Philosophy and the Rise of Ultra-Nationalism in Contemporary Euro-American Politics

by

Chika Mba, Ph.D.
cmba@ug.edu.gh
Research Fellow, Philosophy and Religions Section,
Institute of African Studies, Kwame Nkrumah Complex, College of Humanities
University of Ghana, Legon

Abstract

This study is a critical interrogation of the new era of politics in Europe and North America defined by ultra-nationalism, heightened anti-Black racism and neo-fascism. Deploying the research methods of historical review, critical exposition and critical analysis, the study gathered data from library, archival and online sources in order to investigate the historical trajectories of anti-Black racism, ultra-nationalism and fascism in Europe and America, especially in the context of philosophical literature. The study revealed that major European philosophers of the Enlightenment era, including the German philosopher Immanuel Kant may have paradoxically played and still play a significant role in the rise of anti-Black racism, ultra-nationalism, fascism and its contemporary afterlives in Euro-American politics. The study concludes that the current state of Euro-American politics has deep roots in Euro-American *cultural unconscious*, and suggests that more work needs to be done to ascertain the extent to which academicians, and philosophers in particular, influence political consciousness and policy programs, especially in Europe and America.

Keywords: Brexit, nationalism, Nazism, racism, politics, Trump.

Introduction

Europe and North America are currently living the politics of fear, hate and mutual recrimination. Division along class, creed, race, nationality and ethnicity has never been more pronounced,[1] as right wing demagogues stretch their grip on politics in the Northern Hemisphere.[2] In 2016, right wing populists seeking to end United Kingdom's more than four decade linkage with the European Union (EU) emerged successful in a referendum held in June, simultaneously ousting the incumbent Prime Minister, David Cameron who had stood against the Brexit campaign. As if in a sequence, against all odds and almost universal expectation, Donald J. Trump, the Republican candidate in the November 8, 2016 presidential election in the United States of America, emerged winner after running a highly divisive campaign, and advocating policies that have since forced not a few observers to wonder if we now have an American Hitler.[3] This is by no means a wild insight. As John McNeill pointed out shortly before the 2016 Presidential election, like Mussolini and Hitler, Trump scores very high in the main traits of fascism – both as a political ideology and a political movement. Such fascist traits displayed by Trump include fetishization of masculinity, leader cult, lost-golden-age syndrome, self-definition by opposition, theatricality, militarism and hyper-nationalism.[4] On the other hand, Europe and North America share a historico-political legacy, while pre-Hitler Germany and (pre-Trump) United States in particular, share what the Canadian-American (objectivist) philosopher, Leonard Peikoff in a famous book, calls 'ominous parallels'.[5] Among other parallels, Peikoff identifies 'the rise of defiant old-world racial hatreds disguised as "ethnic-identity" movements and "affirmative action"' as one of the definitive features of pre-Hitler Germany and pre-Trump America.[6]

In a similar vein, Hitler, Trump and the Brexiters, have in common, *inter alia*, the mimetic desire to make their countries 'great again'. How are we to understand this conjuncture? One possible explanation – an explanation that has its merits – would be to blame the rise of global terror and the refugee crisis currently plaguing some countries in the Northern Hemisphere. But Britain and the USA are not the only countries in the North that have been hit by both problems; the latter by a much lesser degree in recent times.[7] Several others (in the social sciences) have pointed the finger at the financialised crisis of capitalism beginning in 2007/2008 and the weaknesses of the Conservative Party (under Cameron) in the UK and the Democratic Party (under Obama) in the case of the United States. The foregoing possible explanations may retain some merits, but require more work to ascertain their explanatory significance. However, at the outset, such explanations appear too much like the view that the Germans took recourse to Nazism because they lost World War I; or the standpoint that Nazism was caused by the Great Depression; or the weakness of non-totalitarian parties in Weimar Republic. As Peikoff again points out, 'Austria lost that war also, but this did not cause it to turn Nazi… All the industrial nations suffered the ravages of the Depression. Few turned to Nazism.'[8]

This work pays attention to the argument that the rise of ultra-nationalism in the Northern Hemisphere as exemplified by Brexit nationalism and Trumpism, are rooted in prejudices embedded in the *cultural unconscious* of Europe and North America. In other words, this piece argues that Brexit and Trump represent a cultural backlash, owing greater debt (than have been acknowledged by mainstream literature and reportage) to embedded prejudices with deep roots in centuries-old Euro-American philosophical and political writings produced from within the mainstream academia. In important ways, Brexit and Trump are probably, the conjunctural afterlives of the Third Reich's *volk* nationalism.[9] But the foregoing claim needs to be unpacked and justified carefully.[10] To begin with, the claim does not suggest that Euro-American history, the world as we know it, intellectuals or human culture is in a linear terminal trajectory; quite the contrary: the claim here is that landmark, earth-shaking events in human history are often the outcome of multivalent, mutually reinforcing or even antithetical sub-occurrences, many of which are frequently downplayed or completely escape mainstream attention.

The greater problem is in twofold, on the one hand, in the murky morass of *history*, the historian and/or historical accounts are constantly in danger of missing out on an important strand in the varying impulses and underlying factors that give rise to a momentous event. The second problem is even more daunting: in the rarified cauldron of conflicting and contending evidences and interpretations of a specific event and its aftermath, how can the (objective) historian or theorist determine the factor/s with the most credible causal saliency? The answer to questions of the latter sort can be difficult to come by, but the historian/theorist is at least committed to go beyond apparent causal linkages to accommodate multiple and multivalent readings of the same story, while striving to overcome the odium of a universe of post-truth solipsism.

Hence, in the cases under examination here, the argument is not that the success of Brexit, or Trump's victory at the polls was determined solely by ingrained racism, xenophobia and populist posturing. political elitism, post-truth nihilism (akin to pre-Hitler Germany) and ascendant Putinism played a significant role in both outcomes.[11] In the specific case of Trump, other factors like protest voting in the Rust Belts of the (de)industrial(ised) mid-western states, misogyny and a pervading sense of disenchantment with the establishment especially in the white working class camp had a strong impact. However, long-standing prejudices traceable to the Enlightenment era played a significant background role in the Brexit referendum and Trump's candidacy. In other words, deep-seated prejudices in the UK and the United States are the bulwarks of Brexit and Trump's electoral triumph, Barack Obama and Sadiq Khan, notwithstanding.

Also, it would seem improbably, that Hitler's *Mien Kampf*[12] has directly influenced prominent American political scientists like Samuel P. Huntington, or economic historians like David S. Landes. More clearly, Hitlerism seems to reverberate in the frantically xenophobic populism of Brexiters and the divisive rhetoric at the heart of Trump's nativist insider versus outsider neo-fascist populism.

At the same time, and disconcertingly, Hitler apparently drew inspiration for his racism, anti-Semitism and *volk* nationalism from some of the most important German philosophers (mostly from the Enlightenment) viz., Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860), Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) and Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) among others; a point the Führer (leader) himself frequently emphasised with a great pride.[13]

Indeed, in this exercise, the above-mentioned historical montage can be contested. Thus, it can be argued – Benedict Anderson notwithstanding – that it is hard to show that academicians and philosophers construct (in a unilateral fashion) political consciousness and policy programs like Brexit – which again, is hard to correlate with univocal racial ontologies. But one only needs to point to Karl Marx and Frantz Fanon, for example. More specifically, this contribution elaborates that certain philosophers have been able to develop hegemonic traditions that have directly created political outcomes, as is the case with Hume, Kant, Hegel and others' influence on Hitler and the Nazis, for example. But, again, since we lack the requisite historical distance in many instances; it is hard to show that certain philosophical ideas directly influenced social and political evolutions in human history. On the other hand, while the march and impact of philosophy and abstract theories may be slow and uneven, it is even harder to deny that they eventually permeate and change society in fundamental ways. To elucidate the basis of these introductory claims, we first turn to the racist and anti-Semitic writings of prominent philosophers of the Enlightenment, in order to show how they invented racism, influenced Hitler and helped in creating Nazism. Thereafter, this presentation highlights the continuing importance of these Enlightenment prejudices in contemporary mainstream academia and politics, in the context of Brexit and Trumpite nationalism.

The Philosophical Roots of Hitlerism and Nazism

In discussing the major influences on Hitler and Nazism, we begin with and emphasise Kant's racism and anti-Semitism for a number of reasons. First, in Germany, Philosophy 'was regarded as the pinnacle of the nation's cultural achievement, and thinkers such as Kant, Hegel and Nietzsche were as sacred to the German people as Shakespeare and Dickens were to the British.'[14] Second. Hitler took for granted the status of philosophy and exhibited a remarkable fascination with Kant's work.[15] Third, Kant's unsurpassed (post)-Enlightenment fame and immense importance in the intellectual history of modern Europe, especially in moral theory, and fourth, Kant and most of the other Hitler's philosophers emerged within the Enlightenment period, when major European philosophers including Kant were ironically advocating freedom, autonomy and universal *human* equality, and yet Kant was a racist and actually has a detailed hierarchical theory of race that many writers seeking to draw a linkage between his work and Hitler's beliefs, frequently overlooked, inexplicably. In Yvonne Sherrat's recent 'carefully researched' and 'meticulously referenced' account of German philosophers' influence on Hitler, entitled *Hitler's Philosophers*, published in 2013, she did not once refer to any of the actual

essays where Kant developed his racist theory of race. This further informed her erroneous view that 'Philosophers from Germany's past had no choice about Hitler usurping their legacy….'[16] The truth is that part of the 'usurped' legacies of prominent German philosophers who lived before the rise of Nazism are explicit racists and held anti-Semitic views, with Kant's legacy taking the cake. Indeed, even though Hitler was enamored of Kant's emphasis on reason, which the former decided, was a unique attribute of the Aryan, although it is not clear that he (Hitler) actually read the *Critiques*, and if he did, he merely, in this case we agree with Sherrat, he usurped Kant's arguments. It is more likely that Hitler actually read Kant's elaborate theory of race and his racist anthropology and geography, and on that basis, found the latter's work 'fascinating'.

In four separate essays published from 1764 to 1798, as well as in a series of lectures he began in the early 1770s, Kant attempted to demonstrate that somehow, he could prove that some human groups and societies have no culture, and how the lack of a national culture reduces from individual persons' achievements and character. He could also, presumably, prove that there is such thing as 'races', and that these races could be placed in a hierarchical order according to which societies, groups of human beings and countries possess a comparatively or even sometimes, ontologically higher cultures.[17] Similarly, it seemed easy for Kant to order countries and societies according to those that could be said to have a 'national character' and those that could not; hence, those *whose* civilization are the most advanced, and those that could never hope to escape a sub-alternate civilization status.[18]

In the last of the four infamous essays published in 1788 (curiously about the same time as the so-called 'Critical Period' in Kant's literature), entitled 'On the Use of Teleological Principles in Philosophy', Kant re-inscribes his hierarchical theory of race, claiming that people from Africa and India lack a drive to activity, and as a result, they do not have the mental capacities to be self-motivated and successful in northern climates, thus, never becoming anything more than drifters.[19] Praising Nature's wisdom in discouraging migration as a result of human disparate adaptive capacities, especially Nature's resistance against migration from warmer to colder regions of the world; Kant laboured to show that Native Americans are weak, inert and incapable of any culture because they 'are a race (or rather, a semi-race) stunted in its development because their ancestors migrated to a different climate before they had fully adapted to their own environment.'[20] Kant's undefended argument has it that there was once a 'stem species' (*Stammgattung*) in one region of the world which possessed the predispositions for all the deferent 'racial' features. The subsequent dispersal of human beings allowed that 'each race' went away with the right dispositions to help them survive in the particular region of the world where they would find themselves. This developmental process, Kant tells us, is irreversible. This is why, in his opinion, migration and intermingling would not in any way present the 'weaker races' with any hope of enlightenment or progression.

141

Kant was sure and preached that only the 'whites' (Aryan for Hitler) were bequeathed with the (eugenically) appropriate predispositions of the human race. At all events, Kant reserved his bitterest prejudices for the 'Negroes of Africa', even though he ranked the native Americans lower than them. In yet another notorious passage, in the first of the four essays (published in 1764), *Observations on the Beautiful and the Sublime,* Kant observed that the 'Negro' carpenter was black from head to toe, was a clear proof that what the 'scoundrel' said was stupid.[21] Kant's only defense for an atrocious 'observation' of this magnitude is an appeal to the equally culturally racist claims by the Scottish philosopher, David Hume. The latter had claimed in his anthropology that 'Blacks' are naturally inferior to whites and are never 'eminent in action'.[22]

Apart from the fact that it is arguable that Kant changed his views on race later on, his writings and many public lectures on this topic (spanning more than three decades) cannot exactly be dismissed as inconsequential, 'bracketing …[them] as a regrettable aberration which expresses common views at the time.'[23] For Kant's racism and theory of race directly influenced Nazis and Hitler's thought and actions, and, both men appear to have continued to influence generations of philosophers and social theorists and politicians in Europe and the United States of America. In *Mein Kampf* (the book that became the Nazi Bible and hugely popular with up to 10 million copies *in eleven languages* either sold or distributed in Germany by the end of the war),[24] Hitler takes up Kant's views on national culture and its overriding importance for determining the humanity, totality and futurity of individuals and groups. For Hitler, however, as Lawrence Birken clarifies, a people with a national culture always occupied a specific territory. This territorial character of culture was above all, for Hitler, evident in architecture which, even more than music, appeared as the highest expression of humanity in his worldview. 'It is in this context that we can assess the Hitlerian conception of the Jew as the demonic enemy. Hitler believed, the Jews' real problem was their fundamental lack of creativity and thus their lack of humanity.'[25] And,

> Of course, Hitler's condemnation of the Jewish people for their cultural sterility was not a charge that could be answered by merely pointing to the number of Jews who had won this or that academic prize. He was not so much claiming that individual Jews were worthless as that the Jewish people as a whole had no national culture. For Hitler, then, the very existence of the Jew seemed to violate the fundamental laws of nature as he described them. Unable to exploit a specific territory by working, they should have disappeared…. [This is a direct appropriation of Kant's cultural racism].[26]

In addition, in developing his religious anti-Semitism, 'Kant claimed the Jews had no right to an independent existence… [and that] Judaism was obsolete. He decreed that pure morality sought "the euthanasia of Judaism".'[27] It is then easy to see why Hitler liked Kant's philosophy, and strove to literally write off the Jews, Slavic Peoples, the Roma Gypsies, the Blacks, and other *Untermenschen* of Europe, from both 'civilisation' and humanity, and proceeded to exterminate them all in the infamous 'Final Solution'.

However, apart from Kant, on Sherrat and others' accounts, Hitler claimed he read and borrowed ideas from other prominent German philosophers.[28] Among them was Hegel, whom he prized less than Kant, but revered all the same. '[T]he similarity between his politics and that of Hitler is hard to escape.'[29] At the same time, in *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807) and *Philosophy of Right* (1821), Hegel expressed strong racist and anti-Semitic sentiments, surpassing even Kant in this regard. In denigrating the Jews and their religion in particular, while extending Kant's privileging of reason, Hegel writes '"The temple of . . . reason is loftier than Solomon's temple. . . . It has . . . been built rationally, not at all in the way the Jews . . . have built on Solomon's pattern".'[30] In a similar pattern, Hitler held that Arthur Schopenhauer (another major German philosopher) is 'One of the greatest thinkers that mankind has produced [because he] …branded the Jews for all time with a statement which is profoundly and exactly true. He (Schopenhauer) called the Jew "The Great Master of Lies".'[31]

In *Hitler's Philosophers*, Yvonne Sherrat unearths how several other highly regarded German philosophers provided the theoretical and cultural tonic for anti-Semitic aspects of Hitlerism and Nazism. This includes Fitche, Feurbach, Karl Marx (surprisingly), Gottlob Frege and Friedrich Nietzsche.[32] Nietzsche in particular, paradoxically did more than his fair share in providing the intellectual munitions for Nazism and the Holocaust. As the Israeli-American writer Barry Rubin regrets, even though Nietzsche was one of the most pro-Jewish German writers of his time, 'No serious thinker has done more harm to the Jewish people than Friedrich Nietzsche, whose writings were an important inspiration for Adolph Hitler and Nazism.'[33] Here, it is worth referring to a particularly revealing passage in Nietzsche's *Daybreak*, entitled 'Of the People of Israel' that Sherrat curiously elided. In that passage, Nietzsche wrote: 'Among the spectacle to which the coming century invites us is the decision as to the destiny of the Jews of Europe. That their die is cast, that they have crossed their Rubicon is now palpably obvious: all that is left for them is to become the masters of Europe or to lose Europe as they once a long time ago lost Egypt where they had placed themselves before a similar either-or.'[34] Nietzsche goes on to seemingly eulogise Jewish industry, resilience and excellence, but ends with the damning conclusion that:

> Their [Jewish] demeanor still reveals that their souls have never known chivalrous noble sentiments nor [sic] their bodies handsome armour: a certain importunity mingles with an often charming but almost always painful submissiveness. …they are unavoidably going to ally themselves with the best aristocracy of Europe… so that a century hence they will appear sufficiently noble not to make those they dominate *ashamed* to have them as masters. …they also know that at some future time, Europe may fall into their hands….[35]

As if this was not enough, in *Beyond Good and Evil*, 'Nietzsche penned what became the core of Nazi philosophy and the death knell for European Jewry:'

> All that has been done on earth against 'the nobles,' the 'mighty, the 'overlords,'…is as nothing compared to what the Jews did against them: the Jews, that priestly people who were only able to obtain satisfaction against their enemies and conquerors through a radical revaluation of the latter's values, that is, by an act of the most spiritual revenge…. It was the Jews who …dared to invert the aristocratic value-equation …saying 'the wretched alone are the good ones, the poor, the helpless, the lowly…. You who are powerful and noble are to all eternity the evil ones….[36]

Philosophy and the Legitimation of Cultural Prejudices

Beyond intellectual influences, a theory – especially a prejudiced theory – often has roots in a particular milieu and the interpretation of events by the contemporary elite intelligentsia. Nonetheless, there is no guarantee that once a theory (born of prejudice) has been endorsed or imposed on a people through propaganda that such prejudiced view will ever die off even when shown to be wrong over a period of time. Once the seeds of prejudice are sown especially by highly influential persons, there could be no way to determine the trajectories of its afterlives and the extent of the damaging consequences. If anything, they become more sophisticated and wide-ranging. No one can say for sure how far a prejudicial comment could live on; to say nothing of how philosophically-elaborate reproducing volumes of hate might affect future generations. Kant has warned, in spite of himself, that 'so harmful is it to implant prejudices for they later take vengeance on their cultivators or on their descendants.'[37] The truth immanent in Kant's sober reflection here can hardly be confuted, especially in the light of the impact his own prejudices has had on his country and beyond.

Amartya Sen has extended Kant's warning, arguing that: 'When there is an accidental correlation between cultural prejudice and social observation (no matter how casual), a theory is born, and it may refuse to die after the chance correlation has vanished without a trace.'[38] And as Birken has written: '…even when theory is not expressed on a conscious level it continues to exist in what might be called the cultural unconscious.'[39]

The prejudices implanted by Kant and other Enlightenment thinkers – racists and anti-Semites – discussed here (and others like Voltaire and Adam Smith for example)[40] in the Euro-American 'cultural unconscious' have not and are not likely to lose their sting any time soon. Instead, as this analysis reveals, the ingrained animus have continued to grow, influence and affect future generations in the North, and globally. This situation is not helped in any way after the Nuremberg trials, because, while Heidegger, Schmitt, Frege and other philosophers who backed Hitler were reinstated into mainstream academia in Europe and North America, reputable Jewish-German philosophers like Walter Benjamin, Theodor Adorno, Hannah Arendt and others who opposed Hitler as the Nazis suffered post war ignominy, and had their work delegitimised.[41]

Meanwhile, Kant's racism and theory of race have continued to enjoy immunising retellings by prominent philosophers. To take one important example, in 2007, Gunter Zoller and Robert B. Louden edited and published a volume (via Cambridge University Press) containing all the essays wherein Kant penned his most unsophisticated prejudices about human groups and societies. In the General Introduction, Louden cites approvingly that Kant's *Observations on the Feelings of the Beautiful and the Sublime* received high praise from Herder and Goethe.[42] Herder had extolled Kant in the light of that essay as '"altogether an observer of society, altogether the accomplished philosopher…. [Kant] …has observed up to the final nuances, analyzed down to the most hidden incentives, and worked out many a tiny caprice – altogether a philosopher of the sublime and beautiful humanity! And this is humane philosophy a German Shaftsbury".'[43] And for Goethe, '"…Kant's *Observations on the Feelings of the Beautiful and the Sublime…* is full of the most delightful observations about human beings, and one already sees how his principles are developing".'[44]

Louden himself goes on to make light of Kant's misogyny, cultural nationalism and outright racism in the essay in question: 'though traditionally viewed as Kant's first work on aesthetics, anthropological and moral themes definitely dominate the later part of the essay, where Kant discusses differences between the two sexes, as well as among cultures and nations, in their capacities for the feelings of the beautiful and the sublime.'[45] In a sub-section he titled, 'Culture, Racism, and Colonialism', Louden laboured to defend Kant's ultra-racism at all cost. He saw little or nothing wrong with Kant's damning doubts about the humanity and right to existence of '*Untermenschen*' ('inferior peoples') both in Europe and elsewhere. According to Louden: 'Kant's firm belief that certain peoples are "incapable of any culture" …and lack sufficient "drive to activity" …in turn leads [Louden means 'justifies'] him to ask "why they exist at all".'[46] Louden goes on to cite at length Kant's misgivings about the right to existence of Tahitians in their 'happy' and 'tranquil indolence', had they never been visited (colonised) by 'more cultured nations'.[47]

145

Louden sees this as 'the most notorious example' of this line of thinking in Kant's literature, but that 'While there is plenty to object to in this passage, its underlying message has often been misunderstood.' To make us see the 'underlying message' we are missing here, Louden found recourse in Kant's mainstream moral theory! But the real issue here should be about how we are to understand the contrast between Kant's racism and his seemingly universal moral theory. As Charles Mills and Lucy Allais argue, and we cannot agree more with them, we should be interpreting Kant's mainstream moral philosophy in the light of Kant's racism; it is patently absurd to try and defend or mitigate Kant's racism using his moral theory.[48] Adolf Hitler and the Nazis obviously didn't think so.

Hitlerism and Cultural Racism in Contemporary American Social Political Writing

Early on, in *Mien Kampf*, aping Kant's racism while seeking to justify anti-Semitism and cultural/racial cleansing in Germany, as well as, the rest of Europe, Hitler grumbles: 'There may be hundreds of excellent States on this earth, and yet if the Aryan, who is the creator and custodian of civilization, should disappear, all culture that is on an adequate level with the spiritual needs of the superior nations to-day would also disappear.'[49] More emphatically, echoing Kant once again, he institutes cultural racism as a historical law:

> History furnishes us with innumerable instances that prove this law. It shows, with a startling clarity, that whenever Aryans have mingled their blood with that of an inferior race the result has been the downfall of the people who were the standard-bearers of a higher culture. In North America, where the population is prevalently Teutonic, and where those elements intermingled with the inferior race only to a very small degree, we have a quality of mankind and a civilization which are different from those of Central and South America. In these latter countries the immigrants – who mainly belonged to the Latin races – mated with the aborigines, sometimes to a very large extent indeed. In this case we have a clear and decisive example of the effect produced by the mixture of races. But in North America the Teutonic element, which has kept its racial stock pure and did not mix it with any other racial stock, has come to dominate the American Continent and will remain master of it as long as that element does not fall a victim to the habit of adulterating its blood.[50]

Defending views similar to Kant's and Hitler's, contemporary American cultural nationalists like Samuel P. Huntington and David S. Landes argue that a better world is achieved when every country, nation or nation-state is able to preserve, and perhaps, develop the pristine ingredients of its culture, unadulterated by alien influences. In addition, Huntington and his ilk contend that a nation's culture defines, symbolises and authenticates their identity, and that American cultural greatness should be protected from alien corruption.[51] He concludes that:

> Americans cannot avoid the issue: Are we a Western people or are we something else? The futures of the United States and the West depend upon Americans reaffirming their commitment to Western civilization. Domestically, this means rejecting the divisive siren calls of multiculturalism. Internationally it means rejecting the elusive and illusory calls to identify the United States with Asia. Whatever economic connections may exist between them, *the fundamental cultural gap between Asian and American societies precludes their joining together in a common home*.[52]

Copying Kant, Hegel and Adolf Hitler, almost verbatim, Huntington argues in defense of the 'distinctive character' of 'western civilization', insisting that the roots of the ideas that set it (the West) aside from and on top of 'other cultures and civilizations', cannot be traced to Asia, Africa or the Middle East; they are simply '*European*' and better than others.[53] The survival of the 'west', Huntington counsels, depends on the willingness of the United States as its most powerful nation, to revive and sustain these extraordinary qualities. One way of beginning to step into this historic role of no minor significance, he asserts, would be for the United States of America to resuscitate the founding fathers' wish that it emerges inexorably as a strong and viable nation, protected against degenerating into 'a tangle of squabbling nationalities.'[54] Like Hitler, Huntington, while purporting to re-inscribe the wishes of the 'Founding Fathers' of United States, contends that America is at great risk for allowing the contamination of the American/'western' superior culture (and blood for Hitler). In *The Clash of Civilizations*, Huntington issues one final warning to the deviant multiculturalists (who he couldn't deign to mention any, and, are merely a coterie of 'influential intellectuals and publicists'): 'History shows that no [multicultural] country …can long endure as a coherent society.

A multicivilizational United States will not be the United States; it will be the United Nations.'[55] Writing in a different book, but expressing his unequivocal anti-multiculturalist view in similar words, he reiterates that 'America cannot be the world and still be America. Other people cannot become American and still be themselves.' The most important 'civilized' pursuit of the American people ought to be in the area of preserving those qualities that make America 'different' and great.[56]

Pointing out the shortcomings of Huntington's conclusions shortly after the publication of *The Clash of Civilizations*, Edward Said questions rhetorically,

> How can one today speak of "Western civilization" except as in large measure an ideological fiction, implying a sort of detached superiority for a handful of values and ideas, none of which has much meaning outside the history of conquest, immigration, travel and the mingling of peoples that gave the Western nations their present mixed identities? This is especially true of the United States, which today can only be described as an enormous palimpsest of different races and cultures [sic] sharing a problematic history of conquests, exterminations, and of course major cultural and political achievements.[57]

But, Huntington derives his views about the United States of America and the 'West' from his reading of the current (emerging) world order. As he states at the outset, the 'fundamental source of conflict in this new world order will not be primarily ideological,' but will instead be 'cultural'. He enjoins us to recall that in ideological conflicts, the key question was 'which side are you on?' and people could and did choose sides and changed sides. One can be born in a capitalist country/society but learn about and root for communism and vice versa. But cultural conflicts, for him, are of a very different mould. 'In conflicts between civilizations, the question is "What are you?" not "which side are you on?"' And what you are, is an irreducible primary entity, 'a given that can't be changed' about your identity.[58] In the very unlikely event that what you are gets altered, what is being changed is not your mind or beliefs, but something more fundamental, *yourself*, your *cultural* identity. Stated in this way, it would now be a lot easier to understand Huntington and (in the context of current US politics) the worries of those in support of 'making America great again'. They are worried that the United States of America – their beloved country – might somehow be lost in an amorphous world of cultural pluralism.

David S. Landes is a prominent American economic historian whose work comes up for mention here because he shares views similar to that of Huntington.[59] In the last chapter of an influential book, *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations: Why Some are So Rich and Some So Poor*, Landes reinvigorates the cultural racist point of view, directly attacking the globalists whom he holds beneath contempt, and describes as 'simply anti-intellectual', and wallowing in the blatant contradiction of facts and the denial of actual historical events. He further complains that 'Above all, say the globalists, we must not account for European priority by "essentializing" it, that is, by tying it to European institutions and civilization – explaining it by European 'presences' as against non-European "absences".'[60] He invites the 'anti-intellectual' globalist to look to history to find out the truth behind 'Western' victories, and the reason why Eurocentrism is true and 'anti-Eurocentric thought' delusional. He writes: 'If we learn anything from the history of economic development, it *is* that *culture makes all the difference*. (Here Max Weber was right early on).'[61] Culture, or more precisely, cultural inequality, for Landes, is currently the most important, if not the only reason why some societies (mainly Europeans) have succeeded in the quest for economic and social progress, while some others (mainly non-Europeans) have underachieved and are 'so poor'. How about enslavement, colonisation and dependency? They no longer matter; the trio are now obsolete explanatory categories of human progress and economic prosperity. If anything, the trio are unassailable evidence of the triumphs of European technical superiority. And it is not as if, Landes coolly informs us, is there any society where people were enslaved that has ever prospered! But the collage of contradictions here is rather pitiable. As one reviewer observed, in Landes' desperation to prove his thesis,

> He becomes like the lawyer who, in order to defend his client from allegations about the theft of a vase from his neighbor, argues that (1) the vase never existed; (2) the vase is still in possession of the plaintiff; and (3) the vase belonged to his client in the first place.[62]

At all events, most of Landes' views above, as much as they are similar to Huntington's, mimic the following passage in *Mein Kampf*, a passage that also speaks to Kant's *Stammgattung* and eugenics.

> All that we admire in the world to-day, its science, its art, its technical developments and discoveries, are the products of the creative activities of a few peoples, and it may be true that their first beginnings must be attributed to one race. The maintenance of civilization is wholly dependent on such peoples. Should they perish, all that makes this earth beautiful will descend with them into the grave. *All the great civilizations of the past became decadent because the originally creative race died out, as a result of contamination of the blood.*

> *The most profound cause of such a decline is to be found in the fact that the people ignored the principle that... in order to preserve a certain culture, the type of manhood that creates such a culture must be preserved. But such a preservation goes hand-in-hand with the inexorable law that it is the strongest and the best who must triumph and that they have the right to endure.*[63]

In the end, how do we account for – and judge the significance of – the clear parallels between Hitler and Huntington/Landes if they weren't directly influenced by Hitler (which they certainly can't have admitted to)? Is this a case of mutual influence by Kant? and/or of neo-fascist ideas being transmitted through more intellectually 'respectable' spaces following World War II?

Brexit and Trumpism: The Current Politics of Fear in Europe and America

Hitler and the Nazis found creative ways to spread the politics of hate, of 'us' versus 'them', but their brand, as our analysis has shown, drew from more 'reputable' roots in Germany. And, since the creators of the cultural/racist prejudices that propelled Nazism and encouraged Hitler are deeply rooted and *widely accepted* in what Huntington narrowly brands 'western civilization', it is no surprise that the lingering desire (in that 'civilisation') to appropriate memes from Nazism and Hitlerism have only strengthened in the face of similar social and political challenges of the kind that created them.[64]

During the run-up to the June 23, 2016 Brexit referendum, Nigel Farage, leader of the Eurosceptic, populist right wing anti-immigration United Kingdom Independent Party (UKIP), while championing the campaigns for Britain to leave the EU, unveiled an ad that many analysts regarded as visually referencing 'images from actual Nazi propaganda that demonized Jews and other minorities in the aftermath of World War I.'[65]

As one reporter highlights further, the scare-mongering poster 'is grindingly obvious in its intentions,' as '[i]t shows an image of a long curving line of Syrian refugees walking to a refugee camp on the border of Croatia and Slovenia and is branded with the words "Breaking Point" written in large, red text, and underneath in white letters: "The EU has failed us all."'[66] Conversely, Boris Johnson, popular British historian, journalist and former Mayor of London who is another staunch supporter of the 'Leave' campaign, few days before the referendum, accused the EU and the then British Prime Minister and leader of the 'Remain' camp, David Cameron, of aiming to march in the tragic footsteps of despotic European leaders of a dark historical past like Napoleon and Hitler. Johnson's accusation is in tandem with that of the then British Secretary of State for Justice, Michael Gove, who accused economic experts who predicted dire consequences for Britain, Europe and perhaps, the global economy in the event of a successful Brexit vote. For Gove, 'economic experts warning about the fall-out of Brexit are like the Nazis who orchestrated a smear campaign against Albert Einstein in the 1930s.'[67] So it would seem that Brexit campaigners either deployed Nazi propaganda to get Britons to vote for EU exit, or accused opponents of their project of deploying Nazi memes and tactics.

In like manner, following the success of Brexit, there are persisting instances where prominent British leaders deploy rhetoric and tropes traceable to memetic influences from Hitler's *Mien Kampf* and Nazism. In October 2016, the newly installed Home Secretary of the United Kingdom, Amber Rudd, had portions and the spirit of her tense speech in favour of an anti-immigrant labour policy directly linked to passages in *Mien Kampf* by the British journalist, James O'Brien. Rudd had in the infamous conference speech of October 4, raised concerns that 'foreigners are taking British jobs', and counseled that employers should employ more British workers, while inveighing that she was not being racist or xenophobic for voicing this view. She insists that:

> British businesses have driven the economic recovery in this country…we still need to do more …so all British people get the more opportunities they need to get on in life. The [new immigration] test should ensure people coming here are filling gaps in the labour market, not taking jobs British people could do. So I want us to look again at whether our immigration system provides the right incentives for businesses to invest in British workers.[68]

But, O'Brien and the Labour Party disagree with Rudd. For the Labour Party, her speech is very likely to '"fan the flames of xenophobia and hatred in our communities";' while O'Brien sees the speech as an unfortunate manifestation of ingrained Hitlerism in Britain.[69]

For him, there is no marked difference between Rudd's entire speech and the intentions of the following passage in *Mien Kampf*: "'For the State must draw a sharp line of distinction between those who, as members of the nation, are the foundation and the support of its existence and greatness, and those who are domiciled in the State simply as earners of their livelihood there".'[70]

Similarly, as highlighted above, recent events in the United States seem to bear out just how popular racist and fascist views akin to what can be found in Hitler's *Mien Kampf* and practised through Nazism may have arrived there. Following repeated terror attacks in several cities in Europe and North America in recent times, the Republican flag bearer for the 2016 presidential elections, Donald J. Trump became unequivocal about his intention to 'take back our country', ensure the safety of Americans, 'reinstall' America's greatness and guarantee her national security precisely by profiling and banning certain groups of people from migrating to the U.S., under his watch. Within a week after the San Bernardino, California attack on December 2, 2015 that killed 14 people and where 22 others were seriously injured in a terrorist attack, the then GOP frontrunner was widely reported to have specifically called for a 'total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives can figure out what is going on.'[71] Apart from the many speeches he delivered in defence of the above view during most of December 2015,[72] he sent out a written statement to thousands of his supporters and campaigners detailing exactly how he intends to implement his anti-Islamic policy if elected into office as the United States' President.

Trumps' hate speeches were met with severe criticisms by many allies and opponents, both locally and internationally; but that did not directly affect his credibility as a potential President of the world's most powerful nation. If anything, his support base apparently increased following the highly divisive and inciting comments, which saw him clinching the GOP ticket and finally winning the White House in November 2016. We have also seen numerous Internet articles, live television interviews and polls clearly suggesting that many Americans are actually in support of his racist and xenophobic chants. Indeed, Trump's victory, like Brexit, has since emboldened closet racists and openly racists groups in the United States.[73] In a widely reported but largely ignored case, on November 19 2016, the white nationalists 'think tank' alt-right group called The National Policy Institute, gathered at the Ronald Reagan Building (a few blocks to the White House) to 'salute' Trump and commemorate his victory. To enliven the group during an 11 hour meeting, their leader Richard B. Spencer, after railing against the Jews and reeling out a series of Nazi propaganda, ended with "'Hail Trump! Hail our people!" and then, "Hail victory!" – the English translation of the Nazi exhortation "*Sieg Heil!*"'[74] His members responded with enthusiastic Nazi salutes. To be clear, the movement has always comprised neo-Nazis, white supremacists, anti-Semites and anti-immigration campaigners. It was later to take Trump up to four days to directly disavow the alt-right group.[75] But the disavowal was precious, given his campaign rhetoric, and early on, he had gone ahead to make many controversial appointments involving persons known to be racists or bigoted.

It came across with an uneasy déjà vu feeling when days before the elections, Trump got the improbable endorsement of the Slovenian philosopher, British political journalist Mehdi Hasan, calls 'the world's best known Leftist philosopher, best known Marxist', Slavoj Žižek.[76] Žižek is 'horrified at him [Trump]', yet, he goes ahead to insist that the latter would if elected, 'shake up the system' and trigger a 'big awakening' and force out fundamental changes in American politics.[77] Žižek has continued to defend Trump after the elections, but his influence on American politics is minimal, so we are probably able to overlook his vocal standpoint. However, he is not the only major thinker currently alive who backed Trump. In late September 2016, George Mason University (near Washington D.C. Buckley) Law Professor F.H. Buckley released a list of 130 Trump supporters that comprised a wide range of prominent American academics/philosophers, including Scott Soames of the University of Southern California and Daniel N. Robinson of Oxford University. While 'many of the people that appear on the list never gave their public endorsement of Trump', none has denied Buckley's list as well.[78] The list elicited a number of 'outraged and snarky' comments on social networks, but once again, it would seem history is only repeating itself here.[79] All of these are unsettling replications of events in Nazi Germany leading up to World War II and the Holocaust. Writing decades before the emergence of Trump, Leonard Peikoff warns:

> Many writers have noted similarities between America today and Germany before Hitler, then have shrugged off their own observations – succumbing to the notion, spread by today's intellectuals, that it is bad history to compare two different countries. The similarities, however, cannot be shrugged off. Our crisis is real. The crisis is the fact that our country, the United States of America …is now moving in Hitler's direction. There are differences between America and the Weimar Republic. Our future, as far as one can judge, is still indeterminate. But the current trend will not be checked unless we grasp, in terms of essentials, the ominous parallels between the two countries—and, above all, the basic cause behind those parallels. If we are to avoid a fate like that of Germany, we must find out what made such a fate possible. We must find out what, at root, is required to turn a country, Germany or any other, into a Nazi dictatorship; and then we must uproot that root.[80]

Conclusion

It bears restating that the Holocaust and the ills of World War II started first with words, before words gained more and more support, and then followed by deplorable actions. Trump is deep into his first term in power, and has continued to wax stronger in the kind of overt racism that has defined his life and career. The aggressive white nationalist/racist chant that traverses his public policies have gone beyond a matter of concern to non-European immigrant and non-European people, to one of outright dread.[81] Such people know they can't trust Trump, even as he continues to trample on hard won legacies of the civil rights movement. The big question is: how long does the world intend to look on as history gravitates inexorably towards repeating itself? And, how should we understand the less-than-noble role of philosophy and philosophers in particular in the making of contemporary Euro-American politics, as described here?

---

[1] William Wheeler, 2013, Fascism and ultranationalism on the rise in countries across Europe, http://pulitzercenter.org/reporting/fascism-and-ultranationalism-rise-countries-across-europe; Antonio Rondón, 2013, Ultra-nationalism in Europe: living with the enemy, http://theprisma.co.uk/2013/06/23/ultra-nationalism-in-europe-living-with-the-enemy/

[2] By the end of the Cold War in 1989, many intellectuals began to entertain the hope of global interdependence and one world political community. But reality is that in the North and elsewhere, fraternal politics and ethno-nationalist ideologies have continued to precipitate conflicts and wars, as well as determine electoral outcomes. Brexit and Trump are likely the final straw that breaks the globalist imagination in the North, or at least compels a rethinking of globalists' perspectives about world politics. Cf. Richard Pithouse, 2016, Democracy is taking a beating as right-wing forces consolidate their grip on power, http://mg.co.za/article/2016-07-20-00-democracy-is-taking-a-beating-as-right-wing-forces-consolidate-their-grip-on-power; Richard Pithouse, 2016, Liberalism's hold on the political imagination loosens as new forms of populism surge, http://mg.co.za/article/2016-10-06-00-liberalisms-hold-on-the-political-imagination-is-loosening-as-new-forms-of-populism-surge-to-the-fore.

[3] See for example, Robert Kuttner, 2016, Trump, Berlusconi and the populist movement, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-kuttner/trump-berlusconi-hitler-a_b_9344570.html

[4] See John McNeill 2016. How fascist is Donald Trump? There's actually a formula for that. Grading the billionaire on the 11 attributes of fascism. https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2016/10/21/how-fascist-is-donald-trump-theres-actually-a-formula-for-that/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.d538547fe168.

[5] Peikoff was obviously not thinking of Trump when he wrote, but his work is read here as anticipating Trump, see Leonard Peikoff, 1982, *The ominous parallels: the end of freedom in America*, New York: Meridian

[6] We agree with most of Peikoff's arguments here, but we do not see, as he does, that affirmative action and the like amount to 'reverse' racism, or that the solution to racial discriminations lies in 'a philosophy of individualism' per se. For the citation in-text, see Leonard Peitkoff, 1982, *The ominous parallels*, Chapter 15; also, http://www.peikoff.com/lr/home.htm; and http://www.peikoff.com/lr/interview.htm.

[7] Jens M. Krogstad, Jeffrey S. Passel and D'Vera Cohn, 2016, 5 facts about illegal migration in the US, http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/11/03/5-facts-about-illegal-immigration-in-the-u-s/

[8] Leonard Peikoff, 1982, *The ominous parallels,* p.8.

[9] Cf. Yvonne Sherratt, 2013, *Hitler's philosophers*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, passim.

[10] One important strand of argument omitted in this essay for want of space has to do with the very fact (as people in multi-ethnically divided societies are well aware of) that in spite of economic factors and the like, the outcomes of elections and other political situations are often, in the last analysis down to ethno-religious and other primordial calculations.

[11] Cf. Jonathan Freedland, 2016, Person of the Year shouldn't be Donald Trump – it's clearly Vladimir Putin, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/dec/09/person-of-the-year-trump-putin-dreams-brexit-us-election-aleppo-post-truth?utm_source=esp&utm_medium=Email&utm_campaign=GU+Today+main+NEW+H+categories&utm_term=203529&subid=20445612&CMP=EMCNEWEML6619I2.

[12] Hitler originally titled the infamous book thus: *Four and a Half Years (of Struggle) Against Lies, Stupidity and Cowardice*, see Yvonne Sherratt, 2013, *Hitler's philosophers*, p. 9 – 10.

[13] Adolf Hitler, 2000, *Hitler's table talk 1941 – 1944: his private conversations*, Norman Cameron and R. H. Stevens, Trans. New York City: Enigma Books, p.720; Yvonne Sherratt, 2013, *Hitler's philosophers*, passim.

[14] Yvonne Sherratt, 2013, *Hitler's philosophers*, p.16.

[15] Yvonne Sherratt, 2013, *Hitler's philosophers*, p. xviii & 20.

[16] Yvonne Sherratt, 2013, *Hitler's philosophers*, p. xviii

[17] The four articles are: Kant, I. 2007a [1764], Observations on the feeling of the beautiful and the sublime; Kant, I. 2007b [1775], Of the different races of human beings; Kant, I. 2007c [1785], Determination of the concept of human race; and Kant, I. 2007d [1788] On the use of teleological principles; most of the lectures are published in one volume: Kant, I. 2007e [1798], Anthropology from a pragmatic point of view.

[18] See Kant, I. 2007e [1798], Anthropology from a pragmatic point of view, p. 7: 319.

[19] See Palter, R. April 1995, Hume and prejudice, p. 7. The citation from Kant's work here is drawn from Kleingeld, P. Oct., 2007, Kant's second thoughts on race, p. 573.

[20] See Kleingeld, P., 2007, Kant's second thoughts on race, p. 573 – 74.

[21] See Kleingeld, P., 2007, Kant's second thoughts on race, p. 576; and Eze, E. C., 1997, Philosophy and the (post) colonial, p. 7.

[22] Kant, I. 2007a [1764], The beautiful and the sublime, 7: 255.

[23] Lucy Allais, 2016, Kant's racism, p.8 – 32.

[24] Every newlywed couple and soldiers fighting in the front were handed a copy, see Yvonne Sherratt, 2013, *Hitler's philosophers*, p.31; also https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mein_Kampf. Note also that as recent as January 2016, a new annotated version of the book sold out 4000 copies within a week, see Andy Eckardt, 2016, Adolf Hitler's *Mien Kampf* sells out after week on German bookshelves, http://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/adolf-hitler-s-mein-kampf-sells-out-after-week-german-n497211.

[25] Lawrence Birken, 1995, *Hitler as Philosophe: Remnants of the Enlightenment in National Socialism*, Westport, Connecticut and London: Praeger, p.72.

[26] Lawrence Birken, 1995, *Hitler as Philosophe*, p.73 – 74. Cf. Adolf Hitler, [1926] 1939, *Mien Kampf*, James Murphy, Trans. London, New York and Melbourne: Hurst and Blackett Ltd, Chapters XI and XII.

[27] Yvonne Sherratt, 2013, *Hitler's philosophers*, p. 40.

[28] In this article, we overlook many other lesser known and less influential German writers/artists like Richard Wagner, who were even more fanatical in their racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism.

[29] Leonard Peikoff, 1982, *The ominous parallels*, p.22.

[30] Hegel is cited here from Yvonne Sherratt, 2013, *Hitler's philosophers*, p.42.

[31] Adolf Hitler, [1926] 1939, *Mien Kampf*, p. 185, 238 and 249. Cf. Yvonne Sherratt, 2013, *Hitler's philosophers*, p. 42 – 43.

[32] Although in his writings and speeches, Hitler leaves no doubt about his avowed hatred for Marx and Marxists. See Yvonne Sherratt, 2013, *Hitler's philosophers*, p. 39 – 61.

[33] Barry Rubin, 2010, The strangest Antisemite of them all: the bizarre case of Friedrich Nietzsche, http://www.rubincenter.org/2010/12/strangest-antisemite-of-them-all-friedrich-nietzsche/, accessed Friday, November 25, 2016.

[34] Friedrich Nietzsche, 1997, *Daybreak: thoughts on the prejudices of morality*, Maudemarie Clark and Brian Leiter, Eds., R.J. Hollingdale, Trans., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p.205.

[35] Friedrich Nietzsche, 1997, *Daybreak*, p.206.

[36] Nietzsche is paraphrased here in Barry Rubin, 2010, The strangest Antisemite, http://www.rubincenter.org/2010/12/strangest-antisemite-of-them-all-friedrich-nietzsche/.

[37] Kant, I. 2003, What is enlightenment?, p. 55.

[38] Amartya Sen, 2006, *Identity & violence,* p. 104.

[39] See Lawrence Birken*,* 1995, *Hitler as philosophe: remnants of the Enlightenment in National Socialism*, Westport, Connecticut and London: Praeger, p.13.

[40] See Arthur Hertzberg, 1990, Voltaire and the Jews, http://www.nytimes.com/1990/09/30/books/l-voltaire-and-the-jews-590990.html, retrieved Tuesday, November 28, 2017; Roland Boer, 2015, Savage Peoples: the racism of Adam Smith in the Wealth of Nations, https://theconversation.com/savage-peoples-the-racism-of-adam-smith-in-wealth-of-nations-35675, retrieved Tuesday, November 28, 2017.

[41] Yvonne Sherratt, 2013, *Hitler's philosophers*, passim.

[42] Robert B. Louden, 2007, General Introduction, in *Immanuel Kant: Anthropology, history and education*, H. Wilson and G. Zoller. Trans., G. Zoller and R. B. Louden, Eds., Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore and Sao Paulo: Cambridge University Press, p. 3.

[43] Robert B. Louden, 2007, General Introduction, p.3.

[44] Robert B. Louden, 2007, General Introduction, p.3.

[45] Robert B. Louden, 2007, General Introduction, p.2.

[46] Robert B. Louden, 2007, General Introduction, p.8.

[47] Robert B. Louden, 2007, General Introduction, p.9.

[48] See Lucy Allais, 2016, Kant's racism, p.31.

[49] Adolf Hitler, [1926] 1939, *Mien Kampf*, p.305 – 307.

[50] Adolf Hitler, [1926] 1939, *Mien Kampf*, p.223 – 224.

[51] For an anthology representing this view, or views largely similar to it, see for example, Harrison, L. E. and Huntington, S. P. Eds., 2000, *Culture matters: how values shape human progress*.

[52] Emphasis added. Huntington, S. P. 1996, *The clash of civilizations,* p. 307.

[53] Italics in the original, Huntington, S. P. 1996, *The clash of civilizations,* p. 311, cf. Harrison, L. E. 2000, Introduction: Why culture matters, p. xvii – xxxiv; Huntington, S. P. 2000, Foreword: culture counts, p. xiii - xvi, and Landes, D. S. 1998, *The wealth and poverty of nations: why some are so rich and some so poor*.

[54] Theodore Roosevelt is cited in Huntington, S. P. 1996, *The clash of civilizations,* p. 306.

[55] Huntington, S. P. 1996, *The clash of civilizations,* p. 305 – 06.

[56] Ironically though, a multiculturalist position can be essentialist if it contends that society must work hard to promote difference and diversity mainly by protecting and preserving unique cultural wholes (though we are not able to take up this interesting argument here). For the citation, see Huntington, S. P. 2004, *Who are we?*, cited in Michaels, W. B. 2006, *The trouble with diversity*, p. 148

[57] Said, E. W. 2003, *Orientalism*, p. 349.

[58] Huntington, S. P. 1993, The clash of civilizations, cited and paraphrased in Michaels, W. B. 2006, *The trouble with diversity,* p. 146 – 47.

[59] Indeed, Huntington and Landes may not be representative dominant or even very influential scholars, but like Trump before he was elected, they express views that are clearly dominant and influential in the United States, even though mainstream scholarship and reportage frequently wish to understate or even ignore this. Also, it is apparent that those in the critical humanities generally do not take Huntington and his ilk seriously, the same way Trump was dismissed by much of the left-leaning establishment, but to what untoward consequences?

[60] Landes, David S. 1998, *The wealth and poverty of nations,* p. 514

[61] Landes, D. S. 1998, *The wealth and poverty of nations,* p. 513 – 16

[62] Jack Goldstone, 2000, Book review: the wealth and poverty of nations, p. 106.

[63] Emphasis added. Adolf Hitler, [1926] 1939, *Mien Kampf*, p.225 – 226.

[64] Huntington's conception of 'western civilization' is narrow and ultimately racist. Cf. Kwame Anthony Appiah, 2016, There is no such thing as western civilisation, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/nov/09/western-civilisation-appiah-reith-lecture, Accessed December 3, 2016.

[65] Note that Hitler spent large portions of *Mien Kampf* disparaging and demonizing Jews. See Ishaan Tharoor, 2016, New pro-Brexit ad gets linked to Nazi-era propaganda, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2016/06/16/new-pro-brexit-ad-gets-linked-to-nazi-era-propaganda/; also see http://www.timesofisrael.com/cameron-warns-against-dangerous-brexit-rhetoric/; http://hyperallergic.com/306366/uk-party-references-nazi-propaganda-in-pro-brexit-billboard/

[66] Indeed, as the reporter further added 'the poster is visually composed to incite fear of the unwashed masses walking towards the viewer of the image…. worse still, the picture mimics Nazi propaganda footage included in the first episode of Auschwitz: The Nazis and the 'Final Solution' (2005), a six-part BBC documentary (currently available on Netflix). See Seph Rodney, 2016, UK Party references Nazi propaganda in pro-Brexit billboard, http://hyperallergic.com/306366/uk-party-references-nazi-propaganda-in-pro-brexit-billboard/

[67] See Oliver Wright, 2016, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/eu-referendum-brexit-economy-latest-live-what-it-means-michael-gove-nazis-remain-leave-a7094931.html

[68] Amber Rudd, 2016, Amber Rudd's conference speech, http://blogs.spectator.co.uk/2016/10/full-text-amber-rudds-conference-speech/, Accessed December 3, 2016.

[69] Harry Cockburn, 2016, Amber Rudd's speech likened to Hitler's *Mien Kampf*, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/amber-rudd-conservative-party-conerence-hitler-mein-kampf-james-obrien-a7347251.html, *Independent*.

[70] See Harry Cockburn, 2016, Amber Rudd's speech; cf. Adolf Hitler, [1926] 1939, *Mien Kampf*, p.342.

[71] http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/12/donald-trumps-call-to-ban-muslim-immigrants/419298/

[72] See for example: http://edition.cnn.com/videos/politics/2015/12/08/donald-trump-muslim-ban-full-interview-part-1-newday.cnn/video/playlists/donald-trump-muslims/

[73] Homa Kahaleeli, 2016, 'A frenzy of hatred': how to understand Brexit racism, https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/jun/29/frenzy-hatred-brexit-racism-abuse-referendum-celebratory-lasting-damage; Miqdaad Versi, 2016,Brexit has given voice to racism – and many are complicit, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/jun/27/brexit-racism-eu-referendum-racist-incidents-politicians-media; Tobias Stone, 2016, History tells us what may happen next with Brexit and Trump, https://medium.com/@theonlytoby/history-tells-us-what-will-happen-next-with-brexit-trump-a3fefd154714#.376o2whs2

[74] In the same speech, a confident Spencer promised to go to college campuses to gain more supporters. See Joseph Goldstein, 2016, Alt-right gathering exults in Trump's Election with Nazi-era salute, http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/21/us/alt-right-salutes-donald-trump.html?_r=0. Accessed December 4, 2016.

[75] Sara Ganim, 2016, Why did Trump wait so long to reject the 'alt-right'?, http://edition.cnn.com/2016/11/22/politics/donald-trump-alt-right-waiting/

[76]http://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/upfront/2016/11/zizek-electing-trump-shake-system-161116062713933.html

[77] http://www.leftvoice.org/From-Farce-to-Tragedy-Zizek-Endorses-Trump

[78] Max Radwin, 2016, List of 130 Trump supporters show strong backing among prominent academics/authors, https://panampost.com/maxwell-radwin/2016/09/29/list-trump-supporters-academics-authors/

[79] Daniel McCarthy, 2016, Why I joined the list of intellectuals for Trump, http://www.spectator.co.uk/2016/10/why-i-joined-the-list-of-intellectuals-for-trump/

[80]We do not share much of Peikoff's objectivist/monarchist political convictions and his description of contemporary American society, least of all the avowal that United States is 'the freest, the most productive, and the most moral country…' But we are convinced that many of the 'ominous parallels' between the two countries are accurate. See Leonard Peikoff, 1982, *The ominous parallels*, p.9.

[81] See Jamiles Lartey 2018. Racism and Donald Trump: a common thread throughout his career and life. https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/jan/12/racism-and-donald-trump-a-common-thread-throughout-his-career-and-life. Also see David Leonhardt and Ian Prasad Philbrick, 2018. Donald Trump's racism: The definitive list.

References

Adolf Hitler, [1926] 1939, *Mien Kampf*.

Adolf Hitler, 2000, *Hitler's table talk 1941 – 1944: his private conversations*, Norman Cameron and R. H. Stevens, Trans. New York City: Enigma Books, p.720; Yvonne Sherratt, 2013, *Hitler's philosophers.*

Antonio Rondón, 2013, Ultra-nationalism in Europe: living with the enemy.

Arthur Hertzberg, 1990, Voltaire and the Jews.

Barry Rubin, 2010, The strangest Antisemite of them all: the bizarre case of Friedrich Nietzsche.

Daniel McCarthy, 2016, Why I joined the list of intellectuals for Trump.

Friedrich Nietzsche, 1997, *Daybreak: thoughts on the prejudices of morality*, Maudemarie Clark and Brian Leiter, Eds., R.J. Hollingdale, Trans., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

H. Wilson and G. Zoller. Trans., G. Zoller and R. B. Louden, Eds., 2007, *Immanuel Kant: Anthropology, history and education*, Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore and Sao Paulo: Cambridge University Press.

Harrison, L. E. and Huntington, S. P. Eds., 2000, *Culture matters: how values shape human progress*.

Harry Cockburn, 2016, Amber Rudd's speech likened to Hitler's *Mien Kampf*

Homa Kahaleeli, 2016, 'A frenzy of hatred': how to understand Brexit racism,

Huntington, S. P. 1996, *The clash of civilizations.*

Ishaan Tharoor, 2016, New pro-Brexit ad gets linked to Nazi-era propaganda.

Jack Goldstone, 2000, Book review: the wealth and poverty of nations.

Jens M. Krogstad, Jeffrey S. Passel and D'Vera Cohn, 2016, 5 facts about illegal migration in the US.

Jonathan Freedland, 2016, Person of the Year shouldn't be Donald Trump – it's clearly Vladimir Putin.

Joseph Goldstein, 2016, Alt-right gathering exults in Trump's Election with Nazi-era salute

Kant, I. 2007a [1764], Observations on the feeling of the beautiful and the sublime.

Kant, I. 2007b [1775], Of the different races of human beings.

Kant, I. 2007c [1785], Determination of the concept of human race.

Kant, I. 2007d [1788] On the use of teleological principles.

Kant, I. 2007e [1798], Anthropology from a pragmatic point of view.

Kleingeld, P., 2007, Kant's second thoughts on race

Kwame Anthony Appiah, 2016, There is no such thing as western civilization.

Landes, David S. 1998, *The wealth and poverty of nations.*

Lartey, J. 2018. Racism and Donald Trump: a common thread throughout his career and life.

Lawrence Birken*,* 1995, *Hitler as Philosophe: Remnants of the Enlightenment in National Socialism*, Westport, Connecticut and London: Praeger

Leonard Peikoff, 1982, *The ominous parallels: the end of freedom in America*, New York: Meridian.

Leonhardt, D. and Philbrick, I. P. 2018. Donald Trump's racism: The definitive list.

Lucy Allais, 2016, Kant's racism, *Philosophical Papers.*

Michaels, W. B. 2006, *The trouble with diversity: how we learned to love identity and ignore inequality*. New York: Metropolitan Books, Henry Holt and Company.

McNeill, J. 2016. How fascist is Donald Trump? There's actually a formula for that. Grading the billionaire on the 11 attributes of fascism.

Richard Pithouse, 2016, Democracy is taking a beating as right-wing forces consolidate their grip on power.

Richard Pithouse, 2016, Liberalism's hold on the political imagination loosens as new forms of populism surge.

Robert Kuttner, 2016, Trump, Berlusconi and the populist movement.

Said, E. W. 2003, *Orientalism*, London: Penguin.

Sara Ganim, 2016, Why did Trump wait so long to reject the 'alt-right'?

Seph Rodney, 2016, UK Party references Nazi propaganda in pro-Brexit billboard.

William Wheeler, 2013, Fascism and ultranationalism on the rise in countries across Europe.

Yvonne Sherratt, 2013, *Hitler's philosophers*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.