MODERN TERRORISM: CONCEPT AND APPROACH ANALYSIS

A.V. Chaika

Southern federal university, Rostov-on-Don, Russia
science-almanac@mail.ru

The problem of modern terrorism as an image of counterculture environment is considered. The analysis of concepts and approaches of foreign and native authors, specialists of terrorism problem research was conducted. Separate features of the modern terrorism are considered and emphasized. The author drew conceptual conclusions on the basis of dialectical approach to modern terrorism counterculture phenomenon research.

Key words: modern terrorism, "net phenomenon", globalization, technization, concept, analysis, tempoworld.

Growth of terrorist attacks and qualitative modification of terrorism towards organization and technization made the theme of the modern terrorism as one of the actual in science and society. Terrorism became not only a form of revolutionary activity, but also one of the leading methods, characterizing some aspects of international opposition, the form of war conducting. In the works of P. Wilkinson, B. Hoffman, U. Laker, B. Jenkins [32. 18. 25. 24] terrorism is undergone to the deepest theoretical analysis. In the works of the given authors terrorism appears to be wide and complex phenomenon of political culture, the method of political doctrines confrontation under the conditions of liberalism domination and its politico-juridical model, and also the form of realization of modern social and geopolitical conflicts. A lot of ideas of these authors are used in modern researches of terrorism, including the given article.

B. Hoffman forms the terrorism classical conception as a form of violence. He speaks about terrorism as a form of violence, or that is also important about threat of violence, that one, beyond all doubt, should beware. According to Hoffman, violence is realized for some political aim promotion [18. p. 7]. In this one can find difference between a terrorist and group of criminals, acting, obeying to the other motivation. "To be called terrorism", - as Hoffman writes, - violence should be completely organized society with some conspiratorial structure and perceived aim of management, but not a separate individual, acting according to personal desire" [18. p. 45].

The further specialization of terrorism theme comprises the wide circle of modern problems. So D. Brin [21] pays attention to the most critical theme of modern culture, particularly – to personal life of a person and problems of public security. To a large extent thanks to his views sad sentence that modern democracy sacrifices personal life of citizens and "their right to privacy", in order to please public security, appeared on the West. In some measure the security problems can remind totalitarian order, when a try to use the right to personal life privacy can be estimated as an attempt on public peace. The development of the given views was found in the works of P. Cholk [22]. D. Rapoport [29] raises questions of ethical character. The attempts of this aim and means problem, and also problems of social justice, which to a large extent motivate up-to-date terrorism to an active revolutionary activity are characterized to his opinion. The works of B. Netanyakhu [27], L. Dokhanyu [23], J. Saimon [30], and also the other authors are dedicated to the questions of various types terrorism consideration, its conative side, psychological problems, and also to some sides of antiterroristic work.

The works of J.Adams [19], Z. Bzhezinskii [2], S. Huntington [17], G. Vardlou [31] and also the other authors are dedicated to definition of up-to-date terrorism, as a global problem of modernity. Terrorism is considered together with charges of sociocultural development of globalizing world modern civilization. Herewith globalization is represented as extremely difficult process, which has not only its ideology, but also proper management. Modern terrorism often acts as an answer to globalization, as to Westarnization and attempt of culture global unification under the pressure of values inculcation of "gold milliard". The process of globalization partly appears to be the reason of terroristic acts and concepts formation, representing liberal west world as stagnate,

amoral and hostile to any local tradition and culture. Thereby not only "left" directions of revolutionary terrorism, but also fundamentalist spiritual movements become actual. That is why modern terrorism often appears as a challenge to liberal culture, liberal structure with its irrepressible modern.

Large terroristic acts at the beginning of XXI century, among which one can call such as complex of terroristic acts of 11th of September 2001 in the USA, hostage taking in Moscow culture complex "Nord-Ost", hostage taking in Beslan, and also a lot of other terroristic acts contributed to attraction of more undiverted attention to this problem. The mentioned terrorist attack in the USA became the reason for alarm conclusion, because it meant the beginning of some new epoch, the features of which are now blurred and not evident. However, the possible severity of this epoch became evident for everybody. The announcements of the western political leaders that global terroristic war proceeds in the world and terroristic structures act, have contributed to the modification of foreign policy life priorities. One has become to consider the world terrorism not only as hypothetical threat, but also as real force, which is capable to realize mighty terrorist attacks, which according to their scope can be compared with army group operations. The leaders of modern Europe Dumas, such as Zh. Bodriyar [3], Yu. Habermas, Zh. Derrida paid attention to the terrorism problems. Predicting the events of the beginning of XXI century Zh. Bodriyar expressed the idea, which to a large extent defined the cultural picture of the future. He specifically writes: "Terrorism is generated not by aspiration to violence, but it is characterized for normal social state - inasmuch as this state in any moment can turn into something directly opposite, absurd, uncontrolled" [3. p. 67-68]. Consequently, terrorism became not only as emphasized problem, case of a group of outcast-revolutionaries, but also a special state of modern culture, society, capable to uncontrolled aggression.

The works of T. Meissane [12], I. Primorats [28], B. Nakos [26] and the others are dedicated to the further consideration of concepts and phenomena of "modern terrorism", "international terrorism", "transnational terrorism", "global terrorism". Despite on the fact that the given terms in a sufficient degree differ from each other, one must admit that all of them stress the special state of the given phenomenon, which essentially differs from the others. This is a state of special organized nature, when terrorism, remaining deeply conspiratorial phenomenon, overcomes national and regional borders, receives the special strength, and becomes mass and significantly mightier. When one speaks about so called modern terrorism, then one means something that directly relates to modern day, one strives to note some specificity, but at the same time one means absolutely specific phenomenon. The given phenomenon is always associated with fantastic madness, outermost injustice, insuperable fear, and also with a sense of its permanent presence somewhere near.

Analyzing the terrorism juridical aspect, as the modern social phenomenon, Kh. P. Gesser concludes to the fact that such complex social construction as terrorism cannot have a simple and practical definition that could essentially simplify its juridical classification that extremely necessary in the international right [5. p. 1]. Therewith he writes: "Terrorism – is social phenomenon that is considered to be too complex… It is appeared to be that the lawyers and other specialists have not came to the unite understanding of its notions and consequences [5. p. 2]. Looking ahead, one pays attention that the given point of view is widespread in the native science. Particularly, the modern researcher N. Litvinov, analyzing the problem juridical aspect writes: "There is no a unite notion of terrorism in legal literature as in Russia, so in neighboring and far-abroad countries" [11. p. 67].

Very often the attempts of conceptualization and terrorism interpretation are amounted to various methods of its classification. According to some scientists mainly fully-featured classification is quite enough for terrorism essence understanding, as long as this or that type of terrorism concludes some sociocultural essence. J. Bell the famous researcher of modern terrorism, tries to take into account some its manipulative essence and includes "terrorism, sanctioned by the authorities" among such varieties as "criminal", "local", ("endemic"), "psychopathic", "revolutionary" [20]. Classification of P. Wilkinson seems to be analogical, he emphasizes terrorism, maintained by the government, political terrorism, and also criminal terrorism [32. p. 37-

55]. Hijacking and hostage taking, which very often occurred in 70-80-s of the last century, even under the presentation of political requirements, with some minor exceptions, considered to be political terrorism acts. Such professionally-pragmatic relation, certainly, excludes revelations of the general reasons of terrorism appearing, - marks isolated, phenomena, without making an attempt to see their general roots.

The growth of the modern terrorism contributes to more intent look to this problem from the side of native scientists. It should be noted that in researches of Russian authors the pretty high level of problem conceptualization is marked on the basis of multidisciplinary approach, presupposing synthesis of various aspects of sociohumanitarian knowledge. Thus M.V. Rozin offered technocratic conception of modern terrorism, fairly thinking, that modern terrorism to a large extent forms terroristic threat, mainly thanks to appliance of technical innovations [14. p. 126-135]. A lot of modern terrorism conceptions, including conception of the native authors, are undergone certain influence of Huntington conception about a clash of civilizations, having universal significance.

One can meet argumentation, concerning different sociocultural aspects of various forces opposition in the modern world, in the works of V.V. Nikitaev and G.G. Kopylov, and also V.G. Fedotov [16] and some other authors. Essentially, this is specification of conception "a clash of civilizations". Thus V.V. Nikitaev considers modern terrorism to be a method of revenge of more backward world, the world existing on the periphery of civilization and progress [13. p. 135]. G.G. Kopylov speaks about impossibility of certain "identity" achievement, that considers to be the reason for contradictions [8. p. 141-144]. Thus, the both authors imply that terrorism roots are at the bottom of the fact of different cultures and various countries civilization uneven development, taking into account, first of all, the level of technological development. But the question about if this fact is a justification of uneven relations of one countries to the others, policy of "double", and more precisely - multidimensional, - standards, is not discussed, as a question about overcoming of this inequality and these standards.

One of the topical questions for the problem solution of modern terrorism essence determination, for many authors can be realized through the definition of its political or traditional dominant. If one imagines that modern terrorism is represented, generally, by different organizations of fundamentalist (religious, ethnical, racial and etc.) sense, then thesis about "revenge" for one part of the society, and is represented in general logical for the others (especially, in the light of history of conquest of the nearest thousand of years). If one focuses attention on a matter of political challenges, which terrorism places in front of it, then tradition immediately departs on the second plan and political pragmatism comes to the first place.

However it is hardly convenient to imply the given thesis in whole volume to the phenomenon of modern terrorism. Its ideologic simplification is to a large extent defined by the circumstance that terrorism became business for one people and a real war for others. Together with that one should remember that depoliticized drug dealers very often appeal to terroristic forms of activity. According to this V.A. Tishkov expressed his idea about that modern terrorism, new terroristic organizations represent social phenomenon which "is not placed into concept of government and concept of ethnical societies". The question is not about "Informal nets" – expatriate community, radically-fundamentalist or drugcriminal coalitions, which today play an important role… Nowadays transnational and "pseudocivilizational" societies appear such as – Islamic, Arabic, Turkic, Maghreb. Solidarity there ranges according to weird principals" [15. p. 25]. And these principles do not always represent a simple, firm ideological doctrine, system of views, social conception, which has been forming for a thousand years. Fight for the reallocation of resources, receiving of their full control very often becomes the subject of the new terroristic organization activity. And in this sense terrorism does practically the same as the more developed governments of the world, which represent as basic aims of terrorism.

In this situation the opinion of L.V. Katrich, which is included in that modern terrorism in virtue of various tempoworlds existing, in reality does not have the roots in the past, but appears to be practically new original phenomenon, looks as discordance [6. p. 15]. The conception "tempoworld", predominantly having culturally-philosophical notion, extremely profitably   lights

"peculiarity" standing in front of researcher of the problem. It includes meaning forming aspects of this or that local culture, and its behavioural stereotype, and consciousness dominating archetypes, and the system of traditions, but at the same time some relation to the progress, to that type of modern, which dominates in present-day western culture. In the other words, the problem is significantly wider than political or traditionalist orientation of modern terrorism. The conflict between tradition and modern – is a well-known theme in a contemporary philosophy of culture, but the fact that the modern world has generated powerful forms of opposition, which manifest in the most unexpected aspects, speaks about that up-to-date sociocultural problems are not solved only within the frames of formed political concepts. The problems of contradictions of now existing civilizational worlds and social groups and societies require enlargement of their means solutions, but this is not apparently achievable at the present moment. Some new approaches are necessary to hear and understand each other.

This idea is maintained by even those who seemingly should keep ward of American imperialism, and mainly it in a present time expresses the basic tendencies of the West development. The American general Wesley Clark, who for a long time did not let critical utterances, as long as he was under the arms, after the retirement he wrote very famous though not controversial in its judgements book. This book is called "How to win in a modern war". Despite on the fact, that "generals dream about the victories", the point of the book is not in analysis of the problem achievement of military victory. Clark thinks that the victory in the war with terrorism is expressed not in simple breakdown of an opponent, but in some terrorism liquidation as real and actual threat. Trying to make sense in the reasons of modern terrorism, he came to nonstandard conclusion for American military man. He does not appeal to "bomb and exterminate", but peers at the meaning of the problem, trying to find the sources and roots of the terrorism. He writes about that facts of terrorism have a fundamental origin: "Their source – is a deep feeling of injustice and disability, combined with ideology, which turns this feeling into rage towards the West. Thus, the victory in war requires great reforms in failed states of the Middle East: more pragmatic education, universal economical development and wide political involvement" [7. p. 229]. Consequently, the West should listen to the East, take into account its political interests, cultural tradition and reject from engrained scheme of relations, under which the East is represented as a perpetual exoticism. Instead of military intervention the author offers to "conduct serious researches and developments, to create technologies, strategies, and organizations and prepare specialists, who can go to failed states and contribute to political and economical reforms there…" [7. p. 230]. Perhaps, the army of soldiers would be changed by the army of talented organizers and specialists, which would contribute to the progress.

Certainly, the good idea, if it would be realized without concealed benefits and doubtful perspectives, while now it is not observed: any western "assistance" to anybody more than a hundred years turns in practice as economical enslavement and resource robbery (as it occurred in the Central and South America in 50-70-s – Honduras, Panama, Columbia, Venezuela, Guatemala and etc.) in Asia – Iraq, Afghanistan and etc., in Africa – Egypt, Syria, Libya and Ukraine).

More than 10 years ago U. Bek offered the idea, which according to its scale, does not relinquish the idea of Huntington about "a clash of civilizations", but in a significant greater degree emphasizes the more developed countries. Not in whole accepting the concepts of "a clash of civilizations" in the work of "Risk society. On the way to another modern" he undertakes an attempt to find the reason to such global and turning, epochal event, which Huntington called as "a clash of civilizations". He marks that: "Public production of wealth is constantly accompanied by public production of risks in the developed countries of the modern world" [1. p. 21]. Consequently, he admits "not impeccability" of the most progressive part of the world, which reproduces its own risks and cannot overcome its development. No doubt, modern terrorism relates to the number of such risks.

In connection with this, it would be acceptable to define the idea of modern terrorism as a result of impetuous complication of the society, process, which proceeds significantly dynamic, than the process of political means and society control methods improvement. Present-day

civilization is "not only global civilization", this is also a dominating "liberal civilization" which implicitly and obtrusively bears its values, which are not always acceptable in the other tempoworlds. As a consequence, liberal civilization, independently, resting on traditional political means, generates more and more advanced forms of rebellion. Accordingly, "Yesterday friends" can suddenly become "enemy-terrorists" or vice versa. Such cases are famous and described in modern literature. The real "boom" in the newest terroristic organizations formation occurs mainly now, when, so called "Arabic spring" has generated the dozens of powerful nationally-ethnical, fundamentalist, terrorist groups. Thus, modern terrorism is a result of political and sociocultural intervention of liberalism.

Growth of terrorism, and sometimes an incredible progress of its spreading scales, in a large extent is connected with the phenomenon of opposition on the political arena, which was originated in the epoch of cold war, when the terrorist groups and ideologies were used to damage the opposing party. Sometimes terrorism is used for legitimate regime deposition, whose policy does not fit geopolitical plans of some states, striving for the world dominance. One of the dramatic examples to this – is present-day events in Syria, where for the purpose of fight with the legitimate regime of Bashar Asad, the USA takes part in creation and maintains all possible paramilitary groups, acting with terror methods. In 2013 such policy led to creation of self-proclaimed state ISIL (Islamic state of Iraq and Levant), radical and extremely powerful terroristic organization. Nowadays new countries proceed to get involved into the fight with this self-proclaimed political selfformation. At that norms of international right are often ignored and new radical organizations which are called in actual and widespread journalistic stamps as "moderate opposition" are yielded and maintained. The Russian Federation according to the norms of international law entered into war actions with ISIL, maintaining the direct support to the army of Syria, which conducts ground war operation against ISIL.

In conclusion of problem analysis of "modern terrorism" one should mention the following. In culturally-philosophical sense terrorism generates some conception, which is formed from the ideas of modern world, which is rather comfortable for the fight, but extremely less comfortable for life. Terrorism rejects the modern sociocultural reality, as unfair and vicious, where false values, inculcated by present-day elite dominate. Herewith sociocultural environment is confessed as utterly profitable and convenient for terroristic, radical protest activity leading. Terrorists have not created any technology, but they readily use all the results of scientifically-technical process, welfare of modern communications, the world is open and achievable for them in virtue of international integration increment. However mainly this world is one of the highest points of the humanity progress, has became the place of fight, and comfort of the world, its openness is used with success for destabilization. Thus, terrorism rejects not only one of the most promising points of progress, but also widely uses it.

The general analysis of conceptions and views lets us emphasize some features of modern terrorism.

1. Terrorism became technocratic. This quality of modern terrorism is appeared to be the most dangerous. Terrorists obtained the possibility not only create the most dangerous types of weapon or differently possess it, but also learnt to analyze specificity of modern society infrastructure. This circumstance forces society to spend a lot of resources for objects security of industrial production, hydrotechnic and other constructions, large traffic intersections, railroad stations and airports, the places where a lot of people gather. Terrorism technization and its skill to use peculiarities of up-to-date infrastructure multiply increased so called "effect of defeat" from terroristic attacks.

2. Terrorism became a net phenomenon [6. p. 15], in other words it self-organizes through social nets, that makes possible to organize terroristic acts, realize managing of their organizations and their coordination.

3. Terrorism intergrew with criminal business and criminal groups. In some measure terrorism became as a form of criminal business leading, such as arms and drug traffic, that significantly enlarges the possibilities of its selffinancing.

4. Terrorism became more simple, if one speaks about the diversity of its expressions. Herewith the discrete character of its manifestations was formed in the form of separate terroristic acts, which are difficult to imagine as some system.

5. Terrorism became to aim its acts to civilian population in a larger degree. The losses of military and political representatives from terroristic acts in general mass of victims from firmly decreases. One can confirm that so called terroristic wars, are generally aimed against civil population. Consequently modern terrorism became not a means for political representatives removal, revenge, retaliation, but also a means of pressure to constituent body, mass civil society.

6. Modern terrorism in relation to mentioned above, orients to "deterrent effect", in whole appearing to be a means of society management. Reaction to the given deterrent effect at a large extent contributes not only to mobilization of society, but also to partial rejection from democratic conquests for safety. According to some estimation, the audience of terroristic act during Munich Olympiad was more than 800 mln. of people, the beholders of tragic events in Beslan and New York became more than 2,5 billion of people. All of this creates the conditions for blackmail of national governments and international societies in whole.

7. Receiving the characteristics of the international scale, terrorism significantly reduced the importance of states (individually states) in a fight with it. Operating on the international arena present-day terrorism requires more coordination of international efforts, the benefit of international relations to the new level of cooperation and coordination that is not always possible – there are a lot number of obstacles.

References

1. Adams J. The Financing of Terror: How the groups that are terrorizing the world get the money to do it / J. Adams. N.Y., 1986.
2. Bek U. The society of risk. On the way to another modern. M., 2000. p. 21.
3. Bell J.B. Transnational terror. Washington, 1975.
4. Bodriyar Zh. In the shade of silent majority or the end of social. Ekaterinburg, 2000.
5. Brin, David. The Transparent Society: Will Technology Force Us To Choose Between Privacy and Freedom?/ D. Brin. – New York, 1998.
6. Bzhezinski Z. The great chessboard: Domination of America and its geostrategic imperatives / Trans. O.Yu. Uralskaya. M., 1998.
7. Chalk, Peter. The Response to Terrorism as a Threat to Liberal Democracy / Peter Chalk // Australian Journal of Politics and History. 1998. Volume 44, No 3.
8. Clark Wesley K. How to win in a modern war / Trans. from Eng. M., 2004.
9. Donohue, Laura K. US CT Measures 1960-2000 / Laura Donohue // Terrorism and Political Violence. Vol. 13, No.3, London: Frank Cass, 2001.
10. Fedotova G.V. Terrorism: an attempt of conceptualization / Pro et Contra. Volume 7. No 4. Spring 2002.
11. Gesser Kh.P. Prohibition to the terroristic acts in international humanitarian law / International Committee of the Red Cross, 1994.
12. Huntington S. Clash of civilizations / S. Huntington. M., 2003.
13. Jenkins, Brian. Terrorism and personal protection / Brian Jenkins. – Burlington, 1984.
14. Katrich L.V. Pluralization of terroristic forms in the modern world: sociological approaches. M., 2009.
15. Khoffman Bruce. Terrorism – outward glance. M., 2003.
16. Kopylov G.G. If people are people? // Philosophic sciences. 2002. No 1.
17. Laqueur W. The New Terrorism: Fanaticism and the Arms of Mass Distruction. Oxford, 1999.

18. Litvinov N.D. Terroristic organizations. M., 1999.
19. Litvinov N.D. International terrorism. M., 1999.
20. Litvinov N.D. The fight with terrorism in modern Russia: the problems and paradoxes // Power. 1997. No 9.
21. Meissan T. the 11th of September of 2001. The villainous machination / T. Meissan. M., 2002.
22. Nacos, Brigitte. Mass Mediated Terrorism: the Central Role of Media in Terrorism and Counter terrorism / Brigitte Nacos. UK: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002.
23. Netanyahu, Benjamin. Fighting terrorism: How democracies can defeat domestic and international terrorists / Benjamin Netanyahu. New York, 1990.
24. Nikitaev V.V. Terrafonia // Philosophic sciences. 2002. No 1.
25. Primoratz I. Terrorism.The Philosophical Issues / Igor Primoratz. New York, 2005.
26. Rapoport D. The Morality of Terrorism / David Rapoport, Alexander Yonah. New York, 1989.
27. Rosin V.M. Terrorism as a significant symptom of crises of our civilization? // Philosophic sciences. 2002, No 1.
28. Simon, Jeffrey D. The Terrorist Trap: America's Experience with Terrorism / Jeffrey D. Simon. – Bloomington, 1994.
29. The fight with international terrorism. [Electronic resource]. URL: http://refu.ru/refs/51/37695/1.html (the date of resort 12 of September 2015).
30. Tishkov V.A. Socially-cultural aspect of terrorism phenomenon / Social and psychological problems of fight with international terrorism. M., 2002.
31. Wardlaw G. Political Terrorism: Theory, Tactics and Counter-measures / G. Wardlaw. – N.Y., 1986.
32. Wilkinson P. Trends in international terrorism and the American response / Terrorism and international order / edited by L. Freedman. London, 1986.

October, 30, 2015