6. Conclusions – The Infinitely Other

Evil and Violence

From 1990 to 1997 seven and a half million foreign-born people entered America legally, forming 29.2 per cent of the population growth.[1] Globally, many white people sincerely believe their rights have been overlooked, and this victim status as the 'new other' then lends them a level of respectability which right-wing groups have capitalized on. Some German neo-Nazis took this position after World War II, arguing the treatment of Germany by the allied forces gave them this victim status. The discourse around books on hooligans, such as *The Football Factory* and various spin-off television series, claims that the white male has been overlooked in general. There is little nuanced analysis over how male violence is still a problem, especially domestic violence. Often racist violence in this context is given overt approval as a form of legitimized retaliation. The terms 'nationalist' and 'populist' replace the concept of 'extremist', and yet it is still extremism, and in some cases terrorism. In controlling the discourse by constantly branding the 'other' as a terrorist, often linked to a specific religion, any level of domestic terrorism can be carried out in the name of homeland security by the state. The state then commits acts of terrorism in the name of preventing terrorism.

Neo-Nazi groups have been quick to utilize social media for their purposes. Politicians like Donald Trump have thrilled in condemning the establishment. It is part of a general discourse to describe the current order as the establishment and the need for a new order as doing away with the old establishment. Adolph Hitler used it as a tactic. In Britain, the whole of Jeremy Corbyn's construction as a leader was to claim he is anti-establishment. Before the Liberal Democrats joined a coalition government, Nick Clegg gained support via live UK television debates by painting himself as an outsider and anti-establishment. Trump, with his personal wealth, was always part of the higher echelons of society, despite the ongoing vagaries around what we mean by class. Clegg had gone to a school of the establishment, which made him part of the establishment. As Stuart Price has explained, the term 'working class' has been weakened, with regards to a positive political identity; simultaneously, the other large category, the bourgeois class, has been challenged. This is exemplified by the growth of managerialism matched with precarious employment practices.[2] There is the significance of the development of the use of technology which needs acknowledging, robots replacing labour, creating a labour-free class.

Whether neo-Nazis are part of the establishment, those that control the media fuel neo-Nazi arguments, which are normalized. No one could argue seriously for any direct hypodermic model of media impact, but the shift to making extreme right-wing rhetoric part of the mainstream offers a platform within which people formulate opinions. This is regardless of whether these ideas make any rational sense, have long-term validity, and stand up to testing.

In the UK and in America in 2017 there appeared to be no actual plan or real strategy, no matter how frequently Donald Trump or Theresa May repeated 'we have a plan'. The media had taken a guiding hand in this chaos, with politicians since Tony Blair overtly guiding their policies in relation to how events were constructed by the media. Trump had taken this a step further, more preoccupied with how he was perceived than any other previous politician. If the media was not supportive of his strategy, or lack of it, then they were condemned as spinning fake news controlled by his opponents. Satire and mockery did not dent Trump's agenda. Simultaneously, the media itself was condemned by Trump as being part of the establishment, a normal tactic that politicians have employed. This condemnation appeared to be working. Trump was continually shown to be lying over various issues, but initially the media was silenced and condemned as being false and fake. To paraphrase a well-known phrase from George Orwell, in a world of lies speaking the truth is revolutionary.

The emphasis on Trump is so relevant because internationally America was still regarded as the leader of the 'free world' in 2017, despite becoming anti-international under Trump and the phrase now appearing antiquated. Trump's use of the media was highly selective. This could be conceived as censorship and was also a theme former UK Prime Minister John Major had touched on when he pointed out that anyone thought to hold an anti-Brexit position was being condemned as being anti-British. In February 2017, the BBC were not allowed to take part in a press briefing by the White House. The BBC challenged this decision, which became a news item in itself. This highlighted how information was now being selectively disseminated to those who would not challenge or question the approved message. Repetition of key messages, regardless of their veracity, became the norm. During Hitler's rise to power he initially advocated brute force, but then realized he had to win people over through the system, and closely manipulated his own image for these purposes. In this regard, it would be wrong to suggest Trump was the arch-manipulator of the media beyond anything seen previously, given Hitler's prowess. Unlike Hitler, however, Trump could reach the world instantly and directly through Twitter.

In America, scholars often use the term 'radical' for some extremists, which is almost a compliment. At its heart is the constant threat of the 'other'. There is also a complexity concerning the relationship with the establishment. Whether you are a white separatist, a survivalist, a KKK member, or a neo-Nazi, you have the same ambition: ridding the earth of any non-white race. How far this goes is continually open to debate. White separatist movements existed before the Nazis, and so labelling all these movements 'neo-Nazi' could be questioned. During times of austerity, those with the most powerful voice, utilizing whatever media they can find, will turn the population against free thinkers. What we find within this discourse is an attack on the educated, those who have the ability to challenge the system. They are demonized as the elite, damaging the position of 'real' people. Once again there is the manufacture of the myth of authenticity and purity, with a continual harking back to a utopia that never existed. The films of Steve Bannon are random and irrational, but have the central theme that there was shift during the progressive and liberal 1960s that attacked the so-called real and pure America. Within this ideology, this is what led to its downfall and must be counteracted at all costs. Myths are then created to serve a purpose.

In his seminal early book *Hitler: A Study in Tyranny* (1952), Alan Bullock showed that Hitler, despite myths to the contrary, was not from a poor or uneducated background. His father was an established customs official, and his pension continued after his death. Hitler pretended in *Mein Kampf* that he had a poor education, which again was false. He did leave school in 1904, not because he was too poor, but because he was indifferent to education, finally leaving without any certificates at all. He may even have completed a short course in marketing at the University of Munich. When Hitler left prison after writing *Mein Kampf* the global media reported that he was a reformed main, who wished to retire into anonymity. Regarding education, Trump is well-known for a court case over his Trump University, where he was sued by former students, who believed their fees were wasted on get rich property courses that had no basis in fact and were unethical. While Trump personally could be labelled an extreme capitalist, the epitome of a certain kind of American greed, calling him a radical or an extremist is suggesting he personally has a wider political ideology, which is debatable. But a basic review of Steve Bannon's propaganda reveals a very clear ideology.

Hitler was in some ways preaching to the converted, as was Donald Trump in 2016. Prior to Hitler's rise to power, there was the belief that hundreds of thousands of Jews were going to attack German girls, and that 'Negroes' were a threat to German purity, fears more recently drummed up with

regards to Muslims. The similarities in rhetoric between the regimes are uncanny, and debates rage on whether Trump is akin to Hitler, or whether that argument is overblown. Even diametrically opposed ideologies can use identical rhetoric, as with the Osama Bin Laden and George W. Bush's speeches.[3] Trump's blustering rhetoric in his campaign and since he gained power focused on war, a sure way to galvanize those who feel they have been mistreated, and who seek revenge. This was essentially a war against liberal elites, a war against immigrants, and a war against the rest of the world, who apparently hated America.

According to Nietzsche, war is a state that ennobles mankind, and Nietzsche can be used to explain the theological concept of Judgement in post-9/11 theology and public rhetoric. Both Bush and Bin Laden used forms of vengeful sermonizing, as has Trump; there obviously would be no President Trump without 9/11. This emphasis on war, again, is nothing new. For Trotsky, war was the locomotive of history. William Gilmore Simms, a poet, novelist and historian from the American South of the nineteenth century, explored the following view: 'War is the greatest element of modern civilization, and our destiny is conquest. The moment a nation ceases to extend its sway it falls a prey to an inferior but more energetic neighbour.'[4] American foreign policy appears to cohere with this view. In Trump's case, as well as Islam, the enemy was switched from the Jew to the Mexican initially, with strong claims they were rapists, hence the need to build a wall. In Steve Bannon's films the covert attack is on Jews. The wall itself was not Trump's idea, and had already existed in part across some of the Mexican-American border. For example, the city of Nogales has an existing wall that is eighteen feet tall dividing Arizona, USA, and Sonora, Mexico.[5]

The Department of Homeland Security patrols the wall, which advanced its militarization after the attack on the Twin Towers in September 2001. In southern Arizona, between October 2000 and September 2014, there were 2,721 people found dead, from a variety of courses, plus numerous others were not discovered, trying to enter America. Arguing which country, America or Mexico, is superior, is a false question, and relates more to fiction than fact. Because the space travelled to is outside the space travelled from it is a 'nowhere, place without place [...] the syncopation of an infinity and paradoxically its limit, its frontier'.[6] Trump's views on miscegenation have a very long history and stem from a great deal of fictional literature. H. Rider Haggard in *Heart of the World* (1894) portrays union between races as causing destruction. This myth is one used time and again in Europe and America by the far right. One even more metaphysical question is: Which country, America or Mexico, is the land of the free? Americans seeking

escape see Central and Latin America as the zone of freedom. This was cultivated by a generation of writers and figures linked to a number of movements, including the Beat Generation.

In the run up to World War II, propaganda worked at home and abroad, with British papers such as *The Express* denying Hitler was a threat, and claiming there would be no war in Europe, even when Hitler was invading Poland. The media in general was in denial. Ownership of these papers was in the hands of Nazi sympathizers, and whatever activity he did initially was justified. Fundamentally, Nazism, like neo-Nazism, is based on long-held grievances. For the former, it stemmed in part from issues over the Treaty of Versailles, and the manner in which Germany lost territory, along with the high reparation payments forced upon them. Hitler, along with other Germans, believed their grievances were justified and they had been harshly treated. For neo-Nazism, grievances are linked with the perceived loss of identity and opportunities, with groups of 'others' to blame. From jobs, to houses, to women and children, the evil other is portrayed as stealing from and ruining the motherland. In America, Trump claimed Mexicans were raping American women. In the UK in the 1930s the newspapers were full of the apparent sex crimes committed by Jews.[7] How much these were believed is questionable but we can see a parallel today with the discourse on immigration, especially in Germany. When repeated frequently enough, propaganda will be taken by the people to have some basis in fact. The evidence of its influence is debatable, but the message worked in Trump's case.

The notion of purity has a long history. A German girl may become pregnant, and a non-Aryan might be blamed. This is also evidence of a threat concerning the power to reproduce. Makers of new technologies have had a problem with how they deal with hackers, those who are intent on subversion and disruption. What better way of subversion than using Hitler? An example of this came in March 2016 when Microsoft was forced to delete its teenage AI after it became a Hitler-loving sex robot. On 16 January 2016, *The Mail Online* reported on 'The Backlash: Neo-Nazis on the Rampage'. Apparently gun sales were soaring. Sue Reid warned that sex attacks by migrants had 'unleashed dark forces in Germany that have echoes of the past'. For *The Independent*, reporting 13 February 2016, the Cologne sex assaults were part of a Muslim rape myth which fitted the neo-Nazi agenda. On 29 March 2014 the *Daily News* reported that the Neo-Nazi Party in Germany had dropped porn star Ina Groll, after discovering she had previously had sex with a black male. Issues over sex crimes can work both ways. On 14 April 2016, the campaigning organization 'Hope Not Hate' reported that Ryan

Fleming, a British neo-Nazi on the sex offenders' register, had released a book, *Codex Aristarchus*.

The media were very keen to unite Nazis with paedophiles. For example, *The Daily Record* reported on 7 May 2016, 'Nazi Thug Who Chanted Allah Is a Paedo – Is Exposed as a Child Sex Pervert', naming Kristopher Allan as an active member of the Scottish Defence League. In Russia and America there have been cases of neo-Nazis taking justice into their own hands, and in using violence in brothels. On 6 August 2016, *The Inquisitor* reported Jeremy and Christine Moody plotted a vigilante murder of a sex offender. There have been many killings globally that have been tangentially linked to neo-Nazism, but the most well-known ones seem isolated from any group ideology. On 23 September 2008 catering student Matt Juhani Saari killed ten people and himself at a college in Kauhajoki, 180 miles northwest of Helsinki, Finland. The day before the police had been questioning him over videos he had released on YouTube, but they had released him due to lack of evidence. Hate crime over social media is a developing area and it is questionable whether the police would have just released him if this happened today. Five days before the murders his YouTube message claimed he hated the human race, and that his favourite video clips were the Columbine school shootings in Colorado.

We need to be cautious when connecting neo-Nazism to a variety of mass killings that occur globally, especially in terms of cause. Similar killings, such as those by Pekka-Eric Auvinen in November 2007, a student from a town outside Helsinki, who shot dead six students, plus the school nurse and the head teacher, before killing himself, suggests that neo-Nazi influences are just some of the beliefs that turn an individual to hatred. The point that these killers make is that this is an avenue to find a voice and achieve notoriety, but it should not be overlooked that the 'classic' example of this is the Columbine shootings. In this instance, after planning on bombing their high school in Colorado on Hitler's birthday, they instead shot twelve people after their homemade bombs failed to work. Postmodernism is key here. The Columbine killers wanted to be regarded as authentic killers, not copycat killers forming part of a wave of other killers, such as those at schools in Oregon and Kentucky. There is a strong argument that these killers are white terrorists, although their victims are not necessarily those from ethnic minorities, and some of the killers are from an ethnic background. Seung-Hui Cho killed 32 people on the Blacksburg campus of Virginia Tech on 16 April 2007. As Peter Conrad summed it up, referring to the current state where biology and technology have fused:

> Killing so coolly, Auvinen, Cho, Klebeld and Harris belong to a generation that has advanced into this uncanny existential future. They are certainly postmodern people, attempting to salvage what Auvinen calls a 'free mind' from the stale sameness prescribed by the media. But I wonder somehow if they're not post-human as well.[8]

Rightly or wrongly, this comes down to the issue of authenticity. Culture in part thrives on the ideal of authenticity, with the idea that to be authentic we must openly express all our rage, raw sexuality, and cruelty, even when this may fly in the face of cultivated morality. Figures such as the Marquis de Sade, Arthur Rimbaud, Georges Bataille, and Antonin Artaud, are all central to lifestyle enclaves and art movements of Western culture. Freud most famously revealed the darkness at the heart of the human animal. But the only way we can distinguish right from wrong is by having a moral map gained from socialization. These killers were anti-society, but they liked to believe they were original, when in fact they were its antithesis, acting out the roles they had seen in films, such as the influence of *Oldboy* (Chan-wook Park, 2003) on Cho. Even the witnesses had been so conditioned by violence on television and film that they failed to believe what they were observing was real.

Postmodern discourse should not be shut down. We see this in the work of Quentin Tarantino. Simulated violence is utilized, offering a postmodern parody that penetrates bland calls for authentic discourse. There are multiple paradoxes. Postmodern philosophers, such as Gilles Deleuze, argue that the best theory leads to more theory. This takes us beyond blinkered thinking. Those that attack such philosophy are looking towards the past, to a period which they believe was clearer, and more authentic. In reality, that pure period never existed, other than in the desired imagination. Black-and-white frameworks and paradigms may have been employed to promote structuralist thinking. The playfulness of the postmodern is more subversive to the simplistic paradigms of fascism than anything else. New media technologies, while often being employed by neo-Nazi groups, have also successfully added to this openness, offering a more fluid way to both present knowledge and opinion, and for people to construct and play out their identities. This can challenge power systems and destructive ideologies, including neo-Nazism.

One of the major concerns of those that believe the Internet needs to be censored is that it may be giving people access to illegal material or misinforming people, as well as all the other issues over child grooming. Worshipping death, attempting to make a monument to death through the

virtual, posting on the Internet, killers, being 'real' neo-Nazis or not, and their followers, conversely wipe away the moment, the space in which an event can take place. While the Internet is a space with infinite possibilities, it becomes a scrapbook for images of nothingness. For Derrida, we cannot have our being without violence; using Levinas, he claims nonviolent language is language without the verb 'to be'. Usually, evil is said to be lies, ignorance, or deadly stupidity, all ways Trump has been described. Following Badiou, when we truly confront the condition of evil, we see it is much rather the process of truth.[9] In relation to totalitarianism, there is always a desire for the omnipotence of the True.

There are further controversial elements to this subject we have only briefly touched on, and some of these relate to pleasure. What, then, are the ethics of Nazism and neo-Nazism as entertainment? The concept of the 'Holocaust industry' is well known, and Nazi chic mentioned in Chapter 1. Does this phrase industry also apply to the Nazism and neo-Nazism and the media? Is there an industry around the use of Nazism and neo-Nazism as entertainment? And, if so, what is the wider purpose of this in the media and for society? Categorizing media products as white power movies, or neo-Nazi texts, can lead to their promotion and better marketing. The study of characters in certain texts can be utilized for knowledge concerning 'the construction of subjectivity in the world' beyond the text.[10] Similarly, these texts may offer indications in the apparent real world of how to behave.

The plethora of media that utilize Nazi and neo-Nazi-related themes are too numerous to address in one book, but the question of entertainment, as a whole, can still be tackled to a degree. The stereotypical savagery of the Nazis has a ubiquitous appeal for screenwriting narratives, given questions of otherness and conflict are always being addressed. Stories concern tackling a secret with secrecy at the very core of power. Despite being so reworked, the full knowledge of Nazism and neo-Nazism can still be viewed as a secret, which can never be fully uncovered. The area of Nazism and neo-Nazism is one of the most contentious there is, and is bound to draw attention from a marketing perspective. To complicate matters, this question of otherness can always be reversed, such as when the skinhead racist finds out he is Jewish, a theme in a variety of films. The creation of a belief in a force that must be destroyed plays with the notion of the sacred, and the imagination.

Hatred towards Jews within a Nazi and neo-Nazi context goes beyond the physical to the metaphysical, a realm that involves the invisible. The belief is their malign influence has caused a negative impact that is beyond that

which is visible. In this regard, when examining Nazism and neo-Nazism and the media it needs to be understood that the frenzy of the visible which allows for a certain magical system. Paul Virilio in *The Vision Machine* declares that what we have in the media age is blindness, leading to a lack of understanding. But the question remains, Is part of the entertainment of the real a secret knowing, that this is, a playing with meaning? This can be illustrated by the Freudian fort/da game, inside the seen and unseen and the lost and found. In the position between the signifier and the signified, do we really allow and then enforce an ethical judgement and shut down engagement? Engaging with this subject is touching on transgression. By doing so, this is moving towards the sacred and the paranormal, between the physical and metaphysical.

There is a playing with secrecy and revelation, and the controlled transgression of the revelation similar to the workings of shamanism. The media creates our contemporary myths, functioning to some degree in this shamanistic fashion. Despite a healthy scepticism towards the media, there is still an addiction to its output and a certain belief. To allow play and to engage the imagination some belief, even if it is simulated, is necessary. As with all forms of terrorism, neo-Nazi violence is a form of entertainment, a way of focusing the eyes of the media. To call this white terrorism re-emphasizes the spurious idea that white as a category has some form of authenticity, although culturally it does. Nazism and neo-Nazism has war as one of its tenets, and war itself is a theatre. Nazi accounts of engaging in war take on a religious and romantic tenor, while French reports of their defeat take on a paranormal tone, their failure described as a '*phénomène d'hallucination collective*'.[11]

There is a philosophy propounded by Virginia Woolf and others that has maintained that an event only really exists if it is recorded. What would we truly feel if we could see inside the Holocaust? A difficult question is whether this reminder of the Holocaust through the emphasis on Nazism and neo-Nazism in the media is actually an effort at doing so, at getting behind the Holocaust. Attempts such as *Son of Saul*, discussed in Chapter 2, despite their well-meaning worthiness always fail. While seeking authenticity may be a noble aim, it should also be remembered that this is impossible. Neo-Nazism is not just about ridding the earth of Jews, and even that aim might be questionable to some neo-Nazis. In its original incarnation, groups like the National Front in the early 1980s in the UK were concerned with headline policies, such as repatriation and capital punishment. Nigel Farage's UKIP had some similar headline policies, forcing the main Conservative Party in the UK to always move further to the right

to capture the support of the far right. Once more, the centre is then forced towards the extreme.

Farage was the first politician to be revealed by the media to be seen meeting with Trump, like a mascot of the new order winning the approval from the demi-god. Theresa May then going to America straight on the heels of this, and offering Trump a state visit to the UK within seven days of his inauguration, is clear evidence of Farage's influence. Time and again, members of UKIP have been under scrutiny, and found to be verging on the neo-Nazi right of politics. May's move legitimizes this. By playing the trump card of a state visit, which would be blessed by the Queen, in her authority May was asserting a triumph concerning class. May was using the status of royalty as a gift to Trump to gain his support, to subvert Farage's power. Despite his party previously winning a vast number of votes, nationally, Farage was not a UK-based politician. Underlying all of this was a class-based nationalism, and a yearning for identity. At the end of March 2017 UKIP had zero MPs, with Douglas Carswell resigning from the party.

Neo-Nazism is not at the extremes of culture but at its heart. A further question is, Can we consider this to be a new phenomenon? Only post-Brexit and with Trump did people feel more comfortable expressing these views, the argument being they were always there. Optimistically, what we might see in America is the last roll of the dice of the extreme right, Trump known as the 'disruptive president', doing everything he can to create chaos, destroying any gains made by progressives. Steve Bannon's films are a prime example of media culture that attacks the notion of progress and equality. Our exploration of the television series *NSU German History X* also revealed how the extreme is at the centre of culture. Furthermore, media forms such as this Netflix series reveal that neo-Nazi belief has just filled a void. Those portrayed in this drama based on fact have no clear direction, and see the older generation as not just conformist, but also betrayers of the past. Once again, there is the view that they have been betrayed, and progress is detrimental. There is also the international element, with the National Socialist neo-Nazis in Germany learning their tactics from Americans. The programme makes clear that Muslims are the new Jews, although this argument has been shown to be contentious.

A question is also raised about education and the contemporary audience through these forms of media. For those not raised on detailed history lessons about the Nazis, these media and cultural products are their history lessons. Identification with groups to gain social acceptance and a sense of personal identity is fundamental to this analysis. For example could, theoretically, a programme such as *NSU German History X* actually encourage

neo-Nazi violence? Influence is a complex area, with no definitive answer. No amount of ethnographic work could make it clear that cultural product X was the reason for behaviour or belief Y. In January 2017, *The Jerusalem Post* reported a number of anti-Semitic attacks across the south-east of England, including bricks being thrown through the windows of Jewish people in Edgeware. Post-Brexit, post-Trump, and post-truth, it appears that there is an increase in actions that can be conceived to be neo-Nazi. Neo-Nazi groups often viewed biopics such as *NSU German History X* as lessons in how to be a neo-Nazi.

One larger question concerns the issue of whether the actual context is important. For Tarantino, the issue is revenge. For Spielberg, the issue is forgiveness. In both contexts, however, there is the negotiation with the other highlighted by the face. For Levinas the face, 'is not biological, ethnic or even social; the face evoked is the concrete appearance of the idea of infinity that exists within me'.[12] Film by its nature deals with this infinity, and working with Levinas we see that his philosophy concerns resisting possession or utilization, which is anti-Nazi, regardless of the meaning of the sign over Auschwitz: work sets you free. Taking this a step further, can we really take on a responsibility that transcends knowledge? As Levinas shows, the face signifies ethical knowledge, which is there from the beginning: thou shalt not kill. This again is anti-Nazi. There is a profound paradox here. There is in the face what seems like the impossible: 'It obliges us to receive the idea of infinity prior to engaging the operations of cognition, but how can we receive an idea prior to entering ideas?'[13]

Theodor Adorno claimed the Hegelian system objectifies the subject, raising it in the process to a transcendental status, but for Adorno the separation in philosophy between object and subject since Descartes is wrong, as they are mutually mediated by each other.[14] For Levinas created being (totality) is but the trace of the passing of the infinitely other.[15] 'It is not the self that constitutes the meaning of the Other's existence; rather, it is precisely the opposite: subjectivity is constituted in and through its relation with alterity.'[16] While seemingly complex and abstract, this needs to be held in mind when considering neo-Nazi discourse within the media, in all its varieties. 'One is not aware of his or her individuality until one enters into a relationship with Another [sic] and so calls the subjectivity of freedom itself into question.'[17] The Nazis destroyed difference, as do all dictators.

Donald Trump has been condemned for being divisive, and also for demonizing difference, but also simultaneously praised for uniting America via hate; over 60 million voters agreed with him enough to vote for him. 'Ethics, the welcoming of the Other [sic] by the self, is only accomplished

through the recognition and maintenance of the radical disjunction of same and other, of subject and object."[18] We need to recognize the importance of the infinitely other, that is non-containable. Fundamentally, it appears that the Nazi and neo-Nazi movements concern containing this otherness. To summarize, for Levinas, 'who was saved the fate of his fellow Jews [...] the violence endemic to sexism, racism, classism, nationalism etc., is the denial of the totality of being as the trace of the infinitely other'.[19]

Denial and Memorial

In February 2017 *Channel 4 News* reported on a survey concerning Internet searches that found that the top four items brought up using any search engine or platform regarding the Holocaust were basically neo-Nazi-orientated messages. People receive all their information from the Internet and despite it often being misinformation people will then believe that the existence of the Holocaust is debatable, for example. Even renowned Holocaust denier, David Irvine, in an interview with Channel 4, found this disturbing. He had tried to escape publicity by moving to a remote part of Scotland, but was still inundated with fan mail, from followers. The film *Denial* (Mick Jackson, 2017) was based on David Irving's 1996 libel lawsuit against academic Deborah Lipstadt and her publisher Penguin. Lipstadt had accused him in her 1993 book *Denying the Holocaust* of being a liar and Holocaust denier. Much of the debate focused on whether there were holes to place the gas into the chambers. The judge suggested that if Irving (played by Timothy Spall) truly believed his account then he was not lying. The drama of the film also focused on the conflict between Lipstadt (Rachel Weisz) and her lawyers. The lawyers were convinced she should not take to the stand, nor should a Holocaust survivor give evidence. Message boards on YouTube concerning the film's trailer were again dominated by neo-Nazi discourse in February 2017, with commentators arguing tautologically that if so much weight was given to disproving the deniers there must be some truth in their denial.

In a Channel 4 interview in April 2000, after the trial Irving argued that he did tell his version of the truth, and that he was not a racist. He blamed the media, claiming the media was obsessed with racism. He positions himself as an old-school patriot, claiming his views are that of the majority, which is a common tactic we find amongst the far right. Almost 20 years later, with the Brexit vote in 2016, Irving's form of racism became overt, suggesting he had a point regarding the majority. By this, I am not suggesting

this is legitimizing these views, or that they are commendable. The judge had called him a racist, stating he had falsified the facts, mistranslated documents, and his perception of Hitler had basically led him away from objective history. Irving's view was that Hitler was basically innocent of the destruction of the Jews, because he was not fully aware of it. Concurrently, he claimed the death camps could not have been used for systematic slaughter. But discussing the trial with Krishnan Guru-Murthy, the *Channel 4 News* presenter, his arguments do not come across as extreme; he agrees that he has to be selective with the facts. With both the trial and the film the very real danger, as we saw with *NSU German History X*, was that this would fuel an interest in Irving's work, especially his website, boosting his popularity once more. Despite the truth, the paradox is this would strengthen neo-Nazism and anti-Semitism.

Irving called the judgement 'perverse' and had called Holocaust survivors 'mentally ill'. The tactic here is to condemn anyone who disagreed with you as morally or mentally inferior, a classic fascist device. A more common way today of doing this is to claim someone is 'on the spectrum', dismissing someone because they may have some form of autism or related different ability. Significantly, in America the burden of proof is on the plaintiff, but in English law the burden of proof is with the defendant. This gives the film *Denial* an opportunity to work as a history lesson, with Lipstadt and her lawyers going to Auschwitz and elsewhere to find further evidence. The film pushes the trial beyond Irving making it about preventing the rise of anti-Semitism, and neo-Nazism, and also about the importance of truth. The UK release date of the film is also significant; the film was released during January 2017 with Holocaust Memorial Day being 27 January. In America, it was noted that the White House issued a statement on the day which unlike previously did not refer to Jews and anti-Semitism. Some, like Jonathan Greenblatt, the CEO of the Anti-Defamation League, criticized the removal of explicit references, but the argument by the new administration was that this was an ecumenical statement.

In the age of Donald Trump, all media outlets became obsessed with the fake news phenomenon. Channel 4 ran a whole week of debates on the subject in February 2017. Commentators who were not exactly supporters of Trump but were attempting to stay outside the mainstream claimed that this phenomenon of fake news had always existed, and was the paradoxically the essence of news reporting. Altering reality, then reporting it as fact, has an old history. David Irving, for example, in his work in the 1960s on the bombing of Dresden, claimed that over a quarter of a million people were killed. The impact of this hyperbole is of note, and reveals how so-called

knowledge is generated from no evidence. Future histories took this as an absolute fact, until two decades later it was found irrefutably that Irving was a fabricator. The judge in the Lipstadt trial pointed out that Irving was not using documents correctly. Irving's increased the number of deaths in Dresden by 1,000 per cent. Irving's early work, taken as historically accurate at the time, was an international best seller. This then had such an influence on belief about World War II that the allied forces in this context were then believed to be the savage aggressor, killing a quarter of a million innocent civilians just at Dresden. The figure now is to thought to be more like 20,000, but in popular debates the view that the allies were as brutal as the Nazis is still held. Trying to dismiss such views as untruths leads to counter-allegations of denial, despite their being no evidence for Irving's arguments. Once such views have been absorbed into the history books it is difficult for them to be retrospectively edited out.

With the amount of rolling news and information on the Internet, the speed of breaking news stories can take precedence over accuracy, especially if the number of gatekeepers is reducing. Neo-Nazi groups globally have been successful in utilizing Facebook and other forms of social media to spread their message. It would be wrong to conclude that just because someone reads a neo-Nazi site, or watches a video posted by Britain First, they are a follower of this ideology. The British Labour Party, itself accused of being anti-Semitic, possesses the largest membership of any party in Europe, but stands in diametric opposition to Britain First. The 2016 London mayoral elections epitomized this, with the winner being a Labour politician and a Muslim, Sadiq Khan. In November 2016, *The Daily Star* reported a neo-Nazi group was calling for Sadiq Khan to be assassinated. The story was linked to the killing of Labour MP Jo Cox, and claimed the extreme-right forum IronMarch had postings demanding: 'Now kill the London mayor.' The administrator of the site was Benjamin Raymond, leader of National Action, a splinter group of the British National Party's young wing. Other serious neo-Nazi-related attacks have occurred in the UK, with Zack Davies being jailed in 2015 for his attack on an Asian dentist. Davies was also a member of IronMarch with links to National Action. The drama concerning these events is central to the debate, conflict key to grabbing the audiences' attention, the news media a form of entertainment. Examples include El Niño Skin, who was arrested for racism on 19 February 2015 and became a hero as he was perceived to be livening up a sports game.

Crimes connected with Nazism did not disappear over time, but were in general bought to light further. The Associated Press reported on 13 November 2015 that Oskar Gröning was charged with 300,000 counts of

accessory to murder. This was significant, as it overturned a 1969 ruling that stated being a staff member at Auschwitz was not enough for you to be convicted. Gröning was known as 'the bookkeeper of Auschwitz', overseeing and helping redistribute the valuables of the Jews. He did express regret and claimed he spoke out in order to contradict Holocaust deniers. This ruling set a precedent for pursuing suspects, many now in their nineties accused of serving in death camps. The federal court's ruling also cleared the way for prosecutions of ex-members of the Nazi mobile death squads known as *Einsatzgruppen*, which operated in Eastern Europe. Campaigners believed at least eight suspects could now be accused of murder because their membership of the death squads would be sufficient proof. This was a significant change in German policy according to Efraim Zuroff, the head of the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Israel. Programmes concerning Nazi hunters have proved to be just as popular as variety of media forms, such as documentaries, a large number about the life and career of Hitler.

In terms of audience consumption, there is a fragmented approach contributing to a diverse construction of Nazism and neo-Nazism in film and media. Certain products are suggested to a user, depending on what they have engaged with before, platforms such as Netflix developing profiles of whole families. One of the most popular platforms, Netflix has a whole category for films that concern football hooligans, often with neo-Nazi content, other feature films, and documentaries. Films such as *Nazi Dawn* (Dennis Devine, 2014), where the spirit of a Nazi ancestor possesses a young woman, and *Nazi Revenge*, where a man has past life regression, following him having nightmares and then believing he was a Nazi, play on the myth that at heart we are all Nazis, and we all have something to atone for. But these are normally horror films drawing on the notion that the Nazi is the ultimate monster, lurking within the uncanny. And such systems do make mistakes. In one instance a documentary on Netflix made in 2011 about Hitler had the description: 'Out and proud, they overcame prejudice to become some of the most influential voices in America's LGBT community.' These words appeared over an image of marching Nazis. Whether this 'mistake' was a real or invented mistake is questionable, given an article was written about it, published on the Internet, and then entered the media domain.

While comedy can be used to tackle the subject of Nazism and neo-Nazism, this could be considered to be trivializing serious matters. Pushing the boundaries through transgressive humour is balanced by changes in the law concerning Nazi-related crimes. Recent neo-Nazi incidents have been addressed through changes in the law, and this has generated media

interest. For example, Ursula Haverbeck-Wetzel received ten months for Holocaust denial, after years of just being fined. She had been a Holocaust denier, at one point suing a Jewish organization for discrimination herself, personally taking on the position of a victim. Her flirting with all forms of media across the decades to her downfall, as this provided documentary evidence concerning her illegal propaganda. In a *Panorama* documentary, broadcast in Germany by ARD television in March 2015, Haverbeck-Wetzel denied the mass destruction of the Jews, claiming it was the biggest and most persistent lie in history. Her level of denial and the publicity she courted indicated she had come herself from a troubled past, although she had infiltrated right-wing political parties, who eventually rejected her. She published a video on YouTube protesting against the trial of Oskar Gröning, and distributed leaflets outside the court, which were reported to feature Holocaust denial. As with David Irving, not only was she trying to rewrite history concerning the Holocaust, but also concerning Germany in general, turning the latter into a victim. In 1992, Haverbeck-Wetzel became the first chairperson of the Memorial Sites Association, remaining in that position until 2003. The association was established to build remembrance for the German civilian victims of World War II, to end what was perceived as an unjustified unilateral view of history.

Just as with the false memory syndrome lobby, there are people active in denying the memories of others. While this might sound like science fiction, it needs to be noted that this is actually the way all of us now exist to a degree. Each news item is filtered through an element of distrust. We get our main news sources electronically, and much of this is entertainment rather than news. Outlets do have fact checkers, but the key point is they often attempt to break the news story as quickly as possible, without actually being at the source. A famous example of this is the German Wings tragedy. No one yet knows the true cause of this, but Russia Today claimed to have broken the news story first, without any of their journalists being at the scene. In this sense journalism and reporting has shifted, morphing into an interesting blend of fantasy writing in parts, given fact checking has become less important. Trump claiming there had been a terrorist attack in Sweden is another example. All he needs to do is promote the same message again and again.

Levinas celebrated difference and attempted to redefine how we viewed the creation of identity, which is a direct reproach to Trump. While Levinas focused on the other, on the refugee or immigrant, for example, Trump denied their existence. The lesson of the Holocaust is one of hope. You cannot destroy a people like this, no matter hard you try, especially a people

who possess a profound faith. While this may appear overoptimistic, to always focus on the evil on the Holocaust actually lends Nazism even more power. This book has recognized that neo-Nazism proliferates all over the world but it has not gone into the resistance to neo-Nazism, which is strong. Writers of science fiction, such as Margaret Atwood, have revealed future worlds where fascism exists but is embodied in the state and normalized. In an age of austerity, people may not resist and may just become one with main system to survive. We see this in totalitarian states like North Korea, but also in a different form in the UK and America.

British universities are a case in point. The voice of those that might be different are often quashed. The late Jewish MP Gerald Kaufman attacked the fact that pro-Israel organizations within universities in the UK were active in silencing any pro-Palestine voices. This book is a call for openness and a lack of censorship. The question is, Should figures such as Nick Griffin be given such a public platform? With figures such as Nigel Farage this is questionable. The media seemed to believe everything Farage does is newsworthy. The only British UKIP MP up until March 2017 when he left UKIP, Douglas Carswell jokingly claimed that Farage was getting a knighthood due to his contribution to headlines. One thing that needs noting about those flirting with fascism is that they seem unable to take a joke. Trump is the main example here. Comedy can be used politically. Charlie Chaplin claimed that he would have not have made his masterpiece *The Great Dictator* if he had fully known about the Nazi death camps. This lack of being able to cope with humour suggests fragility unknown to most, and a preciousness that means more mockery will take place. By the end of February 2017, it did appear that Trump's presidency was unravelling, the press beginning to be the opposition.

There will always be people like Trump and Farage who want to grab headlines. Farage claimed that 4,000 people with HIV/AIDS were coming every year from Africa to use the NHS, suggesting that Africans were infecting the pure British. All of this hate rhetoric gets headlines, and some do believe these headlines. But the accountability of these politicians needs to be addressed, not just by other politicians, media scholars, or teachers, but by everyone. To ignore this would be to accept the status quo, and to enable a regressive state of affairs to commence. While this is a fear, it is a sound assessment and one grounded in current affairs. Unless each citizen believes in accountability, we shall find the rights of the citizen eroded. As with Margaret Thatcher, Theresa May has claimed society does not exist. Simultaneously, figures like May and Trump continually promote ideas concerning nationalism and country.

We began by drawing on the significance of boundaries and postcolonialism, which drew on the wider philosophy of Heidegger. Believing passports should abolished and that boundaries and borders are an absurd human invention is too radical for some to comprehend, but it comes from having a legacy of the Holocaust. Israel strongly defends its borders, and the right for a homeland. For refugees and migrants today having a homeland may sound like a fantasy, and a sense of place is key. We have not yet tackled the true meaning and purpose of neo-Nazism, and to suggest this is singular would be specious. Neo-Nazism in some contexts is part of opportunism, a door to be pushed, or kicked open. In Britain, there is the continual high alert concerning terrorist attacks, which generates a constant fear of the other. After an attack on London in March 2017, the police confirmed that the perpetrator was attacking alone, negating the view that the Western world is under some kind of attack from fundamental Islam. Many people from ethnic backgrounds are killed in police custody, with the work of the Independent Police Complaints Commission stretched. Fear is a way of controlling the population to make the implementation of any policy easier.

To illustrate how extremism has become part of the centre we should consider those who previously seemed from the right now criticizing what they perceived to be too extreme, given its normalization highlights their own complicity. George W. Bush, a former leader of the 'war on terror', has become the voice of reason, claiming he does not like the racism of Trump. In the UK, it is the high echelons of the establishment, the House of Lords, which is attempting to alter Brexit proceedings so the rights of Europeans living in Britain are protected. This reflects on another area, knee jerk culture, the belief doing something is always better than doing nothing. We can identify Trump's policy as being part of this. The philosophy is you need to assert your new order immediately, without any thought and this proof of a deep level of ignorance. You ignore others at your peril. Without a greater depth of consideration, the implementation of anything will be problematic.

Trump's business was sued in the 1970s for discrimination and not employing black people. Time and again he has resisted claims of having sympathies with racists. In the new order what exactly happens is that there is a stalemate. The more Trump pushes for passing policies without consultation the more they will backfire. The greatest leader does not put them self at the centre but situates themselves outside the frame. If we reflect on leadership and the cult of the leader we see that those that desperately need to lead, and require the affirmation of leadership, are often not the best leaders. But fascism, Nazism, and neo-Nazism all revolve

around the cult of the leader, and the cult of war, and with this is the need for an enemy. Peace becomes anathema, as is recognizing human beings as human beings. The drama of entertainment and media will always find the conflicts generated by these movements of use. Even a non-news story becomes a news story. When a group of neo-Nazis in the UK or Germany hold a rally and more anti-fascists turn up than fascists, this is news.

The feelings of fascism get channelled in differing ways, on to terraces, into boardrooms, and into bedrooms. The culture of fascism has blurred with fetishism, often linked with the sexual nature of Bondage and Discipline (B/D), Dominance and submission (B/s), and Sadism and Masochism (S/M), collectively known as BDSM, as mentioned in Chapter 1. This has become popularized and normalized, but in a clichéd way, as in the *Fifty Shades of Grey* trilogy by novelist E.L. James. Censorship has worsened. There is no clear line of progress historically, and history itself is just a selection of events, edited by the writer from their own perspective. Evidence needs sifting, and the writer must admit where there have been elements omitted. As reporters say to Trump when he shouts them down as fake news reporters what he really should be saying is that he disagrees with their opinions. The positive side to rolling news media is that people get easily bored. Diverse people, from writer Steven King to George Bush, have criticized Trump's divisive approach, the former calling him a snake oil seller. Globally, many non-Americans can see this clearly, but being caught in the bubble of the American experience this is less obvious.

Ultimately, this comes down to values. Do we need leaders who bring everything back to themselves, who set out a pathway that concerns producing a mirror image of themselves everything, and behind the image is nothing of substance, like the emperor's new clothes, although is that what is desired? If it is, then let us just admit that we do not really need leaders of substance. Even today, Hitler is often portrayed as the innocent victim of those around him, a puppet. Trump is frequently discussed in the same manner. This comes down to our belief in free will. For those who flirted with fascism, like D.H. Lawrence, it is the so-called 'inferior' races that operate on fate, that goes all the way back to the beginning of time. True fascism also draws on this historical emphasis, but highlights the notion of the great will of the people encapsulates in the leader. The leader must be followed always; any dissent is anathema. Even in the Brexit vote we see a reflection of this: the people have spoken, and the will of the people is then used to implement any extreme policy.

Despite fascism often being concerned with the leader, we can see the weight of the group and society. This is a complex, as each area defines each

group differently. The 'in group' teams up against the outside group. In the UK, immigrants voted to leave the EU to define themselves as part of the group of 'indigenous' people. This phenomenon of defining oneself through difference and similarity continues. Ultimately, we need to consider what has been addressed. The essence of neo-Nazism might be to rewrite or deny history but in Germany the history of the Holocaust is an ever-present mediated reality. Switch on the television most nights and there will be a documentary or discussion on the subject. Publicly it is debated continually, with issues over war memorials (for example; should people be allowed to explore memorials or should they be respected as sacred objects?).

The sacredness of space and place is important, especially when certain places, such as cemeteries, are defaced. This relates to hooliganism discussed in Chapter 1. For example, is there violence endemic in youth culture that concerns the expression of discontent to any other? This is a violence that is omnidirectional, and might involve attacking Jewish graves, Muslim shops and so on. There is no core ideology, and it reflects more on the tenuous nature of youth identity in a period of austerity. We need to be careful when we discuss any act of neo-Nazism as neo-Nazi behaviour because the media may have bracketed an event as such just to make a headline and to bring it to the attention of their readers. This framing of the debate is one way the media lead the creation of neo-Nazi discourse, bracketing together what could be random events under the same banner. With the use of social media, there is a nebulous global network. With hooliganism, even prior to social media, there was a network of right-wing activity. From this perspective, it needs to be emphasized that while the media can create, define and lead the manufacture of neo-Nazism, it exists as an identity.

The strength of the left wing to rebut the right in the UK throughout the 1970s and the 1980s suggests that the threat of the right wing is a monster that has and can be contained. Whatever people think of Jeremy Corbyn as the leader of the left in Britain in 2016 and 2017, he has a large number of supporters who are vehemently anti-fascist. Marine Le Pen in France may have supporters, but how active these are is debatable. Headlines are floated about politicians dabbling with neo-Nazi politics, from Dutch politicians, to Austrian, and Australian. They have not had definitive success, the populace not prepared to go that far. The popularity of Trump is under question globally, while the referendum success of Erdoğan in Turkey in April 2017 is under question. In Germany, Merkel is primarily a conservative, but she has had the ability to be flexible and shift her position over major issues, such as energy. Eric Hobsbawm famously called the current age the age of insanity, and he may be right.[20] Merkel is the alternative voice of reason.

David Cameron gambled and lost everything, and it was Cameron who claimed that Merkel's welcoming attitude to immigrants would mean she would be gone in six months. Despite a variety of incidents, the right-wing hysteria that followed Brexit has not fully taken hold.

In a theatrical sense, Nigel Farage and Donald Trump are comedy figures, a sideshow in the Punch and Judy game. The UK's Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson also fits this paradigm. Despite being attacked by the mainstream press, which is dominated by right-wing ownership, Corbyn had always been known as a moderate while being a backbencher. Unless you engage the press in an entertaining way you will be condemned forever, like Corbyn. In February 2017 Labour lost a seat in Cumbria they had held for 83 years to a political novice. Corbyn, unlike any other British politician previously, would not claim any responsibility for this. In this respect, he can be compared to Trump. The UK was moving towards a one-party state; with no opposition, any policy could get passed, and rights removed. Whether this was fascist or not, it is unhealthy. Without difference there is no accountability, but prefer this to a state that has numerous parties at war, with nothing achieved. The wave of right-wing successes witnessed around the world is not comprehensive. In Austria this was not a total victory for the right. People were now realizing they need to take control.

There is a context beyond party political politics. In small and large organizations the question is, Why do we need leadership at all? The suggestion is that people need orders to be organized, that the human is ultimately not to be trusted. In 2016 Spain appeared to function well without a government for over a year until the left compromised. This needs recognizing. We need to offer a way forward where people feel empowered. Venerating strong leaders does not offer empowerment. The deification of the leader is one element of neo-Nazism. For the media and headline writing this is how the discourse is framed. Farage was given an inordinate amount of airtime, as is Trump. But do people really support these figures, or are they more kicking against a system? In this sense, anything is better if you feel you have nothing. The support for the right should not be misread as popular support, although the emphasis of the media means this mistake is made. Similarly, even if millions of people have viewed or liked a certain neo-Nazi event on social media, it does not mean there is real support. The tangential and often tenuous nature of support needs highlighting. Voter turnout is often poor. This suggests that the population believe there is little chance things will be changed.

As with football 'firms' of the 1980s, right-wing support is not linked to class. Football supporters, who may have had racist sympathies, often

came from wealthy backgrounds. The tribe of football offered an identity where transgressive activity could take place, such as violence. The manner in which Nazi and neo-Nazi groups have been constructed in and by the media has offered them an enormous amount of power that is beyond their real significance. Farage claimed that he had achieved his aim of Brexit, 'without one shot being fired'. He forgot the killing of Jo Cox, murdered by a man who was considered to be a neo-Nazi sympathizer. But violence can be non-physical. Every day immigrants and refugees live under the threat of all forms of violence and terror. This terrorism is far wider and endemic than any threat from fundamentalism. War at any level from Trotsky on the left, to Mussolini on the right, is viewed as the locomotive of history, and there is fatalism. What is necessary is to challenge any form of fatalism. The left believe the right will die away, and the right that they have divine right to rule. Both of these positions are false. The media has added to this sense of fatalism.

The role of the media here is significant. Instead of changing the world, citizens are more likely to photograph and record it, or watch other broadcasts. This may work to change reality, but it might also just mean a false sense of activity that is narcissistic. The way the media colluded with the FBI over Hillary Clinton's emails is of note. Pollsters claim that this attention was the final reason Trump gained victory over Clinton. Clinton had broken protocol and used her personal email account for communications. During the campaign Trump said he would work to put her in jail for this. On this, he relented. Julian Assange was part of this campaign against Clinton, releasing batches of emails. Globally, the media reported on this event instantaneously, as you would expect. With the FBI commenting on this event right up to the election this can be said to be a major influence. The security forces, with underground media movements, along with mainstream movements, enabled the victory of a president who was backed by many white separatists and some neo-Nazis.

This is where the media's responsibility comes into play, operating in a 24/7 climate, where breaking the story is more important than anything else. A surface-level approach to understanding distorts meaning. If this is going to be the only source of information informing opinion, including positions on how to vote, then this is dangerous. With more guerrilla journalism and freelance journalism and independent media outlets, it is hoped that there will be a shift and change in emphasis. Local stories and more different stories might be picked up, with greater depth. However much Nazism and neo-Nazism is rebranded, the worship of the *Volk* appears atavistic, a stepping back to a period that never existed. Brexit was part of

this, and led people to question what exactly is English or British culture; Morris dancing, fish and chips; is that it? The archetypal British writer Iris Murdoch mocks this framework and as early as the 1950s saw this as a fantasy, but one that tempted rational beings.[21] The media has fuelled this fantasy. In psychoanalytic terms, these are aimed at removing anxieties but create more anxiety by removing the thought required to tackle the anxiety.[22]

Tied into developments concerning a backlash over Trump and right-wing politics is the issue of freedom of speech. In Holland in March 2017 there was an active campaign to promote the rights of those who want to speak right-wing views. The ethical and moral question concerns whether people should have the right to state that others do not have rights, and how far should a society promote this right? Should liberal values be used to promote illiberal values? This is not to say that allowing people like Nick Griffin to speak in various settings is wrong. It is felt that giving people this permission lends their views some veracity. Within capitalist systems conflict, not just physically through war but through debate, is felt to be the way to gain a good result for everyone concerned. The reasoning is if we allow such beliefs to be aired they then can be challenged. What is concerning is the manner in which groups, such as white supremacists or extreme right-wing groups, then claim that they are the victim. Holocaust deniers have constructed themselves as victims. Donald Trump and his administration have claimed they are victimized, with any investigation by the media into him or his administration condemned as a witch hunt. The media continually shifts the power balance towards those who sympathize with such beliefs. This is not to suggest the media overtly backs such beliefs, given these beliefs are often overblown by the media. This is part of a strategy not merely to create headlines. Creating a culture of fear means people may pay more attention to the media, as they believe they need to know information about important events to formulate their opinions and behaviour, quickly.

Writers have explored this culture of fear.[23] Waves of panic are constructed, some stemming from valid stories concerning incidents, such as child abuse. In this context, it is unlikely that many people will encounter neo-Nazi violence. Racism is part of a wider problem. The specific elements of neo-Nazism are not as popular as media reporting accounts for. Bracketing events and people within this framework is a way of formulating a type of story which fits a certain brand of news. Contexts and specifics are often overlooked. Those engaging with the media are left to deduce the veracity of these stories and whether they are linked to neo-Nazism or a form of construction. The more extreme right-wing politics becomes mainstream

the more its power dissolves. The political right obviously still exists, its voice is strong, but it has absorbed and watered down some of the extreme right; the left and centre are still resisting the extreme right's demands.

Trump's administration, swamped in scandal by March 2017, may turn out to be even more ineffectual than Obama's, after all the bombastic rhetoric concerning getting things done. As a distraction, in April 2017 Trump decided to create a high level of tension with North Korea and China which continued into August with threats of a North Korean war. Celebrity culture, with the focus on the individual, has allowed a form of phony politics, where someone is seen as a good leader just because they are well known. The weakness of Nazism and neo-Nazism is, amongst other things, an overreliance on the 'truth' of the leader, however fake it may be. The desperate attempts to have a strong leader, who is always right, means there will always be gaps, in that it is very nature of humans to have flaws. Paradoxically, the strength of the human is in the gaps, given creativity comes in the gaps. This is not the case for the perfect Nazi 'overman' who is not merely human.

Why people think they need to be led is an interesting question, as if they have been nurtured from birth to view the opinions of the central leader as superior. This level of subjugation, or a chosen desire for it, in the twenty-first century appears anomalous. In times of global insecurity these needs may become more paramount, hence the desire. Those who want to foster this allegiance are creating this form of insecurity. There is then dependency and conformity, people not challenging the social order. All dictators begin by claiming they are giving power back to the people. This is a process of propaganda that is overt. There is a condemnation of one establishment by the outsider, such as Trump, and then the enforcement of their system of power. In this sense it is voting for someone who claims they will shake everything up. This form of shock therapy is supposed to jolt the system, the social order, and the economic system. It can be perceived to be a form of punishment, aggression and regression. To define progress is a difficult task, and it seems the neo-Nazi system wants to delete history, bypassing globalization and multiculturalism. How this can be achieved is difficult to tell, other than by creating a whole new version of reality based on fantasy, which is what *The Turner Diaries* does.

Richard Spencer's alt-right did not come about through lack of education. There is form of attractiveness, a sense of power and an assurance, that can appeal to a certain personality that is too weak to allow the 'other' to challenge its beliefs. This exists in organizations, cultures, societies and countries, where any form of mistake or unethical edict can go unchecked.

In Nazism there was often guesswork by those following Hitler. A question arose over whether there was a sanctioning or not. Predicting approval is one way of functioning without free will; it is a form of slavery, but it offers a level of freedom through removing free will. The need for a tribe is important for identity formation. Often media discourse is formed through accentuating the differences between tribes. Conflict creates drama, and this creates a story. In this regard, the threat of being an outsider is so great people will do anything to be absorbed into the tribe.

Surveillance culture is an important component, given Nazism and neo-Nazism can only thrive via surveillance, where people feel threatened and under observation. Identity is removed in the herd. There is the notion of becoming one with the masses, but this can lead to an absorption into transcendence, the link between Nazi and neo-Nazi belief systems and quasi-religious experiences strong. With so many 'lone wolves', such as Dylan Roof and John Mair who claim to have acted individually, the wider network of neo-Nazism fed their sense of identity even if it was imagined. They were metaphysically at one with the pack through their allegiance, despite being physically alone. The British media framed the killing of Jo Cox as the killing by a mad man. John Humphrys on Radio 4's *Today* programme refused to permit John Mair to be called a terrorist, saying it was murder by someone mentally ill. Cox had praised immigration in her maiden speech in parliament, making references to Irish Catholics and Muslims from Gujarat in India or from Pakistan, principally Kashmir. In her speech she had emphasized what united people. Mair apparently shouted 'This is for Britain!' before attacking. During his trial it became clear he was a white separatist.

With other white terrorists, it is harder to say. Timothy McVeigh's case is more complex. The authorities wanted McVeigh to take responsibility for the Oklahoma bombing, but he could not have acted alone. While this act of terrorism may have inspired other acts of terrorism it is difficult to just brand this neo-Nazism. Belief systems have variances within them, and can change rapidly, depending on external events. The media can brand and rebrand any of these events as neo-Nazi related, creating an aura around them. This lends them a certain power, often in a paranormal sense, given the mystique initiated through the repeated reporting, lending them deeper significance. The weight the media gives to events indicates it operates as a multiplier, not merely to the signifier, but to the signified, manufacturing meaning beyond meaning. Andy Warhol elevated reduplication of the image to an art form, offering a religious significance. The process works in a similar fashion here.

Whether we wish to frame right-wing attacks as terrorism or not, we need to be careful branding these killers mentally ill. Doing so excuses them of any culpability, and if we look at how methodically many of these incidents are carried out it would be wrong to claim this is all linked to mental illness. Definitions of mental illness alter from place to place and time to time, so we also need to be aware of the cultural construction of the sanity/insanity binary. The same could go for terrorism. With Islamic terrorist groups the term 'brainwashed' is used, so people are not exactly mentally ill, but are being used as tools of a certain ideology. The question in all these incidents concerns culpability and choice. This is about identity formation, of giving up the self to a wider cause. While narrowing a person's outlook, this offers a greater sense of identity.

Any causal relationship between the media's framing of these debates and the actions of individuals is only conjecture but it is clear that indirect elements can be extrapolated. For example, in the case of the killer of Jo Cox, seeing John Mair's case framed as that of just a lonely man having had a psychotic episode, the public will be unlikely to attach any strong belief system to the perpetrator. Repeated often enough, there is no way this will then be interpreted as a form of white separatist terrorism. The cause of the attack is positioned as the act of a mentally disturbed state of mind, brought about via isolation not linked to ideology. Mair then becomes a victim and a man society should have reached out to, vulnerable and in need of help, rather than a dedicated murderer with a sense of purpose and ideology gained from years of following a form of neo-Nazism with international contacts. This is often how such attacks are often framed, especially mass shootings in America.

As these attacks are framed as moments of madness, despite evidence that individuals may have been rationally planning them, political motivations are diluted and become non-existent. The cliché of a mad man opening fire in a shopping mall, a school, or a cinema, is framed as a random event, not linked to gun control, belief systems, ideology, or the system that legitimizes violence. Randomness and chaos become key to this media framing, which is a significant paradox given formulating a narrative around these events is key to news reporting. Nothing is learnt from these attacks, as they are constructed as existing virtually outside time and space in a non-rational zone. They are promoted as part of the unconscious death wish of society just being acted out. In reality, or in fiction, such as the work of J.G. Ballard, these acts of violence become part of the normality of daily life. As with Nazi and neo-Nazi discourse, what is by nature extreme enters the mainstream.

We can directly contrast the way these killings are reported with the way killings by Muslim groups are reported, where they are immediately linked back to the apparent training zones of ISIS, which are supposed to be undermining Western democracy. It is not capitalism that is undermining society, but ISIS. The latter is then positioned as part of a war, but then this war and the events surrounding it are normalized as part of the random nature of day-to-day life. The complexity of this is that the war itself has now become normalized. This is nothing new. Prior to World War II, British newspapers were full of accounts of disastrous campaigns by the British army in Afghanistan, an eternal war. Despite Donald Trump claiming throughout February 2017 that acts of terrorism were going underreported in Europe, for what he stated were political purposes, one could argue the opposite is the truth. Capitalism thrives on fear, and as we enter a post-capitalism era given there is a greater awareness of the limits of capitalism, this further thrives frenetically on stories concerning terrorism and disaster. This legitimizes sanctions and crackdowns, and military sales, gaining government support from the groups they need to support their power base.

This media discourse is not journalism but state-sponsored propaganda. To paraphrase George Orwell again, journalism is printing what someone else does not want printed; everything else is public relations. We should realize by now that the mainstream media is ultimately concerned with protecting the establishment, and the interests of its major shareholders, and this war on terror legitimizes everything and anything. In stories concerning attacks made by right-wing terrorists there is a loss of the signified in the construction of the story. Unlike Islamic terrorism, it is not repeated as part of a pattern connected to a geographical heartland, or territory. It is not constructed as part of a war. This is despite the militarization of the right, covertly and overtly, even in their obvious appearance, with skinheads and army boots and jackets, and names, such as Combat 18.

While the various right-wing groups attempt to project an image of themselves as organized units, with various divisions, as did the Nazis, the media is too busy in rehashing stories concerning Islamic terrorism to really take notice. For Martin Bell, Al Jazeera UK is the most legitimate news organization, offering the most objective news. Media outlets like Russia Today are entertaining, if we acknowledge they are often propaganda outlets that give one side to the story. And it would be farfetched to assume every side to every story could be given. Importantly, during a period when in Britain Enoch Powell was making his 'rivers of blood' speech in Birmingham, claiming the UK was being over taken by immigration, there was actually net emigration. In his Radio 4 series 'Neither There Not Here', broadcast

in March 2017, David Dabydeen revealed how for many the way they were treated in England when they first arrived from different countries was actually better than the situation today. We could be sceptical and suggest people are looking at the past through the eyes of nostalgia, but when we consider that at this period there was a certain level of objectivity towards strangers, this is significant. With the global media focusing continually on ISIS, and the threat of terrorism, and the British police saying an attack is imminent, the incidences of racist attacks against groups, especially Muslims, is predictable. Manufacturing such attacks then detracts from real inequality, and the establishment can continue to move wealth into the hands of the few. This is of real concern in Trump's America.

The police promote the idea that acts of terrorism by Islamic fundamentalists are inevitable, and in this sense unpreventable. Acts of right-wing neo-Nazi terrorism are seldom framed as terrorist acts, and are bracketed as isolated incidents, beyond rationality. This latter device then places these acts as beyond comprehension for any real consideration. Neo-Nazi acts of violence are framed as manifestations of nationalism, after certain groups claim they have become the marginalized voiced and the victim, following mass immigration. This legitimizes certain forms of violence. In Britain, there are numerous inquiries being conducted by the IPCC into racist violence carried out by the police, including many deaths in custody. The UK police was termed institutionally racist. Given the extent and number of the IPCC investigations it seems unlikely that the correct level of resources will be offered to these inquiries. Inevitably, cases will be overlooked and not investigated thoroughly.

The desire to construct an identity around an affiliated tribe can be so strong any level of violence will be utilized to prove membership. This we have seen portrayed in films offering a moral outcome where a shift occurs towards a hopeful ending, suggesting change is possible. Sometimes films do not offer such an ending, as with the popular *American History X*; despite the older white brother reforming in prison, the younger brother shoots a black student. The senselessness of this is emphasized, as is the inevitability. The resistance of groups like the Anti-Nazis League in the UK is well known, and there is a global fight against fascism. Despite the victory of figures like Donald Trump, backed by white separatists, there is a global movement to resist the rise of fascism. This is linked to areas of resistance, but the incidences of neo-Nazi attacks have risen.

While there has been a drift in politics, making neo-Nazism part of the mainstream, the law has actually changed to counter hate crime. For example, the Cult Education Institute (CEI) reported on their website that

on 22 November 2014 a neo-Nazi received seventeen years for email threats. The magazine *Rolling Stone* on 23 June 2014 had the headline 'Heil Hipster', for an article concerning Germany's only neo-Nazi Internet TV show, but this was satirically mocked. In Britain, there were various cases reported by CEI, including a neo-Nazi plot to kill a Spanish judge. In Europe, the CEI reported a rise in neo-Nazi attacks of 16 per cent, the period unspecified, in countries such as France, Germany, Denmark, Poland, Italy, Belgium, Hungary and more widely in Russia. But has anti-Semitism ever gone away, given anti-Semitism is not linked to a time and place, such as Germany in the 1930s and 1940s. Michael Laitman asks, 'Can there now be Nazism in America?'[24] There have been 70 recent incidents of bomb threats aimed at Jewish community centres in America, two graveyards have been attacked (one in St Louis, and one in Philadelphia), plus numerous other incidents.[25] As a society becomes more selfish and divided it becomes more anti-Semitic.

For some this hatred is a form of pleasure, and is an innate part of the human condition, as Slavoj Žižek has claimed throughout his work. With reference to Rattansi, this view has been questioned in this book. It is in many ways egoism, not just today but throughout history that has allowed this hatred to advance. As history moves forward the level of altruism does not necessarily move forward. Laitman makes a good comparison with the Spanish empire. When the Spanish monarchy was at its height in the fifteenth century it moved in for the kill. There was a sanctioning of the Inquisition under Torquemada, who was of Jewish descent, in an attempt to destroy Judaism. Laitman points out that saying the Nazis were a one-time event is inaccurate. For example, it was not the Germans who invented the badge Jews wore, but the British in 1218. In this view, it was because other countries did not take the Jews that Hitler exterminated them, but this was not an intrinsic part of his essential policy. This is still a contested point, given the eradication of all Jews is considered the essence of Nazism.[26]

George Orwell ends his book *1984* with an image of fascism, blending with the sci-fi mechanized dystopia: the future is a boot, stamping on a face forever. Following Levinas, while there are still people alive to recognize the value in each face, and the importance of difference, this boot can be resisted. Regardless of how the media construct, collude, or resist Nazism and neo-Nazism, it is important to stress engaging is the key. In the Western world in particular, where many have forgotten the fight that went on to win democracy, politics is often frowned upon and frequently ignored. By ignoring politics, extreme right-wing politicians can do their work more easily, claiming they are one of the people. Donald Trump may claim the media is full of fake news and lies, and the establishment is out to get him,

but as of January 2018 it is hard to believe he has any credibility. Looked at optimistically and philosophically this does not need exposing, because their behaviour is doing such a good job on its own of bringing about their own downfall. This is an overly optimistic conclusion.

When these belief systems become blurred within the mainstream, exposing, condemning and challenging them because extremely difficult. The suggestion has been made that people benefit from these neo-Nazi beliefs, so why would they challenge them? We have reached a point in history where objectivity is not especially valued, and even the media images people live by are not valued. Those in charge of the main economies of the world have the loudest voice, with the media often being nothing more than public relations. Despite the power of Twitter and Facebook, well thought out and argued journalism is key to resistance. To argue against voices of power, through the media or otherwise, is an important way in which the spectres of Nazism and neo-Nazism are kept at bay. Keeping them at bay will not mean pockets of Nazism and neo-Nazism will not resurface, but it will mean that these voices are not normalized, or accepted totally. No matter how much media spin Britain First has done via Facebook, it is still an ostracized group, on the fringes. This does not mean the arguments of this book are invalid. What we have traced is a trajectory of acceptance. What now is proposed is an attempt to challenge this acceptance.

We do not have to believe in the central destructive power of human nature to accept this urge to attack the other needs challenging. Exposing all levels of inequality is central to combatting Nazism and neo-Nazism, which functions as a quick fix solution: get rid of that group and you will be fine. There might not be as yet any true definition of what it is to be human, but it is easy to acknowledge what it means to be humane. Nazism and neo-Nazi thrive on the degradation of the other, on dehumanizing the other. Paradoxically, an attack on the other does not boost the self, but the opposite. Any magical panacea to the problems of society needs questioning. Figures such as D.H. Lawrence believed that a form of blood lust was within the other, specifically in non-Western races. This could then be used to declare the other needed wiping out. We see this myth perpetually reworked in fantasy genres, such as the vampire story, which frequently bring in a subtext related to the Nazis. There is a deep need to deal with the shadow part of human nature, as analytical psychology describes it. If it is not acknowledged it comes out in many ways, which may not be controlled.

For Pythagoras and numerous thinkers after him no one is free if they cannot command themselves. The savagery of neo-Nazi belief and the violence that can be manifested from this belief leads to the conclusion that

some wish to give up their freedom. It may appear easier in the short term to relinquish one's freedom, to go beyond existential doubt. A certain form of clarity comes with following the pack, believing in the herd mentally, and avoiding the pain of existence. But this is becoming a beast. By doing so, there is then the infliction of pain on others. The trouble with this either or binary scenario is that it removes all levels of freedom, until both sides are trapped. People are then positioned in cages of their own making. Those living in Nazi Germany had to conform, otherwise they too were the enemy, and paranoia was rampant. We see this in contemporary political movements, right and left, which focus on fighting to get the group to adhere to fixed tenants. The question is: Do people want to be free and, if so, what are the costs of this freedom? Enslavement and the degradation of the other?

In the film *I.D.* (Philip Davis, 1995) where an undercover police officer played by Reece Dinsdale joins a racist football gang, the police force can be conceived to be just as racist. A harder and more contentious question we have to ask is: Does he have a choice here? To move away from the animal to the human may be criticized as speciesism, but cooperation, which is inclusivity, is surely one of the important elements of a high functioning human. Nazism and neo-Nazism from this perspective is low functioning, based on a level of tribalism that denies this grander concept of the human. This may seem obvious, but there is a branch of politics that declares greed is good, that selfishness, at all costs, is good. Once this is accepted, anything is acceptable, and all manner of atrocities conducted, and then ignored.

The media can speak out against these atrocities, which may cause them to be stopped, but combating these atrocities needs more than the media on side. Paradoxically, it needs our mainstream politicians and their supporters to realize they are often thriving from inequality. Their silence is complicit with the wider crimes discussed here. This level of complicity is deep and part of a silence concerning austerity and cuts to welfare globally. To resist the status quo, and to be outside the herd is difficult, given the weight in the West to proving one's value through competition, acquisition and consumption. There is, however, a level of self-chosen ignorance. All that is recognized is the self that is warped by an immersion in all forms of media. In such a climate everyone is still culpable, and a choice is still to be had.

Europe's New Far Right and Conclusions

In 2017, a country known for its liberal and progressive politics was at the heart of the immigration debate, with the Dutch party of Geert Wilders

having enormous influence. Despite Brexit and Trump's victory, no one was predicting Wilders' victory, but in many ways he had already won. Mark Rutte, Prime Minister of Holland, had a letter printed in every main newspaper saying people must accept Dutch values. Much of the rhetoric in Holland was even stronger than in America. There was the basic view held by Wilders' supporters that the criminal element in Holland was made up of foreigners, and if you removed foreigners you would remove crime. Wilders used nostalgia to appeal to voters, a tactic employed by other parties such as UKIP. He had already been found guilty of inciting to racial hatred by calling one group scum but continued being contentious which made him a gift for the media.

The parallels between the UK and Holland are obvious. In both cases, mainstream parties felt they had to shift to the right, and use right-wing rhetoric. The fact that the neo-Nazi agenda was now dictating policy should be concerning. The dream of a multicultural Holland seemed to be disappearing. Even though this is just one example, it is a good case study for a global trend, given the once accepting nature of Holland within popular mythology at least. While supporters of a right-wing agenda were airing their views, the media also produced programmes constantly reminding people of Jewish history. In Germany there is a constant reminder of the history of the extermination of the Jews, but support for neo-Nazi groups still remain. In times of austerity this is bound to be the case. What is phenomenal is how the general public is often in full unquestioning agreement with the policies of government.

In the UK, for example, with the Chancellor of the Exchequer Phil Hammond in charge, there were tax breaks in 2016 and 2017, but austerity was emphasized. There was an increase in racist and neo-Nazi violence in the UK post-Brexit, and an increase in those below the poverty line. Blaming this on immigrants was a simple solution, and this was a policy Donald Trump wholeheartedly approved, diverting attention from his own activities. Trump began implementing policies concerning who had entry into America. This was not part of any extreme white separatist movement, but was constructed as a purely rational move. In its second format, after the initial edict banning people failed, by March 2017 this was supported by mainstream Republicans. Trump appeared to have success, even if this was all about media manipulation. The fact that the president of the United States would spend so much time in point-scoring activities with celebrities and media outlets indicated he had the wrong priorities. What was not so clear was where his policies were stemming from exactly.

Bannon had already gained a following through his media outlets. Taking a backseat to Trump, but still leading on policies and manipulating messages, gave him even greater power. When he stepped down in August 2017, he claimed he was going to war for Trump and would have more influence outside the White House. Trump was able to circumvent all criticism by just carrying on regardless, but appeared to be doing more to win the support of his own military. To never admit your mistake was part of his mantra, initially, with the blame always being placed elsewhere, such as: on Obama, the media, the judiciary, China, Mexico, Germany, France, climate change scientists, everyone and anyone else. This tactic was so unlike anything anyone had ever seen before it was genuinely working, although in August 2017 he admitted his policy on Afghanistan had been wrong, and America was not withdrawing. In Holland, Prime Minister Mark Rutte of the centrist People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) absorbed some of the anti-Islam beliefs of the Dutch Party for Freedom (PVV), led by Geert Wilders. Similarly, in the UK Jeremy Corbyn did not explicitly ever claim to be pro-Remain. Despite being praised as a politician with true values, Corbyn was shifting within the political landscape, and most insiders saw him as anti-Europe.

Despite the rising strength of his party, political analysts believed it would be difficult for Wilders to seize power, as no one from the 25 other parties standing would work for him. This was unlike during the period of Hitler's rise to power. At least in Holland this showed a clear level of support for the anti-Islam agenda. What complicated things in Holland further was the strength of the left. Previously, a right-wing politician had been shot dead, and Wilders was given top-level security protection. The strength of feeling was tangible in Holland. *Channel 4 News* in the UK reported on 7 March 2017 that there was a battle in Holland between those Dutch people who felt threatened by immigrants, and the immigrants themselves who felt threatened by the racist local people. Whatever the reality of the situation, Channel 4 was attempting to offer a window into the Dutch elections happening the following week, as a subtle warning on Europe as a whole. The truth was that the position in Holland had shifted. All politicians had to take the position of the right seriously. Unlike in America, they were not forced to work with them.

Writing in *The Daily Express* in March 2017, Alice Foster asked whether Geert Wilders could cause Europe's next right-wing political earthquake, predicting he was leading in the polls and might win.[27] The media has a vested interest from a number of perspectives for writing such headlines, and even for implying there is a certain inevitability to this. *The Daily*

Express had not been fully reporting the Wilders trial, ignoring the fact that Wilders had stated Moroccans were 'scum', something covered by *Channel 4 News* on the 7 March 2017. Like Trump, Wilders claimed the judges hated his party. Wilders wants to ban the Koran, the burqa, and Muslim immigration in general, calling the Koran 'the *Mein Kampf* of today'. Like Trump calling Mexicans rapists when Americans were using Mexico for its cheap sex, Morocco was a zone for sexual exploitation by northern Europeans and the West in general. The level of hypocrisy was extreme, Wilders' followers reversing this reality.

As with Trump, and Farage, Wilders is anti-Europe, and believes holding a referendum on membership in the European Union is key. An anti-international stance is a policy all right-wing parties and neo-Nazism shares. Wilders produced a film in 2008, *Fitna,* splicing passages of the Koran with images of terrorist attacks, and was banned from entering the UK. Since then this ban has been lifted, as he was found not guilty of inciting hatred towards Muslims with this film. The constant message that certain Muslims are being trained in camps, radicalized, and then returning to the West, is promoted without question. Wilders spent two years in Israel. While it is not being suggested this experience was part of his own radicalization to become so anti-Islam, his own history needs addressing.

The UK police in March 2017 claimed over the previous four years they had thwarted thirteen serious terrorist attacks, and at any one time five potential terrorist threats were being dealt with. No details of course were given. The radicalization of right-wing figures, like Bannon, Farage, Trump, Wilders, and Le Pen, needs addressing, but it is beyond the scope of this book. What is of interest is the way these right-wing figures are constructed, as opposed to Muslim radicals. The war in Iraq cost approximately half a million lives. No terrorist act by a Muslim group has caused such extensive loss of life. Such comparisons may not appear on the surface to be in any way reasonable, due to the complexities of each situation. But as the work of Adam Curtis, such as his 2015 documentary *Bitter Lake*, indicates, governments and the media have simplified the issues, especially with Islamic terrorism which in its current form stemmed from agreements in the 1970s. This early agreement between America and Saudi Arabia allowed for resultant forms of terrorism, such as Al-Qaeda and IS. It would be wrong to claim that Western foreign policy was not the primary cause of Islamic terrorism. Nazism and neo-Nazism may be anti-government, anti-international, and anti-Jew and Muslim, but it fails to engage with any historical detail, such as this. Certain tales are taken as the truth, and with a limited view of history and politics, the narrative of the past is rewritten. Wilders calls

Moroccans 'scum', Hitler called Jews 'vermin'. Wilders shouts loudly, and those who feel anger tap into his style, seeing it as offering a voice to the people of Holland, against the 'infidel'.

In America, the alt-right movement has tapped into support from the wealthy. This has resonances with the British football firms of the 1980s. These groups, such as the Chelsea Head Hunters, dabbled in racist violence, but were often made up of high earners, people from rich backgrounds using this as a form of release. American films, such as *Fight Club* (David Fincher, 1999) have covered the theme of the American man oppressed by the system attempting to break free. Ed Norton is the star of both *Fight Club* and *American History X*, previously mentioned, which directly tackles this subject of neo-Nazism, both films revealing how violence can dominate our lives. The former does so, in part, through offering a comic approach to violence. With the History Channel and any number of documentaries covering the topic today, watching the moments in German when they turned on the Jews, we can see echoes today of this moment. There is a certain obvious glee from the local population that is revealed by these documentaries, when we view the Germans destroying Jewish property in the 1930s. People can be seen taking pleasure in this destruction just as today in Holland people condemn Moroccans with a high-spirited virulence.

Riot police clashed with demonstrates in Holland in March 2017, as the Netherlands barred Turkish ministers. This was due to the ministers using the visits as campaigning tools for President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan. Ironically, he then branded his fellow NATO member a 'Nazi', after his own government had been cracking down on all dissent, rounding up and imprisoning tens of thousands of academics and journalists who did not support his regime. The Dutch government needed to look tough, to prevent even more support going to Geert Wilders' party. The demonstrator wanted to meet family minister Fatma Betul Sayan Kaya at the consulate in Rotterdam, but she was escorted back to Germany, while demonstrators were beaten with batons and the police used armoured vans, dogs and water cannon, while some were on horseback. The vote in Turkey concerned turning a parliamentary democracy into a presidential system, plus increase the number of election cycles the president can stand in, meaning Erdoğan could be in power until 2029. He is seeking support across Europe from Turkish émigrés. Elsewhere in Europe tension was high, leading up to the referendum in Turkey in April 2017, with four rallies cancelled in Austria, and one cancelled in Switzerland, with the German chancellor Angela Merkel taking a strong line, saying she would not let the tensions spill over into Germany. Turkey is a prime example of how a country had

moved towards democracy but one leader was now trying to seize supreme authority, claiming this would make the country safer. As with Trump and Putin, the threat of terrorism was being used as a smokescreen to hold on to power. Any change like this in Turkey would be possibly the most significant change since 1923, when the Turkish Republic began.

Turkey then threatened Holland with sanctions, with Wilders in a tweet on 11 March calling on the Turkish people who supported Erdoğan to leave Holland and never come back. Interestingly, this threat from right-wing Turks actually bought all Dutch parties together. With Turkey making these threats in the run up to the Dutch elections they were seeking to threaten the democracy of another country. Holland in March 2017, comparatively speaking, was doing well economically, and resurging from the global economic crisis; unemployment was at a five-year low, and economic growth standing at 2.3 per cent. The main emphasis in the election was immigration and integration. Outside the major towns and cities in Holland there is a certain worship of the past, where immigration is not part of an acceptable form of society. In this respect, it is understandable how Wilders has a broad-based audience, and a strong level of support. Like Trump, Wilders has cultivated a larger-than-life persona, and courting controversy through outrageous statements has been central to his success. The nostalgia that is sweeping the world is linked to this rise of the right, and has come at a moment when the impact of the progressive politics of the 1960s may have been felt the strongest.

Wilders uses windmills frequently in his propaganda, and anything that speaks of traditional values in Holland. Nigel Farage in the UK cultivates the image of a traditionalist, through his carefully manufactured projected behaviour, and even his dress sense. He creates an image of a man who enjoys nothing more than a pint of bitter, in his traditional English pub, but any further culture promoted by the UK that has his approval is difficult to ascertain. There is the false idea that in the past things were simpler, and values were clear, and foreigners have just corrupted the natives. As with Steve Bannon, the progressive politics of the 1960s are condemned outright as encouraging immigration, which has threatened the foundations of society, and this myth is continually repeated until many have believed it. Interestingly, in America while Charles Manson was constructed as the fall of the 1960s, a living embodiment of all that was wrong with the counterculture, Manson was actually a white supremacist. In his cult, he condemned any relationships between white women and black men, and predicted an apocalypse in society caused by such miscegenation. In this regard activities by the Manson family should be branded as terrorism. The

training ground of the family was American soil. Homegrown terrorism like this might be branded as satanic, cultish, racist, or merely an extreme version of the patriarchal system gone wrong, but it is still terrorism. Discourse over apocalypse appears to prevail in each era. Writers such as Norman Cohn have examined such a phenomenon, and it is relevant for neo-Nazism and white supremacy. On the one hand, there is the fear of the end of the world that is being caused by miscegenation, and on the other there is a celebration of this as it leads to an attempt to bring about what is perceived to be a purer world.

The influential text *The Turner Diaries* has been explored as being significant in many forms of media, from the television series *NSU German History X*, to documentaries covering white separatist movements, such as those involving Cobb. All racist movements, from the BNP to the Nazis, have re-interpreted history in a way that constructs the past through a certain narrow lens. Representing the BNP on *Question Time*, Nick Griffin completely rewrote history, emphasizing a mythical purity of the Anglo-Saxon 'race'. Drawing on aspects of Hegelian philosophy, which believes in the spirit of history transcending the human, racist groups concur with the view that there is essentially a predetermined element to racial purity. This view holds destiny and fate to be central to the belief system. In this manner, there is no choice in 'real' behaviour, because destiny will prevail. The weak deserve to be eliminated because they are weak. Even a cursory reflection on this can lead us to see how this view is often part of mainstream discourse. Going all the way back to Abrahamic law, there is the central notion in the West that those who work hard will achieve and prosper, and those who are not prospering are not working hard. In the latter's case, their lack of success is often portrayed as a sign of weakness.

The tabloid press frequently constructed those on welfare and benefits as actually parasites, lesser beings, relying on the overgenerous system. In this sense, some of the core values that can be seen at the heart of Nazism and neo-Nazism are also at the heart of mainstream societies. The fact that this is the case should be cause for concern. People are taught from birth ideologies that connect to these beliefs, so they eventually are not even considered to be beliefs but part of who we are. There is no real agreement on what it means to be human, but it is appropriate to use the term 'humane'. In this regard being human is not a state of being, but an ongoing process. We are not truly human unless we behave in a humane way, but who decides this? Any behaviour that denigrates the other in any form lowers humanity, bringing us closer to animals, who frequently do not have a choice in the way they behave. We possess language and are possessed by language.

Geert Wilders may use derogatory language to describe Moroccans, but this actually reflects on his own humanity. It means he has a lower level of humanity himself. To go with the herd, and seek aggrandizement through group hate, appears to be a position people today in Austria, Holland, the UK, America, and many other countries are in. This self-dehumanization through dehumanizing others, often done unconsciously, reveals people are not fully realizing their potentials as human beings. The fascination that the media has with this whole area of dehumanization, in all its forms, has been the subject of this book. None of this will change unless humans can actively promote knowledge of the concept that humanity is to be searched for and depends on each decision taken every day, over the course of a lifetime.

In March 2017 Les Républicains were accused of anti-Semitism against their centrist opponent Emmanuel Macron, the party's secretary Bernard Accoyer apologizing, saying it had been wrongly interpreted. The right-wing candidate François Fillon condemned the caricature of Macron as a hooked-nosed capitalist, who was not Jewish but had worked for the Rothschild investment bank. The caricature of a hooked nose banker did evoke images from the 1930s that were used by the Nazis to condemn the Jews as part of a wider conspiracy. Like Geert Wilders in Holland, the far-right Front National's Marine Le Pen was gaining support in France. Trump's victory in America can be read as a global move towards the right, although in France support for the Front National has always been strong. In Britain far-right politics, as exemplified by the BNP, EDL, and then UKIP, have been absorbed into the mainstreams, shifting the agenda of the mainstream right even further to the right. Political parties have used digital technologies to reach out to voters, altering their messages, depending on the demographic. Tim Berners-Lee, known as the founder of the World Wide Web, in March 2017 condemned the manner in which the Internet was being used to threaten freedoms. This was a long way away from the utopian rhetoric used in the early days of the Internet.

Political parties were tracking potential voters through the monitoring of their choices. The same party was giving out different messages to different types of voter, altering the message to visit the audience. The audience's preferences were gained from their social media choices. While Berners-Lee finds this problematic, we can see this is just the nature of politics. For decades the Labour Party attempted to court business interests in the UK, for fear of being anti-business, while at the same time giving the impression it was on the side of the working class. It would be naïve to believe the Internet was a private zone, where monitoring did not take place. The harvesting of data on a huge scale is a fear the experts might

have, but most users ignore this aspect of the Internet. There were 50,000 variations of political messages each day on Facebook during the 2016 US election.[28] For Berners-Lee the problem was when users were redirected to fake news sites or messaging discouraging people from voting. This worked against Clinton and it was the demonization of Hillary Clinton that swung the election. Wikileaks and Julian Assange played a part in this, Assange meeting UKIP's Nigel Farage for discussions in March 2017.

Divisions between left and right were breaking down, and social media played a large part in this. Trump was globally renowned for his personal unpredictable use of Twitter, which was often aggressive. Owen Jones, in *The Independent*'s top ten list of the most influential left-wing figures in Britain, had also been a prolific user of social media. The public display of animosity between figures across the political spectrum became even more a form of theatre. In 2016 Jones has been known specifically in Spain for his support of the left-wing political party Podemos, where the left gave up their entrenched position to collaborate with other parties. Jones was interested in finding a position where different sides could collaborate. The fact that he was not fixated on an ideology often meant he was on the receiving end of hatred, especially from those who believed Jeremy Corbyn could do no wrong.

Despite the impact he was creating globally, as a writer and journalist and political figure, Jones announced in March 2017 that he was moving off social media, other than to use it for the sharing of events and news. This was down to the hatred of his enemies, who were using these platforms to target him. Tim Berners-Lee had been speaking as a technologist when he warned of the dangerous situation the Internet was in by 2017. The space had become usurped by those who wanted to drown out the voices of those, like Jones, who believed in equality. In this sense, the neo-Nazis had won. Jones was driven from the debate, and up to this point he was one of the most articulate people of the left. This abuse included people telling him how they were going to murder and torturer him. This censoring was not just in social media but occurred in television interviews, GMTV host Piers Morgan, a known Trump sympathizer, shouting Jones down. This hatred was nothing new and had been building for some time and was explicitly related to neo-Nazism. This indicated how the phrase and accusation 'Nazi' can be used by both the left and the right.

In November 2016 David Duke, a well-known white separatist, Holocaust denier, and former Grand Wizard of the KKK, took to Twitter to attack Owen Jones directly. While later being a member of the Republican Party, Duke in the 1970s was a known member of the self-declared American

Nazi Party. The level of conspiracy theory and beliefs propounded by Duke is comprehensive, but not unusual for American white separatists. Duke believes Jews are in control of the Federal Reserve Bank, the US federal government, Hollywood, and the media. He uses a variety of platforms such as his own website to promote the notion that homosexuality is also part of a Jewish conspiracy. A tweet sent 2:34 am, on 22 November 216 read, 'What's up with these homosexuals, like Owen Jones – pushing for Muslim immigration?' A loyal supporter of Trump and the latter's policy of 'taking America back', Duke had taken offence to Jones calling Trump a 'monster' listing all of Trump's faults, including racism and misogyny. As with Trump, it seems Duke was looking for a battle to create a theatre that attracted attention, but Jones did not take the bait. He then had a very low-key response, 'Oh look, I'm being dissed by a leading American Nazi. How very 2016.' This tweet was apt, summing up the current state of the world. Accused of being anti-Semitic because of his support for Palestine, Jones made a point of rejecting comparisons between Nazi Germany and the State of Israel. Even in that debate he has proven himself to be reasonable, and that was part of the problem for his detractors. Much of the hatred directed towards Jones came from those claiming to be from his own party. In this position, it was no wonder Jones left social media, as voices from all sides were attacking him.

Allegations and accusations of Nazism and neo-Nazism can be flung and are flung by all sides. While this attracts attention to certain figures, creating a theatre, the emphasis on personalities detracts from policies. By late March 2017 the Trump administration was floundering, then Trump accused Obama of wire-tapping. The debate moved into the strange Orwellian zone of what was actually meant by this comment, Trump declaring he did not mean Obama personally. At least, from Trump's perspective, these debates detracted from what Trump was doing on the ground, such as trying to remove ObamaCare, with 15 million people eligible for medical treatment in danger. Whether Trump personally believed in any of the policies or beliefs promoted by white separatists or neo-Nazis did not matter. He was still controlling the narrative. Globally, Trump attracted the most attention but his views were not the most extreme. In Holland, Geert Wilders had the stated policy of shutting down mosques, going one step further than Trump. This did have some similarity to the Nazi tactic of closing down synagogues.

The resurrection of the ideology that a strong man (or, in France's case, a woman) was necessary became the global direction politics was taking. From Turkey, to China, to America, to Spain, to name just a few countries, a sizeable part of the population believed that, for the sake of

security and growth, personal freedom was not as important as a strong man in charge. In Germany some believed Angela Merkel was an ineffectual leader because she was flexible, especially in her approach to immigration. Despite the death of Franco in the 1970s, many believed having a leader like Franco was what Spain was missing. The older generation yearned for this form of leadership, nostalgically believing this offered clarity. As with the propaganda peddled by Steve Bannon concerning America in the 1960s, it was mainstream to believe, following the death of Franco, Spain went through a period of decay due to liberalization. Progress, especially regarding the rights of women and homosexuals, was not felt to be of benefit to the country by many of those looking for a strong leader. This relates to the view in Latin America of the benign dictator.

In Britain in 2017, Prime Minister Theresa May was criticized for not being strong enough, calling a snap election. From an early age the need for a strong leader is instilled in the population, through families, schools, universities, and then work and governments. Globally, there has been the view that groups of people, in any circumstance, need a strong person to fight their cause. This leads not to cooperation and collaboration, and long-term resilience, a position advocated by Owen Jones. An emphasis on single figureheads, driving blinkered ideologies, often flirting with fascism, drives a global economy that is the antithesis of stability. In Germany, the establishment saw Hitler initially as no more than a joke, and refused to collaborate. Once he started gaining support, using ruthless force, there was little choice. Parallels between the 1930s and our current period are not absolute, but practicalities triumph over ethics. Dutch parties claim they will never collaborate with Geert Wilders' party, but they might have to change their position. This sets a dangerous precedent. Theresa May has so far resisted working with Nigel Farage. In France, there have been claims that Marine Le Pen is not as right wing as people believe. Her brand of politics is the antithesis of Trump's, with her strong belief in state ownership of certain services.

Media headlines in March 2017 were claiming Russia's President Putin was the most powerful man in the world. Through the wars in Syria, the Crimea, and elsewhere, plus Russia's suspected intervention in the American elections and UK referendum on Europe, and certain policies, such as the removing of laws protecting women from domestic violence, Putin epitomizes the proto-fascist leader. As we saw in Chapter 1, there were suggestions that, even when it came down to something as trivial as football matches, Russia had sent trained hooligans to attack opposition supporters, especially English football fans. The British media enjoyed reporting this,

and the Russian media denied this. Regardless of the truth, each related activity by Russia concerned projecting the image of a strong Russia. As with Brexit, it appears when given a choice people will often choose to remove their ability to choose. This suggests a herd mentality that is self-destructive. Neo-Nazism has this trait, flirting with apocalyptic rhetoric, rehashing old arguments concerning threats to the 'pure' race.

The notion of purity draws us to the conceptualizing of sex and it would be wrong to assume there is nothing outside of sexual misconduct. But it is also spurious to attack Deleuze and Guattari for illustrating sexuality is both physically and socially polymorphous, and that Nazism 'got fascists sexually aroused'.[29] Culture and the media exponentially reflect on the debates explored here, indicating issues over Nazism and neo-Nazism and film and media are central to the way we understand ourselves in the contemporary world. These extreme beliefs have become part of the mainstream. This book has explained briefly how they always have been. They are intrinsic to the way we define ourselves through framing our group ontology, whether in versions of alignment to, or opposition from. Len Deighton's novel *SS-GB* is just one example of a cultural product drawing media attention, dramatized for television by the BBC, and broadcast in 2017. This explores a world, like *The Man in the High Castle*, where Germany has won the war. Of course, these fictions reflect on the present. In the first series of *The Man in the High Castle* the majority of the accents are American not German, and the German victory is celebrated like Thanksgiving. Fundamentally, good dystopian drama functions as a warning.

With a swift change of outfits and geography, could the Nazis be the evil empire, as in *Star Wars* or vice versa? Even the outfits in *Star Wars*, arguably the most globally recognized and popular franchise of all time, are drawn explicitly from Nazi iconography. Bifurcated ideological systems make the best drama only when moral dilemmas are drawn out via blurring clear divisions, and offering protagonists choices. *Star Wars* can also be 'read' as a commentary on radicalization. In *SS-GB*, Germans are holding the King of England captive but certain Nazis want to protect and free him. Deighton gets behind the divisions within the Nazi Party itself, with the SS at war with the army and various factions, and reveals how the British resistance utilizes these divisions. The moral dilemma of the protagonist, Archer of the Yard (Sam Riley), is emphasized in the fourth episode. Archer is a valued senior policeman, assisting the Nazis with their investigations of unexplained deaths. He has won the trust of his senior Nazi boss, who does not have an interest in politics, but does believe in the Nazi ideology of 'winners', and sees Archer as a 'winner'.

This ideology is identical to the rhetoric spun out by business schools today, part of the winners–and-losers philosophy central to Donald Trump's propaganda. Ignoring all his business failures, commentators and voters believed a man supposedly good at business, and an apparent 'winner', would be good in the White House. What we mean by 'good' here is open to question. When given the chance to become a German, and therefore be a full Nazi Party member and save his family completely, Archer comments, 'Do I have a choice?' but he still says no. Archer's seemingly rhetorical question could be put to those dealing with Trump, Wilders, Putin, and the rest. Do we have a choice? There is a simple choice if we want to remain human. One debatable difference between an animal and a human is the latter's ability to make more deliberate self-reflective choices. This ability is not necessarily always an ability people choose to progress and maintain, abdicating their humanity. This suggests being human is not innate but a process that needs development, or least being humane can be described in this way. This human behaviour to not ultimately be free, and to abdicate responsibility, might paradoxically be a self-preservation device. But it lacks a wider humanity. Philosophers for centuries have contemplated the notion of free will, but when it comes down to it Archer of the Yard chooses to keep his humanity, even if this threatens his life and his family's life. If he loses his humanity what exactly does he achieve through this collusion with the Nazis. Would we do the same?

With the polarization of the left and the right there is an opportunity for neo-Nazis in all of their guises to further align themselves to the centre ground. This has not been something on the fringes, historically. If fascism normalizes itself the media has helped by shifting the focus away from how fascist policies have been mainstreamed. Identity is now the image. For postmodern thinkers this horror is celebrated as a reoccurring reality, as with Nietzsche's eternal recurrence of the same. For Nietzsche this eternal recurrence is overcome by willing its return. Part of the complexities can be summarized within Hegel's approach, where 'transcendence *is* infinity, that is, the impossibility of encompassing or totalizing alterity'.[30] This is far removed from the homogeneity and binary positions advocated by the popular press and media, neo-Nazis, and politicians. Nazism and neo-Nazism have become ways in which we define ourselves, ontologically. Our central question has been whether this has always been in culture and societies, often remaining dormant, or whether it is only due to recent changes that this has come to the forefront. Globalization has been central to this. While some of these events are ubiquitously called terrorism, others are called nationalist activity linked to pride.

Following murder at a 'Unite the Right' rally in August 2017, Trump refused to explicitly condemn white supremacists who had protested in Charlottesville, Virginia, due to the removal of a statue of Confederate General Robert E. Lee. Those fearing Trump's allegiance to the far right felt they had been proven correct when he also blamed so-called left-wing protestors, preaching to the press that there was always two sides to a story and anything else was fake news. As 2012 nominee Mitt Romney tweeted at 1:14 am, 16 August 2017, 'No, not the same. One side is racist, bigoted, Nazi. The other opposes racism and bigotry. Morally different universes.' After a 32-year-old woman was killed and nineteen others injured, 20-year-old James Alex Fields Jr of Maumee, Ohio, was arrested and charged with second-degree murder, malicious wounding and failure to stop for an accident involving death. Three people died on 12 August, including two state troopers monitoring the protest from a helicopter, plus 35 people had been injured in various confrontations during the rally. This was considered to be the largest white nationalist rally in a decade, but Trump's supporters stood by him, despite him being forced to disband the so-called American Manufacturing Council. His response overall was viewed by CNN as being a way for Trump to make political gain, taking America back, undoing 'decades worth of progress towards a freer and better country for all people'.[31] White supremacy is part of the fabric of American life, racial terror and violence central to its history and comparing footage from racial attacks of 2017 and the 1960s the only real difference is the latter was filmed in black and white.[32]

Having commenced the initial work on this book eight years prior to Trump's presidentially victory, it was never my attention to give such an emphasis to Trump and the media. Clearly, it should be obvious now why this has been necessary. Trump's playing with the truth continues to be of relevance for the overall argument of this book, that Nazism and neo-Nazism is not at the fringes of media, culture and society, and never has been. For example, Trump's arguments, backed by the neo-Nazi David Duke, consist of claiming the removal of a statue of Robert E. Lee will lead to the removal of statues of Abraham Lincoln. There is no logic in this, and no connection between Lee and Lincoln. Despite this, it has been my argument throughout that postmodernism's assault on the one truth has been of benefit. This does not give strength to neo-Nazis who might deny the Holocaust. There is a more difficult question concerning what the Holocaust means.

As is recognized by historian John Lukacs, the pursuit of truth changes across time, including its conditions, circumstances, and practices.[33] Through references to Bernard Schlink, Jacques Derrida, and William

Burroughs, amongst others, the significance of language has been emphasized throughout this work, as has the use of apocalyptic rhetoric by politicians and theorists. Discussing American literature since 9/11, Richard Gray has stressed the 'strange dematerialization of the material'. In such a zone, the difference between the actual and artificial is wiped clean, and the real returns as artificial. Quoting Herbert Marcuse's notion of the return of the repressed, making up the 'tabooed and subterranean history of civilisation', there is the notion that this is a way to interpret the world after 9/11. Silence reigns and speech is confounded, but Gray ties this into a movement since Romanticism concerning writing about loss.[34] Taking this a step further, the loss is part of a deification of a prelapsarian world, where difference was unthinkable. In such a zone thinking itself does not and cannot take place as a separate act.

Writing about Ray Bradbury, whose book *Fahrenheit 451* was adapted by François Truffaut and alluded to Nazism, Margaret Atwood notes he was descended from Mary Bradbury. She was a convicted witch in 1692 during the notorious Salem trials, a seminal trope in American history. Bradbury gets to the 'deep, dark, gothic core of America'. At the heart of the trials is the idea of the double. You are not who you are, but more significantly your neighbours are not who you think they are. Paranoia runs rampant. In the seventeenth century they are witches; in the eighteenth century they are traitors in the time of the revolution; in the twentieth they are communists; and in the twenty-first they are terrorists.[35] Atwood forgets to add they have always been the Jews. For the Nazis, the Jews were part of the demonic powers conspiring against their ascension to a state of semi-divine immortal harmony.[36] According to *Fox News*, neo-Nazis in the Charlottesville rally of August 2017 were chanting 'Jews will not replace us!'[37] From 2007 to 2017 right-wing terror groups have accounted for 74 per cent of domestic terror incidents in America, with one credible analyst claiming the chance of a civil war breaking out in America in the next ten to fifteen years was as high as 60 per cent.[38] An emphasis on borders and territorial control arises, with right-wing politicians gaining support by asserting the paramount status of the ethno-national state. As recently as 2007 the reverse trajectory was predicted, with the prediction that the ethno-national state was in decline.[39] This reinstalling of the ethno-national state's importance can be viewed as a reaction to its threatened demise.

Throughout this book it is recognized the term 'Nazi' is a contested one, as is fascism. America has its own traditions, from the Klu Klux Klan established in the mid-nineteenth century, to the investigations into racial cleansing that inspired the Nazis, and even the term 'neo-Nazi' was in

use in the 1940s.[40] The American emphasis may be misleading, but with neo-Nazi groups in American gaining ground and media publicity this is appropriate. We have seen that even in remote places, with no real Jewish presence, neo-Nazi groups are also growing. The Jewish diaspora globally has to reconcile its own status of going beyond borders, breaking down the ethno-national state, with the weight given to the Jewish state of Israel which is the classic ethno-national state.[41] Despite the alarm over the right-wing agenda of Trump and his connection to white separatists, it has been explained how this frequently functions as a smoke screen. Support from the extreme right is gained through airing extreme potential policies whilst getting into power. Then, once they have achieved power, their right-wing policies, which are still extreme, are then felt to be acceptable. In such a climate journalism and politics are transformed and often redundant, and the media struggles to hold politicians to account. As with history, in our struggle to understand Nazism and neo-Nazism in film and media we might find examples by which we consider our future actions, but there are no definitive templates.[42]

Our lack of an agreed understanding over Nazism and neo-Nazism may come down to our collective approach to any attempt at understanding collective and individual morality. Writing just three years before the new salaried employees who populated the cities of Weimar Germany fully embraced Hitler, Siegfried Kracauer showed how the National Board for Economic Viability in Weimar Germany had no place for the term 'human beings'.[43] In this world, salaried office works were the new proletariat slaves, as he put it, fully embracing the notion of rationalization. The word rationalization has a contemporary ring to it, but was at the heart of Germany leading up to the Nazis taking control. There is a nurturing of uniformity and false consciousness in this period, along with the combined spurious claim that difference is allowed and promoted but fundamentally inertness reigns.[44] Kracauer was writing in the 1920s, but could be commenting on the contemporary period, which similarly has fostered a thirst for neo-Nazism. There has been no claim here of offering a deep insight into the human condition. Others have highlighted in a positive way the significance of postmodernism in the context of the Holocaust.[45] Here our focus has been on Nazism and neo-Nazism in film and media, and popular culture by its very nature is postmodern. Teasing out some of the essential paradoxes of this has been within the scope of this book, but examining in detail the impact of certain thinkers is not.

As is now known, Martin Heidegger's Nazism was not a marginal affair, but his influence on theorists such as Jacques Derrida, Jacques Lacan, Michel

Foucault, and all their disciples, is immense.[46] The opening section to this book used a quotation from Homi Bhabha, who is in turn referencing Heidegger. This in itself could be conceived of as problematic, although using a Nazi to understand Nazism and neo-Nazism has some logic. René Girard has explained three core mechanisms governing social interaction: mimesis, with imitation being at the heart of all human behaviour; scapegoating, where collective guilt is placed onto victims then purged; and violence.[47] This framework might explain some of the behaviour of neo-Nazi groups today, but it does not explain their global reach to cultures that are so different. In 1933 Wilhelm Reich claimed that fascism is the politically organized expression of the average human character structure and has nothing to do with race, nation or party but is 'general and international'.[48] The problem with this approach is that the patriarchal family structure is singularly blamed, sexual repression functioning not for moral edification (religion), or culture (Freud), but in Reich's view for the preservation of an authoritarian social regime. Attractive in its simplicity, this is too absolutist and universal, and ignores local variations. Even now some scholars maintain Nazism was sexually repressive, plus film, literature, journalism, and popular culture have emphasized Nazism's perversity.[49] We saw in the previous chapter how local neo-Nazi groups in Asia gained strength from appearing to defend local interests against what is perceived to be the colonial oppression, such as that from China. This included sexual activity.

From an interview I had in 1996 with Margot Male, a former member of the Hitler Youth, it was clear to me she had seen herself as a victim when forced to work in an ammunitions factory. The status of the right-wing white victim has been explicated, along with exposing the underlying myth that now it is a justifiable time for them to rise up. When myths are demythologized, they can be understood not cosmologically, or even anthropologically, but existentially.[50] The manner in which the extreme left and right coalesce over the notion of authenticity has been outlined. With neo-Nazism frequently being at the heart of culture and society it is difficult to separate out its traits. Both sides utilize terminology such as cleansing in the pursuit of their aims. This may involve ridding the earth of Nazis and neo-Nazis as part of a hunt narrative, or removing the 'other'. Aspects of how our current myths concerning identity and race stem from media discourse have been outlined. Writers for film, television and video games have incorporated Nazi themes but this often deadens understanding.

The media has at times constructed neo-Nazism from an ontological crisis. Despite or because of the reworking of Nazism, neo-Nazism and the death camps in film and media, often they appear even more unintelligible.

But it has been argued this does not mean attempts at understanding should be relinquished. The need to understand these beliefs and associated events has not dissipated but only grown stronger. The media can function to replace any event with any other, offering the myths we live by and dangerously delineating moral boundaries. The threat from Holocaust denial is real, despite being exposed. Neo-Nazis have used the media, but deniers have often fallen because documentary footage is then used as evidence against them. This book has offered an approach suggesting that our forever ambiguous humanity is tied to certain choices. We can renounce our ability to choose, for reasons such as animalistic self-protection. This is a dehumanizing process, so what exactly are we protecting?