

Guillaume Faye and the Jews

By Michael O'Meara

Few postwar thinkers in my view have played a greater role in ideologically resisting the forces assaulting Europe's incomparable bioculture than Guillaume Faye. This was publicly evident at the international conference on "The White World's Future" held in Moscow in June 2006, which he helped organize. It's even more evident in the six books he's written in the last seven years and in the innumerable articles, interviews, and conferences in which he's alerted Europeans to the great challenges threatening their survival.

In this spirit he has developed an "archofuturist" philosophy that takes its inspiration from the most primordial and Faustian urgings of our people's spirit; he has incessantly warned of the threat posed by the Third World, specially Islamic, invasion of the former white homelands; he has promoted European collaboration with Russia and made the case for a white imperium stretching from Dublin to Vladivostok; he privileges biopolitics over cultural or party politics; he's developed a theory of the interregnum that explains why the existing system of subversion will soon collapse; and he's successfully promoted anti-liberal ideas and values in a language and style that transcends the often ghettoized discourse of our movement. But despite his incomparable contribution to the forces of white resistance, he has always remained suspiciously silent on certain key issues, particularly regarding the Jews, the so-called Holocaust, and the interwar heritage of revolutionary nationalism — even though he is routinely referred to in the MSM as a fascist, a racist, and a negationist. On those few occasions he has spoken of Israel or the Jews, it has been to say that their cause is not ours and that we need to focus on the dangers bearing down on us. To this degree, his silence was tolerable. Recently, however, he's broken this silence and taken a stance likely to alienate many of his supporters.

The occasion was an interview granted to the Zionist *France-Echos* — now posted at subversive.com. When asked in the interview about anti-Semitism in the "identitarian" movement he leads, Faye responded in explicitly philosemitic terms:

Anti-Judaism (a term preferable to anti-Semitism) has melted away like snow in the sun. There are, of course, pockets of resistance But this tendency is more and more isolated . . . because of the massive problem posed by Islamization and Third World immigration. In these circumstances, anti-Judaism has been forgotten, for the Jew no longer appears as a menace. In the milieu I frequent, I never read or hear of anti-Jewish invectives. . . . [A]nti-Judaism is a political position that is obsolete, unhelpful, out of date, even when camouflaged as anti-Zionism. This is no longer the era of the Dreyfus Affair. Anti-Jews, moreover, are caught in an inescapable contradiction: they despise Jews, but claim they dominate the world, as if they were a superior race. This makes anti-Judaism a form of political schizophrenia, a sort of inverted philosemitism, an expression of resentment. One can't, after all, detest what one aspires to My position is that of Nietzsche: To run down the Jews serves no purpose, it's politically stupid and unproductive.

Besides ignoring the fact that Jewish influence has never been more dominant and more destructive of white existence, three questions are raised in this quote:

1) Is it that the problems posed by immigration and Islam have trivialized those once associated with the Jews?

2) Or is it that Islam and immigration reveal that the Jews are not (and never were) a problem, that the anti-Judaism of the Dreyfus era, like other historical expressions of anti-Judaism, was simply a product of a culture whose traditionalism or resentment “stupidly” demonized the Jew as the Other?

3) Or is it that one can't have two enemies at the same time, that the threat posed by Islamic immigration is greater than whatever threat the Jews might pose, making it strategically necessary to focus on the principal enemy and to relegate the other to a lesser degree of significance?

Faye tends to conflate these questions, leaving unsaid what needs to be said explicitly. He assumes, moreover, that the Islamic or Third World threat (both in the form of the present invasion and internationally) is somehow unrelated to the Jews. He acknowledges, of course, that certain Jews have been instrumental in promoting multiracialism and immigration. But the supposition here is that this is just a tendency on the part of certain Jews and that to think otherwise is to commit the error of seeing them in the way that “old-fashioned” anti-Semites once did. At first glance, his argument seems to be that of Jared Taylor and American Renaissance, being a tactical decision to take the path of least resistance (which many of us don't support but nevertheless can live with). Faye, though, goes beyond Taylor, making claims about the Jews that will inevitably compromise our movement.

The anti-Islamism and philosemitism that Faye here combines reflect a deep ideological divide in French nationalist ranks. This divide is symptomatic of a larger schism that is rarely discussed by white nationalists, but has had worldwide ramification for our movement. Since 1945, when the anti-white forces of triumphant American liberalism and Russian Communism, in alliance with Zionism, achieved world hegemony, the hounded and tattered ranks of the nationalist right, in Europe and America, split into a number of divergent, if not contradictory tendencies. With the advent of the Cold War and the formation of the Israeli state, these tendencies tended to polarize around two camps. One tendency, including certain ex-Nazis, allied with postwar anti-Communism, viewing the Russian threat as the greater danger to Western Civilization. Given Israel's strategic place in the Cold War alignment, these anti-Communists treated organized Zionism as an ally and downplayed the “anti-Semitism” that had traditionally been part of their anti-liberal nationalism. This tendency was opposed by another, which also included former Nazis, but it saw Russian Communism in terms of Stalin's alleged anti-Semitism and nationalism. This led it to assume an anti-American, anti-Zionist, and pro-Third World position.

The legacy of this polarization continues to affect white nationalist ranks, even though elements of it have been jumbled and rearranged in recent years. As ideal types, however, neither tendency is completely supportable nor insupportable. White nationalism, I

suspect, will succeed as a movement only in synthesizing the positive, pro-white elements in each tendency. For a long time, I thought Faye represented this synthesis, for he was both pro-Russian without being hysterically anti-American, anti-Third World without supporting the globalist super-structure dominating the “West.” More impressive still, his orientation was to a revolutionary, racially conscious, and archeofuturist concept of the European race that refused any accommodation to the existing regime.

Recently, however, his anti-Islamism seems to have morphed into a Zionism that cannot but trouble our movement. In the *France-Echos* interview he says in reference to his nationalist critics that it is nonsensical to call him a Zionist since he is not a Jew. But in the same breath he adds:

How could I be anti-Zionist . . . Unlike Islamism, Communism, Leftism, human rights, and masochistic, post-conciliar Christianity, Zionism neither opposes nor restrains in any significant way the ideals I defend, that is, the preservation of [Europe's biocultural] identity. How would the disappearance of Israel serve my cause? For a European identitarian to think that the Hebrew state is an enemy is geopolitically stupid.

He goes on to argue that those who are viscerally anti-American and anti-Zionist are implicitly pro-Islam, pro-Arab, and immigrationist, allies in effect of the Left's Third-Worldism. Pointing to Alain de Benoist's GRECE, Christian Bouchet's revolutionary nationalist movement, and those “Traditionalist” European converts to Islam, all of whom are fascinated by Iran's new leadership and by Hezbollah, he claims, with some justice, that these anti-Zionists are in the process of abandoning their commitment to Europe.

Faye's contention that Islam (the civilization) is a mortal threat to Europe is solidly grounded. While one might appreciate Amadinehjad's critique of Zionist propaganda, especially as it takes the form of the Holofoax, or Nasrallah's humbling of the IDF, to go from there to supporting Iran's Islamic Republic or Islamic insurgents in general (think of the Paris Ramadan riots of November 2005) is, for white nationalists, a betrayal of another sort. Faye here acts as an important bulwark against those in our ranks who would leave it to others to fight our battles — others, if history is any guide, who won't hesitate to subjugate us once the opportunity arises.

Where Faye crosses the line in my view is in arguing that Jews ought to be considered part of European civilization, that the defense and reinforcement of the Israeli state is a vital imperative for Europe, and that Israel is the vanguard in the struggle against “our common enemy.” The collapse of Israel, he claims, would “open the door to the total conquest of Europe.” He concludes by declaring that he is no Judeophile. “I consider the Jews allies, as part of European civilization, with a very particular and original status as a people apart.” He rejects anti-Judaism “not because it is immoral, but because it is useless, divisive, infantile, politically inconsistent, out dated.” For ostensibly strategic reasons, then, he rejects anti-Judaism.

It is not my intention here to critique Faye's new-found Zionism (which I find insupportable) — that would require a format different from this report. It is also not my intention to put his other ideas in doubt, for I continue to believe that he has made an

incomparable intellectual contribution to the cause of white resistance. I do, however, question how Faye can consider a non-European people like the Jews to be part of our biocivilization; how he can ignore the destructive role they have played in European and especially American history; how he can dismiss their role in fostering the anti-white forces of multiculturalism, globalism, and the existing regime; and how he can think that Israel is not a geopolitical liability to Europe and Russia?

Finally, I can't help but recall an earlier occasion when Faye argued that our survival as a people depends on "ourselves alone" — and not on appeals to those whose interests are inevitably served at our expense.

Michael O'Meara, Ph.D., studied social theory at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris and modern European history at the University of California, Berkeley. He is the author of New Culture, New Right: Anti-Liberalism in Postmodern Europe (Bloomington, Ind.: IstBooks, 2004).