

TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS AND SOCIAL TECHNOLOGIES IN CONDITIONS OF THE HYBRID WAR

Yenin M. N.,

Ph.D., Associate Professor of Department of Sociology

National Technical University of Ukraine

«Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute»

The structural-functional approach to the study of terrorist organizations is proposed in the article. It means their consideration as social groups consisting of the following components: political, financial-economic, integrative (disciplinary), ideological. It is shown that in most definitions of terrorism the key concept is «violence». At the same time, the blurring of the boundaries of political and scientific discourse is one of the main obstacles in ensuring the clarity of the notion of «terrorism». A trend of modern terrorism is to use the concepts «republic» and «state», which serve as an ideological justification to seizure new territories. According to the author, the formation and support of modern terrorist organizations is one of the effective technologies of the hybrid wars in the modern world.

У статті запропонований структурно-функціональний підхід у вивченні терористичних організацій, що передбачає їх розгляд як соціальних груп, що складаються з наступних компонентів: політичний, фінансово-економічний, інтегративний (дисциплінарний), ідеологічний. Показано, що у більшості визначень тероризму ключовим поняттям є «насильство». В той же час, розмитість кордонів політичного і наукового дискурсу є однією з головних перешкод в забезпеченні ясності поняття «тероризм». Виявлено тенденцію сучасного тероризму у використанні концептів «республіка» і «держава», які слугують ідеологічним виправданням захоплення нових територій. На думку автора, формування і підтримка сучасних терористичних організацій є однією з ефективних технологій гібридних війн у сучасному світі.

В статье предложен структурно-функциональный подход в изучении террористических организаций, что предполагает их рассмотрение как социальных групп, состоящих из следующих компонентов: политический, финансово-экономический, интегративный (дисциплинарный), идеологический. Показано, что в большинстве определений терроризма ключевым понятием является «насилие». В тоже время, размытость границ политического и научного дискурса является одним из главных препятствий в обеспечении ясности понятия «терроризм». Выявлена тенденция современного терроризма в использовании концептов «республика» и «государство», которые служат идеологическим оправданием захвата новых территорий. По мнению автора, формирование и поддержка современных террористических организаций является одной из эффективных технологий гибридных войн в современном мире.

Keywords: structural-functional approach, hybrid war, social technologies, terrorism.

Setting of the problem. The historical context is important in the analysis of the terrorist organizations, because forms and methods of terrorism have been essentially reshaped for a time. Now the activity of terrorist organizations acquires features of transnational corporations. These organizations are reorganizing in the network structure with ideological center and mass of cells located throughout the world, that's why they are practically invulnerable. Building a network of supranational structures with an efficient management and permanent financing is a consequence of globalization, so it is very difficult to fight with such terrorist organizations. Now the concept of the hybrid war is quite common in science. But the question is what is the connection of this kind of war with forms and technology of activities of modern terrorist organizations («DNR» and «LNR» in the context of Ukrainian realities)? What is the difference between these terrorist formations from classic terrorist movements that fought for freedom of a particular nation or for the releasing of a specific territory? Consideration of these issues is the subject of this article.

The analysis of researches and publications. Acuteness of the problem of activity of terrorist organizations on global scale takes to leading position in the question of social security related to counter-terrorism efforts. This topic is relevant in the context of articles dedicated to the problems of modern state and modernization [6; 7].

A lot of literature has been devoted to the problem of terrorism. Unfortunately, there is no effective theory of terrorism so far. There are many different approaches to the definition of terrorism, nameless classifications of causes of this social phenomenon in jurisprudence, sociology and other sciences. Scientists disagree what is a fundamental question of terrorism studies. Researcher Daaze considers that the central debate in this problem takes place between the supporters of psychological versions of terrorism and supporters of rational choice theory [2]. In line with this discourse the article of Roznatovsky who is one of the few Ukrainian researchers of the phenomenon of terrorism should be outlined [9]. Relevant is his sporadic attempts in Ukraine to develop sociological approaches to the study of terrorism, setting heuristic hypotheses [10; 11]. The sociological researches of Roznatovskysy stand out against the general trend to focus on the criminal aspects of terrorism [3; 15] and narrow perspectives to consider sociological approach (monograph of Gorbunov) in studying terrorism only in frames of poverty, inequality, ignorance and marginalization [1, p. 55-56]. Typically, classification approaches to explain the nature and causes of terrorism are limited and rather artificial. As an example, classification of the approaches to terrorism of Gorbunov consists of sociological, civilization (explanation of terrorism through values conflict of civilizations, including Christian and Muslim), politological (terrorism as a means of achieving political goals) and psychosocial (explanation of terrorist activities on the basis of motives and psychological characteristics) [1, p. 53-64]. Conceptual weakness of the topic of terrorism is explained by heterogeneity of phenomenon. On the other hand, when wave of terrorism swept in West Europe in 60-80 years of XX century, usually it has been seen as a random manifestation of the ill will of political extremists, which can be managed by police methods.

The spread of modern terrorism's definition is as follows: «Terrorism is the strategically indiscriminate harming or threat of harming others within a target group in order to advance some political, ideological, social, economic, or religious agenda by influencing members of an audience group in ways believed to be conducive to the advancement of that agenda» [16].

In the most definitions of terrorism, the key concept is «violence». Violence is not always end in itself for terrorists. Sometimes it is enough to use threats of violence to achieve the desired result for them. For example, the Russian researcher Shvets, comparing various definitions of terrorism, considers the following definition: «... terrorism is a repeated violent act carried out by a person who is in an illegal (semi-legal) position, by a group or persons acting on behalf of the state for political, criminal reasons or because of the rejection of the surrounding world» [13].

The object of violence can be power in the person of individual civil servants as well as in the entire state institutions, society in the person of individual citizens, business entities, large industrial enterprises and small private firms, and computer networks (cyber terrorism) as the trend of modernity. The purpose of violence is to achieve the desired development for the terrorists: the change of power, the destabilization of society, the undermining of economic and information stability of both the states as a whole and individual segments in their economy in particular.

The purpose of this article is a review of the characteristics of modern terrorist organizations and social technologies in conditions of the hybrid war.

Main story. To study and understand of contemporary terrorist organizations, in our opinion, it is productive to use different sociological methodologies, exchange theory, conflict theory, theory of background practices and structural-functional methodology. The structural-functional methodology will be briefly discussed in the article.

As it is well known, Parsons tried to find a single theoretical approach to the study of society as a whole and its segments in the face of large and small groups.

American scientist described the nature of social systems through the development of subsystems that specialize on a specific function in action system as a whole and integrative mechanisms which combine functionally differentiated system. Management (political) aspects of activity within his analytic scheme stand out against the need of social system in maintaining the integrity of differentiated groups (function of pursuing a goal) [12, p. 29-31]. Adaptive function is connected with a rational organization and distribution of material, human and cultural resources. Function of integrative subsystem is to maintain internal unity, solidarity and determination of role responsibilities [12, p. 25]. This function is carried out by the institutions of social control through creating and maintaining common standards and values. The function of cultural subsystems, related to aspects of societal normative order, lies in maintaining core samples institutionalized in society values, motivation activity during performance of social roles [12, p. 27-28].

Under this approach, any terrorist groups have several integral functional components. The political component is the presence of management subsystem, conscious activity of individuals aimed at regulating and organizing social relations, in the course of significant goals of organizations is achieved. Economical component is used for financial schemes to make money. Integrative (disciplinary) component exists through spreading of role requirements and control means. It allows supporting a discipline, to provide the internal unity of the organization. The ideological component – any terrorist organization needs a complex of values and norms that mobilize it to work to achieve a common goal.

DNR and LNR are not classical terrorists' movements who are fighting for freedom of a particular nation or for the releasing of a specific territory. For example, the Irish Republican army fought for the independence of the Northern Ireland or Palestinian organizations on the Middle East fight for the independence of Palestine. Ukraine deals with terrorism like Islamic terrorism. It is directed against the West for all Muslims not for a specific nation. According to Ahmad S. Moussaili «Islamic state may be seen as an early manifestation of the mass social movements articulating religious and civilizational aspirations and questioning fundamental issues surrounding the morality of technology, the capitalist mode of distribution and upholding popular empowerment, non-state legitimacy, and the none-nation-state paradigms» [13, p. 2]. It has some idealistic purpose – to defeat and destroy the West and the USA. This terrorism has a purpose to capture a new territory. This new terrorism has a main difference from the so-called classical terrorism. The latest trend of modern terrorism is using of the concept «state». The terrorist organizations now are not just some ephemeral structures, they are specific territorial units. The most striking example is an «Islamic state» (Islamist international organization operating primarily in Iraq and Syria).

One of the latest organizational achievements in the field of terrorism is the emergence of the Islamic state of Iraq and the Levant (now simply called the Islamic state). This is a new step in the development of terrorism – the word «state» in the name of this organization. And we can draw an analogy with the creation of DNR and LNR in the East of Ukraine. The presence of the words «republic» and «state» (in case of the Middle East) in the names of the terrorist organizations is not just rhetoric or a figure of speech. Abbreviations DNR/LNR were not accidental; therefore, they show that they are a part of state, not just organization from the outside. Using concept «state» the militants of DNR and LNR (like the terrorists of the Islamic state) justify capturing new territories.

The purpose of the terrorists of DNR/LNR (like Islamic terrorists) is maximal intimidating of the Ukrainian population, occupation more territory than they control, to get political concessions or to demoralize the central government and world community. It is happening now in the East of Ukraine: the militants do not simply capture new territories; they threaten to get to Kyiv and Lvov, to reshape and change a modern Ukraine. Islamic terrorists act the same way.

Militants of the «Islamic state» captured large areas of the north and west of Iraq in the summer of 2014, as well as a part of the territory in Syria [14, p. 185-187]. The terrorists announced the creation in their regions of «Islamic caliphate». Messages about their intentions to capture new territories «From Mosul (Iraq) to Jerusalem (Israel)» are constantly appearing. It is believed that the purpose of the organization is the elimination of the boundaries established through the division of the Ottoman Caliphate and the creation of an Orthodox Islamic state at least in Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, Palestine, Jordan, Turkey, Cyprus, Egypt (at least the Sinai Peninsula; the maximum is the entire Islamic world) [15].

However, between Islamic terrorism and terrorism of LNR and DNR there is the difference. LNR and DNR have a specific external sponsor who oversees them. Obviously Russia created DNR/LNR and continues to support them by weapons, manpower and finances. In practice, Ukraine opposes Russia. DNR and LNR are mediators in this war. Example of the war through mediator in the Middle East is a terrorist organization «Hezbollah» which is a puppet of Iran (Iran is funding and supplying weapons for them), in 2006 it started a war against Israel. Iran has «Hezbollah», Russia – DNR and LNR – puppets who terrorize certain regions but their main purpose is destabilizing situation on a global scale: Iran through «Hezbollah» intends to destroy Israel, and Russia through DNR / LNR – Ukraine.

The main sources of financing terrorists of «Islamic state» are the proceeds of their criminal activity: a systematic and organizing looting, ransom for kidnapped people. Cash also come from the sale of oil because the terrorists seized several large fields. They sell oil at deep discounts, sometimes charging the price 2 times smaller from the market price.

The militants of DNR and LNR are engaged in robbery, looting in large enterprises. There are constant reports about terroristic groups of Donbas stealing cars, robbing houses and apartments of local people.

Regarding to financing sources DNR and LNR are more similar to the terrorist organization «Hezbollah» where Iran is the main external source of funding. As a result we have a hybrid: the main funding scheme of DNR and LNR is built on the principle of «Hezbollah» but the militants are actively using methods of terrorists of «Islamic state».

Islamic terrorism is a variant of a religious terrorism but the religious component is on the second place in recent years. The main idea of modern Islamic terrorists lies in hatred of Western values and Western societies. A large number of mercenaries who came to fight sincerely believe that they are going to fight against the United States and Europe.

The behaviour of militants of DNR and LNR is exactly the same as of the Islamic militants, only the first focus is on the Orthodox faith and values. They understand Islam and Orthodoxy as something fundamentally deeply anti-Western. It is some great value which is inaccessible to unmoral West. In this sense, Islamic and Orthodox terrorism are almost identical.

It should also be noted that terrorist groups in the Middle East are more blindly faithful than terrorist groups in Donbas where local population is still much more cynical. Because of its militants DNR and LNR try to enforce the local population to loyalty. The ideological similarity of projects of Islamic terrorism and DNR/LNR is anti-Western and anti-globalization trend. This is their key motivation with the idea of Russian and Orthodox world. The Islamic world is fighting for the Union territories, the creation of Islamic state with the right faith, rules and orders. It is based on religion (Islam) and the Arabic language. The Russian world is fighting for the Union of territories, the resumption of the Great Russian Empire. This is based on the idea of offense and humiliation of Russian language and religion (Orthodoxy). The models are absolutely identical: reunion of the territories with a common faith and one language.

A lot of similarities can be found in the methods of war of Islamic terrorists and militants of DNR/LNR. First of all, the cult of violence: the constant shells, abductions, torture, threats, violence. The common practice of Islamic militants is the using of suicide bombers who are ready for "the right thing" to give their lives. Militants of DNR/LNR also decided to learn this wild and barbarous method. Holding parades prisoners of war is also part of the cult of Islamic terrorists.

Nowadays, terrorist organizations are one of the technologies of the hybrid war in the modern world. War in Donbas has been often described as the hybrid war in Ukrainian public and political discourse. This type of war is not yet clearly defined in social science but different experts agree that it is using social technologies against Ukrainian state, research and prevention of which is the basis of the national security. In our opinion, the hybrid war can be defined as a aggression of one state against another through non formal groups represented by the military (often by guerrilla warriors) and non-governmental organizations, local communities, communication with which is formally denied. The state, which leads the hybrid war is not positioning itself as a member of a military conflict, describing it as a civilian one.

Despite the fact that events in Donbas, which preceded the war, are observed as spontaneous actions of the ordinary people, it was a ruled process of implementation of complex social technologies: the information war, the distortion of democratic procedures, the use of terrorism tactics, combat operations in populated areas etc.

The first – this is the information war, which aims to manipulate public consciousness and rise civil hatred. Seizing of local television stations by organized groups, blocking of opposition media and public access to an objective information are taking place for this purpose. Thus, the main feature of this war is that it takes place not on the streets but in the minds of people primarily, resulting in forming the fifth column – the population rejects their country and supports the aggressor (in Crimea the usage of military force was excessive in this case). It is constructing specific ideological images in this information war (in the Ukrainian version – it is «banderovets», «fascist», «natsyk», «traitor» etc.), which are the source in the «Galician» and «Donetsk» ideological projects which had regionally narrow, but significant mobilization and confrontational potential.

The second is the distortion of democratic procedures expressed in referendums through arbitrary interpretation of rules of national and international law, appeals to transcendence of «popular will». Thus, the referendum in Crimea and Donbas was legitimized through the right of nations to self-determination (Declaration of United Nations organization). Calculation of the aggressor in this case is based on the fact that the issue of dividing lines between the national liberation movement and separatism is politicized and linked to the political situation, because there is a contradiction between the implementation of people's right to self-determination and the principle of territorial integrity, which involves the inability to change the territory of the State without its consent.

An effective way of forming public opinion towards rejection of Ukrainian authorities and the Ukrainian state was to hold democratic, mass scale «people» actions involving organized groups of provocateurs, gangs and civilians, who do not have a stable national identity, calls for separatism and rejection of the new government and Ukrainian state. In the regional centres of Southern and Eastern Ukraine (Luhansk, Donetsk, Kharkiv, Odessa) these actions took the form of anti-fascist rallies.

The third is to use the tactics of terrorism acts by terroristic organizations (capturing administrative buildings, commercial organizations, banks, etc.). During the demonstrations operational substitution tasks took place: converting a peaceful rally in criminal crowd. For this purpose members were given a lift from the territories of the neighbouring state, which together with local provocateurs («titushky») and pro-Russian population, including party activists, had intention to take by force the state power structures.

The fourth is conducting warfare operations in populated areas, hiding behind civilians with further involvement of the mass media to falsify facts and promoting the idea of deliberate genocide by the Ukrainian authorities of their people (combination of technologies of information war with direct military action).

The fifth – the diplomatic technologies which involve convincing political elite of the international community in the existence of a pattern of reality (like the Nazi revolution in Ukraine, spreading neo-Nazism), intimidation of administrative officials and business elite, which is dependent on the Russian economy, creating alliances with part of the Ukrainian political and business elite that was pushed from

power as a result of political events for maximum mobilization of material, financial and administrative resources in war and psychological pressure through moving much of the military equipment close to the enemy abroad (violent intimidation).

It cannot be said that the hybrid war is a unique phenomenon in Ukraine. Similar technologies were constructed and tempted in different variations long before the events of 2014 (participation of USSR and the USA in war in Korea, Vietnam, revolutions in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America). On the other hand, our country intellectually and organizationally was unprepared to counter this particular subversive social technologies purpose of which was anti-national social mobilization, disruption of society, public institutions of which have been weakened as a result of the revolutionary events, demoralization leadership, inciting civil strife and war, warning mechanisms of self-organization of nation for protection of the national security, preparation the springboard for military intervention [16].

Conclusions. In the most definitions of terrorism the key concept is «violence», but because of the blurring of the boundaries of political and scientific discourse, it is not possible to provide conceptual clarity of this concept in the near future. The structural-functional approach to the study of terrorist organizations is based on consideration of terrorist organizations as social groups consisting of the following components: political, economic, integrative (disciplinary), ideological. For the study of modern terrorism the analytical tools of structural-functional approach is not enough. In particular, it is necessary to use the conflict paradigm that would allow considering the origin and development of terrorist organizations as a conflict of interests of the ruling classes, their activity as a catalyst for social change in countries which are donating terrorism and countries which are the object of aggression. Theory of background practices would be useful to uncover the motivation of terrorists, their awareness of everyday life, the degree of their involvement in the struggle and commitment to ideological patterns.

The terrorist organizations now are not just some ephemeral structures, they are specific territorial units and important technology in the hybrid war. It is not possible to transfer the past experience of the struggle against terror in modern realities, as terrorist organizations in the past, as a rule, created and functioned within the framework of national states. Events of 2014 in Ukraine showed the need to create appropriate research institutes or departments for deep study of the problems of national security and explosive social technologies, integrated development of informational, educational, legislative, enforcement measures of their response.

References:

1. Кутуєв П. Держава, що сприяє розвитку: вступ до соціологічної проблематики / П. Кутуєв, О. Якубін, Д. Герчанівський // Соціологія: теорія, методи, маркетинг. – 2015. – № 4. – С. 3-19.
2. Кутуєв П. Модерн, модернізація та розвиток: ідеї та практики: Монографія / П. В. Кутуєв – К.: Талком, 2015. – 467 с.
3. Дааза К. Тероризм – поняття, теорії та стратегії протидії. Результати та проблеми соціально-наукових досліджень [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : <http://www.ji.lviv.ua/n25texts/daase.htm>
4. Рознатовський І. В. Особистість терориста: мотиви до дії, психологічні та соціальні особливості / І. В. Рознатовський // Вісник ЛНУ імені Тараса Шевченка. Соціологічні науки. – 2011. – № 2 (213). – С. 187-193.
5. Рознатовський І. В. Тероризм: внутрішня загроза в Україні / І. В. Рознатовський // Вісник Луганського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. Соціологічні науки. – 2013. – № 11(1). – С. 134-144.
6. Рознатовський І. В. Роль концепції фонових практик у дослідженні тероризму / І. В. Рознатовський // Вісник Луганського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. Соціологічні науки. – 2014. – №10. – С. 181-188.
7. Ємельянов В. Терористичний акт: загальне поняття, відмежування» від суміжних злочинів та шляхи вдосконалення злочину [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : http://nauka.nlu.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/4_14.pdf
8. Shamara O., Komashko V. Place of the Prosecutor's office of Ukraine in the national system of fighting terrorism / O. Shamara, V. Komashko // WSPÓŁPRACA EUROPEJSKA NR 1(8) 2016 / EUROPEAN COOPERATION Vol. 1 (8) 2016. – P. 108-113.
9. Горбунов К. Г. Терроризм: социально-психологическое исследование: монография / К. Г. Горбунов. – Омск: Изд-во Ом. гос. ун-та, 2010. – 384 с.
10. Shanahan T. Provisional Irish Republican Army and the Morality of Terrorism, Edinburg University Press, 2009. – 245 p.
11. Швец Д. Международный терроризм: информационный аспект / Д. Швец // Мировая экономика и международные отношения. – 2003. – № 9. – С. 17-22.

12. Парсонс Т. Система современных обществ / Пер. с англ. Л.А. Седова и А.Д. Ковалева. Под ред. М.С. Ковалевой. – М.: Аспект Пресс, 1998. – 270 с.
13. Moussalli A. S. Moderate and radical Islamic Fundamentalism. The Quest for Modernity, Legitimasy, and the Islamic State, University Press of Florida, 1999. – 247 p.
14. Кузнецов А. «Исламское государство» в контексте политических изменений на ближнем Востоке / А. Кузнецов // «Вестник МГИМО». – 2015. – № 2 (41). – С. 184-192.
15. Тесленко Е., Пеструилова Н. Феномен ИГИЛ / Е. Тесленко, Н. Пеструилова // «Виктимология». – 2015. – № 1 (3). – С. 34-39.
16. Єнін М. Великі війни, великі трансформації: історична соціологія 20-го століття, 1914-2014: Матеріали міжнародної наук.-практ. конф. (м. Київ, 27-28 листопада 2014 р.) / Укладачі А. А. Мельниченко, П. В. Кутуєв, А. О. Мігалуш. – К.: Політехніка, 2014. – С. 177-178.