Enoch Powell’s warning of racial strife was a landmark event for post-war fascists in Great Britain. As a Conservative Member of Parliament (MP), he said “we must be mad, literally mad, as a nation to be permitting the annual inflow of some 50,000 dependants” and “I am filled with foreboding; like the Roman, I seem to see ‘the River Tiber foaming with much blood.’”\(^1\) These words echoed on television and in newspapers throughout the country in April 1968. For many, the “Rivers of Blood” speech played to the worst fears of the population about multicultural Britain and stoked tension in diverse urban cities. Yet for others it reflected a common sentiment among a disenchanted portion of the white population. The fascists immediately praised him and stated that not only did it reflect their long-held beliefs, but Powell’s condemnation by the political establishment was proof that the mainstream parties deliberately ignored important issues such as race and immigration. The marginal fascist parties quickly set out to harness the attention and gain members by appealing to those who shared Powell’s views. The National Front (NF) began marches and demonstrations supporting Powell, and called for the forced repatriation of all “non-whites” from the country. A media frenzy ensued that brought the NF attention and a surge of new members. This event proved to be a watershed moment for the fascists that gave them a bridge to escape political marginality.

This chapter examines the origins of British fascism and how the fascists adapted to issues that arose after the Second World War. It traces the path from inter-war fascism to the early post-war movement by showing
how the organizations harnessed the concerns of the population that supported the Allied war effort against Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. Not only were several key leaders interned by the authorities and demoralized by the situation during the Second World War, but the devastation wrought by the conflict and the Holocaust meant that fascism’s antidemocratic and racial ideas were discredited in the eyes of the public. For British fascism to survive, it needed to modify its message and focus on the contemporary issues that the country faced. More than twenty years after the war, Powell’s speech provided a platform for the NF to spread its racist policies and tap into popular discontent with the major parties. To fully harness the energy surrounding fears about race and immigration, the NF launched several initiatives to spread its message, gain supporters and win elections. This chapter explores those developments and most significant NF initiative, which was worker outreach through “white unions” that opposed multiculturalism and leftist politics.

**Inter-War British Fascism**

Contemporary British fascism’s ideology and tactics are rooted in the social and political turmoil that followed the First World War. The devastation of the conflict challenged tradition and order throughout Europe, which paved the way for young war veterans to introduce new ideas and solutions. In continental Europe, Adolf Hitler made his rise to power with the National Socialist German Workers’ Party, while Benito Mussolini led the National Fascist Party to political control in Italy. Likewise, politicians in Britain sought new ideas to address the unprecedented economic and social changes brought about by the war. In 1918, war veteran Oswald Mosley was elected in Harrow to the House of Commons with more than 80% of the vote, becoming the youngest Member of Parliament. Mosley’s election and party affiliation as a Coalition Conservative was shaped by the war experience and the destruction of pre-war political alliances. As David Howell explained, Mosley argued in his first election campaign that modernization would occur with full employment by growing wages from high productivity, but he also targeted “aliens,” using anti-German, anti-Irish and anti-Semitic “stereotypes.” Yet by the next election Mosley had become an independent and successfully defeated the Conservative candidate.

For the next decade, Mosley altered his political positions and affiliations. In 1924, he lost re-election, but won a by-election in Smethwick
as a Labour candidate. In 1929, Mosley won re-election while his wife, Lady Cynthia Mosley, was elected for Stoke. Mosley’s arguments for reforming banking and his support of trade unionists and socialism made him a “hero” for Labour and “hated” by the Conservatives. In that election Ramsay MacDonald became Prime Minister and Mosley, hoping to gain a position in the government, became Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. Yet his policies put him at odds with the Labour government and he became the first minister to resign his post. In May 1930, he gave a 70-minute speech in the House of Commons, described as the “pinnacle of his political career,” where he argued for insulating the economy and offered specific employment, education and pension policies. In search of a new political vehicle for his ideas, he started the New Party in 1931, but it proved ineffective due to internal party differences and it never established a clear political identity. Mosley blamed the party’s failure on an intentional campaign by the press and political establishment that kept “its policy and aims” from being “known or discussed by the public.”

During autumn 1931, Mosley continued exploring new political strategies and looked towards fascism in continental Europe as a social and political solution to the growing economic problems caused by the Depression in Britain. Scholar Martin Pugh wrote that in January 1932, Mosley traveled to Italy where he found himself “admiring fascist achievements,” which spawned regular visits to Italy and even funding from Mussolini. Though ideologically closer to fascist Italy, Mosley also built connections with Nazi Germany, including meeting Adolf Hitler in April 1935, and Mosley married his second wife, Diana Mitford, in October 1936 at Joseph Goebbels’ Berlin home. Despite foreign influences, Mosley’s new movement hoped to draw patriotic supporters of the Conservative and Labour parties who were disappointed with the political response to the economic crisis.

In October 1932, Mosley started the British Union of Fascists (BUF) with a radical political platform that would replace British democracy with a dictatorship. Scholar Richard Thurlow’s work focused on connecting inter-war fascism with post-war fascism by showing their ideological genealogy and the role key figures played in influencing groups. Thurlow specifically examined how Mosley “increasingly came to see himself as the political spokesman for the lost generation and the survivors of the First World War.” Indeed, Mosley’s 1932 *The Greater Britain* offered his vision for the country and how the fascist party
would rule the nation. Calling the political parties a “farce,” his goal was to establish a “corporate state” that could reconcile “class interests” with a new political structure and a new economic system to address Britain’s unique issues. One year later, in a much shorter publication, Mosley wrote that “[f]ascism is dictatorship in the modern sense of the word, which implies government armed by the people with power to solve problems which the people are determined to overcome.” In 1936, Mosley expanded on his ideas in *Tomorrow We Live*, which highlighted the “Jewish question” by affirming “the right of every nation to deport any foreigner who has abused its hospitality, and we hold the aim of finding, together with other European nations, a final solution of this vexed question by the creation of a Jewish National State.”

When the British Union of Fascists was launched, it generated enthusiasm not only among traditional Labour supporters in industrial towns, but also among Conservative-minded businessmen. Mosley attracted devoted youth as well as fellow military veterans with an aversion to democratic rule. Notably, A.K. Chesterton, a South African-born British Army veteran, joined the BUF in November 1933. Scholar David Baker detailed Chesterton’s attraction to Mosley’s organization based on his desire to preserve the Empire, his opposition to liberal democracy and his interest in “achieving the ‘god-like’ in man.” A professional writer who specialized in William Shakespeare, Chesterton became editor of the BUF’s newspaper *Blackshirt* and his articles were featured on its front page. His writing focused on the “Christian ideal” being “increasingly undermined,” the Empire “slipping adrift” and how National Socialism provides “work and bread.” In 1937, Chesterton went on to write an openly sympathetic biography titled *Oswald Mosley: Portrait of a Leader*, which was also serialized in BUF publications. With chapters such as “Leader of Men,” the book also attacked BUF opponents, including blaming “the Jews” for the violence at Mosley’s Olympia rally in 1934 as well as Mosley’s “discovery” that “the whole bunch of purely parasitical occupations were found to be Jew-ridden.” Chesterton’s praise was not the only support Mosley received from writers and journalists. In fact, Lord Rothermere, who controlled a number of newspapers including the *Daily Mail, Sunday Dispatch* and *Evening News*, showed an interest in supporting Mosley in December 1931 and praised fascism throughout the early 1930s. Martin Pugh argued that the newspapers began a “campaign of promotion” for the BUF with regular sympathetic reports about the group, including the infamous *Daily Mail* article “Hurrah for
the Blackshirts” in January 1934, until the violence at the Olympia rally caused Rothermere to withdraw support. Yet despite support and even foreign funding, the BUF membership peaked in 1934 with an estimated 50,000 members and declined to about 20,000 members by 1939. Though Mosley popularized fascism in Britain and targeted BUF propaganda on issues involving xenophobia, fascism and racism were not new to British politics. Important elements of fascist ideas, such as social Darwinism and anti-Semitism, predate the advent of British fascist parties. The first organized fascist party in Britain was the British Fascisti, established in 1923 by Rothea Lintorn Orman with financial support from her mother. The party explained that it had adopted the term fascist “because of the success attained by Mussolini and his supporters.” An early issue of its publication, The British Lion, declared its policy as “upholding” the monarchy, Empire and Christianity as well as “improving” social conditions. The organization developed a branch in Australia and described itself as an “anti-socialist” movement, which even started “clubs” for children in order to “remedy” communism in Sunday school. The membership remained small, and revenue peaked with magazine subscription orders of £6848, dropping to less than £400, and the party went into bankruptcy in 1934 with an estimated 300 members. Likewise, Arnold Leese, an active racist and anti-Semite, started the Imperial Fascist League in 1928 in opposition to socialism and was later found guilty of public mischief. Though Leese’s group had a much more marginal role than the BUF, his influence and legacy within British fascism grew decades later.

The British Union of Fascists’ success was limited to two local elections in the country, and due to the combination of bad publicity regarding violent behavior and Britain’s drift towards war with the fascist countries, domestic fascists came to be viewed suspiciously. In May 1940, the British government arrested Mosley and Leese along with hundreds of leading fascists under Defence Regulation 18B, which allowed the government to detain people with associations with, or sympathizers of, foreign enemies. Mosley, who had been campaigning for peace with Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, was released in 1943 and re-entered politics in 1948 with the Union Movement, which campaigned for the creation of Europe as “a nation.” The organization’s publication announced that its objectives included a union between Europeans and resistance to communism.
While Mosley was detained in Britain, Chesterton was in the British Army fighting against the Axis powers in Africa. By 1937 Chesterton had grown disillusioned with Mosley and resigned, complaining about Mosley’s favoritism and ego as well as the failure to recognize actual problems in the movement. Chesterton’s military duty during the war was spent in Kenya and Somaliland, where he wrote the racist novel *Juma the Great*, until his health suffered in 1943 and he returned to Britain, writing about politics during 1944. Mosley’s and Chesterton’s experiences profoundly shaped the post-war nature of British fascism. While Mosley continued his descent into obscurity and failed to regain his inter-war following, Chesterton developed political policies and became a significant fascist leader.

**Early Post-War Fascism and the League of Empire Loyalists**

During the Second World War, the British government kept a watchful eye on Chesterton even though he publicly disavowed associations with the British Union of Fascists. He divorced himself from the Mosleyites and denounced former BUF member William Joyce, who had fled to Nazi Germany, as a traitor despite their previous connections. In November 1944, Chesterton and Colin Brooks, editor of *Truth*, started the NF with the stated goals of protecting British sovereignty, Empire and Christian traditions as well as finding an “honourable, just and lasting solution” to the “real Jewish problem.” The organization was quietly started as the After Victory Group and in turn became the NF, which was launched at the end of the war, to avoid opposition. First led by Brooks and then by Chesterton, the NF considered changing its name to the Empire Front or the National Front Against Communism. A Security Service file marked “secret” discussed the “importance” of the NF as a fascist party with the backing of “suitable men,” but noted that by the summer of 1945 it was experiencing problems due to an “internal” fight over leaks to the rival British People’s Party led by John Beckett, a former key BUF activist. The NF quickly disintegrated and by 1953 Chesterton had become a “literary advisor” to Lord Beaverbrook, ghost-writing his publications. Later that year Chesterton, using the pseudonym Philip Faulconbridge, launched his own periodical titled *Candour*, which caused Beaverbrook to terminate Chesterton’s employment.
Conscious of Empire due partly to his South African birth, Chesterton had long taken an interest in preserving British imperial power. With the decline of British influence and the increasingly loud rumblings from the colonies for independence following the war, Chesterton established the League of Empire Loyalists (LEL) in 1954 and *Candour* became its official periodical. The structure of the association included Chesterton as chair, with a council comprising J. Creagh Scott, G.S. Oddie, Austen Brooks (who became deputy chair), Lady Freeman, Alice Raven, M.C. Greene and N.A. Bonnar. Rather than focus on elections, the LEL sought to pressure politicians and the public to maintain and strengthen the “bonds” between British subjects in the world. In an October 1954 pamphlet promoting imperial loyalty and the LEL, Chesterton explained that his group “supports no political party, believing that all have helped to undermine the British present and betray the British future.” He went on to write that there is no difference between American capitalism and Soviet communism, and that the LEL “fights these enemies and their fifth columns in the Empire.” The group organized visits to Africa, but mostly served as a pressure group to get politicians to support strong imperial policies. According to former LEL member Bill Baillie, the group would “heckle” Conservative Party meetings and communist gatherings, which proved to be dangerous in many cases.

Due to Chesterton’s fame in fascist circles as well as his writings on Jewish conspiracy, the LEL drew people who later became leading post-war fascists, including John Tyndall, Martin Webster, Colin Jordan and John Bean. Indeed, the LEL served as an important training ground for these men. Tyndall wrote that “*Candour* brought me face-to-face for the first time with what is sometimes called the ‘Conspiracy Theory’, the idea that the great events of recent history and of the present were not chance occurrences,” and he decided to “join the League of Empire Loyalists and help the spread of A.K. Chesterton’s ideas.” Similarly, Webster said that he realized society and the world were changing, “but wasn’t readily able to interpret the meaning of what I was noticing” until the League of Empire Loyalists “started” helping him. John Bean joined the LEL in 1955, finding that Chesterton’s thinking was in tune with the current issues, and rose to be the LEL’s northern organizer, while Colin Jordan, a school teacher, was the Midlands organizer. At the same time, *Candour* served as an outlet for some of the earliest
publications by these future fascist leaders. Webster explained that the group attracted “old fashioned Tories” as well as a “scattering of pre-war fascists” who would disrupt other political party meetings with heckling and ask politicians tough questions.

While Chesterton’s League of Empire Loyalists attracted attention from hardline radicals, Mosley launched his post-war Union Movement and maintained the support of a fringe minority, but suffered from poor election returns and mass protests. Even some fascists avoided Mosley’s movement because of his post-war objectives. Martin Webster, for example, was horrified by Mosley’s proposals for Europe to become as a “nation,” believing that such an idea was similar to the European Economic Community (EEC) and would dilute British nationality and sovereignty. Moreover, another reason Webster had little interest in joining the Union Movement was because he considered it merely a fan club for Mosley’s pre-war politics that attracted “seedy” people. This sentiment was echoed by John Bean, a former member of the Union Movement before joining the LEL, when he described Mosley’s post-war followers as containing “a higher percentage of degenerates and the socially dysfunctional” when compared with his inter-war movement.

The League of Empire Loyalists not only drew on myths of the imperial past, but argued that Britain should maintain racial and global power. Indeed, Candour’s goal was to offer news with “distinctive British attitudes toward the phenomena of a changing world hostile to British power.” Chesterton argued that there was an urgent need to protect “Christian principles” from “internationalist” organizations, such as the United Nations, that would destroy the values and traditions of the country. Despite its opposition to internationalism, the LEL had foreign chapters through Chesterton’s connections in South Africa. His conspiracies reached a global audience in 1965 with the publication of The New Unhappy Lords about “the new world power,” communism and capitalism, that “subdue and govern, not the British nations alone, but all mankind.” The book was popular among extremists, with the first edition selling out in three months and copies sold in Australia, Britain, Canada, Rhodesia, South Africa and the United States.
(1916–1999) ran as an “independent” LEL candidate in the 1964 general election on a platform opposing the Americanization of Britain, the Conservative government’s support for independence in Africa and joining the Common Market. Bounevialle, a former member of the Conservative Party, began writing articles in *Candour* and became increasingly close to Chesterton. She served as a member of the Candour Advisory Council and continued publishing the periodical after his death in 1973 until her passing in 1999. Immigration was also a key issue addressed in LEL election leaflets, which stated that “the immigration policy must at all costs be reversed,” which “is one of the many reasons why the League of Empire Loyalists deserves your support.” Bounevialle’s election campaign, as all of the LEL election contests, was unsuccessful outside of generating attention in local newspapers.

Some of the most adherent supporters grew frustrated with the League of Empire Loyalists’ limited impact and started branching out with their own groups. In 1957, Chesterton described how the group’s tactics attracted “world” attention with its “public demonstrations,” but the “hardcore” membership remained “pitifully small.” That same year, John Bean grew increasing disappointed with the League’s political goals and wrote to Chesterton describing the reason for his inactivity as rooted in the LEL’s “limited future.” In April 1958, Bean, John Tyndall and several other Londoners left the organization and formed the National Labour Party, which lasted two years and attracted about five hundred members. Bean, a self-described “radical,” had been asked by Chesterton to take Tyndall “under his wing,” and both wanted to form a party that appealed to the “working class” who “suffered from the effects of immigration.” Around the same time, Colin Jordan also left the League and established the White Defence League, which mirrored the LEL as a pressure group, not a political party. In 1960, the National Labour Party and the White Defence League merged to become the British National Party (BNP), with Jordan as leader and Bean as deputy. Tyndall remarked that this period was a useful learning experience and helped provide “good training for the speakers.” Despite being the leader, Jordan was expelled, along with Tyndall, by the BNP due to their support for a “self-defense” group on behalf of their political activities.

In response, Jordan and Tyndall started their own party. Borrowing from Nazi Germany, they named it the National Socialist Movement and welcomed the involvement of many enthusiastic young radicals, such
as Martin Webster and Andrew Brons. The organization had interna-
tional links with American Nazi Party leader George Lincoln Rockwell,
who stayed at Jordan’s home as they worked to establish transnational
alliances under the World Union of National Socialists, with Jordan
being elected “world Führer” and Rockwell named “heir” in sum-
mer 1961. Without their rivals in the BNP, Jordan and Tyndall’s
new group also launched a uniformed paramilitary organization called
Spearhead. In 1962, Jordan, Tyndall, Denis Pirie and Roland Kerr-
Ritchie were found guilty of violating the 1936 Public Order Act that
prohibited creating a military force to promote politics; Jordan received
a nine-month sentence and Tyndall received six months. In 1964, the
National Socialist Movement disintegrated over disagreements between
the two men. Tyndall along with Martin Webster formed the Greater
Britain Movement and launched Spearhead, a magazine in support of
the party. Like Tyndall’s previous organization, the Greater Britain
Movement was self-described as National Socialist, with its “official
programme” explaining “to the British people the meaning of National
Socialism and its programme for the Greater Britain of the future.” Spearhead’s first editorial announced that it was “an organ of National
Socialist opinion in Britain” and would “fill the same basic role as our
previous journal, The National Socialist.”

THE NATIONAL FRONT

As the groups that broke from the League of Empire Loyalists suffered
from internal disputes and low membership, Chesterton began rethinking
his political approach and seeking unity among the different parties. He
missed many LEL meetings in 1965 due to his frequent visits to Africa
and his poor health. Following the March 1966 general election, the
far-right and fascist organizations decided to pool their memberships and
resources for greater social and political impact. The LEL would merge
with the BNP, founded by John Bean and led by Andrew Fountaine,
and the Racial Preservation Society (RPS) to become the NF, with
Chesterton serving as the leader. Meanwhile, Mosley’s election returns in
the 1966 election, when he failed to receive even 5%, were embarrassing
and he never campaigned again. He did not associate with the National
Front as a result of his fringe popularity among post-war fascists and, as
Robert Skidelsky wrote, Mosley had “renounced” some of his pre-war
views that appealed to the radical elements in Chesterton’s organization and this European unity project was very different from NF objectives. At the LEL’s October 1966 Annual General Meeting, the party supported a resolution “for a merger” with “like-minded groups.” On December 15, 1966 a “private” meeting was held at Caxton Hall to organize the integration of parties. Despite violent attacks, including milk bottles being thrown at the attendees, the meeting proved successful. John Bean told the audience that the NF was “a new party not of apologists but which believes Britain remains for the British.” By combining the parties’ strengths, he explained, “we can grow faster.” The plan was for Chesterton to be appointed head of the NF, as he was an obvious choice for leader. As Austen Brooks said at the meeting, Chesterton “is the man who has done as much as anybody since the war to awaken the British people to the way in which their heritage is being destroyed.” Not only was he a well-known figure from the BUF and LEL, he also had resources that eclipsed those of others, including consistently publishing a periodical for more than a decade and having an office across the street from Parliament in Westminster and near the old Scotland Yard building at Palace Chambers, Bridge Street. Indeed, the LEL’s office was notorious among the radicals as its members would regularly drink at the nearby Red Lion pub alongside MPs and the police.

On February 7, 1967 the NF was officially started with the signing of documents that merged the League of Empire Loyalists, the BNP and the Racial Preservation Society. The Caxton Hall gathering represented the culmination of negotiations on party policy between the LEL and the BNP, which agreed to limit membership to people of “natural British/European descent.” Robert Edwards, a member of Mosley’s Union Movement, attended the inaugural meeting as a “spy” for the group and recalled that Chesterton appeared “inebriated” and “could hardly keep his head up” while Andrew Fountaine gave a “militaristic” speech about Empire. Concerns about foreigners in the LEL caused an agreement to be worked out wherein the LEL remained an organization for those outside the United Kingdom. Domestically, former members of the BNP were encouraged to join the NF by John Bean, who received a high-level position in appreciation of his efforts.
from Chesterton as the leader, the party had a Directorate with “plenary powers,” mandated by the constitution to be not “less than 20 not more than 40,” which had the power to expel and suspend members.90

As a new political party the NF needed members, but not everyone who wanted to join was admitted. The NF sought political legitimacy and expected its critics to denounce the party as fascist. From the outset of its creation, the NF stated that it would exclude people involved in neo-Nazi parties.91 Just one month after the NF’s formal creation, the party chose three candidates, including Bean, to run in Ealing for the Greater London Council elections.92 The official membership numbers were never published by the party, but occasionally party leaders did mention figures. According to journalist Martin Walker, the NF claimed to have 2500 members, but really had about 1500, with 300 from the LEL, nearly 1000 from the BNP and more than 100 from the RPS.93

The NF immediately began spreading their ideas through newspaper sales and leaflets across the streets of England. Among the more radical policies they publicized in order to win support was the “orderly repatriation of non-white immigrants (and their dependants) who have entered since the passing of the British Nationality Act, 1948.”94 However, the NF also proposed more innocuous policies, including the development of a “movement” for the “healthy mental and physical development of British youth” and building “the closest cooperation” with Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Rhodesia and South Africa.95 Single-page handbills advertising the party included the words “stop immigration” in large, bold print, and described Britain as “overcrowded” and called for “repatriation” because “immigration is destroying our national unity.”96

Despite radical demands for forced repatriation, youth with neo-Nazi associations were initially kept away. Yet this quickly changed, and they were not only allowed to join the NF but went on to have leading roles. Chesterton wrote that “we must never run away from the word ‘extremist,’” and that the NF is a “serious movement.”97 Tyndall joined the NF months later and recommended that more than one hundred Greater Britain Movement followers do the same, believing the NF “represented beyond any doubt the best hope in our section of the political field.”98 Many members did join, including Tyndall’s friend and lieutenant, Martin Webster.99 Tyndall proved to be a dedicated politician, working as a salesman with all his free time devoted to politics until the NF began paying him £6 per week in 1969.100 The power started to shift in the NF, with Chesterton’s long-time supporters, such as Rosine de
Bounevialle and Austen Brooks, beginning to miss more meetings. As
the composition of the meetings changed, so did the setting. The first
Annual General Meeting of the NF was a marked contrast to previous
LEL gatherings, including the presence of guards to protect members
from opponents.101

After Tyndall joined the NF, he publicly toned down his radical-
ism, especially his neo-Nazism and anti-Semitism.102 Besides his known
incarceration for the Spearhead paramilitary and his membership in the
National Socialist Movement, he hosted private Adolf Hitler birthday
parties until 1966.103 In addition, Tyndall was with Webster when he
was arrested in July 1964 for assaulting Jomo Kenyatta, Prime Minister
and later President of Kenya, in London.104 Aside from newspaper cover-
age about the attack and arrest, they were paid by the press agency for
providing a tip about a “demonstration” against Kenyatta, and those
funds were used to publish the first issue of Spearhead.105 Before join-
ing the NF, Tyndall authored two tracts, *The Authoritarian State* (1962)
and *Six Principles of British Nationalism* (1966), that also highlighted
his extremism. *The Authoritarian State*, published by the National
Socialist Movement, argued that “democracy has failed” and is con-
nected to a Jewish and communist conspiracy.106 *Six Principles of British
Nationalism*, published a year before he joined the NF, laid out a racist
and anti-democratic ideology, with policies such as racial separatism and
goals for attracting “both sides of the present political spectrum.”107

In addition to his personal friendships with other members of the
National Socialist Movement, including Jordan, Webster and Andrew
Brons, Tyndall was linked to other known fascists. Tyndall was romant-
cally involved with Françoise Dior, a French neo-Nazi from the famed
Dior family. She, however, went on to marry Colin Jordan in a public
wedding in which they spilled their blood on an unread copy of Hitler’s
*Mein Kampf* in 1963.108 A few years later, after becoming estranged
from Jordan, she was found guilty of conspiracy to commit arson against
Jewish synagogues and was sentenced to eighteen months in prison in
1968.109 Meanwhile, in the same year Tyndall joined the NF, Jordan
wrote *The Coloured Invasion*, denouncing “non-white” immigration as
a “burden” to taxpayers that caused crime and the peddling of drugs
and brought a “huge increase in disease to Britain.”110 The merging of
these fringe parties into the NF successfully united people with a range
of extremist beliefs, ranging from older imperialists and racists to neo-
Nazis. Even without Colin Jordan ever joining the NF, the public did
not have to examine the group closely to see its fascist leanings. For
the NF to draw any support from beyond the fascist margin, the party
needed a major issue to attract the broader public.

**Rivers of Blood**

When Conservative MP Enoch Powell made his “Rivers of Blood”
speech in front of the West Midlands Area Conservative Political
Centre in Birmingham, not only did he feed on racial fears, but he
expressed ideas that were already part of the far-right and fascist fringe.
Powell, whose 1968 speech coincidentally was given on Hitler’s birth-
day, April 20, discussed a conversation with a constituent about race
and immigration. Powell concluded his speech by supporting repatria-
tion of “non-whites” and opposing anti-discrimination laws, but also
worrying about the violence brought about by immigration. Three days
later, the Race Relations Act of 1968 was passed following a heated
debate in the House of Commons, prohibiting racial and religious dis-
crimination in housing, employment and services. Like the previous
Race Relations Act of 1965 that banned public discrimination, public
opposition was expressed by people who saw no difference between
“non-whites” in Britain and those who wanted to migrate to the coun-
try. Those who were opposed to immigration and who held racial
prejudices praised Powell’s blunt speech, but others denounced its rac-
ism and divisiveness.

The impact of Powell’s “Rivers of Blood” on the NF was nearly
instantaneous. Notably, *The Times*’ headline “The Jordans and
Mosleyites are Rejoicing” connected the speech with the far right and
fascism, and included comments from Chesterton and Mosley. The
article explained how neo-Nazi Jordan and former BUF leader Mosley
supported Powell, with Mosley saying, “Mr. Powell is saying nine years
later what I have always said.” Indeed, Mosley ran his unsuccessful
post-war campaigns with promises “to end coloured immigration” and
“send all the coloured people back.” Meanwhile, Jordan told *The
Times*: “What Enoch Powell said in his speech constitutes what I said in a
pamphlet—for which I got 18 months under the Race Relations Act.”
Yet the newspaper was most interested in the NF’s members who were
“rejoicing over the Powell furore at its one-room headquarters in an
office opposite the Houses of Parliament.” Chesterton, described
as head of the NF, said: “What Mr. Powell has said does not vary at all from our views,” which was that “[i]t is impossible to assimilate people of such differing racial stocks.”\textsuperscript{118} In addition, John Tyndall’s editorial in \textit{Spearhead} was also quoted, claiming “we may as well start preparing ourselves for an era of racial strife that will make Little Rock and Sharpeville look like mild skirmishes after closing time.”\textsuperscript{119} The article not only highlighted the racism of the NF and like-minded groups, but also focused on repatriation. Internally, the NF saw Powell’s words as an opportunity to break from the margins and harness support for repatriation and ethno-nationalism that seemingly came from a mainstream source.

For the NF, supporting Powell meant protests, marches and campaigning to ensure the proposals became realities. Following news about the speech, John Bean called Chesterton who agreed with the idea to apply for a permit to stage “a rally in support of Powell.”\textsuperscript{120} However, at the next NF meeting Andrew Fountaine as well as the majority of the Directorate opposed this out of concern they would be outnumbered by opponents and “slaughtered.”\textsuperscript{121} Internally, Chesterton told supporters, “it is better” that Powell spoke out now even if he did not previously, but “[h]e has done an immense service not so much in being heard himself—the problem was obvious enough—as in providing an occasion for the voice of the nation to be heard.”\textsuperscript{122} The NF’s literature was reaching a large section of the population and about one hundred new members were joining weekly.\textsuperscript{123} The NF, with Bean and Webster, participated in rallies with other groups, such as the Smithfield Meat Porters’ pro-Enoch rally, but also attended protests against Powell to heckle critics, which turned violent.\textsuperscript{124} According to Union Movement member Keith Thompson, Powell’s words also helped Mosley’s organization and combined the Union Movement and NF at the local level.\textsuperscript{125} The head of the Smithfield Meat Porters was a Union Movement member, along with local dock workers’ groups who led workers’ anti-immigration marches.\textsuperscript{126} Aside from regular discussions about party issues, the NF’s bulletin encouraged members to join a march from Smithfield to Westminster to “protest” the government’s “immigration policies.”\textsuperscript{127} The unity in support of Powell came at an important time as there was a “clumsy attempt to split the NF.”\textsuperscript{128} The activity gave the members a rallying point for solidarity and generated party enthusiasm. Indeed, NF marches in support of apartheid, complete with drummers, led about
For nearly a year, Powell’s speech gave the NF energy and a message with which to engage the broader population that shared its views on race but were not overtly sympathetic to its fascism. Journalist Martin Walker described how the NF derived political benefit from Powell’s words, but also that the NF risked losing members to the Powell wing of the Conservative Party, while other NF activists were disappointed with recruits who were merely interested in anti-immigration and not the NF’s other issues. Nonetheless, the image of the NF was not directly associated with more extremist elements that would prevent recruitment. As Keith Thompson recalled, the NF was seen as less extreme because it lacked the decades of publicity that associated Mosley with fascism. The membership grew at the time and drew in many people who became key fascist figures. Richard Edmonds, a future NF and BNP activist, later became involved in politics over immigration and cited Powell as speaking for millions. In 1969, Webster became the NF’s national activities organizer, which he described as “a euphemism for troublemaker,” and led anti-immigration marches to generate publicity for the NF. The public attention brought new members to the party, including former Conservatives sympathetic to the NF’s stance. For example, two local Wandsworth councillors left the Tories and announced their affiliation with the NF.

After a year of membership gains, the NF’s growth slowed and during 1970 internal conflict broke out in the NF over strategy, ideology and Chesterton’s regular trips abroad. Chesterton, for example, doubted the NF’s ability to run ten Parliamentary candidates in the June 1970 general election. Chesterton was correct and the election returns were embarrassing, causing a split in the party’s Directorate with Bean and Tyndall as well as former LEL members supporting Chesterton. More than that, Chesterton had criticized Powell’s economic policies to the disappointment of some NF members. At the 1969 Annual General Meeting, Chesterton was sharply critical of Powell for allowing the Race Relations bills to “pass through Parliament without protest” and for not supporting members of the Racial Preservation Society against criminal charges. Regarding his own opponents, Chesterton wrote that his NF critics were a mere ten out of thirty Directorate members. These people, known collectively as the Action Committee, were behind a plot
to force him out of the leadership, with a small group of people supporting Tyndall. The meetings turned into “shouting” matches wherein the Action Committee wanted Chesterton “deposed by constitutional means.”

Despite Tyndall’s associations and radicalism, his energy and devotion earned him increased duties, allowing him to ascend to the leadership several years later. By 1968, John Bean’s *Combat* was absorbed by Tyndall’s *Spearhead* and began to promote the NF. While Tyndall’s support among the party did not reach critical mass, Chesterton resigned from the NF leadership in late 1970. Webster explained that Chesterton was opposed to adopting a democratic constitution that would prevent the chair from acting in an authoritarian manner, and rather than submit to this change Chesterton quit. The party felt the loss of Chesterton’s leadership and at the NF’s Extraordinary General Meeting (EGM) in 1971, Tyndall praised Chesterton’s “unique contribution to the NF” and denounced Chesterton’s critics. Tyndall, who had known Chesterton since 1956, wrote that Chesterton was “a model to all those who might follow him in single-minded dedication to a cause.”

Following Chesterton’s resignation and a brief period during which a committee filled the leadership role, the NF’s structure was changed. In 1971, John O’Brien, the NF office manager, became the party’s chair and he attempted to “democratize” the party. While the party’s administration changed, O’Brien remained committed to radical policies such as repatriation. Previously, the NF’s leader held firm executive power, with the Directorate mostly serving as an advisory board, but this was changed under O’Brien, giving the chair, who would be elected by the party members, a single vote among the twenty-member committee. Under this new system, according to O’Brien, the NF grew to include between 7000 and 10,000 members and 84 branches in 1971. However, these numbers were undoubtedly an exaggeration. Webster described O’Brien as a good speaker but “incompetent” as an administrator, which harmed the party. In 1972, further internal disputes caused O’Brien to be replaced by Tyndall, who had “reservations” about the new democratic governance of the NF.

While race was a major issue for the NF, it also campaigned against European integration and the European Economic Community. Stan Taylor wrote “that the main thrust of the NF’s ‘exoteric’ appeal was aimed at capitalizing upon racism” and described “other” issues as the NF’s anti-EEC rhetoric. However, not only was opposition to the
EEC a significant issue, it also led to the NF’s most significant electoral campaign. Starting in the early 1960s, Britain sought Common Market membership, but French resistance prevented the country joining until the Heath government’s negotiations in the early 1970s. The NF was vocally opposed to this, claiming it would destroy British character and independence. Even though Chesterton was no longer NF leader, his work in Candour continued to be read favorably by NF members and he wrote several new tracts that reflected the NF’s views. His association with Rosine de Bounevialle grew closer and her residence, Forest House in Liss Forest, later became the address for Chesterton’s publications. In 1971, Chesterton completed Common Market Suicide, which denounced the British government for committing “treason” by supporting the international “cabal” of the European Economic Community and American power.\textsuperscript{153} When Chesterton died of pancreatic cancer in August 1973, he was writing a manuscript titled Facing the Abyss, which de Bounevialle published with the addition of two chapters based on his early drafts. It mirrored his previous conspiratorial writings but focused on liberalism, including university education, “hippies” and the “nexus” of capitalism and communism.\textsuperscript{154} Candour, both under Chesterton and later under de Bounevialle, likewise wanted to “expose the Common Market conspiracy” and “Zionist finance capitalism’s aims and methods.”\textsuperscript{155} Chesterton’s Spearhead obituary, written by NF deputy chair Frank Clifford, celebrated his life by calling him a “great patriot” and praising his “truth and factual reporting.”\textsuperscript{156} Meanwhile, Tyndall wrote that Chesterton was “a great friend and counsellor” who educated “thousands” of people about “contemporary affairs” to improve the future of the country and civilization.\textsuperscript{157}

Tyndall followed in the footsteps of Chesterton’s anti-Common Market campaign. As editor of Spearhead, he ran cover stories such as “Why We Must Say No to Europe” and “Europe: The Fight to Get Out Begins.” In 1971, Spearhead devoted a “special issue” to the Common Market, which denounced its “internationalism,” wage losses, “bureaucratic dictatorship” and shift to a “United States of Europe.”\textsuperscript{158} Then in January 1973, the magazine reported on Heath signing the Treaty of Rome to enter the Common Market and declared that “getting out” was the “foremost task that faces the British people.”\textsuperscript{159} The NF’s angst about Britain signing the Treaty of Rome was rooted in a conspiracy theory about a small group of wealthy bankers working against the nation and the people for their own personal benefit. Clare Macdonald’s tract,
published by the NF’s Policy Committee, claimed that the “only” course to “save Western civilisation from moral and material bankruptcy,” including the future control of a “Socialistic World Government,” was reforming how capitalism functions by creating loans with interest-free credit.\textsuperscript{160} Likewise, John Tyndall denounced the Common Market as “internationalist thinking,” arguing for an “alternative” economic system that was against capitalism and focused on the domestic market.\textsuperscript{161}

While NF opposition to the European Economic Community won the party support, attention-grabbing race issues attracted a stronger influx of membership. Playing on racist fears about immigration causing violence and disease, the party harnessed media attention by talking about asylum seekers and the associated social as well as economic costs. The religious NF members circulated biblical justifications for racism, claiming “a multi-racial society” has not worked and will not “work” because “God doesn’t intend it to work, as race mixing in the sight of God is wrong.”\textsuperscript{162} In August 1972, President Idi Amin of Uganda sought to “Africanize” the country and ordered the Asians in his country to leave within three months, which prompted several countries to take in the stateless immigrants. Edward Heath’s government offered “vouchers” for 3500 displaced Asians to enter Britain, which was met with displeasure from members of his own party. The NF, as with Powell’s 1968 speech, saw its opposition to immigration and the media attention to the issue as a recruitment vehicle. Tyndall’s \textit{Spearhead} described the government’s actions as “a campaign to flood our own country with alien migrants,” which was “without exaggeration” a “conspiracy.”\textsuperscript{163} In a later issue, the magazine discussed the expansion that allowed tens of thousands of immigrants to enter Britain in an article about “the possibility of large scale racial conflict.”\textsuperscript{164} Meanwhile, Martin Webster linked race and disease in the “Asian immigrant disease menace,” connecting it with the “sustained invasion of our country by coloured aliens” from East Africa.\textsuperscript{165} The claim that immigration “threatened” Britain generated publicity that, in turn, was a boon to membership.

In the next few years, the NF declared “success” in local elections with increasing vote shares, even though they failed to win any elections. During 1972, the NF praised its candidates, who received hundreds of votes in local London elections.\textsuperscript{166} The 1972 by-election in Uxbridge was described as a “great moral victory,” with candidate John Clifton receiving about 3000 votes, or 8.2%, against former NF member Clare
Macdonald and a candidate from Mosley’s Union Movement. The public relations for the NF campaign was led by Martin Webster, whom the party credited with attracting press coverage by holding a large march that drew onlookers and led to the publication of photographs of NF slogans in the local newspaper. Even though the attention did not result in a single electoral victory, the NF claimed that its membership doubled by 1973. In fact, the NF reported that its Annual General Meeting that year was the largest in its history, attended by about four hundred people and raising a record £1245.

The NF’s electoral high point was Webster’s 1973 by-election in West Bromwich, which was a Parliamentary seat long held by the Labour Party. The election returns showed a Labour victory with 15,907 votes, but Webster won 4789 and the Conservative candidate received 7582. With only three weeks before the election, Webster was selected to be the NF candidate and led marches through the area to make the public aware of the party’s anti-Common Market and anti-immigration platform. The election was notable because it demonstrated the NF taking Conservative support, and Enoch Powell declined to speak for the Conservative candidate, who was in favor of the Common Market. Webster claimed Powell’s action was an intentional snub. Arthur Osman explained that the NF’s appeal extended beyond issues of immigration as “the bulk of Mr. Webster’s support came from right-wing Conservatives” who lived far apart from “Asian workers.” Likewise, George Hutchinson wrote that Webster’s votes were due not only to immigration but to the “[d]iscontent over the rocketing cost of living widely associated with our membership of the EEC.” He continued that these Tories would “vote for the NF candidate, where there is one, or for Labour.” This was the first election since the Second World War in which a fascist candidate saved their deposit, winning enough votes to receive the money back.

The NF’s radical literature had limited appeal, but one of the NF’s strengths was its ongoing activity on the streets, where its physical presence was greater than its electoral appeal. According to Richard Edmonds, the NF was built around two men: Tyndall being the intellectual leader and Webster being the “man on the street.” Indeed, the party membership put its political words into action on the streets of Britain, confronting and fighting opponents at marches, demonstrations and meetings. Consequently, it became associated with violence starting in the early 1970s, which was part of Webster’s tactic to generate media attention.
Webster, who was the NF’s activities organizer from 1969 to 1983 and editor of the *National Front News* from 1976, had a history of starting fights, not only against Kenyatta but also “insulted and provoked” an interracial couple during 1969 that led to physical confrontation.\(^{179}\) The violence reflected his radicalism, as demonstrated in his 1962 article titled “Why I am a Nazi.”\(^{180}\) However, the violence was not just an expression of ideas, but a tactic that he described to reporter Christopher Farman when he said, “we had to kick our way into the headlines” (Webster disputed this and claimed to have said “crash” instead of “kick”).\(^{181}\) There were also reports of an even more sinister group. Internally, the NF reportedly had “The Meat Gang,” described as a “commy [sic] and nigger bashing outfit” that would be “disowned” by the NF if uncovered by the police.\(^{182}\)

The NF marches regularly drew hundreds and later thousands of people. An article by Tyndall about “propaganda” showed a picture of bagpipers standing in columns with Union Jacks from an “NF march” and had the caption: “a rousing propaganda weapon.”\(^ {183}\) At a Remembrance Day march in 1971, *Spearhead* reported the “biggest ever march and meeting” with more than eight hundred at the Cenotaph in Whitehall and an ensuing “parade” that caused the police to close Whitehall to traffic.\(^ {184}\) In 1972 the NF protested against Irish Republican Army speakers at Polytechnic of North London, which resulted in a “bloody battle.”\(^ {185}\) Then NF activists joined apartheid supporters at Rhodesia House in London, where police forced the group away from leftists to avoid violence.\(^ {186}\) That same year a march on Remembrance Day was attended by 1500 NF supporters and the 1973 memorial reportedly involved 4000 supporters, including Tyndall and Webster.\(^ {187}\) Whereas the “main” London summer rally in 1973 drew between 900 and 1000, an increase from 600 in the previous year, earning cheers from onlookers who welcomed the “forest of red, white and blue flags.”\(^ {188}\) Yet the marches were not just about displaying opposition to the Common Market and “coloured immigration,” but increasingly were about refusing “to be intimidated by the threat of mob action by communists and coloured immigrants.”\(^ {189}\) The protests included heckling and throwing leaflets during a Greater London Council (GLC) meeting, shouting during anti-discrimination Christian sermons and attempting to stop apartheid protests.\(^ {190}\) Some members supported the confrontations, including provocative marches through immigrant areas, but the negative press caused other NF supporters to reconsider the tactics, believing it hurt its image as a legitimate political party.\(^ {191}\)
The NF hoped for a political breakthrough in the next national election with attention on race and the increased media attention since the previous 1970 election. Tyndall announced that the Front would “contest not less than 50 seats,” exceeding its first general election contest in 1970 with ten candidates and allowing the party to air its first televised political broadcast. The Front ran fifty-four candidates in the February 1974 general election and received a mere 76,429 votes, but the leadership claimed this was a relatively positive result when compared with 1970. Tyndall described the election as representing a “miracle” because of the “growth, planning and fundraising” beyond “any political party of our type in Britain—ever.” The Front sent election literature into two million homes, and the NF’s image during its first election broadcast included housewife Sheri Bothwell, who Tyndall wrote was “one of the pleasantest NF representatives in our election broadcast.”

The February election produced a hung Parliament with the Labour Party unable to gain a majority, and a second election was called for October. After months of planning, the NF contested ninety seats, allowing the party to air two political party broadcasts. The Front increased its election total, receiving more than 113,000 votes. The party, however, again lost all its election deposits, costing £13,500, but Webster described the election attention as “a giant advertising drive.” At that time, a faction in the NF began organizing against Tyndall. John Kingsley Read (1937–1985), a former Conservative and military veteran from Blackburn, replaced Tyndall shortly after the October election. He was a candidate for Parliament in both the February and October elections, and his appointment as party leader was described “as a bit of cosmetic surgery to give the Front a more acceptable image.” Indeed, as a one-time Conservative, he did not have Tyndall’s openly fascist past and had support from party members who wanted to broaden the NF’s appeal by steering it away from violence and fascism into anti-immigrant populism.

Following the NF’s failures in the two 1974 general elections, the street clashes and the internal struggles, the NF had a reputation for violence and political marginality. In June 1974, about 1500 NF activists marched from Westminster to Conway Hall, Red Lion Square. Led by Webster to protest Labour’s immigration policies, the two sides clashed violently, leading to the death of NF opponent Kevin Gately. Webster described the violence and mayhem at the march as one of the most memorable in the NF’s history.
John Bean, had taken a back seat to the new members and were less involved in NF activities in the early 1970s. By that time Bean had lost two teeth as a result of street violence and had turned away from politics to spend more time with his family, ultimately not renewing his membership sometime around 1976. Decades later he was critical of the NF’s tactics up to that period, describing the marches and violence as counter-productive and harmful to its political appeal to the broader public.

**Fascist Unions**

The public demonstrations surrounding racial issues were not enough to sustain the revolving door in the NF membership or to propel any NF candidate to electoral victory. The NF began looking for new ways to attract like-minded people to its ranks. Under Tyndall between the 1974 elections, the NF leadership drafted plans to launch its own trade unions comprised of white workers who not only supported its racial policies, but also opposed the leftist politics usually associated with unions. The NF’s literature played on the racist rhetoric that minority employment meant whites were being fired, but also went further in denouncing the ideological link between unions and leftist politics. Nigel Fielding briefly explored the NF efforts to support white workers as part of a strategy to attract publicity and keep the issue in the public sphere. Yet NF members saw this not as a strategy, but as the reality of their support. As Richard Edmonds explained, many NF supporters were working-class, and the NF saw “trade unions as effectively abandoning their own British members and certainly the British working class in general.” As a result, “we wanted to set up trade unions” in order to represent British workers and the issues they cared about.

In contrast with previous discussions, the Front’s goal was not only to recruit, but to provide a voice for racist workers and break the power of the major labor unions. In July 1974, Martin Webster denounced the left-wing influence in trade unions and organized labor, and called for an “alternative” to translate into “actual power” by developing a National Front Trade Unionists Association (NFTUA). He described how a “second generation” of people, who were “unionists recruits,” were joining the NF. Webster concluded that in the “coming months” the NF Directorate would formally develop the NFTUA, which would in turn “lead” the trade union movement by “defending” the working class.
As a result, the NF claimed it wanted “stronger, not weaker, trade unions” to better represent workers’ interests.\footnote{211}

In August 1974, Webster organized a protest in support of the “white workers” and employers at the Imperial Typewriter Company in Leicester who refused to support a strike by hundreds of Asian workers for equal pay and promotion.\footnote{212} The workers’ union did not recognize the demands, claiming that “total support for either white local officials or the East African Asian strikers’ group might easily lead to a split in the union.”\footnote{213} In response, the Interracial Solidarity Campaign staged a counter-protest and the ensuing confrontation resulted in three arrests, with the NF blaming the clash on the “reds.”\footnote{214} Edmonds, who attended the march, called it a demonstration against bringing in “cheap” foreign workers and said opponents had “attacked” the NF with bricks as police targeted only NF members for arrest.\footnote{215} Webster’s strategy worked to generate political support in light of the strike, and the NF candidate knocked “Labour into second place” with 24.4% of the vote in the local elections.\footnote{216} Indeed, the NF declared “victory” in the dispute as not only did it successfully execute a protest for the white workers, but the counter-demonstration helped give the NF “good publicity.”\footnote{217} That November the NF reported another large increase in the number of supporters at its Remembrance Day parade, which attracted 5000 people.\footnote{218}

The idea of creating a radical union founded on non-white repatriation and opposition to “race-mixing” was enthusiastically received. \textit{Britain First}, later edited by Richard Lawson, was launched in 1974 as a broadsheet that was “easy-to-read, down-to-earth” to supplement the “more serious articles and commentaries of \textit{Spearhead}.”\footnote{219} The paper included articles about the Common Market’s “wasteful farm policy” and called for an “end to the employment of coloured labour, and repatriate all coloured immigrants together with their dependents and descendants.”\footnote{220} Philip Gannaway, an NF member, hoped the NFTUA would fight the “cancer” of “left-wing” influence in the labor movement.\footnote{221} Likewise, Neil Farnell, as secretary and publicity officer for the NF Industrial Section, wrote that “union leaders seem completely out of touch with the wishes of ordinary people.”\footnote{222} Claiming that whites were fired so that non-whites could be employed for lower wages, he denounced the current status of trade unions.\footnote{223} With Farnell as leader for the NF’s industrial matters, \textit{Spearhead} began advertising how to join the NF union effort by contacting a local NF industry organizer.\footnote{224}
Aside from creating its own unions, the NF also wanted to participate in organized labor and reap its benefits. In 1975, the NF Directorate passed a resolution “that all NF members should join trades unions,” which prompted Richard Lawson and David McCallen, both writers for the NF, to apply for National Union of Journalists (NUJ) membership.225 Lawson’s and McCallen’s applications went before the board and were voted down, citing racism.226 The NUJ’s executive council told the board to reverse the decision because “political affiliation was not a bar to NUJ membership,” and McCallen could only be refused membership to the union if “he was unwilling to comply with the rules of the union.”227 However, both Lawson and McCallen were ultimately turned down by the NUJ because they failed to file their appeals within the twenty-eight-day period, and the NF denounced the union as “cowards.”228 The following year the NUJ in Yorkshire told its reporters not to write about the Front’s activities because the party had prevented a black reporter from attending the NF’s meetings in Leeds.229 McCallen remained active in British politics until moving to Los Angeles in 1979, where he helped start the Institute for Historical Review and edited its journal, The Journal of Historical Review, which became the global mouthpiece for Holocaust denial.230 Holocaust denial had long been a component of the NF, including in Spearhead articles, and Richard Verrall, Spearhead editor and NF Directorate member, wrote the infamous Holocaust denial book Did Six Million Really Die (1974).231 McCalden continued to write and edit books that denied the Holocaust until his death of AIDS-related complications in 1990.232

The NF claimed success in other union activity, but also met resistance from political opponents. In May 1975, left-wing demonstrators in Glasgow fought to stop an NF meeting, and local union leaders from the mining and transportation industries were arrested while protesting the NF.233 In October 1975, the NF Trade Unionists attempted to march with union members of the Trades’ Council, Shop Stewards Committee and Communist Party.234 However, the group was “asked” by dozens of police officers “not to take part in the march.”235 Ernest Pendrous, a former Conservative, wrote that he was disappointed the Tories and unions did not support their right to join.236 Moreover, at a Transport and General Workers’ Union factory in Dagenham, NF member Ian Newport was selected shop steward, but opponents began efforts to remove him from the post.237 According to Spearhead, the workers then “rallied to his support.”238 In addition, Tom Holmes, then
the Great Yarmouth NF organizer and NF chair decades later, became a delegate for the local trades council. Holmes explained that “orders” from his union headquarters “barred” him “from holding any position in the union” for the “sole reason” of being an NF member. He criticized the “left-wing trade union leaders” for their actions and insisted he would win support among the workers, if not for the higher-level union leadership.

Under the new NF leadership, internal disputes continued between John Kingsley Read and Tyndall’s supporters. Tyndall believed his removal was illegitimate and protested the NF Directorate structure, claiming that it “seriously undermined” the authority of the chair. After fifteen months, in December 1975 a court ordered Tyndall to be restored as chair because he had been removed illegally, in violation of the NF’s constitution. In response, Kingsley Read as well as others, including Richard Lawson, David McCalden and Denis Pirie, split from the NF and created the National Party, and the NF set out to expel anyone who joined or associated with the new organization. In existence for over a year, the National Party at first appeared to be a threat to the NF, but proved unable to attract sustainable numbers of new recruits. The newspaper *Britain First*, which became the National Party’s official publication, was devoted to promoting the party’s principles, such as free enterprise and having industry “serving” the community. The bitter and contentious fight included “smear leaflets” and attempts to remove other Directorate members. Yet in terms of elections the National Party succeeded where the NF failed, as Kingsley Read and another party member successfully won seats in the local Blackburn council for their position on immigration. According to then NF member Richard Edmonds, Kingsley Read made “a deal with the local Tories in Blackburn, Lancashire where he would have two seats to himself, no Tory candidate standing.” The reasoning was that without a Conservative candidate, there would be no “splitting” of the “right-wing vote.”

The battle between the NF and National Party was also ideological, with one of the main differences being the Strasserite policies of the National Party. Derived from the ideas of Nazi Party brothers Gregor and Otto Strasser, Strasserism was a populist and anti-capitalist version of National Socialism in which workers would be organized by profession in “guilds” and given rights by the state to run their industry. Nick Griffin, who joined as a fifteen-year-old in 1974, explained that the
Strasserism of Lawson, McCalden and Steve Brady was far more radical than the Labourite and socialist tradition of the working class, which was in “opposition” to “Tyndall’s Hitlerite Nazism.” Griffin explained that Strasserism was attractive in part as an ideological alternative to the “barely concealed extreme Hitlerism,” which was out of step in a country that had suffered at the hands of Nazi aggression decades earlier. According to Joe Pearce, who joined in 1976, the Strasserites of the NF were more focused on socialism and anti-capitalism, and the youth who joined in the late 1970s would even hold annual Otto Strasser birthday parties. This was in contrast to people like Tyndall who were more sympathetic to Hitler’s version of National Socialism.

The National Party’s “principles” mirrored those of the NF, demanding the repatriation of “all coloured and other racially incompatible immigrants,” but also sought changes in industry with “the introduction of profit sharing and workers’ co-partnership.” Richard Verrall, a Tyndall loyalist and editor of *Spearhead* from 1976 to 1980, denounced the “leftist influence” in the NF, specifically criticizing *Britain First* for its focus on trade unionists and its “Marxist” influence. Without mentioning Lawson by name, Verrall connected the same thinking to Lawson’s publication, *Spark*, for NF students. Yet the NF still saw the need to recruit workers and support racist unions. Neil Farnell, as head of the NF’s industrial department, continued to focus on worker issues with an “Industrial Front” column in Tyndall’s *Spearhead*, which discussed the “betrayal of the British worker” and how a “nationalist government” could end “unemployment for all time.” The NF then launched *National Front News* to replace *Britain First*, which supported the National Party after the split. Within months the *National Front News*, edited by Webster from 1974 until 1983, was being circulated to tens of thousands, with 33,000 copies of its fourth issue published, far exceeding *Britain First*, which peaked at 17,000 copies. Webster described how the newspaper was designed to have a tabloid appearance, with photographs and headlines that would “agitate” people on the streets and get NF commentary into the hands of the common person.

That same year the NF continued its appeal to workers with the National Front Railwaymen’s Association (NFRA). Peter Floyd explained that the NFRA had been started and developed more than two years earlier by NF members who worked for British Rail with the goal “to eradicate the many ultra left-wingers that abound with the rail unions and ultimately the entire trade unions.” Believing that
the transport unions did not reflect the “nationalist feeling” among workers, it established branches in London and the Midlands, with a national council of five men. A membership form for joining the NF’s Railwaymen’s Association declared that the NFRA had been founded due to concerns about the “destruction of our industry” and had established branches at “large stations and depots.” Its policies included to unite “all right thinking railmen against the rise of Communism within the unions” and expose the “preferential treatment afforded to coloured immigrants in respect to British Rail discipline.” Specifically, it mentioned that “most white” rail workers “have personal knowledge of cases of coloured railmen breaking rules and regulations including being drunk on duty.” It protested union contributions to the Labour Party and argued that supporting the NF’s union would “help us rebuild our industry and nation.”

Towards the end of the year, the leadership of the British Railways Board was discussing the NF’s attempt to “infiltrate the railway” and considered responding to “their more unpleasant racist allegations.” The National Union of Railwaymen (NUR) general managers and managing directors told management that they “cannot condone open recruitment on railway premises, etc. or false statements.” Whereas, the Socialist Workers Party argued that the way to “defeat” the NF was “on the shop floor” and “then the ground will be cut from underneath the fascists.” In 1978, the NUR began to take “action” against the NF by working with the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers, who planned to distribute 10,000 anti-NF pamphlets. Yet the Conservative NUR members tried to prevent this, opposing the “political action.” The NUR ultimately decided that NF supporters could join the union as long as they “respect” the rules.

The NF continued gaining supporters through its media stunts and public demonstrations. In summer 1976, the NF received its largest number of votes in a parliamentary by-election in Thurrock that gave the party 6.6%. Building from these gains, three more NF candidates contested parliamentary by-elections, including Andrew Brons and Charles Parker. Brons, a former National Socialist Movement member who was first appointed to the Directorate as Education Officer in 1976, would continue his rise in extremist politics in later years, while Parker became closer to Tyndall when Parker’s daughter and fellow NF member, Valerie, married Tyndall in November 1977.
showed “encouraging results.” The NF started a national effort to run in local elections in places such as Lancashire, Cheshire, East Anglia, Kent and Surrey, including an effort to contest all forty-eight seats in Leicestershire and twenty-two in Bradford. By the end of 1976, the NF claimed it was “poised to replace Liberals” as the largest third party. Despite the split in the NF, the party announced more than three hundred new members within nine months. The NF also reported 4000 attendees at the Remembrance Day event in 1975, increasing to between 5000 and 6000 in 1976.

**Conclusion**

After the Second World War, British fascism adapted to social issues and attempted to address broader public concerns. The NF was formed to pool radical resources together and united people on the political fringes with neo-Nazi and hardline Conservative backgrounds. Indeed, in its first ten years the NF went from being a cell of small fascist parties under an inter-war fascist figure to becoming a party associated with anti-immigration sentiment and opposition to the European Economic Community. Recognizing the support they received from white workers, the NF tried to capitalize on this. Indeed, the NF’s worker initiatives sought to win wider support, but failed to materialize as an electoral breakthrough. While a few Conservatives on local councils joined the party, the NF did not win a single election despite running in hundreds of electoral races. Nevertheless, the media attention focused on its marches and meetings, as well as its extremist stances, earned it a growing membership and a larger but less active community of supporters. By 1977, the British political community was at a crossroads concerning the radicals. Until that time there had been no mass, coordinated response to the NF’s gains or its street strategy. The next chapter examines the anti-racist response from mainstream and leftist parties as well as the NF’s search for new membership beyond the racist and radical-right worker vote. Specifically, it explores the cultural forms of politics, with the creation of Rock Against Racism and the NF’s establishment of their own racist music genre, Rock Against Communism, which improved morale and attracted financial and member support.
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