing in both publications, Patman heaped scorn on the "fractional reserve system," whereby the "present Federal Reserve banking system is manufacturing money in the bankers' interest and the banks' interest." Patman, arguing that this procedure was robbing the citizenry in broad daylight, traced the practice of reserve banking back to seventeenth-century goldsmiths. These same ideas can be the starting point for conspiracy theories that allege international Jewish control of the banks.


The overt British-Jewish conspiracist theory continues to be pursued in many publications, based primarily on tracts "written by British fascists in the 1930's," according to Dennis King, who tracked Lyndon LaRouche's worldview back to this genre. The most energetic purveyor of this theme is Eustace Mullins, antisemitic author of the 1952 book Mullins on the Federal Reserve and the 1954 book The Federal Reserve Conspiracy. Mullins writes in two styles, one ostensibly focusing on banking practices, the other expressing open and vicious antisemitism.

Elite Planning for Global Domination

One strain of conspiracist interpretation filters out most or all of the obvious antisemitic references and shifts the focus to international groups that foster elite planning for economic and foreign policy matters in countries where the members reside or conduct business. This postulates secret control of the economy and the foreign policy of individual nations by globalists so that sovereignty is eroded and collectivism buttressed. As mentioned earlier, frequent targets in the 1950s and 1960s were the Rockefeller family and the Council on Foreign Relations as a nest of conspirators carrying out Rockefeller orders on behalf of international finance capital. A significant work in this genre was the 1952 book by McCarthy supporter Emanuel M. Josephson, Rockefeller, "Internationalist": The Man Who Misrules the World. Josephson saw the Council on Foreign Relations as a nest of conspirators carrying out Rockefeller orders on behalf of international finance capital.

Dan Smoot's 1962 The Invisible Government introduced Josephson's charges to the Birchite audience. Similarly, Mary M. Davison's 1962
• Supplying "its members with the gratifying feelings of self-righteousness";
• Giving members "a perception of themselves as superior to those on the 'wrong' side"; and
• Justifying ideological conflict and aggression against identified enemies, which "provides for release of frustration."\(^\text{133}\)

This model is applicable across the conspiracist Right and holds up well to later sociological theories emphasizing collective identity and conceptual framing.

In the 1970s other branches of right-wing populist conspiracism began to grow, including the Christian Identity religion, the Lyndon LaRouche network, and both secular and religious forms of survivalism. They joined the Birch Society and the Liberty Lobby to spread conspiracist antielitism.

As it coalesced as a political force in the late 1970s the new Christian Right adopted many themes from the Birch Society and subsequently became a major source of conspiracist narrative during the 1980s and 1990s.\(^\text{134}\) Conspiracy theories were also evident in portions of the Black community.\(^\text{135}\) Following the Iran–Contra scandal, a small but vocal network of leftists adopted the right-wing populist critique of secret elites and circulated it in liberal and progressive communities. The Gulf War facilitated further cross-fertilization of conspiracist narratives across ideological and organizational boundaries.\(^\text{136}\)

In this chapter we will look at some of the major factors in the shift from the Old Right of the 1950s and early 1960s to the New Right of the 1970s and 1980s. The first half of the chapter traces several major threads of ultraconservative politics during the lean years from Goldwater's defeat in 1964 to the rise of the New Right in the 1970s. Christian anticommunist organizations, by skillfully reframing issues, provided continuity of ideology and expertise and helped keep core constituencies focused on mobilizing to counter domestic subversion. George Wallace's electoral campaigns showed how scapegoating in the form of implicit race-baiting could be coupled with populist antielitism to attract millions of White voters alienated by civil rights liberalism. New organizing drives and theological initiatives began to bring many Protestant evangelicals, long alienated from the electoral arena, back into political activism with a right-wing agenda. These three developments helped ultraconservatism to remain a political player and provided a bridge from the Old Right to the New Right.

The second half of the chapter examines the cluster of social, political, and economic upheavals that created new challenges and opportunities for right-wing populist organizing in the 1970s and 1980s. The rise of social liberation movements, the expansion of the federal government, economic dislocations, and renewed challenges to U.S. global dominance created a widespread sense that the nation was in crisis. Meanwhile, shifts within the business community created a much larger and more powerful bloc of wealthy funders interested in supporting ultraconservative causes. These factors helped emerging New Right organizations to mobilize rapidly and exert major influence on U.S. politics.
not only on the sidelines but on the wrong side" of the civil rights move-
ment, which he described as “the most central struggle for social justice in
this country.” These remarks fit a larger pattern of Christian rightists con-
demning racism. In 1995 the Southern Baptist Convention, the country’s
largest Protestant denomination and one rooted in the proslavery move-
ment, voted overwhelmingly to “repent of racism of which we have been
guilty” and to apologize to “all African Americans.”

Reed said that the Christian Coalition was building “a true Rainbow
Coalition, one which unites Christians of all races under one banner to take
back this country.” The Coalition sought to recruit people of color around
social issues such as shared opposition to abortion, homosexuality, and por-
ography, and support for school prayer. Other Christian Right groups re-
cruiting people of color included Focus on the Family and the Promise
Keepers (on the latter, see Chapter 16). But while the Christian Coalition
was sometimes able to build tactical alliances with congregations of color
around these issues, few people of color joined Robertson and Reed’s organi-
ization. Antiracist words did not erase the Christian Right’s long history of
racism, or its continuing support for a host of policies that disproporti-
onately hurt people of color.

Even if they were more rhetoric than substance, calls for racial reconcili-
ation put the Christian Coalition and other mostly White evangelical
groups in sharp contrast to the increasingly explicit racial nationalism
among paleoconservatives and other rightists. For the Christian Coalition,
this was one more shift of weight in the balancing act that marked its drive
for political power.

CONCLUSION

Dominion theology, in its broad definition, provides a frame of reference
that allows different theological outlooks to work together in building a
movement for Christian nationalism. Implicit in this Christian nationalism
are many subtexts of White nationalism, although primarily derived from
cultural rather than biological White supremacy. Biological White supreme-
cists are tolerated in this broad coalition as long as they do not openly pro-
mote their views. There is also common agreement that any form of sexual
expression other than heterosexual marriage is sinful or abnormal, and that
ultimately men make the final decisions in family situations. Conspiracy the-
ories that are congruent with these themes are not only tolerated but some-
times openly promoted. All of this neatly fits into the paradigm of repres-
sive right-wing populism and the producerist narrative.

NEW FACES FOR
WHITE NATIONALISM

Reframing Supremacist Narratives

While the New Right and Christian Right flourished in the 1970s and
1980s, the Far Right also rebounded, and many groups in this sector used
populist themes or rhetoric. Like the New Right, the Far Right responded
to the many-sided crisis in U.S. society: the rise of social liberation move-
ments, erosion of the old formal hierarchies such as race and gender, eco-
nomic hardships and insecurity, expansion of the state, and the decline of
U.S. world dominance. The Far Right—encompassing Ku Klux Klan,
neonazi, and related organizations—attracted a much smaller following
than the New Right, but its influence reverberated in its encouragement of
widespread attacks against members of oppressed groups and in broad-
based scapegoating campaigns organized around such issues as immigra-
tion, welfare, affirmative action, and AIDS. Behind all of this was a drive for
White nationalism.

Far rightists developed a variety of political doctrines and strategies in
this period. After the 1979 massacre of five militant leftists in Greensboro,
North Carolina, by a group of Klansmen and neonazis, neonazi ideologies
began to infuse and transform the paramilitary Right, largely supplanting
the Klan’s old-style segregationism. The new doctrines included Christian
Identity, which claimed that Jews were in league With Satan and White
Christian Aryans were God’s true chosen people; separatism, which called
for sovereign national status based on race; and the Third Position, which
denounced monopoly capitalism and called on White supremacists to “take
the game away from the left.”

The Lyndon LaRouche network, an offshoot of the radical student
movement that metamorphosed into a fascist organization in the early
1970s, developed an idiosyncratic doctrine and approach quite different
from other far-right groups. David Duke led a revival of the Ku Klux Klan in
the 1970s and sought to give it a more moderate and telegenic image. Later
Duke recast himself again as a Republican political candidate, presenting himself as an antielite, antwelfare conservative defending fairness for White middle-class people. As Duke’s cryptofascism gained substantial electoral support, both the Republican and Democratic parties shifted to the right to capture his constituency. Meanwhile, political figures ranging from Presidential candidate Patrick Buchanan to rightist intellectual Charles Murray promoted coded and veiled forms of White racial nationalism.

As we discussed in Chapter 12, a new form of clerical fascist ideology also developed within the Christian Right, centered in Christian Reconstructionism and the Shepherding movement.

**REINVENTING FASCISM**

Visions of collective rebirth in the face of near collapse are central to fascist ideology, and the U.S. social crisis that began in the 1960s created several conditions that fascists could exploit. Military defeat in Vietnam brought cries of betrayal against the U.S. government. Economic dislocations—notably, the farm crisis of the 1980s—increased scapegoating’s appeal among sections of the population. The erosion of traditional hierarchies fueled demands to reassert White male heterosexual privilege and power. Newly visible social groups—such as lesbians and gay men, or millions of recent immigrants from Asia, Latin America, and elsewhere—became handy targets for old bigotries. And many people looked for ways to fight back against a growing government apparatus they perceived as bureaucratic, repressive, and answerable to elites rather than ordinary people.

Many of the groups we discuss in this chapter advocated fascism. They embraced racial or cultural supremacy, antielite conspiracism and grassroots mobilization, and hatred of the Left, and they rejected the U.S. pluralist system in favor of an authoritarian new order. At the same time, these organizations were neofascist in that they adapted and reinterpreted traditional fascist politics to fit new circumstances. These changes included the rise of new ideological currents—cryptofascism, Third Position, Christian Identity, LaRouchism—as well as political trends that cut across these differences. For example, fascist internationalism increased. Several far-right groups cultivated ties with fascist movements abroad. U.S. fascists significantly aided the distribution of neonazi propaganda in Germany, where most such material is illegal; the LaRouchie organization maintained active branches in Europe, Asia, and Latin America. Some neofascists even promoted solidarity with right-wing nationalist movements in the Third World—as part of an apartheid vision of fraternal relations among different nations and races based on separate development.

Traditional explicit racism remained prominent within the movement, upholding the purity and superiority of Whites or “Aryans” (roughly, non-Jews of European descent, sometimes used more narrowly to exclude Mediterranean or eastern European peoples). But race was another area where many neofascists adapted and changed politically. Some, such as David Duke, used coded racism—scapegoating people of color implicitly through symbols, or using pretensions of color blindness to mask de facto racist policies. Others, such as Lyndon LaRouche, celebrated “Western civilization” against “barbarism.” This move involved at least a partial shift away from the old biological racism toward a more sophisticated cultural racism, which meant including a few people of color as long as they were loyal to the values of so-called Western civilization. Both the LaRouchites and Tom Metzger’s White Aryan Resistance forged active ties with Louis Farrakhan’s Nation of Islam.

The context for these maneuvers was not only a political culture and legal system that discouraged explicit bigotry but also a system of racial hierarchy that was becoming more complex and fragmented. Since the 1960s, class and ethnic stratification have increased within Black, Latino, and Asian communities, largely because of the growth of a middle-class minority, increased marginalization of the ghetto poor, and immigration from Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean, and Africa. The system of White supremacy continued to target all people of color, but in more complex and sophisticated ways than previously. For one thing, it fostered social and political conflict among people of color more than ever before—native-born versus immigrant, middle-class versus poor, ethnic group versus ethnic group. Neofascists such as LaRouche and Metzger, among many others, sought to exploit this situation.

To varying degrees, some neofascists also shifted away from traditional fascism’s highly centralized approach to political power and toward plans to fragment and subdivide political authority. Many neonazis called for creation of an independent White homeland in the Pacific Northwest, based on the ethnic partitioning of the United States. Posse Comitatus, mostly active in rural areas, repudiated all government authority above the county level. And in the 1990s neonazi leader Louis Beam promoted the influential doctrine of “leaderless resistance.” While such decentralist policies may seem incompatible with full-blown fascism, we see them partly as defensive adaptations and partly as expressions of a new social totalitarianism. Industrial-era totalitarianism relied on the nation-state; in the era of outsourcing, deregulation, and global mobility, social totalitarianism looked to local authorities, private bodies (such as churches), and direct mass activism to enforce repressive control.

In the 1970s and 1980s these efforts to reinterpret fascism were not confined to the United States, but took place among neofascists in many industrialized capitalist countries. European, Canadian, and South African neofascists, too, at times advanced the doctrine known as the Third Position, strengthened internationalist ties, used coded racial appeals, advocated ethnic separatism and the breakup of nation-states, and practiced solidarity with right-wing nationalists of color.
Also during this period U.S. neofascists’ relationship with government security forces shifted dramatically, from active collaboration to militant opposition. During the 1960s, for example, FBI informers had passed on information about police complicity in planned attacks on civil rights workers, yet the Bureau took no steps to stop the attacks, and those resulted in serious injuries. An FBI informer was in the car carrying the Klansmen who shot to death civil rights worker Viola Liuzzo. These and other incidents at least indirectly helped the Klan in its campaign against civil rights. From 1969 to 1972, the FBI helped to create and funded a right-wing paramilitary group called the Secret Army Organization (SAO), whose activities against the Left included theft, bombings, attempted murder, and kidnappings. The SAO was based in San Diego and claimed branches in eleven western states. In 1979 federal agents and informers from the FBI and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (BATF) helped to plan the Greensboro massacre, in which a hit squad of neonazis and Klansmen murdered five members of the Communist Workers Party. Federal and state government security agencies did nothing to prevent the shootings even though the group’s deadly intent had been reported to authorities.4

Many far rightists had maintained ties with (or within) law enforcement.5 Within a few years of Greensboro, however, neoazis were calling for the overthrow of the “Zionist Occupation Government” (often just called ZOG) in Washington or at least the creation of an independent Aryan enclave. In the early 1980s, for the first time since Reconstruction in the 1870s, members of the White supremacist movement “declared war” on the U.S. government and engaged in armed combat with police.

The vision of a White racist revolution against the U.S. government—followed by the extermination of all Jews, people of color, and “race traitors”—was laid out by William Pierce in his 1978 novel The Turner Diaries. In the early 1970s, Pierce headed the National Youth Alliance; in 1974 he founded the National Alliance as an independent neonazi organization that published White revolution tract.

The LaRouchites underwent a related shift. During the late 1970s and much of the 1980s, the LaRouche organization passed on information to the Central Intelligence Agency, the FBI, and local police departments, as well as foreign intelligence agencies. But in the late 1980s, the LaRouchites’ hostility to government security forces increased sharply. This partly reflected Lyndon LaRouche’s 1988 federal conviction for tax evasion and mail fraud conspiracy, but also his organization’s renewed effort to position itself as a militant opponent of U.S. military intervention and domestic repression.

Like the Christian Right, most neofascists upheld a traditional form of sexism: men are superior to women by nature and must protect them, the nuclear family must be defended, and sex is for reproduction, not pleasure. For neonazis, racial ideology gave these themes an added intensity: White men must control White women in order to safeguard racial purity and ensure lots of White babies. Homosexuality, in this framework, threatened the White race’s ability to reproduce itself and undermined the gender roles needed for racial dominance.6

Many neonazi and Klan groups supported or participated in antiabortion actions. Pensacola lay preacher John Burt, regional director of Rescue America and a former Klansman, was a close associate of such antiabortion terrorists as Michael Griffin, Paul Hill, Rachelle Renae Shannon, and others.7 Aryan Nations security chief Tim Bishop told a reporter, “We fight abortion all the time . . . Abortion is one of our battlefronts.” But he added, “I’m just against abortion for the pure white race. For blacks and other mongrelized [races] abortion is a good idea.” White Aryan Resistance leader Tom Metzger declared, “Almost all abortion doctors are Jews . . . Almost all abortion nurses are lesbians.”8

More than ever before, fascists also targeted lesbians and gay men. The LaRouchites accompanied their 1986 and 1987 California AIDS quarantine voter initiative campaigns with streams of antigay propaganda. Lyndon LaRouche wrote that, in the face of AIDS, those who lynched gays would perhaps be remembered as the “only force which acted to save the human species from extinction.” In January 1987, “former” members of the White Patriot Party murdered three gay men in Shelby, North Carolina, and seriously wounded two others in a carefully planned attack.9

THE THIRD POSITION AND WHITE SEPARATISM

The Third Position—which rejects both capitalism and communism—traces its roots to the most “radical” anticapitalist wing of Hitler’s Nazi Party. In the 1970s and 1980s, neonazis in several European countries advocated The Third Position.10 Its leading proponent in the United States was White Aryan Resistance, headed by former California Klan leader Tom Metzger. Metzger, who was a Democratic candidate for Congress in 1980, expounded his philosophy at the 1987 Aryan Nations Congress:

WAR is dedicated to the White working people, the farmers, the White poor . . . This is a working class movement . . . Our problem is with monopoly capitalism. The Jews first went with Capitalism and then created their Marxist game. You go for the throat of the Capitalist. You must go for the throat of the corporates. You take the game away from the left. It’s our game! We’re not going to fight your whore wars no more! We’ve got one war, that is right here, the same war the SA fought in Germany, right here, in the streets of America.11

Metzger’s organization vividly illustrated fascism’s tendency to appropriate elements of leftist politics in distorted form. WAR supported “white
cept. The Fifth Era Klan adherents sought to forge ties with other racist
groups across the nation. One concept hotly debated was the idea of a mass
migration of White supremacists to the Pacific Northwest, where there
were relatively few people of color and a low population density. The idea
was to create a racially pure Aryan bastion.

Posse and Identity organizers capitalized on the farm crisis of the
1980s. Rural America faced its worst economic slump in half a century, owing
largely to unfair and inequitable policies by the federal government and
private banks.24 While most of society ignored angry and desperate rural
families' legitimate grievances, far-right activists urged resistance and of-
fered ready scapegoats, namely, the Jews who supposedly controlled the In-
ternal Revenue Service and the Federal Reserve. In the early 1980s, Posse
activists helped to split the influential American Agricultural Movement,
while Identity theology and antisemitic conspiracy theories gained an alarming
level of acceptance in rural America.25 One poll in 1985 found that in the
farm belt 27 percent of respondents felt that "international Jewish banker-
s" were responsible for the farm crisis.26

In 1983 two federal marshals were killed and several persons were
wounded in a mishandled attempt to serve legal papers on Posse farm belt
organizer Gordon Kahl. Kahl fled underground and was killed in a shootout
with federal officers some months later. Kahl and other White supremacists
killed or jailed by the government became martyrs to Posse adherents and
other neonazis. After the Gordon Kahl incident, many Posse and Christian
Identity activists decided to carry out activities in secret or through front
groups.

Also in 1983, an underground organization was recruited out of the
Aryan Nations and several other far-right groups. Variously called The Or-
der, Aryan Resistance Movement, White American Bastion, or The Silent
Brotherhood, members of The Order were mostly Identity adherents. Led
by National Alliance member Robert Mathews, The Order sought to follow the
revolutionary script laid out in The Turner Diaries. They raised about $5
million through counterfeiting and robberies of banks and armored cars,
and murdered Jewish talk show host Alan Berg in Denver.27 The Order's
November 1984 "Declaration of War" against the federal government as-
serted that "The Capitalists and the Communists pick gleefully at our bones
while the vile hook-nosed masters of usury orchestrate our [race's] destruc-
tion."28 The U.S. government cracked down hard on The Order: Mathews
was killed in a shootout, and many other members were imprisoned. Of the
twenty-three members of The Order convicted in a 1985 trial, according to the
Klanwatch Intelligence Report, "Five had Klan ties, one had been a Nazi
party member, a half-dozen were Aryan Nations, one was a veteran tax pro-
tester, four CSA's [Covenant, Sword and Arm of the Lord], five National
Alliance members."

Another underground group, the Committee of the States, was founded
by Identity leader William Potter Gale in 1984.29 Each state chapter was sup-
posed to form an "Unorganized Militia."30 The paramilitary coalition-build-
ing efforts of groups such as The Order, Committee of the States, and the
Posse Comitatus helped lay the groundwork for the Patriot and armed mili-
tia movements of the 1990s.

THE LAROUCHITE SECRET ELITE SYNTHESIS

Though often dismissed as a bizarre political cult, the LaRouche organiza-
tion and its various front groups are a fascist movement whose pronounce-
ments echo elements of Nazi ideology.31 Beginning in the 1970s, the
LaRouchites combined populist antielitism with attacks on leftists, environ-
mentalists, feminists, gay men and lesbians, and organized labor. They advo-
cated a dictatorship in which a "humanist" elite would rule on behalf of in-
dustrial capitalists. They developed an idiosyncratic, coded variation on the
Illuminati Freemason and Jewish banker conspiracy theories. Their views,
though exotic, were internally consistent and rooted in right-wing populist
traditions.

A former Trotskyist, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., founded the National
Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC) in 1968 as an offshoot of the radical
student movement. But in the early 1970s, LaRouche engineered a political
about-face, using cult pressure tactics to consolidate his grip over the
NCLC and initiating a campaign of physical attacks on Communists and
Black nationalists, which cut his followers off from the Left. The result was a
fascist organization with some unique strengths: a dedicated, full-time
cadre of several hundred members, a high proportion of intellectuals with
advanced training, familiarity with leftist theory and organizing, and inside
information about radical organizations and leaders.

During the 1970s and 1980s, the LaRouchites built an international net-
work for spying and propaganda, with links to the upper levels of govern-
ment, business, and organized crime. The LaRouchites traded information
with intelligence agencies in the United States, South Africa, East Ger-
many, and elsewhere. Their dirty tricks record included harassment cam-
paigns against the United Auto Workers and the United Steelworkers of
America in the 1970s. In 1980, they branded George Bush an agent of the
Trilateral Commission to help Ronald Reagan win the Republican presi-
dential nomination, and in 1984, they helped Jesse Helms retain his U.S. Sen-
ate seat by gay-baiting his opponent. During the 1980s, the LaRouchites
raised an estimated $200 million through legal and illegal fund-raising and
fielded thousands of candidates for political office in every region of the
country. Seeking the George Wallace vote, the LaRouche candidates usu-
ally ran in Democratic primaries.32
for Peace and the Schiller Institute, and put out such publications as *New Solidarity* (later *The New Federalist*) and *Executive Intelligence Review*.

In 1976 LaRouche's original electoral arm, the U.S. Labor Party (USLP), published a conspiracist attack on President Jimmy Carter, claiming he was a tool of secret international elites. The Liberty Lobby criticized the report for failing to mention the role of Jewish bankers, and soon LaRouche publications picked up the theme. The Liberty Lobby and the LaRouche group soon began to cooperate closely on projects. When some groups on the right criticized the Liberty Lobby for working with ostensibly leftist; meaning the USLP, the Liberty Lobby defended the relationship in 1981: "No group has done so much to confuse, disorient, and disunify the Left as they have.... The USLP should be encouraged, as should all similar breakaway groups from the Left, for this is the only way that the Left can be weakened and broken."34

In the 1970s, the LaRouchites' anti-Jewish propaganda was relatively explicit, as in LaRouche's 1978 article "New Pamphlet to Document Cult Origins of Zionism," which declared that "The B'Nai B'rith today resurrects the tradition of the Jews who demanded the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, the Jews who pleaded with Nero to launch the 'holocaust' against the Christians."35 Gradually the LaRouchites developed more sophisticated ways to invoke antisemitic themes while still maintaining deniability.

The LaRouchites borrowed conspiracist elements from various sources to produce their own Manichean picture of world history. For thousands of years, they argued, the good "humanists" had been locked in a power struggle with a vast conspiracy of evil "oligarchs." In ancient times, the oligarchic conspiracy was centered in Babylon; later it shifted to Venice; in modern times it was centered in Britain's royal House of Windsor. This narrative evoked standard elements of antisemitic doctrine: that Jews had dominated ancient Babylon and that Jewish banking families controlled the British government. Sometimes the LaRouchites highlighted prominent Jews as members of the conspiracy, such as "[Henry] Kissinger's friends, the Rothschild family, and other representatives of Britain's financial power." At other times, they portrayed Jews as unwitting tools of the oligarchs, as for example, "Zionism is that state of collective psychosis through which London manipulates most of international Jewry."36

The LaRouchite analysis of British oligarchic control resembles a number of earlier right-wing populist works, such as E. C. Knuth's 1944 tract *The Empire of "The City": alias International Finance, alias the British Empire, alias "ONE WORLD" superstate*. Knuth claimed that the Rothschilds and Sassoons controlled British financial interests, and he cited the International Monetary Fund as proof of their plot for global dominance.

Unlike neonazi groups such as the White Aryan Resistance or the National Alliance, the NCLC has always denied that it is antisemitic and has always included Jewish members (such as LaRouche's longtime security aides Jeffrey Steinberg and Paul Goldstein). The LaRouchites insisted they were not targeting Jews as a whole, but only the "bad" Jews such as Henry Kissinger, Roy Cohn, the Rothschild banking family, and the Anti-Defamation League.

The LaRouchites seem to have shifted from biological to cultural racism, at least in their public pronouncements. In the 1970s, LaRouche and his followers described the British oligarchs as a separate "species" and often referred to people of color as bestial or subhuman. But in 1995, *New Federalist* editor Nancy Spannaus declared, "We don't believe blood or race has anything to do with determining history. Never fear! It's ideas."37 LaRouchite ideology has continued to glorify western Christianity and European civilization—especially the classical German culture of Beethoven, Schiller, and Leibniz—over the "barbarism" of non-Europeans. For example, LaRouchites asserted that by bringing Christianity to the Americas, "Columbus' discovery made it possible to liberate the native populations" from "the practices of human sacrifice, cannibalism, and slavery of the Aztec Empire." The LaRouchites vilified jazz and rock music while praising African American spirituals—so long as they conformed to the rules of European classical music.38

U.S. right-wing traditions such as business nationalism echoed loudly in the LaRouchites' attacks on Britain, the "liberal Eastern Establishment," homosexuality, globalism, free trade, and international bankers. Producerism, with its problematic distinction between productive industrial capital and parasitic finance capital, was central to LaRouchite economics, as it enabled LaRouche to be proradiantist and "anti-imperialist" at the same time: "Imperialism was not the result of capitalist development; it was the result of the conquest of power over capitalist nations by a usury-oriented rentier-finance interest older than feudalism."39

Like traditional fascists of the 1920s and 1930s, but unlike many neonazis and other U.S. rightists today, LaRouchites championed a strong, centralized nation-state as vital to economic and social progress. They declared they were continuing the old Federalist—Whig program of economic protectionism, national control of banking, and government-sponsored infrastructure development to stimulate industrial growth. They attacked both states' rights and laissez-faire conservatism as part of a British plot to undermine the nation-state.40

Also, unlike some neonazis, the LaRouchites vilified the environmental movement and nature romanticism while praising high-technology projects such as nuclear power. But here, too, the LaRouchites were partly repackaging earlier conspiracy theories. Their attacks on the Club of Rome, an ecology and population control group, echoed a 1974 article in the rightist *American Mercury* entitled "The Curious Club of Rome," which asked whether the group was "merely a bunch of boring pedants and doom-sayers, or is it a sinister cabal aiming for world control?"41
In 1989, LaRouche was sentenced to fifteen years in prison for mail fraud conspiracy, based on illegal and manipulative fund-raising practices, as well as tax evasion. His organization continued to operate while he was in prison, and he was released in early 1994.

LaRouche continued his leadership role in various organizations such as the National Caucus of Labor Committees and the Schiller Institute while in prison, and after his release he resumed his peripatetic speaking circuit, quickly building contacts with a number of groups around the world. His call for new global economic policies in opposition to the International Monetary Fund found favor not only in Europe, but in Africa, Central and South America, and Asia. He spoke at a number of conferences organized in countries previously under Soviet influence or control.

During the 1990s, the LaRouchites once again adopted a more "progressive" guise. They opposed the Gulf War against Iraq and worked to build links with liberal and leftist antiwar groups. They made particular efforts to recruit African Americans. They opposed the death penalty, anti-immigrant racism, and law enforcement agencies' harassment of Black elected officials. They defended social programs against Gingrich—Republican budget cuts. They praised the Israeli—Palestinian negotiations and the Israeli Labor Party while denouncing the rightist Likud Party and the Islamic fundamentalists in Hamas. Starting in 1990, the LaRouchites and Louis Farrakhan's Nation of Islam cultivated friendly ties, sharing articles and praising each other's work.

The LaRouchites set an example of how to package fascist ideology as maverick conservatism, progressive antielitism, or both. In 1986, when LaRouche followers shocked the Illinois Democratic Party by winning the party primaries for lieutenant governor and secretary of state, other far rightists praised their efforts. Some, such as David Duke, looked for lessons in their electoral strategy.

DAVID DUKE'S CODED RACIST RHETORIC

While the paramilitary Right were co-opting nervous populists toward open armed resistance and neofascism, and the LaRouchites were building dirty tricks operations around arcane conspiracy theories, David Duke of Louisiana was pioneering a face-lift for White supremacy in electoral politics. The old racist message had been simply that Black people were biologically inferior and dangerous. The new message was that White people were the victims of large-scale discrimination and that someone had to stand up for straight, White Christians against the liberal, internationalist elites and their parasitic clients in the Black underclass.

Symbolic racism can be used by three groups in the public sphere: (1) persons who really believe people of color are biologically inferior; (2) persons who are culturally racist—willing to accept some people of color as potential equals if they conform to the behavior patterns set by the White majority; and (3) persons who are oblivious to the racialized content of the coded rhetoric and do not consciously advocate biological or cultural racism. Duke clearly used coded symbolic racist rhetoric as a cover for his biological racism, no matter how much he claimed to have reformed his views on race.

Duke worked with various Nazi-affiliated groups in the early 1970s. From 1975 to 1979, he headed the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan (KKKK), which his acumen for managing the media helped build into one of the largest Klan organizations in the country. His assistants included California Grand Dragon Tom Metzger, who later founded White Aryan Resistance, and Louis Beam, head of the Texas KKK, who later became a key figure within Aryan Nations. In 1980, Duke resigned from the Klan and founded the National Association for the Advancement of White People (NAAWP). The NAAWP claimed to defend Whites against discrimination and to advocate "equal opportunity and equal rights," but it circulated hard-core neo-Nazi articles by figures such as William Pierce, as well as Duke's own proposals for the ethnic partitioning of the United States and a eugenics program to breed genetically superior Whites.

In 1988, Duke ran for president in the Democratic Party's southern primaries. In the general election he ran on the ticket of the Populist Party, a far-right vehicle created by Willis Carto of the Liberty Lobby, and received about 150,000 votes. In February 1989, with fund-raising and organizational help from the Liberty Lobby, Duke was elected to the Louisiana House of Representatives as a Republican.

In 1990, Duke won the Louisiana Republican nomination for U.S. Senate. In the general election, he received 44 percent of the vote—winning 60 percent among White voters. The following year, Duke outsold the incumbent in the Louisiana governor's race, then lost in a runoff election with 39 percent of the total vote (55 percent of the White vote).

Although running as a Republican, Duke appealed mainly to White working-class Democrats. In his 1989 election as a state representative, he won by converting the vast majority of Democratic voters, but only 20 percent of Republicans, to his cause. During the 1990 Senate race, Duke declared, "I'm the only Republican who can attract a sizable number of the blue-collar, Ronald Reagan, George Wallace voters you need to win."

Journalist Jason Berry wrote that, in the Senate race, "Duke tapped a deep vein of discontent against Washington, crime, and a perception of government favoritism toward blacks." Berry noted that in hard economic times where there were "young white males with poor job prospects that a demagogue's quick fix has its appeal."

Berry and others criticized the mainstream media coverage of Duke for repeatedly failing to challenge his claims that he had left his racist and ant
semitic past behind. Berry was especially harsh on Boston’s respected Ford Hall Forum for inviting Duke to speak at a March 1991 lecture series. Berry wrote that, with the invitation, “the Forum helps legitimize a media huckster whose naked cynicism toward the truth mocks the democracy that guarantees his right to speak.”48 One of the tasks of the Louisiana Coalition Against Racism and Nazism, a multiracial and religiously diverse group that successfully mobilized many voters to oppose Duke’s 1990 Senate bid, was to demand that the news media actually report on the evidence that demonstrated that Duke continued to be an apologist for Hitler and continued to promote racism and antisemitism.49

In 1989, while Duke was in the Louisiana state legislature, Beth Rickey, a Republican who fought to censure Duke, gained headlines when she revealed she had just purchased books and tapes with overt neonazi, White supremacist, and antisemitic themes from Duke’s legislative offices, thus giving the lie to Duke’s claims to have reformed.50

Many in the human relations community (and the Republican Party) argued that giving Duke any publicity, even negative publicity, would only encourage his supporters. The Center for Democratic Renewal disagreed, citing polls taken before and after the “Nazi books” episode: over three months, Duke’s base of support remained unchanged at 23 percent of Louisiana voters, but the number who opposed him rose from 39 to 60 percent.

Duke offered a succinct overview of his cryptofascist message in a speech to the 1988 Populist Party nominating convention in Washington State. Duke warned that, despite “a massive welfare system,” the United States was plagued by “25 times more problems,” including crime, deteriorating schools, and “a drug epidemic, especially in the ghettos and poor areas.” A major reason, Duke argued, was the “illegitimate birthrate” among women on welfare:

I say it’s time for the White middle class or any middle class person in this country that’s productive and works hard, it’s time for us to say, no, we’re not going to finance illegitimate welfare births anymore. Something’s wrong in America when hard-working, middle-class, productive people can’t afford children of their own... while they’re being forced to finance massive welfare illegitimacy.51

As a state legislator, Duke sponsored a bill to provide cash incentives for welfare recipients who agreed to be temporarily sterilized with Norplant implants. He promoted this measure as solely a means to reduce welfare costs. But many of Duke’s supporters undoubtedly viewed this as a eugenist plan to reduce Black reproduction and preserve the White race. This is another example of coded racial rhetoric.52

Duke also employed right-wing populist themes: “We, the people, have so little input anymore. Today it’s government by big business, interna-

tional finance, and organized minorities... It’s time we joined together and break this control and give this country back to our people.”

Exactly who “our people” are was clear to Duke and his audience: “America is not simply a Constitution and it’s not simply a piece of geography. It’s far more than that. It’s a people. It’s a heritage. And our European heritage is what made America possible. And if our European heritage is lost, then we will also lose America.”

Duke declared that racial separation was a God-given natural law. “I’m glad that God created different races. I think it offers greater possibilities for mankind. And I want my grandkids and great grandkids to look something like myself and the people that came before me. And I’m proud of that fact.”

Duke also invoked classic coded antisemitic rhetoric: “The internationalists want to destroy borders. They want to destroy tariffs. They want to destroy the American middle class and they want to destroy our heritage. [They want to] destroy the vitality, the seed, the spirit, the genetic treasure of this society. That’s you and that’s our children, our progeny...” He argued that “there’s no more critical issue than the fact the Zionists control the American media in America.” This enabled “the international financial powers” to “dominate our government... and the American people.” The Zionists were “constantly putting down our heritage, trying to destroy our value system, our faith” while “slavishly” supporting Israel.

Occasionally when speaking to supporters, Duke would expose his rank antisemitism. He told the Populist Party convention that Judaism was “a very vile anti-Christian faith... It doesn’t mean all Jews are that way. But I don’t respect the Talmud, I think it’s a very vicious and vile book and it attacks all Christians and non-Jews in the world.”

Robert H. Weems, a former Populist Party chairman, rehashed many of these themes in a 1996 Populist Campaign Fund direct-mail appeal for Duke’s Republican Senate primary race. He continued by scapegoating liberals as traitors: “Let’s strike a blow for the Constitution and let Bill and Hillary and Dan Rather and Jane Fonda and other such enemies of America know who is REALLY in charge by electing a REAL American to the United States Senate.” Weems even invoked anticommunist Red-baiting: “Now you know why the liberal media and their Mercedes Marxist Elitist buddies hate him.” So the new coded racism and antisemitism dovetailed with the theme of liberal and secular humanist betrayal.53

PATRICK BUCHANAN

Pat Buchanan’s 1992 presidential campaign against George Bush, like the paleocon attack on the neoconservatives, echoed the old struggle between business nationalists and multinationalists. The paleocons wanted to revive
THE ALIEN OTHER

Short of overt biological determinism, monocultural themes extended well into the mainstream. Samuel Huntington in *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* argued that the crucial global division in the post-Cold War period was between cultures. Huntington (who once worried about too much democracy in a paper for the Trilateral Commission) now saw ethnocultural worldviews pitted against one another, with global blocs of Islamic, Orthodox, Japanese, and other cultures battling the beleaguered (heroic, idealized, preferred) Western culture. Noting this paradigm omits consideration of other cleavages, such as between modernists and traditionalists and the have and have nots, Ronald Steel observed:

> Indeed, the whole “civilization” thesis sometimes seems motivated by a profound distaste for multiculturalism at home, and can be viewed as an elaborate “decadence of the West” alarm that requires battening down the hatches against cultural assaults from within as well as without.70

RACIAL NATIONALISM RESURGENT

Buchanan’s electoral campaigns, and paleoconservatism’s revival, resonated during the 1990s with the broader resurgence of White racial nationalism among ultraconservatives and in mainstream political discourse. Examples included a strong anti-immigrant movement, a burgeoning southern heritage subculture glorifying the Confederacy, and a revival of pseudoscientific claims of Whites’ genetic racial superiority. To a much greater extent than the New Right politics of the 1970s and 1980s, such initiatives brought mainstream right-wingers and avowed Klan and neo-Nazi rightists together.

The attack on immigrants involved an interplay among many forces. Some private employers benefited from restrictive laws and policies that kept a large pool of undocumented immigrants vulnerable to sharply exploitative wages and working conditions. The specter of a mass influx of “illegal aliens” fueled the growth of government agencies such as the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and extensive militarization of the U.S.—Mexico border region, contributing to the overall growth of state repression.71 Hate groups and unorganized bigots subjected newcomers to verbal abuse and physical violence. Organizations such as the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), founded in 1979, and the American Immigration Control Foundation (AICF), formed in 1983, conducted propaganda campaigns, lobbying, and electoral initiatives to further limit immigration and immigrants’ rights.72

In 1994, 59 percent of voting Californians approved Proposition 187, which required teachers, police, social workers, and public health employ-
How Duke helped the far right influence the mainstream

In the 1990s, Francis maintained a syndicated column in the paleocon Rockford Institute’s Chronicles, served as cochairman of the American Immigration Control Foundation and as a board member of the Council of Conservative Citizens, and was a contributor to the John Birch Society magazine, New American. Leonard Zeskind comments, “Francis still eschews any overt expression of antisemitism and conspiracies are not his style. His white nationalism may thus prove to be more potent than the Aryan variety.”

Leonard Zeskind comments, “Francis still eschews any overt expression of antisemitism and conspiracies are not his style. His white nationalism may thus prove to be more potent than the Aryan variety.”

Conclusion

From the 1970s on, new doctrines such as the White Rights movement, White Separatism, Christian Identity, Third Position neonazism, and LaRouchite fascism helped revitalize the Far Right. Many fascists moved partly away from explicit biological racism to various forms of coded racism and cultural racism. Meanwhile, sections of the nonfascist Hard Right...
turned once more to White racial nationalism and even explicit claims of Whites' biological superiority—especially after the end of the Cold War and the splintering of the New Right coalition. These trends fostered increased collaboration between fascists and ultraconservatives and blurred the line between them.

White racism and antisemitism are often portrayed in the media as being mostly limited to agitators from the Far Right—the lunatic fringe. This is the paradigm promoted by centrist/extremist theory, and it is still used by most antiprejudice groups and the U.S. government. But elements of White racial nationalism in the 1990s could be seen not only among neonazis and other sectors of the Far Right, but also in sectors of the Patriot and armed militia movements and the Christian Right, as well as in the mainstream electoral system. Furthermore, most hate crimes are not committed by members of organized hate groups, and attacks on gay men and lesbians were growing at a faster rate in the late 1990s than attacks based on White racism or antisemitism.

James A. Aho points out how easy it is “to dismiss racism and religious bigotry as products of craziness or stupidity,” but that such a view is not accurate. According to Aho, “evidence from field research on Pacific Northwest racists and bigots shows that in the main they are indistinguishable from their more conventional peers, intellectually and educationally.” Aho also observes that with the exception of those who have engaged in politically motivated murders, the racists and bigots he studied “appear well within the bounds of normal, psychologically.”

Not only has the centrist/extremist approach to the racist Right not “abolished the movement, nor diminished racism in general,” it “may, in fact, unwittingly support racist beliefs,” suggests Abby L. Ferber. “While the focus is on the fringe, mainstream, everyday racism remains unexamined.” Ferber argues that a discussion is needed on the “points of similarity between white supremacist discourse and mainstream discourses,” especially since “white supremacist discourse gains power precisely because it rearticulates mainstream racial narratives. . . .”

Raphael S. Ezekiel agrees, noting that organized White racism exploits feelings of “lonely resentment.” It does this by weaving together ideologies already present in mainstream culture: “white specialness, the biological significance of ‘race,’ the primacy of power in human relations,” and “the feeling of being cheated.”

This sense of being cheated undergirds the producerist worldview, and provides a powerful mobilizing framework for right-wing populism. This is true when the system of oppression being bolstered is racism, antisemitism, sexism, homophobia, or class hierarchy—alone or in any combination.
cavage found that in fifteen state and federal races in 1996, most of the candidates who "courted" the Patriot movement won the election despite public awareness of the connection.47

On the state level, the best-known elected officials who articulated Patriot themes were Republican California State Senator Don Rogers and Republican State Senator Charles Duke of Colorado.

In 1996, Rogers was involved in a controversy over his having filed legal documents claiming sovereign citizen status, which is often a prelude to claiming no tax liability.48 Rogers also spoke at meetings of Jubilee, a Christian Identity group, even after he was told of their bigoted views. Rogers argued that Jubilee was simply a "group of patriotic Americans looking to restore their individual freedoms,"49 when a more accurate description would be antisemitic and White supremacist conspiracy mongers.

Colorado State Senator Charles Duke claimed taxes were a form of slavery, and defended the Patriot movement. A Duke campaign policy memo issued during his 1996 Republican primary race for the U.S. Senate is revealing:

The current national interest in restoring power to the states began with a resolution sponsored by Senator Duke when he was a member of the Colorado House of Representatives. Since then [1994], 20 additional states have adopted similar resolutions and laws are being crafted in many state legislatures to further the national movement to restore state sovereignty. Having a grassroots constitutionist, like Senator Duke, in the United States Senate will further the restoration of individual liberty. Duke lost the 1996 primary election that selected the Republican U.S. Senate candidate for Colorado. Still, in a four-way race he garnered 18% of the vote. In 1998, with a year left on his term in office, he resigned his state Senate seat, claiming God had directed him to do so. The next year he announced his interest in returning to politics.50

In Montana, human rights activist Christine Kaufmann chronicled how several state legislators pushed the Patriot agenda. She also noted that rightist ideas including "ending affirmative action, asserting states' rights, restricting the rights of non-white immigrants, and making English the official language, are now part of the political mainstream."51

Activism on the state level also came from the grassroots of the Patriot movement. The Spotlight featured a cover story on how right-wing populists in New Jersey had distributed flyers and faxes opposing a proposed state environmental law. According to the Spotlight, "Virtually overnight hundreds of thousands of copies of the flyer appeared as if by magic on bulletin boards, store windows and fax machines throughout the state." The flyer was circulated in part through a fax hotline.52

There were national campaigns as well.53 In 1995 several conservative groups and Patriot networks successfully mobilized opposition to a planned "Conference of the States" that had been supported by the Council of State Governments and National Governors' Association. A conspiracist theory arose that the conference was a secret plot to rewrite the Constitution and specifically eliminate the Second Amendment.

According to The Right Guide, there was "strong grassroots opposition from conservative and populist organizations, particularly firearms owners' groups." The Guide named the groups most responsible for the campaign: American Pistol and Rifle Association, Conservative Caucus, Constitutionists United Against a Constitutional Convention, Council on Domestic Relations, Eagle Forum, John Birch Society, and the National Association to Keep and Bear Arms. They also credited Charles Duke, who the Wall Street Journal said "spearheaded the opposition."54 National radio talk show host Michael Reagan also urged listeners to oppose the conference because it was part of the One World Government conspiracy, along with promoting other conspiracist theories.55

In 1997 U.S. Rep. Helen Chenoweth of Idaho introduced a bill cosponsored by 43 House members to block a federal plan to designate certain historic waterways "heritage rivers." The primarily symbolic gesture had been attacked by the Patriot movement and the overlapping antienvironmentalist "Wise Use" movement as a federal land grab. Some claimed it was part of a UN-backed New World Order initiative. Conspiracy theories about environmental activists created an atmosphere where confrontations accelerated in rate and intensity.56

On the international level, the Biodiversity Treaty was blocked, with a key role being played by a coalition of Patriot, Wise Use and LaRouche network activists who spread misinformation and conspiracist theories.57

CONCLUSION

Many commentators have portrayed the Patriot and militia movements as fascist. We believe it is more accurate to describe them as right-wing populist movements with important fascist tendencies—thus they are quasifascist or protofascist. Like the America First movement of the early 1940s, the Patriot movement and the militias represented a large-scale convergence of committed fascists with nonfascist activists. Such coalitions enable fascists to gain new recruits, increase their legitimacy among millions of people, and repackage their doctrines for mass consumption.

Mary Rupert dubbed the Patriot movement "A Seedbed for Fascism" and suggested that the "major missing piece in looking at the Patriot Movement in relation to fascism is that it does not overtly advance an authoritarian scheme of government. In fact, its emphasis seems to be on protecting individual rights." According to Rupert, there are two "portents of possibility" that could shift this situation: "First is the below-the-surface disposi-
repeatedly calling for increased government powers to conduct surveillance and send informers into “extremist” dissident groups. A related perspective that also cut across political lines even questioned the effectiveness and appropriateness of hate crimes legislation, although supporters of the legislation responded with new research and counter arguments.

GLOBALIZATION, ECONOMIC POPULISM, AND PATRICK BUCHANAN

In 1999 Patrick Buchanan finally bolted from the Republican Party and sought the presidential nomination for the 2000 race from the Reform Party, causing internal dissent and forcing a rift between supporters of Buchanan’s nomination by the party and H. Ross Perot, the party’s founder, godfather, funder, and former candidate. Buchanan had hinted at this move in a 1998 speech to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations:

The day is not too distant when economic nationalism will triumph. Several events will hasten that day. The first is the tidal wave of imports from Asia about to hit these shores. When all those manufactured goods pour in, taking down industries and killing jobs, there will rise a clamor from industry and labor for protection. If that cry goes unheeded, those who turn a stone face to the American workers will be turned out of power. In the Democratic Party or the Republican Party or the Reform Party or some new party, economic nationalism will find its vehicle and its voice. Rely upon it.

In previous campaign rhetoric Buchanan had juggled demonization, scapegoating, conspiracism, apocalyptic and millennialist metaphors, and a crude populist antielitism. In the year 2000, Buchanan sought to broaden his base by reaching out to self-described leftist Lenora Fulani, who ran for president as an independent in 1988 and 1992 and was the first African American woman to be put on the ballot in all 50 states. Fulani, along with her mentor Fred Newman, led a small national group that operated under numerous names, including the New Alliance Party, which dissolved in 1994. The Newmanites have been widely denounced for manipulative organizing tactics, the use of therapy to recruit and discipline members, and a dictatorial philosophy influenced by a 1970s alliance with neofascist Lyndon LaRouche. As early as 1996, Fulani praised Buchanan as an unfairly demonized populist who “has tapped into the anti-government, anti-big business, pro-people sentiments of a significant portion of the American people.”

Bruce Shapiro explained the coalition between Buchanan and Fulani, saying, “In this area, the threshold of anti-Semitism. Buchanan’s Jew-baiting streak, have their parallel with Fulani and the Jewish Newman, whose writings and speeches over the years have described post-Holocaust Jews as “stormtroopers of decadent capitalism” and used other choice epithets. The political identity of both is rooted in declared reverence for deeply authoritarian institutions: In the case of Buchanan, the most reactionary faction of the Catholic Church, which is nostalgic for the days before women could read from the altar or deliver Communion; in the case of Fulani, her “guru” Newman and a system of psychotherapy famous for giving Newman personal control of the most intimate aspects of clients’ lives. Right or left, Buchanan and Fulani offer variations on the same nationalist, scapegoating and authoritarian impulses.

Buchanan may have hoped that Fulani’s support would provide a screen for his own racism, but the only noticeable supporters of the alliance were some right-wing populists and a handful of White social democrats. Fulani and Buchanan later parted ways.

Business nationalism and xenophobia have been part of organizing against corporate multinationalist globalization since the first campaigns against the alphabet soup of international treaties such as NAFTA, GATT, WTO, and MAI. Conspiracist analysis of globalization even reached into the U.S. Congress where congresswoman Helen Chenoweth-Hage (R-ID) worked openly with the John Birch Society. Senator Bob Smith (R-NH) briefly quit the Republican Party to run for president on the antiglobalist U.S. Taxpayers Party ticket, but later returned to the fold.

Some ultraconservatives even cultivated ties with liberal antiglobalists such as Public Citizen founder Ralph Nader. Doug Henwood noted that Nader’s “twist themes, the hypertrophy of corporate power and the monetary perversion of democracy,” are the “core themes of any broad progressive mobilization,” but they largely had been appropriated by the “populist right.” Consider the statement of John Talbott, the Reform Party spokesperson in New Hampshire:
This is an example of repressive populism in the service of nationalist business interests, because it calls on "the people" in the middle to attack the internationalist elites while ignoring the racist and xenophobic policies of Buchanan, who in August 2000 was selected by one faction of the split Reform Party as their presidential hopeful.

Nader and his colleagues worked closely with a business nationalist brain trust financed by right-wing textile magnate Roger Milliken. The strategists included Milliken's lobbyist, Jock Nash, Alan Tonelson of the ultra-conservative U.S. Business and Industrial Council, and Pat Choate of the Manufacturing Policy Project. According to Ryan Lizza, it was Choate, the 1996 Reform Party vice-presidential candidate, who "orchestrated Buchanan's flight from the Republican Party." The Naderites and other antiglobalization forces frequently cited books and reports by authors such as Charles Derber, David C. Korten, Jerry Mander, Edward Goldsmith, and William Greider. In thousands of pages these authors denounce large multinational corporations, global finance capital, international banking interests, powerful elites, and the betrayal by corrupt politicians. Only in Greider is there a serious (albeit brief) discussion of how these historic themes have been woven into right-wing populist conspiracy theories.

Despite important differences, many liberal critics of corporate globalization share certain assumptions with right-wing conspiracy theorists. Both argue that the greedy and power-hungry have corrupted the U.S. political and economic system, but both portray the underlying system as essentially just and democratic, which is also the conventional view. As Henwood notes, "quasiradical" antiglobalists such as David Korten denounce large corporations and financial speculation while claiming that private enterprise and the market economy fostered community values in some vaguely defined past. By contrast, genuinely radical critiques see the multinational corporation as only the current logical expression of the underlying capitalist economic system—not as the basic problem in itself. Thus it is not radical analysis, but conventional mainstream illusions, that make left-leaning antiglobalists vulnerable to right-wing conspiracist overtures. The same is true of other progressive movements.

CONSPIRACIST ANALYSIS SPREADS

Right-wing conspiracy theories made inroads into sections of the Left during the Iran-Contra scandal in the late 1980s with the help of Danny Sheehan and his Christic Institute. Sheehan's theory of a "secret team" hijacking U.S. foreign policy drew freely from the LaRouchites and from the Liberty Lobby's Spotlight newspaper, and at one point Christic developed a close relationship with Patriot movement leader James "Bo" Gritz. During the Gulf War the nationalist Right continued to recruit from the Left around shared opposition to the U.S. intervention. By the mid-1990s, a few activists in alternative, green, and left subcultures defended the militias, or spread conspiracy theories about the bombing of the federal building in Oklahoma City.

In a lengthy article on snowballing conspiracism in The New Yorker, Michael Kelly dubbed this left/right phenomenon "fusion paranoia." Applying a centrist/extremist model, Kelly argued that "both the far right and the far left" have long posited "that sinister, antidemocratic forces have wormed their way into the inner workings of the government and have subverted it to serve not the interests of the nation but those of a powerful few." But this conspiracist idea assumes that the government used to be democratic and at some point served "the interests of the nation"—which is a conventional mainstream view, not a radical one. A truly radical critique sees the U.S. political system as inherently undemocratic from the beginning.

The ease with which anyone can post information on the Internet and reach a potential audience of millions has facilitated the spread of conspiracism, but it can be found in any type of media and across the culture. Even UFO magazine felt compelled to run a two-part series denouncing conspiracy theories that had fascist and antisemitic roots. Conspiracist ideas were popularized by the militias in the mid-1990s, and carried forward by Hard Right groups into the new millennium. But as the militia movement faded as a social movement following the Oklahoma City bombing, populist right-wing conspiracism still flourished in other movements. Far-right antisemitism, such as the Internet attacks on Democratic vice-presidential pick Joe Lieberman, also continued.

Conspiracy theories gained popularity in the Black community, assisted in part by television personality Tony Brown, host of Tony Brown's Journal. In his 1998 book Empower the People: Overthrow the Conspiracy That Is Stealing Your Money and Freedom, Brown exceeded Robertson in the use of antisemitic sources and claims about the Illuminati, and wove them together with material from the conspiracist Christian Right, Patriot movement, LaRouchites, and other segments of the Far Right. The back cover of his book featured a quote from Newt Gingrich: "Tony Brown is a genuine historic figure—and he is going to continue to make history."

In the 1990s, some African Americans embraced unsubstantiated claims that the AIDS epidemic was the result of a deliberate U.S.-government policy of biowarfare. Birchers and LaRouchites were among those promoting these claims, which also circulated among prison inmates. David Gilbert argues that such conspiracy theories divert attention from a racist system of health care and the need for risk reduction measures to interrupt the spread of HIV.

One popular author bringing right-wing antisemitism into left and alternative subcultures was David Icke. A former soccer player and sports commentator, Icke was removed as spokesperson of the Green Party in Britain for antisemitic conspiracism in his book The Robot's Rebellion.

Critics of conspiracism quickly emerged in a number of progressive al-
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