

ASSESS THE DIFFERENT HISTORIOGRAPHICAL APPROACHES TO FASCISM AND THEIR USEFULNESS FOR DEFINING NEW FAR- RIGHT DEVELOPMENTS.

HTANSW 2020, 1st Place History Extension Essay Prize Winner

Aden Weir, North Sydney Boys High School

As a political term, ‘fascism’¹ carries a historical power unparalleled by any other. It has seen prominent use by legislators, philosophers and historians alike to antagonise and control narratives around political enemies.² Fascism as an idea gained these powerful connotations from its unique and universally denounced crimes. The world after the Holocaust was described by historian Nora Levin as ‘in truth, a new planet’,³ cementing the fascist movement as a force against humanity. With this

powerful rhetorical weight, modern, political historians have aimed to control perceptions of fascist history, from the nascent Comintern’s historiographers to the administration of Donald Trump. With conservatives often likening Marxism to Hitler’s national socialism, and leftists decrying police of any nation as ‘fascist pigs’, the main driver for historical approaches to fascism appears political.

Fascist historiography mainly aims to construct what Roger Griffin terms a 'fascist minimum', a set of basic tenets that can differentiate a fascist regime from others.⁴ This minimum serves to identify, and therefore prevent, fascist politics, and thus the recurrence of crimes like the Holocaust. Due to fascism's political connotations, ideologically different historians offer vastly different approaches. On the right, philosophical conceptions of 'great men of history' and the role of the nation define conservative perspectives on the subject, such as those of Ernst Nolte. On the left, Marxist historiography of fascism, pioneered by Leon Trotsky, is expressed through historical materialism and perceiving fascism within the class struggle. In liberal historiography, typical focus on abstract ideas shape perspectives such as that of Roger Griffin, identifying the 'core myth' of fascism as 'palinogenetic ultranationalism'.⁵ This essay will assess these three primary approaches in fascist historiography, their validity, and how they address modern right-wing populism, particularly that of Donald Trump.

Ernst Nolte (1923-2016) was a German historian best known for his seminal work on fascism, *Fascism and its Epoch* (1963), as well as leading the conservative faction in the West German *Historikertreit*. Within conservative historiography generally, two branches can be observed; firstly, that of Rankean empiricism, focused on primary sources and unifying ideas of human history through the actions of individuals,⁶ opposing the second 'philosophical' branch of history, exemplified by G.W.F. Hegel's conception of a spiritual and dialectic struggle of national and individual *geists* (spirits).⁷ Taught by the Hegelian philosopher Martin Heidegger, Nolte leans toward the latter school of historical practise, focusing on the 'metapolitical phenomena' of national struggles and the concept of 'transcendence', aligned with Hegel's conception of the spirit and focusing on the collective will of the nation.⁸

From this Hegelian approach, Nolte sees fascism as a dialectical antithesis to Marxism; 'anti-Marxism [...] radically opposed and yet related'.⁹ This trend of relating fascism to Marxism occurs throughout conservative historiography; sociologist F.A. Hayek believes national socialism to have 'similar intellectual roots' to Marxism,¹⁰ while ethnographer A. James Gregor called fascism a 'variant' on classical Marxism.¹¹ While acknowledging fascism's anti-Marxist qualities, Nolte emphasised the anti-liberal and anti-capitalist rhetoric of fascism. In this, Nolte argued that fascism was a reaction to 'transcendence', a historical phenomenon including both sociopolitical and technological progress, as well as the existentialist goal of releasing man 'from the confines of the everyday world'.¹² In the USSR and USA, Nolte saw examples of transcendence, such as Yuri Gagarin's space flight into the 'province of gods', while fascism rejected these Marxist and liberal efforts, focusing on a return to paganism, 'spartanist' lifestyles and Ger-

man-Roman hegemony in Europe.¹³

Nolte's understanding of fascism as a force of reaction is largely valid, as is his understanding of the distinct national character of fascism, particularly in his analysis of French Integralism, Italian Fascism and German Nazism. Nolte's failure largely falls within his conservative philosophical approach. Focusing on the national character causes Nolte to lose sight of subtler differences in fascist movements, such as the monarchist Carlists and national-syndicalist Falangists of Spain, despite belonging to the same nation, perhaps finding better analogues in the French Action Française or Sorelians respectively. Nolte also appears to ignore fascism's class character, other than some 'anti-bourgeois' sentiments. In reality, fascists were incredibly concerned with class and often supported the bourgeoisie. Adolf Hitler, in *Mein Kampf*, argued for class division's existence being based in genetic factors,¹⁴ and engaged in a policy of mass privatisation upon ascending to power.¹⁵ Nolte's understanding of Marxism and fascism sharing 'identical methods' also breaks upon nuanced analysis; although both being coups, the 1917 seizure of power by Lenin's vanguard party engaged in a non-consensual revolution against the state, immediately followed by civil war, as opposed to the bloodless and complicit regime change of Mussolini's March on Rome. Nolte's reduction of Nazism to an anti-modernist movement, and focusing too heavily on its philosophical underpinnings, has been seen by some, such as Jürgen Habermas, as socially irresponsible. This, when combined with Nolte's rejection of the Holocaust as unique, and his absolving of the German public from guilt in the Nazi regime in characterising Nazi fascism almost exclusively in terms of Hitler, obscures identification, and thus prevention, of fascism.¹⁶

Leon Trotsky (1879-1940), Russian revolutionary and thinker, pioneered Marxist historiography on fascism as the movement emerged, his collected works on the matter, *Fascism: What It Is and How To Fight It* (1969), remaining a seminal perspective on the topic. Originating from the works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, historical materialism focuses on the history of 'class struggle', a political, economic and armed conflict between classes over control of the means of production.¹⁷ Political movements, such as fascism, are understood by Marxists as apparatus of this class struggle, a position Trotsky explicitly adopts in his combative analysis.

In addition to this legacy, Trotsky's theory is defined by his political purposes; classification of, containment of and direct assault of fascist movements. Identifying fascism within the broader class struggle, Trotsky believed the ideology to be 'a plebian movement in origin, directed and financed by big capitalist powers'.¹⁸ Mussolini's movement was thus classed by Trotsky as fascist, but the lack of petty-bourgeois based in Primo De Rivera's

Spain disqualified it from the title. Trotsky also identified fascism as ‘capitalism in crisis’, a notion shared by both his contemporaries and successors, although in different forms. Two contemporaries, Comintern historians Georgi Dimitrov and Clara Zetkin, described fascism as a terrorist form of ‘finance capital’,¹⁹ while a modern writer, Australian Marxist historian Evan Smith, noted that the left view of fascism remains that it is an evolution of capitalism even today.²⁰ Trotsky’s definition of fascism, additionally, classifies it as a historical stage, succeeding the revolutionary ‘Jacobinism’ and stable ‘Democracy’ to defend capitalism against revolution.

Trotsky’s definition of fascism compellingly provides an explanation for fascism’s origin, with almost all fascist movements originating out of some preceding *Bien-nio Rosso*,²¹ or another such leftist conflict, seeming to align with Trotsky’s understanding of fascism as particularly shaped by fear of revolt. Trotsky’s analysis of the class character of fascism, being petty-bourgeois in nature, remains insightful as well, as has been noted by other writers on the subject, such as George Orwell.²² Trotsky’s faults mainly come from a hyper-focus on Marxism; Salazar’s Portugal or Metaxas’ Greece, for instance, grew more out of a general ‘capital in crisis’ period of instability, rather than in response to a communist threat. Additionally, Trotsky’s class focus on the petty bourgeoisie, while fundamental to most fascist movements, ignores far-right populisms from the fascist family, including Francoism or Pinochet’s Chile being driven more by the military class. This class focus, as Robert S. Wistrich points out, results in a loss of sight of many technical and political traits within these movements; national character, aesthetic, social presence; all defining features of most fascist movements.²³

Roger Griffin (1948-) leads much of the modern discourse on fascist history, his seminal works on the topic being *The Nature of Fascism* (1969) and *Fascism* (1990). An academic at Oxford Brookes University, Griffin often appears to emulate his British predecessors in the liberal tradition of Whig historiography, not necessarily in the progressive approach of Hume or the idealism of Macaulay, but rather in the focus on abstract ideas as the force of history. In the pursuit of his fascist minimum, Griffin focuses not on national differences or class fundamentals, but doctrinal beliefs and tenets of fascist ideology.

In this, Griffin directly analyses a ‘core myth’ of fascism, deliberately focusing on the non-class element. This pursuit aims to identify and prevent fascism, Griffin believing the ‘third millennium’ would reawaken the anxieties that originally fueled fascism’s rise. Griffin understands fascism as a ‘revolutionary form of nationalism’, bridging class divides and rebirthing the nation as something new. Here, he opposes both preceding his-

torians; fascism, for Griffin, is necessarily modern and transcendental, and an instrument of class unity, rather than Trotsky’s class war. Griffin additionally believes a key defining feature of all fascisms to be the adoption of certain characteristics based on historical and geographic context, summarising this total definition in one sentence; ‘a political ideology whose mythic core in its various permutations is a palingenetic form of populist ultra-nationalism’.²⁴

Griffin succeeds in creating a geographically and temporally diverse study of fascism, including the Sinarquists and Falangists of Latin America, Nazi-sympathetic groups in the Arab world and nostalgic fascisms of the modern-day. This success has earned him the appraisal of many modern historians, including Stanley G. Payne and Ian Kershaw. At the same time, Griffin’s ideological focus results in the exclusion of many right-wing populists. For instance, Mexican Synarchism is discounted on its Catholic identity, a criterion discounting many dangerous movements, even including Franco or Jozef Tiso. Additionally, Griffin often divides between fascism, proto-fascism and neofascism seemingly arbitrarily, again ignoring large and dangerous political presences such as Jair Bolsonaro’s Brazil. As J. Schwarzmantel points out, Griffin largely ignores Marxist debates on anti-socialist elements of fascism and class composition,²⁵ while Alberto Spektorowski also notes that Griffin leaves out crucial figures in the birth of fascism, including Sorel and Maurras.²⁶

In preventing fascism, the necessary first step is to identify it. Right-wing populists that threaten democratic institutions, as well as the rights and lives of minorities, are often accused of fascism, but the academic validity of these claims remain questionable. This can be seen in the case of President Donald Trump and the modern American Republican Party.

Considering Ernst Nolte’s definition of fascism, one might point to Trump’s unapologetic reactionary tendencies, or the slogan of ‘Make America Great Again’, as a specific rejection of modernity and transcendence. In the earlier phases of his term, Trump appeared to ignore Marxism, but he began to fit Nolte’s understanding of fascism more toward the 2019 State of the Union Address, declaring that ‘America will never be a socialist country’ in response to growing left-wing populism in the nation.²⁷ Both in his protectionist trade war with China, and during his response to the coronavirus pandemic, Trump appeared to move away from the neo-liberal politics of his predecessors, and towards even a socialist bent, with coronavirus income relief and gestures toward a universal basic income seeming to correspond with Nolte’s belief that fascism imitates Marxist policy. Trump’s lack of violent paramilitarism, however, as well as his democratic ascension to power, discount him from Nolte’s core criterion of revolutionary action.

Thus, Nolte would likely find him innocent of fascism.

Trotsky's analysis would appear to situate Trump as a capitalist reaction to the crisis of 2008. Political filmmaker Michael Moore, for instance, commented on Trump as an outbreak of middle and working-class resentment at the failure of neoliberal capitalism.²⁸ Additionally, Trump relies largely on middle-class and petty-bourgeois support, as Lance Selfa of *Jacobin* points out, aligning with Trotsky's class characterisation of fascism.²⁹ However, aside from aforementioned remarks about 'far-left fascism' and never becoming a socialist country, Trump's politics have remained largely illiberal at worst, and never more in an antagonistic struggle with the working class than indifferent, or even cooperative. With a far more racial and identitarian centre to his politics, Trotsky might classify Trump as more of a conservative authoritarian than a genuine mass-movement opposed to working-class activity.

Roger Griffin's conception of 'palingenetic ultranationalism' might appear realised in the nuclear-age nostalgia of Trump's 'Make America Great Again' rhetoric. Trump has made great efforts to bridge class divides, seen by many as capitalising on the anti-elite sentiments of a disgruntled American working class.³⁰ However, Trump's term has not been characterised by the sort of grand projects of Hitler or Mussolini, nor the accompanying popular paramilitary action; no counterpart to Pan-Germanism or the Abyssinian War. As Griffin himself argues, in a piece for *Vox* on the topic of Trump, he has no wish for a truly national rebirth.³¹ More so, Trump wishes to reform American institutions into an autocracy, while remaining liberal and capitalistic.³²

While Trump shows many indications of fascistic tendencies, an observation of the historiographical currents surrounding fascism demonstrates a seemingly consensus opinion on the topic. Rather than variance between political opinion and method, these distinct currents arrive at the same conclusion: Trump appears to be a right-wing populist and an autocrat, but not a genuine fascist. When covering many threatening right-wing populists, the same phenomenon appears. Boris Johnson, or Bolsonaro, would appear to follow the same general pattern as Trump, and thus are innocent of fascism. At the same time, the more 'visionary' and expansionist nationalist leaders, like Xi Jinping or Vladimir Putin, do not fight modernism or transcendence, and operate without popular paramilitaries or traditional palingenesis.

In the broader goal of prevention, this lack of applicability presents a problem. Right-wing populists and widely acknowledged threats to democracy cannot be accurately described as fascist, and thus the primary preventative goal of the historiographical school is rendered mute. For a historiography largely aimed at

prevention, the technical definition of fascism becomes a hindrance, wherein new words like Griffin's 'neofascism' or Timothy Snyder's 'not-even fascism'³³ cloud the possibility of identifying these populist currents. In this sense, new far-right developments become detached from the historiography of fascism and require new historiographies of broader socio-political phenomena, of which fascism and the nascent new populist movement are a part. Inspiration might come from something similar to Umberto Eco's *Ur-Fascism*, wherein fascism is a 'family', or spectrum of interchangeable qualities and traits that provide a more broad categorisation of these movements.³⁴ Fascism remains a threat, but only within an analysis of these new forms of populist and autocratic nationalism can the original goals of fascist historiography be achieved.

The historiography of fascism, then, ceases to function effectively in its preventive measure for the modern-day. However, it invites a forward movement for historians. Fascist historiography heretofore has been too concerned with the creation of a limiting 'minimum', a doctrinaire approach restricting it from any present utility. The defining methods of historians like Nolte, Trotsky and Griffin, limited though they are, should be used to forge a new method in identifying autocratic nationalism; a method in which these new populisms might be prevented, whether they arrive in fascist uniform or not.

Bibliography

- Baldwin, P., 1990. *Reworking The Past*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Bosworth, R. ed., 2009. *The Oxford Handbook Of Fascism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press BPS.
- Dimitrov, G., 1972. *Selected Works*. 2nd ed. Sofia: Sofia Press.
- Eco, U., 1995. Ur-Fascism. *New York Review of Books*, 42(11).
- Edwards, R., 1995. *The Pursuit Of Reason*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Gordon, P., 2020. Why Historical Analogy Matters. *The New York Review of Books*, [online] Available at: <<https://www.nybooks.com/daily/2020/01/07/why-historical-analogy-matters/>> [Accessed 16 January 2020].
- Gregor, A., 1979. *Young Mussolini And The Intellectual Origins Of Fascism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Griffin, R., 1995. *Fascism*. New York: Routledge.
- Griffin, R., 1993. *The Nature Of Fascism*. New York: Routledge.
- Griffin, R. ed., 2002. *International Fascism: Theories, Causes And The New Consensus*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Griffin, R., 2003. The palingenetic core of generic fascist ideology. In: A. Campi, ed., *What is Fascism? Interpretations and research prospects*. Rome.
- Griffin, R., Loh, W., Umland, A., Laqueur, W. and Baker, D., 2006. *Fascism Past And Present, West And East*. New York: Ibidem Press.
- Habermas, J. and Leaman, J., 1988. Concerning the Public Use of History. *New German Critique*, (44).
- Hayek, F., 2008. *The Road To Serfdom*. New York: Routledge.
- Hegel, G., 1975. *Lectures On The Philosophy Of World History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hellmann, J., 2016. *Michael Moore: Supporters See Trump As Human Molotov Cocktail*. [online] TheHill. Available at: <<https://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/presidential-races/298881-michael-moore-trump-a-human-molotov-cocktail>> [Accessed 17 July 2020].
- Hitler, A., 1933. *Mein Kampf*.
- Lamont, M., Park, B. and Ayala-Hurtado, E., 2017. Trump's electoral speeches and his appeal to the American white working class. *British Journal of Sociology*, 68(S1).
- Matthews, D., 2020. *I Asked 5 Fascism Experts Whether Donald Trump Is A Fascist. Here's What They Said*. [online] Vox. Available at: <<https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2015/12/10/9886152/donald-trump-fascism>> [Accessed 27 July 2020].
- Nolte, E., 1965. *Three Faces Of Fascism*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Orwell, G. (1982) *The Lion and the Unicorn: Socialism and the English Genius*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Renton, D., 1999. *Fascism: Theory And Practise*. London: Pluto Press.
- Schwartz, I., 2020. *Trump: "America Will Never Be A Socialist Country"; "We Were Born Free And We Will Stay Free"* [online]. Available at: https://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2019/02/05/trump_america_will_never_be_a_socialist_country_we_were_born_free_and_we_shall_stay_free.html (Accessed: 27 July 2020).
- Schwarzmantel, J., 1994. Review: The Nature of Fascism. *Sociology*, 28(2).
- Selfa, L., 2016. Trump's Middle-Class Army. *Jacobin*, [online] Available at: <<https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/09/trump-voters-populism-middle-class-education-gop/>> [Accessed 16 July 2020].
- Smith, D., 2020. *US Under Siege From 'Far-Left Fascism', Says Trump In Mount Rushmore Speech*. [online] the Guardian. Available at: <<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/jul/04/us-under-siege-from-far-left-fascism-says-trump-in-mount-rushmore-speech>> [Accessed 27 July 2020].
- Smith, E. (2012) *Defining fascism: some notes on the Marxist interpretation*, New Historical Express. Available at: <https://hatfulofhistory.wordpress.com/2012/12/14/defining-fascism-some-notes-on-the-marxist-interpretation/> (Accessed: 18 July 2020).
- Snyder, T., 2020. *Timothy Snyder On Language And "Not-Even Fascism"*. [online] American Academy. Available at: <<https://www.americanacademy.de/timothy-snyder-on-language-and-not-even-fascism/>> [Accessed 25 May 2020].
- Spektorowski, A., 2020. Review: Fascism. *History of Political Thought*, 17(3).
- Stone, D., 2011. *Histories Of The Holocaust*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trotsky, L., 1969. *Fascism: What It Is And How To Fight It*. 2nd ed. New York City: Pioneer Publishers.
- von Ranke, L., 2010. *The Theory And Practise Of History*. London: Routledge.
- Wistrich, R., 1976. Leon Trotsky's Theory of Fascism. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 11(4).

Endnotes

- ¹ For clarity, the lowercase version will be used to refer to the generic fascism this essay discusses, while a capitalised 'Fascism' will refer to the Italian version as implemented and practised by Gabriele D'Annunzio, Italo Balbo, Benito Mussolini et al.
- ² President Donald Trump, for instance, has declared a growing 'left-wing cultural revolution' as part of a 'far-left fascism' in America (Smith, D., 2020. *US Under Siege From 'Far-Left Fascism', Says Trump In Mount Rushmore Speech*. [online] the Guardian. Available at: <<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/jul/04/us-under-siege-from-far-left-fascism-says-trump-in-mount-rushmore-speech>> [Accessed 27 July 2020].)
- ³ Stone, D., 2011. *Histories Of The Holocaust*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp.206

- 4 Griffin, R., 1993. *The Nature Of Fascism*. New York: Routledge. pp.38
- 5 An ideology which focuses on rebirthing the nation in a revolutionary way, palingenesis meaning rebirth.
- 6 von Ranke, L., 2010. *The Theory And Practise Of History*. London: Routledge. pp.30-31
- 7 Hegel, G., 1975. *Lectures On The Philosophy Of World History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp.44-116
- 8 Baldwin, P., 1990. *Reworking The Past*. Boston: Beacon Press. pp.7-8
- 9 Nolte, E., 1965. *Three Faces Of Fascism*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson. pp.20-21
- 10 Hayek, F., 2008. *The Road To Serfdom*. New York: Routledge. pp.181-192
- 11 Gregor, A., 1979. *Young Mussolini And The Intellectual Origins Of Fascism*. Berkeley: University of California Press. pp.xi
- 12 Nolte, op. cit. pp.433
- 13 Ibid. pp.452-453
- 14 Hitler, A., 1933. *Mein Kampf*. pp.601-613
- 15 A term actually coined to describe Nazi policy of rolling back state ownership (Edwards, R., 1995. *The Pursuit Of Reason*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.)
- 16 Habermas, J. and Leaman, J., 1988. Concerning the Public Use of History. *New German Critique*, (44). pp.40-50
- 17 A subject explored particularly in *The Communist Manifesto*, *Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State* and *The 18th Brumaire of Louis-Napoleon*, although both philosophers wrote many more pamphlets, essays and books on the subject.
- 18 Trotsky, L., 1969. *Fascism: What It Is And How To Fight It*. 2nd ed. New York City: Pioneer Publishers. pp.8
- 19 Dimitrov, G., 1972. *Selected Works*. 2nd ed. Sofia: Sofia Press. p.9
- 20 Smith, E. (2012) *Defining fascism: some notes on the Marxist interpretation*, New Historical Express. Available at: <https://hatfulofhistory.wordpress.com/2012/12/14/defining-fascism-some-notes-on-the-marxist-interpretation/> (Accessed: 18 July 2020).
- 21 A period of radical trade union and communist activity following the end of World War I in Italy. Fascist blackshirts were employed by corporations and the state during this two year period between 1919 and 1920 to quell the rebellion, contributing in part to their eventual rise to supreme rule over Italy.
- 22 Orwell, G. (1982) *The Lion and the Unicorn: Socialism and the English Genius*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- 23 Wistrich, R., 1976. Leon Trotsky's Theory of Fascism. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 11(4). pp.157-184
- 24 Griffin, R., 2003. The palingenetic core of generic fascist ideology. In: A. Campi, ed., *What is Fascism? Interpretations and research prospects*. Rome. pp.97-122
- 25 Schwarzmantel, J., 1994. Review: The Nature of Fascism. *Sociology*, 28(2). pp.620-621
- 26 Spektorowski, A., 2020. Review: Fascism. *History of Political Thought*, 17(3). pp.460-462
- 27 Schwartz, I., 2020. *Trump: "America Will Never Be A Socialist Country"; "We Were Born Free And We Will Stay Free"* [online]. Available at: https://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2019/02/05/trump_america_will_never_be_a_socialist_country_we_were_born_free_and_we_shall_stay_free.html (Accessed: 27 July 2020).
- 28 Hellmann, J., 2016. *Michael Moore: Supporters See Trump As 'Human Molotov Cocktail'*. [online] TheHill. Available at: <<https://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/presidential-races/298881-michael-moore-trump-a-human-molotov-cocktail>> [Accessed 17 July 2020].
- 29 Selfa, L., 2016. Trump's Middle-Class Army. *Jacobin*, [online] Available at: <<https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/09/trump-voters-populism-middle-class-education-gop/>> [Accessed 16 July 2020].
- 30 Lamont, M., Park, B. and Ayala-Hurtado, E., 2017. Trump's electoral speeches and his appeal to the American white working class. *British Journal of Sociology*, 68(S1).
- 31 Matthews, D., 2020. *I Asked 5 Fascism Experts Whether Donald Trump Is A Fascist. Here's What They Said.* [online] Vox. Available at: <<https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2015/12/10/9886152/donald-trump-fascism>> [Accessed 20 June 2020].
- 32 However, Griffin has commented after recent events concerning the American Black Lives Matter protests, namely Trump's symbolic appeals to tradition, religion and violence, that America may, in fact, be moving closer to fascism. (Zax, T. et al. (2020) *Trump's church photo has no American precedent. Does it have one in fascism?*, The Forward. Available at: <https://forward.com/culture/448011/trump-church-photo-fascism-st-johns-political-religion-protests/> (Accessed: 29 July 2020).)
- 33 Snyder, T., 2020. *Timothy Snyder On Language And "Not-Even Fascism"*. [online] American Academy. Available at: <<https://www.americanacademy.de/timothy-snyder-on-language-and-not-even-fascism/>> [Accessed 25 May 2020].
- 34 Eco, U., 1995. Ur-Fascism. *New York Review of Books*, 42(11).