

Spring 1-1-2016

Carrying the Torch: the Continuation of Fascist Legacies in the European New Right

Michael Lawrence Colletta

University of Colorado at Boulder, michael.colletta@colorado.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholar.colorado.edu/gsll_gradetds



Part of the [German Literature Commons](#), [History Commons](#), and the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Colletta, Michael Lawrence, "Carrying the Torch: the Continuation of Fascist Legacies in the European New Right" (2016). *Germanic and Slavic Languages and Literatures Graduate Theses & Dissertations*. 24.
http://scholar.colorado.edu/gsll_gradetds/24

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Germanic and Slavic Languages and Literatures at CU Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Germanic and Slavic Languages and Literatures Graduate Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of CU Scholar. For more information, please contact cuscholaradmin@colorado.edu.

Carrying the Torch:
The Continuation of Fascist Legacies in the European New Right.

By

Michael L. Colletta

B.A., Metropolitan State University of Denver, 2005

A thesis submitted to the
Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Colorado in partial fulfillment
for the degree of
Masters of German
Department of Germanic and Slavic Languages and Literatures

2016

The thesis entitled:
Carrying the Torch: the Continuation of Fascist Legacies in the European New
Right written by Michael Colletta
Has been approved for the Department of Germanic and Slavic Languages
and Literatures

(Dr. Beverly Weber)

(Dr. Davide Stimilli)

(Dr. Benjamin Teitelbaum)

Date: _____

The final copy of this thesis has been examined by the signatories, and we find that both the content and the form meet acceptable presentation standards of scholarly work in the above mentioned discipline.

Abstract

Colletta, Michael Lawrence (M.A. German Germanic and Slavic Languages and Literatures)

Carrying the Torch: The Continuation of Fascist Legacies in the European New Right.

Thesis directed by Associate Professor Beverly Weber

The European New Right is an intellectual think tank that was established in the late 1960s, as a counter intellectual, right leaning school of thought that opposes liberalism, egalitarianism, equality, capitalism, communism, and multiculturalism in contemporary European society and politics. They link their philosophies back to historically conservative thinkers who have associations with fascism. I examine the continuing legacies of fascism in the ENR's depiction of religion, political correctness in Germany, and multiculturalism and race.

Acknowledgements:

I would like to thank all of my committee members: Beverly, Ben, and Davide, for their support and guidance through the dark and churning forest of my thesis. I would have been lost without you all. I also would like to thank my wife, Pehle, who supported and listened to every nuance of the project.

Table of Contents

Title page.....I

Signatures.....II

Abstract.....III

Acknowledgements.....IV

Carrying the Torch.....1

Bibliography.....42

Since the New Right's inception in the late 1960s in France, the think tank known as the European New Right has striven to proliferate its philosophies throughout Europe. These philosophies continue heritages that stretch from the late nineteenth century that cover a broad spectrum of topics, thinkers, and ideals. One such heritage that the European New Right is accused of contributing to is fascism; an accusation that many members of the New Right deny fervently and others proudly proclaim. Yet, traces of fascism, such as paligenesis and racism, still remain embedded in their writings and philosophies, while physical violence is not. The purpose of this project is to examine the lasting legacies of fascism and its ambiguities in the European New Right, particularly in the three main representations of paganism, the purpose of political correctness, and multiculturalism and racism. I argue that the authors of the European New Right allow affinities for fascism to be constructed, though not explicitly articulated through these three representations. This project is important to undertake, as academics and the general public should have an accurate landscape of right wing entities and how those entities utilize different discourses and avenues, to disperse their ideas.

Introduction to the ENR

The European New Right is a conservative intellectual society that was established in France in the late 1960s. Founding member Alain de Benoist sees it not as a political movement, but a think-tank and a school of thought (in Sunic, 2007).

The leading group was founded as GRECE, French for Greece (*Groupement de*

recherche et d'études pour la civilization européenne/ Research and Study Group for European Civilization). Identity, specifically what the ENR views as a diverse European identity, is of utmost importance for the New Right (de Benoist *Problem with Democracy* 35). For ENR members the goal is to see Europe's prestigious identity reemerge, since it has been lost. In their view, this European identity is connected to classical Greek motifs, pre-Christian pagan ideals, and the Nietzschean 'Will-to-Power' creation of culture, community, and self (de Benoist *On Being Pagan* 12; 188; Krebs *Fighting for the Essence* 4). According to ENR authors, through the adoption of monotheistic Judeo-Christianity, Europe has steadily lost this original identity and now has no identity or cultural potential that can be identified as European (Krebs *Fighting for the Essence* 19; *Die europäische Wiedergeburt* 30). This cultural potential is most often equated with classical Greece and pre-Christian paganism, but later European institutions such as colonialism, Christianity and imperialism are not. These institutions are associated more with the West, which is not European.

The West is neither a people, nor even a culture. The West is only a system of civilization, the status quo of a mental and geographical occupation of the Earth. Its civilization is only the agglutinating expression, within the common Judeo-Christianity base of support, of all the ideological lines that govern modern universalism and egalitarianism, whose progress one follows conversely through colonialist and capitalist connections... liberal and individualist

connections of the *Homo oeconomicus*... and Marxist and collectivist connections. (Krebs, *Fighting for the Essence* 41)

This distinction that the ENR establishes as Western, distinct from European will be essential in such topics as multiculturalism, which the ENR blames for such institutions like colonialism.

It is important to distinguish the terms European New Right (ENR) and New Right from such terms as radical and extreme. The terms ENR and New Right are used synonymously, by and large, with authors of the ENR preferring the use of ENR over the term New Right, though this is not always adhered to strictly. Specific schools such as *Nouvelle Droite* or *Neue Rechte* refer to their national/ linguistic boundary, but still belong under the ENR/ New Right terminology. As David Art articulates, “‘radical’ and ‘extreme’ are used synonymously in ordinary parlance, the difference is significant enough that the German Interior Ministry—an organization with obvious reasons for taking the far right seriously—has made the distinction central” (“Rise of the Radical Right” 128). Even though Art is concerned with right-wing politics, the distinction is just as important in this instance. The more visible constituents of these extreme groups, such as Skinheads, often use violence in conjunction with their political message, which is abhorred by ENR members. Some scholars, like Art connect the use of physical violence with a strong connection to fascism (132). I argue that the New Right does continue some hallmarks of fascism, such as the inequality of elitism and racism, but it is inappropriate to confuse the New Right with titles such as ‘Radical’ or ‘Extreme.’ Therefore, I will not be using ‘Radical’ or ‘Extreme’ in any way to describe the ENR.

Although it may be inappropriate to designate the ENR as outright fascist, I will argue that their writings demonstrate important affinities with fascist thought. They believe in natural inequality and that those whom nature has deemed exceptional should be placed above others (Krebs, *Fighting for the Essence* 80). Its members draw inspiration from traditionalist and conservative authors and thinkers, like Carl Schmitt, Arthur Moeller van den Bruck, Julius Evola, Martin Heidegger, Oswald Spengler, and Friedrich Nietzsche. Nietzsche is however, a problematic inclusion to the list since his appropriation into conservative circles was posthumous and Nietzsche did not live to give any direct statements condoning or condemning fascism or National Socialism. Sunic even reiterates the same sentiment: “the authors of the New Right do not insist on being qualified as ‘conservative’ or ‘Rightist,’ let alone ‘fascist’... [even though] that the authors and theories presented in this book often embrace the legacy of both the European Left and the extreme Right” (Sunic, *Against Democracy* 44). This remains one of the more challenging aspects of analyzing the ENR. The New Right would reject any allegation that they are fascist or receptive to Nazism, however their arguments against such ideals as egalitarianism, equality, liberal democracy or multiculturalism, as well as their anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism, allow the ENR to adopt certain affinities for fascism, if only in part.

Before I can answer this question of whether the New Right continues affinities with fascism, it is necessary to establish a definition of fascism that serves to underpin the remainder of the project, as the ENR will fit into this definition in some instances and just as other instances, it will not. Roger Griffin defines post-war

fascism as a genus of political ideology whose mythic core is a palingenetic form of populist ultra-nationalism (*Nature of Fascism* 26). Griffin's notion of a paligenetic myth corresponds to the belief of rebirth, especially following a period of decline (25). This is worth noting, as the members of the New Right believe that the current political and cultural climate of capitalism/ Marxism is in decline. This myth has religious connotations, Griffin observes, and this is apt in the context of the New Right, as its members seek a political, cultural and religious rebirth of paganism from Judeo-Christianity. Ultra-Nationalism is a concept of nation as a 'higher' racial, historical, spiritual or organic reality which embraces all the members of the ethical community who belong to it (Griffin, *Nature of Fascism* 37). This is not to say that under the term of ultra-nationalism, all members of a society are included; this is not an underpinning for multiculturalism. Rather, this form of nationalism appeals to a deeper sense of community whose members draw from deeper sources than just nationhood for identity. The ENR embodies this point by constructing a notion of Europe that relies on shared spirituality/ religion (pagan) and race/ ethnicity (white European). Thus, the members of the ENR exhibit this definition of fascism in their work. Griffin even states that "New Right spokesmen would doubtless reject the term fascist, but they make no secret of the debt to a form of political myth-making which our ideal type has revealed unmistakably to be ultra-nationalism" (*Fascism* 315). Where the ENR departs from fascism is in violence. David Art asserts that physical violence, such as what was exhibited by both the Italian fascists and Nazis, is a necessary component of fascism ("Rise of the Radical Right" 132). Several of the New Right authors, de Benoist chief among them, distance themselves from

violence, or even from political/ intellectual groups that have any violent tendencies or associations. So while the ENR demonstrates, in my opinion, having a clear mythological foundation in fascism, the lack of physical violence does exclude them from the historical type of fascism.

Griffin also develops a list he calls “threats of fascism” against democracy (*A Fascist Century* 200) to which the members of the ENR articulate parallel philosophies. Briefly put, Griffin outlines nine traits that constitute a continuation of fascist legacies. The ENR continues four of these nine fascist traits: 1.) a core vision that centers on a longing for a radically new order based on organic principles and authentic spiritual/ racial roots, 2.) a maintenance of a subculture of ideologically rationalized and organized hatred of multiculturalism and liberalism, 3.) a corruption of left-wing critiques by adjusting them in the interests of “cultural hegemony,” and 4.) an intellectual facilitation in rationalizing and legitimizing neo-populist attacks on multiculturalism and feeding fears about an erosion of national/ ethnic identity. (*A Fascist Century* 200-1) While he remarks that the historical form of “fascism cannot mount an attack on state power compared to that of Mussolini or Hitler” (200), Griffin recognizes that these various elements account for a more complex view of fascism, that is different from National Socialism, but also shows similarities. Paligenesis is a concept that is found in both forms of National Socialism and ‘generic’ fascism (Griffin, *A Fascist Century* 195), as both forms conceptualize a re-birth. However, this is where I see the similarities end, as there are many divergent topics from the ENR and National Socialism. One such divergent topic is modernism, as Nazi Germany was integrating their state with the ideals of

modernism that specifically portrayed an industrialized and a progressive Germany oriented in technology. The ENR rejects this vision of modernism or any vision of modernism that relies upon progress or economic means for development. I use Griffin's definition of 'generic' fascism here, as the ENR prescribes to it, more so than Nazism for reasons of historical and political stigma. Additionally, the generic definition includes more aspects that the ENR appropriates, particularly the four ideals listed above. These fascist definitions serve to be an especially active in this project's focus on religion, political correctness and multiculturalism.

Adding to the difficulty of placing the ENR in the ideological spectrum of "left" and "right," the ENR claim that these terms have lost much of their meaning and significance (Bar-On 4). Furthermore, the ENR throws the whole spectrum of "left" and "right"—indeed, even the terminology of "left" and "right"—into question, as the ENR desires to disentangle their ideals from any association to historical expressions of fascism. In this attempt to disentangle their position from historical fascism/ National Socialism, the ENR's authors have equivocated the group's belong into the spectrum. De Benoist was asked in the German New Right journal *Jünge Freiheit* in 1995, "What is left of the New Left? Perhaps the New Right!" (Bar-On 61). Furthering this entanglement, the ENR appropriates Antonio Gramsci's notion of cultural hegemony as influential to their cause. Gramsci's philosophy behind cultural hegemony in the view of the ENR is metapolitical in nature and places emphasis on "new ways of seeing and being, changing hearts and minds and gaining support for alternative, counter-hegemonic conceptions of the world" (Bar-On 5). Indeed, this is the intention of the term metapolitical, which is a philosophy or way

of being that exists as a core belief to ENR members. Ultimately, all of their core beliefs have political ambitions, insofar as the members of the ENR would like to see them turned into law, but they also exist beyond politics. This runs contrary to the Nazi's physically violent seizure of the power, though it bears similarities to the Nazi's use of propaganda, and signals that the ENR is focused on "changing hearts and minds" to their cause. "For the ENR, this cultural transformation of mentalities is more critical to the maintenance of a long-term, revolutionary society than the combined 'hard' powers of the army, police, intelligence services, or any other 'repressive' arm of the state apparatus" (Bar-On 80). However, the members of the New Right are concentrating on the endurance of establishing their ideals as opposite from historical fascism, they are nevertheless still distancing themselves and their stances from Nazism. As Bar-On continues:

For Gramsci, like the ENR, the precondition for all successful revolutions in history has first been a revolt against both the dominant spirit and cultural apparatus of the age. This non-violent, metapolitical stance is directed primarily at European societal elites and intellectuals rather than the masses and has been a practical and tactical choice conditioned by the public's negative historical associations with the right since World War Two, particularly the legacies of fascism and Nazism. (Bar-On 5)

Therefore, adopting Gramsci's theory of cultural hegemony is an allowance for the ENR members to easily escape any affinity with National Socialism. It also complicates the association the New Right has with being on the right. Consistently,

the New Right points to their appropriation of Gramsci as proof of their ambiguous political leanings.

There are numerous authors, intellectuals, and contributors to the ENR both historically and contemporarily, but my project engages with three members primarily: Alain de Benoist, Pierre Krebs, and Tomislav (Tom) Sunic. I single them out because their work is most readily accessible and because they are the most prolific of ENR authors. Alain de Benoist is one of the most prestigious ideologue of the ENR (Griffin, *Fascism* 346, Bar-On 15). He is one of the founding members of the French New Right (*Nouvelle Droite*) and is the founding head of the group GRECE (Sunic, *Against Democracy* 203). His bibliography stretches from the 1960s to present. As a founding member, his philosophies have influenced most, if not all of the ENR members. *Le Académie Française* awarded de Benoist the *Grand Prix de l'Essai* in 1978 for *Vu de Droite* (View from the Right), which the ENR considers to be his most acclaimed work (Griffin, *Fascism* 346). Krebs is considered to be the most prolific author of Germany's New Right (*die Neue Rechte*) (Griffin, "Post-War Fascism" 348), though it seems difficult for Griffin to award him that given the size and scope of de Benoist's bibliography. After leaving GRECE in France, Krebs founded the *Thule Seminar* in Germany in 1980, which would function as Germany's branch of GRECE (Sunic, *Against Democracy* 205). Sunic's professional history includes work as a diplomat, professor at several American universities, as well as an author. Few ENR authors venture into the United States, as he has, preferring instead to cast their disapproving gaze from across the Atlantic. His different

perspective led to the writing of *Homo Americanus: Child of the Post-Modern Age*, which serves as guide for Europeans of American institutions and conventions.

The ENR regards certain ideals as unacceptable for Europe. These concepts include liberalism, universalism, modernity, technological progress, and egalitarianism/ equality. Many of these stem from the root of Judeo-Christianity. Here, I want to discuss the ENR's views on liberalism and egalitarianism, as these concepts will inform the ENR's view on multiculturalism, political correctness and religion. Liberalism is as de Benoist states, "the main enemy" (de Benoist, *Manifesto European Renaissance* 212). Stated broadly, since the New Right sees itself as a force of traditionalism and traditional philosophies, liberalism is their antithesis. Liberalism is present in both forms of socioeconomic ideologies (Krebs, *Fighting for the Essence* 64): in capitalism it has allowed the market society and decadence to flourish. In communism (Marxism), liberalism is responsible for the "eradication of collective identities and traditional cultures, the disenchantment of the world, and the universalization of the system of production" (de Benoist, *Manifesto European Renaissance* 213). The members of the New Right argue the Judeo-Christian tradition laid the foundations for liberalism. Krebs states the ENR's view on liberalism:

In Europa durch das Judenchristentum eingeführt, hat das egalitäre System heutzutage in dem Marxismus jeglicher Richtung einen seiner wirksamsten Anschauungsträger, genauso wie—die Bemerkung ist unseres [ENR] Erachtens entscheidend—in dem Liberalismus amerikanischer Prägung, dessen ideologisch-kaufmännische

Machenschaften auf die Gründung einer von Wirtschaftsfachleuten regierten Weltgesellschaften hinauslaufen (*Die europäische Wiedergeburt* 12-3).

In summation of liberalism, the ENR finds it as a foundation of capitalism and Marxism and antithetical to their traditionalist culture. And even though Judeo-Christianity developed many of the concepts that liberalism furthered, liberalism itself is just as perverted an ideal, according to the ENR. Just as perverted as liberalism in the eyes of the members of the ENR is the notion of egalitarianism, which cultivates Marxism, Americanism, and Judeo-Christianity.

Egalitarianism is a concept that the ENR ascribes to neither in political or social institutions, nor in the natural sense; as they believe that humans are born with inequality of intellect or strength, where some possess more and other possess less and so society should continue that natural inequality. "There is no question whatever that men are created unequal, in the sense that their genes contain the determinants of unequal appearance and development" (Krebs, *Fighting for the Essence* 80). For the ENR, nature provides mankind with the tools to fulfill a specific role: the strong should fight and rule, the intelligent should think and establish laws, etc., and not everyone, particularly if nature has not endowed one with the inability to do everything (Krebs, *Fighting for the Essence* 80). So then, the ENR does not believe that society should level the playing field for individuals who are given less by nature to allow them to be able to take part in whatever they want. By doing this, the members of the New Right argue what makes an individual special is lost in making everyone special (Krebs, *Fighting for the Essence* 13). Judeo-Christianity is

accused here again of allowing equality a foothold in Europe, "...Christianity, that we can trace with greater certainty the genesis and the gradual consolidation of the modern belief system of egalitarianism" (Sunic, *Against Democracy* 131). Sunic continues: "The Judaic ideal is the kingdom of heaven, equality, and peace, and it can be said that these principles also played a considerable role in modern liberal and socialist thought" (132).

The ideals of liberalism and egalitarianism, along with Judeo-Christianity, are key concepts the New Right seeks to surmount. But in the ideals of religion, political correctness, and multiculturalism, the legacies of fascism, though veiled, become visible in the ways they want to surmount those ideals.

Judeo-Christianity, Paganism, Germany, and the ENR.

The ENR considers religion a foundation of European culture, and therefore it should be preserved, but Judeo-Christianity is not what the ENR deems appropriate for Europe. Judeo-Christianity, in the ENR's view, is linked to the Western tradition and thus it has developed specific institutions and mentalities that Europe has adopted, though they are argued as being un-European (Krebs, *Fighting for the Essence* 48). Rather the members of the ENR recognize in the pre-Christian paganisms of Europe what they claim is essential to the European spirit.

The ENR views the Judeo-Christian tradition that Europe adopted as an alien ideology (Krebs, *Fighting for the Essence* 13; Koehne 765) and an inorganic expression of culture from Indo-European paganism, which was naturally developed and befit the cultures that created it. Thus, Indo-European paganism is

venerated as the more appropriate mode of religious expression and worldview for Europe; indeed, Sunic terms it a way of life (*Against Democracy and Equality* 105) more than religion. In truth, the ENR is more concerned with the “European” polytheisms and paganisms than the “Indo”/ non-European paganisms, but there is differentiation within the ENR of how paganism and the European polytheistic tradition are appropriated. The members de Benoist, Krebs, and Sunic do not argue a hardline position of reunion with the old pagan religions—i.e., Europe must convert—but rather see the use of paganism as an antithesis to the West and its Judeo-Christian values. “It must be emphasized that the New Right’s criticism of monotheism is basically aimed at the Judeo-Christian legacy in Europe...” (Sunic, *Against Democracy and Equality* 107). Paganism represents a lost connection to Europe’s history, which Europe needs to reestablish in order to renew (*erneuern*) its organic spirit. While the members of the ENR use European polytheisms as a critique of Western culture, they are quick to claim that their desire to return European paganism as a dominant, religious discourse over Judeo-Christianity, while necessary, is problematic. Tomislav Sunic states:

The New Right still has to demonstrate how it will counter criticism that departure from Christianity, and possibly a return to paganism, may also have unpalatable political consequences...After all, if one accepts the thesis that monotheistic religions have traditionally been repressive throughout history, one must admit that paganism has also had its share of repression. One need only read some classics in order to become convinced of the magnitude of pagan violence in antiquity.

Thus far, the New Right has not examined in more detail the scope...
the social and political implications of 'paganism' in Nazi Germany.

(Sunic, quoted from Bar-On 103)

The ENR is aware then of the problem that underlines paganism, specifically the connotations to Nazism, yet they have not set out to examine those social and political implications of paganism. Instead, they continue to repeat the same dictum of a European return to paganism.

Before the discussion over the ENR returning to paganism or its Nazi connections is approached, it is important to view the Judeo-Christian tradition in the light of the ENR. In particular, I want to focus on the destructive mentalities that the ENR accuses of this religious tradition. Broadly, these accusations are that Judeo-Christianity has shifted the European worldview in terms of their view of time. Additionally, it introduced dualism, the leveling of individuals from uniqueness into sameness, the notion of equality, and the established—if over time—the importance of the Western world that will eventually supplant the European spirit. The ENR views Judeo-Christianity as instrumental in the historical destruction and eradication of organic European culture, as it has shifted certain mentalities in the European psyche. "Following the consolidation of Judeo-Christian belief in Europe, the world came to be understood according to fixed concepts and categories governed by the logic of 'either-or', 'true or false', 'good or evil'—with seldom any shading between the two" (Sunic, *Against Democracy and Equality* 109). In an earlier work, Sunic further elaborates on this change in thinking:

In European culture, polytheistic beliefs began to dwindle with the rise of Christianity. In the centuries to come, it was to be expected that the polymorph system of explanation, whether in theology, or later on in sociology, politics, history, or psychology, come under the influence of Judeo-Christian monotheistic beliefs (*Homo Americanus* 105).

The members of the ENR consider the linear view of time as a Judeo-Christian convention. "Judeo-Christianity monotheism excludes the possibility of historical return or 'recommencement'; history has to unfold in a predetermined way by making its way towards a final goal" (Sunic, *Against Democracy and Equality* 117). This is contrasted with the pagan, cyclical view of time to which older traditional thinkers such as Julius Evola and current ENR authors give credence. This is a view of time that allows for ages to experience the full range of development: birth, maturation, decay, and finally, death, and since the view of time is cyclical, there is an absence of a final end point in the discourse of the ENR, rather the resolution of one age/ time frame/ event and the beginning of another. Evola identified this cycle in *Ride the Tiger*, intended as a survival guide for the aristocratic soul (the actual subtitle of the book) to endure until the cycle completes and changes and therefore, that aristocratic soul may emerge again at the zenith (8). Krebs identified the contemporary time cycle as *Mahapralaya*, the end of the Vedic cycle and the dissolution of current circumstances (*Fighting for the Essence* 32). Both Evola's and Krebs' cycles promise a new beginning that will accompany the turn of the current age. Both of these individuals identified what Griffin determines as paligenesis, the end of a decadent cycle to allow for a new emergence of ideals and systems—a

whole new beginning. And in this new beginning the New Right and the “elite” individual who subscribes to their conservative theories will emerge. Here we can establish the beginning of the elite individual that fascism regards as essential. Not every individual will be accepted as capable to understand or fulfill the requirements that fascism presents. In this underpinning of fascism the New Right perpetuates only the few, who are fit and favored by nature will accomplish a new reality. Additionally, there was Nazi rhetoric that surrounds the re-emergence of their “new” kingdom (Rosenberg, “Establishment of the Third Reich” from Griffin *Fascism* 131); this notion of cyclical thinking shares similarity with such rhetoric.

The ENR accuses Judeo-Christianity of leveling uniqueness to a homogeny, as they see Judeo-Christian religious traditions as regarding and treating individuals as equal. In the ENR’s imaginations of Judeo-Christian traditions: all are sinners in the eyes of God. All are marked with original sin and all are worthy of his forgiveness. All can come before God and find salvation and God will not discriminate. This leveling process allows for the introduction of egalitarianism and equality into Europe, where before they were not considered; thus, Judeo-Christianity is regarded as the origin of egalitarianism and equality by the ENR. Sunic sums up the leveling force that Judeo-Christianity exudes:

The most serious reproach that one can level against the Judeo-American [Christian] mindset is that it has inaugurated secular versions of an egalitarian cycle, notably the idea of political progress, while introducing into the mind of its constituents a revolutionary anthropology with a universalistic and globalist character. Judeo-

Christian monotheism, along with its secular liberal exclusiveness, presupposes an underlying idea of universalism, as well as the establishment of one undisputed truth. The consequence of the Judeo-Christian belief in ontological oneness, i.e., that there is one God and, therefore, only one democratic truth, resulted, over a period of time, in an effort to obliterate or downplay any other possible political truth or any other value system. (Sunic, *Homo Americanus* 108)

Pierre Krebs shares this sentiment and accuses Judeo-Christianity of laying the foundation of egalitarianism, progress, and universalism. Krebs, however, considers these traits symptomatic of the culture of the West, which is not European anymore. While Judeo-Christianity bequeathed the West the virtues of universalism, equality, egalitarianism, and progress, the culture of the West champions them globally. “One understands to what degree Western discourse, which turns without fail around the recurring idea of progress and modernity, remains essentially a reflection of Hebrew mental archaisms of the Old Testament in which it has, so to say, been intellectually and spiritually fossilized [in the West]” (*Fighting for the Essence* 48). He also states: “the role that Judeo-Christianity has played without stop, for twenty centuries, both in the intellectual development and in the historical, political and social progress of universalism, is much too central to allow one to see in Western civilization” [...] (40). Regardless of who now holds the mantle of these leveling traits and continues their perpetuation, Judeo-Christianity is considered to be their source.

Thus according to the ENR, the Judeo-Christian monotheistic religion has proven a damaging, religious institution to Europe's sense of cultural identity. It has shifted Europe's historical inhabitants' thinking and mentalities inorganically towards equality and egalitarianism while stripping them of their sense of uniqueness. Europe must sever its connection with Judeo-Christianity in order to rekindle its lost relationship to its organic, polytheistic paganisms. Additionally to reconnecting to paganism, the members of the New Right use paganism to criticize the Judeo-Christian West. Kathryn Rountree articulates that pagans traditionally distinguished their religion from the sexually and culturally repressive, guilt-ridden Christianity that fosters intolerance and hypocrisy (82). The ENR has attached paganism to their criticism of Christianity, but it may only exist as just that, a critique. The ENR has no articulated plan on helping Europe overcome Christianity or on returning to paganism, although de Benoist comes the closest when he expresses that paganism will recur when Judeo-Christianity and all that it has established ends (*On being Pagan*, 194). Thus, there is a continuation of paligenesis even in paganism, as it must be reborn through the destruction of the current Judeo-Christian tradition in Europe. Absent though from the ENR's discourse is a plan of combating or removing the embedded connections of Nazism that have become associated with paganism. Thus, paganism's importance is in the identity it represents for Europe, rather than the actual belief.

The ENR looks to Indo-European paganism as the saving grace for Europe's soul. The Judeo-Christian monotheisms have removed Europe from its cultural and spiritual past; returning to paganism is the only way to reestablish that cultural and

spiritual past. "If Europe is to stave off spiritual chaos, it needs to replace a monotheistic vision of the world with a polytheistic vision...which alone can guarantee the 'return of the gods' and the plurality of all values" (Sunic, *Against Democracy* 115). As the Judeo-Christian tradition has changed the cultural mentalities of Europe, the history that Europe has undergone with Christianity has lead to a further change in values. Values that were traditionally stressed by European polytheistic pagan religions were courage, personal honor, and spiritual and physical self-overcoming, contrasted to the Judeo-Christian values of humility and an overarching fear of God (Sunic, *Against Democracy* 116). These new values of humility and reverence have played a part in the building of Europe under the values of liberalism and egalitarianism. As Bar-on states: "For the ENR, the latter two political categories [liberalism and socialism] are equivalent with a monotheistic, egalitarian and universalist Judeo-Christian worldview that is seen as the precursor to a full-scale, dogmatic and mass totalitarianism" (103).

Thus the first mentality that the ENR desires to strip Europe from Judeo-Christianity is its current worldview. The ENR seeks a new vision. Paganism allows for this new vision, as it doesn't dissolve individuals or unique cultures into a multitude of same, with every individual and culture believing in one set of values. Paganism also is enabled to evaluate its own history in a way that the history developed from Judeo-Christianity is not. "Unlike a Christian, a pagan is encouraged to assume complete responsibility before history because he is the only one who can give history a meaning" (Sunic, *Against Democracy* 116). In the mind of a Christian, all history is reduced to God's will and thus remains immutable, whereas the pagan,

with its plurality of beliefs and gods, is better able to reflect upon history with different viewpoints. These unique viewpoints lead to a deeper understanding of history, unlike the Judeo-Christian accepted view of history. The individual is also able to gauge his or her own personal responsibility in that history. "For Neopagans, history is like life. It sits on the premise that as human beings are innocent, so is historical development" (Poewe 389).

The ENR is keen to adopt another aspect of paganism that directly relates to a profession of their movement, tolerance. De Benoist states that it is "generally accepted that paganism contains the constituent principle of tolerance." He continues: "paganism is tolerant by nature, not only because it is (potentially) polytheist, and polytheism is already a sublimated form of pluralism, but also because it is not dualistic, because it opposes the fundamental discontinuity of God and the world..." (*Being Pagan* 110). This touches on a number of points that the ENR would find very appealing. First, the ENR faults the Judeo-Christian tradition for perpetuating a binary discourse of 'right or wrong', 'good or evil'. Second, this relates back to the ENR profession of tolerance known as "right to difference". Bar-On is mindful of this position, but argues a political discrepancy: "While there is no reason to believe that the ENR's pro-Third World [i.e. tolerance of difference] solidarity positions are not genuine, this stance is largely a geopolitical one dictated by the will of many Europeans to politically weaken the United States" (111). So while topically, the issue of paganism and the Third World in the ENR's discourse seem unrelated; really paganism and its pluralistic values have a potential relationship that exists to debase the United States. The ENR's affirmation of right to

difference has a veiled association of a purposeful, cultural hegemony, which brings into question the notion of tolerance in paganism.

Historically, neo-paganism experienced an attempted revitalization during the Nazi regime in Germany. As Sunic states, the ENR achieved an unfair amount of fear in wanting to reinvigorate paganism for exactly this reason (*Against Democracy and Equality* 108). This fact has significantly stigmatized the religion in contemporary German society and as a result of this, the neo-pagan religion and its practitioners are conscious to remain as apolitical as possible and be vocal about that apolitical stance (Rountree 87). Katheryn Rountree claims that contemporary members of Pagan and Native Faith¹ groups throughout Europe are exchanging and incorporating new ideologies in order to experience the full measure of a polytheistic religion's content, and thus are complex and constantly morphing (82 & 87). So, the religious members and ideologies are fluid in moving from group to group and in this situation, there is a potential for political ideologies to enter. In Germany however, this situation is more tenuous. "...Nationalism's associations with Paganism can also provoke anxiety among Pagans and the wider communities they inhabit. Hegner (forthcoming) claims that among Neo-pagan witches in Berlin, the association between nationalism and Nazism means Pagans being branded as neo-Nazis by the society at large" (Rountree 87). ENR members not only acknowledge the connection between Paganism and Nazism, but there are points of similarity

¹ Rountree untangles the uses of these terms as such: academics or any non-practicing Pagans use Neo-pagan in order to distinguish the modern and post-Christian history. Practicing Pagans call themselves as such, particularly to stress the pre-Christian link. Native Faith is used to emphasize specific local traditions, politics, and are more geographically and culturally restrictive (81 & 82).

upon which the ENR would agree. “In attitudes like anti-Christianity, anti-capitalism, rejection of dualism, search for pre-Christian roots, ancestor veneration, organicism, assigning meaning to all happenings, love of world as it is, concern for ecology, and blurring of faith and knowledge, National Socialism and neo-paganism are in agreement” (Poewe 398). The ENR would find this list of beliefs completely in line with their philosophical proclamations, which draws attention to their affinities with National Socialism. Nazism’s appropriation of paganism extolled the virtues of manly heroism, valor, and defiance, particularly in contrast to Christian humility, repentance, and sense of sin (Goodrick-Clark 257-8). The ENR has proclaimed that some of the traits they seek in paganism are courage, self-reliance, and self-determination and that these are expressed particularly in the Edda and are comfortable to the Germanic way of life (Silfen 48). In seeking these similar attitudes that paganism provides, the ENR venerates a similar Nazi position. Poewe contends that though liberal democracies guarantee the freedom of practice, she remains unsure as to the political inclinations of the neo-pagans and their commitment to preserving those same institutions that provide them protection: “while the constitutions of western liberal democracies guarantee freedom of new religions, I am not sure whether new religions, including New Age and neo-paganism, preserve western liberal democracies” (Poewe 398). The ENR would assert definitively that paganism is not compatible with western liberal democracies and that western liberal democracy is not compatible with Europe. Bar-On identifies an additional problem of paganism—at least as it is defined by the ENR—as polarizing to nearly every other religion in Europe and to many political affiliates.

“This form of ‘paganism’ has never achieved unanimous public support. Rather it has created tension with liberals, the left, Catholic ultra-nationalists and traditional monotheistic believers throughout Europe, whether Catholics, Protestants, Jews or Muslims” (Bar-On 109). There also exists a racial component of paganism that is historically tied to Nazism. Samuel Koehne articulates that Hitler identifies the Nordic races as possessing three traits that Jews do not: work as duty or working for the betterment of the whole, physical health that relates to higher intelligence, and a deeper spiritual life (775). This intensely racialized connotation remains untouched by ENR members regarding paganism.

The New Right has not exerted a high level of influence on reemerging paganism in Germany or in the broader European context. While the neo-paganisms may have similarities with the New Right and for the politically active Pagans, the connection to the right could be established, though Poewe observes, that “Americans accept that New Age and neo-paganism are politically left, green, and correct. How can the same basic ideas be left in North America, but right in continental Europe” (398)? Even Bar-On concedes that the “thirst in liberal societies for a renewed spiritualism [...] might still make the ENR ideological synthesis appealing” (104). But regardless of this, Europe still remains overwhelmingly Christian. “The ENR thinkers’ esoteric intellectualism, elitism, self-striving and self-surpassing have been largely rejected by a Europe still firmly anchored to the Judeo-Christian tradition, its basic values and its principles of mass hope” (Bar-On, 104). Thus, paganism still remains a minority religion, even despite the ENR’s desire to

reunite Europe with its ideals. Perhaps this is appropriate, as the religion still has yet to disentangle itself from Nazism's fetters.

Political Correctness in the ENR

Political correctness is a difficult concept to specify and the history of the concept has taken many turns over the decades. In Germany, the conditions surrounding political correctness unavoidably deal with National Socialism. In understanding political correctness, scholars such as Thomas Mittmann suggests that the public, intellectual discourses around politics and culture are more important to examine than in the private discourses of everyday life.

Auch wenn der Begriff eher als politisches Schlagwort denn als analytischer Beschreibungsbegriff geeignet ist, schlage ich aus forschungspragmatischen Gründen vor, „Political Correctness“ sowohl als Sprachnormierungssphänomen als auch als unterschwellig vermittelte, universelle Verhaltenslenkung zu definieren, die dazu dient, einen bestehenden öffentlichen Konsens—etwa über die Bewertung der nationalsozialistischen Vergangenheit—zu konservieren. „Political Correctness“ berührt dabei in der Regel kaum den Sprachgebrauch im privaten Alltag, sondern findet in erster Linie im intellektuellen Diskurs der öffentlichen Politik und Kultur statt. (Mittman “Vom ‘Historikerstreit’ zum ‘Fall Hohmann’” from Hölscher 63)

In examining the public discourses that include politics and culture, political correctness in Germany is continuing a tradition that has been built since the end of the Second World War. It is the construction of a public discourse of communication about Nazism rather than a discourse of relativizing or silence, which sublimates Nazism into a taboo. The ENR has engaged in both of these.

The concept of political correctness in the ENR's view has connotations of censorship and silencing that have been produced in historical instances. Jan Müller—one of the most prolific German scholars of the New Right after the Second World War—provides some insight into why this could be, as “Germany’s public sphere was dominated by a left-liberal media, which, in its zeal for ‘political correctness,’ had set up a ‘discourse apartheid,’ through which members of the Right were systematically silenced and excluded” (*Another Country* 202). The members of the ENR accuse the broader academic culture and the Left of a pervasive use of political correctness to silence their particular discourses. So the New Right perceives itself as a victim of silencing which in the context of Germany means any discussion of National Socialism that is challenging or contrary to the public directed discourse of consciousness (Müller, *Another Country* 202-3). Silence is a key component to the position the New Right is in. They believe that their position has been silenced, so they appropriate silence in order to continue a rebellious sentiment about the discussion of Nazism. This association has two implications for the New Right in the context of Germany, where it firstly establishes a public discourse of shame, where the only explicit discourse allowed is one of German collective guilt (Müller, *Another Country* 30) and the second implication that the

New Right associates with political correctness is, who has shaped/ is shaping that discourse. Tom Sunic identifies the “Jewish” intellectuals of the returning (1950s) Frankfurt School as establishers. This puts him in a critical position of the Jewish intellectuals and of the Holocaust, though, just as in other issues, the ENR is not overt in any anti-Semitic language. Here too, therein lies a problematic legacy of National Socialism: that the ENR is unable to express any sentiment for it outside of guilt and that there is a Jewish element that is present in determining the discourse, even the guilt that Germany should feel.

In examining the discourse in Germany surrounding Nazism, there emerge two intellectual cultures in postwar Germany (Marks, “Silence and Communication” from Niven 249). “On one side, there was the official public culture of guilt, sanctioned by the Allies and centered on emigrants and liberals. Counter to that was the culture of silence, which preserved the value of honor in taboos. Communication and guilt dominated in public while the counterculture of silence became characteristic of private life” (Müller 31). Thus the New Right’s use of silence demonstrates anti-humanist ideals (Müller 31) that presents an affinity with Nazism. David Art argues that this is an attempt for the New Right to adopt an apologetic discourse about Nazism. “They [ENR members] wrote polemical essays attacking the political correctness that prevented Germans from departing from the contrition narrative” (Art 169). Jan Müller casts the affinity with National Socialism into a new light with the argument that the members of the ENR are products of their own experiences

Most members of the New Right were young historians who grew up during the years of the *Tendenzwende* in the 1970s and experienced the *Historikerstreit* during their early academic careers. Mostly, they perceived the dispute as a witch-hunt of academics who dared to utter unorthodox historical opinions. They also came to believe strongly that any change in the present and future self-understanding of Germany was to be affected through changing perceptions of the past (Müller, "Rise and Fall" 6).

In revisiting National Socialism, the members of the New Right build several particular sympathetic narratives for Germany, the most salient of which is the narrative that the Germans were themselves victims of National Socialism during and after the Second World War (Woods 75). The capitulation of peace drafted in the Marshall Plan is an especially evocative trigger for the ENR. Pierre Krebs has criticized several plans/ treaties in Europe's history: the Maastricht Treaty of 1992, the Treaty of Versailles in 1919, and the Marshall Plan of 1946 as similar; an entity exterior to Europe that forces its politics, philosophies, and values in order to change the very spirit of Europe (Krebs, *Fighting for the Essence* 51). So National Socialism victimized Germany throughout the war and afterwards with a treaty that forced them (and Europe) to become something inorganic, according to the New Right. And since the members of the ENR sees themselves as true historians of Europe, "while publishing polemical political essays, members of the New Right also continued the parallel project of 'historicizing', or rather 'normalizing', National Socialism in their scholarly work" (Müller, "Rise and Fall" 6). "Historicizing" or

“normalizing” serves the end of changing the discourse surrounding National Socialism, as both of these put a different focus on Nazism from the public discourse of shame. Sunic articulated a point that the world consistently recalls the atrocities of the Nazis, with little focus on communist atrocities (*Homo Americanus* 81). He continues: that “if the public was more sensitized to the communist syndrome, National Socialism or Fascism, if not pardoned, could at least be better understood” (81). Sunic, here, is attempting to normalize National Socialism by means of historicizing. Thus, the ENR relativizes National Socialism so as to facilitate a different discussion from the common consensus about guilt and communication. Ultimately Germany does not desire to facilitate this discussion.

Many mainstream academic authors view the New Right in the framework of politics, with two distinct narratives in mind: Are the New Right fascist or do the New Right continue any fascist connotations? This project falls into the latter category. Also, does the liberal democratic world need to be worried about the New Right, presumably in terms of repeating a history of fascism or Nazism? For modern Germany, the issue of fascism and Nazism cannot be supported without potential legal consequences, nor easily skirted around in order to approach another conservative, political agenda. Germany is overwhelmingly aware of its history; this hypervigilance about its culture and history has allowed it some success in coming to terms with its past (*Vergangenheitsbewältigung*). As Roger Woods states “...German confidence is not undermined but strengthened by remembering the Nazi past. In the broader arena of public debate those behind the Holocaust memorial, [...] declare that only a confident and democratic Germany is capable of

erecting [such] a monument” (81). Woods continues with what could be a rallying cry for dealing with Nazism that the future generations of Germany should “learn from history” (81). Therefore, the ENR’s claim that Germany needs to approach National Socialism in a different discourse or through silence is not Germany’s strategy. The New Right sees Germany as under threat from loss of its identity (Woods 89) and the issue of National Socialism is a part of that past, but their relativizing or silencing of National Socialism fails to gain popular or intellectual traction in Germany today.

Multiculturalism in the ENR

The topic of immigration is crucial now in Europe, particularly amidst the context of Syrian refugees. De Benoist has commented on this very situation of Syrian immigration in recent issues of *Righton.net* (see “Pro French Muslims in France?”). But immigration has always been an issue in Europe, and for the New Right, this is not a new struggle. In the late 1960s, when GRECE was in its nascent state, de Benoist and other members were witnessing the Algerian civil war and the influx of refugees into France (Bar-On 31). It was in this time and space Bar-On asserts that de Benoist and the New Right began to seek to avoid fascist connotations. “This adaptation process², which seriously began around the time of the Algerian War, would entail the transformation of fascist and Nazi discourse and

² Bar-On articulates that future GRECE members were involved in other organizations that adopted “excessive tactics of the revolutionary right and fascism such as extreme chauvinism, excessive militarism, quasi-mystical leader cult, the totalitarian one party state and police brutality” (Bar-On 13). Thus the avoidance of these activities was in the name of political survival (13).

the avoidance of making any conspicuous links with the discredited fascist culture of the past” (Bar-On 13).

Roger Woods describes the ENR’s view of multiculturalism as threats from both “external” and “internal” (Woods 58-9). “Whereas Krebs and de Benoist see external forces behind a loss of cultural identity, other New Right authors take a philosophical approach which locates the origins of decline within society itself and, more broadly, within Modernity” (Woods 61). Immigration represents the external threat, while the internal collapse is represented by multiculturalism. Additionally, multiculturalism is paradoxical for the ENR: on one hand, the ENR is opposed to any mixing of races, intermingling in society or mixing of cultures, as de Benoist articulates, to “[not] blend all the races into an undifferentiated whole” (de Benoist *Appendix II* 231). On the other hand, the ENR supports diversity or what they call “ethnopluralism” or “heterogeneity” in the world. This ethnopluralism has both racial and cultural connotations and their heterogeneous argument means that the world should be differentiated (de Benoist *Appendix II* 225) and that uniqueness should not be reduced to uniformity (Woods 59). Thus the New Right believes that there should be diversity among the populations of the earth, but these populations should not mix, integrate, or immigrate into one another’s boundaries (60).

According to the Krebs, this is called “ethnoregionalism,” where people are allowed to be themselves, but within their own spaces (*Fighting for the Essence* 86). Any legal rules or cultural customs they establish should be regarded as characteristic for that culture and only further serve to prove the ENR’s sense of diversity. This allows the New Right of Europe to distance itself from Europe’s colonial history

(Bar-On 98). Firstly, the ENR takes umbrage at another culture imposing its own rules and customs onto any other. This is one of the foundations for the ENR's rejection of communism, Westernization, globalization, and Americanism, since these entities are seen to destroy cultural uniqueness as to replace it with their ideals. Secondly, the ENR's notion of ethnopluralism allows people to be unique but only within their own borders and cultural boundaries. The ENR adopts this world plurality mainly to prevent immigration into Europe. If viewed in the light of Third World nations, de Benoist states "The New Right favors policies restrictive of immigration, coupled with increased cooperation with Third World countries where organic interdependence and traditional ways of life still survive, in order to overcome imbalances resulting from globalization" (*Appendix II* 231). While de Benoist may be promoting global heterogeneity here, this strikes me as a continuation of the colonial mindset, particularly because the Third World remains reliant upon Europe for development.

Fatima El-Tayeb articulates an important attitude that the ENR is employing here, which is an exclusionary discourse of colonialism. "By excluding colonialism from the list of key events shaping the continent's identity, the complex aftereffects of colonial rule on contemporary Europe can be ignored or externalized as can its (post) colonial populations" (El-Tayeb 13). The ENR rejects colonialism as a convention of the West, thus the West has to bear the burden of the colonial legacy, not Europe. The New Right is allowed to remove the undesirable legacy of colonialism from Europe. Therefore, this reiterates the importance of casting a critical view on the New Right and their ideals. Especially, since they are engaging in

a subtle form of revisionist history that ignores glaring aspects like colonialism and silences discourses around National Socialism. Furthering the connection to colonialism is what the Third World nations get from this deal, which is very little and who is dominating the debate on this issue, which is Europe. As Bar-On states:

...The majority of non-Westerners are increasingly tied down by materialist preoccupations, which have reduced their lives to the daily grind of mass poverty, starvation, disease and cycles of endless militarization. The prevailing question for this growing army of global poor is not, like the ENR thinkers claim, namely, the preservation of 'difference' in the world, but how to end this cycle of poverty and despair, which has both internal and external causes. (Bar-On 111)

Non-Westerners may be concerned with rising out of poverty, but they are not concerned with the loss of their identity, whereas the authors of the ENR and some political parties in Europe are consumed with this. "ENR debates are still largely European, with European authors and essentially European themes and references" (Bar-On 111). The ENR may reject the historical mode of colonialism as inappropriate; it still continues its legacy in this instance. "[The] whitewashing of the colonial past has obvious implications for Europe's perceived role in contemporary global politics in which it appears as benevolent, neutral mediator, wizened by past mistakes and without a stake in current power struggles" (El-Tayeb 13). Akin to the Nazi notion of *Lebensraum*, which allowed enough area to live comfortably and ensured Germany a place on the world stage (Housden 2), the ENR seeks to establish space for Europe's various identities. The ENR is not attempting to

solve the problems of the Third World; rather they use the Third World as an additional example of the loss of cultural identity, promulgated by America or liberalism. By arguing that the non-European nations of the Third World are struggling for identity, the members of the ENR use the Third World to perpetuate their desire for European cultural identity.

The ENR has developed theories that entwine the physical space of a country to the ethnic component of people that consistently is brought up in conjunction against multiculturalism. Krebs calls it “territoriality” and de Benoist articulates it as “right to difference.” It is tied intrinsically to the evolution of any group: “territorial demarcation equally responds to a need dictated by evolution... the cultural life of an ethnic group is tightly bound to the territorial demarcation of a space that guarantees it a separate development that it imperatively needs to know and affirm itself” (Krebs, *Fighting for the Essence* 87). Territoriality has strong anti-immigration sentiments incorporated into the framework by its very nature, since an ethnic group knows what is best for its survival, the integration of a foreign group into the mix would lead to instability and loss of identity. “Immigrants who settle permanently take possession of the most precious resource that a people possess—namely, their territory. It is for this reason that they are perceived as invaders, and this situation then automatically triggers a desire for territorial defense among the natives” (87-8). The New Right believes that this would cast their non-invasive, anti-colonial message for Third World countries into a favorable context. When viewed with Germany in mind, the connotations to Nazism are striking. The ENR does not address what to do about removing immigrated peoples from any given territory;

they only seem concerned with stopping the inflow. If they ventured a solution into the removal of immigrants, this would cast them too far into National Socialism and the New Right is constantly seeking to maintain both a distance from fascism, while not completely rebuking the ideology all together.

After discussing the New Right's stance on immigration and multiculturalism, it is worth considering that, as a part of continuing fascist legacies, the ENR continues a racist legacy. I believe that they do. Race and ethnicity are defined by Rita Chin to work in conjunction. "Ethnicity connotes a sense of peoplehood based upon shared customs, language and (sometimes) religion. It derives from a 'belief in common descent' and therefore tends to be self-ascribed and embraced as a positive collective identity" (Chin 4). Chin continues: "race, on the other hand, implies a 'harder' or 'deeper' sense of difference from some specified or unspecified norm. Unlike ethnicity, which evokes an unhierarchical social landscape of coexisting diversity, racial ascription is at least implicitly hierarchical..." (4). With these definitions in mind, the ENR ascribes ethnicity to Europe without problem. This concept of European ethnicity includes ancient forms of European paganism, and classical Greek motifs and it includes the expression of all the various cultures within Europe. When examining territoriality, the first implication of racism can be seen, as a space for each European group is clear, but the ENR does not make exceptions for people not of European descent or people of color or non-European citizens in those spaces. Thus, a hierarchy is constructed in the notion of territoriality, where Europeans and their identity are placed as more important to preserve than any non-European. Several generations of non-

Europeans, like the Turks in Germany for example, may have grown-up, learned German, and in every other way, participated in German society, but the ENR excludes them from the nation-ethnic-space articulated in territoriality. European countries are then established as for Europeans only. The ENR does not propose any forceful expulsion, but these groups are treated as non-existent in European countries, since the ENR advocates that the world has provided a space for Turks—Turkey. After Europe is established as European only, then the New Right would turn its attention to the establishment of non-European spaces for non-Europeans. “Racialized thinking can be found in institutional patterns, policies, social practices and behaviors that target, stigmatize, treat as unequal, exclude or adversely affect individuals on the basis of their perceived ethnoracial membership” (Chin, 4). Thus, the ENR is engaging in racialized thinking in articulating their “right to difference” theory, because though it allows a space for the non-European, it excludes them from any, or potential, European identity. And while the ENR may see the difference in not continuing the racialized violence characteristic of National Socialism directly, their exclusion of non-Europeans in European spaces and politics in favor of the “ethnoracial” member does continue that legacy.

While the immigration and territoriality have been discussed within the ENR for some time, they recently resonate with anti-immigration sentiment in contemporary Germany, demonstrated both by the populist right as well as the widespread response to the author Thilo Sarrazin and his book *Deutschland schafft sich ab*. Sarrazin is himself not a populist, but his book resonates with populist movements. He published his book in 2010 and in it, he discusses and researches

the failing institutions of immigration and multiculturalism and the negative role that Muslims were playing; in particular, the introduction of Muslims into Germany was “undermining German vitality, the German work ethic, and German ingenuity” (Ossewaarde 174). It was immediately received with both popular success and political shock (Meng 104). “The German public was now discussing, with alacrity, his arguments—cultural incommensurability, feeble multiculturalism, demographic anxieties, and failed integration. This topical shift had the effect of diminishing robust critique of Sarrazin’s racism... all the noise about integration quieted talk about racism” (105). According to Michael Meng, Sarrazin’s book highlighted the discussion of post-war Germany surrounding race, “Why do Germans, today committed to remembering their racist past in the public sphere, struggle to discern racism in their present society?” (106). I include Sarrazin in this project not because he is affiliated with the New Right, which he is not. He is a member of the SPD (*Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands*) and his book has not even made a ripple in the writings of the New Right. His inclusion here highlights three similarities with the New Right’s mentality surrounding race and multiculturalism: his appropriation of genetic racialization, how German racism is connected to the legacy of Nazism, as opposed to colonialism, and the denial of accusations of racism. In explaining the intelligence of Muslims and Germans, Sarrazin “grounds his argument in the reading of Charles Darwin, Francis Galton, Julian Huxley, Gunnar Myrdal” (Meng 110) and concludes:

Das Muster des generativen Verhaltens in Deutschland seit Mitte der sechziger Jahre ist nicht nur keine Darwinsche natürliche Zuchtwahl

im Sinne von 'survival of the fittest', sondern eine kulturell bedingte, vom Menschen selbst gesteuerte negative Selektion, die den einzigen nachwachsenden Rohstoff, den Deutschland hat, nämlich Intelligenz. (Sarrazin 353).

This sentiment resonates with the members of the New Right, especially in arguments against egalitarianism (see above, p.9). Krebs though, harkens to the eugenics movement in his statement: "never, in the domains of biology or cytology, or psychology or genetics, have the researchers shown the fundamental differences that distinguish races and cultures with so much evidence" (*Fighting for the Essence* 80). And while Krebs contextualizes this statement in the New Right's commitment to the preservation of difference of the world, it is difficult to separate his sentiment with Sarrazin's, which still distinguishes a difference, but places it in a hierarchy; namely, a German is smarter than a Muslim. Even appropriating the scientific discourse of genetics as an explanation for social inequalities is a newly invigorated racist discourse (Erel 365). The New Right does not make the explicit claim that a European is categorically better than other races, however, it is in avoiding these claims that the New Right falls prey to racism. To highlight this, Meng explains the position that Sarrazin was writing in, was essentially a German one: "as a symbol of postwar redemption, Germany's memory culture in its current form diminishes or perhaps even disavows the significance of racism; racism must be displaced—by marginalizing it on the fringes of society... or silencing it through talking about other topics" (107). Additionally, Erel claims that "articulations of racism in countries such as Italy and Germany, where fascism is seen as the point of reference for

contemporary racisms” (366). I argue that this is precisely what is happening with the New Right and Nazism. Just as racism is displaced, Nazism is displaced too. And since Nazism has had such a huge impact on racism in Germany, the New Right needs to neuter the meaning of the term in order to gain any intellectual traction. In a *Righton.net* article de Benoist claims that fascism is an obsolete category and a “catchall” term without any precise context (“the Sole ‘Anti-Fascist’ Thought 2015). And while de Benoist is not coming from a post-war German perspective, he is articulating a silence that strips meaning out of the term ‘fascist’, with the goal of removing the memory and history from the term.

Conclusion

The ENR does continue some legacies of fascism in their writings, just as they also divert from historical manifestations of fascism. In their definitions of multiculturalism, the authors of the ENR continue racialized thinking and practice exclusion of non-Europeans groups from European history or contemporary European society. It is difficult to disentangle racism from Nazism, so the New Right strips both concepts of power through silence and disavowal. In their treatment of political correctness, the ENR claims to have been victimized by silence and subsequently uses silence as a rebellious attitude toward the current German cultural discourse of shame and acceptance regarding National Socialism and the Holocaust. For paganism, the very religion itself is tainted by the legacy of fascism, both in its historical appropriation and in values that National Socialism and the ENR have extolled from the religion as superlative: courage, self-sufficiency, etc.

This has not escaped modern practicing pagans, some of whom are keenly aware of the correlation between the religion and the ideology and try to remain aloof. The ENR continues to contribute to the intellectual landscape of Europe, whether online or in hard print. But, as they continue to produce works, intellectuals need to keep them in focus, not necessarily because they constitute a physically violent threat to liberalism, but because they continue legacies of fascisms that seep into other discourses and undermine cultural conventions. It is only in struggling against their ideals, do the ideals of liberalism, democracy, equality, and multiculturalism become strengthened.

I want to leave this project with a final note that should be addressed in future research. It focuses on de Benoist and Camel Bechikh and their combined, rigid stance against immigration. In an article titled “Pro French Muslims in France?” (*Righton.net*) de Benoist praises the anti-immigration stance that *Fils de France* leader Bechikh adopts. Bechikh is a French born Muslim who, according to de Benoist, “proclaims ‘an eternal love for France’ with accents of patriotism that would be hard to find amongst many ‘French born’ citizens” (de Benoist, *Pro French Muslims in France? Righton.net*). De Benoist in this comment grants Bechikh and French Muslims acceptance into the European discourse against immigration, but does not address the role Islam plays in any further religious discourse for Europe nor does de Benoist address any potential connections that the Islamic monotheism could bear with the Judeo-Christian tradition. He only praises the work of Bechikh. So intriguingly, de Benoist—as well as the Krebs and Sunic—remains silent as to the emergence of Islam or the role it plays in Europe and thus it is hardly mentioned in

their published work. De Benoist is more open to comment on such topics as ISIS and Islamophobia (see Righton.net January 2015 “What to Replace ISIS with” and January 2016 “Islamophobes are the Useful Idiots of Radical Islam”), but he will not make any overt comment, disparaging or praiseworthy, about the religion of Islam and the potential role it plays in Europe. De Benoist states at one point that “[he feels himself] to be the heir of a European culture whose earliest roots predate monotheism” (*Pro French Muslims in France?* Righton.net), and this legacy to which de Benoist considers heir will not include Islam. So then why champion a non-European in the struggle against immigration, especially given the fact that many of the ENR’s authors—including de Benoist—contribute and perpetuate racialized ideas?

Many of the ENR’s views are steeped in historical figures and past experiences and because of this, I believe the ENR cannot accurately see the current landscape of Europe. De Benoist confirms the viewpoint of Bechikh, but does not comment on the contradictions that Bechikh represents for the ENR: a European of non-ethnic European descent who is practicing another non-historical European faith set against an intellectual group that has and does hold racialized ideas and constructs the hierarchy of racialization that El-Tayeb expressed. Here, Bechikh is given a voice against immigration by a prestigious member of the ENR, who defends his position, but de Benoist certainly does not acknowledge the contradiction that Bechikh presents, nor does de Benoist attempt to bridge the racialized gap in which the ENR operates. Perhaps then the New Right’s future lies not in the regurgitation of past authors and past ideals, but rather in the inclusion of new voices that will

lead to new complexities in Europe. This makes the study of the ENR even more importance as they continue to influence, scholars must strive to understand them too.

Bibliography

- Art, David. *The Politics of the Nazi Past in Germany and Austria*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- . "Rise of the Radical Right: Implications for European Politics." *Brown Journal of World Affairs*. 19.2 (2013): 127-137.
- Bar-On, Tamir. *Where Have All the Fascists Gone?* Hampshire, UK: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- Betz, Hans-Georg. *Radical Right-Wing Populism in Western Europe*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994.
- Chin, Rita, Heide Fehrenbach, Goeff Eley and Atina Grossmann: *After the Nazi Racial State: Difference and Democracy in Germany and Europe*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 2009.
- Chrysogelos, Angelos-Stylianos. "The Evolution of the 'Populist Potential' in European Politics: From New Right Radicalism to Anti-System Populism." *European View* 12 (2013): 75-83.
- De Benoist, Alain. *On Being Pagan*. Trans. Jon Graham. Atlanta: Ultra, 2004.
- . *Appendix II: Manifesto for a European Renaissance*. Sunic, Tomislav. *Against Democracy and Equality: The European New Right*. London: Arktos, 2011.
- . "Pro French Muslim Living in France?" *Righton.net* November 2015.
- . "The Sole 'Anti-Fascist' Thought" *Righton.net* September 2015.
- Griffin, Roger. *A Fascist Century*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.
- , ed. *Fascism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- . *The Nature of Fascism*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.
- Goodrick-Clark, Nicholas. *Black Sun: Aryan Cults, Esoteric Nazism and the Politics of Identity*. New York: New York University Press, 2003.
- Derrida Jacques and Jürgen Habermas "Unsere Erneuerung: Nach dem Krieg: Die Wiedergeburt Europas" *F.A.Z.* 31.05.2003: 33-42.

- El-Tayeb, Fatima. *European Others: Queering Ethnicity in Postnational Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2011.
- Erel, Umut. "Racism and Anti-Racism in Europe: a Critical Analysis of Concepts and Frameworks." *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research* 13(2007): 359-375.
- Evola, Julius. *Ride the Tiger: A Survival Manual for the Aristocrats of the Soul*. Trans. Joscelyn Godwin and Constance Fontana. Rochester: Inner Traditions, 2003.
- Hansen-Thomas, Holly. "Language Ideology, Citizenship, and Identity: The Case of Modern Germany." *Journal of Language and Politics* 6.2 (2007): 249-267.
- Housden, Martyn. "Lebensraum: Policy or Rhetoric?" *History Today* 51.11 (2001): 23-26.
- Hölscher, Lucien. *Political Correctness: Der sprachpolitische Streit um die nationalsozialistischen Verbrechen*. Hamburg: Wallstein Verlag, 2008.
- Krebs, Pierre. *Die Europäische Wiedergeburt: Aufruf zur Selbstbesinnung*. Tübingen: Thule-Forum Grabert-Verlag, 1982.
- . *Fighting for the Essence: Western Ethnocide or European Renaissance?* Trans. Alexander Jacob. London: Arktos, 2012.
- . *Mut zur Identität: Alternativen zum Prinzip der Gleichheit*. Struckum: Thule-Bibliothek, 1988.
- Koehne, Samuel. "Were the National Socialists a *Völkisch* Party? Paganism, Christianity, and the Nazi Christmas." *Central European History* 47 (2014): 760-790.
- McIntosh, Christopher. "The Pagan Revival and its Prospects." *Symposium / Futures* 36 (2004): 1037-1040.
- Meng, Michael. "Silences about Sarrazin's Racism in Contemporary Germany." *Journal of Modern History* 87.1 (2015): 102-135.
- Minkenbergh, Michael. "The Radical Right in Public Office: Agenda Setting and Policy Effects." *Western European Politics* 24.4 (2001): 1-21.
- Moeller van der Bruck, Arthur. *Das Dritte Reich*. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1931.
- Müller, Jan. *Another Country: German Intellectuals, Unification and National Identity*. New Haven: Yale University, 2000.

- . "From National Identity to National Interest: The Rise (and Fall) of Germany's New Right." *German Politics* 8.3 (1999): 1-20.
- Niven, William and James Jordan, eds. *Politics and Culture in Twentieth-Century Germany*. Rochester: Caden House, 2003.
- Ossewaarde, Marinus. "The National Identities of the 'Death of Multiculturalism' Discourse in Western Europe." *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 9.3 (2014): 173-189.
- Poewe, Karla. "Scientific Neo-paganism and the extreme right, then and today: From Ludendorff's *Götterkenntnis* to Sigrid Hunke's *Europes Eigene* religion." *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 14.3 (1999): 387-400.
- Piwoni, Eunike. "Claiming the Nation for the People: the Dynamics in Representation in German Public Discourse about Immigrant Integration." *Nations and Nationalism* 21.1 (2015): 83-101.
- Ritter, Henning. "What is Left and What is Right in Germany?" *Society* 34.2 (1997): 51-54.
- Rountree, Kathryn. "Neo-paganism, Native Faith, and indigenous religion: a case study of Malta within the European context." *Social Anthropology* 22.1 (2014): 81-100.
- Sarrazin, Thilo. *Deutschland schafft sich ab*. München: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2010.
- Sedgwick, Mark. *Against the Modern World: Traditionalism and the Secret Intellectual History of the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Steigmann-Gall, Richard. "Rethinking Nazism and Religion: How Anti-Christian were the 'Pagans?'" *Central European History* 36.1 (2003): 75-105.
- Silfen, Paul Harrison. *The Völkisch Ideology and the Roots of Nazism: The Early Writings of Arthur Moeller van den Bruck*. New York: Exposition Press, 1973.
- Sunic, Tomislav. *Against Democracy and Equality: The European New Right*. London: Arktos, 2011.
- . *Homo Americanus: Child of the Postmodern Age*. Self-Published, 2007.
- Woods, Roger. *Germany's New Right as Culture and Politics*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.