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In September 1988 three leading members of the British neo-fascist party the National Front (NF) travelled from London to the Libyan capital of Tripoli. They were there, ostensibly, to learn from the example of Libya’s dictator, Colonel Muammar Qathafi, who had come to power in 1969 on the back of a revolutionary military coup. Having deposed the Western-backed monarchy, he led the transformation of Libya into, first, a republic and, from 1977, a unique form of socialist state – a *Jamahiriya* (literally “state of the masses”). Qathafi envisioned the Jamahiriya as the solution to what he cited, in *The Green Book* (the ideological handbook he wrote to explain and promote his vision), as “the prime political problem confronting human communities”, namely “The instrument of government”. Particularly troublesome, Qathafi explained, were parliaments: “The mere existence of a parliament means the absence of the people”, he argued, before emphasizing his belief that “true democracy exists only through the direct participation of the people, and not through the activity of their representatives”.[[1]](#endnote-1) This interpretation of true democracy infiltrated (at least theoretically) every element of life in Qathafi’s Libya, from the rule of law to the running of supermarkets, and was at the heart of what Qathafi believed to be his own unique ideological synthesis: Third Universal Theory.

The NF observers, reporting on their Libyan visit in one of their party journals, suggested that Qathafi’s implementation of these ideas had transformed his country into “a progressive and forward-thinking nation” that was naturally “of great interest to National Revolutionaries throughout Europe”.[[2]](#endnote-2) At first glance this might seem strange. Qathafi’s aforementioned vision of a supposedly pure democracy was always full of many of the same contradictions as those visible in fascism, not least in that its populism and supposed investment of power in the hands of the people ultimately translated into severe authoritarianism.[[3]](#endnote-3) Qathafi’s thought was also undeniably antisemitic and, like fascism, reached for an approach to political economy that went beyond what was envisaged by either capitalism or communism.[[4]](#endnote-4) It would, however, be a stretch to brand Qathafi’s ideology as fascist. Even acknowledging the existence of some crossover between Third Universal Theory and fascism does not, however, necessarily explain how an organization like the NF could declare themselves admirers of the Libyan dictator. After all, during the 1970s, the NF made its name through a crude form of racist populism that briefly threatened to attract major support from those Britons opposed to non-white immigration – a threat that was ultimately curtailed by a series of party splits and by the strength of anti-fascist opposition.[[5]](#endnote-5) More fundamentally, as contemporaneous research by the social psychologist Michael Billig demonstrated, the 1970s NF was (at its core) not just neo-fascist but essentially neo-Nazi, in a mimetic sense. Behind its populist attacks on immigration, the most dedicated members of the NF were largely committed to a worldview dominated by an almost fetishistic faith in and adherence to Hitler’s political programme and – crucially – to antisemitic conspiracy theory.[[6]](#endnote-6)

There was, of course, some degree of alliance between the Third Reich and select Islamic regimes in the Middle East during the Second World War. Fundamentally, however, such collaborations were marriages of convenience, reliant upon the Nazi regime’s shift towards pragmatism as the tide of the war turned against them in the early 1940s.[[7]](#endnote-7) Thus whilst Nazi-Arab alliances may have, in Jeffrey Herf’s words, “leapt over the seemingly insurmountable barriers created by [the Nazi] ideology of Aryan racial superiority”, this was essentially a process in which existing Nazi antisemitic propaganda was adapted according “to the religious traditions of Islam and the regional and local political realities of the Middle East and North Africa”, not one in which Nazism became significantly influenced by the ideas of Arab leaders.[[8]](#endnote-8) Ultimately, contextually useful though they may be, the NF interest in Libya and the ideas of Qathafi did not stem from these limited Nazi-Arab collaborations at all. Certainly, the NF’s interest in the creation of transnational alliances with Qathafi (and others, discussed later) acted as a continuation of long-term fascist tendencies towards building supranational links to try and shift the balance of global hegemony.[[9]](#endnote-9) Alongside this basic ideological motivation, however, there was a unique convergence of several domestic and international political factors in the 1980s that prompted the NF to take on an (ultimately unrequited) fascination with a not just Qathafi but also Nation of Islam (NOI) leader Louis Farrakhan and the Ayatollah Khomeini of Iran. It is worth briefly sketching these factors out before continuing.

Within Britain the political context was dramatically altered by Margaret Thatcher’s willingness to employ anti-immigration rhetoric, swiftly endorsed by the tabloid press, which presented her position as moderate compared to the NF, even if her suggestion that Britons felt “swamped” by immigrants was not far short of the language used by British fascists and legitimized racism by depicting immigrants themselves as “the source of racial antagonisms”.[[10]](#endnote-10) On the eve of Thatcher’s election the cultural theorist Stuart Hall famously branded Thatcherism as a form of “authoritarian populism”, suggesting not that her political philosophy was fascist but that it represented a “swing to the Right” that effectively removed the need for fascism through, among other things, its emphasis on authority and its transformation of NF ideas about race into “a more respectable discourse”.[[11]](#endnote-11) Historian Eric Hobsbawm, meanwhile, suggested that there was something almost “semi-fascist” about the way Thatcher turned what could have been an extremely minor conflict with Argentina over the Falkland Islands into “a dramatic victorious war” in 1982.[[12]](#endnote-12) On an international level, of course, Thatcherism was part of a broader shift towards what is today recognized as neoliberalism. As Quinn Slobodian has recently emphasized, neoliberal thought emerged in a “specifically post-fascist context” and was rooted in “The tension […] between advocating democracy for its peaceful change and condemning its capacity to upend order”.[[13]](#endnote-13) Equally, Slobodian notes, neoliberalism had an important “postcolonial context”, with “the tension between the nation and the world” also highly significant in determining neoliberal strategies of “militant globalism” based on a “perceived […] need to constrain nation-states and set limits on their exercise of sovereignty” in order to maintain the “holistic integrity” of the “world economy”.[[14]](#endnote-14) These longer-term global processes, alongside the shorter-term sense of political rupture within Britain, necessitated changes in the British neo-fascist program – even if it was only a small group of young radicals in the NF who recognized this fact. The search for new ideological inspiration led, perhaps inevitably, to exemplars like Qathafi’s Libya, which consciously resisted the globalist slant of burgeoning neoliberalism (especially as represented by the United States, Britain’s chief ally in both a diplomatic and ideological sense in the period under discussion).[[15]](#endnote-15)

I will return to Qathafi and Libya later. First it is important to sketch a brief timeline of changes within the NF. The radicals (who became known as “political soldiers” after one of their more important ideological handbooks) gradually gained control over the movement from 1983.[[16]](#endnote-16) They were more cognizant than the old guard of the practical need for the party to expand its political vocabulary, so as to become less reliant on popular anti-immigration sentiments. Crucially they were also somewhat less beholden to essentially mimetic neo-Nazi ideals. This latter element was partly responsible for another major split in 1986, which saw the most radical members of this younger generation left in control of the party proper (or rather what was left of it), whilst dissidents splintered off to form the National Front Support Group (NFSG). The NFSG, along with the equally NF-descended British National Party (BNP), continued along much the same path as in the 1970s but with severely decreased returns.[[17]](#endnote-17) This left the NF to pursue an – ultimately deeply flawed and almost completely unsuccessful – new form of neo-fascism that it generally referred to as the politics of the “Third Way” (or “Third Position”).[[18]](#endnote-18) Its failure notwithstanding, the ideological synthesis that the NF pursued in the mid-late 1980s was a significant and distinctive variant of far right extremism that that emphasized different elements of classical fascist ideology to those favoured by the majority of neo-fascist (especially neo-Nazi) organizations. Thus this article assesses the Third Way NF less through judging its success or failure – although, as shall be seen, this is not irrelevant to the discussion provided here – than in terms of what it can reveal about both the mutating character of post-war fascisms, particularly in the specific context of the 1980s. It contributes to ongoing debates about neo-fascist transnationalism and on the capacity of the extreme right to absorb new ideas and form new ideological models. In part the point here is historiographical, designed to demonstrate the continued post-war ability of fascism to draw together (even if only vaguely coherently) a wide range of disparate ideological influences. Equally, however, there is a rather more subtle historical point to be made here about neo-fascism’s relationship (and potential ability to collaborate with or learn from) other anti-globalist forms of politics. This is a transnational story, first and foremost in the general sense that it ‘explore[s] connections between peoples, societies and events usually thought of as distinct and separate’.[[19]](#endnote-19) More specifically, however, the analysis here is focused on an example of transnational politics, with regard both to the circulation of ideas across borders and continents and to the fact that the NF’s Third Way ideas could only ever be realised through change on a global scale: specifically the destruction of capitalism and communism, and the reshaping of international politics along ethno-nationalist lines.

Fittingly, the NF’s Third Way approach did not emerge in a vacuum but as part of more widespread changes across the European neo-fascist underground. Of particular note to this case study were connections between British and Italian extremists, developed in the early-mid 1980s, which were a central prerequisite to the development of NF ideological transnationalism. The first section of the article proper focuses on these connections and highlights their importance in influencing the NF radicals. Moreover, in tandem with this, it shall provide some clarity as to the Third Way NF’s relationship with fascism as a generic phenomenon.

**Fascism, the NF Italian Connection, and the Third Way**

Readers will no doubt be aware that fascism can, at its very core, be considered a body of thought that promotes a “Third Way” of sorts: one that supposedly avoided the problems perceived by extreme rightists as inherent in both capitalism and communism or socialism. Richard Griffiths emphasizes that many of the energies that ultimately produced fascist dictatorships stemmed from a more general inter-war desire to reject the materialist worldviews of capitalism and communism.[[20]](#endnote-20) Roger Eatwell – in one of the most oft-cited definitions in a crowded field – identifies fascism as seeking “to create a ‘new man’ […] who would forge a holistic nation and radical Third Way state”.[[21]](#endnote-21) For Ruth Ben-Ghiat, “the ‘third way’ may be viewed as one response to the perceived ‘crisis of the West’” in the inter-war period, but, as she has expertly demonstrated with reference to the Italian case, the new path that it represented was not merely political or socio-economic. “[T]he fascists”, she affirmed, “argued that their revolution […] was spiritual”, and thus would not cause “harm to individual identity or national traditions”.[[22]](#endnote-22) These aspects of classical fascism were, as shall be apparent from the examples provided, still important to the Third Way proffered by the NF in the late 1980s, albeit with some minor caveats, especially as regards Eatwell’s fascist minimum. So, for Eatwell, fascism is “Holistic because [it seeks] to homogenize the nation rather than celebrate diversity within it” and represents a “Third Way because [it seeks] to synthesize aspects of both capitalism and socialism”.[[23]](#endnote-23) The Third Way NF certainly sought to homogenize the nation and, in the latter years of the 1980s, it saw the championing of other separatisms (including the pan-Arabic nationalism of Qathafi and the radical black nationalism of Farrakhan) as a method by which this could be accomplished. This was partly due to continental influences drawn from the *Nouvelle Droite* (or European New Right; not to be confused with the Anglo-American neoliberal New Right), which has long sought to “absolve its thinkers of any racialist bias through the adoption of the ambiguous formulation known as the ‘right to difference’”.[[24]](#endnote-24) Moreover the Third Way NF did not look to blend capitalism and socialism but to reject them outright, although it is, of course, debatable if this element of the organization’s thinking was ever even remotely realistic. In a sense, however, the practicality or otherwise of Third Way visions of a future economy was beside the point. Behind the NF’s rejection of materialist doctrines lay a convoluted array of motivations, of which antisemitic conspiracy theory was a central pillar.[[25]](#endnote-25)

The NF Third Way program also had important – and quite specific – roots in some of the more radical and esoteric variants of Italian neo-fascism that had emerged in the 1960s and 1970s. The key figure in making connections between Britain and Italy in this regard was Roberto Fiore, a young Catholic from Rome who in 1978 had co-founded an organization called *Terza Posizione* (Third Position, TP). Unlike some other Italian neo-fascist groups, TP showed little nostalgic interest in Mussolini and the Fascist past. Instead it purported to offer a radically new path between orthodox radicalisms of left and right, an approach clearly indicated in its logo (a Wolfsangel – a traditional German symbol associated with branches of the SS – overlaid with a fist holding a hammer) and its slogan (“Neither red front nor reaction, armed struggle for the Third Position!”)[[26]](#endnote-26) In the oft-divided Italian neo-fascist underground of the late 1970s and early 1980s TP’s views regularly caused controversy. Gianni Alemanno, a future Mayor of Rome who was a member of the orthodox neo-fascist *Movimento Sociale Italiano* (Italian Social Movement) in this period, recalled in a 2004 interview that those active on the extreme right of Italian politics in this period often found the innovative approach of TP confusing and alienating. “Sometimes we had more clashes with those of the Third Position than those on the left”, he admitted.[[27]](#endnote-27) In many ways the eclectic range of ideas present in TP’s approach, and the ambiguous ways in which it presented them in its logo alone, made the organization a perfect example of a strange form of hyper-syncretism. It has long been widely accepted that fascism is “a unique syncretic ideology”, defined to a not insignificant extent by the “major ambiguities” discernible in its combination of “among other ideas anti-Marxism, populist ultra-nationalism, syndicalism, corporatism and socialism”.[[28]](#endnote-28) It is important to affirm, at this juncture, that this syncretism was neither wholly genuine nor necessarily damaging to attempts to present a coherent whole. George L. Mosse, describing fascism as “a scavenger which attempted to co-opt all that had appealed to people in the nineteenth and twentieth-century past”, stressed the cynicism of this tendency whilst also emphasizing that “all these fragments […] were integrated into a coherent attitude toward life through the basic fascist nationalist myth”.[[29]](#endnote-29)

TP was no less cynical than any other fascist movement in its picking of ideological meat off the bones of historical (and indeed contemporaneous) radicalisms, but it was a fair deal less coherent. This is not surprising. As Roger Griffin has argued, neo-fascism(s) have often become largely “faceless” phenomena, adapting to the less favourable context provided by the post-war world in a bewildering variety of different ways, with ideological coherence sometimes prone to becoming an inevitably secondary concern as a result.[[30]](#endnote-30) For Griffin, transnationalism – “an aspect of fascism that was comparatively underdeveloped during the interwar years” – has been one of the central innovations, with “the dominant forms of fascism now see[ing] the struggle for national or ethnic rebirth in an international or supra-national context”. Griffin refers to “Third Positionism” as a key example here, describing this particular branch of extremism as an “ideological Third Way [that] looks forward to an entirely new economic system and international community […] its struggle against the world system foster[ing] a solidarity with non-aligned countries such as Libya”.[[31]](#endnote-31) Third Way neo-fascism’s shift of emphasis towards sculpting a new global system of political economy made it more flexible – in the case of the Third Way NF to the point of undermining the racism that had always been a core part of British neo-fascist thought – whilst also creating new problems and ambiguities for activists and ideologues. In this sense, Third Way neo-fascism can be considered an a fascist variant that prioritizes demonstrating its antagonistic relationship with existing national and global power structures over asserting national and racial superiority.

The lengths that TP itself was prepared to go to were apparent from its connections with the militant *Nuclei Armati Rivoluzionari* (Armed Revolutionary Nuclei, NAR), members of which were found guilty of carrying out the infamous Bologna railway station bombing of August 1980. In the aftermath numerous NAR members fled Italy under fear of arrest. Fiore was one. He arrived in London in late 1980 and, despite a vocal campaign by the anti-fascist journal *Searchlight* (which accused Fiore of leading the NF towards terrorism), successfully avoided multiple extradition requests from the Italian government.[[32]](#endnote-32) Sharing a flat with NF activist Michael Walker, Fiore became close friends with many of the younger, more intellectually minded figures on the British extreme right, especially the Cambridge graduate Nick Griffin, and the intensely Catholic (and somewhat eccentric) Derek Holland. Fiore would introduce NF radicals to several of his major influences, the most important of which was Julius Evola, the Italian philosopher who had critiqued fascism from the right and inspired a whole generation of post-war extremists in his home country.[[33]](#endnote-33) This “fervent critic of US-style liberal democratic modernity and […] advocate of European spiritual rebirth” was also beloved by the Nouvelle Droite, whose ideas were conveniently being circulated in Britain at precisely the same time by Walker, whose journal *The Scorpion* (initially *National Democrat*) “became the leading proponent of Nouvelle Droite thought in Britain throughout the 1980s”.[[34]](#endnote-34)

Fiore worked with Holland to produce a journal, *Rising*, which sought to convert NF members to a more spiritual form of activism, inspired not only by Evola but also the likes of Corneliu Codreanu, leader of the Eastern Orthodox inter-war Romanian Iron Guard. In 1984 Holland also produced a major ideological statement for NF radicals: *The Political Soldier*. Whilst both *Rising* and *The Political Soldier* served a purpose in spreading radical ideas within the NF (and thus helping to take over the party, albeit partly by alienating some long-term members to the point that they left), these publications also worked, alongside *The Scorpion*, to attempt to tackle the problems caused for the extreme right by the renewed ascendance of globalization fuelled by the successes of the neoliberal Anglo-American New Right. In doing so they absorbed elements of other bodies of thought that were influential in the NF around this time. These included “Strasserism” (the more overtly anti-capitalist Nazism associated with Gregor and Otto Strasser) and distributism (an economic ideology, based on the redistribution of land and industry, that emerged from Catholic social teaching and was particularly associated in Britain with Hilaire Belloc and G.K. Chesterton), filtering them through the spiritual anti-materialism of Evola, whose largely un-translated works would have been explained by Fiore.[[35]](#endnote-35)

Crucially, the NF radicals saw the newly invigorated free market capitalism of the 1980s as just one side of a coin that featured – on its other face – communism. This perspective had its roots in antisemitic conspiracy theory, which attacked a shadowy “internationalist Establishment […] with sectional, international and/or alien interests and loyalties” promoting capitalism and communism “towards the same end of a world monopoly of economic and political power”.[[36]](#endnote-36) Crucially, for Evola-influenced radicals like Fiore and Holland, resisting the power of this euphemistic internationalism necessitated detachment from the orthodox socio-political realm and the values associated with it. This could be found in a state that Evola referred to as *apolitìa*, a vague concept that Evola scholar Paul Furlong describes as “the interior quality that preserves one’s being from being corrupted by interaction with a world that is increasingly unstructured and lacking in values of any kind”.[[37]](#endnote-37) The introduction to the second issue of *Rising* made clear the importance of this concept to the new NF radicalism:

On a practical level today we see our “new man” as one whose character is fundamentally opposed to the influences which created the bourgeois and Marxist outlooks.

In the world today there is a pervasive network of factors all preventing people from waking up, from looking at themselves and the world and appreciating the true relationship which one bears to the other. These factors include television, advertising, the work ethic, the greedy ideals of acquisitive society, and the ineffectual game of the democratic party system.

All these factors work together in an effort to enslave people to the idea that the object of life is pleasure, which comes from buying things. So why don’t we break away from all this – by building our own houses; educating our own children; creating our own communities which could be the basis for a new world![[38]](#endnote-38)

In essence, then, *Rising* argued that true radicals needed to genuinely disentangle themselves from the web of materialism in order to adequately pursue revolutionary nationalist goals.

Ideas of this nature had been circulating for some time in the Italian fascist underground, where they were essentially utilized as a justification for terrorism.[[39]](#endnote-39) In the British context, however, what these ideas might justify was less important. Instead the focus was, in a classical fascist sense, on the creation of a proto-typical New Man who would be able to resist the decadence of contemporary materialisms and move forward to help create an altogether new world system. As the next section of the article will demonstrate, it was this anti-materialist, but authentically fascist, element of NF Third Way ideas that would lead to the radicalized party’s interest in Islamic radicalism.

**Islamic Radicals, Racial Separatism, and the Evolution of the Third Way**

It was clear from the beginning that the NF Third Way project was necessarily transnational. *Rising* clarified that it was Europe, not just Britain, which needed “to be reborn”.[[40]](#endnote-40) Similarly *The Political Soldier* emphasized that it was “The death of Europe” that needed to be prevented, as this would “signal the end of the White peoples forever” and leave “Britain […] a vague, unimportant memory”.[[41]](#endnote-41) Unsurprisingly, then, *Rising* stressed that “No single European nation can stand up to Zionism, U.S. Capitalism or Soviet Imperialism by itself. Our independent nations must learn to co-operate – or else lose their independence forever. We speak the gospel of Nationalism, that is the gospel of the real Europeans!”[[42]](#endnote-42) For all that *Rising* emphasized its Europeanness, however, it also prefigured the ostensible softening of attitudes towards race that would become a central part of the Third Way NF’s approach. In its very first issue *Rising* informed its readers that

The African or the Asian man who strives to create his own national identity deserves our respect. Our enemy is he who seeks to destroy the difference between races and who suffocates traditions. A yankee who, with his blonde hair and blue eyes, when representing the mercantilist Coca-Cola ideology, is doubtless a more dangerous enemy. The White capitalist who promotes the influx of cheap coloured labour to this country for mere economic reasons is our major adversary.[[43]](#endnote-43)

This mirrored the Nouvelle Droite’s tendency “to blame capitalism rather than immigrants for the problems associated with immigration”.[[44]](#endnote-44) Far from being simply a cynical trick, this (and indeed all of *Rising*’s pronouncements)must be read as genuine attempts to reorient the views of NF activists, since this was a purely underground journal intended for circulation only within extreme right circles. In this case, by presenting immigration as a by-product of capitalism, *Rising* sought to persuade readers to channel their racial prejudice through opposing globalization. On one level this represented the continuation of antisemitic conspiracy theory, with the forces of materialism being portrayed as engaged in a secretive plot to undermine ethnic distinctions. At the same time, however, this rhetoric should be taken at face value, in so far as it established that the endorsement of non-white racial separatisms was a potentially useful route towards the collapse of the multi-racial society the NF so abhorred. It therefore enabled, or even encouraged, activists to recognize and endorse examples of such separatisms.

In the context of these developments, Farrakhan, Khomeini, and Qathafi were relatively obvious influences for the NF to adopt. All were authoritarian figures fundamentally opposed to globalization and to the political consensus represented by the Anglo-American New Right. They shared the NF’s distaste for racially diverse societies and, by virtue of the core role of Islam in their political philosophies, they also promoted a worldview rooted in timeless, spiritual values. Early examples of NF praise for this trio of figures reflected these elements of loose crossover. In one, published in the ideological journal *Nationalism Today*, Holland critiqued Britain and the USA for their censuring of Iran, praising the Khomeini regime for promoting “a view of the world which rejects the crass materialism and despiritualization of Yankee imperialism on one hand and the exploitative tyranny of Soviet communism on the other”.[[45]](#endnote-45) Soon after, in the midst of the Libyan embassy siege in London, similar arguments were discernible in an article that attacked the numerous British Conservatives publicly calling for the fall of the Qathafi regime.[[46]](#endnote-46) Griffin, upon returning from a trip to the United States in 1985, was effusive in his praise for Farrakhan, in particular endorsing the NOI leader’s diagnosis of white society as “mortally sick”.[[47]](#endnote-47) Of course it was also not entirely coincidental that these three regimes and leaders were vocal critics of Israel, and indeed the radical NF’s endorsement of each should be seen as also appropriated the cause of Palestinian nationalism in the mid-late 1980s, especially after the afore-discussed party split of 1986.[[48]](#endnote-48)

Predictably this split also allowed the NF to support these alternative ideological touchstones more explicitly. A *Nationalism Today* editorial directly after said split alerted readers – under the heading “Farrakhan Aid” – to the inclusion in the journal of an article by Abdul Wali Muhammad, then editor of the NOI newspaper *The Final Call*. This, readers were reassured, marked nothing less than “a new stage in the fight against multi-racialism”. For the purposes of clarity the editorial then emphasized that

The current leadership of the NF is not interested in the mindless bigotry or nihilism of the past […] we are ready and willing to work with those of other races who wish to maintain their separateness and identity. Black Power and White Power are *not* enemies. They are allies in the struggle to resist and defeat the race and nation destroying Capitalism that is engulfing the globe. Unity in diversity is *not* a slogan, it is a Way of Life.[[49]](#endnote-49)

This amounted to a dramatic progression of the views on race expressed in *Rising* four years earlier. Now the NF radicals did not merely request respect for non-white racial separatists, they demanded that members of the party actively engaged with individuals and groups promoting such ideas. As per the Third Way’s discursive focus on globalization, this shared racial struggle was presented as part of a struggle against capitalism – the pitting of one way of life against another. Wali Muhammad’s contribution hinted at these themes, but was predominantly an advert for the NOI and its leader. Much of the focus was on portraying Farrakhan as the true, popular voice of black Americans. It also highlighted the NOI’s militancy – in the form of its armed wing, the Fruit of Islam – as well as its leader’s virulent anti-Zionism (in reality antisemitism) and supposed willingness to collaborate with American white supremacists. A brief, sanitized rundown of the NOI’s core beliefs was also provided.[[50]](#endnote-50)

Unsurprisingly, no mention was made here of the depth of the NOI’s racial views, which were not merely separatist but predicated on “the genetically given divinity of the black man and the genetically given evilness of the white man”, an idea that would, of course, have been anathema to all *Nationalism Today*’s readers, including the leading proponents of the Third Way.[[51]](#endnote-51) Of course the fact that radical NF leaders were prepared to overlook this element of NOI belief can be seen as proof of the genuineness of their respect for Farrakhan and his ideas. This respect was no doubt strengthened by an additional factor, related to Farrakhan’s ability (or otherwise) to visit supporters in Britain. In January 1986 the Conservative government decided to ban Farrakhan from entering the country after he was invited to speak in London by the Hackney Black People’s Association. The issuing of the invitation indicated the growing global reach of the NOI’s appeal to disenfranchised black communities, whilst the ban – on account of perceived antisemitism and largely as a result of the British-Israeli group in parliament – proved that those in power saw Farrakhan’s politics as genuinely divisive.[[52]](#endnote-52) This enabled the NF to position Farrakhan and the NOI as presenting a real threat to the established political order – in other words, a worthy ally. Equally, of course, for the NF, the process behind the ban also fitted neatly into its conspiratorial worldview, as clarified in an earlier *Nationalism Today*: “The thought of anybody – Black or White – exposing Jewish power and demanding racial separation and racial freedom is an horrific challenge to the ‘Powers That Be’”.[[53]](#endnote-53)

By the autumn of 1987 the NF was distributing leaflets in support of Farrakhan, bearing the slogan “Louis Farrakhan: He Speaks for His People, We Speak for Ours”.[[54]](#endnote-54) This was the realization of the radical leadership’s earlier call to fully commit to strategies of engagement with black separatists, or as *National Front News* put it, to engage in “**political** action designed to replace the capitalist system and the corrupt politicians who imported millions of coloured immigrants into our land”.[[55]](#endnote-55) Crucially, this was now part of a broader discourse of supposed anti-imperialism. “Imperialism is the domination of one nation by another”, the party newspaper declared. “Since all peoples have an inbuilt preference for rule by their own kind, such a policy can only be maintained by oppression and by cultural and even national genocide”, it continued, before emphasizing that such drastic means “inevitably [lead] to the mixing of the different populations and to ‘subject peoples’ being brought back to the ‘mother country’ as cheap labour […] the result of which is the disastrous immigration which is destroying the identity of our own country”.[[56]](#endnote-56) If the long history of British imperialism figured at all in this perspective, it was stripped of its national specificity and its racial dimension was inverted. *National Front News* readers were warned about Soviet imperialism (“the most brutal […] of all time”), but it was the American empire – cited as being heavily influenced by the “hidden power” of Zionist imperialism – that was established as the chief threat to Britain, and indeed Western Europe more generally. Cultural Americanization through Hollywood was presented as part of a chain that included “mass immigration and forced multi-racialism”, all as part of “the drive of American capitalists to create a rootless, coffee coloured world of mindless consumers”. Through this philosophy of “Profit [as] God”, the radicals concluded, the American model was “**the most dangerous empire of all time**”.[[57]](#endnote-57)

On the one hand, this expanded anti-capitalist rhetoric can be cast as a natural extension of that which appeared in *Rising* and *The Political Soldier* earlier in the decade. This time, however, there was a greater – more global – purpose. This became apparent in March 1988, when *National Front News* placed Farrakhan, Khomeini and Qathafi on its front page and declared that there was now a “New Alliance” ready to replace the “Old Order”. The paper elaborated by asserting that

Revolutionary nationalist groups, racial separatists and the anti-Zionist nations of the Middle East, are beginning to recognize a common set of interests and enemies which make closer co-operation both beneficial and inevitable.

Against our common enemies – Capitalism and Communism – we are at last beginning to develop a credible alternative: the *Third Way*.[[58]](#endnote-58)

The clear implication here was that it was only through a globally oriented alliance of Third Way forces that the materialist doctrines of capitalism and communism could be defeated. The globalist imperialism that the NF saw as being maintained by these two competing bodies of thought could be overridden, distinct nations could be saved – but the process by which this could be accomplished was inherently transnational in itself. There was, of course, a caveat. Despite the impression given by the bulk of the article, *National Front News* admitted that there remained a need for “Common interest [to] be turned into practical co-operation”.[[59]](#endnote-59) In effect, this was an admission that its actual relationships with those it now held up as key allies were relatively insubstantial. If the so-called New Alliance existed in fact, then the NF was scarcely part of it.

What was less limited was the willingness of radical NF activists to introduce ideas from Libya, in particular, into the NF. Holland, by far the most influential ideologue in the party in the late 1980s, had clearly devoured the *Green Book* and saw a synergy between its key ideas and those of his political soldier program. More specifically, Holland saw in Qathafi’s Third Universal Theory a set of ideas that he believed would make it possible to realize the unclear utopian vision he had of an alternative post-revolutionary society. Particularly appealing, in this regard, was Qathafi’s vision of a “society of all people, where all men are free and equal in authority, wealth and arms, so that freedom may gain the final and complete triumph”.[[60]](#endnote-60) Writing in the same 1986 issue of *Nationalism Today* that featured Muhammad’s article on the NOI, Holland explained that he felt this aspect of Qathafi’s thought was the route to ensuring “the subordination of the State to the Nation”. What this amounted to was, in effect, securing the tyranny of the majority. By arming the people, a process that Holland accepted would only occur gradually after “our people have […] be[en] re-educated into the responsible use of their new freedoms” (thus individually becoming Holland’s version of the proto-typical fascist “New Man”), the population would be able to defend their own interests against the despotism of capital, which was enforced via the concentration of arms within the arsenal of the state. As such, Holland asserted, “Only those – like Thatcher and Gorbachev – who have something to fear from ordinary folk will be against arming the people”.[[61]](#endnote-61)

Qathafi’s broader vision of direct democracy also gained significant stamps of approval from the NF over the following months, particularly his excoriation of parliaments and “establishment of Popular Congresses and People’s Committees”.[[62]](#endnote-62) The NF thus began to call for “People’s Democracy”, based on Third Universal Theory principles. This would be realized through various tiers of democratic engagement – from “Street Councils” to a “National People’s Council” – in which “*all* people [would] have the facility to debate issues affecting themselves, their families and their property, and to take part in the decision-making process at the end of such debate”.[[63]](#endnote-63) Such a process would also, *Nationalism Today* noted, require new ways of thinking, fully achievable only “when the centralized mass media of today is transformed into the Media of the Masses”.[[64]](#endnote-64) This was another nod to Qathafi, who saw “The continuing problem of press freedom” as “a product of the problem of democracy”, therefore arguing that alongside the implementation of “popular rule” must come the implementation of a “democratic press […] issued by a popular committee”.[[65]](#endnote-65) The global dissemination of Qathafi’s thought through the *Green Book* and other methods – including newspapers such as *Arab Dawn* in Britain – was one outcome of this process as it was applied in Libya. The NF leadership undoubtedly saw their output in a similar light, and they took seriously the education of those who read their publications – encouraging them to buy works including the *Green Book* and *Islam & Revolution*, an essay collection introducing Khomeini’s thought to the West. Such was the hero worship of the Libyan leader that the NF even sold t-shirts bearing the slogan “Death to Imperialism” alongside Qathafi’s portrait.[[66]](#endnote-66)

One can only speculate, but the NF’s increased promotion of Qathafi’s philosophy may well have been what secured three NF directorate members – Holland, Griffin, and Patrick Harrington – their invitation to Libya in September 1988. Despite the party’s best efforts, however, the trip was a minor disaster. In a, no doubt unintentional, embodiment of the trip’s failure, Griffin and Holland were pictured on the front of *National Front News* standing in front of a giant billboard of Qathafi when, no doubt, they harbored hopes of being introduced to the man himself.[[67]](#endnote-67) The center pages continued the NF’s pro-Qathafi propaganda campaign – with the damage done to Libya by American air strikes being billed as a “TORY WAR CRIME” – and provided a brief account of some of the activities the trio had participated in, from discussing the economic situation in Libya with shopkeepers to visiting the ruins of the ancient Roman city of *Sabrata Magna*.[[68]](#endnote-68) The NF’s hopes that the visit might provide the beginning of a real partnership were, however misguided. It was clear from the coverage in *National Front News* that the trio had ultimately been treated as tourists rather than potential partners. Now unavailable internal party documents seen by one researcher apparently suggested that not only did the visit to Tripoli secure no funding for the NF’s activities in Britain, but also that the Libyans only paid half the trio’s plane fares.[[69]](#endnote-69) It is worth acknowledging here that the NF’s visit to Libya came only two years after the British-aided 1986 US air strikes on Tripoli and Benghazi. In retaliation, Qathafi had elected to resume his previous policy of providing arms for the Irish Republican Army (IRA), massively increasing the dissident organization’s firepower in the process.[[70]](#endnote-70) It would make sense that any potential alliance with the NF would have had similar motivations: to sponsor activity designed to undermine the US and its allies. The NF, however, was not a paramilitary organization like the IRA, and it did not have the ideological or practical structure to enable any transition in this direction. It must have been quickly apparent, to the representatives of the regime that the trio met in Tripoli, that the NF had no serious hopes of seriously destabilizing the British political establishment in the way that Qathafi might have desired.

The party’s contacts with the NOI ultimately proved similarly meaningless. Whilst Matt Malone, an NF contact in the United States, did pursue contacts with the NOI, Farrakhan’s organization showed no real interest in the NF in return.[[71]](#endnote-71) By mid-1989, stung by these effective rejections, the NF was falling apart. The potential that its radical leadership saw in the ideas of the Third Way never materialized. The party undoubtedly suffered from appalling timing – the Lockerbie bombing took place in December 1988 (although Libya was not directly implicated until 1991) and the Ayatollah issued his *fatwa* against the British Indian novelist Salman Rushdie in February 1989. It was also, however, the victim of its own poor decision-making, spending much of the late 1980s attempting to run before it could walk. Explaining its vigorous support for Qathafi behind closed doors and in ideological journals was one thing. Having to publically defend itself (as an organization with some links to Northern Irish loyalists) for applauding a man known to have a long history of supporting the IRA was another.[[72]](#endnote-72)

**Assessing the Third Way NF: Transnationalism and Radicalism**

For all that the transnationalism of the Third Way NF had the potential to open new doors for the party, then, it can also be seen as contributing to its eventual collapse, which followed swiftly in the wake of Harrington declaring – in a statement issued to the Board of Deputies of British Jews – that the NF was an organization open to Jews and explicitly opposed to antisemitism. He only succeed in receiving a swift rebuttal, with the *Jewish Chronicle* suggesting the statement was nothing more than a deception.[[73]](#endnote-73) His decision, made without the approval of the rest of the NF directorate, led to Griffin and Holland (not to mention Fiore) quitting the NF and moving on to pastures new. After all, as has been shown, the precepts of the Third Way ideology they had helped craft were strongly rooted in euphemistic antisemitism, and this was not easily overcome. Harrington, left with a small handful of activists, soon gave up the ghost, allowing the NFSG to regain the party name. By this time, however, the NF had shrunk dramatically. As Ryan Shaffer’s brief summary illustrates, all this occurred at least in part because many ordinary members were perplexed or offended by the idea of endorsing the likes of Farrakhan, Khomeini and Qathafi.[[74]](#endnote-74) Some of the ideas the Third Way NF absorbed from these figures did continue to resonate in a variety of ways in other, later groups. These included the various projects of one-time NF political soldier and later national anarchist Troy Southgate, Patrick Harrington’s more moderate post-NF group (conveniently entitled Third Way), and the International Third Position (ITP), co-founded by Holland, Griffin, and Fiore.[[75]](#endnote-75) Crucially, however, none of these organizations made any even vaguely significant impact. This, aligned with the collapse of the Third Way NF at the end of the 1980s, raises the possibility that – sincerity notwithstanding – certain forms of overt transnationalism, especially those that seek to supersede fascist interpretations of racial hierarchy, can be an actively damaging addition to neo-fascist political programs, even when they may appear to offer potential new routes forward. As if to demonstrate they had learned this lesson, both Griffin and Fiore reached a new level of prominence – after 9/11 (and in the midst of the Qathafi rapprochement with the West) as the leaders of (and members of the European Parliament for) unambiguously nationalist, deeply Islamophobic parties: the BNP and Forza Nuova.[[76]](#endnote-76)

It can scarcely be denied that the Third Way NF aspired to a truly transnational form of political action and thought. It is clear from the examples gathered above that many of the NF radicals devoted much of their intellectual energies to the absorption of ideas from abroad (not least from Italy and Libya), which they consciously tried to fit into their pre-existing ideological framework. For Andrea Mammone, a study of transnational neo-fascism will tend to focus on “forgotten people crossing borders, and neglected cultural transfer”, the effect of which is to provide analysts with a route in to the “interconnected neofascist web” that may spread across nations and, indeed, continents.[[77]](#endnote-77) These features can certainly be seen to neatly characterize the NF in the 1980s, with its many overseas contacts (of which only the most ideologically significant have been referred to today) and its importing and, on a far smaller scale, exporting of ideas (in the latter case chiefly through post-NF movements such as the ITP). In this sense, moving away from the overly definitional realm of the fascist minimum that was briefly entered at the beginning of the article, the 1980s NF can be regarded as a transnational movement because it consistently engaged in “fascist processes of global circulation, adaptation and reformulation”, which Federico Finchelstein righty cites as being at least as important as the “aspects of fascism” that many scholars tend to reify.[[78]](#endnote-78)

What is less clear-cut is the extent to which the NF’s incorporation of its myriad of new foreign influences created an authentically transnational ideology. Finchelstein, following Benjamin Zachariah, notes that most existing scholarship on fascism remains, again largely because of its overly definitional slant, doggedly Eurocentric – not just in that it focuses on European case studies but also in that it continues to foreground “‘top-down’ Eurocentric frameworks” that render non-European forms or adaptations of fascism purely mimetic.[[79]](#endnote-79) Whilst the major problem this creates is the sidelining of studies that seriously consider the spread of fascist ideas outside of Europe, there is also another potential side-effect: the dismissal – out of hand – of the possibility that elements of contemporary fascism may in fact have important origins outside Europe. This may be said to be especially pertinent in the case of the Third Way NF, and not only because of its fascination with select Islamic radicals. Evola, for all that he believed in the need for European regeneration, was deeply influenced by traditions from outside the continent. As he was a pagan, something that makes his magnetic appeal for so many fervently Catholic neo-fascists a little strange, Evola took a deep interest in a range of spiritual practices, particularly Buddhism (which he credited with helping to save his life when he considered suicide in the early 1920s).[[80]](#endnote-80) He also, however, praised elements of Islam – particularly its dual conception of internal and external “Holy Wars” – and characterized it as “a tradition at a higher level than both Judaism and the religious beliefs that conquered the West”.[[81]](#endnote-81)

Both Finchelstein and Zachariah suggest that, in place of the classic fascist minimum, scholars should utilize what the latter calls a “fascist repertoire”, a selection of fascistic qualities “from which ideologues have the agency to choose”.[[82]](#endnote-82) The Third Way NF may be said to have expanded this repertoire to include ideas borrowed from the likes of Farrakhan, Khomeini and, of course, Qathafi. In this it would, in some senses, be following Evola in seeking inspiration from a wider array of sources than most orthodox fascists would ever consider. Just as Evola’s interest in Buddhism and Islam should not be taken to mean that either of these religions should be re-interpreted as fascist, so the NF’s appropriation of ideas from the aforementioned trio does not necessitate the branding of any of these figures as “Islamo-fascists”.[[83]](#endnote-83) We should also, of course, avoid taking Evola’s incorporation of selected elements of Buddhism and Islam into his worldview as evidence that the Italian was, in some meaningful sense, a practitioner of either of these philosophies. Similarly, there is a need to note the limitations of the Third Way NF’s transnational development. As has been clear throughout, whilst NF radicals participated in processes of exchange and networking, these were often ineffective and one-sided – as is particularly clear in the sections that deal with the NF’s borrowing from Qathafi. Moreover, it must be acknowledged that, in most cases, the NF used new ideas from such sources chiefly to fill gaps in its pre-existing ideology. As Alan Sykes suggests, Qathafi’s philosophy provided “a revolutionary solution” to the central problem left unresolved by distributism: “the need for, but threat from, the state”.[[84]](#endnote-84) Whilst this verdict underestimates the real affinity that some NF radicals (no doubt not all) felt for Qathafi’s politics, it is accurate in so far as it recognizes that the NF’s adoption of elements of Third Universal Theory never quite got beyond a focus on how structures and ideas from Libya could be applied in Britain.

In effect, then, the NF added the ideas of Qathafi (and, to a lesser extent, others like Farrakhan and Khomeini) to their fascist repertoire. Even if a full, intensive fusion of ideas never quite took place, there was enough overlap between the Third Way NF’s core beliefs – essentially those Holland had outlined in his writings, meshed with antisemitic conspiracy theory – to leave open this possibility. The apoliteic resistance to materialism that was at the center of Third Way ideology prompted NF radicals to believe that they were capable of becoming a revolutionary elite, but the actual vision that the likes of Griffin and Holland had for their future utopia was ultimately rather foggy beyond the fact that it would be ethnically homogenous and free of supposedly malign Jewish influence. In this, in fact, some further comparisons could be drawn with the reality of both Third Universal Theory and, even more so, with Khomeinism. In a 1980 interview, later distributed more widely via its inclusion in *Islam & Revolution*, Khomeini explained that the success of the revolution that had brought him to power was in large part because “The people were ready for revolution: they were dissatisfied with their government and discontented with their lives, and – most importantly – God had brought about a spiritual transformation in them”. This spiritual basis for the revolution was then acted upon through the guidance of “the religious leaders, who are capable of arousing the people and inspiring them to self-sacrifice”.[[85]](#endnote-85)

This was almost precisely how the political soldiers saw the situation. They believed that the majority of people in the West were, at heart, ready for change and that all they needed were spiritual guides (essentially enablers of radicalization) in the form of the NF’s revolutionary elite. It is impossible to see how, in practice, the NF’s Third Way revolution would have ended up all that different to that of Khomeini’s or Qathafi’s, which both relied on demagoguery and dictatorship even if they lacked many of the classical fascist features that no doubt would have resurfaced within a more powerful NF.

**Conclusion**

One of Margaret Thatcher’s most oft-used slogans was “There is No Alternative”, by which she meant that globalist capitalism was the only route the world could take. In this context, looking to nations like Iran and Libya made sense for the NF precisely because, at the historical moment in which politicians like Thatcher were rapidly embarking on a newly vigorous program of globalization, these were amongst the few nations combining vocal opposition to American-dominated global capitalism with alternative (albeit poorly realized) “Third Ways” of their own. Nonetheless the NF’s interest in these alternative models must also be seen as an early example of what Paul Gilroy has cited as a wider blurring of ideological divisions, and undermining of “racial solidarities”, engendered by “a new geopolitical context that increasingly lacks even the possibility of imagining an alternative to capitalism”.[[86]](#endnote-86) In effect, context is crucial here. The 1980s produced a situation in which the neo-fascist radicals that populated the Third Way NF recognized that the various discontents produced by globalization could exacerbate opposition to materialist ideologies and multicultural societies in certain national and, potentially, diasporic environments. We can be thankful that their attempts to build alliances with the likes of Qathafi failed to make any serious headway but we should also accept that the potential for new forms of collaboration between racial separatists of many stripes today. Such a threat is only made more likely by the impasse of political economy that continues to furnish us with global and national forms of desperate inequality so as to maintain the cynical structures of consumerist late capitalism. Thus, whilst this article has shown the limitations of radical transnational reorientations of neo-fascism, it has also demonstrated the potential crossover that can be identified between the extreme right and other non-Western anti-globalist ideologies. A truly global fascism may well be an oxymoronic concept, but there is a need for us to remain vigilant about the idea of a transnationally oriented fascism engaging seriously with other forces – particularly those centred on racial separatism – in pursuit of common anti-globalization goals. After all, the context of the moment once again seems potentially favourable to such a meeting of ideas and perspectives.
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