Introduction to Ethnocriminology

YURII M. ANTONYAN
All-Russian Research Institute of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russia, antonyan@yandex.ru, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0030-3031

A b s t r a c t
Introduction: the article considers crime from ethno-religious perspectives and in the context of interethnic conflicts, pays special attention to extremism and terrorism, and identifies critical features of these phenomena. The author emphasizes that extremism and nationalism in politics can put humanity on the brink of disaster. *Task:* to draw attention to insufficient study of crimes of an ethnic and ethno-religious nature, substantiate the need for criminological ethnological research aimed at developing new general theoretical approaches to understanding crime, its causes and measures to combat it. *Methods:* the axiological approach is a methodological basis of this research. To solve the research problem, general philosophical principles of dialectics and special methods of cognition, such as systematic, formal legal, sociological, etc., are used. *Results:* the author considers problems of fanaticism in ethnic and ethno-religious groups and emphasizes its particular danger. It is noted that it is fundamentally wrong to assert that there is a civilization that is at enmity with the rest of the world, since civilization includes not only a religious component. *Conclusions:* the state can successfully resist nationalism and ethno-religious fanaticism; in countries where these phenomena are punishable, criminals may renounce their beliefs.

K e y w o r d s : ethnic; ethno-religious; fanaticism; extremism; Nazism; ethnic and ethno-religious conflicts; ethnocriminology.

12.00.08 – Criminal law and criminology, penal law.

5.1.4. Criminal legal sciences.

F o r   c i t a t i o n : Antonyan Yu.M. Introduction to Ethnocriminology. *Penitentiary Science,* 2022, vol. 16, no. 2 (58), pp. 153–160. doi: 10.46741/2686-9764.2022.58.2.004.

Crimes of an ethnic and ethno-religious nature are insufficiently studied in Russian criminology, except for modern ethno-religious terrorism. Meanwhile, as it is well known, ethnic and ethno-religious factors play an important role in the life of mankind, therefore, they cannot but influence crime, in some epochs significantly. Knowing them is important, especially in multinational and multi-confessional Russia.

Ethnology is the science of nations and peoples, including those who have not reached the status of a nation, studying their characteristics as a nation and people, their culture, customs, traditions, archetypes and symbols. Its subject also includes religiosity, theistic positions, perversion of religious ideas and fanaticism arising on such grounds, which is especially important for law and order.

Conducting ethnocriminological research, it is necessary to abandon the idea of the transitory nature of the sense of ethnic and religious affiliation and the national and religious intolerance that grows on its soil, its limitation by narrow historical limits and the level of social development. The national character does not change due to shifts in the external material environment.

In our opinion, the national character is a combination of historically stable socio-psychological, moral and spiritual characteristics of a given nation, expressed in national and religious symbols, national and religious values. It is associated with historical, including unremembered unconscious collective experience, sometimes millennial, of a given nation or peoples, generated by it and can be considered the spirit or soul of a nation or peoples.

Such a character is stable, moreover, very conservative, inflexible, and reluctant to adapt to new conditions. But even adaptation by no means indicates a significant change in the ethnic formation itself and its religious and cultural basis. They, like individuals, can be transformed due to external stimuli, thus often creating the illusion of changes in these traits, therefore, it is crucial to take into account that external social conditions have relatively weak possibilities of influencing the core of the national and religious spirit, if we understand by it what arises as a result of the functioning of the collective unconscious by archetypal mechanisms and is the basis of existence of this ethnic group or religious group.

One of the paradoxes that give rise to religious and nationalist terror is that nationalists and religious extremists react very acutely to real or imaginary insults to their nation. Although they are usually completely insensitive to the humiliations and insults that other nations themselves or their individual representatives are subjected to.

Summarizing, we can identify the following grounds for interethnic conflicts, which they try to solve with the help of terrorism sometimes:

– desire to redistribute certain vital resources and natural wealth;

– mismatch of ethnic, national and religious borders, presence of territorial, political, and other claims of one nation to another; desire to make one's country mononational or monoreligious;

– impairment of nations' rights to self-determination (here we mean only those cases when they in fact have the right to claim sovereignty);

– desire of some national group or organization to seize state power by separating it from the rest of the country (sovereignizing) (surely, this is not reflected in slogans designed for mass consumption;

– violation of the personality rights of representatives of a certain nation (ethnos); humiliating, dismissive attitude towards them; failure to take necessary measures for their economic and spiritual development;

– desire to demonstrate one's superiority to another nation, peoples, or race and, at the same time, intimidate it. Sometimes this is provoked by impoverishment of the population, when they have nothing left but their national identity; marginal consciousness, as you know, can transform into national socialist (Nazi, fascist, racist) one;

– variety of people's ideas about national wealth, national dignity and national or racial interest, in which the most archaic, even primitive roots can be manifested.

– inept, ill-considered policy of the central government in relation to certain national regions; failure to take measures to neutralize negative consequences during restructuring of hierarchical structures and violation of the previous balance of power and capabilities.

– desire of any nation (ethnos), or race to preserve its national identity and in this regard resistance to another way of life, worldview and ideology, or other values imposed by authorities or other structures.

– emergence of a shadow national component in the formation of the national bourgeoisie and entrepreneurship. In some cases, they may resort to nationalist terrorism to defend and assert their economic interests, i.e. on the basis of wild market competition. In our country, organized criminal groups used terror against others under the guise of nationalist ideas.

– unwillingness of the authorities (at different levels) and the intelligentsia to outbreak of nationalism and inability to predict it in time, take preventive measures, and stop destructive behavior.

– political struggle based on religious, national or nationalist or racial movements.

– prevalence of sovereignization processes over economic expediency, political, spiritual, and other interests and values, promotion of maximalist demands, not confirmed by reality.

– growth of unemployment, especially in large cities with a diverse national and racial composition: minorities, i.e. refugees and migrants, will be blamed for the lack of work.

The hierarchy of causes of interethnic conflicts varies among different peoples and may change over time; but it seems that it is still stable over a long period of time.

Naturally, the question arises: what the role of religion in generating and provoking ethnoreligious crime is? The answer to it cannot be unambiguous.

To begin with, the sacred texts of different religions contain calls for violence or justify its use. In this sense, the Koran, for example, almost does not differ from the Bible, especially from the Old Testament. What is more, a lot depends on the interpretation of specific texts, i.e. on the position of the one who does it. That is why there is no reason to consider the same Koran as the main source of Muslim extremism. But even if the sacred books do not shy away from violence and one can get inspiration and justification for terrorism there, then religion turns out to be very involved in such a phenomenon. Revelation of Saint John the Theologian (Apocalypse) is very eloquent in this sense.

Besides, it is religion that is very sensitive to all encroachments on what it considers its

sanctity or important value. It is ready to protect it also through aggression, and in critical situations it is especially prone to a black-and-white perception of the world, dividing everyone into friends and foes.

The Church makes purely religious symbols the national heritage of the people and basis of their culture, declaring them inviolable and especially revered. People perceive them as such and therefore regard a real or imaginary infringement on them as the greatest danger, which should be avoided at all costs.

What is more, the sacred texts condemn violence and preach love, forgiveness and mercy. And in this respect, the Koran is no different from the Bible. Therefore, the fight against terrorism presupposes maximum reliance on religion and church ministers of all faiths.

Many authors distinguish between postulates of Islam and provisions of Sharia, which is a set of prescriptions governing the behavior of a Muslim in various life situations. Some authors believe that the public law of Sharia does not represent the law of Islam, which modern Muslims are obliged to follow in fulfillment of their religious duty. Sharia sometimes directly contradicts international law, which is not surprising, since it was formed in a completely different era. While the UN Charter prohibits the use of force in international relations except in cases of self-defense, Sharia, on the contrary, gives such permission in the name of spreading Islam and maintaining the purity of faith. Sharia legalizes slavery as one of the options for treating prisoners of war (execution and release with or without ransom, depending on the will of the winner, are other options). Sharia accepts discrimination by gender and religion and punishes deviation from Islam with the death penalty. Being created by Muslim lawyers in the first three centuries of Islam, Sharia, although it comes from the Koran and the Sunnah, is not sacred in itself.

Undoubtedly, the extremes of sharia in civilized Islamic countries are officially excluded, but they can persist in certain social groups.

In Islam, the right to declare and wage a holy war on behalf of the state, i.e. in order to repel aggression and protect freedom of religion, belongs only to the state itself. Individuals, public and religious communities are not entitled. It is noteworthy that the correct interpretation of the Koran can be given only by scientists who know both the context and the history of its revelation. The Koran states that "there is no compulsion in religion" (2:256), i.e. it explicitly prohibits forced conversion to Islam. Meanwhile, in justification of crimes against non-Muslims, Islamic fanatics use the following Koranic law: "And kill polytheists wherever you find them... O Prophet! Fight the infidels and hypocrites and be merciless to them" (9:5, 73). To justify the aggression against non-Muslims, the following statement of the Prophet Muhammad is also cited: "I was ordered to fight with people until they testify that there is no deity except Allah, and Muhammad is His Messenger, they start performing prayer and giving zakat, if they do this, their lives and property will be under my protection, otherwise they should be treated according to the law of Islam, and the judgment over them is in the hands of Allah Almighty". Both statements directly call for violence and can indeed be used to justify terrorism. However, we should bear in mind that they were written in the 6th century and addressed to completely different people for different purposes. Calls for violence can be found in the Bible in abundance as well.

However, nowadays Muslims come to the conclusion that Islam unequivocally condemns terrorism, violence can only be used as a way to protect this religion. Contrary to Islamic extremists' claims, they do not serve Islam, but harm it.

How can we describe the current ethno-religious situation in the world and what is its essence and main causes? We believe that it is mainly a clash of two world cultures – Islamic and Christian, East and West, if we understand them not geographically, but as areas of distribution of certain civilizations. It is a clash of two mentalities, two worldviews, two attitudes to life and work, to oneself and the world around us. The essence and content of these conflicts need constant in-depth and thorough research.

To begin with, one can see here the envy and even hatred of the relatively poor and not possessing sufficient military power of the East towards the rich, prosperous, leading a prestigious existence, having indestructible military forces of the West, moreover, not always fair and often aggressive towards its needy neighbor. That is why the World Trade Center, a symbol of the West's economic prosperity, and the Pentagon, a symbol of its military might, were attacked on September 11, 2001.

The Islamic East has no way to resolve the conflict with the West through military force, so it resorts to terror, which, as in other cases, becomes a weapon of the weak. In addition, the open use of military force is possible only on the part of the state, but no Muslim state expresses such a desire, and many of them really do not want any conflicts, but are simply unable to curb their terrorists.

Why does the modern terrorist aggression come from the Islamic, and not from any other extremists?

It would seem that most of the terrorists come from poor countries, which now have no chance of approaching the developed ones. This is true for Afghan and Iraqi Al-Qaeda fighters, Pakistanis and Algerians, Chechens and other representatives of the North Caucasus who were involved in terrorist actions. However, a closer analysis shows that many terrorists are not poor at all and fight for the sake of the idea. In addition, we can name a number of the poorest countries in the world that do not take any part in terrorism, have no idea about it at all. Consequently, it is not poverty or, more precisely, not so much poverty that can be the cause of terrorism.

In our opinion, the essence of the problem is that Islam is the youngest of the world's religions. Others, such as Christianity, Buddhism, Judaism, Hinduism, have long defined their place in the world, their identity and subjectivity. They have nothing to search for. Islam's attempt to find its own identity, often realized in a violent form, should not be surprising: at certain stages of development this was also characteristic of Christianity and some other religions (we can recall the Crusades, St. Barthalamew's Night in France, the Inquisition, etc.).

However, to say that the entire Muslim civilization is at war with the rest of the world would be fundamentally wrong, since civilization does not only consist of the religious component, which, in turn, is also not guided by aggressive attitudes only. The majority of Muslim clerics, as well as ordinary believers, actively and constantly oppose violence.

There is another significant circumstance: Islam in some backward countries (Afghanistan) forms and cements a traditional society, which has long been replaced by an industrial and post-industrial one, created primarily by Western Christian civilization. In addition, Islam sometimes, but not in everything, shows conservative trends, stubbornly defending the most archaic forms of human existence and their daily communication, and therefore perceives and evaluates anything from the Western world very hostilely.

Meanwhile, its influence in the conditions of modern globalization is active and even destructive for the values and symbols of traditionalnd any serious threats are perceived by this society extremely painfully. Modern extremist movements are gaining popular support, denying the very need to accept and even simply respect Western values. As a program of action, they call for living to meet the laws of Islam. We emphasize that we are not talking about Islam in general, but about extremist movements.

Admittedly, the West has simplified the task for theorists and ideologists of terrorism. Mere enumeration of acts of violence and injustice against Islamic countries, including in past colonies, causes violent resentment of Muslims and outweighs all positive economic consequences of relations with the West. Of course, one may urge the West not to put pressure on Eastern civilization, not to impose its values on it, but how realistic it is? Can it weaken intercultural contradictions? Will it help to overcome the largely negative attitude of the East? The answer will be negative, since some eastern Islamic countries may remain poor, it will not be possible to make them civilized "in their own way".

We face an unsolvable problem: the attitude of the population of the West and the East to work is completely different. The East will remain poor until it radically revises its attitude to work and removes all obstacles to improving its efficiency. However, there is a fear that this is an intractable problem, and the East will remain poor, since the work of its citizens in some countries does not meet the requirements of modern standards and lead to prosperity.

It should be borne in mind that competition and, in connection with it, conflict relations between the Christian and Muslim churches developed back in those distant centuries when Islam had just begun to spread in the world.

Extremist crimes are often committed in the field of ethno-religious conflicts. Extremism is a universal concept, it includes dangerous, even extremely socially dangerous phenomena, but in no case useful, even exceptional, overcoming certain boundaries and showing new frontiers of human capabilities, which then can become the norm. This is very likely in sport, in scientific research based on experiment. However, extremism and nationalism in politics, for example, and further development of mankind, can put it on the brink of disaster.

Critical features of ethno-religious and nationalist extremism are the following:

1. Ethno-religious extremism constantly sets goals that are difficult to achieve or even unattainable.

2. Extremist organizations can fight for political power themselves, or they can be used by any communities in the struggle for political power.

3. Such organizations are characterized by the division of the world into their own and others, into black and white, fairly clear representations of the enemy, but mainly of its external signs and manifestations that cause envy and a sense of injustice. The enemy is a permanent, enduring figure, an archetype.

4. Disrespectful attitude towards other cultures that seem unnecessary, harmful, subject to destruction or, in any case, should be taken under full and strict control.

5. Constant concern about acquiring supporters, allies, and like-minded people from among crowd, but the crowd that is not a gathering of people before a football match, but masses of people, illiterate, simple-minded, gullible, mainly from the middle and lower social strata of the population. To do this, extremists use all the media available to them, the Internet, and information networks. The crowd is the main creator and guardian of ethno-religious and nationalist mythology. The crowd itself can provoke and carry out extremist violence.

6. The most favorable ground for ethno-religious and nationalist extremism is a crisis society, but extremism can also appear in a prosperous society, striving to make it a crisis, especially if it receives help from outside.

7. If we keep in mind Islamic ethno-religious (more often religious) extremism, it should be noted that Islam itself emerged 6–7 centuries later than, for example, Christianity.

8. Technological equipment, fluency in modern means of communication, allowing to engage in the fight against state communications agencies and obtain the information necessary for terrorists.

When assessing ethno-religious risks, it should be borne in mind that religion does not play such a significant role in modern history as it did in the Middle Ages and the ancient world. It seems that criminological ethnological research can lead to emergence of new general theoretical approaches to understanding crime, its causes and measures to combat it.

Belonging to a nation or religion can cause fanaticism, generated by a passionate, even to the point of self-forgetfulness, desire to protect them from real or imaginary enemies, achieve victory and complete triumph. The idea of the nation and religion, their perception and significance predetermine the essence of the personality. Along with such an attitude to them, it is very dangerous to have an indisputable possession of the most important truth, the knowledge of how to get to heaven or create it on earth.

P. Konzen writes about fanaticism that a "large number of people are seized with uncontrollable fanatical emotional reactions, enthusiasm, indignation, passionate hatred, which can easily turn into unbridled violence and desire for destruction. This refers to the crowd calling for total war in the Berlin Sports Palace, the rampaging Hindus who destroyed Ayoja Moshe in December 1992, or the desperate mourning filled with hatred during the funeral rituals of the executed Palestinians. Mass mobilization is an ancient trick, which in the 20th century became a scientific experiment. The constant question is whether rationally disciplined forces will win during general strikes, or an uncontrolled furore will break out during the onset of the protest. Great political changes have always been possible only due to united collective forces. On the other hand, the rebellious masses, in an exalted sense of universal solidarity, could underestimate the strength of the enemy. They could – as in the uprisings of slaves and peasants – be brutally beaten with batons. Being in the crowd, a person is especially prone to "get infected" by the fanatical. An individual falls into a "collective whirlpool", into the abyss of primitive feelings. Everything that has been building a differentiated identity in a person for centuries disappears instantly. Collective intoxication suppresses the whispering of the critical-self, ethical motives – even high education and extraordinary intelligence – are often unable to protect from this disorganization" [2, p. 115].

Fanatics are very often filled with hatred and even hysteria, strive to dominate and suppress, in many cases they intend harm, including extremely cruel. Fanatics are narcissistic, they can admire themselves, they supposedly know the idea that will save people, not realizing that unshakable faith in it deprives them of freedom, because they cannot go beyond it. Outstanding personalities, gripped by fanatical fervor, incite the masses and subjugate them during the years of crises, while committing the most terrible crimes. All of them are demagogically justified by the fact that they are allegedly committed for the benefit of the people, who believe in it because they themselves passionately desire it.

National, or rather nationalistic and ethno-religious, fanaticism leads to a loss of connection with reality. At the same time, control over the loyalty of other people of the same nationalist or ethno-religious group to a common idea is being strengthened. Its leaders and most passionate members may seem to be only fighters for the rights of their humiliated people or their only true religion, but they show their deadly determination when it comes to fighting. Then they show fanaticism and cold-blooded cruelty. For some fanatical leaders, the persecution of people of a different national, religious and racial affiliation is a way to satisfy their gaming potencies and realize their sadistic drives. Being successfully opposed by the state, they may give up their fanatical lies under threat of punishment.

P. Konzen believes that some "leading" fanatics, obviously meaning, for example, Hitler, left an indelible imprint on their era, while others were killed like rabid dogs. The thirst for revenge has always fueled protracted conflicts between peoples and religious denominations, which manifested themselves in the form of irrational forms of retaliatory violence. In the past, political regimes always maintained their power through fanatically brutal repression. On the other hand, fanaticism inspired the masses, who set in motion the most important historical events, and each time at the most terrible cost.

In almost all forms of philosophical ethics, there are calls for abstinence, "apathy", curbing rage; the founders of religions and saints also called for sympathy, forgiveness and mercy. But, at the same time, it was the religious leaders who, as if they had broken loose, could conduct a dogmatic struggle against manifestations of evil, questioning the existence of the "spark of God" in man.

In the age of globalization and urbanization, there is inevitably a mixture of peoples, but it is unlikely that someday, even in the very distant future, humanity will turn into a single people. Such a merger will never happen, because peoples live in different social, socio-psychological and geographical conditions, develop at different rates and with different historical memories. But if such a merger happened, it would be a misfortune for the whole world, people in it would become monotonous and gray, all the unique, special beauties of language, religion, customs, art, etc. would disappear. Meanwhile, culturologists have long known that different peoples have the same or similar customs and traditions, myths and fairy tales, rules of behavior and even forms and ways of violating them. For example, the myth of the world flood has become widespread. D.D. Fraser writes about it this way: the similarity is explained by a simple borrowing with some more or less significant modifications, but there are many cases when similar customs and beliefs of different peoples arise independently of each other, as a result of the same work of human thought under the influence of similar living conditions [5, p. 64].

These factors, differences and similarities of peoples determine the structure, nature and dynamics of crime among them. Even in the conditions of living in one city, some national groups, as a rule, constituting a minority of its population, isolate themselves from the rest and behave to meet not only common requirements, but also those specific of this nation. Voluntary isolation is very relative, since no one can completely or mostly isolate themselves from other people, excluding religious fanatics with damaged psyche. Some small or scattered peoples, for example, Gypsies and Yezidis, are capable of voluntary or, in fact, forced isolation in certain countries. Compulsion may consist not in the forceful pressure of the state, but in the displacement of such peoples by society with the tacit consent of the same state.

But it should be emphasized once again that the creation of informal, national, isolated groups is not always a consequence of external, even disguised pressure, and in many cases a conscious or unconscious desire of national (and religious) groups to preserve their identity and their values. Although this requires a criminological assessment, but in general there is a huge benefit for humanity, since it does not allow it to turn into a dull and standard landscape. Undoubtedly, not all representatives of this people, even in one city, are closed within the framework of their national association. Obtaining a higher education and work qualifications, as well as accumulating wealth, people leave it (sometimes maintaining a facade of former connection).

Certain peoples may have their own settlements not only within the borders of cities, but also outside them. This is observed in many countries of the world. Their separation from the rest of the population, which makes up the majority in the country, in no way leads to their criminalization; however, certain types of crime can develop there, such as production and sale of drugs, cattle rustling, creation of gangster and extremist organizations, etc.

It is possible to raise a very difficult and even sensitive question, whether there are criminal peoples? The deliberately straightforward question shows that the answer to it should not also be as such.

To begin with, what the adjective "criminal" means in this context, whether it can be used in relation to a particular people. If the answer is positive, it is necessary to explain whether it presumes committing grave, especially grave or insignificant crimes constantly or in some acute periods of its history. It begs comparison of the people with a man; C. Lombroso writes about the latter that there is a criminal person, believing that he/she inherits criminal genes. The evidence of this scientist is based on sociological material, which is absolutely unsuitable and, therefore, his position is untenable. But still, it can be reasonably assumed that the criminal person is a reality. How else can we call a person who was brought up in unfavorable conditions, began to commit crimes even in adolescence, was brought to criminal responsibility 8 times,

and follow prison and antisocial ideas. This is a completely alienated person, and not all through his/her own fault; a considerable share of responsibility lies with the family, school and law enforcement agencies.

It is clear that a person and a people are different phenomena, although people of the nation make up the people. Crimes are committed only by some part of it, but it is known exactly which one. If we analyze the entire history of mankind, it turns out that some peoples, including in antiquity and the Middle Ages, attacked other peoples, usually neighboring ones. They destroyed them in whole or in part, the other part was captured, assimilated. At the same time, the invaders knew that by killing or capturing they were committing crimes, but they were sure that this was their right, that they were obliged to do so, that the defeated peoples themselves threatened them, which gave rise to their aggressive defense, that such peoples were inept and insignificant and they had no reason to live on earth, etc. Such a worldview and such a world interpretation have been popular among the ancient Jews who escaped from the Egyptian captivity, the ancient Romans and other modern peoples in the Middle Ages, modern and contemporary history. We see that civilization does not abolish the laws of history and does not change the psychology of peoples. Hitler's Germany and the people of that time can serve as a proof of this statement.

It was the Germans of such a Germany, and not Germans in general, one of the most civilized and educated nations in the world, who committed extremely cruel and heinous crimes during the Nazi era. Usually they blame Hitler for it, but cannot answer the question why the Fuhrer could not act in Great Britain or Russia, but particularly in Germany. Hitler as a necrophile [4, pp. 319–373] won a complete victory by organizing and implementing an unprecedented genocide and aggression against other countries in history. All this became possible only in Germany, whose history and archetypal values gave him unprecedented power, which he fully used to commit mass murder and destruction.

The Germans proved themselves to be brave warriors back in the era of resistance to the Romans, and at that time there emerged the archetype of the evil blonde gorges, merciless to those whom she considered enemies. For centuries, the cult of militarism and military force was created; so, Kaiser Wilhelm II had six sons and all of them were army officers. The Kaiser was one of the initiators of the First World War. Therefore, the Germans suffered defeats in the wars with Napoleon very painfully and invariably craved revenge.

The explanation of Hitlerism can be found in many works, in particular, H. Arendt, K. Bassiuni, I. Fest, E. Fromm, O.Yu. Plenkov, L. Rees, G. Lewy, K. Jaspers, T. Mann, H. Rauschning, W. Reich, P. Kontsen, etc. Considerations of the outstanding ethnologist and geographer Jacques lis e Reclus are important for understanding roots of German militarism and crimes committed by the Germans during the Hitler years. "The Germans, in the end, began to personify their empire as a woman armed from head to toe, threatening someone with her sword. Here one involuntarily recalls the "national" monument of Germany, towering on the high hill of the Niederwald, located on the right bank of the Rhine. The proud, armed statue of Germany, standing above surrounding hills and meadows, looks with hatred over the Rhine, towards France. In this monument, there is a threat not only to France, but to the whole world; every German, looking at this monument, is completely imbued with the consciousness that "Germany is above everything on earth" and therefore meekly makes heavy sacrifices to maintain the greatness and power of his/her beloved fatherland. Similar monuments, only of smaller dimensions, were erected to educate people in many cities and towns of Germany.

Recognizing the main task of the nation to achieve world power with the help of armed force, the Germans, of course, had to create a well-organized state power that could lead the nation to achievement of its ideals. Indeed, the state power in Germany has reached its highest development and there is no government in the world, whose representatives enjoy the same honor as in Germany" [3, p. 12].

E. Reclus cites a children's song, widespread in German rural schools back in the 19th century.

"Trumpets sound solemnly,
And banners are noisily unfurling.
March, march on the enemies in the name of God!
Chop them down until they all burn!
Beat them, do not give mercy!
If you cannot lift the sword,
Then strangle your enemies without being timid".

The very names of the Hitler era (Nazism) and the Hitler's Party (National Socialist" indicate not only the criminal regime in Germany, but also that all the monstrous crimes of the Germans were of a national character. Of course, not all Germans were affected by Nazism, but a significant majority of them were. There is every reason to think that all this was in the past, although in the recent past. But, of course, Germans, like any other nation (and race), can by no means be called criminal. Crimes are committed by individuals, perhaps even the majority of people of this nation

or racial group, but not the entire nation or racial group. Besides, any of these ethnic units can live in different countries.

We agree with H. Arendt that comparing the absolutely innocent Jewish people with the absolutely guilty German people does not mean that it is possible to make the entire German people look as guilty as the Nazis did with the Jews. Establishing and maintaining such differences would mean establishing and maintaining a permanent hell on earth [1, p. 349]. This, of course, does not mean that the German people do not bear any responsibility to the whole world, because it and no one else brought Hitler to power, which was officially handed over to him by President Hindenburg, who supported him in everything, applauded him, believed him implicitly, moreover, idolized him, not doubting the sanctity of his orders at all. Hitler and his criminal regime, with the almost full support of the people, attacked countries and peoples who obviously could not resist them, but showed a complete lack of strategic thinking by entering into war with democratic countries and the USSR. They were simply short-sighted.

A new post-communist Russia in the crisis period of its youth faced an acute national problem – the Chechen one. At first, people of non-Chechen nationality were forced out of Chechnya, and the civil war of this region with the rest of Russia began. Peace in this small republic was achieved at the cost of thousands of lives on both sides, but Chechen radicals often resorted to terrorist acts due to military actions, which is always characteristic of the weaker side of the conflict. At the same time, the following very im-

portant circumstance should be taken into account: the Chechen authorities and the people of this country were at war with Russia not because they hated Russians, Ukrainians, etc. Chechens would do the same if their freedom was hindered by the French or the Japanese, i.e. they fought with the Russian government, with a force that does not give them the opportunity to become independent, but not with other peoples, living in Russia.

This is not the first time for our country to address a national problem: after the 1917 October Revolution, the Bolsheviks faced a very painful task to restore Russian power in the Central Asian region. It was, basically, a colony of tsarist Russia and this status needed to be preserved.

Uprising of the peoples of Central Asia was not something extraordinary in world history, so did the inhabitants of many colonies of Great Britain, France, Spain and other European powers. Soviet propaganda, of course, did everything possible to denigrate and spit on the movement of Central Asian nations towards independence, presenting them as purely robbers and criminals, and people who took up arms as basmachs. They were heroes in the eyes of their peoples, which the Communists could not agree with in any way, especially since they acted against them with maximum cruelty.

There have never been racial conflicts in Russia, since there is a small number of representatives of the Negroid race in Russia. As for the Mongoloid race, for many centuries, peoples have become so close that they do not notice racial differences.

REFERENCES

1. Arendt H. *Opyty ponimaniya, 1930–1954. Stanovlenie, izgnanie i totalitarizm* [Experiences of Understanding, 1930–1954. Formation, Exile and Totalitarianism]. Translated from English by Elena Bondal et al. Moscow: Izd-vo In-ta Gaidara, 2018. 707 p. ISBN 978-5-93255-519-4.
2. Konzen P. *Fanatizm. Psikhoanaliz etogo uzhasnogo yavleniya* [Fanaticism. Psychoanalysis of this terrible phenomenon]. Translated by S.S. Dmitrova. Edited by A.I. Kugai. Kharkov: Gumanitarnyi tsentr, 2011. 392 p. ISBN 978-969-8324-71-0.
3. Reclus J.E. *Narody i strany Zapadnoi Evropy. Knigi 1–2* [Peoples and countries of Western Europe. Books 1–2]. Ed. by N.K. Lebedev. Moscow: Tip. t-va I.D. Sytina, 1915. 792 p.
4. Fromm E. *Anatomiya chelovecheskoi destruktivnosti* [The anatomy of human destructiveness]. Moscow: Respublika, 1994. ISBN 5-250-02472-6.
5. Frazer J.F. *Fol'klor v Vetkhom Zavete* [Folklore in the Old Testament]. Translated from English by S.A. Tokareva. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1985. 650 p.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHOR

YURII M. ANTONYAN – Doctor of Sciences (Law), Professor, Honored Scientist of the RSFSR, ChiefResearcher of the All-Russian Research Institute of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russia, antonyan@yandex.ru, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0030-3031