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Preface

Throughout the last decade of the twentieth century and into the first years of the twenty-first, a curious disposition manifested itself – particularly among Anglophone thinkers. They have attempted to address the issues of political violence, racial hatred, hostility to immigrants, the invocation of “Nazi-Maoist” strategies, mayhem at soccer games, and stupidities of sundry sorts – by conceiving them all as expressions of “neofascism.” Instances of “conservative,” “neoconservative,” “right-wing,” and “radical right-wing” political behavior were all equally imagined to be similarly neofascistic. What makes that exceedingly odd is the realization that it is very unlikely that all of it might plausibly be associated with historic Fascism. It would seem that we might expect better of serious scholarship.

Somehow or other, several lifetimes after Mussolini’s Fascism disappeared into history, its specter still troubles the research of some of our most industrious social scientists. They seem to find evidence of Fascism everywhere. Some find Fascism in the neofascism of the French “New Right.” Some find it in the American “Radical Right,” Reagan Republicans, and militia irregulars. Some find it in the neofascism of the “Stalinofascists” of Eastern Europe. Others seem to trace Fascism, as neofascism, to the “pathologically contorted idealism of religious fundamentalism.”

Other than all that, we are told that contemporary Fascism, as neofascism, is to be found in the guise of racism, sexism, sadomasochism, terrorism, and anti-Semitism, as well as among aficionados of heavy metal bands and “proletarian rock.” Wherever we find them, neofascists, we are told, entertain only two “absolute values”: violence and war. But for those two absolutes, neofascists, heirs of Fascism, entertain no discernible ideological convictions. We are told that neofascism is “inherently protean,” empty of content, always decked in “new guises.” It entertains no coherent thought.

It is a prevailing belief among many academicians that no coherent thought is possible among neofascists, because only the political left and traditional liberals really concern themselves with matters ideological. We
are informed that the political right (the genus, apparently, of which neofascism is a species) finds lucubration tedious. That is the case, we are told, because neofascism, like Fascism before it, is driven, almost exclusively, by hatred, fantasy, and occult impulse, to the exclusion of thought.

In fact, the study of neofascism, as it is presently conducted, leaves us with a ragbag of disappointments, fragments of analyses, and vague allusions to “radicalism” and “racism” as defining properties of a “right-wing extremism” that presumably provides the substance of inquiry – that frequently, and effortlessly, slips into talk of Nazism and the mass murder of innocents. All of this seems singularly unsatisfying.

The contemporary discussion of “neofascism” remains in that parlous state, providing scant satisfaction to those seeking credible information about a subject that would appear to have some immediate significance. To date, “neofascism studies” encompasses so wide a variety of topics that it is difficult, at best, to characterize its range or reference.

The work before you cannot pretend to resolve all the problems that attend so loosely jointed a study. It cannot pretend to advance a formal definition of the presumed subject matter. Neither Mussolini’s Fascism nor its putative modern heirs lend themselves to such characterization.

I am convinced that to attempt formal definitions in the informal disciplines of social science and history more often than not hinders rather than furthers inquiry. Discursive disciplines do not lend themselves to the rigors of more formal inquiry. To pretend otherwise is to deceive. So we are left with informal accounts, lacking rigor, that at best are calculated to persuade – much like the judgments tendered in civil courts that turn on the preponderance of evidence, rather than those verdicts of the criminal courts that require proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

Whatever its shortcomings, this work is offered with pedagogical intent. If nothing else, it may illustrate the limitations of current efforts to discuss “neofascism” as an academic subject. In my judgment, the greater part of the contemporary work devoted to neofascism leaves a great deal to be desired. My hope is that the ensuing pages offer something that, in some fashion or other, assuages at least some of those desires.
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