

gray-unesco-lalibela-berichte?utm\_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2F> (Zugriff: 28.08.2021); B. Dörries, Truppen aus Tigray nehmen heilige Stadt ein, in: Süddeutsche Zeitung 6.8.2021, <https://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/buergerkrieg-tigray-felsenkirchen-1.5375694> (Zugriff: 28.08.2021); Lalibela: Ethiopia's Tigray rebels take Unesco world heritage town, in: BBC News 5.8.2021, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-58101912> (Zugriff: 28.08.2021).

- 2 UNESCO. Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. World Heritage Committee. Second Session, Washington DC 5 to 8 September 1978, List of Nominations to the World Heritage List and of Requests for Technical Cooperation, CC-78/CONF.010/7, <https://whc.unesco.org/archive/1978/cc-78-conf010-7e.pdf>.
- 3 Tourismus taucht hier häufig nur als (Management-)Problem bzw. Gefährdung und etwas dem Programm Äußerliches auf, vgl. u.a. L. Meskell: A Future in Ruins. UNESCO, World Heritage, and the Dream of Peace, Oxford 2018; C. Cameron/M. Rössler, Many Voices, One Vision: The Early Years of the World Heritage Convention, Farnham 2013.

**Daniel Geary / Camilla Schofield / Jennifer Sutton (eds.): Global White Nationalism. From Apartheid to Trump, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020, 338 pp.**

Reviewed by  
Paul S. Landau, College Park

As an “ideology”, the claim to whiteness as an excluded or newly marginalized state of being, a subjected status, is impoverished. After all, white men still dominate wealth all over the northern hemisphere, so the premise would seem to be shaky. None-

theless, white people, offended at being called out for racism or other wrongs, have managed to rally worldwide, as suffering, somehow. They do not all speak about white supremacy, but the rhetoric of many of them within one or two menu clicks is rank, ugly, racist, and, yes, white supremacist. Since the days of William F. Buckley's purge of the Republican Party of the dominance of the John Birch Society and other “patriotic” racist orders, we stand on the edge of a resurgence of overt racism into the legitimate political sphere again.

The victimhood inherent in this recent growth of white supremacy is a focus of *Global White Nationalism: From Apartheid to Trump*. That is a reversal, because whiteness, when it has any political meaning, has historically indexed a dominant status in cosmopolitan societies, both in the old and new worlds. How, then, have white supremacy and white separatism (or both, amalgamated into white nationalism) managed to incorporate victimhood in recent decades in the English-speaking world, to become a force to reckon with? Is this really a form of self-pity masquerading as nationalism? Hasn't it got something to do with the internet and the way anyone's “content” is magnified or diminished by counted views?

Yes and no. There are several recent books of note that have highlighted the problem thus: the stance, “Whites must rule”, is simply rarely encountered in national discourse as a legitimate policy position. Instead, there is an intricate weaving of white supremacy in “states' rights”, “conservative, traditional”, “pro-family values”, “pro-law and order”, and, most interestingly in this book, “nostalgia for settler empire” and (connected to that) “anti-IRA

pro-Ulster Protestantism”. Fake memories and phony equivalences have ensured white supremacy’s survival in these terms, while arguments and persons are rehabilitated from one sketchy domain to the next. The authors in this valuable book track them.

Inevitably, some chapters (by some contributors) are stronger than others or overlap. Several figures recur: Enoch Powell, whose famous 1968 “Rivers of Blood” anti-immigration speech is still shared by jingoists; Ian Paisley; Mark Cotterill; George Wallace; David Duke; Mary Whitehouse. The volume ties together nostalgia for white settler rule with observations about real continuities not just in imagery for the Other, but in personnel from the 1970s onward (p. 164). There are nine chapters. Kennetta Hammond Perry looks back, via Du Bois and Paul Gilroy, at the intersection of Brexit and racialism. Stuart Ward, in chapter 2, then focuses on Australia and New Zealand because of the Christchurch mass killing and on Southern Rhodesian nostalgia because of murderer Dylann Roof’s selfie with a Rhodie flag. Chapter 3 is very strong, with Bill Schwarz considering the relationship between Brexit and Trumpism and showing how whites came to see themselves as a “defeated race”, conflating racial privilege with citizenship (p. 76). Nixon and George Wallace are placed in the family tree here as well (p. 95). There is a return almost to the post-Civil War “Lost Cause” ideology, reset as a worldwide relationship and not just a U.S. national (ostensibly) colonial one. Clive Webb’s chapter 4 brings in Powell and his reception in the United States, including by Buckley’s *National Review* (not *New Review* [p. 111]). Daniel Geary’s brilliant-

ly exposes the Paisley white-nationalist matrix, the appeal to “Christianity” and “Scots-Irish stock [genetic ancestry]”, and his intersection with pro-campus segregationist Bob Jones University in 1962 and the CCC-style racist organizations – CCC or Concerned Citizens’ Councils, indexing the KKK (Ku Klux Klan) in the U.S. South – white-persons’ committees. There was also the International Council of Christian Churches of Carl McIntire, publisher of the rightist *Christian Beacon* [p. 137] and radio host on the same frequency as Dan Smoot, who was Rush Limbaugh’s predecessor in the 1970s and early 1980s. Josiah Brownell (cited re p. 164 above) takes up Rhodie nostalgia from its (surprising) overlap with Paisley’s agitation, fascinating material. Zoe Hyman, in chapter 7, returns to Powell, Rhodesia, the Southern National Party, and the CCCs, and shows how Welsh, Basque, Cornish, and even Sami (Lapland) nationalisms or autonomies were embraced in the 1970s. It should therefore not surprise when the same pro-separatist efforts today are shown to be tied to white nationalism. Robert J. Hoy’s American-Afrikaner union formed in 1986 and might have been considered alongside German pro-white settler “societies”, and there were such, but the analysis is confined to the Anglophone world. There is little integration of genuine events in Southern Rhodesia, Mozambique and Angola (absent here), and South Africa, such as the post-1960 rise of the anti-apartheid movement as a counterweight and provocation to racism. There is a bit in late chapters on the internet. But I was left with some questions: How does the ideology work, where is it detected as such, and when is it concealed? Evan Smith gives us a

history of the National Front in Australia, and Kyle Burke, for the first time in the volume, brings in the American infatuation with guns and investigates Mark Corrill and Tom Metzger and his son, who recruited among skinheads 30 years ago with a message not unlike Trumpism. Racism is shown to work in these chapters by visibility.

The introduction assures us we are in capable hands (race is an “unstable social construct” [p. 3]), and a few of the essays address the wider dimension, but the unspoken assumption somehow becomes, and remains, that white nationalism is a nationalism that has to be hidden in plain sight, there but unalluded to in (most) contemporary public English-speaking political theaters since Verwoerd and Menzies. In my view, white nationalism thrives however when it can shock, destroy, undermine, and damage: not just when it can cloak or silence itself. It is a disruptive force and insofar as it has grown worldwide, the subject still awaits a single volume fully treating the phenomenon; there is nothing on Germany, Austria, Hungary, Poland, Russia, Israel, Algeria, Brazil, the Café Wars in Paris, etc. in these pages. Until then, however, this very worthy book makes a real contribution. It opens up seams of engagement and dispersal from the 1950s through to the present, explaining that much of what appears to be a sudden disgraceful turn now is not that, but a recrudescence and a continuity.

**Johanna Meyer-Lenz/Jochen Weil:  
Kinderkardiologie(n) in Berlin,  
Erlangen, Hannover, London,  
Minneapolis, München und Tübingen  
1950–2000: Die Entwicklung der  
Kinderkardiologie als neue  
Spezialdisziplin in der medizinisch-  
technischen Revolution des 20.  
Jahrhunderts, Leipzig: Leipziger  
Universitätsverlag, 2021, 655 S.**

Rezensiert von  
Norbert Finzsch, Köln

Der umfangliche, aber präzise Titel dieses monumentalen Buches gibt wieder, um was es geht: es ist dies eine Geschichte die Pionier:innen des Fachs Kinderkardiologie im Kontext der medizinischen und technologischen Veränderungen der zweiten Hälfte des 20. Jhs. Beleuchtet werden einerseits berufsbiographische Aspekte, andererseits treiben die Verfasser:innen erheblichen Aufwand in der Bereitstellung des transferhistorischen und komparatistisch angelegten Umfelds, vor dessen Hintergrund berufsgeographische Ansätze überhaupt erst Sinn machen.

Moderne Ansätze der Geschichtswissenschaft wie Transnationalität in der Form von Verflechtungs- und Netzwerkgeschichte und Wissenstransfer haben die Methodik des Bandes geleitet. Dieses Buch ist in Umfang und Anlage kolossal, allein das Inhaltsverzeichnis umfasst 14 Seiten. Die Untersuchung basiert auf Interviews mit Kinderkardiolog:innen aus Deutsch-