

# WHY WE WRITE

MICHAEL O'MEARA

---

“Qui dit ‘ni droite ni gauche’ dit de droite.”  
—Charles Peguy

In an earlier piece with the same title, Kevin MacDonald said what most of us at *The Occidental Quarterly* must feel: that we, the country's white majority, have been dispossessed, that we no longer belong to America, and that America no longer belongs to us.

Given the nature of the cultural establishment responsible for legitimizing this dispossession, MacDonald claims “the existence of intelligent, well-written, well-documented, and fundamentally honest articles arguing for the importance of white identity and white interests,” as found in TOQ, “represents a unique vision on the right” and thus a critical counter-stroke in defense of the white nation that is “Our America.”<sup>1</sup>

I concur whole-heartedly.

But when TOQ's editor, Greg Johnson, asks me “why I write,” it's not, I must confess, for quite the same reason MacDonald does. Though I suspect we agree on fundamentals, especially in believing that the Judeo-liberal elites sustain their rule not simply through their wealth and power, but through slander and subterfuge, I nevertheless go my separate way in writing neither for the political right nor, perhaps, for the same white America.

It's not just that my Irish side harbors a certain grudge against the old Anglo-Protestant right (a grudge, I realize, that has no place in our racially conscious community). But, more important, I believe the right “in itself” bears a major responsibility for our dispossession.

America is not a conservative country, and the American right has always been a caricature of its European counterpart. Historically, both rights have been a political catastrophe, serving usually as a

---

<sup>1</sup> Kevin MacDonald, “Why We Write,” *The Occidental Quarterly* 7, no. 4 (Winter 2007–2008): 3–9.

complicit partner in modernity's merciless assault on the nation's blood and beliefs. The ideas of certain "true rightists" and Traditionalists (like Joseph de Maistre, Donoso Cortéz, and Julius Evola), as well as Germany's "revolutionary conservatives" (Schmitt, Spengler, Heidegger, etc.), are, it's true, of immediate pertinence to white America—but their ideas have rarely been those of the political right, and it's the latter which is toxic to our cause.

Born in opposition to the New Deal and in defense of the classical liberal remnants of the old capitalist elite, the American right rather quickly made its peace with Roosevelt's new managerial state system.

I remember the rightists of my youth, many of whom saw themselves as race realists and patriots: to the man, almost, they thought Russian Communism was the great bugbear threatening our people, while all the time a more dangerous enemy was planning its anti-white offensive—in the guise of a military-industrial complex devised to extend the wartime New Deal (re-christened the National Security State) into the postwar era, shoring up, in the process, those corporate/financial sectors favoring America's transformation into a neo-Carthaginian superstate.

Since Eisenhower's administration this technocratic/managerial regime has metastasized into a "military-industrial-technological-entertainment-academic-scientific-media-intelligence-homeland security-surveillance-national security-corporate complex" that affects virtually every facet of American life. Commanded by the new imperial presidency, such a totalizing system (call it the "matrix" if you will) diverted everyone's attention with its phony Cold War, waged mainly as an ideological campaign against a closely related but foreign system whose alleged hostility warranted a huge military buildup and thus a justification for bailing out the near bankrupt armament industry.<sup>2</sup> In the process, the complex sought not just a restructurization of the American population, but the imposition of its spread-eagle rule over the rest of world. Both processes, in parallel ways, repudiated the country's original racial-nationalist foundations.

A major reason the system's assault on the white population went largely unopposed in the last half-century is that the right was so preoccupied with its anti-Communist crusade that it ignored the toll it was taking on the American people. A false flag operation pivotal to

---

<sup>2</sup> Frank Kofsky, *Harry S. Truman and the War Scare of 1948: A Successful Campaign to Deceive the Nation* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995).

the right's postwar identity, anti-Communism legitimized not just the dysgenic transformations taking place in state and society, but a subversion that was, arguably, a hundred times more threatening than anything dreamt up in Moscow. For despite their American-baiting propaganda about equality, the Russians never believed in, let alone practiced, race-mixing. This was the hobby horse of our home-grown subversives who were bent on sending troops against racially conscious whites in the deep South and in South Boston, doing so for the sake of a universal democracy which recognizes no borders, upholds no cultural or national identity, and resists no special interests. It seems hardly coincidental that the bloodless right championing this system subsequently became the plaything of Jewish ex-Trotskyists.

Nearly every strain of US conservatism has embraced (and embraces still) this soft totalitarian system, undergirded not by Soviet-style coercion but by Madison Avenue-style persuasion and conditioning that "the new managerial liberals" set in place during and immediately after the Second World War. Mainstream conservatives, accordingly, pursue policies favoring military Keynesianism and the primacy of world markets, just as their greatest fear is not the corruption of the nation's blood, but the dreaded "class-war rhetoric of nativists" exposing and opposing their oligarchic policies.

By contrast, paleoconservatives have a certain sense that America is undergoing an Orwellian make-over, but they nevertheless prattle on, in the legalistic style distinct to them, about a Constitution lost in 1861, seemingly oblivious to what's happening to the nation's genetic heritage.

As for the "racialist right" – those marginal groups and individuals who once, before the internet killed them off, defended the racial basis of American nationality in the real world – it has rarely been anything more than a disreputable collection of con artists, embezzlers, sexual deviants, alcoholics, government informers, costumed Nazis, and closet Jews, whose chief accomplishment has been to tarnish the very ideal of white racial preservation.

I find it difficult not to conclude that the national interests of white Americans have been poorly served by the right, whether paleo, neocon, Republican, or racialist.

I write thus not as a rightist, who wants to conserve something in a political system geared to white dispossession, but as a nationalist who believes the United States is a soft totalitarian regime based on creedal propositions contravening the laws of nature and that this regime is the

principal enemy of the American nation. Our people's only hope of survival, if this is the case, lies in throwing off this system and asserting our right to self-determination — i.e., our right to our own state.

In the history of nineteenth- and twentieth-century nationalist movements, conservatism's so-called traditions often, admittedly, inspired nationalist concerns, but so too did the radical tactics and vision of the revolutionary left: hence both the Gaelic Revival and the physical force Republicanism of the Irish nation, the Aryan consciousness and anti-Semitic socialism of the German nation, the ancient Roman themes and Futurist modernism of the Italian nation, the messianic spiritual vocation and revolutionary industrialism of the Russian nation.

Among different peoples in different eras, nationalists have pursued different agendas, none of which fit the neatly-ordered left-right categories of the modernist narrative. Instead, their aims and methods were distinct to the nation whose cause they championed. When white workers in nineteenth-century California, for example, invoked radical egalitarian principles and organized trade unions and anti-coolie clubs to defend the existing racial hierarchy and resist monopolist designs to import Asiatic labor, there was nothing specifically right-wing about it. Indeed, it's almost a historical axiom that the more conservative the right becomes in defending the status quo, the less overtly racial it is.

Given that the right supports policies resistant or indifferent to the racial basis of American nationality, that the left serves as the vanguard of the state's present anti-white campaign, and that the globalist elites promoting multiracial "diversity" operate at a level transcending right and left, the politics I favor are those indigenous to the American nation: the nativist, populist, and racial-nationalist politics which historically animated what Sam Dickson calls "the yeoman white working and middle classes."

These politics, of course, are an anathema to our parasitic ruling class. But from the beginning, the racial nationalism of those who built America from the bottom up defined the nation as a white man's country. Working-class (as well as agrarian, backcountry, and red-neck) America arose, thus, in opposition to the continent's aboriginals, to the imported negro slaves who supplied (often against its settlers' wishes) the stoop labor for its plantations, to the mestizos who infiltrated from the south, to the Asiatic hordes the big corporations sought to import, and, not least, to those whites (planters, bankers,

reformers, etc.) who put their grand ambitions above the national interest.

The contempt I feel for the left, which promotes the nation-destroying principles of feminism, homophilia, multiculturalism, democratism, and globalism at the expense of white working people knows no bounds. But this does nothing to change my mind about the right's inherent bankruptcy. I think it's revealing that the specter of nationalism, and not conservatism, haunts the corrupt governing elites of the former white homelands, having replaced Communism as the force uniting the barely distinguishable remnants of the system's left-right factions. It stands, as such, as the one real opponent to the system's capitalist, cosmopolitan, and anti-national policies.

For more than half a century now, the white nation has ceased to exist "for itself." But all is not lost. For as white Americans become a minority in their own land and increasingly experience the racial nature of their dispossession, they, like whites in prison, will be forced, if they are to survive as a people, to organize—and, in organizing, be forced to the realization that the right's system-defending principles are a source of, not a solution to the problems threatening their survival.

At this hopefully not-too-distant point, when white Americans awake to their fate as a people in the grips of an ethnocidal regime, I expect TOQ to become the metapolitical organ NOT of a revitalized, racially conscious right, but of a revolutionary nationalism assertive of the white man's unique identity. It is for this that I write.

*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.: 1stBooks, 2004).*