

# A LIFE FOR HIS PEOPLE

An Interview with Michael Walker

---

HUNTER JACKSON

For over twenty-five years, Michael Walker has been at the forefront of nationalist thought: translating hitherto unknown works into English, examining the foibles and prejudices of our civilization, and almost single-handedly introducing the ideas of the European New Right to the English-speaking world. In 1981, Walker began publishing his theoretical journal *The Scorpion*. Featuring articles by such continental thinkers as Alain de Benoist, Guillaume Faye, Robert Steuckers, and Julius Evola, each issue deals with a certain theme: the loss of heroism in the modern world, the idea of empire, America, and similar subjects of interest to nationalists. In 1982, Walker editorialized, "If we wish to change society, we must truly understand it, understand what nihilism and egalitarianism really are and not simply condemn the consequences of these doctrines. In this sense cultural change precedes political change. We look forward to a revolution, a cultural revolution."<sup>1</sup> Today, we still carry this idea in our hearts: ever we look forward to our rebirth.

*The Occidental Quarterly*: Tell us a little bit about your background: your education, any political affiliations, age, and what led you to start *The Scorpion*.

**Michael Walker**: I was educated at a private Roman Catholic school in England. I was quite anti-British at school and, from an early age, had the reputation of being so. I was always impressed by the heroic gesture in politics—my first ever political hero was King Harold who fell at the Battle of Hastings in 1066. For most of my time at school, I was a liberal with a capital L, which in some respects I still am (I mean liberal in the British rather than American sense, that is to

---

<sup>1</sup> Editorial, *The Scorpion*, No. 2 (Spring-Summer 1982), 1.

say, with a strong belief in fairness and openness to other views).

What nudged me towards radical nationalist/racial politics was my deep and constant distrust of all political manifestos or ideas which take a situation or idea for granted. This is exactly what was done with multi-racialism in the 1970s/1980s. It was taken "as a given" that people would accept a multi-racial society as a *fait accompli* and all for the best. I rebelled against that as I probably would have rebelled if the reverse had been the case.

I was drawn to the French New Right as an organization which was prepared and, indeed, keen to talk issues through, rather than just having a number of ideas or beliefs (this time from the nationalist corner) as just "taken as read." I was also much impressed by the intellectual and, above all, cultural fanaticism of the French New Right—it was like a breath of fresh air, the experience that "right wing intellectual" did not have to be an oxymoron.

**TOQ:** *Who are your influences?*

**MW:** The Christian Church for the feeling of solidarity and fanatical faith. Heroic figures down through history. Various individuals who have impressed me by their humble non-dogmatic contribution to human well being. My father's devout faith and my mother's *bon vivant* attitude to life, philosophy of selfishness, and skepticism. From both of them a deep respect for the faith of other people and their distrust of mockery of the faith or argument of others, if sincerely held. I have always disliked excessive satire and mockery and don't much enjoy programs where mockery, including racial, is the key tone.

I have been influenced by many writers: Shakespeare, Nietzsche, also E. M. Forster strangely enough, although, I think he only confirmed me in beliefs I already held, and any number of people through daily social intercourse.

An enormous influence, the greatest of all, is my daily experience of the creeping ugliness which I associate with ultimate evil: banality, mediocrity and, as D. H. Lawrence so succinctly put it, a lack of wonder. I could write for pages on influences . . .

**TOQ:** *How long has The Scorpion been in publication?*

**MW:** Since 1981 when it was called *The National Democrat*. It is on

ice at the moment, although I hope one day it will come out of its sleep and start again, and if that sounds as though it has a life or ideas of its own, I sometimes think that is indeed the case, that it has decided of its own accord at the moment to hibernate.

**TOQ:** *The Occidental Quarterly is especially concerned with cultivating young nationalists. Do you have any advice for young activists today?*

**MW:** What a difficult question! To network, to use a modern expression, but not with those with whom one is not in some kind of agreement. To meet up and do things together, to socialize, to present oneself as a force of strength, to show solidarity when required. For those who are involved in political activity, to create the opportunity for others to demonstrate solidarity. To have a plan as to how to balance personal career and survival with one's commitment—so many young enthusiasts are drawn into their career and bury, or forget, their earlier ideals. Another danger is addiction, be it to sport, to sex, to gambling . . . addiction arises very often from excessive isolation. Networking in the context of one's ideas/beliefs is a good antidote against addiction and forgetting what is important. It is wrong to live in hope of quick results—more useful than the sudden sprinter is the reliable long distant runner, one who can keep going for decades. There should be certain core beliefs which one is prepared to defend and not sacrifice for expediency, and others which are to some extent negotiable. If one is involved in politics one should have an idea as to which is which. In the world we live in, more transparent than times before, it is as well to be very conscious that what we do or say now may be held up and quoted to us in 20 years time without warning. We should be prepared to stand by what we write and say wherever and whenever we say or write it.

**TOQ:** *Can you tell us a little bit about the state of Europe? Is there any hope in the various political parties operating today?*

**MW:** I am not sure if I am in the position to be able to make a sweeping observation on the state of Europe. What is meant by "hope" in your question? The established political parties are firmly committed to multi-racial constituencies. Of course it is different with a number of the populist parties such as *Vlaams Belang*, or the *Dansk*

*Folkeparti*, or *La Lega Nord per l'Indipendenza della Padania*. Broadly speaking, they seek a compromise or an alliance with Jews and Jewish groups in order to present a common face against Muslim immigration. If they once begin to cooperate with libertarian anti-statists who are opposed to the social support many immigrants receive, a very potent brew could develop. Jewish support is, of course, crucial so far as winning influence in the media is concerned, but that has a heavy price.

Europe has become in general politically apathetic—but I think there is a potential for a political turn around via a non-dogmatic populist challenge to the established order. The prerequisite for this is an economic meltdown leaving the middle class and upper working class trapped in poverty. A well-organized and financially sound populist movement could reap really enormous benefits from such a situation. To date, the economic crisis in Europe which many have been predicting has not really unfolded, but the banking property crisis, coupled with Chinese economic domination, not least of financial markets, may lead to that situation. When that happens, establishment parties, which have little popular basis or support today (they are tolerated *en défaut de mieux* and because of general disinterest in politics) could be swept away in a tide of resentment.

The situation is complicated by the nostalgia of nations, such as Ireland and Britain, for the old order of national independence coupled with a somewhat hypocritical adherence to the high living standards perceived as coming from open markets and European unity, and in Ireland's case, from direct subsidies. Europe is entirely materialistic in its aspirations today, and political revolt, if, and when, it comes, will come directly out of disappointed economic hopes. Given trends in globalization, that is not at all improbable. Britain especially strikes me as a country where things may turn very nasty economically in the next few years. In that case, a major populist revolt is not improbable.

**TOQ:** *Can you comment on the New Right's hostility to America?*

**MW:** The perception is that the USA is the global driving force behind reducing all humanity to a single identity, *Homo economicus*, as he has been called. To a certain extent, America replaces Jewishness as the quasi-symbolic figure of non-heroic, economics-based society, a society where the hero is the man or woman who makes money, not the man or woman who is brave, or who upholds certain ideals or

principles in the face of adversity. America is perceived as being home for the wandering Jew, because the United States is, by the nature of its history, a nation founded primarily on an ideal and not primarily on an ethnic *fait accompli*, which is the case in the coming to being of the nations of Europe.

America, as the land of opportunity, is the pragmatic land where what matters is only the pragmatic advantage, the material gain. It is therefore seen in Europe as firstly, a cultural enemy and ultimately, a racial enemy. In addition to this, America is understood as the champion of individual rights, human rights, internationalism, and democracy, which all arouse hostility in New Right theorists. As the New Right in Europe has been dominated by French thinkers, French/Gaullist suspicion towards the USA has also played its role and, perhaps ironically, a suspicion of the tendency in US politics to be internationally idealistic more than pragmatic European politicians. The New Right is perhaps a little too dismissive of American religious idealism as cynical hypocrisy to gain economic and political advantage, whereas some of its crusading zeal is rooted in genuine belief. A recent issue of the New Right house organ *éléments* sought to redress the balance to some extent by painting a more favorable picture of the US, stressing that the US is the home to individualist suspicion of big government and home to many populist initiatives.

Nevertheless, the strong anti-Christian beliefs of the New Right make it instinctively hostile to the Biblical messianism and Puritanism of nearly all of American conservatism.

**TOQ:** *You've been residing in Germany for some time now. What is the current state of both the traditional right and the New Right in Germany today?*

**MW:** For historical reasons, and because of quite repressive laws, a climate of left bias, and dogmatism in a pro-establishment media (the German media offer nothing which deviates from a pro-Israel, pro-internationalist, pro-multiracial line), and for other reasons, there is nothing to speak of in Germany.

At the same time, it should be noted that Germany is remarkable in the extent to which different groups or schools of thought exist in ghettos. What I mean, for example, is that there is an excellent publication called *Junge Freiheit*, which in its politics might be comparable

to *Chronicles* in the USA, that has organized interviews with many well-known, and even establishment, or quasi-establishment figures — politicians, for example, from establishment parties. (It has been more successful in this respect than comparable publications elsewhere.) It is, however, so effectively cut off from mainstream political commentary, most educated people are not hostile to it — they haven't heard of it, and its interviews excite relatively little comment outside the charmed circle of the anti-fascist lobby which in turn seeks to ensure that the magazine is kept out of main-line book stores. All this goes on without the general public having the least idea.

In other countries, such as France or Britain, there is much more awareness within the country of what is going on. Hate him or love him, just about everybody in France knows who Le Pen is. In Germany, I doubt if even 5 percent of the population could give the name of the leader of the NPD.<sup>2</sup> If *Junge Freiheit* existed with the same circulation and success with interviews in France or Britain, it would be a household name in those countries. In Germany, few people who are neither readers nor “anti-fascist” activists have even heard of it.

**TOQ:** *Other than The Scorpion, are there any other projects you are working on at this time?*

**MW:** I presume that you mean in the metapolitical/political sense. Yes, I should like to see my play (*Hitler's Temptation*) performed or recorded. Also, I am engaged in writing a novel.

**TOQ:** *Why has the New Right met with such limited success in the English-speaking world?*

**MW:** The main reason is that the English-speaking world has always been seen, and sees itself, as suspicious of theory, eschewing philosophy in favor of solving challenges pragmatically. It is precisely the view of the New Right that this approach is wrong for the situation we are now in. We need to be metapolitical, that is to say, consider our position philosophically before going into practical politics. Another point to note is that conservatism in the English-speaking world is deeply rooted in fighting racialism and fighting fascism, so a

---

<sup>2</sup> *Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands*, National Democratic Party of Germany — TOQ.

good deal of conservative thought in the UK or USA is expended in revering figures (for example Churchill, Lincoln, Margaret Thatcher) whose conservatism was a mixture of pragmatism and Christian faith, both intrinsically hostile to a tough policy of racial or cultural identity politics.

**TOQ:** *Do you see any hope in the future of European man?*

**MW:** Sure, why not? Who knows what will happen tomorrow? It may be scientifically possible to create a million clones from the last few examples of a dying race. It is not a subject I spend much thought on because it does not affect the way I behave.

**TOQ:** *You've been working for an awakening of European man for years now. Do you have any regrets?*

**MW:** My regrets are linked to my personal weaknesses and failings and are therefore ongoing.

I do regret, though, not having planned while I was young exactly how I would go about, for example, ensuring that my writing would not be stonewalled and would not have gone headlong into political groups without a thought as to how that would affect my chances of having a book published or a play produced. I regret not having become a regular history teacher. On the other hand, that might have meant I would never have even edited *The Scorpion*. I regret not being able to work with other people better, and I regret not being able to make correct decisions quickly and effectively, but these regrets, as I say, are more like ongoing defects of character. I very much regret not having made a concentrated effort in penetrating the world of letters and becoming a halfway successful writer like Jean Raspail.

**TOQ:** *Given the ubiquitous nature of consumerism and cultural homogenization, what advice can you give to those who seek to preserve their identity?*

**MW:** If they follow my earlier advice of networking and keeping together, that is a good start. From that, it should be possible to organize cultural and political events. Enthusiasm is notoriously infectious – with enthusiasm in private life much can be achieved in reviving

traditions and beliefs which may be lying dormant but which are not dead. A small living tradition is worth more than an apparently “stronger” tradition in which the fire of true belief has already died out.

**TOQ:** *Would you care to comment on the role of the Jews in European society?*

**MW:** The great majority of people today are unaware that there is an issue to discuss here; the allegations of mass murder have served as a way of defusing any criticism of that role. In my opinion, we should refrain from polemic until we have established the important facts, facts about the percentage of Jews in different areas of social, cultural, economic, and political life. It is with these facts that people should first be confronted and the first discussions begin. Once the facts have become widely known and accepted, once awareness has been reestablished, then anyone who wishes may turn to the conclusions which may, or should be, drawn from such facts. Then it will be time to begin making comments. Making comments today is going to be a fairly useless exercise since comments and polemics fall on deaf ears. I’ll say it again—we need agreement on the facts first and, added to that, some form of accepted data bank where the facts can be collected. Commentary is for another day.

**TOQ:** *Americans, drawing off Wilmot Robertson’s *The Ethnostate*, tend to debate the feasibility of an ethnic homeland. Do you think this is a plausible solution for the survival of our people?*

**MW:** Yes, but only if others agree—it is difficult to imagine it in a hostile world. It would have to be developed in cooperation with others seeking to build their own states who also have an advantage in doing so. Modern technology is such that increasingly belonging to one geographical area is less a matter of compulsion and increasingly one of choice. One ethnostate alone would not be tolerated—but groups cooperating with each other are another matter. Sometimes the ethnostate is used as a Trojan horse to weaken large nations. On the other hand, by their very nature, small breakaway states, movements, and ethnostates stress the historical ethnicity of the region for which they seek independence.

**TOQ:** *The New Right sought to become a new school of thought. You've published on issues ranging from America, to nihilism, and education. Is there any underlying position linking your work together?*

**MW:** I would say that a common thread is a belief in variety, a celebration of variety, and a distrust of all systems, religions, schools of thought which impose uniformity and homogeneity. That is frankly just about the only opinion which is probably a prerequisite of belonging to a New Right school of thought.

**TOQ:** *Guillaume Faye argues in The Colonization of Europe that immigration is the greatest threat to Europe today. What do you see as the greatest danger to Europe today?*

**MW:** World overpopulation and guilt about the Third World: the two prime causes of mass immigration into Europe

**TOQ:** *One often hears the names of Alain de Benoist, Guillaume Faye, and Robert Steuckers whenever the New Right is mentioned. Are there any other writers in Europe that we should take note of?*

**MW:** Marco Tarchi in Italy edits *Diorama Letterario* and *Trasgressioni* which are excellent publications (the first is a journal of critical review and the second a theoretical journal—both appear monthly) and they appear more regularly than any other New Right publications, but the style of writing is rich, dense, and complex, and heavy going, even for those who are fluent in Italian. The French of *Elements* and *Nouvelle Ecole* and *Krisis* is straightforward by comparison. These two publications are not well known outside Italy. If Marco Tarchi were a writer in English he would be much better known. I can't think of any other name spontaneously.

**TOQ:** *You've been called the leading exponent of the New Right in English. Do you think this is an accurate statement?*

**MW:** I dare say. I think that what I did helped project the New Right into the English-speaking world. On the other hand, if it hadn't been me it might have been someone else.

**TOQ:** *What is the response of the average European citizen to immigration? Do Europeans care that their homelands are radically changing?*

**MW:** There is some truth in the old Marxian argument that it all comes down to economics in the end. It is not entirely true, I stress, but there is truth in it. So far as immigration is concerned, most people are frankly not greatly interested so long as they do not feel economically threatened or threatened in terms of crime. Your question implies that it is immigration which is the sole cause of rapid change, but I would dispute that. The explosion of urban conglomerates, the increased mobility, wealth, and domesticization (sic) of modern man, the triumph of utility, and intentional anti-aestheticism in architecture have done as much to change the homelands of Europe, in my opinion, as colored immigration. The average European, like the average African, Asian, or American is firstly interested in creature comforts, jobs, material progress, and security. If immigration is not seen as threatening that, immigration will not cause much hostility. However, immigration does threaten security in many ways: for example, in terms of jobs and crime, and, to that extent, is indeed perceived as a threat. When economic times get rougher, the average member of any indigenous population is likely to look around for the cause of the problems (what the left always disingenuously labels "scapegoating") and hope for, and even call for, political solutions to those problems.

**TOQ:** *Can you comment on the historical role of fascism in the current state of Western man?*

**MW:** Not very much. Fascism was an expression of extreme religious nostalgia, a yearning for a military and religious solution to many of the challenges of modern mass society. The defeat of fascism, and the circumstances of that defeat, have, however, meant that attempts to defend European identity are rejected as fascism or Nazism, while those who themselves want to defend European identity find it hard to avoid fascist clichés and associations.

**TOQ:** *You've written that the average man is basically a nihilist. What do you believe in?*

**MW:** I don't remember writing that the average man was a nihilist.

I wouldn't write that so crassly today – most people do not articulate their thoughts to such an extreme extent or conclusion. I believe in a large number of what might be called virtues which sound sentimental or even kitschy if written down in black and white. If I had to put it simply, I would say I believe in everything which increases our sense of wonder and oppose everything which diminishes it.

**TOQ:** *There's a bit of confusion on our side of the Atlantic concerning "the right to difference" and its relation to the idea of racism. What is "the right to difference?" Is it a feasible idea for preserving our own identity?*

**MW:** There is, of course, an intentional provocation in taking the term "the right to," but it is true that a respect for the difference of others is a respect for one's own identity, and those who do not respect the identity of others themselves have an identity which is homogenizing and destructive. Those who seek the ending of difference share a common wish to destroy identities, whether as part of the globalization of modern society, with its associated multiracialism, or in terms of a racial superiority which seeks the destruction of other races. This latter form exists much more in the attitude of the human species as a whole to the nonhuman world and not in the form of a racial totalitarianism, which is essentially a bogey created by the far left and multiculturalists for their own reasons.

There is, to be sure, a problem in being a cultural relativist (respect for all cultures and identities) and at the same time an adherent of one's own culture, but that is a complex issue. Certainly it is hypocritical if Americans, for example, claim that their identity is threatened by the Spanish language, while they themselves show no intention of respecting the cultures or languages of the countries which they visit. (The American ignorance of other languages and their literally loud insistence on speaking English everywhere and all the time is relentless and a factor which contributes, I suspect, to the poor international image of Americans to a larger extent than most people, Americans or not, realize.)

**TOQ:** *On a positive note, what kind of world do you want your descendants to inherit? In other words, what would a healthy society look like to you?*

**MW:** A world in which the human species has rediscovered its equilibrium in nature and can reconcile its genius and quest for change with the cycles of life and death. That means above all, breaking with the nostrum of growth whereby our species has turned into a cancer so far as the planet is concerned and becoming a truly natural part of our worldly home again. I personally believe that without the white race this is impossible. The race which caused the Promethean conflagration has alone the ability to quell it.

**TOQ:** *Is there anything you would like to add?*

**MW:** I wish I had more time to answer these sorts of interviews at leisure. I am grateful to you for giving me the chance to express some of my views. The questions were intelligent, in marked contrast to the sort of questions I could expect from establishment media.

**TOQ:** *How can interested readers contact The Scorpion?*

**MW:** Well, as I say, *The Scorpion* is on ice, although, of course, I still have back copies. I can be contacted by post at *The Scorpion*, BCM 5766, London WCI N 3XX London or by electronic mail at Michael.Walker@gmx.net.

**TOQ:** *Thank you for your time.*

**MW:** Thank you.

*Hunter Jackson is pursuing a Ph.D. in history. This is his first appearance in **The Occidental Quarterly**.*