

THE
**REVOLUTIONARY
CONSERVATIVE**
review

Conservative, Nationalist, Unionist. Issue No.1, £2.00

...a journal of new thinking...

In this issue...

Everything you have ever wanted to know about **The Revolutionary Conservative Caucus**, its ideology, aims, and purpose, where it comes from and what it aims to do, together with analysis of Marxism, the Left, structuralism, the collapse of Communism, GRECE and the New Right, a rebuff to the New Left, a totalitarian onslaught of mind-numbing extremity against Political Correctness and such like blather. **Towards** the dawn of a totally British New Right sensibility from our leading writers and intellectuals. We answer your questions and introduce you to the concept of the counter-revolutionary New Right enlightenment - the post-Marxist, post-feminist, post-politically correct, post-Leftist, post-Majorite thinking for the 21st century.

Welcome to the first issue of The Revolutionary Conservative Review. This is the intellectual hand grenade of The Revolutionary Conservative Caucus. It is a publication of unmatched rigour, vitality and force - it is certainly not for the lightweight, the crude, the stupid, the morally-cretinous and otherwise moronic. It is a magazine which will not go down well in certain circles - it is not dedicated to the internal politics of rate revaluation, or the internal mechanics of the country's many Conservative associations - their concern with white elephant stalls and Anglican country fetes (the party is £20 million in debt after all) - pass it by. For this publication is too rigorous to be called academic and yet too detailed in its theoretical comment to merely pass muster as just another drivellish tabloid, street-sold by large young men of mediaeval appearance. This is a magazine which is more forceful than The Times Literary Supplement, too dexterous and civilised ever to appear in Pseud's Corner, too extreme to be anything more than raw meat for effeminate liberal sensibility, and too nakedly "Fascistic" to be easily bracketed with The Salisbury Review. We intend this publication to be sinuous and direct in its approach, daring in its abstraction, purposeful in its dissemination of ideology. For this is a journal which you are in no danger of encountering as you rifle the magazine rack in your local W.H. Smith - it would be like finding Thus Spake Zarathustra amidst a pile of unsold Mother and Baby magazines. But seriously this is an attempt to produce our Nouvelle Ecole, our Elements, our International Situationist, our Arguments, or Socialism or Barbarism (the journal of the Cardan anti-Bolshevik French Left.) This is our attempt to influence intellectual life, to engage in struggle at the level of raw and pure ideological abstraction. If any man says "hold, it goes too far, it's giving me a headache" we say, pile on the agony!

What is The Revolutionary Conservative Caucus?

The Caucus has been established by Right-wing activists within the Conservative Party in order to disseminate information, ideology and intellectual opinion within and beyond the party. We are well aware that this sort of thing has never been done before, particularly within the Conservative and Unionist Party, where there has been a complete dearth of intellectual and ideological activity. Indeed it would be true to say that the only intellectual creativity on the Right-wing of British political life has taken place in a ghetto beyond the Conservative Party where it is bedevilled with fringiness, faddishness and electoral irrelevancy. Nor are we unaware of continental precedents in relation to our vision of how things should proceed in this country, although we do not feel at all beholden to foreign examples. For instance, no-one taking a long hard look at what we are trying to achieve would discount the example of GRECE and the French New Right under Alain de Benoist. Whilst respecting M. de Benoist and what he has achieved we believe that a totally different approach is necessary in what might be described as an Anglo-American milieu. For example, it is highly unlikely that a group of intellectuals - with or without leather jackets - coming together in various hotel rooms and holding press conferences with fringe journalists would get anywhere in our culture, particularly when the organisation they represented was called the Group to Research into the Origins of Indo-European Culture and Civilisation (the anglicised version of the acronym GRECE). Such things will not work in our culture in our view, for in France the precedent of small groups of intellectual ideologues, intellectual "terrorists", and metapolitical extremists influencing things out of all proportion to their size and

ultimate importance is a fact of French political life and development. After all, in the mid to late-18th century a group of liberal ideologues and metaphysicians, anti-metaphysicians, and taxonomists of the word - the Encyclopaedists - came together in the form of the Enlightenment to provide the intellectual backdrop to the French Revolution. This set the scene for what has come to be known as the Gramscian view of history and ideological determination whereby the intellectual currents within a society circulate around its structures and influence them at one remove. Such a notion believes that there is an intellectual superstructure to even quite rudimentary political and economic practice, for example, in a recent speech at the Carlton Club our less than esteemed Premier John Major compared his vision of the future Britain to the pricing policy in suburban bakeries. Now where does this idea come from? It is essentially the bargain basement expression of a liberal humanist and capitalist viewpoint which sees society as asocial, unorganic, and non-voluntaristic. It is a purely libertarian conception of society which originates in the Scottish Enlightenment, achieves its zenith at the time of the Manchester School, the intellectual think-tank behind Victorian classical liberalism, and has re-emerged in the 20th century through anti-Keynsian economic ideologues associated with the re-working of the classical conception of money and its uses, namely the Austrian school of economics and Milton Friedman at the Chicago Business School. So we see that behind a tendentious and possibly cretinous remark by Major, a piece of tabloid throwaway dialogue, there is actually a superstructure of intellectual ideas about the nature of Homo Economicus (Economic Man) and the inter-relationship of market, individual, and state which has a long and advanced theoretical pedigree. In other words, behind the simplest and crassest statement of contemporary politicians there lie some

pretty rigorous intellectual notions, in this case attributed to figures such as Ludwig von Mises, Friedrich von Hayek, Milton Friedman, in an extremist "fictional" guise, Ayn Rand, and other neo-classical liberal intellectuals, all of whom Major has never read. It is quite likely that his speech writers have never read them either, for these ideas have been communicated to them through intermediaries, institutes and various foundations which existed to disseminate radical versions of old liberal thought in the West during the period of Keynsian hegemony. There was a time after all when anyone reading Hayek's *Constitution of Liberty* in your average economics department at university level would have been criticised for being an intellectual dinosaur, a buffoon, a Right-wing extremist, even a "Fascist", somewhat bizarrely. For the truth of the matter is that liberalism (so-called) is extremely hostile and authoritarian towards all other systems of belief, including older forms of its own belief system, such as the classical liberalism which Hayek represents. In fact in relation to the charge of being "extreme-Right", which was often levelled against people like Hayek during the heyday of New Liberalism, the Austrian School was opposed to social corporatism, a mildly social democratic market, welfarism, (Keynes and Beveridge: its intellectual godfathers), and much else of the post-war consensus because it was "fascistic" in their terms. They see the connection - quite rightly - between radical Keynsian capitalist reform in a deflated market and Lloyd George's New Deal of 1936, a programme which was based on Sir Oswald Mosley's and John Strachey's *Revolution through Reason* in 1929.

So we can see from the above that very simplistic statements made by politicians can have behind them enormous superstructures of intellectual thought and sensibility, which are communicated into

the mass-society by intellectual middle men - in the case of neo-classical liberalism - the Adam Smith Institute, Aims of Industry, the Institute for Economic Affairs (in a slightly more leftish version of this ideology), the Social Market Foundation, and the radical proselytising of the two wings of the Libertarian Alliance. Perhaps the creation of the form of simplistic political ideology and governmental practice which was widely called Thatcherism is a perfect example of quite rarefied intellectual ideas, existing in a purely conceptual space to one side of politics, suddenly leaping to centre stage and almost animating the very policy of the state itself. In some ways this is a sort of intellectual fantasy, whereby the veritable scribbler of theory in his garret can suddenly see his ideas transformed into the structures and policies of states.

All of this relates most keenly to what Alain de Benoist has attempted to do with the French/European New Right since it was inaugurated in 1968. Indeed it is of supreme importance that this coming together of forces happened in 1968 - the year the French New Left ran amok, creating chaos and civil disorder in France, the "May events" of that year - all of which led to the collapse of the civic authority of France's elected dictator General de Gaulle. There is also another point to make here and this is that many of the 68-ers are now to be found, at least in part, in the ranks of the *Nouvelle Droite*. If we were to reflect on them a little bit further the events of May 1968 are another perfect example of small-scale ideologues having a social impact way beyond their numbers or any great resources, such as money and access to direct political power, which they are able to lay their hands on. Looked at critically, the May events were primarily the work of a small group of intellectual terrorists and Left-wing nihilists called the Situationist International - something which has been

widely recognised on the Left, hence the French Communist Party's repudiation of "the events" in their early stages, primarily because they did not control them. Who were the Situationists? The answer is that they were a small sectarian shard, a fragment of late Left Surrealism, a radical cultural movement of the modernist avant-garde whose intellectual master of ceremonies Andre Breton had linked with the Communist Party. By the early 1950s surrealism - in actuality the French version of German Expressionism, Italian Futurism, and British Vorticism - had quite clearly run out of steam. A Left nihilist faction influenced by the Romanian theorist Isou and known as Lettrism broke from failing surrealism together with tiny little fragments of late-surrealist extremists, such as the Movement for an Imaginist Bauhaus, to form the Situationist International. To put it briefly this group believed in a re-Hegelianised and somewhat dessicated neo-Marxism, an anarchist type of politics and a deliriously aesthetic vision of society, never mind social rebellion - particularly when you realise that these people hated the notion of art. (Hence the graffiti put up on walls during May 1968 by the occupation committees at the Sorbonne: *seize the day, abandon the spectacle of capitalist consumption, reconstitute the work of art as a form of proletarian play, oppose the bureaucratic socialism of the east and the bureaucratic capitalism of the west, art is a gun in the hands of the bourgeoisie, and overthrow reality to achieve personal liberty at the moment of its realisation*). - All of this is reminiscent of a couple of under-educated/over-educated intellectual *lumpen* at a provincial British poly (we refuse to call them universities), or "art college" who has taken a bit too much amphetamine sulphate (speed) and read a bit of Hegel. Now we appreciate that to many British Conservative readers, if indeed there are any British Conservative readers, this is frightfully obscure stuff - a

world away from John Major's bakery - and yet these two intellectuals, because we are ultimately only talking about two people, Guy de Bord and Raoul Vaneigem, totally changed the face of modern France, at least to a certain extent. At the high point of the events for which they were responsible, a million people were demonstrating in the centre of Paris, the CRS (the Central Riot Squad) had to retreat and told its political masters that it could not control the streets and de Gaulle left Paris to obtain the endorsement of senior Generals in the French Army Corps over whether they were prepared to stand by the existence of the French state. Now no-one is pretending that a magazine, *Internationale Situationiste*, and two theoretical books, *The Society of the Spectacle* by de Bord and *The Revolution in Everyday Life* by Vaneigem, caused these events. What did happen though is that these individuals on their own initiative put into circulation an ideology which was Leftist, really middle-class or bourgeois (despite the extreme proletarian rhetoric), non-Stalinist, anti-Soviet bloc, and yet also totally anti-western. In relation to the supermarket soap powder version of intellectual ideas, they had come up with a brand - a lumpen bourgeois form of student agitation as a radical brand of Daz or Omo - which was bound to go down well among would-be alienated middle-class students during the 1960s, who ultimately wanted a Left-liberal consumerist society which was not socially conservative, as France had undoubtedly been during the 1950s. All of which was completely contrary to what the Situationist thinkers wanted to achieve, as de Bord was honest enough to recognise in the 1970s, when his organisation was wound up in 1972, and he declared that the events of 1968 were just another form of consumption - people go to the supermarket, people have a war, people get into a bit of anti-semitism (Vichy), people go on a bit of a riot for a few days

to throw over everybody's papa, General de Gaulle. So in de Bord's ultimately cynical estimate, even rioting against the system with a background of intellectual ideology disseminated through a truly miniscule group, is inevitably part of what it rebels against - witness the futility of the prospect of continuous rebellion as outlined in Albert Camus' work *The Rebel*.

None of which alters the fact that an intellectual system of ideas, a mini-zeitgeist, was put into circulation on the French Left by some people who knew what they were doing, although to be frank they could not have expected to have seen the events which did occur. But the important point is that they put ideas out into a society, or a particular sub-section of that society, namely the Left, which was ready to receive them. These then filtered down through re-duplication in students' magazines and fanzines - underground magazines such as *The Poverty of Student Life* (tens of thousands of which were printed up illegally using the finances of the student union at Strasbourg University.) They then found their level in the society and when alienated students, hot on drugs, with their genitals hanging outside their trousers, and in a mad stew with just about everything - the general culture, their parents, their professors etc - needed a system of belief to back up the fact that they really wanted to have a punch-up in the library, they turned to these people to furnish them with ideas. In a sense intellectuals of some sophistication - people who had certainly read Marx's *On the German Ideology* and Hegel's *Phenomenology of Mind* - provided them with the notions that they needed in order to carry out the type of politics they knew that their parents would despise (what it was really all about). But the important thing is that these thinkers were alternative, they were the non-establishment Left, they had nothing

to do with the official Left and indeed went out of their way to upset and ostracise established forms of Leftist opinion, whether traditional communist (a very important force in the French context), Trotskyist, Maoist - an important tendency of opinion in France - and anarchist. So they could appear to be new, refreshing, not old hat, anti-establishment in a Leftist, never mind a Rightist, manner. The interesting thing is that apart from what we might call archival interest in the thinking of the Left and their effect upon the ideological element in punk rock as a phenomenon, no-one reads these people any more. Yet they are a perfect example of forming a tendency of opinion, a fully worked-out structure of ideas - both in terms of its origins, its internal consistency, and its effects - and leaving these ideas in the society in book, magazine, and other formats (for instance, de Bord made several films, one of them merely a soundtrack, because many of them were films without images, on the Marquis de Sade - a heroic figure in both situationist and surrealist culture). They then left these cultural artefacts to have an impact upon the society - rather in the manner of a computer virus, to use a modern image, which is created and left in electronic networks to wreak havoc and form new structures, chaotic trace elements in the electronically-simulated mind - something that fits in very well with the destructive urges of the contemporary Left in relation to a society they wish to completely destroy and replace.

So we have two complete examples of ideological tendencies manifesting themselves beyond the realm of theory and into the world of current political practice, insofar as recent events in the 1960s can be considered to be current. Now as always happens the Right partly reacts to the Left, basically due to the fact that the Right is reactive in the sense that it supports what exists - it inevitably

responds politically to the schemata of those who wish to rip down existing structures. Therefore it was no accident that the events of May 1968 sent a great shock throughout the entire French Right, on the political front many of the formations which had been fanatically divided over the issue of Algeria - a synonym for Ulster in the British context perhaps - the Gaullist Right, its paramilitary wing the Civic Action Service, the Secret Army Organisation (the OAS), and much of the extreme Old Right all came together again. They agreed to bury their differences over the past in relation to the common and tangible threat which existed on the extreme Left. (Indeed the future Socialist President Francois Mitterand was appalled to find ex-OAS *terroristes* guarding a relatively centrist conservative like Giscard d'Estaing when he met the latter for a televised political debate). On the ideological and intellectual front however, a whole new start was initiated by Alain de Benoist and various intellectual figures of the Old Right (as they came to call it), whether these old right tendencies of opinion looked back to Maurras, or were integralist Catholic, ultra-reactionary or conservative, neo-fascist or neo-national socialist in the French context.

So a wide range of opinion came together to form a wholly new departure for the modern European Right - albeit in an admittedly French context - and one thing which became very noticeable about this new tendency was how many of the ideas of the people who came together to form it changed absolutely over time. Now in relation to answering the question which was posed at the top of this article, namely what is the Revolutionary Conservative Caucus, the actual ideas of GRECE - which we will come on to discuss in the later stages of this magazine - are less important than what it set out to achieve. It set out - as we do - to totally transform

the nature of intellectual debate on the Right in Europe in comparison to its previous parlous, and to a certain extent, cretinous state. The model will be in many respects GRECE, but the ideas will not necessarily be the same as that of the European New Right. In the first instance the Caucus is really a metapolitical organisation, a focal point for the dissemination of ideology, a tool or vehicle for ideological struggle in an anti-Marxist sense, an organisation which is essentially a lightning conductor for the mass-media - hence its name - and it will serve to draw media attention in a much more self-consciously philistine and non-intellectual society like Britain (at the very least a culture in which the abstract ideas of various thinkers are not accorded enormous significance as has been the case in France). If you like, the Revolutionary Conservative Caucus is an initiative in struggle, a colophon or trademark for the dissemination of the ideology known as Revolutionary Conservatism. An ideology which understands that the type of conservatism it wishes to promote is non-liberal in form. This relatively anodyne statement entails a directly revolutionary conclusion in comparison to the intellectual discourse of Professor Roger Scruton and *The Salisbury Review* for instance. None of these individuals wish to admit that if they are to be honest about a form of intellectual Right-wing belief then they cannot repudiate the intellectual tradition of Fascism - of the extreme Right (so-called) - although they can repudiate certain elements of Fascist political practice if they choose, in the way that Marxist intellectuals often repudiate the practice of Communism whilst endorsing the postulates of *Anti-Durhing*.

How does the vision of The Revolutionary Conservative fit into the scenario of the post-war Right in this country?

The RCC itself, certainly in relation to most of its leading members, comes out of the internal politics of the Federation of Conservative Students (FCS). The latter was a somewhat notorious organisation which was shut down by Norman Tebbit (no less) after the extreme radicalism of the early to mid-80s. The two conferences at Sheffield (1981) and Loughborough (1984) brought to a head the profound differences in the whole Conservative youth movement - the difference between "party men" and those such as the mainly Libertarian faction who had their own revolutionary agenda. The debate in and around the so-called "sound" faction which dominated FCS throughout this period is very interesting because it brings to the surface the reality that there are two Rights within the Conservative Party. In many ways it could be said that the Party has a coherent Left, as witnessed by the Tory Reform Group (TRG), the European Movement, and in many respects the leadership of the Young Conservatives within the Party nationally, together with the Lollards on the parliamentary benches. Whereas the Centre of the Party is very mushy indeed and hardly seems to exist, it certainly has no recognised pressure group other than the Bow Group which has often contained within it ideologues from both the Party's Left and Right. In a sense this is fitting, for rather like Fianna Fail in the Republic of Ireland, the centre of the British Conservative Party is proud to be pragmatic and non-ideological. It can swing between radically different positions, such as the post-war consensus on welfare, neo-Keynsian economic management, the politics of the Heath-Barber boom, and the totally contrary policies of radical free-market semi-libertarianism which was practised during the Thatcher period. As at the moment, various centrist Tory MPs can hold, usually at the behest of the whips, totally divergent positions throughout their political careers - for and against

Rhodesia, Ulster Unionists and yet so moderately so, in favour of a prices and incomes policy and then the reverse, opposed to EC membership and now an eager supporter of Maastricht etc. In all of these things socio-centrist Tory backbenchers can twist and turn about incoherently and without prior thought, but they can always justify it to themselves and their constituents afterwards because they are just apolitical servants of both party and state. The Right of the party on the other hand has always had two wings, although this did not become obvious until the late 1960s and the influence of Enoch Powell. In a sense, Powell was the ideological precursor for much of the Thatcher period, both in relation to substantial areas of policy and the political rhetoric used. From his very earliest speeches Powell carved out his own niche in British Conservative thought, in many ways an integralist and an isolationist - a man who rejected the doctrine of East of Suez, the fading Empire, and far-flung British resources overseas - and who left the Suez Group of Right-wing backbench Tory MPs as a consequence. (All of which must have meant that Powell had a decidedly diffident attitude towards the Suez operation and the war against Nasserite Egypt which it involved). Powell then proceeded to tie two doctrines together: on the one hand there was economic liberalism of a relatively extreme and free-market character, in direct contravention to Keynesian demand management and the social democratic/liberal/moderate Conservative consensus which underpinned the 50s and 60s economic booms until the advent of stagflation (inflation and unemployment tied together) in the 1970s. The other pole of Powell's thought was nationalist in tone, fitting in with the essentially isolationist posture in relation to foreign affairs, and involved racialism and outright opposition to New Commonwealth immigration - the most controversial

element of his entire political career. These ideas had such an effect upon the Conservative Party that they effectively broke the bi-partisan arrangement on immigration and race as brokered by liberal Conservatives like Norman St. John Stevas and Lord Thorneycroft. Yet apart from rhetoric and the emotional identification which many Tories had with Powell's ideas, the nationalist element in his thinking was not to be carried over into the Thatcherite period, as is seen in the Lancaster House agreement on Rhodesia, the Anglo-Irish Agreement, the Single European Act, and the decision to allow a measure of Hong Kong immigration as part of a deal with the Communists in Beijing. The Thatcher period underscored a radical liberal desire to defeat entrenched union power, to increase the virility of the middle classes generally and to open up the British economy, *in extenso* the world economy, in relation to the billions of dollars of oil wealth which had come on stream throughout the preceding decade. Indeed the real reason for the restructuring of the capitalist West during the Reagan-Thatcher years was the need to utilise this enormous amount of international capital, at a time when the post-war consensus had clearly broken down in mainstream politics.

The Federation of Conservative Students represented these divisions in a very transparent and obvious way, in the manner of all youth groups which are always more radical than the parent party. The "sound" faction which ran FCS after a political *coup d'état* against the Wets (the Tory student Left), who had controlled the organisation for many decades, had to rely on the support of the hard-Right, most particularly activists around the Young Monday Club and hard-Right associations like Essex University FCS. The Libertarian "sound" faction were themselves ideologically confused and should not altogether be

taken too seriously in matters of political ideology or intellectual rigour. What can you say about a political grouping which advocates the privatisation of the Trident missile system on the one hand, and yet on the other, most particularly in the bar afterwards, is given to lusty renditions of The Sash my Father Wore and other well-known Orange anthems? For in truth many of the so-called libertarians, unlike genuine ideologues such as Tame, Micklethwaite, and Lestor, were there essentially for a good time and were primarily concerned to have an ideology they could use against the Left which could not be construed as "fascistic". Indeed the whole point of FCS politics could be summed up in the phrase "so far and yet no further". It was an attempt to fuse radical neo-liberalism with the flag, in a manner which the Left would find infuriating and that enabled them to criticise many post-war sacred cows, such as the National Health Service, but it did not involve the truly hard-core questions of immigration, multiculturalism, and race - things which were taken to be the preserve of the National Front. Indeed the nationalist element in FCS politics was largely sublimated into foreign national disputes between Left and Right in the Third World - the fulcrum of the Cold War. So you had a large number of activists who were very gung-ho indeed about the Angolan Civil War between the Marxist-Leninist MPLA and Savimbi's UNITA movement, the war between the Nicaraguan Contras and the Sandinistas, and other disputes such as the civil war in Mozambique involving RENAMO, the Kampuchean civil war (which paradoxically featured the genocidally-Maoist Khmer Rouge fighting along "pro-western" lines against the Vietnamese satellite Government), and so on. British nationalism was channelled into a vicarious appreciation of the Loyalist struggle in Ulster and the semantics of anti-federal/anti-EEC activity. What was

actually missing from the scenario was a genuinely nationalistic political position which could be associated with the radical Tory Right. So you had a split between the synthetic nationalism of the libertarian "sound" faction and some of their hard-Right backers, even in the area of foreign policy - where many of these debates were carried out at one remove - you had organisational division. For instance, the International Freedom Foundation represented an internationalist, pro-western, "American", pro-capitalist, pro-establishment white South African, and ultimately a multiracialist and liberal view of the world. Whereas the Western Goals Institute, for instance, founded as an antidote to the IFF mentality and originally a split from the Young Monday Club, was a pan-cultural, more Right-wing and nationalistic strand of opinion which was by no means anti-capitalist but distrusted the political bias of elements of international capital (certainly on the South African issue) and was altogether more nationalistic in tone. Indeed the organisation became notorious with the liberal media for inviting various foreign nationalist leaders such as Dr. Treurnicht of the South African Conservative Party, Roberto d'Aubisson of the El Salvadorean ARENA movement (initially the para-military FAN or Broad National Front), and most climactically the highly-successful London meeting, rally and dinner with Jean Marie Le Pen - ex-paratrooper, Deputy for the Military Centre, French Algerian patriot and hero, who lost an eye as a student fighting with Communists in Montmartre - and is now leader of the French Front National. This increasing spirit of nationalism led to a certain proximity between elements of the radical and Young Tory Right and the nationalist wing of ex-curricular Right-wing politics beyond the Conservative Party. Such a development led several of the leading figures in this tendency of youthful Tory nationalism to

join the British National Party, a decision which was later repudiated by some of their number. This was not an unimportant development because it brought a tradition of Tory authoritarianism - albeit in youthful guise - and the tradition of the "fascistic" Old Right beyond the Conservative Party into some sort of meaningful engagement.

The Revolutionary Conservative Caucus believes that the creation of a New Right, at least in an ideological, cultural, intellectual, and metapolitical manner, has to involve an analysis of the nationalist Old Right which has never succeeded in Britain, but which came to power, in one form or another, in Spain, Portugal, Italy, Germany, and through partly imperialistic German conquest elsewhere in Europe, France, Belgium, Poland, the Ukraine and other occupied states. Like Communism on the other side however, the movements of classical Fascism, as described above, have to be differentiated - at least in part - from the intellectual systems of the radical Right which influenced them, from which they took their ideas, and yet which they partly repudiated in their political practice. We are speaking in particular of the main French intellectual and cultural circle of the Old Right, the Action Francais led by Charles Maurras, and the writers and intellectuals of its slightly different German equivalent, the Conservative Revolution - many of whose individual figures such as Oswald Spengler and Ernst Junger were to be ignored or repudiated by the National Socialist regime. Indeed some of them had their books banned or at least allowed to fall into desuetude (Spengler), went into internal exile in relation to the regime (Junger), or shot themselves when the June club collapsed and Adolf Hitler gained ascendancy over the entire German radical Right (as is the case with Moeller van den Bruck). A certain symmetry could also be said to exist on the Left, where a large number of Marxist intellectuals were

forced into proto-Stalinist positions and justifications of the Left-wing dictator's intellectually cretinous *Problems of Leninism*, as is the case with George Luckas and his enforced sojourn in Moscow while Hungary was occupied by the Germans.

Returning to the British Right however, we can say that its intellectual development has been relatively poor. Despite the existence of a nascent "Rightist" intelligentsia in the form of the great early modernists - T.S. Eliot, Ezra Pound, Wyndham Lewis, T.E. Hulme etc - this was never effectively built on and apart from Mosley's system of thought, as contained in works such as *Revolution through Reason* (with the dissident Marxist John Strachey), *The Greater Britain, My Answer, The Alternative, and Europe: Faith and Plan*, little creative intellectual endeavour has occurred on the British Right. We shall return to analyse the full nature of Sir Oswald Mosley's thought at a later date in *The Revolutionary Conservative Review*, but suffice it to say that his European national idealism after the war - a form of unadulterated neo-Fascist Europeanism - alienated what might be described as the British Nationalist Right. The doctrine of Union Movement, as encapsulated in the Venice Declaration of 1961, with its radical commitment to a European federal state - at least in some form - and the ideology of the European New Order, albeit in partially democratic guise, of the later National Socialist regime and in particular the Waffen SS, was bound to alienate a British audience. The irony is however that the British far-Right of the post-war era turned to the most discredited pre-war wing of radical Right opinion, namely that of the Leesite strand of British National Socialism. This meant that the plethora of radical Right organisations post-war, which existed outside the Mosleyite orbit (always

straightforwardly radical neo-Fascist rather than neo-Nazi) turned for ideological inspiration to the sub-intellectual ghetto of Arnold Leese and metaphysical conspiracy theory, as adumbrated in the back catalogue of the Britons Publishing House. It was not until the internal National Front disputes of the mid-1970s that any intellectual creativity emerged in Right-wing thinking in Britain. This had to do with the desire on behalf of one faction - later the National Party - in this dispute to differentiate themselves from the ideological pedigree of some of the Front's leading figures, who had certainly been fashioned in the Leese mould. All of this resulted in a number of younger activists seeking a critique of straightforward National Socialist positions from within the intellectual tradition of the radical Right. The critique that was chosen, in an exact simulacrum of the Trotskyite critique of Stalin on the Left, was Strasser's Left-wing attack on Hitlerism from within classical Fascism. This led to a process of intellectual debate and re-alignment whereby the influence of Strasser - who criticised classical Fascism and National Socialism from the Left - and Evola - who criticised classical Fascism and National Socialism from the Right - (both within the range of opinion associated with the post-war radical Right) became current. In many ways this ideology went to the head of certain of the individuals involved and led to multiple political splits and the collapse of various organisations. Nevertheless it was a period of intellectual creativity, epitomised most effectively by the magazine *Nationalism Today*, and it resulted in the gradual dissemination, partly through the magazines *National Democrat* (later *Scorpion*), and then *Perspectives*, of the ideas of de Benoist and the New Right, which first reached a British audience in this way. (It is important to point out that the doctrine of Revolutionary Conservatism adumbrated in this Review and in the quarterly journal

The Revolutionary Conservative - albeit in a slightly more populist form - is not beholden to any of the aforementioned strands of opinion. It takes note of them and wishes to debate with them, but it is a fully worked out scheme of opinion which is British in orientation, does not rely on foreign models, and pre-dates, in the thinking of the individuals behind it, the influences of de Benoist, GRECE, Evola, and Strasser. Much of which will become clear in a major new book by one of the senior members of the Caucus called *Right*).

In what ways are your ideas influenced by GRECE and the French New Right and in which areas do you disagree with their analysis?

First of all the Caucus believes it is necessary to thank Alain de Benoist for what he has done in relation to improving the quality of Right-wing thought. Irrespective of disagreements which we have with elements of GRECE policy, de Benoist's overall contribution cannot be too highly praised. What he has essentially done is to make Right-wing ideas respectable again, at least intellectually respectable again in a French context. He has tried to recreate the spirit if not the ideology of Maurras' *Action Francaise*. When we remember that the journal of the same name had an enormous circulation in France between the wars - nor was its cultural impact restricted to the Right - Marcelle Proust, a homosexual French Jew, used to purchase *Action Francaise* every time it appeared. Yet de Benoist has made important changes to the perspectives of the New Right as against the Old.

He has partly overturned the Catholic basis of French integralism by embracing Germanic/Nietzschean thought and

paganism, a sideline which has led to the repudiation in every way, even metaphorically, of the notion of conspiracy theory. To our mind the most significant thing de Benoist has done is repudiate the notion of metaphysical conspiracy.

Anyone who has ever been active on the British Right, either within or beyond the Conservative Party, knows that there is a sub-text of "conspiracy" to the thinking of various individuals, sects and groups associated with this range of opinion. The notion of conspiracy, although present on the Left, has always drawn on a greater currency on this wing of political life. The most famous conspiracy - the one most commonly attributed to Hitler - involves the fiduciary conspiracy of Jewish bankers who control money and credit in bourgeois capitalist societies - all of which is associated with nods and winks in certain ultra-Right circles - primarily Chestertonian ultra-Toryism (the League of Empire Loyalists) and the Leesite strand of opinion which runs through non-Mosleyite far-Right opinion, as represented by organisations from the National Labour Party to the British National Party. What de Benoist has effectively done is to knock this notion on the head once and for all! It is essentially a fiction; a sort of sub-poetic image, an intellectually second-rate way of apprehending reality whose origins are to be found in High Catholic integralism and various occult ideas which the Nazis took from the Thule Society, a sect pre-dating their own party. Such ideas are essentially magical notions of reality, they obey what we might call an aesthetic understanding of observable social phenomena - in the manner of the old artistic image which says that you can trace one pattern from amongst many others in a carpet. This is the idea that - reductively speaking - everything in relation to social life can be reduced to one primary cause, something which exists behind reality and upon which

all civic ills can be blamed. It is a form of "divine"/"undivine" logic which is not at all logical, a type of irrationalism *tout court*. In a sense it is a neo-platonic conception where everything can be said to approximate to the nature of itself - behind post-Enlightenment liberalism one can allegedly discern the money power and behind this grinning children's mask is the figure of the the skulking Jewish financier! When in actual fact what this element of the far-Right did was to conflate social processes of a highly-complicated and nuanced form with an ethnic scapegoat upon whom they could be blamed. For it is relatively difficult for neo-religious movements to have a non-specific demon, a Satan of their own imagination (the Left has always had this problem in relation to its opposition to what it calls the bourgeoisie or the bourgeois - a designation which ultimately lost all specific meaning.) Did it mean the capitalist class, the non-bourgeois ruling class, the general middle class, elements of middle class life which Leftists have always disapproved of, in the manner of Samuel Butler's *The Way of All Flesh*? What did it actually mean? For in Stalinist Russia so-called rich peasants, or *kulaks*, were designated as bourgeois and subjected to massacre in a similar manner to Hitler's desire to exterminate Central and East European Jewry.

Indeed both extreme Left and Right largely committed these atrocities because they wished to rid the world of a demon of their own manufacture - in the one case ethnic, and in the other, social. Both sought to extirpate the demons which lurked within their own systems of thought, systems of belief which contrary to the so-called scientific nature of Marxism were theological in form. These conceptions of bourgeois and Jew are essentially hate words without meaning, they are designations for liberalism and the modern world which is not prepared to

own up to the fact that the modern world is what is actually being opposed. For both of these categories are mistaken, the one a class that could be held responsible for the capitalist/liberal/protestant nexus, and the other the cosmopolitan non-nationally specific group which could be blamed for the consequences of the Enlightenment, even when its own theology was counter-Enlightenment in form. Yet it is much more difficult to be opposed to the process of modern life, or at least some of its most salient features. It is much easier to stick to the old demons, yet de Benoist has had the courage to dispense with these notions and like the New Left has declared that he is opposed to the doctrines of the liberal Enlightenment, not a particular grouping - in some ways no more responsible for them than any other - upon which they could be blamed.

The Revolutionary Conservative Caucus agrees with de Benoist, GRECE and the New Right generally in being opposed to notions of Jewish - Masonic - Trilateralist - Council for Foreign Relations - Bilderbergers - Illuminati etc etc...notions of conspiracy. Put very simply, we believe that the world consists of social structures which are created out of history, genetics, and biology. These self-same institutions are governed by ideological ideas which different groups compete with one another in order to control. In short we believe that conspiracy theory, for which there is no factual evidence except inter-textual exegesis (everyone quoting everyone else's conspiracy), has been developed by the Right in order to discredit itself!

What are The Revolutionary Conservative Caucus' views on European integration?

The Caucus believes very strongly in the idea of "European Man", as well as in the notion of British national identity. As a

composite of European cultures, Britain is most definitely a European country. Our society has been formed out of Celtic, Roman, Saxon and Norman influences to create an entirely British identity, existing within the similitude of European civilisation. We disagree with those on the Right who think of all Europeans as aliens and foreigners, yet we disagree with those who believe that Europeans are all identical and that nationality does not matter. With this in mind, we favour the creation of a "European Union" - but of sovereign, independent nation-states. Our view of European union is thus completely different to the concept of integration as put forward in the Treaty of Maastricht, to which we are - as patriots - radically opposed.

Undoubtedly the most important question facing Europeans, whether in the "heart of Europe" or on the continent's Atlantic fringe, is the preservation of Europe as a distinctive cultural area. It is therefore imperative for us all to come together in defence of our ancestral heritage, for it is the existence of European-ness that gave the world Florence, Siena, and Rome. We must develop common initiatives to limit immigration from non-European countries if we are to maintain the continuum of European history and development: we must preserve the established cultural atmosphere of Europe. These considerations scarcely come into the deliberations of so-called pro-Europeans. The EC of Jacques Delors and John Major has little to do with with the Europe of Verlaine, Eichendorff, Nielsen, Mahler, Rembrandt or Botticelli. The Delors Europe concentrates instead on the promotion of Euro-Disney, the promotion of bureaucracy, and worst of all, multiracialism. A Euro-establishment that sponsors graffiti exhibitions and encourages Third World immigration is hardly pro-European.

But as far as the issue of European political development is concerned, we favour a complete halt to the integration process of which Maastricht is just a part. The process would then be re-directed in order to ensure that European institutions, such as the increasingly powerful Commission in Brussels, became directly accountable to the parliaments of the states. In short we stand for strong, yet flexible structures across Europe that are subordinate to the member nations and their peoples. Our aim is to create a new kind of Community - an imperium of nationalist countries, proud of their own identities and proud of their European identity too. As a Conservative group on the Right of the party, the Caucus backs the general view of anti-federalists such as Lord Tebbit, but the all-important difference is that we want Europe to be rather more than a free-trade area. We seek not the voluntary exchange of goods and services, but the re-birth of the national spirit within a renaissance of the European soul.

What is the Caucus' view of the "Rushdie incident" and the fatwa which has been pronounced upon him by the late Ayatollah Khomeini and the Revolutionary Islamic Republic of Iran?

In our view the death sentence which has been passed on Rushdie is a genuinely interesting example of the clash of cultures, as well as divisions within a recognised culture. Perhaps the most important thing to say is that this is a dispute *which does not involve us directly*. In that Islam is antithetical to our understanding of European culture and identity, there can be no such thing as an Islamic form of European civilisation, even though the crescent has often planted its banner on European soil. Yet all of these occasions were purely historical and

involved invasion and depredation, as evidenced in Spain by North African conquest and in Eastern Europe by the onward march of the Ottoman Empire. All of this was due to conquest, war, battle and strife between a Christian West and the nature of Islam - both Arab imperialism into Spain and Ottoman Empire-building in the Balkans were to be defeated by armed might. So the relationship between the Occident and Islam has always been martial and oppositional. So it remains today. For the truth is that Islam is a great religious civilisation for a non-European people, for primarily the Arabs - a demi-caucasoid population group who are in many ways a sister people of the Europeans but who are not Europeans themselves. The modern Right within the West has a split sensibility towards Islam, on the one hand it sees it as an implacable enemy of European civilisation, on the other it sees it as a metapolitical system of theology and belief which is illiberal, anti-materialistic, and capable of driving a spoke into the doctrine of the New World Order. It would also be quite in order to point out a certain fellow feeling for elements of Islam among Western Right-wingers, at a time when Christianity is quite clearly in its death throes, most particularly in semi-secular and post-Protestant societies.

In relation to this clash of culture and belief a dissident and somewhat errant Indian intellectual living in Britain called Salman Rushdie has written a book which allegedly blasphemes against the Prophet. Whether or not he is guilty of this offence is not for us to judge - it is not our culture after all. He has certainly not committed blasphemy in an orthodox Muslim sense because the Prophet, unlike Christ, is human rather than divine - it is possible to blaspheme against Allah but not necessarily his prophet. What Rushdie has certainly done however is to act against the interests of the faith, to outrage the

sensibilities of ordinary Muslims and to commit a lower form of semi-blaspemous obscenity in relation to the dignity of the Prophet. For Rushdie's part he can claim that he has written a novel - a picaresque post-modernist work which draws upon fictional techniques first used by the European modernist avant-garde - and that such an activity cannot be condemned by mediaeval writ. His supporters, such as the International Committee for the Defence of Salman Rushdie led by Frances D'Souza, make great play of the fact what he has done is partly novelistic and partly within the tradition of Islam itself. In effect he has drawn upon a cross-grained, even scatological tradition of irony and mis-statement within Islamic literature which does have a certain pedigree, certainly in relation to the poetry of Persia in the 13th-century and fringe traditions in relation to Shia/Ismaili literature. Yet all of this is partly tedious self-justification/exculpation. It is like saying that the endless slaughters and mass-slayings in the Marquis De Sade's *120 Days of Sodom* is in actuality a skit upon Enlightenment humanism and rests within a tradition of Rabelaisian counter-statement and mock-blasphemy. All of this may be true. But the point that needs to be answered is, first, why is Rushdie carrying on his incendiary literary activity in our country, which has no quarrel with Islam and quite possibly no great desire to see 1 million citizens of this faith numbered among its citizens. Second, Rushdie seems to believe somewhat foolishly that semi-blasphemy of the sort which says "I hate Christ" is an intelligent activity for an educated and reasonably purposeful intellectual. Indeed one can say that after a lifetime of reading and writing is this the best Rushdie can come up with? For in truth he has not been particularly clever, in fact many people believe - far beyond the ranks of serried Muslim fundamentalists - that Rushdie has been rather stupid, crass, arrogant, and

vainglorious - something which seems to have typified his career all along. In point of fact he suffers from the liberal intellectual delusion that one can say virtually anything without comeback upon oneself, without giving offence, without really saying anything at all (in such circumstances it might be best to say nothing at all!) For in truth the liberal does not respect speech, most particularly when it is written down. He respects nothing enough to want to restrict it. In such a pink-tinged blancmange of nothingness and insipidness we are faced with the extremism of empty statement. It is as if Rushdie has said: how far can I go in subjecting all the elements of the culture from which I originate to scorn and ridicule before I am actually stopped? In *Midnight's Children* - a book that was banned in India - he lambasts post-independence India and the Gandhi dynasty which has ruled that country through the mechanism of the Congress Party - in *Shame* he attacks post-war Pakistan and savagely excoriates the policies of the Muslim League which has dominated that country's post-independence period (surprise, surprise: that one was banned in Pakistan as well!) Later on he decides it would be a good idea to stop the messing about and savagely attack Islam itself in *The Satanic Verses* - a title which originates from an event chronicled in The Koran where the devil tries to inveigle several polytheistic verses into the work which is spotted and prevented by Mohammed. As a result of this, the Prophet is depicted in scatological guise through the mechanism of a dream/fantasy in the mind of somebody in the novel who is believed to be insane - an old authorial conceit of high-modernist usage, where in the manner of Dorothy Richardson authorial comment can be hidden amidst a character's stream of consciousness. Now the Ayatollah Khomeini is not particularly bothered about the post-modernist sidesteps of a

deracinated semi-Muslim cultural apostate living in Britain. As far as he is concerned this is straight blasphemy or at least denigration of the faith and is punishable by death. It is impossible for Western intellectuals such as ourselves to have a meaningful response to this - it is not our culture after all. Has an Imam of Shia Islam the right to condemn an author to death? The answer is most certainly yes, although the notion that such an edict can never be repudiated is not entirely true and does not accord with certain acts of religious precedent, even though these are capable of multiple interpretation. On the one hand such a statement of death appals a certain element of the Western mind with its ferocity, on the other hand, it is the desire to keep certain things sacred in life - for in truth there are certain things, ideological and otherwise, that it may be necessary to kill over. The idea that conflict about ideas precludes in and of itself conflict between men is a particular delusion of the contemporary liberal age. This weak (de Benoist's term is *lax*) civilisation cannot bring itself to admit that certain things are worth fighting and dying for. In our view let Rushdie die for his sacred belief - if he perceives it to be sacred - of free speech in relation to the re-interpretation of Islamic holy writ. Let his persecutors, for their part, enact vengeance on the errant author in order to sustain their view of the correct relationship between art and obedience to the will of their God. For in our view this is not a matter of murder in a common or garden way but a form of cultural warfare between implacably opposed entities. Certainly such a struggle should not take place in our land or at our expense. It is totally outrageous that the British taxpayer should have to pay large sums of money, perhaps £1 million per year, to protect with armed Special Branch officers the life of this miscreant. Most particularly when we bear in mind that he is bringing down

directly on his own head, and indirectly on ours, the consequences of his own folly.

Let there be no mistake about this: post-communism radical Islam linked to a Third Worldist ideology may well be the new enemy which Europe and the West has to face. But this does not mean that we necessarily disrespect this enemy - the Crusaders always respected the forces of Saladdin. What we say is that Rushdie should pay for his own defence, that there are plenty of mercenaries who advertise in the back pages of *Soldier of Fortune* and who will be perfectly prepared to guard him if the price was right. We should certainly not be paying for his gilded cage; similarly some would say that there is a question over whether he is really "British" or whether he should be living in this country in the first place - in any event he should either hand himself over to an international court of Muslim jurisprudence there to be tried (not as desperate as it sounds: he has many allies in the Muslim world) or he should return to a Muslim country there to await judgement, or he should take his chance as an international fugitive of Asiatic modernism and would-be blasphemy, or he should commit suicide in the manner of certain Roman authors and political ideologues who opened their veins in a warm bath. Take for example Cicero who quietened the protestations of his servants and who turned to meet the legionaries who had been sent by Caesar to waylay him. In short let Rushdie live in a prison of his own manufacture - prison is often beneficial for writers anyway - but let it not be at our expense. Let him write or die in accordance with his understanding of the divine. For when the youth wing of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard march past the Fountain of Blood in the centre of Tehran shouting "death to liberalism" we know that they are our fanatical enemies but at the same time we salute them!