

8-2019

The Dangers of Rhetoric: Nationalism in The Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries

Diana L. Forry

Follow this and additional works at: <https://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Forry, Diana L., "The Dangers of Rhetoric: Nationalism in The Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries" (2019). *Theses and Dissertations (All)*. 1762.

<https://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd/1762>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Knowledge Repository @ IUP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (All) by an authorized administrator of Knowledge Repository @ IUP. For more information, please contact sara.parme@iup.edu.

THE DANGERS OF RHETORIC: NATIONALISM
IN THE TWENTIETH AND TWENTY-FIRST CENTURIES

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

Diana L. Forry

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

August 2019

© 2019 Diana L. Forry

All Rights Reserved

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of English

We hereby approve the thesis of

Diana L. Forry

Candidate for the degree of Master of Arts

Michael T. Williamson, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of English, Advisor

Thomas Slater, Ph.D.
Professor of English

Jutta Gsoels-Lorensen, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of English, German, and
Comparative Literature
Penn State University-Altoona

ACCEPTED

Randy L Martin, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: The Dangers of Rhetoric: Nationalism in The Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries

Author: Diana L. Forry

Thesis Chair: Dr. Michael T. Williamson

Thesis Committee Members: Dr. Thomas Slater
Dr. Jutta Gsoels-Lorensen

The dangers of Nationalist or Othering rhetoric were evident in Adolf Hitler's Third Reich government as they led to the Holocaust and the implementation of the Final Solution. Currently, it is concerning that the same language may be present in the United States under the government administration of President Donald Trump. This study, which is both qualitative and quantitative, seeks to discover whether similarities in language and rhetorical context between President Trump and Adolf Hitler exist. Further, this study also offers a historical analysis of the sociopolitical climate during both periods to determine what opportunities have allowed for dangerous language to be accepted and perpetuated by the larger population. The dangers of a Nationalist identity and attitude as they are presented in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries are also explored. Lastly, the study displays how Nationalist and Othering language is the cornerstone of absolute government control and can lead to forced relocation. Utilizing historian Timothy Snyder's *On Tyranny: Twenty Lessons from the Twentieth Century* and *Black Earth: The Holocaust as History and Warning*, this study places rhetorical analysis in conversation with his findings and builds upon them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members for their hard work, incredible suggestions, and sharing of knowledge. Without all of you, especially Dr. Michael Williamson, this would not have been possible. Certainly, Dr. Gail Berlin: your course started this all. Thank you for sharing your mother's story and showing that there was hope beyond Auschwitz. It is because of you that I will never stop believing that we, as academics and humans, can be the difference in the world that we desire.

To my family and friends: thank you for listening to my thoughts, no matter what you were doing or the time of day, for the past two years. You all encouraged this vision without hesitation, recognized its importance, and have pushed my thought process further than I could have ever imagined. Specifically, I would like to thank my parents. Your support of my education and dreams have been absolutely unwavering and, for that, I could never express how grateful I truly am.

To my wife and son: you have been my cornerstone. You are the reason that I will always strive to do better.

Lastly, to every single person who endured the horrors of the Holocaust: your stories will never be forgotten nor lost. Your truth will continue to be heard.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	DANGEROUS LANGUAGE IN PRACTICE	6
3	RISE TO POWER AND OTHERING RHETORIC	27
4	NATIONALISM AND IDENTITY	47
5	CONTROL, RESISTANCE, AND RELOCATION OF SPACE.....	73
6	CONCLUSION.....	106
	WORKS CITED	109

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Word cloud of shared themes between Chapter XI and President Trump's speeches	19
2	Word cloud of President Trump's 2015 announcement speech	21
3	Word cloud of Chap. XI from Adolf Hitler's <i>Mein Kampf</i>	21

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The need for this study came from the concern that began during President Donald Trump's election campaign. His use of language and rhetorical practices seemed pointed, aggressive, and worrisome on a multifaceted level. The way he referenced women, minorities, opposing political candidates, and other countries in a dismissive and superior manner was offensive and seemed to encourage a replication of this behavior. Initially, it was because of these bold and derogatory rhetorical practices that I, the researcher, felt that Donald Trump would not win the 2016 presidential campaign. As history displays, he did.

As Trump's presidency has continued, I have found his use of rhetorical practices to be alarming. Specifically, the way he continues to address those who are often considered minorities and how he uses Twitter to reach the people of the United States rather than holding set press conferences to update the country on issues and progress that is being made. During the conferences that have been held, President Trump has ignored or verbally attacked news reporters who openly question or oppose his decisions. This was concerning and appeared to teeter on the edge of the American constitutional rights to freedom of speech and freedom of the press. In turn, I felt that President Trump's language and reactions to the language of others had a Nationalist overtone.

This concern was further compounded when discussing the sociopolitical climate of Nazi Germany in Dr. Gail Berlin's Holocaust literature course at the Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Adolf Hitler was a renowned Nationalist who pushed his political agenda and ideology to the extent that millions of Jewish people and other minorities were forcefully relocated, imprisoned, and executed. To me, one of the most shocking aspects of Hitler's rise to

power and the persecution of Others was that his ideologies were willfully supported. The influence of Nazi rhetoric was so strong that individuals voluntarily served in the discourse of Hitler's Final Solution and encouraged his implementation of Nationalism despite the cost of human life. The rhetorical strategies of Adolf Hitler were discussed throughout the course, leading to the discussion of dangerous language, and its manifestation in Donald Trump's presidency. This feeling was cemented further after the class read and discussed Timothy Snyder's *On Tyranny: Twenty Lessons from the Twentieth Century*. Snyder's book addressed my concerns and the capability that was present in the United States political climate to replicate Adolf Hitler's Nazi Germany. The dangers of Nationalism via rhetorical practice and language appeared glaringly obvious considering Snyder's observations, and that conversation was present in the classroom, but seemed to be otherwise ignored. President Trump's behavior and comments were, and still are, an element of his presidency that have generated a large amount of discussion and controversy. However, these discussions or news reports did not seem to address the potential for danger that President Trump's rhetorical practices could ignite.

I felt that this was a direly important issue that needed to change as language is largely influential to people on a variety of levels whether society is aware of it or not.

Individuals encounter and find value in different types of rhetorical practices every day: people see a quote and associate a personal value with it, literature engages fantasy and opens other worlds, graffiti has a specified message based on the receiving culture, a card can express sympathy or hope through design; there is a duality to language within rhetorical practice. The presence of duality inspired the following thoughts: the power of language, the ability for its meaning to change based on rhetorical context, and its ability to be manipulated.

Therefore, I found the need to truly explore the presence of Nationalist language, the context in which it was situated, and its potential for danger. This would aid in the understanding and identification of harmful rhetorical practices so that another Holocaust does not take place. Having the ability to recognize dangerous language and rhetorical practices goes beyond political positioning and is an integral part of being a good global citizen. Recognizing and resisting targeted language becomes a human rights issue that should concern the entirety of a nation. Building upon Timothy Snyder's *On Tyranny: Twenty Lessons from the Twentieth Century* and *Black Earth: The Holocaust as History and Warning*, this study uses these texts as guides to explore the history of Nationalism in Hitler's Nazi Germany and the current use of similar rhetoric. Therefore, this discourse comes at a critical moment of history in the United States. Without language recognition, resistance may come too late and the unthinkable has the potential to reoccur.

The following study is divided into four chapters of discussion. Chapter Two is a brief study that seeks to identify Nationalist or Othering rhetoric. A section of Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and three of President Trump's speeches were used to identify specific phrases that embodied Nationalist or Othering rhetoric. This was accomplished by loading these primary sources into the computer program, NVivo, and searching for keywords. NVivo also aided in identifying the rhetorical context that these keywords were found in. Further, a brief history of rhetorical practice within politics is also discussed. Details of the computer program, the methodology of the study, a literature review, and its results can be found in the second chapter.

Chapter Three further analyzes the historical rise of power with the Nazi Regime and the Trump administration. Specifically, this chapter addresses the question of how this was possible. Hitler was placed in a position of power that allowed for him to implement the Final Solution

with support but how could something so inhumane take place? Why didn't more resist his Nationalist rule? Chapter Three attempts to answer these questions and understand the presence of Nationalist or Othering rhetorical practices as they were present in that rise. The chapter also explores how harmful language was a part of President Trump's election. Overall, the chapter analyzes how individuals manipulate language and may present blatantly dangerous language as a cornerstone to their rhetorical practices, yet, they are still placed in positions of power by the people.

The fourth chapter delves further into the dangers of Nationalist language, identity, and its duality. Nationalism has a natural sense of duality because it raises one group while disregarding another. The consequences of this trait can be catastrophic to those who are placed in the Other category. On the other hand, those that fully embrace and practice Nationalism may feel falsely entitled to a sense of superiority as evidenced through Helga Schneider's *Let Me Go* and current Nationalist groups. The acceptance of Nationalism is also to accept a course of persecution. This again places emphasis on the importance of identifying harmful language and its potential.

Chapter Five, the last discussion chapter, examines the final result of accepting and perpetuating Nationalism: control, resistance, and forced relocation. Language and rhetorical practices can create invisible and physical borders that act as a form of containment to minority groups. The result of forced relocation in Hitler's Germany, as evidenced through the literature of Charlotte Delbo and Dawid Sierakowiak, was the implementation of ghettos and concentration camps. In the contemporary sociopolitical climate of the United States, danger rhetoric is present that has allowed for the establishment of inhumane government policies which create dangerous borders.

In conclusion, this study has sought to search the potential similarities of Nationalist and Othering language within a specific rhetorical frame as they existed in Adolf Hitler's Nazi Germany and may exist in the current sociopolitical climate of the United States under the presidency of Donald Trump. Holocaust and World War II literature also serves as a historical warning to the entirety of humanity so that another Holocaust never occurs. These warnings are applicable to the current social and political climates of the United States. The Nationalist identity invoked through rhetoric that swept through the Third Reich during the Second World War are also currently displayed through the rhetoric of President Donald Trump. Further, the support that President Trump has garnered despite the consistent use of inaccurate statements and false claims marks a harmful but accepted Nationalist language. The twentieth century was irreparably damaged by the employment of Othering or Nationalistic language and the twenty-first century is currently subject to the same danger. If society, especially the American public, does not heed the historical warning or recognize the harmful rhetoric that Holocaust and World War II literature propose; there is an unadulterated risk to the well-being of humanity. By gaining the ability to recognize the potential of risky language, individuals will also learn the skills to avoid perpetuating abusive and manipulative rhetoric.

CHAPTER 2

DANGEROUS LANGUAGE IN PRACTICE

Introduction

This chapter will explore the use of language and rhetorical practices in politics and how they are informative of identity. Although language studies within politics is not a new area of discourse, the current sociopolitical climate in the United States has regenerated a conversation regarding the role that language plays in the political realm. When President Donald Trump announced that he would run for presidency, a discussion about his language and rhetorical practices were generated among the general public and academia. That dialogue has continued throughout his presidency and remains a central focus of the role that language plays in politics.

The following study will examine the rhetorical practices of President Donald Trump during the election campaign and after he took office. The need for this study comes with the conversation regarding President Trump's utilization of language as his rhetoric has been questioned as being inflammatory and discriminatory. Regarding Trump's language being of these characteristics, individuals have felt that President Trump has created a state of Otherness amongst the general population and perpetuated a Nationalist agenda. This is incredibly problematic as Othering and Nationalism promotes a singular identity as being acceptable. All other identities are considered unwelcome, inferior, and problematic. Therefore, there is also the underlying implication that these Other identities should be removed.

This is also the ideology that also ruled Adolf Hitler's Germany. The Third Reich government and its leader encouraged the promotion of an Aryan identity and the removal of all others by language. Hitler's *Mein Kampf* is full of Othering rhetoric that specifically targeted the Jewish population and other minorities. This Nationalist identity was so thoroughly instilled

among the Germans that it led to the Holocaust during which 6 million Jewish people and 11 million others who had been deemed unfavorable (“Documenting Numbers”) were systematically persecuted and executed by the Nazi government. Hitler relied heavily on language to accomplish this unfathomable practice.

Timothy Snyder, author of *On Tyranny: Twenty Lessons from the Twentieth Century* and *Black Earth: The Holocaust as History and Warning*, specifically addresses Hitler’s exploitation of language. He takes this a step further in *On Tyranny* by also discussing the rhetoric of President Trump. According to Snyder,

Victor Klemperer, a literary scholar of Jewish origin, turned his philological training against Nazi propaganda. He noticed how Hitler’s language rejected legitimate opposition: The people always meant some people and not others (the president uses the word in this way), encounters were always struggles (the president says winning), and any attempt by free people to understand the world in a different way was defamation of the leader (or, as the president puts it, libel). (*On Tyranny* 60)

Identifying this language and its potential to be, not only problematic, but dangerous is key to preventing a catastrophic event like the Holocaust from reoccurring.

This study explores the rhetoric of Adolf Hitler and Donald Trump to identify any similarities that may exist. Further, an analysis was performed of the context in which any parallels existed. This study seeks to explore the legitimacy of Snyder’s claims and evaluate the use of rhetoric in politics as Rosina Lippi-Green asserts. Lippi-Green’s *English with an Accent* plays a theoretical role in this study that helps to frame and situate how language varies amongst political parties, individuals, and the media. This study uses primary sources to uncover

Nationalist language and analyze its rhetorical context because it is necessary, at a societal and individual level, that people have the ability to recognize Othering and Nationalistic language.

Literature Review

Four primary sources were used in this study. Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and three of President Donald Trump's speeches: his presidential announcement speech from 2015, a border wall speech from early 2019, and the 2019 State of the Union address. The primary sources will be further discussed in the methodology section. However, supporting secondary sources are explored and evaluated in the literature review.

The secondary sources used in this study have helped lay its foundation and argument. These sources aid in identifying language, rhetorical practices, and their characteristics as they exist in politics. Further, these secondary sources were also used to establish how rhetoric can create or remove identity.

Timothy Snyder's *On Tyranny: Twenty Lessons from the Twentieth Century* also serves as a cornerstone to exploring the parallels of language and rhetorical practice in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Snyder produced this text to draw attention to the parallels between the state of Nazi Germany and the sociopolitical climate of the United States during President Trump's election. Chapter 17, "Listen for danger words," specifically addresses language. Snyder writes that society needs to "[b]e alert to the use of words *extremism* and *terrorism*. Be alive to the fatal notions of *emergency* and *exception*. Be angry about the treacherous use of patriotic vocabulary" (99). The author warns that these words and similar language are applied to incite fear and used as a tool "to surrender freedom in the name of safety" (Snyder 100). Further, Snyder points out that this was a key rhetorical strategy of the Nazi party to gain the support of the German population. It is "[a] Nazi leader [who]

outmaneuvers his opponents by manufacturing a general conviction that the present moment is exceptional, and then transforming that state of exception into a permanent emergency. Citizens then trade real freedom for fake safety” (Snyder 100). Additionally, it is the tyrant who speaks of extremism but “they just mean people who are not in the mainstream—as the tyrants themselves are defining that mainstream at that particular moment” (Snyder 101). The points that Snyder makes in this chapter also have the potential applicability to President Trump’s use of rhetoric. This study seeks to find if Snyder’s claim holds legitimacy.

Snyder made a similar assertion in *Black Earth: The Holocaust as History and Warning*. There is a precise piece of language that Snyder draws attention to in the history of Hitler’s reign: the use of the term *Volk*. *Volk*, which translates to English as people or folk, was at the core of Hitler’s Othering and Nationalist rhetoric. According to Snyder, “The definition of the domestic was that which had to be manipulated to destroy what is foreign. Germany itself had no context. The idea of the people, the *Volk*, was there to persuade Germans to throw themselves into their murderous destiny as a race. The people were only what they proved themselves to be, which without struggling was nothing” (144). Use of the word *Volk* by Hitler was a manipulation of language that referenced only the German people. The term was used to perpetuate the Nazi ideology that “[t]he definition of the domestic was that which had to be manipulated to destroy what [was] foreign” (144). In other words: the domestic, applicable only to true Germans, was necessary to remove the foreign or Others that would destroy their culture and way of life with their presence.

The term *Volk* worked in conjunction with Hitler’s use of *Lebensraum*. *Lebensraum* held multiple meanings in the context of Hitler’s politics, however, each context was linked to the concept of space. According to Snyder, “Hitler’s merger of science and politics took the

name *Lebensraum*: ‘habitat’ or ‘ecological niche.’ Races needed ever more *Lebensraum*, ‘room to live,’ in order to feed themselves and propagate their own kind ... At the same time, *Lebensraum* also meant ‘living room,’ with the connotations of comfort and plenty in family life” (321). For Hitler, *Lebensraum* and its concept meant there was room for only one party; “*Lebensraum* thus brought together two claims: that human beings were mindless animals who always needed more, and jealous tribes who always wanted more. It confused lifestyle with life itself, generating survivalist emotions in the name of personal comfort” (Snyder 321-322). This works in conjunction with Chapter 17 from *On Tyranny*. The invocation of specified language in certain contexts invokes a feeling of fear of the Other. It causes for one party or identity to be raised above another without legitimacy.

Placing Snyder’s concepts together formed the foundation of this study and responds to the idea of literacy practices. In politics, language is relied upon as the primary tool that is used to reach the people. Politicians, especially in the United States, travel throughout the country utilizing their rhetorical appeals to relay who they are and what they stand for. This requires that one, at the least, be capable of employing basic literacy practices. However, language has the potential to become dangerous when it is intentionally manipulated in a harmful manner. The term “people” or “the people” and the concept of the appropriation of space based on identity is evident in Hitler’s *Mein Kampf* but it also seems to be present in President Donald Trump’s literacy practices. This has prompted the need for this study and to identify potentially dangerous rhetoric.

Rosina Lippi-Green’s *English with an Accent* explores how language contributes to politics. Chapter 8, “The information industry,” was specifically used for this purpose. Lippi-Green discusses the use of spin in mass media and by politicians and maintains that a large voice

of authority in language are media representatives as they broadcast the identity that language can portray. The media “plays a major role in the stability and perpetuation of the nation-state, and the way language serves as both a tool and a target in that process” (Lippi-Green 131). Adolf Hitler took control of the media and only distributed propaganda that promoted German Nationalism and denounced the Jewish population. Meanwhile, President Donald Trump has repeatedly attacked the news outlets and media, specifically the liberal or Democratic media, as portraying him incorrectly. He has accused them of being biased and perpetuating fake news and false information to support their own agenda.

Considering this allegation, it was important to understand the role that language plays within politics and political media. Regarding opinion, spin, and propaganda, Lippi-Green asserts that “[e]verybody practices spin in communication” (133) and that “[o]bjectivity is a theoretical concept and hardly attainable in real-world communication, even by the best trained, widely experienced and most profession and sincere journalist” (132). This is due to the “theoretical *purely objective* to *purely subjective*. On this continuum, *spin* sits somewhere between the center point and the purely subjective” (Lippi-Green 133). In other words, people have an opinion, and this is reflected in their reports. It is unavoidable because individuals are prone to stand by their ideologies or report an event from the way they perceive it. The example the author utilizes is about how one may speak to their co-workers concerning an unfavorable performance review. The individual may begin “with the fact that [they] had the flu that day” (Lippi-Green 133) and that may have contributed to the poor review. Essentially, everyone uses spin as a form of persuasion even within a low-level context. It is significant that one understands spin, so they have the ability to distinguish between spin and language manipulation.

Spin is unavoidable and not only applicable to the media but also to the individual who is speaking.

Lippi-Green demonstrates this by analyzing the 2008 presidential election as “[t]here was a striking and unprecedented contrast between candidates in 2008” (136). In the 2008 election, there was a specific focus on Governor Sarah Palin and Senator Barack Obama and the news outlets, based on their political affiliation, reported accordingly. Lippi-Green states that, “[o]n one extreme (the conservatively oriented Fox news programs) news reporters and commentators were very positive about Governor Palin and negative about Senator Obama; MSNBC News reporters and commentators took the opposite stance” (136). However, “[w]hen rhetoric got out of hand, responsible media and watchdog organizations that set out to correct the public record were usually lost in the roar of the crowd” (Lippi-Green 136). This may be evidenced throughout the history of politics as party supporters parrot a specified political agenda, but Lippi-Green takes the 2008 presidential election a step further by also analyzing the rhetoric of the individual politician and the way their language was generally regarded.

Politicians rely on language, rhetorical practices, and spin to reach their supporters as this is a crucial aspect of engaging the audience. Sarah Palin, for example, “was presented as a small-town, working-class American mother with a no-nonsense approach to politics. At the same time, she accused her Democratic opponents of being too removed from ‘real Americans’ to know what was needed. She emphasized the difference (as she saw it) between city and country, secular and non-secular, and the classes” (Lippi-Green 136). Senator Obama, on the other hand, was presented in a completely different light. Lippi-Green states that “[d]uring the campaign detractors often used ‘arrogant’ and ‘elite’ in their criticisms of Obama” (143) and that he was too articulate for a person of color. Senator Harry Reid was specifically criticized for his

comments regarding the way Senator Obama spoke. Although they were both members of the Democratic party, Senator Reid stated that Obama was “‘light skinned’ and that he spoke ‘with no Negro dialect, unless he wanted to have one’” (Lippi-Green 143). Therefore, it is not just the media’s rhetorical practices that may be questioned but also the individuals.

“The information industry” chapter by Lippi-Green plays an important role in this study. Lippi-Green presents two important ideologies that exist in the propaganda of politics: “The first is George Orwell’s extensive writing on the subversion of power by means of language manipulation, most particularly by the media in reporting on politics. The second is the concept of doublespeak ... which William Lutz describes as deliberate, calculated misuse of language” (134). The latter is at the center of this study. Although spin exists across politics and media regarding politics, the direct manipulation of language is intentional and harmful.

“The effects of traditional news, partisan talk, and political satire programs on perceptions of presidential candidate viability and electability” by Jones, Brewer, and Young was employed to further explore Lippi-Green’s chapter. This article helps to address Lippi-Green’s ideas referencing media and spin in media and how it effects political candidates. The researchers explore how “when voters are able to evaluate candidate viability and electability, they typically rely on media coverage of early contests in doing so” (172) and, in turn, how politically geared satire programs impact the general population’s “assessments of candidate viability and electability” (174). Jones et al. produced three hypotheses in response to this question: “H1: Viewing coverage of a candidate winning a caucus or primary will increase perceptions of the winner’s viability” (174); “H2a: Viewing conservative-oriented political talk show coverage of caucuses/primaries will lead to increased perceptions of Republican candidates’ electability, relative to viewing other (or no) coverage” (175); “H2b: Viewing

satirical news show coverage of caucuses/primaries will lead to decreased perceptions of Republican candidates' electability, relative to viewing other (or no) coverage" (175). These hypotheses were tested via survey with 1,060 research participants (Jones et al. 177) on the 2012 Iowa Republican caucuses with the following media outlets or shows: ABC World News, Hannity, and The Daily Show with Jon Stewart. The findings of this study showed "that media coverage of early nomination contests carries significant consequences for viewers perceptions of candidate viability and electability" (Jones et al. 181). Further, results also "suggest that the distinctive frames used by different media genres can carry consequences for public perceptions but also that differences across genres in framing may need to be considerable to matter" (Jones et al. 182). The Jones et al. study solidifies the need to rely on primary texts rather than reports from media in the study of rhetorical similarities of Othering and Nationalism between Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and President Donald Trump's speeches.

Methods

Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* was completed in two sections: Volume One and Volume Two. The first half was written while Hitler was a political prisoner, prior to taking control of Germany's government, and was published in 1925. Volume Two was published a year later in 1926. The section used in this study comes from Chapter XI of Volume One, titled "Nation and Race." In the span of just 45 pages, Hitler focuses his argument on the rise of the Aryan race and the erasure of the Jewish people. He specifies in this chapter why he felt the Jewish people were to blame for the downfall of Germany's government and its people. This theme is common throughout both volumes, but it is a core component of this chapter specifically.

Chapter XI was chosen for this reason. Because this study seeks to explore any similarities in language that may exist between Adolf Hitler and Donald Trump regarding Othering and

Nationalistic rhetoric, those qualities would be largely prominent in this section. Chapter XI is not a biased selection but one that potentially has the most compact and representative sample of Hitler's perpetuation of harmful Othering and Nationalist language.

As the chapter from *Mein Kampf* was larger in page number, this determined the need to choose three separate speeches from President Trump so the comparison sample would be as equal as possible. The presidential announcement speech was chosen because for two reasons. First, it shows what language President Trump relied upon prior to winning the election and to appeal to a specified group of people. As a political candidate cannot possibly win the favor of every single citizen, they often target groups that they feel will support them. The second reason the announcement speech was chosen was the controversy it caused because of targeted language. This is when President Trump, as a political candidate, first faced criticism for the way that he spoke about other nations and their people. However, the border wall speech was selected for its content due to President Trump's insistence that a border wall between Mexico and the United States is necessary for the safety of all Americans. He referenced problems at the U.S.-Mexican border heavily in his announcement speech, spoke unfavorably of the Mexican people, and this theme has continued to dominate his presidency. The content of President Trump's border wall speech is, therefore, inherently built upon his idea that a wall that separates two countries is necessary for the purpose of protecting only one of those nations. Lastly, the 2019 State of the Union address was chosen because of its purpose. Presidents give State of the Union addresses to inform the American people of the progress of the country. If President Trump continues to find people from other nations to be problematic to the growth of America, then this theme should continue throughout his presidency and would likely be present in his State of the Union speech.

Due to Lippi-Green's insistence that spin is unavoidable, primary sources were chosen to study language as perpetuated by the source rather than the media. Regarding President Donald Trump, this was an important factor that was considered because news outlets tend to align with either the Democratic or Republican Party and would have an unavoidable bias because of that alignment. The purpose of the study is not to find fault with the current president but rather to find similarities in Othering or Nationalist rhetoric if they exist because of the danger that language can present. It was not to explore the opinion of the media or the way that President Trump has been portrayed. Additionally, a comparison is not being drawn between Donald Trump and Adolf Hitler but the focus is solely on language and rhetorical context. It is these two elements, specifically, that can produce dangerous language.

The next step in the study process was to find a program that would have the ability to run a comparison between the two materials. NVivo was chosen because of its accessibility and quality. The NVivo program allows for the storage, organization, categorization, analysis, and visualization of results. Further, it lets the "[i]mport [of] data from virtually any source – text, audio, video, emails, images, spreadsheets, online surveys, social and web content and more" ("What is NVivo"). Essentially, NVivo allowed for me to load copies of *Mein Kampf* and the chosen speeches into the program and establish parameters that would search for specific terms, phrases, and their contexts. This program was chosen because of its efficiency and accuracy. To physically search this much material would have required an extensive amount of time and has a larger degree for the potential of human error. NVivo is used across a variety of disciplines to sort and categorize data. In the English field of academia, researchers may use it to help transcribe interviews or search the frequency of specific words or phrases; similar to how this

study uses the program. Further, NVivo was recommended as a reliable and successful program via academic instructor.

After selecting NVivo as the program, a digital copy of *Mein Kampf* was required. The Universal Digital Library had contributed a 1941 copy of the text to archive.org that was downloadable in various forms; full text was chosen due to ease of access. Transcripts for each of President Trump's speeches were also chosen from online sources. For the upload of each source, the individual sources copied and placed in a Microsoft Word Document.

Each document was then loaded into NVivo and an autocode was performed on each source. Search parameters were set to identify themes, by paragraph, in each text. Then, keywords and their frequencies were displayed based on that analysis. This was performed multiple times, but variations existed in testing which will be explained further into the study. After the autocode for each document was complete, Chapter XI was compared with each of President Trump's speeches individually. However, all of President Trump's speeches were also placed in one document and then uploaded, autocoded, and compared with Chapter XI. The purpose of the comparison analysis was to identify shared themes that existed between these texts and to test if the results could be replicated. Replication of these results were successful, and the former variation of results were contributed to the individual comparisons. The individual comparisons would have a different percentage of keyword recurrence because of the material differences.

Additionally, comparison diagrams and word clouds were completed to identify any shared themes. This was done to generate a different visualization of themes that were present within and between the texts. Any shared themes were then explored manually by the researcher and using the context analyzation tool of NVivo. Rather than relying upon

NVivo solely to produce the context of these themes, I found it effective to also physically access the texts and personally review these contexts for a greater understanding of rhetorical practice. Manual engagement provided a more complete understanding of the texts rather than only examining specific sections. The researcher felt this was necessary to remain as unbiased as possible.

Results

For the purpose of this study, two specific results will be discussed. The first is the comparison that was performed between all of President Trump's speeches and Chapter XI. This analysis was chosen because it gives an inclusive and holistic view of all texts. The second is the comparison between President Trump's announcement speech from 2015 and Chapter XI of *Mein Kampf*. The reasoning for this will be further explored in the "Discussion" section of the chapter.

The autocoded themes between all of President Trump's speeches and Chapter XI produced 23 shared themes. Some of the coded themes that appeared were the following: fellow citizens, citizens, progress, state, people, class, rise, and fall. These were found to be most concerning as they have the capability of being used in the exploitation of language depending rhetorical context.

Switching to a node matrix, NVivo results showed that the commonly used themes between the two texts were as follows: fall, force, great, human, people, possibilities, principles, product, progress, race, real, rise, school, state, trade, worker, and world. The themes that appeared at the highest frequency between the texts were "human" at 10:3, "worker" at 7:5, and "great" at 7:2. The first number in these seriations represents Chapter XI from *Mein Kampf* and the last represents President Trump's speeches.

Lastly, a content analysis was performed manually by the researcher and through NVivo. NVivo was used to find where the term “people” appeared in each document and the basic context surrounding the phrase. A manual analysis was performed to understand the larger context in which “people” existed. In Chapter XI of *Mein Kampf*, “people” was used predominantly in two ways: to promote German Nationalism and identity as the superior group or to degrade the Jewish people and reduce them to the inferior group. In President Trump’s speeches, “people” was used in a drastically more repetitive manner which would indicate why his coverage was 0.57% as compared to 0.42% even though President Trump referenced “people” 27 times less than the chapter from *Mein Kampf*. President Trump also appeared to utilize “people” in a more neutral manner, but this is largely in-part due to the amount of repetition. Manually viewing the context in which “people” was used showed that the term was repeatedly used to distinguish a superior and inferior group.

This usage was dominated by President Trump’s announcement speech which is the other comparison that will be briefly discussed. In this analysis, the same methodology that was used in the full comparison study was applied. The weighted percentage in the word frequency query between Chapter XI and President Trump’s announcement speech was 1.07%. In the announcement speech alone, President Trump used “people” 55 times and it was during this speech that the term was used most often and most negatively. This will be explored further in the “Discussion” portion of the study. However, the word cloud from the President’s announcement speech (e.g. see Figure 2) displays the language he relied upon prior to being elected President. To gain further visualization of this rhetoric in comparison to Chapter XI, the individual word cloud of that text was created (e.g. see Figure 3).

presidential announcement speech, however, is disturbing and at the core of the literature that was used to construct this study.

This links directly to the earlier discussion of Timothy Snyder's *On Tyranny* and *Black Earth* and Hitler's use of the term *Volk* to encourage a Nationalist state. This will be further expanded upon throughout the upcoming chapters in the discussion of dangerous language and rhetorical context. The emergence and heavy use of "people" or "the people" may seem normal for a politician as a means of rhetorical appeal as the politician tries to reach the potential population that will support them. However, it is the context in which this term appears that can make it manipulative and dangerous. The similarity of this same keyword being used so heavily in both primary sources needed to be further explored.

Hitler's use of "people" or "the people" is clear but President Trump's needs to be expanded upon. Especially, the lack of this term's use in his later speeches. Lippi-Green asserts that "[i]n the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, Republicans have tended to be much better at getting their message out to the public, and getting the public to listen. They do this, in part, by coining new, ideologically laden and emotive terminology and repeating those terms until they become embedded in the public consciousness" while the Democratic Party has been left "scrambling for new, more effective ways to reach the public (Bai 2005)" (133). Further, Lippi-Green cites multiple articles from George Lakoff to argue "that liberals run into trouble because they operate on the basis of a self-defeating political rationalism ... [assuming that a] person who believes strongly in the value of rationalism will conclude that once the public has the facts, they will come to the same reasonable conclusion" (133). However, this is a faulted sense of logic in "the language subordination process" (Lippi-Green 133). Essentially, the competing Republican and Democratic Parties have specific populations that use their rhetorical

appeal to reach. The Republican Party does a better job of appealing to the working class while the Democratic Party incidentally alienates them. However, as Lippi-Green argues, the Republican Party is able to accomplish this by producing a new message that appeals to their target audience and repeating it until it has become engrained in that population which, in turn, means that it will not be questioned.

This has the potential to be applied to the lack of “people” in President Trump’s latter speeches. Like his slogan, Make America Great Again which has also declined in use since his campaign, the separation of what “people” means and truly references is already engrained with his supporters. The true definition of “people” for President Trump was made clear in his announcement speech when he stated the following:

When Mexico sends its people, they’re not sending their best. They’re not sending you. They’re not sending you. They’re sending people that have lots of problems, and they’re bringing those problems with us. They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapist. And some, I assume, are good people. But I speak to border guards and they tell us what we’re getting. And it only makes common sense. It only makes common sense. They’re sending us not the right people. (“Here’s Donald Trump’s Presidential Announcement Speech”)

President Trump drew an incredibly clear line with this statement. It was clear that Mexico’s people were inferior, criminals, and violent while the Americans that he was appeals to (the working class) were the best. The repetition that Lippi-Green referenced is also strongly present in this excerpt.

The context of this quote also strongly aligns with Hitler’s opinion of the Jewish people and the promotion of an ideal Germany. Hitler found the “lack of ‘national pride’” (30) to be

deplorable and that the Germans “question of regaining our people’s political power is primarily a question of recovering our national instinct of self-preservation” (332-333); an act that would exclude anyone who did not fit the Aryan standard. Additionally, Hitler also insisted that “[t]he mightiest counterpart to the Aryan is represented by the Jew” (300), further pushing the ideology that the Jewish people were inferior. They were not the best and they also “[had] lots of problems” (“Here’s Donald Trump”).

In fact, just as President Trump blamed other nations for the economic problems of the United States in his announcement speech, Adolf Hitler also blamed the Jewish people for the collapse of Germany. This will be further elaborated upon in the following chapter. Both leaders placed blame on a foreign party for the decline of what they consider to be a great nation rather than addressing the root of their country’s problems. Hitler and Trump, in their use of “people,” create a clear separation of superior and inferior parties while simultaneously placing blame on the inferior. They both appealed to the working-class population, who tend to be severely disadvantaged, by accusing the inferior “people” or Other of being the cause for economic decline. In turn, this implies that the Other has unrightfully stolen jobs from the working class.

Although the derogatory use of “people” may have declined lately for President Trump, it was a foundation of his presidency campaign and has been utilized periodically. He has continued to insist that the United States needs to build a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border to prevent dangerous individuals from entering the country, but he has completely failed to address the issues of violence that already exist in America. A border wall would simply place those in need or pursuing political asylum into a space that the United States does not have to bother with or address while the United States would seek to thrive. Similarly, a Nationalist ideology led Hitler to believe that the Jews “should be separated from other people and forced to inhabit

some bleak and inhospitable territory” (Snyder, *Black Earth* 10). This returns to Hitler’s rhetorical use of the term *Lebensraum*.

President Trump, in a speech supporting Senator Ted Cruz in October of 2018, reiterated a similar ideology when he stated that, “As we speak, the Democratic Party is openly encouraging millions of illegals to break our laws, violate our borders, and overwhelm our nation. That’s what’s happening. The Democrats have launched an assault on the sovereignty of our country, the security of our nation, and the safety of every single American” (“President Trump Campaigns”). He used this opportunity to again advocate for a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border: “People are seeing how pathetic our laws are. That’s an assault on our country. In the caravan, you have some very bad people. We can’t let that happen to our country. We need a wall built fast” (“President Trump Campaigns”). This is simply one example in which President Trump has aggressively pitted the Republican and Democratic Parties and their supporters against each other. Again, this is the promotion of one identity, one nation, and one ideology. Thereby making it difficult to resist the mainstream rhetoric that he endorses which is another tool that Hitler relied upon to rationalize the persecution of those who opposed him.

Conclusion

The results and discussion of this study show that harmful rhetoric and the exploitation of language plays a part in the current sociopolitical climate of the United States. Contextually, the use of the term “people” by both Adolf Hitler and President Donald Trump closely mirror each other. They have both employed “people” to promote and/or appeal to a singular identity while persecuting the Other. This keyword has also been used to place a higher value on one nation over another. This is a core component of Nationalistic language.

Although only Chapter XI: “Race and Nation” was used for the purpose of this study, *Mein Kampf* is filled with Othering and Nationalist rhetoric. *Mein Kampf* evidences Hitler’s personal and political ideologies that were founded upon racial bias and hatred. It was Hitler’s goal to raise up an Aryan nation that would rebuild German the way he envisioned it and that excluded all others that were considered inferior. Rhetorical strategy was used to gain support of the German people as he implemented the Final Solution and attempted to wipe out the entire Jewish population and other minorities that he found to be unfavorable. The abuse and intentional manipulation of language that Hitler utilized led to the persecution of these individuals and, ultimately, the death of approximately 11 million people.

President Trump has used a similar rhetoric that echoes Nationalistic ideologies and the removal of the Other; both physically and metaphorically. The danger of this language lies in what history has evidenced is possible. Identifying this language and its potential to be dangerous is vital to preventing another Holocaust from happening. The repetition of key phrases that eventually remove conscience and rational from the common person has the potential to prevent the individual from standing against what is morally wrong and instead becoming complicit in actions that rob the Other of their identity.

As Timothy Snyder argues, the individual must be aware of the dangers that language can present and its potential. The purpose of this study was to identify any risky language from President Trump that encouraged Nationalism and Othering in comparison with its presentation in Adolf Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*. In conclusion, this study found that the term “people” or “the people” have been used by President Trump in a similar manner. President Trump has relied upon these keywords in his literary practice of rhetorical appeal to promote one identity, encourage a Nationalist identity, and to remove a humane identity from the Other.

CHAPTER 3

RISE TO POWER AND OTHERING RHETORIC

Introduction

World War II remains a profound moment in history that is marked by the daring of Prime Minister Winston Churchill, the drive of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the undying resistance of France, the resilience of the Red Army, and the courage of countless individuals. By the end of the war, the Allied forces of Britain, the United States, the Soviet Union (present day Russia), and France were found to be the victors of the largest global conflict that had ever occurred. However, the Allied forces who moved across German-occupied territories at the end of the war also unveiled newfound and unrivaled atrocities: the evidence of Adolf Hitler's Final Solution.

The walking skeletons and piles of bodies that the Liberators encountered were the ultimate culmination of German Nationalist and Othering rhetoric that allowed for the Jewish people and other minorities to be inhumanely imprisoned and executed by the millions. It was Hitler's manipulation of language by means of oratory skill, the distribution of propaganda, and Nationalism that allowed for the Holocaust to take place. Consequently, Holocaust and World War II literature evidences how the Nazi Party gained power through various forms of manipulative rhetoric that promoted Nationalism. Further, these literatures identify the widespread forced relocation and genocide that occurred because of the Nazi Party's harmful rhetoric. These serve as a continual warning that must be heeded.

The following will address the rise to power of both Adolf Hitler and Donald Trump. A common theme that surrounds the rise of Adolf Hitler and the establishment of the Nazi regime is the term "how." How did Hitler gain the support that he did? How was he able to manipulate

an entire country into following him? Or how did those that followed Hitler justify the Holocaust? This question appears to be especially prominent considering the distinct use of harmful rhetoric. However, for anyone to take power, the circumstances must be right. History shows there were key moments that allowed for Hitler's power moves to take place. Similarly, President Trump's rise to power also needs to be reviewed. What circumstances were happening in the United States that he was elected president? When did his language first become questionable or generate discussion? These windows of opportunity are directly linked to the rhetoric that was present during this time. Otherwise, people may not have been susceptible to the political message and positioning that these leaders have stood for.

Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Regime

After their defeat in the First World War by the Allied Powers, Germany was left impoverished and in shambles and the government bankrupt. Adolf Hitler, though Austrian born, had fought in the Bavarian army on behalf of Germany. During his service, Hitler was injured twice: he was wounded in the leg at the Battle of Somme in 1916 and in 1918 temporarily blinded by a mustard gas attack during near Ypres. He was awarded two decorations for bravery, including the Iron Cross First Class, for his service which would later help propel his notoriety. However, Germany and its states were left marred, penniless, and leaderless by the war's end as the German monarchy had fallen apart. The Weimar Republic, as it has been designated, took control of Germany's government in 1919, but an impossible strain upon the German economy as the government tried to simultaneously "create a welfare state and to pay the reparations imposed under the Treaty of Versailles" (Ferguson 236). The Republic's flimsy government authority allowed for two major sources of opportunity that Hitler was able to

capitalize on: a scramble to seize government power and an impoverished people who were desperate to have their quality of life improved.

In late 1918, Hitler had returned to Munich and allied himself with the Germans' Worker Party which held a strong sense of Nationalism and advocated for the German working class. This was a direct result of the war as a large portion of citizens felt that outsiders were responsible for the country's devastating loss. He became head of the Nazi Party by 1921 as "[s]uccess and money finally won for Hitler complete domination over the National Socialist Party" (Heiden 111). The party had also adopted the hakenkreuz as its official symbol as Hitler took power (Heiden 142-143). The hakenkreuz, or hooked cross, is more commonly known as the swastika and presently remains synonymous with the Third Reich and Hitler's Nationalistic ideologies. According to Konrad Heiden, Hitler "had grown too powerful for the founders" (111) of the National Socialist Party but he had the backing of the S.A. or "*Sturmabteilung* (Storm Division)" (111). These "hoodlums" (Ferguson 238) used physical intimidation to deal with the monetary repercussions of the Weimar Republic's rule that they felt was damaging to the German people. Finally, on November 8, 1923, Hitler and the S.A. acted upon the desire for government control in an even that has become known as the Beer Hall Putsch.

The Beer Hall Putsch, though unsuccessful on Hitler's behalf, made him famous. Hitler and about twenty associates forced their way into a beer hall and claimed, "The national revolution has begun. The building is occupied by six hundred heavily armed men. No one may leave the hall. Unless there is immediate quiet, I'll have a machine gun placed in the gallery. The Reichswehr and police barracks have been occupied, Reichswehr and police are marching on the city under the swastika banner" (Heiden 187). They left the beer hall later with the intent to march on the center of Munich but were met by state police. A shootout ensued and Hitler fled,

managing to evade the police for a few days, but was eventually arrested on November 11, 1923. He was accused of high treason and sentenced to five years in prison on February 26, 1924. However, this event brought national attention to Hitler and cemented his position as a potential political leader for the German people.

During his imprisonment, which only lasted nine months, Hitler began what would be the first version of *Mein Kampf* or, translated to English, “My Struggle.” With its publication in 1925, Hitler’s distaste for the Jewish people and his anti-Semitic views became abundantly clear. Historian Niall Ferguson cements this ideology and Othering rhetoric in the following passage:

He blamed them for Germany’s defeat in the First World War. “If at the beginning of the War and during the War,” he notoriously wrote in *Mein Kampf*, “twelve or fifteen thousand of these Hebrew corrupters of the people had been held under poison gas, as happened to hundreds of thousands of our very best German workers in the field, the sacrifice of millions at the front would not have been in vain. On the contrary: twelve thousand scoundrels eliminated in time might have saved the lives of a million real Germans, valuable for the future.” (248-249)

In this excerpt, Hitler’s aversion to the Jewish people and Nationalistic views are direct and above all: dangerous. It is also important to note that the author, Niall Ferguson, has been accused of being a Holocaust denier but even he has recognized the dangers that Hitler’s rhetoric and actions presented.

Hitler’s ideas regarding Nationalism are established in the beginnings of *Mein Kampf* with: “This lack of ‘national pride’ is most profoundly deplored, and horror at such an attitude is expressed in no uncertain terms” (30). His Othering attitude towards the Jewish people continues with statements such as, “The cleanliness of this people, moral and

otherwise, I must say, is a point in itself” (Hitler 57) and “Was there any form of filth or profligacy, particularly in cultural life, without at least one Jew involved in it?” (Hitler 57); the next line then compares them to maggots in an abscessed body. *Mein Kampf* vilifies the Jewish people and treats them as a disease to the German state despite that fact that they were an incredibly small part of the population. According to Ferguson, “[t]here were fewer than 503,000 Jews in Germany in 1933, a tiny 0.76 per cent of population, and the number had been falling steadily since the war as a result of a striking decline in the Jewish birthrate to roughly half that of the rest of the population” (249). The Jewish people presented no threat to the German people, the state, nor its economy but Hitler continued to falsely insist they did.

Building upon this anti-Semitism, *Mein Kampf* also established Hitler’s infamous ideology of a pure race; an ideology that is built upon Othering rhetoric and Nationalism. Marriage between Jewish and non-Jewish individuals had risen “from 7 per cent in 1902 to 28 per cent by 1933” (Ferguson 250) and this was problematic to Hitler’s idea that ““Race [...] does not lie in the language, but exclusively in the blood”” (*Mein Kampf* as qtd. by Ferguson 253). Hitler felt that “the folkish philosophy finds the importance of mankind in its basic racial elements” (383) and that the only means for a state, specifically the German state, to rise again was by remaining racially pure; that the “[h]uman culture and civilization on this continent are inseparably bound up with the presence of the Aryan. If he dies out or declines, the dark veils of an age without culture will again descend on this globe” (Hitler 383). It is important to note the term “folkish philosophy” as it is another form of the term *Volk* which was previously discussed. The use of *Volk* will also be further discussed and analyzed throughout the study. This strong sense of German Nationalism and racial purity was also noted in a 1940 review by Eugene N. Anderson. Anderson’s opening line reveals that, “The particular interest of this book in the

history of nationalist literature lies in the fact that it was written by a man in the midst of a struggle for dominance not merely over a nation but over competitors within and without his party” (399). However, *Mein Kampf* is only a small piece in the physical puzzle of evidence that remains of Hitler’s nationalism and hatred as “his egocentric demand for power into conformity” (Anderson 399) would lead to the persecution of the Jewish people and other minorities.

However, despite his blatant Othering platform, Hitler was still regarded by some of the German public as a strong political candidate because of his appeal to the working class. This may also be in part because anti-Semitism was not uncommon in Europe but had been a long-established hatred dating back to the Middle Ages. Hitler spoke against outsiders and the influence of Marxism which enabled the Nazi Party to become “a kind of catchall protest party for those who felt helpless and wanted radical action in the face of the depression” (Bernhard 72). The German government was rapidly falling apart and, in January 1933, “Hindenburg and his coterie in desperation turned to Hitler as chancellor fully expecting they would be able to control him” (Bernhard 72). They were horribly wrong and with the Enabling Act of 1933, which was established in March, Adolf Hitler was given the power to make decisions without government approval. The Nazi dictatorship of the Third Reich had taken complete control of Germany.

The circumstances in Germany post World War I created the perfect storm for Hitler to take control. He took advantage of an impoverished people and capitalized on their fears. The Treaty of Versailles had placed reparations on the country which, in turn, put a heavy strain on the German people. Germany was trying to rebuild but the Treaty was harsh on the German population; their economy suffered, their military had been reduced, and a loss of national pride

and dignity was felt. Hitler, through language and rhetorical manipulation, capitalized on this momentary weakness and fear to garner support of his Nationalistic ideology.

Donald Trump and his Campaign

The most recent presidential election in the United States created an uproar amongst voters. Hillary Clinton, the wife of former President Bill Clinton, was the primary candidate for the Democratic Party and Donald Trump, a notorious businessman from New York, represented the Republican Party. However, as the two competitors debated and campaigned across the country, questions were raised regarding Trump's ethical standards and leadership abilities. Despite these reservations, Donald Trump was elected as the 45th president of the United States on November 8, 2016. As explored previously, the question of "how" must also be answered regarding President Trump. There are key moments prior to and during the election campaign, as there were with Hitler, that Trump capitalized on: his popularity and notoriety, border and immigration concerns combined with scapegoating or Othering rhetoric, and the infamous slogan: Make America Great Again.

Donald Trump was already a well-known public figure by the time he announced his entrance into the 2016 presidential race because of his success as a real estate mogul and businessman, the television series *The Apprentice*, and appearances on other popular television shows such as *Sex and the City* and *WWE*. His public persona as a loud mouthed, shrewd individual on *The Apprentice* was both well received and rejected amongst viewers. According to iMDB public reviews, user classicalsteve rated *The Apprentice* with eight out of ten stars and stated that the show, "demonstrates that the traditional job interview and resume do not necessarily predict teamwork skills, task dedication, and job performance" and that "The losing team comes to the dreaded board room where Trump hears the lame excuses of the members and

knocks off one or more of the contestants like pieces off a chess board with the now infamous ‘You’re fired’” (“The Apprentice: User Reviews”). Despite this favorable review, others such as user koziki2003 wrote: “I’d love to hear just one person get up and say ‘Donald I quit and take some of your money and buy a decent hairdo’. I see he’s even trying to buy fame in the wrestling WWE ... I’d give this show a negative mark if I could but it gets a 1 and it doesn’t deserve that” (“The Apprentice: User Reviews”). However, regardless of viewer opinion, Trump’s notoriety and personality became cemented in the public eye with the “You’re fired!” catchphrase. However, these comments indicate the varying acceptance of his language and rhetorical practices before entering the political arena.

As early as the late 1980s, Trump had talked about and been considered for public office. Mike Dunbar, the “former vice chairman of the Portsmouth, N.H., Republican Party” (Mills), tried to get Donald Trump’s name on the New Hampshire primary ballot in 1987. Dunbar “decided to try to draft New York real estate tycoon Donald Trump” despite Trump’s repeated expressions that he had “absolutely no interest in seeking political office or running or president of the United States” (Mills) at the time. Despite Trump’s rebuff, Dunbar continued to insist that Trump had what it took to be a successful politician because of his monetary accomplishments as a successful businessman and real estate mogul. During an interview with Kim I. Mills of *AP News*, Dunbar stated: “I figured that on issues like the deficit, Trump has really great qualifications ... Every project that I know he’s ever undertaken, he’s come in under budget and ahead of time. If we had a guy like that running the country, and who could delegate that sort of expertise to the Pentagon, I think we could make some real inroads into the financial problems the country has” (Mills). This is an important circumstance to take note of as some people defended their decision to vote for Trump because they were tired of politicians and

the poor status of the U.S. economy. A number of supporters felt that Donald Trump could use his business experience and savvy to help the national budget, improve jobs, and increase the country's economic value.

Despite Dunbar's endorsement, Trump did not take political action until 1999 when he denounced the Republican Party and presidential nominee Patrick Buchanan, ironically, as a "Hitler lover" (Clines) in favor of the Reform or Independent Party. According to Francis Clines of *The New York Times*, Trump said that the Republican Party was too crazy at the time, and that he would instead support the Reform Party. However, they did not receive his possible candidacy with open arms. *The New York Times* cited Beverly Kidder, a Reform Party member from New Jersey, as heavily critiquing Trump's new political affiliation. Kidder responded to Trump's potential presidential nomination with the following: "We don't need name-calling ... His treatment of women -- his wives, plural -- is notorious. If I were Ivana I would have gotten a better deal" (Clines). As previously discussed, the way that President Trump spoke about women during the election campaign, after, and has continued to reference them was a rhetorical warning sign that signaled the presence of dangerous language. Further, his treatment and referencing of women was viewed as problematic even in the 1990s. A misogynistic image has followed Trump prior to, throughout his election campaign, and remains an ever-developing area of concern during his presidency.

Another clear instance of Othering on Trump's behalf came to light as he continued flirting with politics throughout the late 2000s. According to reporter Cooper Allen of *USA Today*, it was during this time that Donald Trump began to "gain increased notoriety for questioning President Obama's citizenship (claims that were false) and had indicated he was serious about seeking the GOP nomination to challenge Obama's re-election bid." Further,

Trump spoke and tweeted repeatedly about President Obama's true birth place, thereby challenging his legitimacy as president. Barack Obama is the only president to have his citizenship repeatedly and openly questioned and Trump's public comments incited the birther conspiracy that followed Obama throughout his presidency. President Obama, prompted by the birther conspiracy, released an official copy of his birth certificate in April 2011 but this was not satisfactory. On May 30, 2012, Trump tweeted that he would like to see Obama's college records "to see how he listed his place of birth in the application" (@realDonaldTrump, 30 May 2012, 9:44 a.m.). It wasn't until September of 2016, five years after the birther controversy was started, that Donald Trump admitted President Obama had been born in the United States. However, he never took responsibility for being a part of the rumors or addressed why he had taken part in the controversy. This Othering rhetoric may be associated with the reality that Barack Obama was the first African American president of the United States, he was born in Hawaii, and his father was from Kenya. These factors made President Obama an easy target for Trump to take advantage of as a potential political opponent.

However, it wasn't until June 16, 2015, that Donald Trump officially announced he would be entering the United States' presidential race as a candidate for the Republican Party. Trump publicly announced his bid outside of Trump tower in New York and stated early in his speech that, "Our country is in serious trouble. We don't have victories anymore. We used to have victories, but we don't have them. When was the last time anybody saw us beating, let's say, China in a trade deal? They kill us. I beat China all the time. All the time" ("Here's Donald Trump"). The most deeply concerning aspect of Trump's speech, however, were his comments regarding Mexican immigration and the presence of Othering rhetoric.

Continuing in his announcement, Trump said, “When do we beat Mexico at the border? They’re laughing at us, at our stupidity. And now they are beating us economically. They are not our friend, believe me. But they’re killing us economically. The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else's problem” (“Here’s Donald Trump”). The direct attack continued with the statement that Mexico is “sending people that have lots of problems, and they’re bringing those problems with us” (“Here’s Donald Trump”). Trump also went on the offensive regarding foreign relations by attacking the response to ISIS in the Middle East before returning to the trade market with China and other countries. It was maintained that the United States has fallen behind in global production competition and needed to reclaim its title as a global leader. Domestically: Obamacare was addressed harshly and President Obama himself was called a cheerleader rather than a leader and then a “negative force” (“Here’s Donald Trump”), the power that lobbyists hold was criticized, and it was stressed that the U.S. economy was failing regarding the unemployment rate. Trump further appealed to Conservative voters by advocating for the Second Amendment. The speech covered a large amount of hot button topics that had been a source of contention between political parties but, unlike Democratic front-runner Hillary Clinton, Trump’s announcement blatantly targeted specific countries and their citizens in a negative manner.

The presidential announcement speech ended with Trump reinforcing the idea that “the American dream is dead. But if I get elected president I will bring it back bigger and better and stronger than ever before, and we will make America great again. Thank you. Thank you very much” (“Here’s Donald Trump”). Make America Great Again would become Trump’s presidential campaign catchphrase. President Ronald Reagan had also used a similar slogan and been successful in his bid for presidency and procured Conservative support, but it was Trump

that patented the phrase and made it famous. Falling on the ideology that America needed to be made great again, he began campaigning across the United States and appealing to a variety of Americans by continuing to target controversial topics such as immigration and economics by maintaining the stance that jobs needed to be brought back to America and that available jobs were being stolen by undocumented immigrants. Trump also reinforced the false perception that citizens were in danger by the influx of Islamic immigrants and undocumented peoples from Mexico. Capitalizing on these issues and pushing to “Make America Great Again” implies that there is something wrong with America, it needs to be fixed, and he is the one who can fix it.

Donald Trump was not favored to win the election against Hillary Clinton but on November 8, 2016, he was announced as the 45th President of the United States. He insisted that his win was “a movement comprised of Americans from all races, religions, backgrounds, and beliefs, who want and expect our government to serve the people – and serve the people it will” (CNN Staff). Ironically, he also insisted that “We will seek common ground, not hostility; partnership, not conflict” (CNN Staff) despite his rhetoric creating an immense amount of hostility between the Democratic and Republican parties. There was a lack of Othering rhetoric present in the acceptance speech, but the ideology was maintained throughout Trump’s campaign and remains a part of his presidency.

Othering Rhetoric

It is when the Other is rejected in this negative manner and infused with rhetoric that it becomes harmful. The ability to understand another human is severed and is instead replaced with dangerous language. Timothy Snyder’s *On Tyranny: Twenty Lessons from the Twentieth Century* directly addresses the Othering rhetoric that was employed by Hitler during the Second World War and has been recently utilized by President Donald Trump.

In the seventeenth chapter of his book, “Listen for dangerous words,” Snyder opens with: “Be alert to the use of the words *extremism* and *terrorism*. Be alive to the fatal notions of *emergency* and *exception*. Be angry about the treacherous use of patriotic vocabulary” (99). Both Hitler and Trump have utilized Othering rhetoric to create a false sense of danger and disguised it in patriotic language. Hitler’s warped sense of patriotism openly pushes a Nationalist agenda that was intended for a specific type of German only and Trump repeatedly attacks certain groups of immigrants.

Mein Kampf is full of dangerous words and Othering language. Hitler’s distaste and distrust of the Jewish people was made abundantly clear by equating them to a “pestilence, spiritual pestilence, worse than the Black Death of olden times, and the [German] people was being infected by it” (Hitler 59) and “the first time I recognized the Jew as the cold-hearted, shameless, and calculating director of this revolting vice traffic in the scum of the big city, a cold shudder ran down my back” (Hitler 60). Author and social psychologist Richard A. Koenigsberg also provides numerous Othering assertions in *Hitler’s Ideology* through compiled statements from *Mein Kampf* “and Baynes’ two volume collection of Hitler’s speeches (1942)” (3) that further display the progression of Hitler’s doctrines and theories. Koenigsberg cites Hitler as saying the following: “The Jew is a ferment of decomposition in peoples,” “The Jew is therefore a disintegrator of peoples,” and “The Jew ... is the demon of the disintegration of peoples, the symbol of the unceasing destruction of their lives” (9). All these statements were used as a direct attack that blamed the Jews for the fall of the German state and its people. As previously exhibited, it was not one group of people responsible for the failing German economy but rather the heavy toll that World War I had taken on the country. Hitler instead chose to use the Jewish people as a scapegoat for Germany’s

problems and produced unwarranted fear amongst German citizens which placed the Jews in the position of the Other.

A similar type of rhetoric existed in Trump's campaign announcement. To reiterate what was said about Mexican immigrants:

The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else's problems. Thank you. It's true, and these are the best and the finest. When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're not sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people. But I speak to border guards and they tell us what we're getting. And it only makes common sense. It only makes common sense. They're sending us not the right people. ("Here's Donald Trump")

This statement is grossly problematic in a multitude of ways and possesses a disturbing similarity to Hitler's Othering rhetoric. Trump names the ways in which Mexico, and therefore Mexicans, have negatively affected America and its citizens but these claims have no factual evidence as they are presented. The comment regarding rape is particularly disturbing as the threat of sexual violence was a tool that Hitler also used to fear monger and assert the need for a pure or Aryan race.

Hitler wrote in *Mein Kampf* that it is "[w]ith satanic joy in his face, the black-haired Jewish youth lurks in wait for the unsuspecting girl whom he defiles with his blood, thus stealing her from her people. With every means he tries to destroy the racial foundations of the people he has set to subjugate" (325). Nazi propaganda of women being taken advantage of by Jewish men lurking in the shadows like a predator flooded Germany during World War II (Gottfried). The

threat of and language regarding sexual violence painted a specifically grotesque image that instilled fear and encouraged German women to remain sexually pure until they found a male, Aryan partner to produce children with so that German bloodlines would be untainted by outsiders who were considered unclean and there would be no “Lower of the level of the higher race” (Hitler 286). This is also connected to Hitler’s idea of the *Volk*. German women were held to a high standard by the Nazis because it was their responsibility to continue the Aryan race. Joseph Goebbels insisted that women had a duty to Nazi Germany “and told a group of women leaders in 1934, ‘Woman’s proper sphere is the family. There she is a sovereign queen. If we eliminate women from every realm of public life, we do not do it in order to dishonour her, but in order that her honour may be restored to her’” (Rupp). The images of sexual assault on German women by Jewish men were multifaceted: it created fear, further alienated the Jewish people from the idea of the *Volk and* acted as a direct attack on those who were responsible for the continuance of German sovereignty.

Although Trump has never suggested the idea of a pure or higher race, he has perpetuated Hitler-like fearmongering through the continued targeting of minorities with false or skewed claims. For example: On June 5, 2013, three years before running for presidential office, Trump tweeted that: “Sadly, the overwhelming amount of violent crime in our major cities is committed by blacks and hispanics-a tough subject-must be discussed” (@realDonaldTrump, 5 June 2013, 3:05 a.m.). This type of language not only incites fear with a sweeping statement but also lacks any type of critical foundation or integrity especially considering that “The country saw a drop in overall violent crime by 1.6 percent between 2013 and 2014. That includes a 2 percent drop in murders, a 6.7 percent drop in robberies and a .7 percent rise in aggravated assaults across America” (Johnson). Trump’s tweet also does not acknowledge the fact that most major cities

experienced a decrease in violent crime (Johnson) and that white individuals accounted for 58.4% of those arrested in 2013 for violent crime (Federal Bureau of Investigation). Although this exact information may not have been available at the time of Trump's tweet, the United States had been experiencing a steadily decreasing violent crime rate that would have been easily accessible and there has never been an attempt to rescind the tweet. However, lack of factual evidence and high amounts of criticism have not stopped Trump from negatively referencing minorities. On June 3, 2016 in an interview with Jake Tapper, Trump said, "I've been treated very unfairly by this judge" ("CNN Press Room"); alluding to U.S. District Judge Gonzalo Curiel who was presiding over the Trump University lawsuit. Trump insisted that Judge Gonzalo Curiel was unable to do his job effectively due to a conflict of interest because "this judge is of Mexican heritage ... and he's very proud of it" ("CNN Press Room") and, at the time, Trump was strongly advocating for a border wall. Jake Tapper immediately addressed these statements by pointing out that the judge was born in the United States and an American, only Mexican by heritage, a point that should not be attacked. Tapper said, "...I don't care if you criticize him. That's fine. You can criticize every decision. What I'm saying is if you invoke his race as a reason why he can't do his job..." Trump quickly interrupted and reaffirmed: "I think that's why he's doing it" ("CNN Press Room"). This is an outright attack that has absolutely no basis. It only places an individual in the category of Other and is another fearmongering tactic.

By criticizing Judge Gonzalo Curiel's race, Trump instilled the fear that one cannot get a fair trial from a Hispanic judge if that individual's politics align with President Trump's or they support the border wall. This would be a direct violation of one's basic rights in the United States. With these two statements, President Trump has actively pursued the ideology that

minorities are dangerous and also have the power to manipulate the legal system in their favor when it's convenient.

The Dangers of Othering Rhetoric

The previous examples from both Hitler and Trump are just a small sampling of the Othering rhetoric they have both perpetuated. This language is in and of itself danger. As shown, to utilize Othering language is to reject another group in a negative and discriminatory manner. It generates fear and hatred. The naturally insulting and inferiority qualities of Othering language often minimizes an already minimized group, and it also creates a clear separation of which group or groups should be considered as superior and inferior. Therefore, this language takes on an even larger danger when it is accepted and perpetuated that society must remain vigilant of.

Unfortunately, Hitler's ideology that the pure German or Aryan race were meant to be superior was accepted and this is how the Holocaust occurred. The establishment of a one-party or Nationalistic state meant that the government that would only be run by the truest of Germans and the Jewish people, along with other minorities, had no place in it. Carl Schmitt, a German legal theorist, became Hitler's warhorse of Nationalist acceptance. According to Timothy Snyder, "Throughout Hitler's career, Schmitt had provided elegant theoretical support for his *Führer's* actions, in domestic and then foreign policy, as Hitler mutated the German state and began to destroy its neighbors" (*Black Earth* 145). Schmitt aided in providing both moral and legal justification to Hitler's actions under the umbrella ideology of domestic (German) self-protection. "The definition of the domestic was that which had to be manipulated to destroy what is foreign. Germany itself had no content. The idea of the people, the *Volk*, was there to persuade Germans to throw themselves into their murderous destiny as a race. The people were only what

they proved themselves to be, which without struggle was nothing” (*Black Earth* 144). The use of the word *Volk*, or People in English, was a specific language exploit that only referenced the German people. This is further evidenced by Schmitt’s belief “that the German understanding of law had to be purged of the Jewish ‘infection,’” (*Black Earth* 146). The purge of the Jews came with the implementation of the Final Solution.

The United States is presently at risk for welcoming a Nationalistic ideology through the acceptance of Othering rhetoric. With the election of President Trump, it became evident that his use of Othering language would not only be excused but accepted as Hitler’s had been.

According to Timothy Snyder,

Victor Klemperer, a literary scholar of Jewish origin, turned his philological training against Nazi propaganda. He noticed how Hitler’s language rejected legitimate opposition: *The people* always meant some people and not others (the president uses the word in this way), encounters were always *struggles* (the president says *winning*), and any attempt by free people to understand the world in a different way was *defamation* of the leader (or, as the president puts it, *libel*). (*On Tyranny* 60)

As evidenced in the earlier examples of rhetoric, a similar phrasing of “the people” was present in Trump’s announcement speech when he said that Mexico wasn’t sending their best people. He also talked about the need to beat Japan and Mexico in the economic race. This language implies that there is a winner and a loser. President Trump has also openly attacked the press and media. On October 29, 2018, he tweeted: “I refer to Fake News Media when mentioning Enemy of the People - but dishonest reporters use only the word ‘Media.’ The people of our Great Country are angry and disillusioned at receiving so much Fake News. They get it, and fully

understand!” (@realDonaldTrump). This tweet is closely related to the language of defamation and libel.

Conclusion

The rise of power by Adolf Hitler and Donald Trump are both rooted in harmful Othering and Nationalist rhetoric. Hitler’s Othering language is present throughout *Mein Kampf* and Trump’s almost interchangeable verbiage was made clear during his presidential announcement speech. Both leaders, through language and rhetorical context, extend a tone of Nationalism; especially when engaged with variations of the term “people.” Historically, each individual also capitalized on opportunities such as economic struggle, controversial topics, and fear which allowed them to seize positions of power.

To be clear: this study is not making a comparison between Adolf Hitler and Donald Trump as individuals. Hitler purposefully targeted minority groups through anti-Semitic ideology and the thirst for German Nationalism. The language of Hitler was deliberate and targeted with the ultimate goal of implementing the Final Solution or extermination of the Jewish people and other minorities. Hitler wanted a country that would be one of the best in the world and it could only be the best if it was governed by Aryans. This ideology is resolutely hateful and Nationalistic. Donald Trump, on the other hand, does not appear to target his language purposefully. Rather, it seems disorganized and a tool of rhetorical appeal towards his followers to maintain support. The problem is that the intention of language becomes almost moot at this point. Dangerous language is dangerous language.

The opportunities this chapter has discussed leave the receiving population susceptible to harmful language and removes their ability to recognize it. Othering rhetoric becomes emboldened and accepted by the population majority if it gains a foothold. In Nazi Germany, this

allowed for the establishment of Nationalism and a single-party state that had no room for the Jewish people and other minorities which lead to their persecution. The United States is currently accepting an Othering or Nationalist form of rhetoric from President Donald Trump that places society at risk of engaging a similar Nationalistic ideology that was present in Adolf Hitler's Nazi Germany. One must be aware of the dangers that language manipulation, rhetorical context, and Othering or Nationalist rhetoric present to identify it and prevent its continued use.

CHAPTER 4

NATIONALISM AND IDENTITY

Introduction

When language is weaponized in this harmful manner, that rhetoric may be accepted and then perpetuated on a larger scale. In turn, this can lead to the acceptance of a singular identity and the rejection of all others. The ideology that there is a superior and inferior group that exists within a specific social structure and that the inferior group does not belong creates a sense of Nationalism. It was Nationalism that lead Hitler to believe that the Jews “should be separated from other people and forced to inhabit some bleak and inhospitable territory” (Snyder, *Black Earth* 10); a direct connection to the term *Lebensraum*.

When a Nationalist identity is accepted, the duality of language is again present, and causes separation. The duality that exists is the promotion of one group while isolating and rejecting the Other. Therefore, those who accept a Nationalist identity will be affected differently than those who do not. This acceptance leads one to move from word to deed and into action. The following will analyze the perils of a Nationalistic ideology or a one-party state and its influence on identity.

The One-Party State as Establishment

As previously referenced, the Enabling Act of 1933 appointed Hitler to chancellor of Germany and gave him the sole power to make government decisions without the approval of another political party or parliament. He essentially became a dictator. With the power of the Nazi Party backing him and absolute government authority, Hitler was able to incorporate the Nazi Party’s politics into the everyday lives of German citizens and gain their support which quickly evolved into the establishment of a one-party state. A one-party state is the first step in

the death of democracy. Timothy Snyder directly addresses this in the third chapter of *On Tyranny*. Democracies are vitally important to a free government as the ideology itself was conceived in “a historic moment to make political life impossible for their opponents” (Snyder 26). In other words, political parties developed because individuals have felt there was a need to stand against an opposing view. If there is no opposition and only a single party, then that party has a totalitarian power that becomes difficult to combat because they are the ultimate authority figure.

Further, Snyder asserts that, “An empire on Nazi principles required an open subordination of inferior races, and thus an extravagantly visible difference between the political existence of Germans and that of others” (*Black Earth* 125). Hitler’s Othering and anti-Semitic rhetoric in *Mein Kampf* is clear but so is his Nationalistic ideology which founded the Third Reich government on racial superiority. He wrote that, “*The quality of a state cannot be evaluated according to the cultural level or the power of this state in the frame of the outside world, but solely and exclusively by the degree of this institution’s virtue for the nationality involved in each special case*” (394); this is to mean that the state of Nazi Germany could not be measured by other Western standards, such as the United States or Britain, as each nation’s virtue was individualized. However, it is ironic that he found these governments to be inspirational, especially the United States. Hitler found the United States to be inspirational with their history of revolution and “America taught Hitler that need blurred into desire, and that desire arose from comparison” (Snyder, *Black Earth* 12). On a global scale, Hitler would have had to engage with Britain as “[a] prosperous Germany required exchange with the British world, but this trade pattern could be supplemented, thought Hitler, by the conquest of land empire that would even the scales between London and Berlin” (Snyder, *Black Earth* 12) but

Germany could have the potential to compete economically with countries like the United States and Britain.

It was “[g]lobalization [that] led Hitler to the American dream” (Snyder, *Black Earth* 13), but to compete with the established superpowers meant that Germany would have to raise itself up. Hitler twisted the word *Lebensraum* or “living space” to enhance his Nationalist expansion and war. *Lebensraum* became “attached to the natural struggle, from an unceasing racial fight for physical survival all the way to an endless war for the subjective sense of having the highest standard of living in the world” (Snyder, *Black Earth* 14). The use of *Lebensraum*, when combined with Nationalism, meant that space was to be taken by any means necessary which fueled Hitler’s ideas of colonization. As “racism was an asserted hierarchy of right to the planet, it could be applied to Europeans who lived east of Germany” (Snyder, *Black Earth* 17); this would become detrimental to the Jewish population in countries such as Poland and Estonia.

In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler wrote that, “Hence our judgment concerning the quality of a state can primarily be determined only by the relative utility it possesses for a definite nationality, and in no event by the intrinsic importance attributable to it in the world” (395). It is key that Hitler specifically designates a “definite nationality” in the previous quote. He is explicitly stating that the only way Germany can grow, and progress is by the recognized standard of one nationality. Hitler verifies that this is a pureblood, German standard by also writing, “Our German nationality, unfortunately, is no longer based on a unified racial nucleus. The blending process of the various original components has advanced so far that we might speak of a new race. On the contrary, the poisonings of the blood which have befallen our people ... have led not only to a decomposition of our blood, but also of our soul” (Hitler 395-396). This section

of *Mein Kampf* ends with the following finality that cannot be named as anything but Nationalistic: “*The German Reich as a state must embrace all Germans and has the task, not only of assembling and preserving the most valuable stocks of basic racial elements in this people, but slowly and surely of raising them to a dominant position*” (Hitler 398). This Nationalism is clearly founded on the ideology of racial superiority and inferiority or the Other. It was those who were considered racially superior or of the “Aryan states [which were] based on work and culture” (Hitler 153) who would become the dominant group of the Third Reich.

With the title of Führer, it was cemented “that Hitler was the head of a racial body as well as the head of government. Hitler was a racial colonialist in theory and an opponent of the Weimar Republic in practice. In the name of radical consolidation he destroyed the republic’s basic freedoms and mocked its constitution” (Snyder, *Black Earth* 38). The one-party state “was founded on the assumption of endless racial conflict” (Snyder, *Black Earth* 38) and violence in the attempt to expand Germany’s physical boundaries, their economic status, and to build up the Aryan race. These would eventually lead to the implementation of the Final Solution.

The One-Party State as Theory

During the previously mentioned campaign rally for Senator Ted Cruz on October 22, 2018 in Houston, Texas that President Donald Trump declared himself to be a Nationalist. However, prior to this declaration, the president continued his attack on the Democratic Party with Nationalistic overtones by targeting immigration issues, policy differences, and making wild accusations. Trump provokingly said, “Explain that to me. They [the Democrats] are for open borders, which means crime. They are for massive tax cuts. They’re against law enforcement. They’re totally against ICE. And law enforcement. They’re against your military and they’re not good to your vets. How do you win on that platform?” (“President Trump

Campaigns”). This rhetoric itself is Nationalistic. Trump is pitting Republican supporters against the Democratic party by promoting the false ideology that all Democrats are anti-military, anti-law and customs enforcement, and do not care about American veterans. It is a blanket statement that cannot be proven, has no basis, and promotes the separation of ideologies in an Us versus Them manner. Us, in this scenario, is the Republican Party and they are also the winners. Timothy Snyder specifically addressed the “language [that] rejected legitimate opposition” as Hitler utilized the term “struggles” and Trump relies upon “winning” (*On Tyranny* 60). This terminology erases the foundation of bipartisanship.

The rally was opened with the slogan, Make America Great Again, and the statement that “Everyone in this room is in the army of Trump” (“President Trump Campaigns”); language that is threatening and Nationalistic. A roaring crowd, however, indicated acceptance of this assertion. President Trump went on to say during the rally that, “A globalist is a person that wants the globe to do well, frankly, not caring about our country so much and you know what? We can’t have that ... You know what I am? I’m a nationalist, okay? I am a Nationalist. Nationalist. Use that word, use that word” (“President Trump Campaigns”). Immediately following this, the crowd began to chant “USA” and “Use the Word” (“President Trump Campaigns”). This corroborates that a large majority of those in attendance at the rally were accepting of the term Nationalist but rejected the idea of a Globalist. By saying that the Democratic Party were Globalists, President Trump insinuated two ideas: first, that the Democratic Party did not care about the overall welfare of America or its citizens but rather those outside of the United States. Second, that Globalist was a negative term and Nationalist was a positive term and an acceptable one. This was a rhetorical twist on the idea of Cosmopolitanism which has a lengthy and exploited history in the realm of politics.

Cosmopolitanism, by definition, infers the ideology that all human beings belong to a single community based on a shared or common morality despite individual diversities. According to Nancy Isenberg and Andrew Burstein, the election of President Trump “the populist revolts in the United States and Great Britain suddenly forced Americans to look to the mother country for insights into what many saw as Trump’s dangerous mixture of nativism and anti-globalism, along with crude appeals to the white working class” (58). Isenberg and Burstein argue that the election created a clear divide between the Democratic and Republican parties as the “Democratic Party placed too much emphasis on ‘pedigree,’ by which [Vice President Joe Biden] meant intellectual pedigree, class pedigree” (60); Trump capitalized upon this divide which allowed for him to become the victor for the “common” people “who would dismiss political correctness in an abrupt way that struck them as ‘raw honesty.’ Put another way, Trump’s vulgar style made him ‘common’ and provincial” (60). This is the platform that Trump relies upon to place the people of the Democratic and Republican parties in opposition with each other and “American politics thrives on exploiting confusion about real and perceived interest, whether those interest are tied to region or class or both” (Isenberg and Burstein 64). The attack on Globalists that Trump uses assumes that the Cosmopolitanism of the Democratic Party means that they only care about a specific group of people, but this is another abuse of language.

The history of Cosmopolitanism, as adopted by the Democratic Party, insists that humanity bears a common morality that binds humankind together which, in turn, implies that individuals should act as global citizens. Simply: humans should care and support all other humans equally. However, “Trump’s campaign rhetoric deliberately and successfully exploited the loaded binaries of regional and class conflict: urban/rural; pedigreed elites/working stiffs, cosmopolitan tolerance/provincial patriotism” (Isenberg and Burstein 64). Essentially, Trump’s

language during his campaign was truly an efficient attack on identity politics, including the ideas of Cosmopolitanism, which lend themselves to the use of the term Globalist as an insult. To be anti-Cosmopolitanism in the current sociopolitical climate “plays on the cultural gulf between town and country, between literature urban elites and commonsense country folk” and “The ‘politically correct’ designation that attaches cosmopolitanism has morphed into a slur against urban snobbery” (Isenberg and Burstein 65). Cosmopolitanism encourages the bridging of humanity, as a Globalist would, despite the societal boundaries that Trump capitalized on by means of rhetorical appeal.

Timothy Snyder also addressed the ideas of Cosmopolitanism in an interview with Eva Salinas following the election of President Trump and the release of *On Tyranny*. When asked about a chapter that makes the distinction between “patriotism and nationalism ... saying that patriotism means serving one’s country” (Salinas). Snyder attempted to clarify this point by replying that “the opposition between patriotism and nationalism that I make is mine. I’m trying to clarify things that I think are out there but haven’t been clarified. The way I argue it is that patriotism and nationalism are not different degrees, they are actually opposing concepts” (Salinas). This is a critical distinction as Nationalism is often associated with patriotism but the latter “is wishing your country well according to some standard which goes beyond what your leader is saying at the moment” (Salinas) or standing firm in a country’s foundational ideologies. However, “We’re up against a nationalist, someone who tells Americans they’re wonderful in order to lead us into a world where there really are no standards of anything” (Salinas). It is Nationalism that tells society that “we can’t do anything wrong and our leader’s job is to tell us that” (Salinas). With President Trump taking office, Snyder insists that to create change, the United States is “just too big to rely on internationalism or just upon cosmopolitanism ... the

U.S. is just too big for this to be found out on any other terrain than what kind of country we're supposed to be" (Salinas). Snyder is affirming that Cosmopolitanism can be used to combat Nationalism but that the United States has progressed beyond the help of Cosmopolitanism alone.

Therefore, he is also arguing that the abuse of language has pushed the current sociopolitical climate of the United States beyond common human tie. The acceptance of Nationalism and the exploitation of identity has created a rivalry of individuality instead of a celebration. It is critical to recognize that President Trump has promoted the idea of a one-party state through the language and declaration of Nationalism.

Oneself as Another

Following the ideas of Cosmopolitanism, philosopher Paul Ricoeur also addressed the way humanity regards the individual, each other, and the self. As a pupil of Emmanuel Lévinas, Ricoeur built upon Lévinas' theory and asserted that Oneself as Another existed in addition to the Face of the Other or Another. Ricoeur's philosophy takes the idea of the self and furthers it to address the self in relation to the Other and the ethics that accompany the interaction between humans.

According to Ricoeur, it is "implied that the Other was not reduced, as is too often taken for granted, to the otherness of another Person ... [and] is the result of the change of orientation of the celebrated dialectic of the Same and the Other when it comes in contact with the hermeneutics of the self" (Ricoeur 317-318). This is to assert that the concept of the Other cannot simply be applied to the existence of another person and whether the self rejects or accepts the Other. It is the interaction of the Same and Other from which the self is informed and develops. Therefore, "The term 'otherness' is then reserved for speculative discourse, while

passivity becomes *the* attestation of otherness” (Ricoeur 318). This is not to insinuate that the Other does not exist but rather that it is the second step in “the *triad of passivity and, hence, of otherness*” (Ricoeur 318).

The triad’s three levels are: One’s Own Body, or the Flesh, the Otherness of Other People, and Conscience. These entities work together to form a sense of self and identification. Ricoeur argues that sameness and selfhood are not the same but separated as numerical and qualitative identities (116-117). However, the primary concern regarding Ricoeur’s philosophy is that the Same and the Other come together to form one’s ethical identity (341).

Ricoeur presents the idea of conscience and affirms that it is engrained as a part of the self which strives, above all, to live a well and positively meaningful life. Removing the social concepts of good and bad, one’s conscience should still be able to guide an individual’s sense of morality. It is through conscience and the ability to recognize the self and another that a person should have the ability to determine what is true and what is false. It is this sense of conscience that drives “the basis of common notions, the Golden Rule being the most striking example, without our have to erect conscience as a supplementary agency” (Ricoeur 341-342).

Therefore, it should be engrained that one does not perpetuate or accept a Nationalist rhetoric. It causes harm to the Other and strips them of their identity. Further, an accepted Nationalist rhetoric is to mean that one has accepted a Nationalist identity or sense of entitlement and superiority above the Other. The acceptance of Nationalism is the rejection of true self and conscience. In turn, there is a loss of morality and ethics. The language of Nationalism is the language of persecution.

Nationalist Identity

The acceptance of Nationalist identity and the refusal of self may be found in Helga Schneider's *Let Me Go*. Schneider recounts the experience of seeing her mother again after twenty-seven years and her search for answers. Answers to how her mother could have abandoned Schneider and her brother, Peter, to become a guard at Auschwitz-Birkenau and how she voluntarily took part in the Nazis Final Solution. How had she freely participated in the systematic removal and extermination of an entire people?

Helga Schneider's recollection evidences the dangers of accepting and acting upon a Nationalist identity. Her mother accepted and perpetuated the rule of the one-party state that Timothy Snyder repeatedly references and warns against. She was an active participant of racial superiority and the "open subordination of inferior races, and thus [there was] an extravagantly visible difference between the political existence of Germans and that of others" (Snyder, *Black Earth* 125). In doing so, Schneider's mother firmly rejected Ricoeur's doctrine of conscience and ignored the most basic principles of ethics: the difference between right and wrong.

It was her mother's undying loyalty and praise of Hitler's regime that Schneider remembered predominantly. After all, these were the only memories she truly had. The author, prior to the meeting with her mother, recalled how she used to talk about Rudolf Höss, commander of Auschwitz:

You bragged about having known him well and also of having known and socialized with his wife and their five children. You said that Hoess was the best commandant in Auschwitz and that you were very sorry when he was transferred. You could no longer visit Frau Hoess in her charming little house in the SS estate beyond the electrified

perimeter fence—the same one that so many prisoners tried to hurl themselves against, hoping for a quick and liberating death. (Schneider 6)

It is clear from this passage that Schneider's mother had not simply embraced the Nazi Party's Nationalistic ideology but that she was proud of it. She found men like Rudolf Höss to be “irreproachable family men” (Schneider 6) rather than the integral parts of a well-organized killing machine that they were.

The meeting that Schneider recalls in *Let Me Go* took place in 1998 and was the last she would ever have with her mother prior to her passing in a nursing home at the age of 92 (Paterson). However, Schneider had previously found her mother in 1971 in her initial search for answers. Schneider “was only four when he[r] mother left in 1941” (Paterson) to join the SS and she wanted to know why. It was during this meeting that her mother had tried to give her a gift of jewelry: “rings, bracelets, cuff links, pendants, brooches, a watch, and a handful of necklaces, large and small. For a moment I looked uncomprehendingly at all that gold. Then I understood, and it was as though my hands were on fire” (Schneider 10). Schneider's mother could not understand her daughter's refusal of the gift and continued to insist that she accept it, becoming increasingly irritated when Schneider continued to refuse. She could not comprehend the wrong attached gifting someone stolen jewelry that had the price of death attached to it. Almost thirty years after the end of the war, Schneider's mother still held close the jewelry she had taken from Jewish prisoners being sent to the gas chambers. The only time she became angry about the jewelry was Schneider's repeated refusals to accept the offensive gift. This displays that she had no regrets regarding her actions at Auschwitz and how fully she had rejected the basics of human conscience.

Rather than moving to rectify this conflict of morality, Schneider's mother instead continued to cling to her days as an SS officer despite her old age and deteriorating mental condition in 1998. She would have been 87 at the time and "[t]he old woman remained unrepentant about her past" (Paterson). Fräulein Inge, a staff member at the nursing facility, tells Schneider upon her arrival that her mother "also talks about her time in prison and...yes, sometimes she feels the need to remember those times. I mean...the camps. In fact, when she addresses that subject, she becomes extraordinarily lucid, although the following day she can't remember a single word she said'" (Schneider 24). The acceptance of Nationalism and racial superiority within Schneider's mother was so strong that being part of the Nazi Party had consumed her entire life. She did not initially recognize her own daughter and had even convinced herself that the children were dead; preventing even that memory from bringing her any consolation as her body and mind began to fail her. Instead, the only moments that brought comfort, joy, or aroused her cognizance was her time as an SS officer. This she remembered more clearly than any other point in her life.

As Schneider continued speaking with her mother, her hatred for the Jewish people and her acceptance of Hitler's Nationalism still remained unwavering. Schneider's mother boasted of her conquests and cruelty as a guard. She spoke specifically of a Jewish man whom Eva, Schneider's cousin who accompanied her on the trip, had been associated with and spoke cruelly about her encounter with him at Auschwitz. Her lack of remorse is clear in the following:

"That's where I saw that man Silberberg again! In the camp! When he arrived, he dared to use my name at the Aufnahmebaracke, can you imagine? ... He used my name because we once bumped into each other at your villa ... in the mistaken belief that it might

ensure more considerate treatment for his daughter, that it might even save her from the rat poison!” She cackles shrilly, winking at the bystanders. (Schneider 45)

Silberberg, the Jewish man Eva’s father had co-owned a factory with, had indeed been sent to Birkenau along with his wife, their three children, and his parents. Only the oldest of the children, Edith, who had been thirteen when they were sent to the camps had survived (Schneider 45-46). Schneider’s mother also spoke of the human experimentation that took place in Ravensbrück but was void of any sympathy or remorse. She admitted that she ““had to tie the prisoners to the tables”” (Schneider 72) for the experiments to take place and that she ““felt no compassion ... for ‘those people,’ because the operations were being carried out for the good of humanity”” (Schneider 74). The use of “those people” highlighting the presence of Othering and Nationalist language.

The only time Schneider’s mother confessed to feeling any amount of regret was when she recalled a woman who had previously been a comrade but later joined the Resistance. This prisoner spat in the face of Schneider’s mother and so she ““put her in the selection for the brothel”” (Schneider 77). She was, indeed, sent to the brothel in 1943 and soon ““died of a venereal disease”” (Schneider 77). The brief admittance of guilt was short and curt, unlike the self-proclaimed glory of being an Auschwitz guard: ““At first...I felt a kind of sorrow ... but I soon overcame it. I couldn’t allow myself that kind of emotion, I mean pity and regret for people who deserved to be in a camp. It never happened again. I was in the Waffen-SS. I couldn’t permit myself the sentimentality of ordinary people”” (Schneider 78). The use of “ordinary people” and “people who deserved to be in a camp” in this rhetorical context and “those people” as cited previously is clear evidence of Othering rhetoric. The Jewish people did nothing to deserve their relocation to concentration camps; they were simply Jewish. With these statements,

Schneider's mother automatically elevated herself above those who were prisoners at Auschwitz. The ideology of racial superiority, the foundation of Hitler's Nationalism, is undeniably clear within the passage.

The account of Helga Schneider's meeting with her mother in 1998 is the result of Nationalism. Schneider's mother accepted, believed, and perpetuated a Nationalistic ideology to the extent that she abandoned her two young children to become a member of the Nazi SS. Further, she held so fastidiously to this rhetoric that at the age of 87, she still believed that she had done nothing wrong. She believed that the Jewish people were guilty "[o]f everything. Of Germany's defeat in the First World War, of constant defeatism toward Germany, of international conspiracies to unleash fresh conflict" (Schneider 155) and that it was her duty to protect her country. Schneider's mother exclaimed, "I believed in Germany's mission: to free Europe from that...from that repugnant race" (Schneider 157), and this was why she volunteered to be a guard at Auschwitz. One of the last things that she said before Schneider's departure was:

As far as I was concerned, what was right for the government was right for me ... and I had no right to any kind of personal thoughts, opinions, or feelings. Rather I had the duty to obey, without argument, orders from above, and if those orders meant the gassing of millions of Jews, then I was willing to collaborate. Which is why, believe me, I could not allow myself even the slightest weakness over mothers or children. When I saw the littlest ones going into the bunker, all I could think was: There's a few less Jewish brats, there are some kids who will never become repellent adult Jews ... I was convinced of the rightness of the Final Solution, and so I carried out my tasks with great commitment and conviction. Consequently, I was treated as a criminal, but even during my detention I

never stopped feeling proud and worthy to have belonged to the Germany of our great Führer.... (Schneider 159)

This statement embodies the innate harm and cruelty of accepting a Nationalist identity.

Let Me Go also exemplifies the rejection of Oneself as Another and true conscience.

Schneider's mother only expressed regret once for her actions despite being previously imprisoned for her role as an SS guard but should have never considered the position based on the Ricoeur's theory of conscience and the ideologies of Cosmopolitanism. The fundamentals of ethics and humanity should have prevented Schneider's mother from accepting and extending Nazi Nationalism. Rather, she made the conscious decision to persecute and eliminate minority groups. She held steadfast to Nationalism, the Nazi Party, and parroted their rhetoric until the end of her life.

In comparison to Schneider's mother, the current sociopolitical climate of the United States has also indicated an acceptance of Nationalist rhetoric and a perpetuation of its ideologies. This can be evidenced through the clashes of President Trump's supporters and those who stand in opposition, the chanting of "Make America Great Again" and Othering rhetoric at his rallies, and the support of Nationalists who have cited the president's language as means of ideology verification. As referenced previously: language is leading, and the actions of both Trump and his supporters display the progression of an accepted Nationalist rhetoric.

One of the primary concerns of these incidents is that Trump supporters have felt comfortable, emboldened, and supported in their biased actions. As some of these incidents have been violent it is concerning, at the least, that supporters have embraced a mob mentality and took physical action to remove someone who was acting in opposition of their ideology. These

are Nationalistic actions; inherently, they reject the common ties of humanity, conscience, and instead promote the separation of binaries.

A campaign rally held for Donald Trump in Louisville, Kentucky on March 1, 2016 became violent when several groups of protestors were removed. Notably, a young African American woman, Kashiya Nwanguma, was repeatedly shoved by Trump supporters when asked to leave the rally. She was physically surrounded, pushed, and screamed at as then-nominee President Trump shouted ““get ‘em out of here”” (Jefferson Circuit Court Division) during the altercation; an encouragement that furthered the removal of the literal and metaphorical voice of opposition. One of the men that could be seen approaching Nwanguma, Alvin Bamberger, was sued by the young woman and two other protesters with claims that Bamberger ““physically attacked them, forcing them to leave the rally”” (Jefferson Circuit Court Division). The 75-year-old Bamberger can be clearly seen in multiple videos wearing a Korean War Veterans Association hat and confronting Nwanguma before shoving her.

Bamberger’s defense claimed that, “Bamberger admits only that he touched a woman, denies that he assaulted that woman ... and denies the characterization of his actions as ‘most aggressive’ or ‘shoving ... and striking”” (United States District Court Western District of Kentucky Louisville Division). However, Bamberger wrote a letter to the Korean War Veterans Association (KWVA) and blamed Trump for inciting the actions. He wrote that, ““Trump kept saying ‘get them out, get them out’ and people in the crowd began pushing and shoving the protestors ... I physically pushed a young woman down the aisle toward the exit”” (Jefferson Circuit Court Division). Further, his attorneys claimed that Donald Trump or his campaign should be held equally liable because he ““urged and inspired Bamberger to act as he did”” (Yuhas). Bamberger admitting that he took physical action against Nwanguma, despite an

apology and saying that he did not belong to any hate groups or condone their actions (Yuhas), because Trump had urged the removal of protestors shows the acceptance of Nationalist language and identity. The claim that he acted violently because a figure of authority appeared to approve of the action is to ignore one's true conscience and take inappropriate steps to further isolate the Other. Language moved Bamberger to action despite his awareness of conscience and what is right and wrong by inherent moral and societal standards.

However, Bamberger is just one example of pro-Trump individuals who have taken physical action against protestors. The other man named by Kashiya Nwanguma, et al. in their case was Matthew Heimbach. Heimbach is a known white Nationalist. He can be seen at the rally wearing a red hat that appears to be embroidered with Donald Trump's "Make America Great Again" slogan as he approaches Nwanguma in a physically threatening manner before shoving her multiple times.

As an officially established Nationalist, it was in 2015 that Heimbach "founded the Traditionalist Worker Party. They're white separatists who want distinct homelands in the U.S. for whites and blacks. They want Jews out of the country entirely" (Tobia). The party that Heimbach has founded has a name similar to the original name of the Nazi Party which was the German Workers' Party and their foundations are also transparently similar. When confronted in an interview by reporter P.J. Tobia of the *PBS NewsHour* about similarities with Nazi ideology, Heimbach simply replied that, "And so our movement is moving towards being a European-style nationalist movement. And I respect all my comrades from other organizations. They might take a little bit of a different presentation than we do. And you can see what direction our movement is moving in. And I'm happy to be a part of that" (Tobia). A European-style Nationalist

movement means a Nationalist identity that is inclusive of a specific group and for Heimbach, it is those who identify as white.

Both Heimbach and co-founder of the Traditionalist Worker Party, Matt Parrott, named their support of Trump's ideology in the interview. Heimbach stated that, "[Trump] has shown us that the majority of everyday Americans support our sort of message. They're tired of globalism, they're tired of rampant capitalism, they're tired of Wall Street being put first, instead of Main Street" (Tobia). This statement is a clear exploit of the term Globalist or the idea of Globalism which was previously discussed. Parrott agreed with this sentiment saying that Trump "taps into a deep sense of foreboding in white America" (Tobia). Later in the interview, Tobia cited the Southern Poverty Law Center as claiming that "hate groups in the U.S. increased by 14 percent last year." The Traditionalist Worker Party and similar white Nationalist groups have contributed to this increase. This increase further evidences the acceptance of dangerous language and its enablement to action.

According to the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), the Traditionalist Worker Party is a neo-Nazi hate group "that advocates for racially pure nations and communities and blames Jews for many of the world's problems." The organization also cites quotes from both Heimbach and Parrot that are openly racist, anti-Semitic, and homophobic. Therefore, groups or individuals that identify with the same ideology as that of the Nazi or Traditionalist Work Party are fully embracing a Nationalist identity that promotes the inclusion of straight, white, Christians only. These individuals are recognizing Trump's rhetoric as support and encouragement of their Nationalistic credo.

A similar event occurred when President Trump failed to immediately condemn the actions of neo-Nazis and white supremacists on August 11-12, 2017. The Unite the Right rally,

which has also become known as the Charlottesville rally or Charlottesville riots, began as a protest by white Nationalists and sympathizers against the removal of the Confederate statue of Robert E. Lee from Lee Park. A clash of protesters and counter-protesters led to approximately 30 people being injured after James Alex Fields Jr. ran his car into a group of counter-protesters; 32-year-old Heather Heyer was killed in the assault (Yan, et al.). Virginia's governor, Terry McAuliffe, clearly denounced the presence of the white supremacists with the statement that, "They get out of bed every day to hate people and divide our country ... Let's be honest, they need to leave America, because they are not Americans" (Yan, et al.). However, "rally organizer Jason Kessler blamed law enforcement officer for the violence over the weekend" (Yan, et al.) rather than accepting responsibility for the incitement. The rally, "which was believed to be the largest gathering of white nationalists in at least a decade" (Associated Press) was clearly militant in nature as protesters hands were taped in preparation for a physical altercation, they carried torches and racist or Nationalistic signs, and began to chant racist slogans when they were met by counter-protesters (Associated Press).

President Trump had a less than adequate response to the violence at Charlottesville. Though he did denounce the violent actions that had been occurred, he placed the blame on both protesters and counter-protestors: "We condemn in the strongest possible terms this egregious display of hatred, bigotry and violence on many sides, on many sides" (Rascoe). He did not directly address the actions of the supremacists and neo-Nazis but instead promoted unity amongst the general American population. This, in and of itself, is not necessarily problematic but what was troublesome was when President Trump stated that, "you have some very bad people in that group. But you also had people that were very fine people, on both sides ... You had people in that group that were there to protest the taking down of, to them, a very, very

important statue and the renaming of a park from Robert E. Lee to another name” (“Read the Complete Transcript”). He insisted later that he was not referencing the neo-Nazis or white nationalists but that there were normal, everyday people who were in the crowd that had tried to appropriately protest. However, the rally was itself was organized by a white supremacist; a fact that went unacknowledged. Further, President Trump pointed out that Presidents Washington and Jefferson had also been slave owners and asked, “are we going to take down his statue” before saying the media was “changing history. You’re changing culture” (“Read the Complete Transcript”) by focusing solely on the neo-Nazis at Charlottesville.

President Trump’s statement that there were “a lot of bad people in the other group” (“Read the Complete Transcript”) placed the blame on both protestors and counter-protestors. However, the fact that protestors arrived armed and prepared for violence was largely ignored. They began the protest with the expectation that it would turn violent because they knew there would be opposition to racism and hatred. The President’s failure to truly address this causality inadvertently excused Nationalism and shifted blame onto those who opposed racism.

Although President Trump did blatantly denounce the violent actions that took place, it can almost be glossed over because of the follow up that evenly spread the blame. He did not take a solid or stance against neo-Nazis, thereby, displaying a tolerance of their actions. Trump’s verbal lack of intolerance for racial hatred by Nazi based groups promotes the perception that their Nationalist actions are acceptable.

Removal of Identity

This Nationalist identity breeds entitlement amongst those who accept it, but it also strips the identity of those who are of the inferior group or reject Nationalism. The promotion of one identity or ideology naturally removes autonomy from others. It prevents those who accept

Nationalism from being able to recognize the Other as the same and breaks the bonds of humanity. This can be evidenced through the methodical stripping of the Others' identity which reduces them to a state that does not allow for them to be viewed as human by the superior group. Predominantly, this is transparent within Holocaust literature.

The Diary of Dawid Sierakowiak: Five Notebooks from the Łódź Ghetto identifies how the Jewish people systematically had their identities stricken. "Dawid's *Diary* begins on June 28, 1939, a few weeks before his fifteenth birthday, and breaks off on April 15, 1943, a few months before he would turn nineteen" (Sierakowiak vii). Sierakowiak's diaries, which were found by Waclaw Szkudlarek, details the slow deterioration of the Jewish people and their status as German Nationalism took its place.

Sierakowiak's initial entries relay a young man full of life and adventure as he has finally arrived at summer camp. However, on August 6th, he first mentions the threat of Hitler: "He [Marshal Smigly-Rydz] spoke simply in soldier's language. He clearly warned Hitler against any temptation regarding Gdansk, since Poland will defend it to the last drop of blood. Poland has the same right to its territory as Germany. The speech did not last long, but it was greeted with extreme enthusiasm" (Sierakowiak 26). It was only about two weeks later, on August 21st, that he noted "The political situation is beginning to worsen. The newspapers shriek that the final crisis will come in the next two weeks. The Germans are now demanding not only Gdansk, but the Slask region as well" (Sierakowiak 27). Entries observing the next few days displayed the growing unrest of the Jewish people in Łódź and the increasing threat of German occupation. There was a brief reprieve on August 28th with the "certainty about Hitler's withdrawal" (Sierakowiak 30) but that feeling was replaced with "uncertainty, uncertainty, and even more uncertainty" (Sierakowiak 30) the following day.

The beginning of September showed resistance by Polish forces but Jewish fear until it ended on September 8th with “the terrifying news: Łódź has been surrendered!”

(Sierakowiak 36). German citizens greeted the military “with happy cries of *‘Heil Hitler!’* ... Everything patriotically and nationalistically [German] that was hidden in the past now shows its face” (Sierakowiak 36). It only took two days of occupation before the Germans began “seizing Jews to dig” (Sierakowiak 36) which signals the beginnings of loss to Jewish identity and the culmination of German Nationalism. Sierakowiak recorded on September 12th that more

People are being seized again for forced labor; beatings and robbings. The store where my father works has also been robbed. The local Germans do whatever they wish. There are numerous stories of how they treat Jews at work; some Germans treat them very well, while others bully them sadistically. At one place, for example, the Jewish employees were ordered to stop work, undress, and face a wall. Then they were told that they would be shot. Indeed, they were aimed at with great precision. No one was hurt, but this procedure was repeated several times and it threw most of the Jews completely off balance—that's what Łódź Nazis can do. (37-38)

It only took a total of four days for the Germans to gain possession of Łódź, the support of their local countrymen, and begin implementation of the Final Solution. These types of movements solidify the takeover of Nationalism and the acceptance of a superior and inferior group.

It was without hesitation that the Nazis continue their assault upon the Jewish people of Łódź; physically and mentally. They were quickly denied rations of bread, adjustments were made to schooling, and German regulation was placed upon currency. By early October, German Nationalism was being celebrated as Sierakowiak “could see almost nothing but swastikas on all buildings along the street, as well as a lot of German cars and a great number of soldiers and

Łódź Germans with swastikas on their arms” (47) and “Hitler said that he [was] ready to settle the Jewish question” (50). Although, Sierakowiak did not address what the “Jewish question” was in his entry, Hitler often used this terminology in his speeches to reference Nationalist and anti-Semitic ideologies and introduce the Final Solution. The use of the term “question” implies that there must be an answer or solution. For Hitler, this answer became mass extermination.

On October 20th, Sierakowiak wrote that, “The Germans are going into action. They have issued an order forbidding Jews to trade manufactured goods, leather, and textiles. Jews are forbidden to buy anything, and they can sell only to Christians ... While this order may effectively fight profiteering on clothing, it forces thousands of Jewish families into ruin” (53-54). The removal of rights and basic humanitarian aid continued and on November 16th, in a movement “returning to the Middle Ages” (Sierakowiak 63), the order was given that the Jewish people must “wear a band of ‘Jewish-yellow,’” (Sierakowiak 63) on their arms that denoted who they were. All the above takes place in Dawid Sierakowiak’s first notebook, “June 28-December 31, 1939: Łódź is occupied.”

The diary of Abraham Lewin, a Jew from the Warsaw ghetto in Poland, also details the removal of Jewish identity. While the beginnings of Dawid Sierakowiak’s diary showed a fluctuation of anger and disbelief towards the Nazi takeover and treatment of Jewish people, Lewin appeared prepared for the potential extermination of the Jewish people by Nationalism. However, he took great care to ensure that these actions would not be tolerated or erased from history as he took the time to record “the names of his friends and associates who [had] vanished forever” (Lewin 160). The following takes place prior to the mass deportation of the Warsaw ghetto in 1942.

On July 22nd, Lewin described the status in Warsaw: “A day of turmoil, chaos and fear: the news about the expulsion of Jews is spreading like lightning through the town, Jewish Warsaw has suddenly died, the shops are closed, Jews run by, in confusion, terrified. The Jewish streets are an appalling sight—the gloom is indescribable. There are dead bodies at several places. No one is counting them and no names are being given in this terrifying catastrophe” (161). This entry is horrific and alarming; as it should be. Jewish identity had been so removed at this point that occupying Nazis did not even care enough to clear bodies from the street. The Jewish people were not being treated or viewed as humans but a problem to be dealt with by any means. Germans who supported Nationalism were the only individuals worthy of recognition and humanitarian treatment.

Two days later, “11,000 people have been rounded up” (Lewin 163) and “Human life is dependent on some little piece of paper” (Lewin 164). The papers that Lewin mentioned are identity papers that had been issued by the Jewish Self-help Organization but they were often ignored or used against them as the Nazis continued the round-ups. Lewin reported that on August 2nd, “It looks like they have stopped recognizing the identity papers of the Jewish Self-help Organization” (169). Not only had Nationalism slowly taken away minority rights and humane conditions, caring little as to whether people lived or died, but this is a literal and physical removal of identity. The removal of identity papers shows that Jewish identity no longer matters except for deportation and persecution.

The killings and round-ups in the Warsaw ghetto continued without hesitation. Lewin named these actions as “Appalling, horrendous” (175). On August 13th, “The 23rd day of the slaughter of Jews of Warsaw” (Lewin 176), Lewin wrote that he was to be thrown out of his flat and wondered what had become of his wife as news had reached the ghetto that mass killings

were occurring at Treblinka. Cast out of his home, Lewin's worry and gloom grew substantially in the following entries and on August 23rd, he wrote that "The whole society has been pillaged from top to bottom. God, is there any help or salvation for us? Will the survivors stay alive, or will our end be the same as that of the hundreds and thousands who have already died?" (184).

Overall, the first round-up in the Warsaw ghetto "which began on July 22 and lasted for fifty-four days" (Lewin 159) during which "Approximately 300,000 of the ghetto's Jews were set to their deaths in the gas chambers, chiefly at Treblinka" (Lewin 159). According to Lawrence Langer, Lewin wrote in January of 1943 that "'Jewish Warsaw now has the air of a cemetery'" (Lewin 160). Lewin's last entry was on January 16, 1943 and it is believed that he and his daughter were taken in the second round-up and also sent to Treblinka (Lewin 160).

Lewin's diary shows the brutality of accepted Nationalism and its forceful removal of identity. However, he fought to keep Jewish identity alive by recording all the names and events that occurred in the Warsaw ghetto. He refused to allow the replacement of Jewish identity with German Nationalism.

Conclusion

The fight against the removal of identity is at a vital point in the current sociopolitical climate of the United States as the rise of Nationalism continues within the establishment of Donald Trump's presidency. It is imperative that citizens around the world heed the warning that the diaries of Dawid Sierakowiak and Abraham Lewin have given. Timothy Snyder warns that citizens should "[b]eware the one-party state" (*On Tyranny* 26) as it defies the most basic principles of American democracy.

However, America must also be able to recognize the imperfections within its democracy. "The odd American idea that giving money to political campaigns is free speech

means that the very rich have far more speech, and so in effect far more voting power, than other citizens” (Snyder, *On Tyranny* 29-30) but this does not mean that voices of the Other go unheard. As Snyder writes in Chapter Eight: “Stand out. Someone has to. It is easy to follow along. It can feel strange to say something different. But without that unease, there is no freedom. Remember Rosa Parks. The moment you set an example, the spell of the status quo is broken, and others will follow” (*On Tyranny* 51). It is imperative that individuals speak out and resist the one-party state so that identity of the Other is not forcefully removed or lost. One’s natural conscience indicates that this is the ethically correct action to take.

Resistance is not always easy but is necessary. One of the most vital steps of resistance is being able to recognize Nationalist rhetoric and the potential it has to separate and persecute minority groups. If left unchecked and unresisted, Nationalism will strip the identity of minority groups and become solidified as an acceptable standard of ethics. This would allow for the final step in Nationalism to take place: the relocation of space. Nazi Germany utilized the relocation of space to implement the Final Solution in an effort to wipe out the Jewish people. It was because of resistance that the Third Reich was unsuccessful, but the United States is presently teetering on the thin line of resistance and relocation of space.

CHAPTER 5

CONTROL, RESISTANCE, AND RELOCATION OF SPACE

Introduction

Resistance to an ideology and support of that same ideology can be found in various forms of media. The Nazis utilized propaganda effectively to promote the Nazi Party and their principals while simultaneously crushing those who remained in opposition. Those who resisted the Nazis were removed from power, positions of education in academia and the community, imprisoned, or executed. According to Timothy Snyder, “When fascists or Nazis or communists did well in elections in the 1930s or ‘40s, what followed was some combination of spectacle, repression, and salami tactics—slicing off layers of opposition one by one. Most people were distracted, some were imprisoned, and others were outmatched” (*On Tyranny* 28); media presented a form of empowerment but also a form of resistance. If the media could be controlled, the information that citizens received would also be controlled, and the Nazis capitalized upon this.

While control of the media has not been implemented in the current sociopolitical climate of the United States, President Donald Trump has repeatedly attacked the media and reporters that remain in opposition. He has attempted to discredit them or ignored their questions on multiple occasions. Further, Trump often redirects the questioning that occurs during press conferences when his authority and decisions are challenged. This is a tactic that aids in removing the voice of opposition as it can never gain any foothold or traction. If questions go unanswered or are turned around in an accusatory manner, the President’s authority remains intact and there is little for the media to report on except for what President Trump is willing to speak about or the unsavory interaction itself.

This places those who would oppose those in power in a precarious and dangerous situation. Those who resist may be at risk for being discredited and ostracized or they may even come under attack. Even if they were not initially in the Other category, resistance automatically classifies them as such because they are not following the desired manner of thinking that is to be the desired majority. To create a Nationalistic hold on an entire people means there is no room for opposition or free thinking; all individuals must be in agreeance to promote the majority and remove the minority. Those who resist and the Other must be removed or silenced. Therefore, the danger of resistance becomes relocation.

Nazi Propaganda and the Media

When Adolf Hitler came to power, he already had the support of the Nazi Party and much of the German working class. However, he needed the support of the majority to implement the Final Solution. According to Nicholas O'Shaughnessy, academic and professor of communications and post-Cold War German history, "Nazism and its ideology also inherited a distinctly Germanic ethnonationalist intellectual and populist tradition, one which it coarsened and interpreted in perverse ways, and it was this legacy which proved the intellectual nutrients to the Nazi dream of German hegemony" (16); elevating the idea that Germans were superior. Essentially: Hitler, the Nazis, and their ideologies had to be sold like a product to gain and maintain support, but the thought of German superiority was not a new concept. Hitler was simply the first leader to act upon it. German Nationalism was a dream that had become a reality as "ideas of national exceptionalism had penetrated German civic discourse from the very beginning of the nineteenth century, and it is these which served as the conceptual foundations of Nazism" (O'Shaughnessy 16-17). Hitler replied upon language and rhetorical context strategies didn't just penetrate the German civic discourse; it saturated it.

As previously discussed, the defeat of Germany in World War I had left a sense of bitterness amongst its people. They had had a serious advantage throughout much of the war, including “the German breakthrough of March 1918 [which] came with the Ludendorff Offensive of 21 March – 5 April, Operation Michael ... [and] For the first time in four years the Western Front was broken, and German armies streamed in the land beyond” (O’Shaughnessy 18). However, this victory was short lived as “the Allies had crushed the German line” (O’Shaughnessy 18) by the beginning of August 1918. It was Hitler’s refusal to accept this loss that led to “the genesis of Nazism’s propaganda ethos; propaganda was the druidical magic which had enabled a British victory, therefore, let Germans become superior magicians” (O’Shaughnessy 18) by perfecting the use of propaganda.

It is further notable that “Hitler’s first, regularly paid employment in the period after the First World War was as a professional propagandist, initially within the army itself where he worked as a political commissar fighting the propaganda of the socialists and the Communists. He proved worth of his role. Hitler’s rhetorical form was developed as he sold a visceral nationalism to his military audiences, and when addressing the groups he fed on the excitement he created” (O’Shaughnessy 20). Through this employment, Hitler became well acquainted with the power of the media and propaganda. Propaganda could help fight the shame of the great loss the German empire had suffered in World War I while simultaneously promoting a specified ideology. While the use of propaganda by the Nazi regime in World War II was implemented quite effectively, Nazi propaganda was simply “a narrative of victimhood with a roll call of loss and humiliation whose elements could be recited as a formal litany on every conceivable occasion ... [and] constantly portrayed Germans as innocents” (O’Shaughnessy 22). The Nazis painted the German people as blameless victims who would never recover from the unfair

sanctions of the Treaty of Versailles and that they would continue to suffer if they did not take back their state, identity, and lives.

Pushing this agenda, it was Hitler's brilliance as an orator and his use of propaganda that garnered initial support and propelled him to success. According to O'Shaughnessy, "Hitler events were unlike any other in that they were theatrical, entertaining and boosted by garish poster and booming sound" (26), but when Joseph Goebbels was appointed the head of propaganda in 1926, "by the end of the 1920s Nazism appeared to be a defunct enterprise. In the elections of May 1928, they had lost 100,000 votes with a mere twelve deputies being sent into the Reichstag and only 800,000 voters" (27). This showed that propaganda could work both ways and posed a form of resistance to the Nazi Party. Propaganda was a tool and "a controversial medium in German, and for many of the same reasons: those holding authority resented it, but their challengers deployed it as a tool and advocated it as a function. Propaganda was a stratum of post-war intellectual discourse" (O'Shaughnessy 30). Therefore, the perfection of Nazi propaganda was necessary to crush resistance, and this was implemented in the 1930s.

The attempt to envelop more than just the German working class and to silence anti-Nazi propaganda came with a new "positioning strategy [in 1932 that] was to portray Hindenburg as the immobile status quo and Hitler as the dynamic agent of change" (O'Shaughnessy 34). Hitler was presented as a revolutionary and "[t]he Nazis even used posters to suggest that good Germans should support Hitler because Hindenburg was the candidate of the Jews" (O'Shaughnessy 34). The use of propaganda by the Nazi Party exploded as they worked to promote Hitler in the elections. His likeness was displayed, alongside radical slogans, as Nazism was promoted, and his political opponents were attacked relentlessly. Joseph Goebbels used airplanes to further broadcast Hitler's message of "'Against reaction!'" (O'Shaughnessy 35)

while crowds gathered and banners with bright slogans were flown. Although Hitler did not win this election, the power of propaganda had been solidified and the Nazi Party simply worked harder to harness its full power. Hitler's physical image was at the heart of Nazi propaganda. His likeness was continually used to enforce his ideologies and political platform: "the idea of a nation wronged, the language of victimhood, framed by a narcissistic conception of all Germans as innately noble and, actually or latently, heroic" (O'Shaughnessy 42). Once Hitler took power in 1933, this identity was pushed even further as the Nazi Party began to take complete control of the country and, therefore, its media.

German media was censored so that the information its citizens received was what the Nazi regime wanted them to hear. This was a clear move to further invoke German Nationalism and remove opposition that existed. Further, censorship is also an ethical conflict that is rooted in language or rhetoric. Censorship ensures that a population is only influenced by one form of rhetoric or specified language that holds a certain set of values that must be adhered to. Current studies "no longer approach censorship as an undifferentiated evil, but rather have begun to analyze censorship as a complex configuration of both restrictive and productive textual practices further mediated by dynamics of social and historical context" (Boyer 512). However, the censorship that existed within the Third Reich was the direct result of "a politicized faction of intellectuals [who] sought monopoly control over state power" (Boyer 513). This further established a Nationalistic state that was driven purely by Nationalist language distributed in the rhetorical context of media.

The need to raise German Nationalism to a higher status was "a social agenda first articulated among the nineteenth-century German cultural bourgeoisie – the world-historical transcendence of the particularities and contradictions of capitalism and the cultivation of a new

modern *Volk* (people, nation) held together by means of a non-extractive (that is, homogenous and state-directed) economy of cultural production” (Boyer 515). By introducing censorship, the goal of a specific cultural production could finally be accomplished and the blemish of Germany - the Jewish peoples and other minorities - would be excluded from the new Germany that was built under authoritarian rule. Propaganda and control of the media in Hitler’s Third Reich aimed to do two things: enhance the *Volk* and remove the outsider.

The “heteroglossic discourse around national identity from *within* the cultural bourgeois elite and the inevitable polysemy that infected terms such as *Volk* and *Nation* that was the actual root of the cultural elite’s phenomenological anxiety about their cultural order slipping away” (Boyer 518). Controlling the media protected and enhanced the precious ideology of the *Volk* via language control; a tactic that remained present throughout the establishment of the German Democratic Republic (GDR). According to Boyer, this was the intersection of intellectual drive and control. The Socialist Unity Party (SED), the governing party of the GDR, followed Hitler’s lead with media control by “actively seeking to ‘engineer’ collective consciousness of the ‘real world’ through standard languages of representation and interpretation at the same time they told themselves and their citizens that they were simply crafting into actuality the ontological potentiality of the *Volk*’s own naturally systemic consciousness” (Boyer 533). It was “[t]his distillation of language in the name of the *Volk* [that] linked the professional intellectuals working GDR media-control apparatus to the work upon national identity undertaken by the German cultural bourgeoisie of the last century. Standardizing labors upon language and their desired results of predictable semantico-referential order were the means through which the intangible systematicity of the *Volk* could be made manifest” (Boyer 533). Essentially,

the propaganda and media control of the Third Reich was a perfection of language meant to enhance Nationalism via the *Volk*.

Nazi propaganda, through media control, launched a direct assault on the Jewish people before the party had even taken over the government. Ted Gottfried's *Nazi Germany: The Face of Tyranny* references a German district government official who wrote that, “one hears everywhere that ‘our government is delivering us over to the Jews’” (44) when anti-Jewish propaganda began to appear in early March 1920 and a variety of anti-Semitic publications began to appear. According to Gottfried, “[t]he *Voelkischer Beobachter*, an anti-Semitic newspaper the Nazis bought in 1920 and published as a daily, was an important tool” (45) that was utilized to raise anti-Semitic feelings amongst the German population. *Der Sturmer* or translated, *The Storm Trooper*, was another popular anti-Semitic publication “put out by Julius Streicher, a Nuremberg elementary school teacher with a low IQ who carried a whip everywhere he went” (Gottfried 45). This publication, specifically, “featured lurid fantasies of Jewish sex crimes and trumped-up stories of ceremonies involving human sacrifices” (Gottfried 45); a tactic that Joseph Goebbels would later rely heavily upon through poster publications that were clearly designed to instill fear of what the Jewish man would do to the German woman. This fear mongering can be linked directly to Hitler’s ideology of Jewish assault on the pure German bloodline in *Mein Kampf*.

President Trump and the Media

Timothy Snyder’s second chapter of *On Tyranny*, “Defend institutions,” addresses the way that Nationalism attacks institutions that protect that individual and “help us to preserve decency” (22). Snyder specifically points out that institutions need our help just as much as the general population needs their help. Society cannot make the assumption “that institutions will

automatically maintain themselves against even the most direct attacks” (Snyder, *On Tyranny* 23). This mistake was present in Nazi Germany, as further evidenced in a February 1933 publication by a German Jewish newspaper that stated, “*We do not subscribe to the view that Mr. Hitler and his friends, now finally in possession of the power they have so long desired, will implement the proposals circulating in [Nazi newspapers]; they will not suddenly deprive German Jews of their constitutional rights, nor enclose them in ghettos, nor subject them to the jealous and murderous impulses of the mob. They cannot do this...*” (Snyder, *On Tyranny* 23). History has proven that a system of checks and balances did not stop Hitler from moving the country towards a state of persecution by means of rhetorical manipulation; Nazi Germany did deprive German Jews of their constitutional rights and they were systematically executed by the thousands. This was in large part due to the assumptive mistake “that rulers who came to power through institutions cannot change or destroy those very institutions” (Snyder, *On Tyranny* 24). Currently, this is a mistake that cannot be repeated, that one must be aware of, and is a crucial part of listening for dangerous words as Snyder has suggested.

President Trump repeatedly utilized social media to promote himself prior to his presidential campaign, during the election period, and has continued its use throughout his presidency successfully. Primarily, Trump has used the social media platform, Twitter, to reach the public. This is not uncommon as a large number of celebrities, politicians, and other well-known individuals use social media to engage their audience or followers. However, President Trump has also used Twitter to openly attack political opponents or those who have resisted his position of authority.

Returning to Trump’s opposition of Barack Obama’s presidency, Twitter has been a rhetorical platform that Trump has repeatedly used to attack Obama personally and politically.

Further, some of these barrages were laced with racial commentary which falls into the category of Othering language. On November 25, 2014, Trump tweeted that, “President Obama has absolutely no control (or respect) over the African American community-they have fared so poorly under his presidency” (@realDonaldTrump) and, later the same day, “Sadly, because president Obama has done such a poor job as president, you won’t see another black president for generations” (@realDonaldTrump). These tweets alone are alarming, but Donald Trump’s long history of attacks on the free press are purely disturbing. On October 3, 2012, Trump simultaneously attacked President Obama and a news outlet by tweeting, “Obama’s ‘07 speech which @DailyCaller just released not only shows that Obama is a racist but also how the press always covers for him” (@realDonaldTrump). President Trump’s assault on news publications, media outlets, and the general press has been continually present and increased in the face of opposition.

As early as December 10, 2016, President Trump began using the term “fake news” (@realDonaldTrump) to denounce media coverage that he dislikes. Primarily, “fake news” has been used to denounce reports from Democratic or Liberal news sources that stand in opposition of Trump’s presidency or question his policies. For example: on February 15, 2017, President Trump tweeted that “The fake news media is going crazy with their conspiracy theories and blind hatred. @MSNBC & @CNN are unwatchable. @foxandfriends is great!” (@realDonaldTrump); @foxandfriends being the Twitter handle of a morning show that is an extension of the Conservative news provider, Fox News. The phrase “fake news” would not be problematic if it were being used properly to address incorrect news coverage but there is little legitimacy to President Trump’s claims. Instead, it is utilized as a rhetorical tool to dismiss and discredit the media that poses the threat of opposition via political party affiliation.

On May 20, 2019, President Trump tweeted that “The Mainstream Media has never been as corrupt and deranged as it is today. FAKE NEWS is actually the biggest story of all and is the true ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE! That’s why they refuse to cover the REAL Russia Hoax. But the American people are wise to what is going on.....” (@realDonaldTrump, 20 May 2019). Trump never ventures to address what the “REAL Russia Hoax” is and only continues in the extended tweet about how news outlets are focused on his use of banks and availability of cash money. However, the focal point of these tweets is the naming of “fake news” as the enemy of the American people. President Trump only uses “fake news” to disparage Democratic and Liberal news sources, therefore, insinuating that the Democratic Party is the enemy of the American people. Currently, the United States is predominantly made up of the Republican and Democratic parties and the term “fake news” capitalizes on that division with the constant accusations that the Democratic media is somehow deceptive. President Trump uses “fake news” loosely, with no factual basis or corrections, and repetitively; the repetitious aspect being a rhetorical strategy that is employed to cement an idea amongst the receiving population.

The Republican Party, specifically, has been successful in their use of rhetorical strategy and accomplish “this, in part, by coining new, ideologically laden and emotive terminology and repeating those terms until they become embedded in the public consciousness” (Lippi-Green 133). Constantly using “fake news” to discredit an opposing news source is a direct attack on opposition as it plays on the emotive terminology that Rosina Lippi-Green has referenced. President Trump uses “fake news” to claim that he is under attack simply because the Democrats do not like him; thereby, insinuating that those who support him will also be attacked. This preys directly on the fear that American’s may lose their basic Constitutional right to the freedom of speech. This is undoubtedly similar to the “narrative of victimhood” (O’Shaughnessy 22) and

“the language of victimhood, framed by a narcissistic conception” (O’Shaughnessy 42) that was used to describe Adolf Hitler’s rhetorical manipulation in the media. Essentially, the term “fake news” is used as a fear mongering tactic that President Trump has exploited extensively which, ironically, attacks the Constitutional right to freedom of the press.

However, there is an additional aspect that must be discussed regarding information, the media, and President Trump. While Trump has capitalized upon the catchphrase “fake news” to discredit reputable news sources and those who oppose him; fake news does exist. As Mircea Botei contends in “Misinformation with Fake News,” the idea of “fake news” is not uncommon or new but the 2016 Presidential election in the United States and Donald Trump’s use of the term has pushed this subject into the limelight. President Trump is not the only individual who uses social media to engage with politics and, “especially in the modern era, when the technical means of communication have evolved too much and their impact has reached increasing values” (Botei 133), there is a greater amount of means to access information and to also spread false information. The 2016 election was heavily effected on “an unprecedented scale” (Botei 133) by false information; “[i]nvented news, in an unprecedented volume, posted on certain sites and social networks, and then taken over by the traditional media ha[ve] come to occupy an important place on the public agenda of the electoral campaign” (Botei 133). The distribution of misinformation is manipulative of the masses and engages “the primal emotions and impulses of citizens (fear, anger, attachment, preferences, etc.)” (Botei 133-134) in a negative manner and, “the speed of contagion of large masses of people, have been considered elements that distort the meaning and content of the democratic exercise. Exposed to such attractive, but misleading news, citizens eventually come to believe and consequently make decisions in society, including voting” (Botei 134). Therefore, the language that is distributed

through social media and other information spreading platforms have a severe impact on the population which, in turn, effects the future of the political state.

Despite President Trump's attacks on the media and accusations of "fake news," a study named "Social Media and the Fake News in the 2016 Election" by Stanford University "shows that Donald Trump benefited most from false news in the election campaign" (Botei 134). The study "identified no less than 115 fake news, distributed 30.3 million times. The pro-Hillary Clinton news stood at 41 fake news, distributed 7.6 million times ... pro-Trump news was almost three times as numerous as that of candidate Clinton" (Botei 134). A site named "Ending the Fed' spread the largest number of fake news during the presidential campaign in the United States" (Botei 134) which favored Donald Trump. The distribution of false information "is a phenomenon of the hypermedia civilization of today" (Botei 137) that is accelerated by its constant and easy accessibility via the internet and social media.

The modern age and social media allow for the sharing of information to occur with the touch of a button and, without fact checking or verifying credibility of authorship, fake news can be redistributed in seconds. However, verification is the key to determining if information is false. Fake news is a problem that the populace must be aware of, but President Trump is also using the term as a controlling fear factor. As the Stanford University study uncovered, fake news helped to promote President Trump during his election and likely had an impact on the election, but he has not spoken against this false information. President Trump uses "fake news" to discredit news sources and individuals that do not support him. He does not provide any factual evidence or clarification that would prove he has been incorrectly reported. Instead, President Trump spreads fear to the public conscious by tweeting "fake news" in response to unfavorable reports regarding him or his presidency.

This oxymoron of President Trump's relationship with the media and social media links directly to Timothy Snyder's call to defend institutions. Trump gained popularity and has been able to reach his supporters through the social media platform, Twitter, which he also uses to attack the press. Social media, variations of media, and news information sources are so closely linked in their utilization and foundations that they are all protected by the same Constitutional rights to freedom of speech and freedom of the press, but President Trump is only for the media institution when it is self-serving. As Timothy Snyder warned: it is a deadly mistake to believe "that rulers who came to power through institutions cannot change or destroy those very institutions" (Snyder, *On Tyranny* 24). It is critical that one be aware of the irony and threat that exists within Donald Trump's relationship with the media. The institutions of news and media aided in President Trump's success in the 2016 election and continue to support his presidency, yet, he attacks these very institutions when they oppose him. These actions display the potential danger that the current presidency may pose to the free institutions of news and media.

Nazi Control of the Institution

Resistance to tyranny is a must when the unthinkable arrives as an authoritarian rule is one of control and terror. Hitler "used an act of terror, an event of limited inherent significance, to institute a regime of terror that killed millions of people and changed the world" (Snyder, *On Tyranny* 105). However, the Nazis were systematic in their oppression and removal of rights that any thoughts of resistance often came too late for the Jewish people. Those who resisted or did not belong to Hitler's *Volk* steadily came under this methodical attack. Education, one of the strongest forms of resistance and an integral institution to free thought, quickly fell under Nazi control.

According to I.L. Kandel, “[t]he importance of education as an instrument of social control has been recognized throughout the history of mankind. That the character of education is colored by the political form of societies ... but it was not until the positive state emerged in the nineteenth century that the full implications of this thesis were put into practice” (153). The ability to control the education of an entire population is “the most important instrument for the promotion of their [the totalitarian state] stability” (Kandel 153). Education shapes the thought process of the individual and, therefore, the future of the state.

Kandel, in “Education in Nazi Germany,” argues that in a totalitarian revolution “[t]he new ideologies, whether Fascist, Communist, or National Socialist, have, indeed assumed the place of the Bible or other sacred writ, and have engendered a type of fanaticism always associated in the past with deeply profound but intolerant religious convictions” (154). The Nazi takeover of Germany substituted political ideology for religion as “Hitler’s *Mein Kampf* is to be substituted for the Bible; the swastika is to replace the crucifix” (Kandel 155) in the traditional form of education. *Mein Kampf* became the law of the land in Hitler’s Germany in every sense as *Gleichschaltung* took hold. *Gleichschaltung*, a Nazi term referencing the process of Nazification, was a “physical, emotional, and intellectual goosestepping” (Kandel 156) of shifting the political state of Germany. Kandel argues that “[t]he most significant definition of *Gleichschaltung* is that given by Goebbels” (156) who stated that:

The revolutionary forces must be directed into all channels of public life. This is the real sense of *Gleichschaltung*. This coordination only outlines what will be the normal condition of Germany. This Germany is to have only one goal, one party, one conviction [and, he might have added, only one fiction of a race and one religion], and this state

organization is to be identical with the nation itself. Revolutions know no compromises.

The state must stand for the principle of totality. (Kandel 156)

The takeover over the education system meant that *Gleichschaltung* would be properly executed. Religious instruction in education would be as the Nazi government saw fit and would effectively remove Jewish ideology and instructors. It is notable that the construction of Nazi education “restored the authority of the teacher to control and discipline pupils and to use corporal punishment” (Kandel 159) in January 1933, sex education was forbidden in April 1933 and replaced the following month with lessons on the importance of the German mother, and in September 1933, a decree was passed that “required the teaching of hereditary and race knowledge” (Kandel 159). *Gleichschaltung*, another Nazi manipulation of language that reinforced the idea of German superiority, was implemented into every level of education to ensure Nazi control and minimize the ability to resist.

However, those who were not a part of Hitler’s ideal Germany had their education slowly removed. Dawid Sierakowiak recorded how the educational control affected him as a young Jew in the Łódź ghetto which also evidences the duality of Nationalist language. An entry from September 10, 1938, only two days after Łódź had been surrendered, showed Sierakowiak’s reservations regarding the Nazi takeover:

The first signs of German occupation: they are seizing Jews to dig. A certain retired professor living in the eleventh building warned me against going downtown ...

Tomorrow is the first day of school. Who knows how our dear school has been?

My friends are going there tomorrow to find out what's cooking, while I have to stay home. I have to! My parents say that they are not going to lose me yet. Oh, my dear

school! . . . Damn the times when I complained about getting up in the morning and about tests. If only I could have them back! (37)

On September 18th, Sierakowiak's mother "found out that as of today our three schools have been united into one coeducational *gymnasium*" (Sierakowiak 40), but he was able to return to school the following day. The entries for the next two days relayed Sierakowiak's excitement of finally being able to attend school, but distaste for the changes that were made as boys and girl would be taught at different times; therefore, limiting the time he would receive educational instruction.

The diary entries through October 3rd describe the systematic encroachment of Nazi rule as "[s]lowly and painfully, people are getting used to the new conditions and are beginning to return to their businesses" (Sierakowiak 46). However, on October 4th, Sierakowiak wrote that he "didn't escape the sad fate of my countrymen who are being seized for work" (46) and was prevented from going to school by means of forced physical labor. The following is the entry from that day:

Then, near Andrzeja Street, some student from the German *gymnasium* ran up to me with a big stick in his hand and shouted: "Komm arbeiten! In die Schule darfst du nicht gehn!" [German; Come work! You can't go to school!] . . . The work at the square was supervised by a single soldier, also with a big stick. Using rude words, he told me to fill puddles with sand. I have never been so humiliated in my life as when I looked through the gate to the square and saw the happy, smiling mugs of passersby laughing at our misfortune. Oh, you stupid abysmally stupid, foolish blockheads! It's our oppressors who should be ashamed, not us. Humiliation inflicted by force does not humiliate. But anger and helpless rage tear a man apart when he is forced to do such stupid, shameful, abusive

work ... I came to school in the middle of the first class. It was the first time I've been late to *gymnasium*. The teachers can't do anything about it: "For reasons beyond the Jew's control." (Sierakowiak 47)

This entry evidences the removal of education from the Jewish population while the Germans were receiving a specified education that would cement the belief in Hitler's anti-Semitic Third Reich. However, October 4th was just the beginning of Sierakowiak's the Nazi attack on education and ability to resist.

On October 9th, 1939, the principal of Sierakowiak's school declared that those who did not have paid tuition should not come to class. Sierakowiak "tried to talk to him after classes to explain our dire food situation, but he pushed me back, saying: 'I don't care, there are no exceptions'" (Sierakowiak 51) and on October 11th; he was expelled. Although he was later allowed to return to school intermittently, Dawid Sierakowiak's family had been placed in the position of eating or their child's education; an idea that is reaffirmed on October 16th with: "I have school now, but I don't have bread" (Sierakowiak 53). The Nazis further strengthened their chokehold on October 26th by also limiting the media that was allowed in the ghetto by seizing "all radios" (Sierakowiak 55).

Sierakowiak did continue his schooling for an extended period but education for the Jewish people of the Łódź ghetto had changed significantly. Students were forced to learn German, Polish was discouraged and removed from the curriculum, but there were those who resisted. On June 15th, 1941, Sierakowiak wrote that two teachers, Majerowicz and Mrs. Laks, had been fired. According to Sierakowiak, "[t]he overt reason: they organized resistance among teachers against the installation as commissioner—Superior Principal—of Mrs. Weichselfisz. The probable reason: alleged Communist activities in the school ... There is danger of a purge

among the students, and possibly a shutdown of the school” (102). A footnote from the editor relays that Estera Majerowicz and Rykla Laks were both deported to Auschwitz in August 1944.

Dawid Sierakowiak’s diary shows how the Nazi regime slowly weakened the Jewish population to the extent that resistance felt impossible. Physically, they were weakened and exhausted by the conditions of the ghetto. Food was scarce, to the point that Sierakowiak’s second notebook from April 6-October 23, 1941 was named the “Never-ending hunger,” and prices for food were so high that the Jewish population was often unable to purchase basic staples. Jewish possessions were seized by the Nazis; leaving them little to bargain with when they did not have the monetary means to purchase food. Their jobs were taken away and businesses destroyed; effectively ending their ability to make money for food. Disease in the ghettos was rampant as people fell ill from lack of nutrition and the close and unsanitary living conditions. Education was steadily limited and then completely cut off. The only information that the ghetto received, officially and primarily, was from the propaganda and newspapers that the Nazis allowed. These elements effectively limited the Jewish ability to resist.

Resistance of Nazi Control and Persecution

The Jewish people were systematically strangled by the Nazi regime; their rights were taken away, they were sealed into ghettos, their institutions were attacked. Yet, there were organizations and individuals who resisted Nazi rule. It is difficult to assign a quantitative value to the number of those who resisted as records have been lost, individuals were executed because of their actions, and relocated or murdered by the state. Yet, “[w]e might for the purpose of argument stipulate as a starting point a (probably high) figure of 1 percent

(90,000) of the European Jewish populace as actively involved in resistance (fighters, couriers, administrators)” (Lang 30). One of the most well-known moments of Jewish resistance was the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising.

The Żydowska Organizacja Bojowa (ZOB) was an extension of the Zionist youth movement. The Zionist youth were crucial to the Jewish efforts to resist *Gleichschaltung* and Nazism in Warsaw. Prior to the war, “their activities had been focused on the ‘elite’ among Jewish youth training for *aliyah* in Palestine, [but] during the war their sense of responsibility and range of activities broadened” (Patt 404). The established underground schools, a press system, and acted as a vital focal point of communication that combated Nazi propaganda and control efforts. They were an essential part of distributing the truth about Nazi activities, Jewish deportations, and work camps to the Jewish population; eventually “emerging as an alternative leadership organization to the Judenrat” (Patt 407). It wasn’t until the mass deportations and killings in Treblinka and Auschwitz had been confirmed that “left wing and centrist Zionist youth movements ... joined together with the Communists to form a broad-based public political group, called the Jewish National Committee and an expanded ZOB” (Patt 413). Together, founded in their new organization, they resisted what they felt would be the final liquidation of the Warsaw ghetto by means of armed confrontation.

The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising “began in January 1943, and grew to full force in April ... It came at a time when the populace of the ghetto, that at one time had reached more than 400,000, was 50,000, of whom between 400 and 1,000 would be active combatants” (Lang 31). According to Havi Dreifuss, “Mordechai Anielewicz is one of the most renowned figures in history of Jewish resistance during the Holocaust” (24) as commander of the Uprising and a leader of the Żydowska Organizacja Bojowa (ZOB, Jewish Combat

Organization). Dreifuss maintains that the ZOB was formed in response “to the wave of mass deportations of Jews from Warsaw to Treblinka in the summer of 1942” (26) even though the results of the deportations were not immediately known. The members were determined to resist the Nazis anyway they could: “Its members warned the Jewish public about the Germans’ murderous intentions and worked to expose the true nature of the Treblinka death camp” (Dreifuss 27), they destroyed German equipment, and even “attempted to assassinate Jewish Police Commander Jozef Szerynski” (Dreifuss 27). Ultimately, the month-long Uprising left 17 Germans dead and 93 wounded as per German records, but “the estimate based on Resistance sources was about three times those numbers” (Lang 31). Although the ZOB suffered a high number of casualties, the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising produced hope and motivation for other resistance organizations and remains a significant moment in Holocaust history.

Even though there were instances of resistance such as the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, which was only partially successful, most Jewish ghettos did not experience an armed uprising. Most ghettos and their Jewish inhabitants shared an experience like that of Dawid Sierakowiak in the Łódź ghetto; most thoughts of resistance came too late. The primary form of resistance was to hide from the Nazis. Outside organizations, such as the Polish underground, played an integral part of keeping Jewish individuals safe from persecution. According to Timothy Snyder, “28,000 Jews were hiding in Warsaw on the Aryan side, beyond the ghetto; of these, some 11,600 survived” (*Black Earth* 269). However, those who were unable to escape the ghettos faced starvation, malnutrition, sickness, outright killings in the street, hard labor, and, lastly, the emptying of the ghetto. Treated like leftover and unwanted product, Jewish ghettos were liquidated, and their inhabitants were taken to concentration camps as the last step in the Final Solution.

Resistance in the United States

The United States is at a crucial point that is entirely dependent upon the recognition of dangerous language and resistance. Religious, ethnic, class, gender, and racial backgrounds cannot be a dividing point as Nationalism attacks the core of humanity. Even in Hitler's Germany, organization such as Zegota, which was anti-Semitic in nature, recognized the danger that Nationalism presented. The rescue of Jewish people by anti-Semitic organizations or individuals "was not as contradictory as it might appear. Almost no one rescued Jews from a sense of obligation to Jews; a few people rescued Jews out of a sense of obligation to fellow human beings. The anti-Semitic rescuers tended to dislike the Jews and want[ed] them out of Poland, but nonetheless regarded them as human and capable of suffering" (Snyder, *Black Earth* 270). Resistance in the United States, at this moment, is a move to defend human rights.

Resistance in the United States is growing as various institutions under the Trump administration have moved to limit women's and LGBTQ rights, immigration and trade protectionism policies have drastically changed, and an economic trade war has begun. The fight for women's rights, LGBTQ rights, and immigration protection are currently at the forefront of resistance against the Trump administration. These three subjects fall under the need for basic human decency and rights.

In June 2019, the Trump administration rejected "requests from U.S. embassies to fly the rainbow pride flag on embassy flagpoles during June, LGBTQ Pride Month, three American diplomats told NBC News" (Lederman). President Trump, during his campaign, pledged to back the LGBTQ community and even "announced a campaign to decriminalize homosexuality overseas and this month issued a tweet and formal statement to 'celebrate LGBT Pride Month and recognize the outstanding contributions LGBT people have made'" (Lederman). The official

denial to fly the pride flag in Israel, Germany, Brazil and Latvia stands in stark contrast to what the Trump administration has declared it supports. President Trump has tweeted and come out in public support of the LGBTQ community on a variety of occasions, but administrative actions do not match verbal and media driven support. Rather, the Trump administration has effectively moved to “barring transgender people who have undergone a gender transition or been diagnosed with gender dysphoria from enlisting in the U.S. military” and “has also rolled back Obama administration rules designed to prevent health care discrimination against transgender people” (Lederman). This is a clear issue of human equality that a variety of institutions have stood against. The state of California, amongst others, joined together in resistance by “waving the rainbow flag over state Capitol building this month for the first time ever” (Maxouris). Although the Trump administration specifically denied the request from U.S. embassies to fly the pride flag, states that have chosen to raise the pride flag for the first time over their capitals are doing so to show that they firmly back the LGBTQ community as a government entity.

California Assemblymember Todd Gloria issued the statement that, ““At a time when the Trump administration is forbidding U.S. embassies and consulates around the world from raising pride flags, we are sending the message that we acknowledge and respect LGBTQ people, and they have a home here in California”” (Maxouris). States are showing their support of a minority community and participating in resistance through this display.

Similarly, the Women’s March on Washington in 2017 was another show of resistance. The march came the day after President Trump’s inauguration and was an “event [that] grew from humble origins – a simple Facebook invitation after Election day – to the much more massive demonstration seen Saturday” (Dwyer). Part of this opposition was rooted in the refusal to accept President Trump’s position of authority after he was elected despite vulgar and

disparaging comments about women. This sparked the infamous wearing of “pink knitted caps known as ‘pussyhats’ among the marchers” (Dwyer). However, the crux of the Women’s March was “the principle that ‘Women’s Rights are Human Rights and Human Rights are Women’s Rights’” (Dwyer). President Trump’s comments regarding women that surfaced during his election campaign, specifically an audio recording that revealed “the then-candidate bragging about groping and having sex with women” (Wulforst), sparked an international conversation about sexual harassment and assault. Overall, “more than 200 organizations – ranging from Planned Parenthood and the NAACP, to Amnesty International and the AFL-CIO – partnered with the Women’s March on Washington” (Dwyer) to take a stance against President Trump and his administration. Even though the tape that surfaced was 12 years old, Trump’s comment of “‘Grab them by the pussy. You can do anything’” (Wulforst) was found to be unacceptable and regarded as a direct attack on a woman’s right to bodily autonomy. These comments combined with a strong pro-life stance and an administration that “has proposed or undertaken measures that many see as harmful to women’s rights, particularly in the areas of abortion access, health insurance, child care and workplace policies” (Wulforst) caused the Women’s March resistance.

These two examples display forms of resistance to President Trump’s administration under the premise of basic human rights. The right to be free of persecution despite sexual orientation and gender is a right that all should be entitled and there is a current movement in the United States to protect these rights. Donald Trump’s administration, and the actions of the President himself, have relayed that these rights are circumstantial and flexible; they are not. Human rights are a matter of decency and equality that must be protected at all costs.

Relocation

The final step of Nationalism is the implementation of borders. However, the implementation of borders does not begin through hard labor or physical materials alone. False reasoning and language manipulation may be found behind the implementation of physical or ideological borders. It was the abuse of rhetoric and the physical segregation of an entire people that enabled Hitler to implement the Final Solution against the Jewish people and force their relocation. Thereby, language is the root and initial weapon of forced relocation.

Although every step towards relocation is dangerous, as evidenced and analyzed, the true danger of forced relocation lies in what occurs once that relocation has taken place. For many Jewish people and other minorities, their relocation to Nazi concentration camps meant that they would not survive. It was a death sentence. Auschwitz, one of the most infamous concentration camps that Others were relocated to, was the largest camp that the Nazis designed. Broken into three sections - Auschwitz I, Auschwitz II or Auschwitz-Birkenau, and Auschwitz III - it was effectively designed for forced labor and execution. It is estimated that approximately 1.3 million people were deported to the Auschwitz complex and, of those, approximately 1.1 million individuals died at this location; nearly 1 million of these people were Jewish (“Auschwitz”). The camp was only open from April 1940-January 1945.

Charlotte Delbo, a French Resistance fighter sent to Auschwitz on January 24, 1943, documented the conditions of the camp in the narrative, *Auschwitz and After*. As horrific as the conditions were that she experienced, “Delbo freely admitted that ... the situation for Jews was worse” (xi). Upon her arrival to Auschwitz, Delbo is in a state of disbelief when “At first, we doubt that we’ve seen what we’ve seen. It’s hard to tell them from the snow. The yard is full of them. Naked. Stacked side by side. White, a bluish whiteness against the snow. Heads shaved,

pubic hair straight and stiff. The corpses are frozen. White with brown toenails. There is something ridiculous about these cocked-up toes. Horrifyingly laughable” (Delbo 17).

Although Delbo was initially shocked by this sight, the disbelief quickly fades with time as she comes to realize that this the normal status of the camp; people dying or being killed every day in large numbers. She recalled frequently watching as “The condemned women [Jewish women] were loaded in trucks going up to the gas chamber. The last ones in were ordered to load corpses to be incinerated, then climb up” and wondering if ““Those of the last truck, the living mingled with the dead, would they go through the gas chamber or be poured out by the dump truck directly in the flames?”” (Delbo 34). There was little comfort in the camps as the conditions were horrendous and suffering took an entirely new form that became almost indescribable.

The inability to justly portray the anguish that prisoners suffered in the camps is evident throughout *Auschwitz and After* as Delbo switches between recollection, prose, and poetry; grappling with the trauma that was suffered. Even the natural element of being cold changed with the appalling conditions of Auschwitz as

Each breath drawn in is so cold that it strips the whole respiratory system. Skin ceases to be the tight protective covering for the body. The cold strips us nude, down to the bowels. The lungs flap in the icy wind. Wash out on a line. The heart is shrunk from cold, contracted, constricted till it aches, and suddenly I feel something snap there, in my heart. My heart breaks loose from my chest and everything that holds it in its place.

(Delbo 64)

It is also in this moment that Delbo loses the will to live as she’s suddenly overtaken and “filled with a wonderful sense of well-being” (64). The core of her person has completely fractured as “everything assumes the fluidity of joy. I surrender, and it is the sweet to surrender to easeful

death, sweeter than to love, and to know that it is over, no more suffering and struggling, or requiring the impossible from a heart at the end of its resources” (Delbo 64). Charlotte Delbo, once a proud resistance fighter who dared to oppose the power of Nazi Germany and its Nationalism, had finally broken under the weight of forced relocation.

Similarly, Sara Nomberg-Przytyk also recorded her time at the camp in *True Tales from a Grotesque Land: Auschwitz*. However, unlike Delbo, Nomberg-Przytyk was imprisoned because she was Jewish. The group that she was deported from Stutthof to Auschwitz with was “a motley crew who shared nothing in common but the tragedy of having been born Jewish” (3). After only a week of being there, she “decided to commit suicide” (Nomberg-Przytyk 22). It was only fear of being another nameless corpse and encouragement from fellow prisoners that she decided against it.

There is a particularly striking moment from Nomberg-Przytyk’s story that displays how resistance persisted despite the complete lack of humanity that was present at the extermination camp: “The Lovers of Auschwitz.” “The Lovers of Auschwitz,” Mala and Tadeusz, were able to escape and run away together in the fall of 1944. Nomberg-Przytyk recalled that “The whole camp was talking about it. This pair became a fascinating symbol for all of the inmates. Their love affair, their courageous flight, and now their torment had all the elements of the tragedy of Romeo and Juliet, set in Auschwitz” (102). The torment Nomberg-Przytyk referenced in this passage was that the pair were caught three weeks after their escape and beaten and interrogated. The *komando* “set up a mock tribunal” (Nomberg-Przytyk 102) and gallows before marching Mala out to be hung in front of the female block. However, before they could hang her, Mala “pulled a razor out of concealment. She started to cut her veins” (Nomberg-Przytyk 103). Mala was stopped by Ilse Koch, a female *komando* who had been delivering a speech, and the female

prisoners were quickly dispersed before the Mala's fate at the gallows could be sealed.

According to Nomberg-Przytyk, other prisoners reported "the corpse of Tadeusz ... hanging on the gate" (104) and that "Ilse wanted Mala to be thrown in to the oven alive. That was to be her revenge for the aborted ceremony and for the slap that Mala had delivered in front of all the women. But the SS man who worked in the crematorium did not carry out her orders. He shot Mala with his own hands and then threw her body into the oven" (104). The Lovers of Auschwitz were executed because, even imprisoned, they actively resisted their inferior status and forced relocation by the Nazis.

Relocation in the United States

As a Nationalist rhetoric has been perpetuated throughout the United States by President Trump, immigration camps and holding facilities have become more prominent and supported. Asylum seekers who have legally presented themselves at the U.S.-Mexico border and undocumented individuals have been separated from their families under the Zero Tolerance Immigration Policy that President Trump's administration announced on April 6, 2018.

The Zero Tolerance Immigration Policy is an active attack on basic human rights as families are separated when they are detained. According to *Humans Rights Watch*, "nearly 3,000 children were separated from their parents before President Donald Trump signed an executive order on June 20 [2018] halting family separation. The order, however, stated that the 'zero-tolerance' policy would continue" ("Q&A: Trump Admin."). The Trump administration is not the first presidential administration to create harsher immigration laws or to crack down on those who enter the United States illegally but it is the first that has "resulted in immediate separation of parents traveling with children" ("Q&A: Trump Admin."). The presidential

administration has maintained that the separation of families is not meant to be a deterrent but is simply a side effect of the Zero Tolerance Immigration Policy, however, “[t]he Trump administration had stated more than a year earlier that it was considering separating families to deter them from entering the U.S.” (“Q&A: Trump Admin.”). Further, President Trump’s administration “also began separating families ... who crossed the border legally, in October 2017” (“Q&A: Trump Admin.”) which is a gross abuse of power. The administration has backtracked under criticism that they promote they separation of families but have stood by the Zero Tolerance Immigration Policy and its results.

Further, these individuals are detained in inhumane conditions. Recently, a makeshift detention area in El Paso, Texas that physically resembled an animal enclosure was disassembled “following an outcry over the conditions at the site” (Romero). According to Simon Romero of *The New York Times*, “Criticism over the bridge enclosure had been building all week, with reports of children sleeping on trash-strewn gravel at the site under the Paso del Norte bridge. Some migrant families stayed inside a military tent set up at the site; others remained outside even as nighttime temperatures dipped in to the 40s.” Pictures of the outdoor enclosure showed barbed wire around the top of the fence and piles of trash littering the asphalt area. It was reported that this area was used to detain hundreds of families and that the “processing of migrants [had simply been moved] to another site on the other side of the bridge” (Romero). This article was published on March 31, 2019.

The increase of detainment amongst undocumented migrants prompted Nolo, a legal advice website, to publish the article, “Living Conditions in Immigration Detention Centers.” This article functions as a how-to guide for migrants who may be apprehended and placed in a detention facility. The article describes the general, physical conditions of the detention site, how

to interact with staff, and how to communicate with people outside of the facility. Regarding physical surroundings, the article warns that “detention centers feel like prisons, in many cases, they are actually housed in correction facilities” and that “you may not know for how long you will be detained” (Myslinska). The article also provides information to migrants about how they should handle any abuse they may endure. If a migrant experiences any “abuse or serious mistreatment (such as lack of medical care, withholding medication, physical violence, sexual abuse, discrimination, unsanitary conditions, lack of a bed, water, or food, segregation used as punishment, or being forced to sign documents) make notes of your grievances so you can later remember all the details, and speak to your lawyer about them” (Myslinska). The list that is present in this article evidences the various and grievous situations that migrants may be placed in if they are detained. These conditions are unacceptable and inhumane. Humans being kept in a holding facility in which they may experience unsanitary conditions, physical or sexual abuse, and have no immediate access to legal counsel for crossing a border without documentation or presenting themselves legally by way of asylum is a violation of human rights. The rhetorical promotion and acceptance that these people are dangerous have allowed for these actions to take place.

In the past two years, 22 immigrants have died at Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) detention centers (Seville, Rappleye, and Lehren). According to an article from NBC News, “Some [immigrants] had been longtime legal residents, arriving as refugees or students. Others were recent asylum seekers. Many were young – half were not yet 45 years old.” Most recently, the death of a transgender woman seeking asylum from Honduras and two young children while in ICE custody have brought scrutiny and criticism upon U.S. immigration policies and the Trump administration. Although a crackdown on immigration is not a new

platform for politicians, President Trump's administration has been so heavily criticized because of his position during the election and the inhumane way he referenced migrants and the conditions they are placed in. Further, the introduction of the Zero Tolerance Immigration Policy has increased the rate at which undocumented migrants are arrested and imprisoned. This increase is attributed to the criminalizing of any unlawful entry into the United States under this new policy. This is also the primary cause of families being separated for extended periods of time if they are taken into custody by ICE. A large number of those detained are initially placed in makeshift sites like the one under the bridge in El Paso before being relocated to long-term facilities, some of which have been found by the DHS Office of Inspector General to be negligent in general maintenance and safety standards (Seville, et al.). It was also found during a series of inspections that the staff of these ICE facilities were ill-equipped or improperly trained.

Rather than addressing the issues with the immigration camps following these deaths, President Trump tweeted on December 29, 2018 that, "Any deaths of children or others at the Border are strictly the fault of the Democrats and their pathetic immigration policies that allow people to make the long trek thinking they can enter our country illegally. They can't. If we had a Wall, they wouldn't even try!" (qtd. in Seville, et al.). However, it was President Trump that "signed an executive order nearly two years ago broadening the types of immigrants considered priorities for ICE enforcement" (Seville, et al.). Since this order was enacted, "'administrative' arrests for violations of civil immigration law have risen 44 percent" (Seville, et al.). Violation of civil immigration law references individuals who are in the United States under the DACA program, visas, or other means of legal immigration and broken terms of the agreement that allowed for them to remain in the country. However, these violations may be as simple as a

speeding ticket or another low-level form of “crime” and immigrants are taken into custody with the threat of deportation until their case can be resolved.

These makeshift sites and ICE detention facilities are the vessels of relocation that have been enabled by the rhetorical practices and the implementation of inhumane policies. Recently, Congresswoman Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez has come under fire for saying that President Trump is running concentration camps at the Southern border. Although the conditions of ICE facilities and sites are not close to the conditions of those that were present for the Jewish people during the Holocaust, the United States has reached a point under the Trump administration that fellow humans are being placed in poor, unsanitary, and unsafe conditions. Additionally, Andrea Pitzer, who is an investigative journalist and the author of *One Long Night: A Global History of Concentration Camps*, backed Cortez’s statement via her expertise and experience. While the term “concentration camp” is most closely linked to the events of the Holocaust it is not exclusively applicable to the imprisonment of Jewish people and other minorities by the Nazis. The literal definition of concentration camp is “a place where large numbers of people (such as prisoners of war, political prisoners, refugees, or the members of an ethnic or religious minority) are detained or confined under armed guard –used especially in reference to camps created by the Nazis in World War II for the internment and persecution of Jews and other prisoners” (Merriam-Webster). The current Zero Tolerance Immigration Policy enacted by the Trump administration has created a situation that embodies this definition.

However, there is a clear distinction that needs to be made regarding the use of the term “concentration camp.” By dictionary definition, there are shared similarities between the ICE holding facilities that are currently being used by the United States and how the Nazis held Jewish, minority, and political prisoners. The decisive difference between these types of

concentration camps, however, is the intent of their design. Nazi Germany did not simply have concentration camps, which are used to detain a specific group they constructed death camps.

Nazi concentration camps, like Auschwitz, had gas chambers that were used to kill people quickly, efficiently, and effectively. The use of gas chambers killed prisoners by the hundreds and crematoriums were used to burn the bodies or they were discarded in mass graves that, often, other prisoners had dug. Individuals that were not put into the chambers were worked and starved to death or killed after they had served their purpose. There was absolutely no regard for the life of the Other in Nazi concentration camps as extermination was the Final Solution. The United States is not running Hitler-like concentration camps, but there are people dying. They are being forcefully confined in horrible conditions by a questionable government policy and no responsibility is being taken for the harm that is being done.

Conclusion

Language was used in the twentieth-century to encourage the removal of an entire people and this exploitation has continued into the twenty-first century. Individuals such as Adolf Hitler and Donald Trump have capitalized upon specific terms to create a sense of fear among large groups of people and encouraged the rejection of Others under the guise of Patriotism. However, the exclusion and persecution of minorities is not patriotic; it is Nationalistic. Minority groups have been and are currently being pushed into physical spaces that force them to dwell between literal and cultural borders which also removes their identity. As citizens of humanity, it is imperative that this abuse of language is recognized to prevent the continuation of forced relocation.

Words such as *Lebensraum* or *Volk* define a specific living space for a specified group of people. Falsely claiming that migrants from another country incite violence and are rapists

produces fear and infers the idea that they are not welcome and should not be. Taking power and promoting a Nationalist agenda only leaves room for a majority group and grossly disregards the minority or Other by way of persecution. Attacking institutions and constitutional rights is a byproduct of Nationalism that moves to continue fear mongering. Lastly, by relocating the minority or persecuted and placing them in unfit physical areas of containment is the final step before the complete removal of humanity. These elements are all a direct assault on the basic human right to live without persecution.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to identify if there were any similarities between the Nationalist and Othering rhetoric of Adolf Hitler and President Donald Trump's speeches. Chapter Two found that similarities are present with the largest commonality being a variation of the term "people." The rhetorical context that this phrase appeared in was then analyzed to determine whether Nationalist or Othering tones were present. It was discovered that variations of "people" existed predominantly within Nationalist or Othering rhetorical contexts. This prompted a historical examination of the rise to power for both Adolf Hitler and Donald Trump and how dangerous language was utilized by both parties. The following chapters discussed the dangers of falling into and accepting Nationalist language. Accepting Nationalism is to assume a singular identity that disregards and persecutes others. This persecution led to Hitler's Final Solution and, in the United States, has enabled the practice of inhumane immigration policies along the U.S.-Mexico border.

Overall, the purpose of this study was to bring awareness to the dangers of language and aid in recognition. If there is no recognition of dangerous language and rhetorical practices, there can be no resistance, which can encourage the continued persecution of minority groups. However, I am not asserting that Adolf Hitler and Donald Trump are the same person or that their goals are necessarily the same. This study focused entirely on language because rhetoric holds an immense amount of power, but it is this power and the susceptibility to Nationalist and Othering rhetoric that can lead to a Hitlerian rule.

Adolf Hitler took his rule by force and, although he was named chancellor, that was simply a formality. Nazi Germany fell under the rule of an absolute dictator who was determined

to instill a sense of Nationalism and destroyed those who opposed him. President Trump was voted into power by the American public and has not begun an active purge in the United States of all minorities. However, his language and rhetorical strategies do not relay that they are welcome in a country that has been founded upon immigrants. President Trump's language does not appear to be calculated in the manner that Hitler's was, but this does not make his rhetorical practices any less dangerous. Asserting that most of a minority group only brings violence, drugs, and sexual assault does not imply that they are welcome or good, but that keeping them out of America is necessary and will make the country great again. Hitler blatantly called for minority groups in Nazi Germany to be expelled or exterminated as a necessary means to greatness.

However, the susceptibility to dangerous language remains the same in both situations, as evidenced by the fact that these men have been able to maintain positions of power. The ultimate danger that lies with the acceptance of Nationalist and Othering rhetoric is that the Other is persecuted. In Hitler's Nazi Germany, the Final Solution was implemented, and minority groups were systematically relocated and executed. Currently, the United States is acting upon the removal of rights for specific minority groups, such as the LGBTQ+ community and female reproduction, and the forced relocation and criminal detainment of undocumented migrants has been enacted under the Trump administration.

The United States truly stands in a dangerous place through the current sociopolitical climate. Careless and dangerous language is being used, President Trump has openly declared himself to be a Nationalist, and individuals are acting upon this rhetoric. The increase of hate crimes and the violence that has been present at President Trump's rallies evidence the continued danger that his Nationalist ideas and language present. This must end or society risks allowing

another mass persecution to happen. The first step to resisting another Holocaust is to recognize dangerous language and rhetorical contexts. If the ability to recognize Nationalist rhetoric is obtained and employed, then resistance can be enacted before the unimaginable arrives. While the United States has a system of checks and balances that should prevent authoritarian rule such as “the right to a fair trial, and so on, is the oldest trick in the Hitlerian book. *Do not fall for it*” (Snyder, *On Tyranny* 103). Society must stand for equality amongst all humans and challenge those who do not fight for these rights. We must be courageous because “[i]f none of us is prepared to die for freedom, then all of us will die under tyranny” (Snyder, *On Tyranny* 115).

Works Cited

- @realDonaldTrump. "I want to see @BarackObama's college records to see how he listed his place of birth n the application." *Twitter*, 30 May 2012, 9:44 a.m., twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/207875027008368640?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E207875027008368640%7Ctwgr%5E393039363b636f6e74726f6c&ref_url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.trumptwitterarchive.com%2Fhighlights%2Fbirtherism.
- @realDonaldTrump. "Sadly, the overwhelming amount of violent crime in our major cities is committed by blacks and hispanics-a tough subject-must be discussed." *Twitter*, 5 June 2013, 3:05 a.m., twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/342190428675796992?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E342190428675796992&ref_url=http%3A%2F%2Ftime.com%2F4473972%2Fdonald-trump-mexico-meeting-insult%2F.
- @realDonaldTrump. "Sadly, because president Obama has done such a poor job as president, you won't see another black president for generations!" *Twitter*, 25 Nov. 2014, 12:15 a.m., twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/537157586316165120.
- @realDonaldTrump. "President Obama has absolutely no control (or respect) over the African American community-they have fared so poorly under his presidency." *Twitter*, 25 Nov. 2014, 6:05 a.m., twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/537245792378294272.
- @realDonaldTrump. "Obama's '07 speech which @DailyCaller just released not only shows that Obama is a racist but also how the press always covers for him." *Twitter*, 3 Oct. 2012, 12:44 p.m., twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/253581368087437312.

@realDonaldTrump. “Check out tweets from last two days. I refer to Fake News Media when mentioning Enemy of the People – but dishonest reporters use only the word ‘Media.’ The people of our Great Country are angry and disillusioned at receiving so much Fake News. They get it, and fully understand!” *Twitter*, 29 Oct. 2018, 5:14 p.m., twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/1057063101189836801.

@realDonaldTrump. “Reports by @CNN that I will be working on The Apprentice during my Presidency, even part time, are ridiculous & untrue – FAKE NEWS!” *Twitter*, 10 Dec. 2016, 6:11 a.m., twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/807588632877998081.

@realDonaldTrump. “The fake news media is going crazy with their conspiracy theories and blind hatred. @MSNBC & @CNN are unwatchable. @foxandfriends is great!” *Twitter*, 15 Feb. 2017, 3:40 a.m., twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/831830548565852160.

@realDonaldTrump. “The Mainstream Media has never been as corrupt and deranged as it is today. FAKE NEWS is actually the biggest story of all and is the true ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE! That’s why they refuse to cover the REAL Russia Hoax. But the American people are wise to what is going on.....” *Twitter*, 20 May 2019, 4:20 a.m., twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/1130433207487336450.

Allen, Cooper. “Donald Trump and White House bids: A long history of not running.” *USA Today*, 15 June 2015, www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/onpolitics/2015/06/15/donald-trump-president-campaign/81230050/. Accessed 23 Jan. 2019.

Anderson, Eugene N., and Adolf Hitler. “Mein Kampf.” *The American Historical Review*, vol. 45, no. 2, 1940, p. 399. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/1906314.

Associated Press. "White Supremacists arrested on Charlottesville Riot Charges." *PBS NewsHour*, 24 Oct. 2018, www.pbs.org/newshour/nation/white-supremacists-arrested-on-charlottesville-riot-charges. Accessed 13 Apr. 2019.

"Auschwitz." *United States Holocaust Memorial Museum*, 2019, encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/auschwitz. Accessed 12 Jan. 2019.

Bernhard, Michael H. *Institutions and the Fate of Democracy: Germany and Poland in the Twentieth Century*. Pittsburgh U P, 2005.

Botei, Mircea. "Misinformation with Fake News." *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov. Series VII, Social Sciences and Law*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2017, pp. 133–140. *DOAJ*, https://sshelco-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/202aau/TN_doaj_soai_doaj_org_article_9ea941cca1834463939b1285496367be.

Boyer, Dominic. "Censorship as a Vocation: The Institutions, Practices, and Cultural Logic of Media Control in the German Democratic Republic." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 45, no. 3, 2003, pp. 511-545. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3879460>.

classicalsteve. "The Apprentice: User Reviews." *IMDB*, 11 Oct. 2017, www.imdb.com/review/rw1744652/?ref_=rw_urv. Accessed 7 May 2019.

Clines, Francis X. "Trump Quits Grand Old Party for New." *The New York Times*, 25 Oct. 1999, archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/library/politics/camp/102599wh-ref-trump.html. Accessed 2 Feb. 2019.

"CNN Press Room." *CNN*, 3 June 2016, cnnpressroom.blogs.cnn.com/2016/06/03/tapper-to-trump-is-that-not-the-definition-of-racism/. Accessed 1 Mar. 2019.

- CNN Staff. "Here's the Full Text of Donald Trump's Victory Speech." *CNN*, 9 Nov. 2016, www.cnn.com/2016/11/09/politics/donald-trump-victory-speech/index.html. Accessed 13 Apr. 2019.
- Delbo, Charlotte. *Auschwitz and After*. Translated by Rosette C. Lamont, 2nd ed., Yale University, 1995.
- "Documenting Numbers of Victims of the Holocaust and Nazi Persecution." *United States Holocaust Memorial Museum*, 2019, encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/documenting-numbers-of-victims-of-the-holocaust-and-nazi-persecution. Accessed 1 May 2019.
- Dreifuss, Havi, and Itamar Haritan. "The Leadership of the Jewish Combat Organization during the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising: A Reassessment." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2017, pp. 24–60. *Oxford Academic*, <https://doi.org/10.1093/hgs/dcx016>.
- Dwyer, Colin. "Women's March Floods Washington, Sparking Rallies Worldwide." *NPR*, 21 Jan. 2017, www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2017/01/21/510932265/demonstrators-gather-early-to-kick-off-womens-march-on-washington. Accessed 2 June 2019.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. "Arrests by Race, 2013." *Uniform Crime Report*, 2013, Table 43A, ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2013/crime-in-the-u.s.-2013/tables/table-43. Accessed 17 Feb. 2019.
- Ferguson, Niall. *The War of the World: Twentieth-Century Conflict and the Descent of the West*. Penguin Press, 2006.
- Gottfried, Ted., et al. *Nazi Germany the Face of Tyranny*. Twenty-First Century Books, 2000.
- Heiden, Konrad, et al. *Der Fuehrer; Hitler's Rise to Power*. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1944.

- “Here’s Donald Trump’s Presidential Announcement Speech.” *Time*, 16 June 2015, time.com/3923128/donald-trump-announcement-speech/. Accessed 26 Apr. 2019.
- Hitler, Adolf. *Mein Kampf*. Translated by Ralph Manheim, Mariner Books, 1999.
- Isenberg, Nancy, and Andrew Burstein. “Cosmopolitanism vs. Provincialism: How the Politics of Place Hurts America.” *The Hedgehog Review*, vol. 19, no. 2, 1 July 2017, pp. 58-69. EBSCO, <http://proxy-iup.klnpa.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hus&AN=124050003&site=ehost-live>.
- James, Nathan. “Recent Violent Crime Trends in the United States.” *Congressional Research Service*, 20 June 2018, pp. 1-38. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R45236.pdf>.
- Jefferson Circuit Court Division. *Kashiya Nwanguma and Molly Shah and Henry Brousseau vs. Donald J. Trump, Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., Matthew John Heimbach, Alvin Bamberger, and Unknown Defendant*. 31 Mar. 2016, www.politico.com/f/?id=0000015b-6ef5-db04-ad5b-7ffd23680001. Accessed 19 Feb. 2019.
- Johnson, Mason. “FBI’s Violent Crime Statistics For Every City In America.” *CBS Chicago*, 22 Oct. 2015, chicago.cbslocal.com/2015/10/22/violent-crime-statistics-for-every-city-in-america/. Accessed 5 Mar. 2019.
- Jones, Philip Edward, et al. “The effects of traditional news, partisan talk, and political satire programs on perceptions of presidential candidate viability and electability.” *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, vol. 24, no. 3, 2016, pp. 173-184. EBSCO, doi: 10.1080/15456870.2016.1184666.

- Kandel, I.L. "Education in Nazi Germany." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 182, no. 1, 1935, pp. 153–163. Sage, doi: 10.1177/000271623518200118.
- Koenigsberg, Richard A. *Hitler's Ideology: a Study in Psychoanalytic Sociology*. Library of Social Science, 1975.
- koziki2003. "The Apprentice: User Reviews." *IMDB*, 14 Apr. 2007, www.imdb.com/review/rw1637376/?ref_=tt_urv. Accessed 7 May 2019.
- Lederman, Josh. "Trump admin tells U.S. embassies they can't fly pride flag on flagpoles." *NBC News*, 7 June 2019, www.nbcnews.com/politics/national-security/trump-admin-tells-u-s-embassies-they-can-t-fly-n1015236. Accessed 10 June 2019.
- Lang, Berel. "Why Didn't They Resist More?" *Jewish Resistance Against the Nazis*, edited by Patrick Henry, Catholic U P, 2014, pp. 27-39.
- Lewin, Abraham. "Abraham Lewin: Diary of the Great Deportation." *Art from the Ashes: A Holocaust Anthology*, edited by Lawrence L. Langer, Oxford U P, 1995, pp. 159-196.
- Lippi-Green, Rosina. *English with an Accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2012.
- Maxouris, Christina. "California joins states flying Pride flag this month as Trump administration blocks displays at US embassies." *CNN*, 18 June 2019, www.cnn.com/2019/06/18/us/california-pride-flag-capitol-first-time-trnd/index.html. Accessed 5 June 2019.
- Merriam-Webster. "Concentration Camp." *Merriam-Webster, Inc.*, 2019, www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/concentration%20camp. Accessed 23 June 2019.

- Mills, Kim I. "New Hampshire GOP Activist Wants to Draft Trump for President." *AP News*, 13 July 1987, <https://apnews.com/7c1fd4809c7707852989c33daab5435b>. Accessed 5 Apr. 2019.
- Myslinska, Dagmar R. "Living Conditions in Immigration Detention Centers." *Nolo*, 2019, www.nolo.com/legal-encyclopedia/living-conditions-immigration-detention-centers.html/. Accessed 26 June 2019.
- Nomberg-Przytyk, Sara. *Auschwitz: True Tales from a Grotesque Land*. Translated by Roslyn Hirsch, Edited by Eli Pfefferkorn and David H. Hirsch, University of North Carolina, 1985.
- O'Shaughnessy, Nicholas. *Selling Hitler: Propaganda and the Nazi Brand*. C. Hurst & Co., 2016.
- Paterson, Tony. "My shocking reunion with SS sadist who was my mother." *The Telegraph*, 19 Jan. 2003, www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/austria/1419368/My-shocking-reunion-with-SS-sadist-who-was-my-mother.html. Accessed 22 Feb. 2019.
- Patt, Avinoam. "Jewish Resistance in the Warsaw Ghetto." *Jewish Resistance Against the Nazis*, edited by Patrick Henry, Catholic U P, 2014, pp. 393-425.
- "President Trump Campaigns for Senator Ted Cruz in Houston." *C-Span*, 22 Oct. 2018, www.c-span.org/video/?453256-1/president-trump-campaigns-senator-ted-cruz-houston&start=1436. Accessed 26 Apr. 2019.
- "Q&A: Trump Administration's 'Zero Tolerance' Immigration Policy." *Human Rights Watch*, 16 Aug. 2018, www.hrw.org/news/2018/08/16/qa-trump-administrations-zero-tolerance-immigration-policy#. Accessed 19 March 2019.

- Rascoe, Ayesha. "A Year After Charlottesville, Not Much Has Changed For Trump." *National Public Radio, Inc. [US]*, 11 Aug. 2018, www.npr.org/2018/08/11/637665414/a-year-after-charlottesville-not-much-has-changed-for-trump. Accessed 22 Apr. 2019.
- "Read the complete transcript of President Trump's remarks at Trump Tower on Charlottesville." *Los Angeles Times*, 15 Aug. 2017, www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-trump-charlottesville-transcript-20170815-story.html. Accessed 7 Apr. 2019.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Oneself as Another*. Chicago U P, 1995.
- Romero, Simon. "Migrants Moved Out of Holding Pen Under El Paso Bridge." *The New York Times*, 31 Mar. 2019, www.nytimes.com/2019/03/31/us/el-paso-bridge-migrants.html?rref=collection%2Ftimestopic%2FImmigration%20Detention%E2%80%AF. Accessed 2 Apr. 2019.
- Rupp, Leila J. "Mother of the *Volk*: The Image of Women in Nazi Ideology." *Signs*, vol. 3, no. 2, Winter 1977, pp. 362–379. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3173289>.
- Salinas, Eva. "Twenty ways to resist tyranny." *Centre for International Governance Innovation*, 6 May 2017, www.opencanada.org/features/twenty-ways-resist-tyranny/. Accessed 17 May 2019.
- Schneider, Helga. *Let Me Go*. Penguin Books, 2005.
- Seville, Lisa Riordan, Hanah Rappleye, and Andrew W. Lehren. "22 immigrants died in ICE detention centers during the past 2 years." *NBC News*, 6 Jan. 2019, www.nbcnews.com/politics/immigration/22-immigrants-died-ice-detention-centers-during-past-2-years-n954781. Accessed 8 Apr. 2019.
- Sierakowiak, Dawid. *The Diary of Dawid Sierakowiak: Five Notebooks from the Łódź Ghetto*. Translated by Kamil Turowsky, Edited by Alan Adelson, *Oxford University*, 1996.

- Snyder, Timothy. *Black Earth: The Holocaust as History and Warning*. Tim Duggan Books, 2015.
- Snyder, Timothy. *On Tyranny: Twenty Lessons from the Twentieth Century*, Tim Duggan Books, 2017.
- Southern Poverty Law Center. "Traditionalist Worker Party." *The Southern Poverty Law Center*, 2019, www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/group/traditionalist-worker-party. Accessed 18 Apr. 2019.
- Tobia, P.J. "Why white nationalists hear a political ally in Donald Trump." *PBS NewsHour*, 26 Oct. 2016, www.pbs.org/newshour/show/white-nationalists-hear-political-ally-donald-trump. Accessed 7 Mar. 2019.
- United States District Court Western District of Kentucky Louisville Division. *Kashiya Nwanguma, et al. v. Donald J. Trump, et al.* 14 Apr. 2017, www.politico.com/f/?id=0000015b-6ee9-dd98-a9fb-eeefc4690002. Accessed 19 Feb. 2019.
- "What is NVivo." *QSR International*, www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo/what-is-nvivo. Accessed 26 Apr. 2019.
- Wulforst, Ellen. "U.S. Women's Group Plays Trump's 'Grab Them' Tape on Washington Mall." *Reuters*, 6 Oct. 2017, www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-women/u-s-womens-group-plays-trumps-grab-them-tape-on-washington-mall-idUSKBN1CB2EL. Accessed 15 June 2019.
- Yan, Holly, et al. "Virginia governor on white nationalist: They should leave America." *CNN*, 14 Aug. 2017, www.cnn.com/2017/08/13/us/charlottesville-white-nationalist-rally-car-crash/index.html. Accessed 5 Mar. 2019.

Yuhas, Alan. "Man accused of assaulting woman at election rally says Trump inspired him."

The Guardian, 15 Apr. 2017, www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/apr/15/trump-campaign-rally-lawsuit-assault-kentucky. Accessed 19 Feb. 2019.