

SOVIET AND POST-SOVIET POLITICS AND SOCIETY

Edited by Dr. Andreas Umland

Roger Griffin, Werner Loh and
Andreas Umland, Eds.

Fascism Past and Present, West and East

*An International Debate on Concepts and Cases
in the Comparative Study of the Extreme Right*

With an afterword by Walter Laqueur



ibidem

Roger Griffin, Werner Loh and Andreas Umland (Eds.)

Fascism Past and Present, West and East

An International Debate on Concepts and Cases
in the Comparative Study of the Extreme Right

With an afterword by Walter Laqueur

SOVIET AND POST-SOVIET POLITICS AND SOCIETY

ISSN 1614-3515

Recent volumes

- 27 *Peter Koller*
Das touristische Potenzial von Kam"janec'–Podil's'kyj
Eine fremdenverkehrsgeographische Untersuchung der Zukunftsperspektiven und Maßnahmenplanung zur
Destinationsentwicklung des „Ukrainischen Rothenburg“
Mit einem Vorwort von Kristiane Klemm
ISBN 3-89821-640-3
- 28 *Françoise Daucé, Elisabeth Sieca-Kozłowski, (Eds.)*
Dedovshchina in the Post-Soviet Military
Hazing of Russian Army Conscripts in a Comparative Perspective
With a foreword by Dale Herspring
ISBN 3-89821-616-0
- 29 *Florian Strasser*
Zivilgesellschaftliche Einflüsse auf die Orange Revolution
Die gewaltlose Massenbewegung und die ukrainische Wahlkrise 2004
Mit einem Vorwort von Egbert Jahn
ISBN 3-89821-648-9
- 30 *Rebecca S. Katz*
The Georgian Regime Crisis of 2003-2004
A Case Study in Post-Soviet Media Representation of Politics, Crime and Corruption
ISBN 3-89821-413-3
- 31 *Vladimir Kantor*
Willkür oder Freiheit
Beiträge zur russischen Geschichtsphilosophie
Ediert von Dagmar Herrmann sowie mit einem Vorwort versehen von Leonid Luks
ISBN 3-89821-589-X
- 32 *Laura A. Victoir*
The Russian Land Estate Today
A Case Study of Cultural Politics in Post-Soviet Russia
With a foreword by Priscilla Roosevelt
ISBN 3-89821-426-5
- 33 *Ivan Katchanovski*
Cleft Countries
Regional Political Divisions and Cultures in Post-Soviet Ukraine and Moldova
With a foreword by Francis Fukuyama
ISBN 3-89821-558-X
- 34 *Florian Mühlfried*
Postsowjetische Feiern
Das Georgische Bankett im Wandel
Mit einem Vorwort von Kevin Tuite
ISBN 3-89821-601-2

Roger Griffin, Werner Loh and Andreas Umland (Eds.)

FASCISM PAST AND PRESENT, WEST AND EAST

An International Debate on Concepts and Cases
in the Comparative Study of the Extreme Right

With an afterword by Walter Laqueur

ibidem-Verlag
Stuttgart

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <<http://dnb.ddb.de>> abrufbar.

Frontcover picture: The flag (in colours reminiscent of the Nazi banner) of Russia's National-Bolshevik Party, co-founded by Aleksandr Dugin in 1993. The publications and activities of the NBP, especially during its early phase in 1994-1998, touch upon many of the issues discussed in this volume such as the relationship between classic and neo-fascism, new strategies of the postwar extreme right, and the nature of Dugin's ideology.

∞

ISBN: 978-3-8382-5674-0

© *ibidem*-Verlag
Stuttgart 2006
Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Dies gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und elektronische Speicherformen sowie die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Contents

	<i>Contributors</i>	13
	<i>Acknowledgements</i>	17
	<i>Instructions for the Reader</i>	18
	<i>Abbreviations</i>	19
	<i>Foreword by the Series Editor</i>	21
I	Main Article/Hauptartikel	
	Fascism's new faces (and new facelessness) in the „post-fascist“ epoch <i>Roger Griffin</i>	29
II	Critique/Kritik 1	
	Of fascism and idealising abstractions: Are all cats grey? <i>David Baker</i>	69
	Fascism and neo-fascism: Ideology and „groupuscularity“ <i>Jeffrey M. Bale</i>	78
	A critical response to Roger Griffin's „Fascism's new faces“ <i>Tamir Bar-On</i>	87
	Griffin's new consensus: A bit too minimal? <i>Alexander De Grand</i>	94
	Palingenesis and the rebirth of the study of fascism <i>Martin Durham</i>	99

The nature of fascism: or essentialism by another name? <i>Roger Eatwell</i>	104
Fascism and illiberalism <i>Peter Fritzsche</i>	110
Roger Griffin, social science, „fascism,“ and the „extreme right“ <i>A. James Gregor</i>	115
„Wiedergeburt“ – ein nationalistisches Geschichtsbild <i>Klaus Holz und Jan Weyand</i>	123
Der Blick über den Kanal <i>Siegfried Jäger und Alfred Schobert</i>	130
Too many „fascisms“? <i>Aristotle A. Kallis</i>	136
Der Faschismus als „Rache“ der Gegenmoderne <i>Melitta Konopka</i>	141
Ernst Nolte oder Max Weber: Braucht die Wissenschaft einen (Gott-)Vater? <i>Bärbel Meurer</i>	148
Recognising the enemy <i>Philip Morgan</i>	156
Faschismus – eine palingenetische Form von populistischem Ultra-Nationalismus? <i>Ernst Nolte</i>	161
Generic fascism and the historians <i>Kevin Passmore</i>	168

Commentary on Roger Griffin's „Fascism's new faces“ <i>Stanley G. Payne</i>	175
Der faschistische Proteus: Eine fortschrittliche Aufklärung aus England über das Wesen eines vielgesichtigen Phänomens <i>Friedrich Pohlmann</i>	179
Vom Schleimpilz zum Wurzelstock <i>Karin Priester</i>	188
Faschismus – praxeologisch: Ein Kommentar zu Roger Griffin <i>Sven Reichardt</i>	196
Understanding fascism as historically specific <i>David D. Roberts</i>	202
Neue Formen, neue Themen, alte Kernideologie? <i>Albert Scherr</i>	207
What is meant by „revolutionary“ fascism? <i>Robert J. Soucy</i>	212
Fascism again: In search of the right conceptualization of generic fascism <i>Mario Sznajder</i>	219
Konzeptionelle Grundfragen vergleichender Rechtsextremismus- forschung: Der Beitrag der Faschismustheorie Roger Griffins <i>Andreas Umland</i>	224
Locating fascism in time and space <i>Leonard Weinberg</i>	233
Schimmelpilze machen Käse, aber keine Faschismustheorie <i>Wolfgang Wippermann</i>	239

III Response/Replik 1

<i>Da capo, con meno brio: Towards a more useful conceptualization of generic fascism</i> <i>Roger Griffin</i>	243
---	-----

FIGURES

1 Organigram of top echelons and power-centres of the <i>NSDAP</i> in 1936	282
2 Organigram of French extreme right wing party and groupuscular organizations in 1992	283

IV Critique/Kritik 2

Generic fascism: An off-road vehicle mired in the conceptual mud; or speeding down the highway towards a greater understanding of Nazism? <i>David Baker</i>	285
---	-----

(Still) more on fascist and neo-fascist ideology and „groupuscularity“ <i>Jeffrey M. Bale</i>	292
--	-----

Roger Griffin and the conceptualisation of fascism <i>Martin Durham</i>	300
--	-----

Chiaroscuro or fascismo grigio? A response to Roger Griffin's <i>Da capo, con meno brio...</i> <i>Roger Eatwell</i>	304
--	-----

Once again on Roger Griffin and the study of „fascism“ <i>A. James Gregor</i>	311
--	-----

Faschistische Semantik und Organisationsstruktur <i>Klaus Holz und Jan Weyand</i>	319
--	-----

On „rebirth,“ „consensus,“ swords and other (academic) weapons <i>Aristotle A. Kallis</i>	326
Der rechte Neopopulismus als neues Gesicht des Faschismus <i>Melitta Konopka</i>	331
Reicht der „alte“ Faschismusbegriff oder brauchen wir einen „neuen“? <i>Bärbel Meurer</i>	339
Ein letzter Rückblick auf einige Fragen der „Faschismus-Diskussion“ <i>Ernst Nolte</i>	347
The essence of fascism <i>Kevin Passmore</i>	352
Zweitkritik eines doppelt amputierten Faschismusbegriffs <i>Friedrich Pohlmann</i>	360
Antwort auf die Replik von Roger Griffin <i>Karin Priester</i>	364
Die Praxis des Faschismus – kontextualisiert und historisiert <i>Sven Reichardt</i>	371
Roger Griffin, Ernst Nolte, and the historical place of fascism <i>David D. Roberts</i>	376
„Those Metaphors Again!“ Rhizom, Schleimpilz, Parasiten und die Arbeit am Text <i>Alfred Schobert und Siegfried Jäger</i>	381
Lack of response <i>Robert J. Soucy</i>	389

Still in search of the right conceptualization of generic fascism
Mario Sznajder 390

Einige Beispiele für die forschungspraktische
Relevanz der Griffinschen Taxonomie
Andreas Umland 395

What remains of the day?
Leonard Weinberg 402

Verteidigung und Kritik der ideengeschichtlichen
Faschismustheorie Roger Griffins
Wolfgang Wippermann 407

V Response/Replik 2

Grey cats, blue cows, and wide awake groundhogs: Notes towards
the development of a „deliberative ethos“ in fascist studies
Roger Griffin 411

VI Secondary Debate on Aleksandr Dugin

ROUND 1

Dugin *kein* Faschist? Eine Erwiderung an Professor A. James Gregor
Andreas Umland 459

Andreas Umland and the „fascism“ of Aleksandr Dugin
A. James Gregor 466

ROUND 2

Some addenda on the relevance of extremely right-wing ideas

Putin's new Russia

Andreas Umland 474

Response to Dr. Andreas Umland

A. James Gregor 481

ROUND 3

Classification, Julius Evola and the nature of Dugin's ideology

Andreas Umland 486

Once again on fascism, classification, and Aleksandr Dugin

A. James Gregor 495

Afterword

Walter Laqueur 501

Appendix

Fascism—borderless and red

Aleksandr Dugin 505

Contributors

David Baker is Senior Lecturer in Politics at the University of Warwick, UK.

Jeffrey M. Bale is Assistant Professor of International Policy Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, California, USA.

Tamir Bar-On is Professor of Politics and Sociology at George Brown College, Toronto, Canada.

Alexander De Grand is Professor of History at North Carolina State University, USA.

Martin Durham is Senior Lecturer in Politics at the University of Wolverhampton, UK.

Roger Eatwell is Professor of European Politics at the University of Bath, UK.

Peter Fritzsche is Professor of History at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA.

A. James Gregor is Professor of Political Science at the University of California at Berkeley, USA.

Roger Griffin is Professor in the History of Ideas at Oxford Brookes University, UK.

Siegfried Jäger is Professor Emeritus of Linguistics at the University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany.

Klaus Holz is Director of the Evangelisches Studienwerk e.V. at Villigst, Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany.

Aristotle Kallis is Lecturer in European Studies at Lancaster University, UK.

Melitta Konopka is a social psychologist at Bochum, Germany.

Walter Laqueur is Professor Emeritus of History at Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA.

Werner Loh is a Research Fellow in Social Sciences at the University of Paderborn, Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany.

Bärbel Meurer is Extraordinary Professor of Sociology at the University of Osnabrück, Germany.

Philip Morgan is a Senior Lecturer in Contemporary European History at the University of Hull, UK.

Ernst Nolte is Professor Emeritus of Modern History at the Free University of Berlin, Germany.

Kevin Passmore is Lecturer in History at the University of Cardiff, Wales, UK.

Stanley G. Payne is Hilldale-Jaume Vicens Vives Professor Emeritus of History at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA.

Friedrich Pohlmann is Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany.

Karin Priester is Professor of Sociology at the University of Münster, Germany.

Sven Reichardt is Professor of Contemporary History at the University of Konstanz, Germany.

David D. Roberts is Albert Berry Saye Professor of History at the University of Georgia, USA.

Alfred Schobert is Research Fellow in Social Sciences at the Duisburger Institut für Sprach- und Sozialforschung, Germany.

Robert J. Soucy is Professor Emeritus of History at Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, USA.

Mario Sznajder is Leon Blum Professor of Political Science at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel.

Andreas Umland is DAAD Lecturer in German Studies at the National Taras Shevchenko University of Kyïv, Ukraine.

Leonard Weinberg is Foundation Professor of Political Science at the University of Nevada, USA.

Jan Weyand is a Research Fellow in Sociology at the University of Erlangen-Nürnberg, Germany.

Wolfgang Wippermann is Professor of Modern History at the Free University of Berlin, Germany.

Acknowledgements

This debate was initiated by Dr Werner Loh in 2002 who invited Prof. Roger Griffin to submit a leading article as the basis for a forum discussion on the theory of fascism and its relevance to contemporary democracy, and who contacted a wide range of German- and English-speaking experts to participate. In 2003-2004, Dr Loh took on the considerable task of preparing the ensuing interventions for publication and circulating the replies over the course of two rounds of criticism and response. In 2004-2005, Dr Loh, in addition, permitted and accompanied three rounds of a secondary debate on Aleksandr Dugin between Prof. A. James Gregor and myself that had span off from the initial controversy over Griffin.

The entire discussion appeared in three issues of the volumes 15 and 16 of *Erwägen Wissen Ethik* (EWE, Deliberation Knowledge Ethics), previously *Ethik und Sozialwissenschaften: Streitforum für Erwägungskultur* (Ethics and Social Sciences: A Forum of Debate for a Deliberative Culture). This outstanding journal is published under the imprint of the Lucius & Lucius Verlagsgesellschaft mbH, Stuttgart.

In 2005, Dr Wulf D. v. Lucius, kindly, gave his permission for a reprint of the debate as a book. Dr Loh provided the texts and contributors' addresses and helped securing an agreement of all authors to a reprint.

Prof. Walter Laqueur is acknowledged for providing, on short notice, a thought-provoking afterword to the discussion.

My special thanks have to go to Christian Schön of *ibidem*-Verlag who generously offered favourable publishing conditions that made this project possible.

A.U.

Kyiv, March 2006

Instructions for the Reader

The quotations are the following:

- The main article is quoted as (Griffin ((XX))) or (Griffin (XX)).
- The response 1 and response 2 are referred to as (R 1 ((XX))) or: (R 1 (XX)); respectively (R 2 ((XX))) or: (R 2 (XX)).
- The critique 1 and the critique 2 are referred to as (Baker 1 ((XX))) or: (Baker 1 (XX)); respectively (Baker 2 ((XX))) or: (Baker 2 (XX)).
- The three rounds of the secondary debate are referred to as (Secondary Debate 1, 2 or 3 (XX)).

Abbreviations

AF	Action Française
AN	Alleanza Nazionale
BRD	Bundesrepublik Deutschland
BUF	British Union of Fascists (and National Socialists)
CEDA	Confederación Española de Derechas Autónomas
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CoE	Council of Europe
DAP	Deutsche Arbeiterpartei
DDR	Deutsche Demokratische Republik
DISS	Duisburger Institut für Sprach- und Sozialforschung
DKP	Deutsche Kommunistische Partei
ENR	European New Right
FN	Front National
FPÖ	Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs
GRECE	Groupement de Recherche et d'Études pour la Civilisation Européenne
GUD	Groupe Union Défense
GULag	Glavnoe upravlenie ispravitel'no-trudovyykh lagerei
IASL	Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur
JE	Jeune Europe
KPdSU	Kommunistische Partei der Sowjetunion
MSI	Movimento Sociale Italiano
NPD	Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands
NRW	Nordrhein-Westfalen
NS	Nationalsozialismus
NSDAP	Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei
PNF	Partito Nazionale Fascista
PPF	Parti Populaire Français
PSF	Parti Social Français
REP	Die Republikaner
RF	Russian Federation
RSI	Repubblica Sociale Italiana
SA	Sturmabteilungen

SPD	Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschland
SS	Schutzstaffel
UN	United Nations
UNIA	Universal Negro Improvement Association
UR	Unité Radicale
VS	Verfassungsschutz

Note: For the numerous abbreviations in Figure 2 on page 283, see Nicolas Lebourg „Les Nationalismes-révolutionnaires en Mouvements: Idéologies, propagandes et influences (France 1962-2002),“ thèse de doctorat, Université de Perpignan 2004.

Foreword by the Series Editor

In his 1996 survey of classic and neo-fascism, Walter Laqueur wrote that „[t]he prospects of the extreme Right in the former Soviet Union and Soviet bloc seem better than in most other parts of the world.“¹ Eight years later, the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe, Alvaro Gil-Robles, after two visits to Russia in 2004, reported to the CoE’s Parliamentary Assembly: „I would like to stress again that the widespread rise in xenophobia is most alarming. Excessive nationalism and the ideologies transmitted by parties and organizations attached to the extreme right are the main causes of this state of affairs.“² Aleksandra Radkovskaya, a psychologist at Moscow State University, in late 2005, argued that „[x]enophobia exists in many countries, but in Russia it has become a norm, a commonplace for the majority of the country.“³

The appearance of a volume of collected essays, statements and letters on fascism in a book series on post-Soviet politics might have seemed out of place a few years ago. However, as the above statements indicate, recent Russian affairs constitute a suitable context for the publication of a discussion of the notion of generic

-
- 1 Walter Laqueur, *Fascism: Past, Present, Future* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 178. Already in 1993, Assen Ignatow had noted: „One of the most important and dangerous spiritual events of the post-communist period is the ‘sudden’ resurgence of conservative-nationalistic fundamentalism and its messianic pretensions.“ See his paper „Das postkommunistische Vakuum und die neuen Ideologien: Zur gegenwärtigen geistigen Situation in Rußland,“ *Osteuropa* 43, no. 4 (1993): 311-327, here 313. The most important early analysis of the resurgence of Russian ultranationalism after the break-up of the Soviet Union was Walter Laqueur’s seminal *Black Hundred: The Rise of the Extreme Right in Russia* (New York: HarperCollins, 1993). One of the earliest warnings against the coming threat was the same author’s article „Russian Nationalism,“ *Foreign Affairs* 71, no. 5 (1992/1993), <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/19921201faessay5906/walter-laqueur/russian-nationalism.html>.
 - 2 *Report by Mr Alvaro Gil-Robles, Commissioner for Human Rights, on his Visit to the Russian Federation 15 to 30 July 2004, 19 to 29 September 2004* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2005), 67. At about the same time, the late Thomas Parland wrote that, „[i]n post-totalitarian Russia, the ideological climate has been gravitating more and more towards right-wing conservative values coloured by Russian nationalism.“ See his *The Extreme Nationalist Threat in Russia: The Growing Influence of Western Rightist Ideas*. RoutledgeCurzon Contemporary Russia and Eastern Europe Series 3 (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2005), 1.
 - 3 As quoted in *Financial Times*, 30th December 2005.

fascism and its relation to neo-fascism. The study of contemporary mainstream (and not only fringe) politics in Russia is a setting

- where „fascism“ is still a topical, and not only academic matter,
- where it is, as illustrated by numerous political and legal actions concerning the term „fascism,“ a concept of societal concern, and
- where the issues discussed below acquire more than a mere historical, cultural or sociological meaning.⁴

It is true that there is already a rather (too?) large number of collected works on fascism. Moreover, the below debate has already been published in three issues of *Erwägen Wissen Ethik* in 2004-2005.⁵ A few years before, the same journal had published two equally stimulating controversies on Wolfgang Ippermann's theory of fascism,⁶ and Ernst Nolte's philosophy of history,⁷ the former of which has, in the meantime, too been reprinted as a book.⁸ Already, in the late 1960s, a provocative essay by Gilbert Allardyce had triggered a series of responses reminiscent of the dispute below.⁹ Not to mention the hundreds of conference papers and journal essays on fascism reprinted in dozens of more or less voluminous collections, the most important of which—the massive five-volume *Fascism* within Routledge's *Concepts of Political Science* series—has been compiled by no other than Roger Griffin, the main protagonist in the debate published here.¹⁰

4 For some early indications, see Aleksandr A. Galkin, „Rossiiskii fashizm?“ *Sotsiologicheskii zhurnal*, no. 2 (1994): 17-27; *idem* and Iurii Krasin, „O pravom radikalizme v rossiiskom obshchestve,“ *Obozrevatel'*, no. 12 (1995): 52-58; Aleksandr Yanov, *Posle El'tsina: „Veimarskaya“ Rossiya* (Moscow: KRUK, 1995); Vladimir Ilyushenko, ed., *Nuzhen li Gitler Rossii? Po materialam Mezhdunarodnogo foruma „Fashizm v totalitarnom i posttotalitarnom obshchestve: ideynye osnovy, sotsial'naya baza, politicheskaya aktivnost'“*, *Moskva, 20-22 yanvarya 1995 goda* (Moscow: PIK, 1996).

5 Vol. 15, nos. 3 & 4 (2004); vol. 16, no. 4 (2005).

6 *Ethik und Sozialwissenschaften* 11, no. 2 (2000): 289-334.

7 *Erwägen Wissen Ethik* 13, no. 1 (2002): 75-172.

8 Wolfgang Ippermann and Werner Loh, eds., „*Faschismus*“ – *kontrovers*. *Erwägungskultur in Forschung und Praxis* 3 (Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius, 2002).

9 Gilbert Allardyce, „What Fascism is Not: Thoughts on the Deflation of a Concept,“ *American Historical Review* 84, no. 2 (1979): 367-398. Roger Griffin's essay „The Primacy of Culture: The Current Growth (or Manufacture) of Consensus within Fascist Studies,“ *The Journal of Contemporary History* 37, no. 1 (2002): 21-43—postulating the existence of a growing scholarly consensus about the definition of fascism—also provoked controversy that anticipated many of the issues raised in the *Erwägen Wissen Ethik* debate.

10 Roger Griffin in collaboration with Matthew Feldmann, eds., *Critical Concepts in Political Science: Fascism*. 5 Vols. (London: Routledge 2004). See also Roger Griffin, ed., *Fascism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1995); *idem*, ed., *International Fascism: Theories, Causes and the New Consensus* (London: Arnold, 1998).

If seen against such a background, adding yet another thick volume to shelves already overloaded with publications on comparative fascist studies may seem redundant. This would be wrong not only in view of the specific format of the *Erwägen Wissen Ethik* discussions distinguishing this journal's essay collections significantly from standard anthologies, and constituting a pioneering enterprise in contemporary Western humanities. As indicated, the endeavor gains also relevance in the light of recent developments in Eastern Europe. At least, within the study of Russia, researchers should still be grateful to be provided with one more update on comparative fascist studies, and to be able to follow a debate which deals prominently with some central issues in the assessment of current Russian trends, such as the question and degree of the comparability of inter-war and post-Cold War political phenomena,¹¹ and the significance of groupuscular and meta-political forms of ultra-nationalism in contrast to the movements and regimes that dominated European history between 1918 and 1945.

There is a second reason why such a volume appears well-placed within a German book series on Soviet affairs. The theory of totalitarianism claimed a number of important similarities between fascist and (purportedly) communist regimes—an approach that has, by now, become widely accepted by most scholars, including many in post-Soviet Russia. In Germany, furthermore, the concept of totalitarianism acquired a *political* role in as far as „anti-totalitarianism“ became a founding myth of the Federal Republic of Germany, and led to the emergence of a number of laws and procedures that inhibit the freedom of expression of both extreme right- and radical left-wingers to an, in the Western context, unusually high degree.

„Totalitarianism's“ special importance for German post-1945 patriotism may have been also a reason for the transformation, in West Germany, of the originally unpretentious (and, some may argue, in and as of itself empty) concept of „extremism“ into a whole new, nation-wide political science sub-discipline that is called *Extremismusforschung*—extremism studies—and has its own yearbook,

11 A brief discussion of the seminal essay on this issue somewhat reminds the *Erwägen Wissen Ethik* debates. See, Stephen E. Hanson and Jeffrey S. Kopstein, „The Weimar/Russia Comparison,“ *Post-Soviet Affairs* 13, no. 3 (1997): 252-283; Stephen D. Shenfield, „The Weimar/Russia Comparison: Reflections on Hanson and Kopstein,“ *Post-Soviet Affairs* 14, no. 4 (1998): 355-368; Jeffrey S. Kopstein and Stephen E. Hanson, „Paths to Uncivil Societies and Anti-Liberal States: A Reply to Shenfield,“ *Post-Soviet Affairs* 14, no. 4 (1998): 369-375.

book series, specialized journal, and section within the German Political Science Association.¹² Within „extremism studies,“ the state-typological concept of totalitarianism develops into the ideology-typological notion of „political extremism“ which asserts a fundamental similarity between radically ascriptive and ultra-egalitarian ideas. Right-wing rejections of the idea of democracy are seen as of the same kind as left-wing utopias about a more „just“ form of society (than liberal democracy). Marxism and racism appear as, fundamentally, alike insofar as they belong to one and the same genus—„political extremism.“¹³

Within this particular context, the publication of a book on fascism in a series on Soviet affairs is less of a surprise than it would have been in other national scholarly frameworks where „extremism“ might be a less prominent concept. If not only the regimes and states created by those leaders claiming to be particularly patriotic or especially universalistic are similar, as the theory of totalitarianism has been asserting for more than fifty years, but also their ideas are strongly likened to each other, as the concept of political extremisms claims—then „communism“ and „fascism“ are two sides of one medal. Many, if not most findings that comparative fascist studies have to offer should be also relevant to the study of communism. Within „extremism studies,“ this should concern not only institutions created and actions undertaken by „extremists“ (as the concept of totalitarianism had already suggested), but also their world views, biographies, psychology, culture, habits, etc.

A number of caveats have to be stated:

1. The main part of this debate was conducted in 2003-2004. Only A. James

12 *Jahrbuch Extremismus & Demokratie* 1-17 (1989-2006), [http://www.nomos.de/Schriftenreihe Extremismus und Demokratie 1-13 \(2001-2005\)](http://www.nomos.de/Schriftenreihe/Extremismus_und_Demokratie/1-13_2001-2005/), [http://www.nomos.de/Schriften des Hannah-Arendt-Instituts 1-29 \(1995-2006\)](http://www.nomos.de/Schriften/Hannah-Arendt-Institut/1-29_1995-2006/), http://www.tu-dresden.de/hait/publ_sch.htm; *Totalitarismus und Demokratie* 1-2 (2004-2005), <http://www.hait.tu-dresden.de/td/>; „Ad-hoc Gruppe ‘Politischer Extremismus’ in der DVPW,“ <http://www.politik.uni-mainz.de/dvpw-politischer-extremismus/>. See furthermore <http://www.extremismus.com/>.

13 Of course, there are adherents of the assumptions of German „extremism studies“ as well as similar research networks outside Germany too. For instance, the European Consortium for Political Research comprises an active Standing Group on Extremism & Democracy that publishes its own newsletter and book series. See <http://webhost.ua.ac.be/extremismanddemocracy/>. Yet, at least on the national level, it is only in Germany that this approach has been systematically developed into an entire study and research program with a refined conceptual framework and formidable institutional infrastructure.

Gregor's and my exchange of letters, documented as a „Secondary Debate,“ at the end of this book lingered into 2005. Therefore, the more recent literature on comparative neo/fascism and related issues discussed below¹⁴ as well as on Russian fascism and Aleksandr Dugin, the subject of the „Secon-

-
- 14 To name, in chronological order, but a few, for the various issues in the below discussion, potentially relevant English- and German-language studies which have appeared since 2004 and could thus not fully or not at all be incorporated here: François Furet and Ernst Nolte, *Fascism and Communism*. With a preface by Tsvetan Todorov. Translated by Katherine Golsan. European Horizons Series (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004); Robert O. Paxton, *The Anatomy of Fascism* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2004); Michael Mann, *Fascists* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Angelica Fenner and Eric D. Weitz, eds., *Fascism and Neofascism: Critical Writings on the Radical Right in Europe*. Studies in European Culture and History (Houndsmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004); Cas Mudde, *Racist Extremism in Central and Eastern Europe*. Extremism and Democracy Series (London: Routledge, 2004); Wolfgang Gessenharter and Thomas Pfeiffer, eds., *Die neue Rechte – eine Gefahr für die Demokratie?* (Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2004); Sven Reichardt, „Was mit dem Faschismus passiert ist: Ein Literaturbericht zur internationalen Faschismusforschung seit 1990. Teil 1,“ *Neue Politische Literatur* 49 (2004): 385-406; Armin Nolzen and Sven Reichardt, eds., *Faschismus in Deutschland und Italien: Studien zu Transfer und Vergleich* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2005); Wolfgang Wippermann, „Auserwählte Opfer?“ *Shoah und Porrajmos im Vergleich: Eine Kontroverse*. Geschichtswissenschaft 2 (Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2005); Leonid Luks, „Bolschewismus, Faschismus und Nationalsozialismus im Vergleich: Ein Skizze,“ in: Waltraud Schreiber, ed., *Der Vergleich: Eine Methode zur Förderung historischer Kompetenzen* (Neuried: ars una, 2005), 157-193, <http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/ZIMOS/Netzwerk/Dateien/BolschFaschNS.pdf>; Elisabeth Carter, *The Extreme Right in Western Europe: Success or Failure?* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005); Carlo Ruzza, *Reinventing the Italian Right: Territorial Politics, Populism and „Post-Fascism“* (Routledge, 2005); Chloé Lachauer, *Die dunkle Seite Europas: Rechtsextreme auf dem Weg zum politischen Akteur? Netzwerkbildung der Rechten in der Europäischen Union* (Marburg: Tectum, 2005); Pieter Klandermans and Nonna Mayer, eds., *Extreme Right Activists in Europe: Through the Magnifying Glass*. Extremism and Democracy Series (London: Routledge, 2005); Stefan Breuer, *Nationalismus und Faschismus: Frankreich, Italien und Deutschland im Vergleich* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005); Uwe Backes and Eckhard Jesse, *Vergleichende Extremismusforschung*. Extremismus und Demokratie 11 (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2005); *idem*, eds., *Gefährdungen der Freiheit: Extremistische Ideologien im Vergleich*. Schriften des Hannah-Arendt-Instituts 29 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006); Thomas Grumke and Thomas Greven, eds., *Globalisierter Rechtsextremismus? Die extremistische Rechte in der Ära der Globalisierung* (Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2006); Piero Ignazi, *Extreme Right Parties in Western Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); Roger Griffin, ed., *Fascism, Totalitarianism and Political Religion* (London: Routledge, 2006); George Michael, *The Enemy of My Enemy: The Alarming Convergence of Militant Islam and the Extreme Right* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2006); Richard Wolin, *The Seduction of Unreason: The Intellectual Romance with Fascism from Nietzsche to Postmodernism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006); Roger Eatwell, *Fascism and the Extreme Right*. Extremism and Democracy Series (London: Routledge, 2006); Cyprian Blamires, ed., *World Fascism: A Historical Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2006).

dary Debate,¹⁵ is not or only partly considered here.

2. The discussion is reproduced here almost exactly as it appeared in *Erwägen Wissen Ethik*. The nature of the exchange as consisting of direct responses to previous statements did not allow the editors to permit improvements or corrections by the authors in their original contributions. Such an option could have triggered a (potentially endless) chain reaction of alterations. We thus had to stick to the 2004 version.¹⁶
3. In connection with the latter issue, it needs to be emphasized that the 2003-2004 *Erwägen Wissen Ethik* controversy was a discussion conducted under some constraints concerning the deadlines for, and length of, the individual contributions. Except for Griffin's initial, main article, they had to be written under certain pressure—which, no doubt, the reader will sometimes feel. All participants had to make their statements relatively quickly, i.e. within

15 Mark Sedgwick, *Against the Modern World: Traditionalism and the Secret Intellectual History of the Twentieth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004); Stefan Wiederkehr, „‘Kontinent Evrasija’ – Klassischer Eurasismus und Geopolitik in der Lesart Alexander Dugins,“ in: Markus Kaiser, ed., *Auf der Suche nach Eurasien: Politik, Religion und Alltagskultur zwischen Russland und Europa*. Bibliotheca Eurasica 1 (Bielefeld: transcript, 2004), 25-138; Leonid Luks, „Eurasien aus neototalitärer Sicht – Zur Renaissance einer Ideologie im heutigen Russland,“ *Totalitarismus und Demokratie* 1, no. 1 (2004): 63-76; Marlène Laruelle, „The Two Faces of Contemporary Eurasianism: An Imperial Version of Russian Nationalism,“ *Nationalities Papers* 32, no. 1 (2004): 116-136; L.Ya. Dadiani, „Fakty i mysli o russkom fashizme: Diskurs,“ in: *idem* and G.M. Denisovskii, eds., *Sotsial'noe soglasie protiv pravogo ekstremizma 3-4* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo instituta sotsiologii RAN, 2005), 145-215; Vladimir Pribylovskii and Vyacheslav Likhachev, eds., *Russkoe Natsional'noe Edinstvo. V 2-kh tomakh*. Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society 10 (Stuttgart: ibidem-Verl., 2005); Anastasia V. Mitrofanova, *The Politicization of Russian Orthodoxy: Actors and Ideas*. Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society 13 (Stuttgart: ibidem-Verl., 2005); Leonid Luks, *Der russische „Sonderweg“? Aufsätze zur neuesten Geschichte Russlands im europäischen Kontext*. Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society 16 (Stuttgart: ibidem-Verl., 2005); Marlen Laryuël' [Marlène Laruelle], „Aleksandr Dugin, ideologicheskii posrednik,“ in: Aleksandr Verkhovskii, ed., *Tsena nenavisti: Natsionalizm v Rossii i protivodeistvie rassistskim prestupleniyam* (Moskva: Sova, 2005), 226-253; Aleksandr Verkhovskii, ed., *Putyami nesvobody* (Moskva: Sova, 2005); Andreas Umland, „‘Negrazhdanskoe obshchestvo’ v Rossii,“ *Forum noveishei vostochnoevropeiskoi istorii i kul'tury* 2, no. 2 (2005), <http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/ZIMOS/forum/docs/Umland%20richtig.pdf>; *idem*, „‘Konservativnaya revolyutsiya’: imya sobstvennoe ili rodovoe ponyatie?“ *Voprosy filosofii*, no. 2 (2006): 116-126.

16 This is also one of the reasons for leaving the German contributions in German language, as they were submitted originally. Some minor stylistic changes were made in all the contributions, and some sources were updated in the endnotes. The *Erwägen Wissen Ethik* contributions' formatting was slightly changed in order to secure greater uniformity. Apart from that, no changes to the initial debate were made. Only the foreword, afterword and appendix were added. The usual caveats concerning possible erroneous information or interpretation in the contributions apply.

three months or so. The contributions are thus not fully worked through journal papers, but can be thought of as interventions in a panel discussion of a paper delivered at a conference.¹⁷

4. The volume is, therefore, not the usual collection of extensively edited research papers, but a text that follows the aims of the *Erwägen Wissen Ethik* project as stated on the journal's WWW site.¹⁸ The purpose of *Erwägen Wissen Ethik* is to create a forum that allows scholars to debate key issues in a field of enquiry and move towards consensus, or, at least, reformulate the original questions and issues. The purpose is thus heuristic rather than adversarial—whatever the tone of certain interventions.

The particular value of the below protracted, complex, sometimes arid, some exhilarating controversy lies in highlighting differences in scholarly approaches to classic and neo-fascism as generic phenomena, and revealing what practical repercussions the various approaches have for an evaluation of individual cases ranging from late 19th-century German ultra-nationalism to early 21st-century Russian right-wing extremism. The debate's rationale is less to present new empirical findings or theoretical approaches, but to give some major specialists in the field the opportunity to „deliberate“ on them. It is the course, turns and tone of the exchange—rather than the (often already known) contents of the individual contributions—that might be the most interesting aspects of the following lively discussion.¹⁹

A.U.

Kyïv, March 2006

17 It should be mentioned though that, as Werner Loh has clarified to me, the debate's participants were not obliged to make their contributions and had, until a certain point, the opportunity to withdraw them. In other words, the discussants were always free to leave this debate. While the above caveat remains, the below statements can thus also not be regarded as somehow inadequate expressions of their authors' views.

18 <http://iug.uni-paderborn.de/ewe/konzept.htm>.

19 In an appendix, the debate is complemented with an English translation of a 1997 essay on fascism by Aleksandr Dugin. Dugin's article which became the subject of A. James Gregor's and my exchange (Secondary Debate) that span off from the discussion of Griffin. The text is both, a documentation of the point I tried to make in my critique of Gregor's evaluation of Dugin, and a peculiar additional contribution to our debate on fascism by somebody who actually subscribes (or, at least, claims to subscribe) to it.

I Main Article/Hauptartikel

Fascism's new faces (and new facelessness) in the „post-fascist“ epoch

Roger Griffin

Summary: The article offers a synopsis of a theory of fascism's definitional core and its evolution in the 20th century that is fully consistent with the „new consensus“ that has grown up in Anglophone fascist studies. Its main contestable features are that:

- a) its methodological premise is derived from Max Weber's theory of the „ideal type“ which rejects Marxist, essentialist, or metapolitical notions of the „fascist minimum;“
- b) it identifies this minimum in a core ideology of national rebirth (palingenesis) that embraces a vast range of highly diverse concrete historical permutations;
- c) while fully recognizing the singularity of Nazism, the application of this theory to the Third Reich categorizes it as an outstanding example of a fascist regime;
- d) its application to the post-war era identifies new variants of fascism that have evolved a long way from its inter-war manifestations, notably those associated with Third Position and the New Right;
- e) it postulates a major organizational transformation within post-war fascism since its extensive „groupuscularization,“ namely the emergence of „rhizomic“ qualities.

1 Not „fascism“ again! An apologetic preamble

((1)) The European New Right, so alarmed at the prospect of the comprehensive homogenization of culture in the wake of the inexorable process of globalization, should take comfort that there is no equivalent of McDonaldisation in the human sciences. On the contrary, they continue to host a steady proliferation of contested definitions, methodological assumptions, conceptual frameworks, and ethical