

СЕКЦІЯ: ІСТОРИЧНІ НАУКИ

УДК: 323

Kupriianova L.S.,
 Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs
 Kupriianova D.S.
 The National University of Opole
 (Opole, Poland)



**FASCISM AND NAZISM UNDER THE
 PRISM OF THE ANTIC LAW
 DOCTRINES. HISTORICAL
 JUSTIFICATION AGAINST MODERN
 CRITICISM. THE PHENOMENON OF
 “THE MORAL STABILITY OF
 NATION”**

If we speak about Fascism and Nazism, we think at the same time mostly about Germany at times of Hitler's epoch; because of the fact, that it is an inter-historic phenomenon of cruelty and egoism relatively to human nation. In practice, it is not oppositely even an independent historical study; it is just a compilation of few the most famous political doctrines of all times though. Moreover, after a detailed scientific research of previous century, Fascism and Nazism were manifested finally as different, according to level of radicalism, directions of the Totalitarianism, and it stood even on the same stage with Stalinism. According to this fact, it would be absolutely justified, if at the time of describing of criticism relatively to the rule of Hitler, we would emphasize a historical parallel with criticism of The Soviet Union times and Stalinism as well. However, the last doctrine, since a long time ago, was postulated as more officially justified political system comparing with the first one. But, when we begin our research using doctrinal sources, as well as when we begin analysis of the historical and political studies under the prism of few epochs; I this case a similarity in the positive aspect could be pointed as such logic and clear, that it could be justified as well as perspective enough to speak in our article only about negative aspect of Fascism and Nazism, and, consequently, injustice of this regime. According to the fact, that the main topic of our article is investigation of “injustice”, in particular, “illegality” of Adolf Hitler's rule; as well as discussion about main doctrinal epithets under the prism of fundamental political studies of all times.

To start with, we would like to discuss Fascism and Nazism, because of the fact, that exactly “the phenomenon of the morally unstable German nation” would be repeatedly postulated in our article. We would involuntary return to main and well-known criticism of these doctrines, which was presented by scientists of after-totalitarianism period from time to time. As famous “father” of Nazism' criticism, as well as Hitler's regime in general, could be named definitely Erich Fromm. In his political treatise “Escape from freedom” among main and the most important reasons of the successful power usurpation Fromm declares a moral unstable position of nation at the after I World War period. A fear of people of being independent of something or someone was something like a justified feel of self-

loss on the political European arena of those times. As a logical conclusion of such situation was a lightning ascent of Hitler into the political Olympus and a very similar lightning moving towards the carrier stairs to the position of the chancellor of the state; and by keeping the feel of fear of himself in souls of people from all around Europe. A great theorists of the law and policy negotiated absolutely a character of the Hitler's rule from one point of view; but, from another point of view, at the same time, he is definitely confident, that it was absolutely no other possibilities for history to develop. And he could present the most valuable argument in honor to his personal theory. According to his point of view, if it was no power of authority of Hitler of those times; Germany, after the I World War could be totally ruined by states-winners, and separated between them forever. So, it was Hitler exactly, who turned the German nation to previous stability, and returned a state in general to a policy of a successful European state, which is deserve to be respected by other states. But, the most important thing, which Hitler's had done for Germany, though, was a psychological aspect of his rule. Namely, he returned a feel of self-confidence to souls of German people, he turned them back to feel of personal importance of every person for whole nation! But, at the same time, according to the Fromm' theory, German nation turned from initiators of the I World War, into victims of rigorous policy of European states relatively to them. Fromm built his criticism on undemocratic character of the Fascism' and Nazism' regime; but he absolutely forgot about the fact, that the German nation was the greatest initiators of all their problems and unsuccessful conclusions of the War. Moreover, if we speak personally about "the theory of the moral unstable character and spiritual degradation of German nation", so, against this theory we could emphasize a stable and logic enough argument, that such negative and "ruined" position was a reality not just of German state, as it was shown by Fromm, but it was a normal and negative reality of every state after the I World War.

Namely, according to this fact, and after definite thesis of the compilation of different political doctrines into the doctrine of Totalitarianism in general; we lean to the most important postulate of our article. After a deep analysis of different historical sources, and after providing after personal research, we lean to the idea, that main reasons of lightning success, as well criticism of power usurpation by Hitler, we should looking for on the primary historical stage of development of political doctrines of all times.

In the aim of reaching our main idea of the article, we would like to return to first sources of the theory of law and policy; namely, to the doctrine of Tomas from Aquino, called 'Aquinato'. If we start speaking about doctrine of Aquinato, so, we should emphasize, that this political theory could not just declare a treatise as justify, as well as unjust aspects relatively to different regimes with a Totalitarianism as a general description of their direction; his doctrine definitely could totally ruined a theory of Fromm about "psychological unstable character of nation", as a main phenomenon of the Hitler's rule in Germany; and it would be done even despite of the fact, that the theory, which Aquinato ruined would be created more and more years later. Generally, Tomas postulated (very similar to Nicollo Machiavelli, to the point), that, in real policy thee are only two logic types of power accumulation in the state: and these are tyranny and monarchy (Machiavelli told about monarchy and republic consequently). These regimes change one by one, and this changing could be found out through the whole period of history and in every state in the world! So,

by making such conclusions, Tomas leans to idea, that the rule of Totalitarianism generally in Germany at the after-War period was absolutely logical, because of the fact, that among two different regimes, only tyranny could prevent a political and territorial separation of the state after losing in the European political battle.

The main question of the "justify Stalinism" from one side, and "the unjust Nazism" from another one, it totally formal; because mostly it depends on characteristics of the power' usurpation in the state; when, at the same time, if we speak about real political aim of these authorities, they could be postulated as very similar though. However, according couple of points of views of modern theorist of the policy and state; we could found out, that historically most of these scientists are confident, that the Nazism should be definitely treatise as a totally unjust type of rule. Moreover, what could be the most interesting fact, is that Tomas postulated a personal and united accountability of German nation for all their problems, and even for moral ones, to the point; and he also manifested, that all political losses were just types of God's punishment to all German's because of their initiative in case of the I World War. So, according to such conclusions of the Aquinato, we should say, that he ruined definitely postulates of the future doctrine of such morally unstable German nation, and he logically turned to its real responsibility relatively to most of European nations; Tomas destroyed "the doctrine of holy spirit of German people"! Moreover, a historical well-found of the Tomas' doctrine could be also support an argument of an atheistic direction of the Totalitarianism power in general. It could be simply explained by the fact, that the religious background of every political doctrine postulates not only a justified character of the "power usurpation", but it is really important as well; deizm in political power is generally against processes of usurpation and future accumulation of the whole political power in one pair of authority hands. And, what is obvious for now, such religious direction is absolutely against destroying the political opposition by such authorities. So, such characteristic features of the policy grounded on the religion was impossible for tyrannies of the Totalitarianism epoch.

Consequently, to sum up, we should say, that the doctrine of Erich Fromm won among other doctrines only on the German backgrounds, and only at the after-War period; because of the fact, that it was logically the easiest way not to feel responsibility for most of European tragedies of those times. Truly, in our point of view, we should not definitely say about something, what was described by this famous scientists as a "phenomenon of people, who would like to escape from freedom"; easily because of the fact, that in this case we could objectively declare a couple of other nations, that would like also escape from freedom at the after-War period because of all tragedies, that they became victims of. In addition, a doctrine of the Tomas from the Aquino confirmed, that we should not definitely forget about real initiators of the IWW; and, what is more important, we should not also forget about political "invisible stones", that collected their value at those times. In each case, according to our personal position, there is a sense to pay attention simply on the fact, that it looked like the doctrine of Tomas exactly was not a favorable use according to Hitler' and Stalin' points of views. And exactly this doctrine they would like to eliminate from every possible influence into their policy forever, by prohibiting religion, private property, opposition and so on. Why? Because both of them were clever strategists with a great political power.

Consequently, to the end, we lean to the baseless character of the Erich Fromm' criticism; but, we should definitely no to negate anti-terrorism points of view and intentions of this doctrine though. But, in the aim of completing more objective imaginary picture of all actions; we should undoubtedly provide deeper analysis of the political arena of those times.

SOURCES OF LITERATURE

1. Krystyna Chojnicka, Henryk Olszewski "Historia doktryn politycznych i prawnych".
2. Nicollo Machiavelli "The Prince".
3. Erich Fromm "Escape from freedom".
4. Thomas von Aquin "Ökumenisches Heiligenlexikon".