THE SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE ITALIAN FASCISM AND THE GERMAN NATIONAL-SOCIALISM

Abstract

The theme of the paper is the similarities and differences between the two extreme right ideologies that emerged in Europe after the First World War. One, fascism, is born in the country of victory, Italy. Second, national socialism, in the defeated country, Germany. They formed a good part of the dissatisfaction of the two countries and nations. In Italy, there was dissatisfaction because the country of the winner did not receive more territory. In Germany, with the defeat, humiliation has come in the form of high war reparations and the loss of territory, centuries in German power. Reparations were accompanied by the economic crisis and the impoverishment of the population. When we look at these two ideologies, they share some characteristics, such as nationalism, corporatism, a tendency towards a totalitarian system. However, these similarities bring in the differences, which came out not only from their perception of supporters of fascism and national-socialism, but were simply dictated by the historical and political circumstances that ruled in Italy and Germany at the beginning of the twentieth century.
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1. INTRODUCTION

There are about four points to which the origin of fascism can be traced. According to the first, fascism can be viewed as one kind of instinctive state of consciousness, founded in all forms of social organization since the emergence of civilization. This state of affairs is articulated through the ideology of fascism. On the one hand, it was done by German commentators who linked national socialism with “national consciousness” and the history of the Nordic race, or the Italian fascists who linked their vision with the history of the Roman Empire. In addition, some of the psychological research in the twentieth century fused fascism with certain universal structures of personality, which could potentially include all people. The second point, which can be especially followed by Italian fascism, has “emerged” from European cultural movements, such as Renaissance or Enlightenment. For example, one of the leading fascist thinkers, Alfredo Rocco has seen in Machiavelli the founder of fascism. Rocco claimed that “Fascism is learning not only from his doctrine, but also from his actions.” The third point, which can trace the origin of fascism and national socialism, relates to a complex negative reaction to the French revolution within European thought. The critical and fatalistic response of many European thinkers, but also the ruling regimes to the rise of liberalism, egalitarianism, democracy, rationalism, industrialization and later socialism, formed the “background” for the emergence of fascism during the nineteenth century. The fourth point was the twenties of the twentieth century. Francis Carsten argues that “there was no fascism anywhere in Europe before the end of the First World War. Without any doubt, this great reversal, the destruction, the crisis that followed, and the fear of the “red” revolution, which emerged in many European countries, brought about a movement that, according to the Italian case, is called “fascist”.” On the other hand, the main root of national socialism is in the specific definition of nationality, which consolidated at the end of the nineteenth century within the political elite and the broader social strata. The definition above had the term “polarization”, through inclusion and exclusion, in which marginal or minority religious, political or ethnic groups (eg Socialists, Catholics, Poles or Jews) were stigmatized as “enemies of the Reich”. Official approval, coupled with the consolidation of such political, cultural and ethnic rejection, has helped to create an atmosphere in which, under extreme conditions of crisis or disorientation, fertile
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ground could be provided for the emergence of a “radical community ideology” in which “the language of exclusion “could easily turn into a “language of eradication”. If anything connects these two movements-its anti-communism. Fascism emerged partly as a reaction to the threat of socialism and workers” organizations. He received an organized form during the repression of extreme left and organized labor activities during the period of instability after World War I. It came to power at a time when the threat from the left could have been presented as very dangerous. In Italy, the first fascists were formed in the cities of northern Italy. They participated in the suppression of strikes, and generally in the terrorizing of organized workers, especially during the occupation of factories 1919-20 years. Fascists then expanded especially in rural areas, especially in the Po River area, where peasant and village workers’ organizations were particularly strong. On the other hand, Hitler began a political career as a political advisor to the troops involved in the suppression of leftist movements in Bavaria. Repression was carried out by paramilitary formations. These formations, also known as clubs formed by armed citizens, opposed the threats from the left, provided the basic form of organization and social support on which an early national-socialist movement was established. In Italy, the fascist rejection of power came directly from the post-war unrest, which did not in any way downplay. In Germany, the Weimar Republic became stable between 1924 and 1928. Nevertheless, in the period from 1928 and 1933, especially in the last three years of the mentioned period, was a period, when instability returned. One of the aspects was a sharp increase in the number of votes of the German Communist Party. Once again, the threat from the left made the fascist thing more attractive. Both fascism and national socialism owe their appearance to solid grounds of extremism in their countries. These grounds „could be found everywhere, but it is still most common in the environments in which the power is being held by the authoritative regimes for a long time, and also the environments witnessing turbulent changes, in which the important historical processes, like modernization or political integration hasn’t finished yet. Also, extremism is more often in the revanchist-oriented environments, and also in the culturally retarded layers of a society. All these factors can, but do not have to be connected. For example, the appearance of Nazism and fascism in Germa-

ny and Italy as countries that cannot, and could not at that time be subdued under culturally retarded environments are related to lower and middle classes of those countries as the ones that are inferior to the classes that give those countries the glow of culturally sublime environments."

During their history, these two movements had other touch points, but also striking differences. They can be viewed through a large number of ideological elements. In this case, nationalism, conservatism, corporatism and the totalitarian system are taken. Perhaps the key point of dissolution is antisemitism, which has been brought to death in national socialism.

2. ATTITUDE TOWARDS NATIONALISM

The core of Italian nationalism emerged at the beginning of the nineteenth century thanks to the influence of the French Revolution. During Risorgimento, the nationalist movement emerged as a product of a small number of intellectuals who wanted to modernize the Italian society, after a century of decline and slavery, to promote the national awakening of the Italian people and bring unified and independent Italy to the level of developed European nation states. These intellectuals looked at France and England as models and models of political and cultural contemporaneity.

Nationalism at the beginning of the twentieth century (not only in Italy) has become increasingly populist ultranationalism. It is a subtype of nationalism that is “far from outside” and therefore rejects anything that is compatible with liberal institutions or with the tradition of enlightening humanism, which supports liberalism. Such a defined, populist ultra-nationalism excludes the nationalism of dynastic rulers and imperial powers before the rise of mass politics and democratic forces (eg, Habsburgs), but excludes populist liberal nationalism, which only fights for the overthrow of colonial powers and the creation of representative democracy.

In time, there was a breakthrough of so-called “Palingenetic myth” (Greek pal-in-again, genesis-creation, birth), which refers to a new beginning or recovery after
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more crises or decay. The myth can be connected both with something mystical, religious (eg, the Second Coming of Jesus), and with secular reality (eg New Germany). The Palingenetic myth, adopted by fascism, is not derived from a religious myth, but simply the expression of a strong archetypal mythopoetics in a secular form.9 When the concepts of Palingenetic and Ultranationalism are combined, they are so precisely determined by each other (such as the “nation-state” or “social democracy”), to become relatively precise political concept. These two terms do it like two telescopic lenses, which suddenly bring the visible object into focus. The resulting binominal expression defines the type of political energy more precisely than the vast area that these two phenomena involve separately, namely, those whose driving vision refers to the national community that emerges as a phoenix after a period the terrifying decadence that completely destroyed it.10

Although the role of nationalists was decisive for fascism in the long run, it was not predetermined. In its early years, fascism was a movement of energetic clashing currents and factions. When fascists and nationalists formally fused in 1923, former nationalists confronted a with battered opponents inside fascist movement, who were not ready to give in to the newcomers. Among these rivals, nationalists emphasized in several ways: they were dedicated to the gradual reform of the state, determined that all changes were carefully controlled by state representatives and believed that the state must take on a significant part of responsibility for ensuring social justice for the people. Thus nationalists were conservative not in terms of opposing change, but with the desire to keep control of these changes that were inevitable in the process of modifying society. It is possible only in one case to speak of fascist conservatism: the changes are carefully controlled “from above”, without any concessions to pluralism and an independent initiative. For Rocco, who served as Minister of Justice from 1925 to 1932, this meant nothing less than the staging of a “conservative revolution”11

German nationalism is more of an ethnic, racial character. Racism can be seen in German nationalism through two segments. The first is the so-called National-Ethnic Movement (Völkische Bewegung), which in 1924, a German religious

9 Ibid, pp. 33.
and nationalist-oriented anthropologist Paul Hartig described through two traits. According to the first, it is “the affirmation of the Germanic race and everything that belong to German blood with all the resulting conclusions and duties in accordance with this philosophy of life.” The other characteristic is “unconditional physical and mental rejection of all foreign”. This culture began to develop in the nineteenth century, and the expansion is experienced in the twenties of the twentieth century through the form of novels, but also of popular art. The above-mentioned works popularized the “German” posture and values and rejected the influence of the new cosmopolitan elite of big cities. They endeavored for peace, harmony and genuine prosperity, and they could only be reached through ethnic culture, which required national unity and, in that connection, firm and authoritarian leadership. Ethnic culture has especially affirmed the so-called “myth of war experience” (German Kriegserlebnis), favored in all forms of nationalism. They insisted on the “holy union of war”, mutual responsibility and shared responsibility, initiated by national struggles and sacrifices, but also that more values and re-examination of life are possible due to German unity in military and patriotic things. What gave racist nationalism of historical significance was not its cohesion as a political force, but that the common denominator of all supporters of this kind of nationalism was “a myth of the German nation reborn and post-liberal order.” This created an abundant reservoir of proto-fascist mythology, which the Nazis changed into a complete fascism, after the war changed the political situation to an unrecognizable.

The second segment is the “Myth of the Nordic Race”. The two most prominent racial theorists of the Nazi movement, who believed that they revealed the primary role of the “Nordic race” in history, were Alfred Rosenberg and Walter Dare. Rosenberg considered that the states of the West and their achievements were the work of the Nordic Race. During the ancient times the Norids had descended to the south in several waves and established ancient Greek and Roman culture. When the Old Rome collapsed, a new wave of settling was encountered, and then Germanic states were established on Roman soil. Rosenberg believed that the “German race” remained unsettled for a while, since the Germans adopted the

14 Ibid, pp. 86.
so-called “Aryan type of Christianity”. After the conversion of Germans (Germans) into Roman Catholicism, “bastardization” began and continued for centuries. Rosenberg interpreted the Renaissance as “the innocent re-occurrence of German blood”. After the Renaissance, the bastardization of Germanic elements increased. Liberalism, with slogans of freedom, equality and fraternity, has undermined the racial instincts of many “Nordic” people in different countries of Europe, and especially in France. Rosenberg and his companions racialized that in the modern era of lower race people (Untermensch), they are preparing a new assault on “racial purity” or members of the “economic race” (Herrenmensch). Hitler, Goebbels, Rosenberg, Himmler and others doubted the Jews as either inciters or among the first instigators of almost all the rebellions of inferior against the superior, which they did under the mask of Christianity, liberalism (the example of the French Revolution), democracy and the most recent time of Marxism, and all in an attempt to destroy the “creator of culture, order, state, and morality”, that is, they claim “Nordic man”.

3. CONSERVATISM

Conservatism in Italy expresses constant loyalty to the family, local community, country or religion, as well as relations and social values based on the respect of these institutions, rather than commitment to a specific political institution or process. General reliance on approving specific political forms other than in the short run means that conservatism in Italian politics has sought to appear as such in the eyes of the observers. “Participants” in conservatism prefer to be known as supporters of change, modernization and progress. Critics of close fascism have fiercely denied allegations of the conservatism of fascism. For example, Giuseppe Botai believes that Fascism is “the only revolutionary movement in the twentieth century because of its roots in a cultural reaction to the rationalism of the nineteenth century.” More often, fascist intellectuals emphasize the alleged uniqueness of their movement, which they claim to have escalated from the conventional dis-
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tinction between the left and the right. “Such a view may be a non-effective“, said Sergio Panunzio, who, however, confirms the conservatism of the movement on „issues such as family ties, the propagation of Catholicism in the masses, respect for the authority of the state, the role of the woman in the family, the restriction of the people’s initiative“, but also argues and stresses that in respect for other institutions fascism is „innovative to the extent that conservatives are afraid of it. Especially when they affirm the commitment to the establishment of the union state and the demolition of the parliamentary one.“17

The concepts of the “conservative revolution” and “Third Reich” played a major role in national socialism. Conservative Revolution explains, among others, Edgar Jung in the work “Deutschland und Conservative Revolution” (“Germany and Conservative Revolution”) published in 1932. According to Jung, the conservative revolution implies “ending the decline of Western humanity, the establishment of a new order, a new ethos, and the new unity of the West under German leadership.” Under the term “conservative revolution,” Jung refers to “returning to respect for all the basic laws and values without which he alienates nature and God and disables the establishment of the right order. Instead of equality, the inner value of the individual comes. In the place of socialist convictions comes the fair integration of people into their (hierarchical) place in society. Instead of mechanical selection, an organic development of the lead comes. Instead of bureaucratic coercion, the internal self-responsibility of honest self-government, and in the place of mass happiness, the real personality created by the state would come. “18 Regarding Third Reich, he states that “it can not be a continuation of the widespread process of secularization, but only its termination. The Reich will be German and Christian, or it will not be. It will surround itself with deterrence from the secular form of a nation state, from the limitations of wrongly oriented nationalism. New nationalism is a religious-cultural concept that suppresses all-in-the-totality, and does not tolerate any ban on a purely political concept. “19
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19 Ibid, pp. 353.
4. CORPORATISM

Social corporatism, defined as a model of compulsory, vertical (hierarchical) integration of related socio-economic interests, has evolved its contemporary life as a cooperative doctrine of organic negotiations and the integration of interests that could reverse the trends of liberal-capitalist individualism and socialist materialism. What added a concrete political dimension to this doctrine was the merger (and the explanation of the same) with the so-called “The third way theory”, the model of post liberalism in inter-European Europe. Thus, once again, the advocates of corporatism as an alternative model of modern political organization, representation and co-operation have expanded the field of fascism and the new radical right and thus reached various polling bodies such as the Socialists, Solidarists and authoritarian conservatives. Nevertheless, the successful consolidation and dynamism of the Fascist Italy society, as well as the centralization of a corporatist experiment for its own purposes, opened international channels for the spread of “fascist” ideas, which in time evolved into specific interpretations and hybrid connections. The growing consensus among the forces of the interwar old and the new right that parlementary democracy is very harmful to national interests and historically exhausted has certainly supported and triggered a wave of authoritarian, post-liberal transformation across the continent during the 1920s and especially thirties.20

The institutionalization of corporatism in Italy began with the adoption of the Charter of Labor (Carta del Lavoro) in 1927. It was compiled by Justice Minister Alfredo Rocco. The charter defined three main principles of fascist social corporatism: the first, authoritarian regulation of labor disputes and the abolition of the right to strike and blockade of working premises with the establishment of labor courts. Secondly, the state monopoly on labor relations through the only law-abiding association of employers and one union for each sector of work and the third creation of the first corporative telecross institutions of the National Council of Corporations. These elements have created an authoritarian model of labor relations and subordinated stakeholders to the state.21


On the other hand, especially after 1933, national socialists showed much less interest in corporatism, both in theory and in practice. Hitler himself was very interested in this idea, and later used it as a propaganda tool. This does not mean that corporatist theory did not appear in Germany. National Socialists, such as Gottfried Feder, Gregor Strasser and Walter Dare, and to a certain extent Alfred Rosenberg, have taken a comprehensive push for a form of corporatism. The emphasis of German writers, however, was moving toward the interpretation of corporatism in the context of the Middle Ages. Corporations were seen as part of the German people (Volk). This understanding comes from the romantic views of Moeller van den Brueck, and later from Otto Gierke.22

5. TOTALITARIAN SYSTEM

The totalitarian regime can be viewed through two basic characteristics: ideology and organization. The ideology of a totalitarian regime is a typical “official ideology”. The official implies authoritative, ideology, formal ideology, the only ideology. Totalitarian societies are not inclined to think that they “organize” a kind of competition of ideologies. There is only one ideology and all efforts are directed to convince people to identify with this ideology that support this ideology. The official ideology has three components: First, to reject at first and criticize the existing order as corrupt, immoral, unjust, hopeless and irreversible. The second component is the condemnation of the existing system through the “call” to more norms and principles. A totalitarian ideology proposes an alternative vision of a better, more superior society. A typical alternative is embodied through a utopian vision or a great myth, let’s say about a superior race or classless society, which becomes a battle cry for the masses. The third component is a “statement” about plans and programs that help the new order to be achieved.23

Another feature is the organization. Totalitarian societies are strictly hierarchical, divided from top to bottom. Under the domination of one man, a political organization (party) is provided from the center and penetrates the whole country. The social organization is practically inhabited by youth groups, professional groups,


cultural groups, Government and military bureaucracy are regularly placed on increasingly important positions in government and military organizations. Paramilitary formations are comprehensive and in the form of a secret police. All information is effectively monopolized through the control of all media: television, radio and newspapers. Although today it is recognized by most historians that Italian fascism failed to create a true totalitarian state, the fascists used the term “totalitarian” indicating the beginning of a process, during which all aspects of life would be “fascist” taken over by an all-powerful state, to whom every individual is subordinate. This reflects on the description of fascism given by Hegelian philosopher and pedagogue Giovanni Gentile as “the total concept of life” and Mussolini’s formulation of the idea of “everything within the state, nothing outside the state and nothing against the state.” as a definition of a totalitarian system in which all boundaries between society and the state disappear.

On the other hand, Hitler had clearer goals than Mussolini. The one-party state and political dictatorship have been reached in just five and a half months instead of the planned three years. National Socialists sometimes used their regime as a “total state” or “a Fierer state”, while the Italian term “totalitarian” is rarely used. The fact that the “revolutionization” of the state structure was followed, because Hitler sought to rely on a relatively efficient bureaucratic apparatus and a highly professional officer corps, in order to develop the force for military expansion. As a consequence, the Nazi party could not simply “take over” the state, as Communists in the Soviet Union, but at the same time Hitler did not satisfy Mussolini’s “limited and pluralistic dictatorship,” where the party was actually subordinated to the state. Thus, in Germany, a kind of “dual state” developed, in which the regular system continued to operate within its specialized structure, but the parallel system of bureaucracy and the functions of the National Socialist Party were expanding. The final product was a dual system, which was characterized by an increasing number of state boards, commissions, bureaus and agencies, which eventually increased to sixty. This made administrative maze was almost impossible to present with the diagram. He ruled the “multiform administrative

24 Ibid, pp. 72.
25 Dunnage, Jonathan “Social Control in Fascist Italy: The Role of the Police”, in, ”Social Control in Europe: 1800-2000”, Herman Roodenburg (Editor), The Ohio State University, Columbus, 2004, pp. 261.
chaos”, which Hitler himself chaired. It is alleged that in fact Hitler preferred confusion and competition in such a system, in order to increase personal domination. He himself had supreme authority over the system and no one could collect the equivalent power. All members of the board of directors had to consult with him to resolve disputes.27

6. ANTI-SEMITISM AS THE SPECIAL POINT OF DIFFERENCE OF FASCISM AND NATIONALSOCIALISM

In Italy, anti-Semitism was not permeable, powerful, or universal among fascists, as many assume. Hatred towards the Jews did not play almost any role in the early days of the Fascist movement in Italy. The autochthonous Italian Jews themselves also attracted in large numbers under Mussolini’s flag. In other fascist movements (eg. the Netherlands, Finland, Spain, Bulgaria) anti-Semitism was not more important, and even where it played a bigger role (Hungary, Romania), Fascist leaders were distancing themselves from the extreme racism of national socialists.28 True to the will, one can not deny that anti-Semitism in Italy has existed. The main source was his Catholic press, which from the last decade of the nineteenth century treated the Jews not only as enemies of Christianity, but also of race. Already, discrimination and expulsion from the country began to be promoted. Fascism has attracted both Catholics and nationalists, thereby “antisemitism” being imported. This was especially noticeable in the circles around Robert Farinacci (Roberto Farinacci), who opposed the “normalization” of fascism and wanted a radical revolution. These radicals, however, criticized Germany, which states that their views were independent of their admiration for Nazism (or it should have looked, p.a.).29 Anti-Semitism becomes actual in the true sense of the word after September 1 and 2, 1938, when the Council of Ministers of the Italian Government approved laws aimed at the exclusion of foreign Jews (Royal Decree No. 1381/1938), then the law relating to the “arialization” of public school (Royal Decrees No. 1390/1938 and 1630/1938) and the creation of a special state agency that will take care of the implementation of the adopted laws. Then, on 7,

27 Ibid, pp. 180. and further.


9 and 10 November, the main decree (1728/1938) and the decree on comprehensive measures in education (1779/1938) were approved. In Law No. 1728/1938, the case forbids marriages between members of the Aryan and Jewish races, but the Jews are still guaranteed (at least on paper) the right to own buildings, land, and to conduct business, to serve a military term, to They are employed in insurance companies, such as lawyers, pharmacists, doctors, accountants, agronomists, etc. The laws were, however, affected by only a few tens of thousands of people and were related only to the period 1938-1943. years.30

On the other hand, national socialism has emerged from the merging of philosophical, political, cultural and religious expressions of hatred against Jews, anti-Semitism rooted in totalitarian tendencies to be the very manifestation of God, to be more radical than ever before. Nazi anti-Semitism was exterminating not because it was more of a nature than other antisemites, but because it had the means and the will to execute extermination as the first rule to its logical end. This meant not only the destruction of the Jews, but also the preaching and vowing of Judaism, represented by the Jews by the very presence of the world.31 Anti-Semitism in the Third Reich culminated in the adoption of the Racial Laws in 1935 and then through the implementation of the “Final Solution” during the Second World War.

Racial or Nuremberg Laws (German Nürnberg Gesetze) entered into force on September 15, 1935. These were the Law on German Citizenship and the Law on the Protection of German Blood and German Honor (shorter Law on the Protection of Blood). Article 2 of the Law on German Citizenship states that “1. The citizen of Reich is a subject of the state of German or related blood, which proves by his behavior that he is ready and able to faithfully serve the German people and the Reich. “ 2. The Reich nationality is acquired through the approval of the Reich nationality. 3. The Reich’s citizen is the sole holder of full political rights in accordance with the law. “In the Law on the Protection of German Blood and German Honor,” marriages between Jews and citizens of German or allied blood are forbidden. Marriages that are nevertheless concluded are invalid, even if they are concluded abroad. The cancellation procedure could have been initiated only by the state prosecutor. The relations between the Jews and the citizens of German

30 See more details, Sarfatti, Michele („Ebrei nell’Italia Fascista“, English,) „The Jews in Mussolini’s Italy-From Equality to Persecution“, translated by John and Anne C. Tedeschi, The University of Wisconsin Press, 2006. pp. 129. and further.

or related blood were also banned. Jews could no longer hire in their households women of German or related blood who are younger than 45 years. The Jews were forbidden to expose the flag of the Reich or the Flag in the colors of the Reich. They, on the other hand, could highlight the flag with Jewish national colors! The exercise of this right was under the protection of the state. Any person who violates the provisions of these laws has been subjected to imprisonment.” An additional “clarification” of the terms of the Jews and their rights followed on November 14, 1935. The first decree On the Application of the Law on the Protection of German Blood and German Honor. According to this decree “(1) The laws are applied both to the full-blooded Jews, as well as to persons of mixed blood (Mischlinge). An individual of mixed Jewish blood is one who is the descendant of one or two babes and grandfathers who were completely Jewish by race. Only Reich’s citizen, as the holder of full political rights, exercises the right to vote and the right to be the bearer of political and public functions. The Minister of the Interior of the Reich, or any agency authorized by the Minister, may make exceptions in the period of transition, in relation to holders of public office.32

The final solution is the euphemism for the “complete extermination” of the Jews. The origin of the idea can be traced back to the proposal of the so-called. “Madagascar Plan”. This plan was considered after the fall of France in 1940 and would mean the deportation of the Jews to the island of Madagascar, then the French colony. They had a similar plan in the British Foreign Office, which was inclined to “invest” on the fertile soil of “Jewish politics”. This plan had obviously passed through European antisemites, and even attracted the attention of Teodor Herzl, the father of Zionism. In reality, no German planner has worried over the survival of more than 4 million Jews that would be covered by the plan. Tropical Madagascar would be extremely unpopular for any European population. The indication that there was a change of mind was the killing of Jews in German mental hospitals after July 1940, and as part of the euthanasia program. They were not even given a superficial examination, as opposed to German patients. The Madagascar Plan was finally discontinued in August 1940. In March 1941, Hitler hinted that the Generalguardman (part of Poland under military administration p.a.) should be Germanized in the near future. Allegedly, now the intention was to force the Jews to go over the Northern Urals, to the so-called. Arhipelag Gulag. The Jews capable of work would be exploited, left to their “natural” destiny, while the Jew-

ish-Bolshevik elite would have been killed. This plan was not implemented, as the precondition was “a quick victory and the destruction of the Red Army’s head, before it receded into the interior and regrouped. This would have isolated Britain, and the war may have ended before the United States intervenes.”

The final outline of what we call the Holocaust today is defined by the so-called Conference in Wannsee, held on January 20, 1942. The conference was chaired by Reinhard Heidrich, Chief of the Central Security Service of the Reich (Reichshauptsicherheitamt, RSHA). According to the minutes (record) of that conference, the main objectives regarding treatment for the Jews can be seen: “a) The exclusion of the Jews from all life spheres of the German people; b) The expulsion of Jews from the living space of the German people. “

7. CONCLUSION

Since its foundation, Fascism has been “represented” as a “revolution of a different kind”, a revolution that sought to destroy the existing political order and to root out the theoretical and moral foundations, while at the same time preserving all the achievements of modern technology. The revolution was to take place within the industrial society, with the full exploitation of power within it. The Fascist revolution sought to change the nature of the relationship between the individual and the collective without disturbing the movement of economic activities. This is one of the newspapers brought by fascism: the fascist revolution is supported by the economy and determined by the laws of the market. When Fascism applied corporatism based on the liberal economy, and when before that, through Mussolini’s speeches announced that the state would free up economic functions, it was not said from pure opportunism. On the contrary, Mussolini only repeated the lessons of political economy, learned at the beginning of the twentieth century by intellectuals, representatives of revolutionary syndicalism. In essence, the fascist thought was the rejection of values, which were called materialism in that culture at the time. For fascism, liberalism, which developed into liberal democracy at

the end of the nineteenth century, and Marxism, whose branch was democratic socialism, represented one and the same materialist evil. In the sense in which it is understood at the end of the nineteenth century, antimaterialism implied the rejection of the rationalistic, individualistic and utilitarian heritage of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.36

And while Fascism saw itself as a revolutionary movement, until then national socialism shared more features with counterrevolutionary theory. He rejected rationalism, civil rights, equality and self-determination of the people. Nevertheless, there were insurmountable differences. For example, Edmund Berk did not want to change the basis of society. He wanted to save them. De Mestre and Bonal, though, were zealous Catholics. For them sovereignty rested on the church, not on the secular authorities, and consequently were rationalists. They could not, nor did they want to deny that “a man, although today corrupted, will no longer fully establish the power of the church, will become essentially free.” Stahl, who was a legal positivist. he believed that the monarchy and Protestant church had identical interests. He carried out the validity of the interests precisely from the stated identity, and at the same time he never denied the necessity of a state of law (Rechtstaat), a state based on law that would inevitably guarantee the rights of individuals.37 There are approaches to the political theory of restoration, especially with the views of Karl Ludwig von Haller, who in his works considered the state a natural fact for the divine institution, where there is a domination of the strong over the weak. In addition, Haller dismissed civil rights, parliament and human reason.38 And also national socialists. In the end, it remains to be noted that two extreme right ideologies again “met” at the end of the Second World War in one similarity: they caused great damage to their own (Italian, or German) people. Italy lost about 800,000 of its citizens.39 Germany ended the Second World War with about 8 million victims.40 Besides, after „losing the war the Germans could not have avoided the destiny of being charged themselves with collective guilt.

38 Ibid, pp. 461.
They were guilty both because of having been defeated and because the winners carried banners of ideologies opposite to the Nazi ones. The collective guilt of the Germans was set as a combination of the guilt of the defeated and ideological guilt determined by the dominating political leaders of liberal and socialist countries. It can also be identified as the guilt of threatening the general harmony, a determination mapped out by both winning sides, each in its own way.\textsuperscript{41}
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