

Sun, Steel, and Raw Eggs:

The Far-right Politics of the Male Body

Michael Feola

Abstract: This article explores an emerging strain of far-right politics that makes two major claims: (1) that cultural decline can be tracked to a feminized, egalitarian society; and (2) restoring culture (or the nation) hinges upon resurrecting “true” masculinity. What distinguishes this movement is not simply an abstract investment in masculinity, but an investment in the hardened, purified male body as the path to renewal. As the article details, the far-right investment in the masculine body goes beyond a preening bodily aestheticism. Instead, these anxieties over gender ultimately represent a desire to write illiberal commitments into the structure of nature.

Keywords: far right, masculinity, Bronze Age Pervert, Raw Egg Nationalist, fascism, transphobia, gender politics, anti-gender movement

1.

The screen plays a montage of muscular young men, exercising in a coordinated rhythm. A stern voice-over tells the viewer that this scene is now a thing of the past. The present is instead a time of soft bodies, produced by a sedentary lifestyle. The scene comes from the documentary (*The End of Men*) produced by the conservative media personality, Tucker Carlson. As the film proceeds it illustrates this verdict with a set of examples demonstrating the threats that supposedly face the nation. As the narrator argues, “surrounded by the wealth and comfort they [contemporary Americans] have won, they lose their life force. They become confused and isolated. They lose faith in themselves, and the civilization they’ve created begins to decline.” And if this narrative of decline sounds familiar culture war notes, the core of the film links this verdict of civilizational decline to something more tangible: a degeneration of male physiology. In the terms of the film, the most apt symbol of this cultural decline is the supposed epidemic of “man boobs. They’re a physical manifestation of something bigger, the decline of manhood, of

virility, of physical health, all of which together threaten to doom our civilization.”¹

On its own, the film could easily be reduced to a histrionic piece of masculinity panic. The commentary routinely traffics in assertions over masculinity and physicality—and it takes a notably tongue-in-cheek tone when it addresses one proposed remedy for this dilemma: testicular tanning. Setting the documentary in a broader context, however, reveals its deep roots within the contemporary far right. In short form, major strains of the far right insist that the supposed crisis of the present must be understood through a linked set of issues: The nation or culture is presently endangered; a central component of this danger is a threat to masculinity; and if the nation or culture is to be repaired, it demands that “authentic” manhood be salvaged or reclaimed. Masculinity and civilization do not simply exist in some kind of metaphorical relationship. Instead, their connection is presented in more intimate terms, so that cultural decline supposedly registers at the embodied level.² Conversely, if culture has fallen into disrepair, a counterinsurgency at the level of physiology will be necessary to redeem social values, traditions, and institutions.

The politics of masculinity has a long history on the far right. The Italian proto-fascist Julius Evola for instance argued that all genuine traditions are defined by a stark gender divide, where the “male principle” gives order to the disordering, generative powers of femininity.³

These investments in masculinity are not, however, limited to the annals of conservative thought. Indeed, large portions of the contemporary far right commit to masculinity as the path to lift the nation out of its present malaise. This commitment is troubled, however, by the widespread belief that the present is defined by a “war against men” or a “war against masculinity” For instance, Ryan Landry, author of *Masculinity Amidst Madness* asserts “There is a war all around you.... The enemy deploys columns and weapons where you work and where your children go to school. Its propaganda, overt and covert, subverts your mind through every form of media. This is the spiritual war against men.”⁴ And these charges often take a distinctly antifeminist tenor. One persistent argument holds that generations of feminist activism have produced a “gynocentric” or “matriarchal” society, where the aim is no longer female equality, but rather a widespread attack on masculinity. These figures often target areas such as human resources policies and divorce proceedings as sites of female ascendancy—though the charges go well beyond these local instances. Instead, “gynocentric” society is typically presented as a project to domesticate and control men, forcing them to

renounce their natural, male instincts. Suzanne Venker, author of the aptly titled broadside *The War on Men* puts this argument in brute terms: “Feminism isn’t about equal rights, nor is it about providing women with choices.... Feminism is a war on men.”⁵

Against this background, the aims of this essay can be put simply. Major strains of the far right ultimately fuse the fates of masculinity and culture, so that a redeemed culture rests upon saving “authentic” manhood. For Paul Waggoner, head of the far-right Operation Werewolf collective, a resurgent masculinity can only be secured when men withdraw from mainstream society to perform masculinity with other men.⁶ These men push one another to their male limits, affirm appropriately male values, and surveil one another for signs of flagging masculinity.⁷ And yet, much far-right masculinity politics takes a twist that brings it beyond a flat statement of male separatism. Instead, the value of masculinity is meant to be saved through an investment in the male body—a physical site that must be honed, strengthened, and hardened if it is to a) reclaim its authentic nature and b) anchor a different, better society. Ultimately, the essay will argue that this far-right body politics must be pursued beyond its outward aesthetic of glistening, hard bodies; instead, it reflects deeper fears over the unmooring of politics from nature. Though this politics of the male body often invokes a language of fitness or nutrition, it ultimately channels central intuitions of the fascist imaginary: a desire to write reactionary commitments into the order of nature, thus promoting illiberal ideals under the guise of health.

2.

Perhaps the most notorious example of this body politics comes from the pseudonymous alt-right author simply known as “Bronze Age Pervert” (or, more frequently, by the acronym BAP).⁸ BAP’s 2018 book, *Bronze Age Mindset* fueled his ascendance through conservative social media circles. As a sign of its popularity, the work was reputedly celebrated by figures in Donald Trump’s first presidential administration and was publicly discussed by Michael Anton (a senior fellow at the ultraconservative Claremont Institute and official advisor to Trump).⁹ At the heart of the book’s success is a story of cultural decline that follows a broadly Nietzschean critique of modernity. The book persistently figures cultural greatness as the product of rare, singular human types, possessing an overpowering creativity and the capacity to impose their will upon reality (what BAP typically names “mastery over space” or “mastery over matter”).¹⁰ Conversely, the malaise of the present stems from what BAP

terms “yeast life”—a moniker that is meant to reflect the predominance of the masses, spurred by egalitarian ideals and desires.¹¹

If the foregoing exhausted BAP’s argument, it could be lumped with familiar far-right narratives of decline, dressed up by some catchy, web-friendly language. There is perhaps no theme more prominent in the far-right literature than the indictment of egalitarian ideals—typically condemned for obscuring the “natural” hierarchy that supposedly holds between human beings and cultures.¹² What bears attention for present concerns is how BAP frames this process of decline. Repeatedly, the threat to excellence is presented in distinctly gendered terms—as a “female” effort to domesticate male instincts. This point is illustrated through the speculative historiography that BAP enlists in his story of civilizational loss. As the title of the book suggests, the Bronze Age is promoted as a time where great human types supposedly had optimal chances to flourish. Though no historical period can be classified as a pure era of greatness, BAP privileges those cultures and practices that permitted the reign of aggressive instincts, signaled in his persistent nods toward piracy, seafaring, or elites who act beyond the reach of law. In contrast, BAP describes the present as a “longhouse” society—another ideal type distilled from the historical record. In plain terms, the longhouse refers to those agrarian communities where village life was organized around a communal meeting hall as a shared site for dining and meeting. For BAP and his followers, however, the longhouse is a metaphor for a world where women (or, in more broadly metaphysical terms, the “female principle”) are tasked with supervising and managing the community. As one of BAP’s disciples argues, “the most important feature of the Longhouse is... the ubiquitous rule of the Den Mother.”¹³ This phrase is meant to capture the constellation of ills that supposedly attend “matriarchal” society. In BAP’s own rendering, the longhouse is defined by “communal life... with its young men dominated and broken by the old and sclerotic, by the matriarchs, by the blob and yeast mode in human life overtaking and subjecting all higher aspiration.”¹⁴

A “longhouse” society is thus not simply defined by movements for gender equality. Instead, the term serves as shorthand for a system of control and egalitarian conformity, associated with “matriarchal” impulses and female empowerment. It is for this reason that the longhouse has exploded as a trope across the anti-feminist terrain of the far right, used to deride “the gynocratic henhouse” where “it was women who held the whip hand.”¹⁵ As one of BAP’s promoters recently argued, the longhouse reflects an insidious set of norms and practices that have supposedly come to pervade public life—a “cult of safetyism” that marks “the remarkable overcorrection of the last two generations toward social

norms centering feminine needs and feminine methods for controlling, directing, and modeling behavior.”¹⁶

According to BAP’s acolytes, this overweening system of constraint can be witnessed in everything from campus speech codes to COVID mitigation strategies (e.g., mask or vaccine mandates) to workplace behavior policies. Each is meant to signal an area where initiative and risk-taking are constrained for purposes of predictability, control, and mediocrity.

BAP’s popularity, however, goes well beyond this masculinist reading of cultural decline. Instead, much of his influence stems from a theme that reflects the interests of this article: a vision of how the leveling tendencies of egalitarianism could be contested. Bronze Age Mindset persistently endorses the usual commitments to inequality that tend to characterize far-right literature—based in the insistence upon differential human ranks and values.¹⁷ In BAP’s own terms, the revitalization of culture will hinge on “higher men to reclaim their sovereignty and not let themselves be at the mercy of gynocracy.”¹⁸ The gendering of this formula is significant. A wide field of far-right movements commit themselves to a “complementarist” position, where men and women simply are different by nature, defined by different powers, characteristics, and drives.¹⁹ What is distinctive about BAP’s vision is how he persistently figures his investment in masculinity in physiological terms. BAP’s social media presence describes him as an “aspiring nudist bodybuilder” and it regularly features images of glistering, muscular bodies.²⁰ And this aesthetics of male physicality is further reflected in BAP’s insistence that only a “regime of sun and steel”(i.e., tanning and weightlifting) can produce a person that would meet the aesthetic ideals of a supposedly superior life.²¹ The phrase is taken from the far-right Japanese figure, Yukio Mishima, who coined it to reflect his personal turn away from a sedentary, scholarly lifestyle in order to pursue human excellence, instead through a practice of bodily refinement.²²

As a result, the masculinity politics promoted by BAP often resembles a pastiche Nietzscheanism (e.g., appeals to physicality, overcoming, and form giving), cross-pollinated with bodybuilding motivational literature.²³ One prominent alt-right meme campaign pursues this insight in visual form—superimposing the text “equality is a false god” over images of predator animals, muscled warriors, or classical statuary of deities. The clear message is that the muscular, male body signals a superior form of human existence, contrary to the egalitarian ideals of modernity. Furthermore, this life of distinction should be celebrated over the embodied mediocrity of “the bugman” (those defined by mass tastes and the soft body of consumerism). What has fueled BAP’s popularity,

then, is not simply his disdain for egalitarian ideals, but his investment in a hyperbolic, embodied masculinity as the path toward a society that would promote human greatness. This individualized work on the (male) body is persistently presented as the counterpoint to the homogenizing, leveling tendencies of the (female) “longhouse.” The rippling physique of the bodybuilder is instead excellence made flesh—a supposed reminder of the ancient equivalence between the beautiful and the good.²⁴ True masculinity, in this vision, is not simply the site of bodily strength that demands attention from the eye; instead, it offers the possibility of a qualitatively higher existence, designed to overcome the basic impetus of “yeast life.”

3.

This insistence upon a distinctly bodily politics exerts an outsized influence on far-right masculinity influencers. As one of BAP’s disciples argues, “it is not an exaggeration to call BAP a leader—if not the leader—of our spiritual renaissance, of a worldview which could be said to rely, above all else, on a single premise: the supremacy of the body.”²⁵ It would be a mistake, however, to reduce this vein of body politics to a single source. To do so would commit the “great man” error of intellectual history, where diverging lines of thought are flattened out for the simplicity of a single, major name.

This masculinity movement gains greater political scope through another pseudonymous (though also recently doxed) author who goes by the pen name of Raw Egg Nationalist.²⁶ For casual observers, REN (as he is typically referred to in the literature) entered the public eye in the *End of Men* documentary noted at the opening of this article. At a pivotal moment of the film, REN details (through a voice-over designed to preserve his anonymity) how global institutions “want you to be fat, sick, depressed, and isolated. The better to control you and milk you for as much economic value as they can before they kill you.”²⁷ Well before the documentary, however, his influence had been rising through the far-right world, due to his stance on physiology, masculinity, power, and politics. As REN has persistently asserted, the current political moment is defined by wide-ranging threats to masculinity. And yet, any adequate threat diagnosis must look beyond social norms that stifle “natural” male traits. Instead, it must account for the forces that supposedly diminish masculinity at a biological level. To pose this question already reveals its stakes. If the threats to masculinity are not simply social or cultural—but are rooted at the brutally biological level—then the danger runs deeper. These forms of power go beyond “anti-male” social sanctions (e.g.,

shaming, derision, employment loss, etc.); instead, they supposedly poison the most fundamental roots of masculine personhood: the hormonal functioning of the body.

REN has pursued this argument through a number of avenues. Most prominent is the magazine that REN curates, bearing the instructive title of “Man’s World.” The magazine’s core mission is to promote the central article of faith for far-right manhood politics: The ongoing cultural crisis is rooted in a decline of masculinity and this decline is inscribed, most fundamentally, in male bodies. Characteristically, then, REN rails against threats to masculine biology within the phytoestrogens and xenoestrogens present in food, drink, fabrics, and even the air. These chemicals are meant to transform the organism from the inside, eroding the basis for masculine embodiment and personhood. This claim is echoed by the avowed “right-wing bodybuilder” Sonny Arvado, who argues “If you live in or near any major metropolis in the West, you have been impacted by chemical warfare. The food you eat, the water you drink, the air you breathe, and the products you consume have all been laced with endocrine disrupting chemicals.”²⁸

The effort to track threats to masculine biology does not, however, end with abstract concerns for the integrity of the food and water supply. Instead, the nationalist flavor of REN’s diagnosis is rooted in his insistence that these nutritional changes are part of a much broader assault by global powers upon the sovereignty of nations. Indeed, REN’s chosen moniker is instructive, as his politics of embodiment is specifically pitched as a form of nationalism.

The opening sections of REN’s major book, *The Eggs Benedict Option*, accordingly offer a detailed engagement with the specter that haunts much recent far-right literature: the “Great Reset.” In short form, the phrase targets a proposal announced by Klaus Schwab, head of the World Economic Forum. Schwab famously used the formula in 2020 to describe a restart of economic and social institutions in the wake of the COVID pandemic. Far-right figures typically invoke the phrase in a sense that pervades online conspiracy theory forums: an occult project to submit the nations of the world to global institutions (particularly the global financial sector). It is for this reason that far-right forums associate the “Great Reset” with a culture of perpetual surveillance and the loss of personal or local sovereignty. Fears of global rule have long standing in the far-right media ecology, perhaps most notoriously vis-à-vis the “New World Order” promoted by conspiracy entrepreneurs such as Alex Jones. In this vision, global institutions (e.g., the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, the World Bank) would confiscate individual property and firearms in order

to subject all nations and communities to some version of authoritarian, communist rule. In the terms of a popular far-right meme, the New World Order is “the fiendish plot to take away your rights, your lights, your property, your children, and everything you love.”²⁹

These established threat narratives help inject political substance into far-right campaigns around nutrition, gender, and embodiment. At a surface level, REN condemns how food suppliers have shifted away from meat-based protein, in favor of plant-based sources that introduce phytoestrogens into the male organism. In doing so, REN channels the prolific far-right memes surrounding the supposed “soy” culture of the left—where “soy” or “soyboy” are used as patently anti-Asian epithets for a flagging or inadequate masculinity.³⁰ This derision is expressed through a well-known set of images in far-right internet culture, where “soy” individuals are physically weak, wear glasses, and possess shrunken chins that house inadequate, scraggly beards (e.g., the ubiquitous “soyjak” meme in far-right visual culture).³¹

REN’s argument is not, however, reducible to memes that caricature liberal culture, consumerism, or internet consumption (each of which is meant to render the body “fat, weak, and unhappy”). Instead, REN ultimately argues that these nutritional shifts must be read in political terms—as strategies, by global organizations, to weaken bodies and corrupt the material foundations of gendered embodiment.

REN’s polemics against “soy globalism” therefore channel familiar far-right fears. As literary scholar Frida Beckman has argued, much far-right antagonism toward globalization can be read through the lens of “paranoid masculinity”—a stance obsessed with perceived threats to the sovereignty that the (white, male) individual is promised within the liberal normative imagination.³² These threats might be surveillance technologies, big data algorithms, public health mandates, or, in this case, nutritional inputs that alter the body’s functioning. Each of these represent ways that an absolute claim to sovereignty is conditioned through technologies of power. Bodily manipulation occupies a particularly fraught place within this far-right conspiracy culture, particularly for those who believe that “globalist” organizations are conducting a hidden war against nations and cultures. According to many far-right figures, it is because the physical body has been enfeebled and demasculinized that natives have been rendered compliant to the alleged loss of their nations through mass immigration (a process supposedly engineered by global organizations).³³ Far-right body influencer Marcus Follin (screen name “The Golden One”), for instance, regularly cites the physical weakness of European males as a key factor in how their nations are being “overrun” by “culturally incom-

patible” migrants.³⁴ As he argues, the debilitation of the body is akin to a “mental illness” (in his terms, *oikophobia*) that leads center-left males to prefer outsiders over their “own kind.”³⁵ From this perspective, nutritional degradation supposedly serves “globalist” efforts to erode nations and cultures. The weakening of the body translates into a weakened capacity for defense, even a willingness to welcome foreign “invaders” that will take the nation from its native heirs. For much far-right body politics, then, the body serves as a metonym for the nation itself in global times—where the permeability of the body reflects the porous nature of the border, opening both to powers that corrupt it from within.³⁶

The foregoing already reveals the basic contours of far-right gastro-politics, which is organized around two distinct poles: a) a threat-narrative of nutritional manipulation, where nutrition (and its bodily impact) is viewed as a hidden instrument of “globalist” power, and b) positive alternatives, such as nutritional integrity, back-to-nature lifestyles, and local sovereignty.³⁷ By pushing these ideals, the project hews to a familiar far-right strategy: laundering extremist commitments through the language of ecological conservation. As Sam Moore and Alex Roberts have helpfully detailed, one of the most prominent rhetorical avenues for contemporary far-right thought is what has been termed “*eco-fascism*”—a term that indicates how far-right theorists, movements, and actors routinely pitch illiberal commitments through the categories that define ecological activism.³⁸ Nativist movements, for instance, often couch their xenophobia in terms of ecosystem conservation, where they portray white, native groups as the sole responsible caretakers of a given nation’s natural resources (conversely, non-white migrants are framed as rapacious devourers of these same goods).³⁹ At other times, far-right movements reconfigure the language of “conservation,” shifting from non-renewable natural goods to instead highlight the racial composition of a given nation as the “natural resource” to be preserved.⁴⁰ For the far-right politics of embodiment, however, it is the body itself that is supposedly besieged by globalism. These figures do not just obsess over the perceived debilitation of the body, but also the erosion of the most fundamental basis for gendered embodiment. It is here, then, that the deepest form of nationalism is meant to root itself—through a body that is hardened, strengthened, and “remasculinized”—all to furnish the basis for a restored, virile nation.

This thus resonates with a longer far-right politics of embodiment. Perhaps most obviously, it evokes classic fascist campaigns that placed a reborn nation on the shoulders of what they termed the “new man.” This fascist vision appealed to an aesthetics of the strong, racially pure body, modeled after the Greek or Roman exemplars that were meant to furnish the ancient roots of national greatness. To this end, classic fascist art regularly featured male musculature intended to symbolize a vital, resurgent nation. And these aesthetic campaigns were doubled by a material politics of the male body—programs of diet and fitness designed to strengthen the body in preparation for the trials that would birth the new nation. This is a hard, “defeminized” body, forged in military readiness and martial virtues.⁴¹ As the sociologist Klaus Theweleit influentially argued in his study of Nazism, this emphasis on hardness was hardly incidental to fascist mobilization. Instead, classic fascism persistently called for a work of disciplining, where the ideal man steeled himself against all the feminine impulses that lay within. This was not simply a demand for martial readiness, but a deeper mission to expel any traces of gender ambiguity. All that flows, yields, or absorbs (all female-coded within the fascist imaginary) must be mastered for a body “like armor”—and only through this “body armor” could the “new man” be born, as a foundation for the new nation.⁴²

This fixation upon the strong male body resonates in the far right’s ongoing body politics. The ideal female body is typically presented as a site of maternal care and reproduction for the nation—illustrated by how the pregnant body is routinely lionized in the far-right meme-world.⁴³ In one recent episode, the Republican representative to the Louisiana Congress, Danny McCormick, shared on Twitter a meme of a pregnant woman’s body (head cropped out of the image), accompanied by the text “This is the ideal female body... this is what peak performance looks like.”⁴⁴ This sentiment is echoed by the far-right “manfluencer” Andrew Tate, who recently tweeted, “Peak female performance is pregnancy.”⁴⁵ In contrast, bodily strength is typically figured as distinctly masculine in the far-right media ecology. This investment in male strength gains significance through the threat narrative detailed to this point, where male bodies are allegedly poisoned through xenoestrogens and phytoestrogens in the food supply, leading to an epidemic of testosterone or sperm decline in advanced industrial societies. As the pseudonymous far-right author Peachy Keenan expresses this cluster of threats, “men are getting curb-stomped from birth by woke feminists.... But there is another factor causing the ‘shrinkage’ of male power and dominance in American society: falling testosterone levels and cratering male fertility.... Our boy

babies are literally swimming in a toxic environmental stew of feminizing chemicals from birth.”⁴⁶

In response, much far-right masculinity politics pushes a vision of reversal. In short form: The best hope for reclaiming the truth of masculinity is reversing the currents that have led to widespread demasculinization. This commitment is routinely expressed through the anti-urbanism that dominates much of the far-right social media landscape. One of the central tropes of the “Great Reset” conspiracy theory, for instance, is that global organizations will herd individuals into concentrated urban areas, where people can be easily surveilled and forced to “live in pods” (shorthand for the elimination of private living spaces). In reaction, far-right memes tend to glorify the rural and pastoral. This antiurban commitment extends well beyond the far-right fascination with the survivalist lifestyle. For instance, “cottagecore” is a thriving social media genre that glorifies “living off the land” in the mythic imaginary of a pristine, unsullied nature. Though cottagecore is often gendered as a feminine householding aesthetic, the far-right culture of masculinity likewise hyperidealizes the rural.⁴⁷ Authentic men are pictured in wilderness settings: chopping wood, lifting rocks, diving into icy waters, and generally testing their mettle against nature. The aims of far-right masculinity politics go deeper, however. It is not simply that the male body must remove itself from urban settings to regain its masculine core; rather, the body itself is privileged as a site of resistance to perceived threats of globalism or a feminized society. Where nationalist movements often draw metaphorical parallels between bodily and geopolitical vitality, this movement literalizes the tie between masculinity and national strength. As REN puts this point, “We... want you to be fit, healthy, and free, because the nation needs you. And a nation is only as strong as the people it is composed of.”⁴⁸

This far-right politics of masculinity thus exalts the body as the material foundation for the new nation. To meet this project, the far-right has seen the explosion of wellness influencers, promoting what the social theorist Josh VanDiver has termed “bro science”—“amateur efforts to optimize male health... through popularizing scientific research on how certain diets, exercise, and hormone treatments can counter the debilitating, emasculating, and enervating effects of modern life.”⁴⁹

Exemplary in this regard is REN’s “raw egg nationalism” that indicts grain-based diets and privileges instead animal fats and proteins (lauded for possessing some “natural” connection to bodily vitality). This posture involves a diet organized around local food sources and “slonking” eggs (REN’s term for drinking raw, locally produced eggs).⁵⁰

Other figures have gained notoriety in far-right circles for devouring raw meats in an effort to rid their bodies of the supposed toxins of a “modern diet.” Perhaps the most well-known figure is the “Liver King” (screen name for Brian Johnson)—a social media personality whose screen presence typically reduces to devouring raw beef liver or lifting heavy objects (all the while shirtless) in order to sell a product line of nutritional supplements to his followers (currently numbering over six million on TikTok alone). But he is not alone—as “Sol Brah” has also come to prominence in far-right social media circles for his gospel of health through weightlifting, tanning, vaccine avoidance, and dietary detoxification (largely, the consumption of raw foods).⁵¹

What binds these figures is not simply a commitment to “folk” health discourse, but a turn to what S. Marek Muller has termed “primal” rhetoric. The phrase aims to capture a core argument of these masculinity influencers: that the strong, healthy body will only be salvaged by refusing “modern” culture (along with its nutritional inventions) and instead returning to an “ancestral” diet that could produce an un- lied connection to nature.⁵² As Muller, et al. put this antimodernism: “primal rhetoric is... premised upon reclaiming a spiritual wild-ness. This discourse is particularly ‘primal’ inasmuch as carnivore diets are meant to find some version of white men that has been ‘lost’ through the cancer of modernity.”⁵³

This demand for dietary purification feeds into the bodybuilding culture that defines the far-right politics of masculinity. Even a casual tour of the literature reveals a persistent linkage between masculinity and bodily strength—signaled by how the movement routinely advertises itself through a single label: “right-wing bodybuilders.” Strength as such often seems less important than its visual performance. These commitments are clearly staged in *Man’s World*, the magazine edited by REN. The pages of the magazine are peppered with images of rippling male physiques; the many advertisements that fund the magazine steer the reader toward workout gear and supplements; and every issue offers features on the habits and techniques of classic bodybuilders. To cater to an audience that seeks this aesthetics of strength, the magazine regularly offers features to isolate and work certain muscle groups, designed to generate the visible musculature idealized by far-right visual culture. This aesthetics of masculinity is perhaps most evident in the advertisements dedicated to mastic gum—a type of chewing gum designed to restore a “manly” jawline.

At its heart, then, this politics of masculinity offers a perverse restaging of the historian Ernst Kantorowicz’s “two bodies” of the

sovereign.⁵⁴ For Kantorowicz, drawing from medieval jurisprudence, the king's body was doubled in the imagination of authority. At one level, there was the physical body of the sovereign, his immediate, material presence. This material body was, however, duplicated by the king's mystical body—a spiritual extension of the king's person that ran through the body politic, binding its many actors and interests as one.⁵⁵ In the far-right politics of embodiment, the logic is inverted. If the nation or the culture is to be redeemed, it will not happen through the spiritual personality of the sovereign. Instead, political rebirth must be secured through the sensuous, physical body, hardened through discipline, diet, and exercise. As the masculinity scholar Scott Burnett has argued, this individualist angle offers a wrinkle to the fascist lineage of this body politics. Though both movements fetishize the strong, male body as a path to national renewal, classic fascism pursued an idealized fusion with the person and the body of the leader.⁵⁶ This was the impetus behind the great public spectacles of fascism, as ceremonies where the individual could lose itself within the regimented collective. In contrast, the recent politics of far-right masculinity demands a practice of bodily cultivation from each and every right-wing bodybuilder.⁵⁷

For these influencers, it is not absorption that is desired, but rather a preening singularity that distinguishes itself from the derided masses of “bugmen.” In the challenge posed to the reader by REN's publication *Man's World*: “This is the age of yeast life. Life at its lowest level. Undifferentiated. Ugly. A train of flesh. But another way is possible. A path of cleansing fire. Do you have it inside you to burn bright?”⁵⁸

5.

One way to understand this investment in embodied masculinity is through the militant imagination of the far right. Far-right figures often promote a single narrative to explain the supposed disaster of the present. It is not simply that culture or the nation is in decline; rather, it has suffered a hostile assault. The agents, targets, and figures of the war differ in various renderings. At times, far-right figures rail against a “war on traditional values”; at other times, it is a “war against the nation.” The enemies might be a cabal of global elites (a specter often rendered in antisemitic terms), progressives, a global ring of pedophiles, or a “submerging wave” of immigration. What binds these verdicts is how frequently they enlist masculinity as the saving power. It is only by fighting a counterwar that the nation or culture will be salvaged; and in this counteroffensive, it is strong men who will play the preeminent role.

The far-right politics of masculinity persistently draws from this militant imaginary. Their literature often maintains that men have been weakened specifically so that they cannot defend themselves through their own forces; they must instead submit (in “feminized” fashion) to the state for protection.⁵⁹ In response, the meme culture of the far-right routinely worships the militant, male body—often pictured in warrior attire from diverse histories and cultures (e.g., ancient Greek hoplites, Vikings, Catholic crusaders), clad in armor, carrying the weapons of war. The message is that the nation or culture can only be saved by strong men willing to risk everything in order to preserve their way of life. In the stark formulation of the pseudonymous far-right writer Barbaric Disciple, only the “brotherhood of armed men” can “win the Holy War... spread like an unquenchable fire until our people are rightfully back on top.”⁶⁰ To this end, far-right movements have long invested in mixed martial-arts gyms, street gangs, and fight clubs (often rebranded as “active clubs”) in order to hone this masculine capacity for defense.⁶¹

Where the warrior body is idealized through the far-right media ecology, the masculinity politics under consideration draws from deeper reserves, reflecting deeper fears and aspirations. The literature persistently returns to a core threat narrative: that masculinity is under attack.⁶² Their rage against “soy” culture is not simply a caricature, designed to mock a lifestyle built around effete (presumably leftist) values and consumerist pleasures. Instead, it reflects a panic over the material forms of embodiment that ostensibly define masculinity. This fixation upon the biological roots of masculinity is reflected in one of the most pervasive indictments that circulates in far-right spaces—that a weak or inadequate man can be described as “low testosterone” or, more simply, as “low T.” The insult is instructive. Hormone levels are presented as a naturalized barometer of authentic gender identity—some bedrock indicator that requires no further explanation or appeal.⁶³

And this indictment is often literalized to propose that declines in testosterone levels will degrade the male-female dyad that ostensibly rests at the heart of a healthy civilization. It is not, then, simply a challenge to sovereignty that haunts the far-right imagination, but the perceived dissolution of gender, as an immutable human distinction. As REN argues, for instance, the shift away from meat-based proteins, the rise of vegetable oils, and xenoestrogens in the food supply mean that “sexual dimorphism... is almost certainly going to decrease. Males and females are going to become more, rather than less, alike, as men’s stature, hormone levels, and musculature decline.”⁶⁴

Though some fixations of far-right masculinity politics may seem narrow in scope, these fears over gender mutability have found broad purchase across the international far right. Indeed, a variety of constituencies have found common ground on their opposition to what they term “gender ideology” or “the gender movement.” By this phrase, they typically appeal to a constellation of issues. Minimally, the supposed threat of “gender” (often rendered in English) is meant to highlight a field of academic theory that allegedly views sexual difference as a performance of a social role, rather than something rooted within basic human biology. As the social theorist Judith Butler puts this fear, gender theory is meant to signal “a single ‘ideology’ that refutes the reality of sexual difference and that seeks to appropriate the divine power of creation for those who wish to create their own genders.”⁶⁵ Far-right actors often track this theory to a constellation of academic disciplines, such as women’s studies, gender studies, and queer theory. For much of the “antigender” right, however, this threat runs far beyond the ivory tower. Instead, it supposedly represents a far-ranging social project to destabilize the proper “nature” of gender roles. In the European arena, the “anti-gender” movement provides a point of convergence for an array of far-right actors and movements. Official political parties combine with local social movements and internet activists under the “antigender” umbrella, and these alliances are often bolstered by the pulpit of the Catholic Church, to form a coalition that avows the defense of a natural, divinely ordained gender order.⁶⁶

Where the “truth” of gender may seem too abstract for coalition-building, this movement draws energy from a more familiar far-right commitment: a reactionary nationalism. Their persistent choice to invoke “gender” in the English language figures the enemy not simply as an academic theory run amok, but as a form of political imperialism—an effort by Western nations (typically the United States) to impose their “degenerate” gender ideals on other nations. Here, “antigender” figures often cite efforts from global institutions that require nations to adopt laws concerning gender equality, LGBTQ+ rights, or transgender recognition as conditions of international assistance.⁶⁷ In response, far-right coalitions graft commitments to a “natural” gender order onto ultranationalist campaigns against global institutions. This argument is given voice by Scott Howard, author of *Transgender-Industrial Complex*. This book largely offers a histrionic threat narrative that weaves the medical, media, and pharmaceutical industries into a single agenda-driven “complex” (an argument that borrows heavily from established antisemitic conspiracy tropes). More significant for present purposes, Howard argues that the spread of transgender acceptance and a

broadened platform of rights for transgendered individuals “is a conscious undertaking by the ruling class... they all serve a function in consolidating power at the top and subjugating the whole of humanity under the banner of the insidious One World government.”⁶⁸ These conspiracy narratives from movement actors are given greater theoretical heft by Alexander Dugin, one of the most prominent intellectual guides for contemporary Russian ultranationalism. As Dugin asserts, international support for non-traditional gender practice is central to “globalist” efforts to undo the deep grounds of human distinction (in this case, gender, allegedly the most fundamental, biologically inscribed basis for identity). In Dugin’s terms, “gender is... something collective: either masculine or feminine. So the next step [for “globalists”] was the destruction of gender as something objective, essential, and irreplaceable.”⁶⁹

In terms that pervade far-right forums, this supposed assault on gendered embodiment reflects the designs of the “globohomo” order—an epithet that consolidates a number of threads in the far-right political imaginary.⁷⁰ At one level, “globohomo” signals the supposed “globalist” effort to erode local attachments and identifications in favor of a decultured, deracinated consumer. In this sense, the phrase abbreviates the characteristic far-right charge of “globalized homogenization.”⁷¹ In the terms of one far right commentator, “it [globo- homo] intends to destroy all local cultures, whether they be national, provincial, city, town, village or family. These local cultures must be destroyed so that people have no resistance to the propaganda of the globalists.”⁷² At another level, the neologism aims to expose a “homo- sexual agenda” that targets the supposed bedrocks of national and cultural stability: the family and gender difference. Generations of culture warriors have indicted LGBTQ+ movements for supposedly destabilizing the “natural” family unit and diminishing reproduction (itself figured as the “natural” aspiration of the family unit). For many far-right figures, however, commitments to gender flexibility (e.g., transgender acceptance, drag performance, non-traditional gender roles) reflect a deeper danger: an effort to erode bodily nature itself (along with the social order that a gendered nature is meant to undergird). Scott Howard puts this line of argument into particularly hectoring terms, describing transgender advocates as “sociopaths who believe that man may defy the rules of nature—may be above nature— and that we are all infinitely malleable to be molded in to the crude and broken shapes of their choosing.”⁷³

It is now possible to disentangle more fully the politics behind the far-right investment in embodied masculinity. The most obvious project is announced by far-right meme culture, where muscled men with strong chins are pictured in states of exercise or military training. This is the

body that will supposedly be needed to fight the last battles against the “New World Order” or the “Great Reset.” That said, this military vision does not exhaust the far right’s investment in masculinity. Instead, for large portions of the far right, masculinity is a lens through which a larger story is told about identity, meaning, and sovereignty. The much maligned “attack on masculinity” is meant to be part of a deeper, globalist project, designed to uproot traditional identities and build a new global order (based on a new kind of human) in its place. Within this threat assessment, far-right commitments to a hardened, remasculinized body take on hyperbolic importance. By purifying their bodies, boosting their testosterone, and committing to a gendered regime of bodily discipline, these “right wing bodybuilders” take themselves to reassert the most fundamental marker of identity and distinction: the order of gender, written into the physical body, the most basic foundation of human difference.

In doing so, these far-right body influencers draw from the fascist political imaginary, which long rooted its politics within an entrenched set of gender commitments. To recall the influential work of Klaus Theweleit, fascist projects rest upon a hard gender distinction, where “the new man” must master, domesticate, and expel every last trace of the feminine.⁷⁴ To fail in this labor—to permit the feminine and masculine to mix within a single subject—can only (in the terms of the literary scholar Barbara Spackman) come legible to the fascist eye as “an unnatural monstrosity, perversion, or aberration.”⁷⁵ And the aims were not simply to restore the delineations ostensibly set out by nature. By shoring up this hard gender binary, the “new man” could participate in the core fascist ideal of palingenesis—the radical rebirth of society from its essential core.⁷⁶ This remasculinized body is not, then, simply the authoritative expression of gendered nature; it is meant to be a fount from which a healthy social order could be renewed.⁷⁷ From this perspective, the far-right politics of male embodiment must be understood as something more than what some commentators have concluded: the commitments of disaffected youth, angered by slights to their masculinity and disillusioned with the traditional channels of politics.⁷⁸ More deeply, it channels a reactionary politics of nature, where embodied nature is meant to provide a timeless scaffolding for social order, meaning, and hierarchy. Here, the body takes on a different cast than is often ascribed to the public culture of fascism. It is less a unit that would be shaped by others in the military barracks, and more the subject of a labor taken on by the individual himself. This body is not to be absorbed in mass rallies, and more the material that must be hardened, purified, and re-masculinized to provide the basis for a different, redeemed society.⁷⁹ This individualized work of diet,

exercise, and purification is the work that the social theorist Zach Bratich has termed micro-fascism—the everyday, sub-institutional labor necessary to become the subject of fascism in affect, body, and desire.⁸⁰

What can easily come across as an aestheticized cult of the body thus rests upon a deeper effort to fetishize nature as an illiberal basis for human identity and social renewal. This is the malignant project masked by the official arguments of far-right body influencers— which is why the scholar Cat Tebaldi has described this movement as “Granola Nazis.”⁸¹ At the surface level, these influencers offer a language of environment, nutrition, and anti-globalism. The investment in the body is presented as a movement for health against multi-national corporations. All of these are aims that have long mobilized center-left coalitions. Beneath these trappings, however, far-right body politics pursues a project rooted within the historical imagination of fascism—the authentically male body as the medium to restore the “nature” of gender and, by extension, the system of ranks that are meant to be anchored in this gendered nature. This biological order will be the bedrock for a social order founded upon the fixity of gender, the primacy of the nuclear family, and hierarchical gender relations. It is not simply a desire to restore gender difference that is at stake in far-right body politics (as might be suggested by the popular formula in far-right circles: “there are only two genders”); instead, this commitment to a gendered order carries with it a set of beliefs in differential powers, abilities, and appropriate social roles. It is for this reason that the social theorist Alberto Toscano links the “gender panic” of far-right body politics to a “late fascism” in which “the repair and reinvention of a martial masculinity and the anxious nostalgia for the heteronormative family as the cell-form of the demos and ethnos are the foci around which an entire institutional and ideological infrastructure is cohering, with ‘gender ideology’ and transness as nemeses.”⁸²

Ultimately, then, one of the core dangers to the far-right “manfluencer” movement reflects its debt to a characteristic far-right strategy—a project to take over core normative terms of the liberal universe and turn them to promote illiberal aims and ideals. The far-right lexicon has justified ethnonationalist projects and white ethnostates, for instance, through appeals to “difference” and “diversity.” It has pushed regressive racial and gender pedagogies under the language of “parent’s rights.” And, for the far-right politics of masculinity, it increasingly couches reactionary, transphobic gender commitments through a language of nature and health. In doing so, the movement does not only seek to restore what it views as “traditional” gender identities, performances, and relations. In a more troubling sense, it shrouds particular visions of gender in the cloak of nature, mystifying them as an eternal scaffolding for human

life and pathologizing those who would practice bodies and genders differently.

Notes

1. The End of Men, Tucker Carlson Originals, 2022.
2. This is what Josh VanDiver has pursued, in different terms, as a “constitu- tional conspiracy.” As he elaborates, these far right figures offer “a political theory deeply concerned with threats to the constitution’s two bodies”—both the political and physical body of a polity. See VanDiver, “Constitutional Conspiracism: Aryans, Alpha Chads, and White Nationalists” in *American Conspiracism: An Interdisciplinary Exploration*, ed. Luke Ritter (Routledge, 2025), 214.
3. In Evola’s terms, “in all superior types of Tradition, man has always been the bearer of the lineage of the Uranian, solar principle... it always remains the qualifying principle that bestows a form and orders the feminine generating substance.” See Evola, *Revolt Against the Modern World*, translated by Guido Stucco (Inner Traditions International, 1995), 169-170.
4. Ryan Landry, *Masculinity Amidst Madness* (Terror House Press, 2020), 1.
5. Suzanne Venker, *The War on Men* (WND Books, 2013), 4.
6. See Paul Waggener, *Operation Werewolf: The Complete Transmissions*(Operation Werewolf, 2016).
7. As Jack Donovan, the far-right “manfluencer,” (associated for a time with the Werewolf Collective) has influentially argued, “masculinity is about being a man within a group of men. Above all things, masculinity is about what men want from each other.” Jack Donovan, *The Way of Men* (Dissonant Hum, 2012), 2.
8. BAP has been recently identified as Costin Alamariou. For purposes of the article, I will use his chosen pen name, as this is the moniker that has been widely adopted by the vein of body politics I will be exploring throughout.
9. See Michael Anton, “Are the Kids Al(t)right?,” *Claremont Review of Books*, 19, no 3 (Summer 2019), <https://claremontreviewofbooks.com/are-the-kids-altright/>

10. See Bronze Age Pervert, *Bronze Age Mindset* (self-published, 2018), 23-24.

11. Bronze Age Pervert, *Bronze Age Mindset*, 27-32.

12. For a helpful account of these antiegalitarian tendencies (and how they translate into the racialized dimensions of neo-fascism), see Chetan Bhatt, "White Extinction: Metaphysical Elements of Contemporary Western Fascism," *Theory, Culture, & Society*, 38.1 (2021): 27-52.

13. Lom3z, "What is the Longhouse?" *First Things*, <https://www.firstthings.com/web-exclusives/2023/02/what-is-the-longhouse>, February 16, 2023.

14. Bronze Age Pervert, *Bronze Age Mindset*, 62-63.

15. The first quote is from Andrew Mew, "Descrambling the Gynocratic Henhouse," *Man's World*, vol 11 (YEAR). The second quote is from Raw Egg Nationalist, "The Longhouse Illusion," *Man's World*, no 10 (April

2023): 35.

16. Lom3z, "What is the Longhouse?"

17. This angle is treated by Michael Anton, "Are the Kids Al(t) Right?" The point is also well treated by an unpublished essay by Ronald Beiner, "Do the Straussians now 'Own' Costin Alamariu?" <https://www.taylorfrancis>

[.com/chapters/mono/10.4324/9781003666011-11/straussians-costin-alamariu-ronald-beiner](https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/mono/10.4324/9781003666011-11/straussians-costin-alamariu-ronald-beiner)

18. Bronze Age Pervert, "The Right of the Stronger and the Better," *Man's*

World, 7 (July 2022): 237.

19. See, for instance, Eviane Leidig, *The Women of the Far Right: Social Media*

Influencers and Online Radicalization (Columbia University Press, 2023),

76-77.

20. This point is also noted by Josh VanDiver, "Metapolitics, Masculinity, and Technology in the Rise of 'Bronze Age Pervert'," in *Contemporary Far-Right Thinkers and the Future of Liberal Democracy*, A. James McAdams and Alejandro Castrillon, eds. (Routledge, 2022), 242-263. The body fixation is also noted by Graeme Wood in his helpful overview

of BAP's rise through the far-right thought-world. See Wood, "How Bronze Age Pervert Charmed the Far Right," *The Atlantic*, August 3, 2023, <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2023/09/bronze-age-pervert-costin-alamariu/674762/>.

21. *Bronze Age Pervert, Bronze Age Mindset*, 191.

22. Yukio Mishima, *Sun and Steel*, translated by John Bester (Kodansha International, 1970). This aesthetic dimension is noted by Michael Anton, "Are the Kids Al(t) Right?"

23. This dimension has led the conservative political scientist C. Bradley Thompson to describe BAP's followers as the "pajama-boy Nietzscheans." See Thompson, "The Rise and Fall of the Pajama-Boy Nietzscheans," *The American Mind*, May 13, 2020, <https://americanmind.org/salvo/the-rise-and-fall-of-the-pajama-boy-nietzscheans/>.

24. See VanDiver, "Metapolitics, Masculinity, and Technology," 242.

25. Giles Hoffman, "Between Biceps and Mail Bombs," *Man's World 2*: 118.

26. At the time of writing, *Raw Egg Nationalist* has been exposed as the pen name of Charles Cornish-Dale. See Gregory Davis, "Egg-sposed: We Reveal the Identity of Far-right Bodybuilder 'The Raw Egg Nationalist,'" *Hope not Hate*, June 20, 2024, <https://hopenothate.org.uk/2024/06/20/egg-sposed-we-reveal-the-identity-of-far-right-bodybuilder-the-raw-egg-nationalist/>. In recent writings, Cornish-Dale has embraced his earlier pseudonym and begun to publish under his own name. See, for

instance, Charles Cornish-Dale, *The Last Men: Liberalism and the Death of Masculinity* (Regnery Press, 2025).

27. *The End of Men*, Tucker Carlson Originals, 2022.

28. Sonny Arvado, *Of Tyrants and Tellers: Stand Tall, Build a Masculine Culture, Win the War on Men* (self-published, Createspace, 2017), 17-18.

29. Meme found at <https://911nwo.com/new-world-order-articles/>.

30. A useful overview of this argument (specifically focusing on the "anti-soy" gastropolitics of the far right) appears in Eviane Leidig and Joshua Farrell-Molloy, "The Emerging Raw Food Movement and the 'Great Reset'" *Global Network on Extremism and Technology*, October 10, 2022, <https://gnet-research.org/2022/10/10/the-emerging-raw-food-movement-and>

-the-great-reset. See also S. Marek Muller, David Rooney, and Cecilia Cerja, "Long Live the Liver King: Right-wing carnivorism and the digital dissemination of primal rhetoric," *Frontiers in Communication*, vol 9 (2024): 1-14.

31. In the terms of the far-right author, Orwell Goode, this society produces "weak men exhibiting soyish features—mouth agape, thin scraggly beards, plaid shirts, poor muscularity (skinny fat) etc." See Goode, "The Clowning of America: Masculinity Under Fire" in *Man's World* no 1 (2021):9.

32. Frida Beckman, "Paranoid Masculinity, Or, Toward A New Identity Politics" sympleke, Volume 29, no. 1-2 (2021): 235-246.

33. These fears are particularly prevalent within the so-called "great replace- ment" narratives that have come to prominence within the far-right media ecology. See Mark Davis, "Violence as Method: the 'white replacement,' 'white genocide,' and 'Eurabia' conspiracy theories and the biopolitics of networked violence," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 48.3 (2025): 426-446; Michael Feola, *The Rage of Replacement: Far-right Politics and Demographic Fear* (University of Minnesota Press, 2024).

34. See Marcus Follin, Justin Garcia, Henrik Palmgren, and Paul Waggener, "Man Up to the Invasion," January 18, 2016, RedIce Radio, <https://redice.tv/red-ice-radio/man-up-to-the-invasion>

35. Marcus Follin, "Politics and Biology", November 21, 2024, <https://www>

[.youtube.com/watch?v=OoyrEGJisM8](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OoyrEGJisM8). Cornish-Dale makes similar arguments with regard to testosterone levels and in-group loyalties in *The Last Men*, 207-209.

36. I owe this formulation to an anonymous reviewer for the journal.

37. For a helpful discussion of these strategies, see Catherine Tebaldi, "Granola Nazis and the Great Reset: Enregistering, Circulating, and Regimenting Nature on the Far Right," *Language, Culture, and Society* 5.1 (2023): 9-42.

38. See Sam Moore and Alex Roberts, *The Rise of Eco-Fascism: Climate Change and the Far-right* (Polity, 2022). Another helpful account of eco-fascism appears in Blair Taylor, "Alt-Right Ecology: Ecofascism and Far-right Environmentalism in the United States," in *The Far-right and the Environment*, edited by Bernhard Forchtner (Routledge, 2020), 275-292.

39. For a helpful discussion of this strategy, see John Hultgren, *Border Walls Gone Green* (University of Minnesota Press, 2015).

40. As Renaud Camus argues, for instance, “the only coherent ecologists are those who fight for the happy conservation of all races, peoples, cultures, languages, ethnic groups and civilizations, as well as for animal and plant biodiversity.” Camus, *You Will Not Replace Us!* (Chez l’auteur, 2018), 131.

41. As George Mosse argued in his study of fascist masculinity, “this new man must be disciplined, at one in spirit with like-minded men through a way of perceiving the world, of acting and behaving, based upon... a love of combat and confrontation.” George Mosse, *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity* (Oxford University Press, 1996), 156. As William Connolly has helpfully pointed out, these confrontational ways of being were not just “attitudes,” adopted at the cognitive level, but became “bodily postures,” written into the collective physiology of fascist life. See Connolly, *Aspirational Fascism: The Struggle for Multifaceted Democracy under Trumpism* (University of Minnesota Press, 2017).

42. See Klaus Theweleit, *Male Fantasies*, vol 1: *Women, Floods, Bodies, History*, translated by Stephen Conway (University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 229-362.

43. For a helpful overview of the link between maternal reproduction and nationhood, see Nira Yuval-Davis, *Gender & Nation* (Sage, 1997), ch 2.

44. Though McCormick has deleted the original tweet, a screen grab is preserved at <https://twitter.com/rosiewestwood/status/1569729220510711814>. “In a now-deleted tweet, State Rep. Danny McCormick (@McCormick4LA) tweeted that pregnancy is the “ideal female form.”

45. Andrew Tate (@cobratate), “Peak female performance is pregnancy,” Twitter, September 12, 2024, <https://x.com/Cobratate/status/1834224176145584141>

46. Peachy Keenan, “Masculinity Goes Extinct,” in *Man’s World* no. 9 (2023):136. Scott Burnett helpfully discusses these fears over the weaponization of testosterone in “Healthy White Nationalists: Far-Right Selbstbilder in a Digital Age,” in *Masculinities and Discourses of Men’s Health*, G. Brookes and M. Chalupnik, eds. (Palgrave, 2023), 161-188.

47. For an account of how cottagecore tends to be gendered female, see Robin O’Luanaigh, “Co-Opting Cottagecore: Pastoral Aesthetics in Reactionary and Extremist Movements,” *Global Network on Extremist and Technology*, May 19, 2023, <https://gnet-research.org/2023/05/19/co-opting-cottagecore-pastoral-aesthetics-in-reactionary-and-extremist-movements/>.

48. Raw Egg Nationalist, Eggs Benedict Option, 34.

49. Josh VanDiver, "Constitutional Conspiracism," 213.

50. See REN, Eggs Benedict Option, 170. And this practice has been taken up more broadly by far-right body influencers. Benjamin Braddock, for instance, has endorsed the consumption of raw eggs in order to combat the "corrupted toxic food supply" that has allowed "globalism" to undermine "the health and vitality of the country." See Benjamin Braddock, "It is Time to Practice Raw Egg Nationalism," Countere, June 19, 2020, <https://www.countere.com/home/raw-egg-nationalism>.

51. See <https://x.com/SolBrah>.

52. Such arguments reflect the gastrological expression of the oft-repeated mantra of the far-right (borrowed from Julius Evola): "revolt against the modern world." Evola, *Revolt Against the Modern World*.

53. S. Marek Muller, David Rooney, and Cecilia Cerja, "Long live the Liver King: right-wing carnivorism and the digital dissemination of primal rhetoric", *Frontiers in Communication*, vol 9 (2024): 2. Helpful discussions of this anti-modernism are also found in Cat Tebaldi, "Granola Nazis and the Great Reset: Enregistering, Circulating, and Regimenting Nature on the Far Right," *Language, Culture, and Society*, 5:1 (2023).

54. Josh VanDiver has made a similar point—though he is more interested in how far-right body influencers are invested in ancient reflections on the doubling of the nation's "constitution" (e.g., Plato). See Josh VanDiver, "Constitutional Conspiracism: Aryans, Alpha Chads, and White Nationalists,"

<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003459255-15/constitutional-conspiracism-josh-vandiver>.

55. See Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton University Press, 1957).

56. See, for instance, Nidesh Lawtoo, (New) *Fascism: Contagion, Community, Myth* (Michigan State University Press, 2019).

57. Scott Burnett, "Healthy White Nationalists", 184.

58. *Man's World*, no. 5 (2022), 242.

59. As far-right author Ryan Landry argues, "These chemicals, foods, and pills all feminize men, yet this is not seen as harmful by the authorities. They want men weak and feminized so that they clamor for a third party to provide security." See Landry, *Masculinity Amidst Madness*, 27.

60. *Barbaric Disciple, Barbaric Vitalism* (Resavager Media, 2023), 129.

61. A helpful overview is offered by Cynthia Miller-Idriss, *Hate in the Homeland: The New Global Far-right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020), ch 4.

62. BAP puts this argument in brute terms: “Women become... very aggressive once real and relaxed manhood atrophies.... Of all the things that you blame for the decrepit times we live in, feminism and the ‘liberation’ of women is both the proximate and the ultimate cause.” *Bronze Age Mindset*, 165-166.

63. See, for instance, Burnett, “Healthy White Nationalists”, 174. An extended defense of this testosterone-based argument appears in Cornish-Dale, *The Last Men*.

64. Raw Egg Nationalist, *Eggs Benedict Option*, 153.

65. Judith Butler, “What Threat? The Campaign against ‘Gender Ideology’,” *Glocalism: Journal of Culture, Politics, and Innovation*, 3 (2019): 2.

66. For some helpful overviews of this “anti-gender” movement, see Judith Butler, *Who’s Afraid of Gender* (Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2024), chapters 1-2; Kaiser, *Political Masculinity*, 124-196.

67. See Butler, *Who’s Afraid of Gender*, 37-72.

68. Scott Howard, *The Transgender-Industrial Complex* (Antelope Hill Publishing, 2020), 149.

69. Alexander Dugin, *The Great Awakening vs The Great Reset* (Arktos Press, 2021), 12.

70. Helpful discussions of the term appear in Scott Burnett, “Healthy White Nationalists.” See also Cat Tebaldi, “Tradwives and Truth Warriors: Gender and Nationalism in US White Nationalist Women’s Blogs,” *Gender and Language*, 17.1 (2023): 14-38; Josh VanDiver, “Masculinist Identitarians, Strategic Culture, and Eurocene Geopolitics,” in *Global Identitarianism*, Jose Pedro Zúquete and Riccardo Marchi, eds. (Routledge, 2023), 175-196.

71. For an articulation of the term from within the far right, see VJM Publishing, “What Is ‘Globohomo’?,” November 28, 2018, <https://vjmpublishing.nz/?p=10728>. This piece is also discussed by Talia Levin, *Culture Warlords: My Journey into the Dark Web of White Supremacy* (Hachette Books, 2020), 62-66.

72. VJM Publishing, “What is Globohomo?”

73. Howard, *Transgender-Industrial Complex*, 428

74. See Klaus Theweleit, *Male Fantasies*, vol 2: *Male Bodies—Psychoanalysing the White Terror*, trans. Erica Carter and Chris Turner (University of Minnesota Press, 1989).

75. Barbara Spackman, *Fascist Virilities: Rhetoric, Ideology, and Social Fantasy in Italy* (University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 34.

76. The fascist emphasis on palingenesis (or “palingenetic ultranationalism”) is most strongly associated with the influential work of Roger Griffin. See Roger Griffin, *The Nature of Fascism* (Routledge, 1991); Roger Griffin, *A Fascist Century: Essays by Roger Griffin* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

77. It is for this reason that proto-fascist Julius Evola notoriously asserts that “a new State and of a new civilization will always be ephemeral unless their substratum is a new man.” Passage cited in Zach Bratich, *On Microfascism: Gender, Death, and War* (Common Notions, 2022), 40.

78. This is, for instance, the verdict of Michael Anton. See Anton, “Are the Kids al(T) Right?.”

79. See Scott Burnett, “Healthy White Nationalists.”

80. Zach Bratich, *On Microfascism: Gender, Death, and War*, 1-24.

81. See Tebaldi, “Granola Nazis and the Great Reset.”

82. Alberto Toscano, *Late Fascism: Race, Capitalism, and the Politics of Crisis* (Verso, 2023), 152.