NATIONAL STATE MODELS FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS

Andrei Manoilo

Department of Foreign Policy and International Relations at the Diplomatic Academy
of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation

Despite the fact that the epoch of global confrontation has come to a close, the number of political conflicts in the modern world continues to be on the rise, in new shapes and forms that are not terribly responsive to stabilizing impact of traditional institutions and systems of collective security. Moreover, international efforts to resolve political conflicts are today are enduring a systematic crisis that requires not only the search for new paradigms and methods for impacting conflict situations, but also to create new paradigms for managing international conflicts. Given this, technologies for information and psychological warfare are being pushed to the forefront, which today are not generally universal in nature, but rather capture national-state and cultural particularities of these civilizations.

In today's world a significantly large quantity of various types of political conflicts, internal and external, different in scale and covering a variety of geographical territory, involving different ethnos, social and political strata, and political systems, are arising simultaneously, undergoing all kinds of degrees of escalation and fading away. With each and every new conflict, that has reached an institutional stage as a result of political action to resolve it, experience is gained with respect to the impact it has on modern day conflicts to try to prevent the conflicts from escalating into a destructive stage for society. Today various countries garner their efforts together to resolve international conflicts, various international institutions are in effect that enable a third party to foster resolution to the conflict. However, despite the amount of experience gained, the number of current conflicts is hardly on the decline, on the contrary, their numbers are dynamically growing, and in some cases so quickly that the system of socio-political relations of modern day society simultaneously have become more complicated.

Today's existing models and means of impacting conflict situations have clearly expressed ethnic and state peculiarities. The belief is that government differences in technologies for mitigating modern day conflicts are linked with the type of political system of the government that is embroiled in the conflict dictating a particular tactic on the part of politicians on how to react to the conflict situation. Nationality differences are related first and foremost with the political world view and mentality of the people and ethnic groups that make up the populations of the country, including the traditions and customs deeply rooted in these ethnic groups with respect to social and political behavior, the social and cultural traditions of that nation in mitigating conflict, that are well grounded in the depths of psychological archetypes, and with the historical experience of interactions with other ethnic groups.

In examining a number of models of impact on a conflict situation, the easiest is to highlight the intergovernmental differences. In addressing various intergovernmental approaches to managing and mitigating modern-day conflicts, researchers have primarily examined the role of social "conflictology" whose development can be greatly attributed to the contributions of G. Zimmel, R. Darendorf, and L.Kozer. This classical approach is based on dividing government systems into "open" (democratic) and "closed" (totalitarian, authoritarian) types of systems, and is currently widely used, despite the fact, that this division is subjective and in today's world there is no longer clear cut definition of "closed" states, any more than there are absolutely "open" democratic political systems.

L. Kozer indicates that the positive or negative role of the conflict is associated with the subject of the confrontation, as well as with the type of social structure that prevails [1; p. 17-22]. Types of conflicts and types of social structures are intertwined. Social systems that are noted for their close internal connections, considerable frequency of interaction and high level of personal responsibility tend to suppress conflicts. However, if a conflict in this particular kind of system does arise, then it is particularly fierce and quite often has destructive consequences. Social systems with only partial individual participation are less likely to experience such a destructive conflict. For social systems of this kind, a multitude of conflict situations are characteristic. The energy of individual turns out to be dispersed in all kinds of directions, making it difficult to concentrate on the level of one potentially explosive situation, and is fraught with the possibility of driving a wedge in the whole system.

According to L. Kozer, it is possible to identify two very important mechanisms for achieving stability from the destructive forces of conflicts, depending on the type of social structure being talked about:

- Suppressing conflict potential in "harsh" ("closed" societies) types of structures.
- Adapting to conflicts and using them as signal systems in "open" types of societies.

Intergovernmental differences in models and means used to have an impact on a conflict situation lie, first and foremost, in the political course, which that particular government conducts in relation to other subjects of its foreign policy, particularly with respect to its relative peaceable disposition or aggression. The political

course is formulated by the ruling elite, i.e. a rather small circle of citizens of the country who hold the reigns of power. Moreover, the course itself may not, not only not coincide with the declared humanitarian principles of a democratic society, but may in fact be in complete contradiction with them: we see that in the USA, the administration of George Bush Jr., consequently is leading an aggressive course of action directed undoubtedly toward the USA forcing other countries and their allies to be subordinate to the USA, despite the fact that the absolute majority of the country's population does not approve of it. Thus, under current conditions "open" countries are capable of conducting a harsh forceful line in the international arena to suppress conflicts and any other protest movements in general, while the countries traditionally known as "closed" societies (e.g. the so-called "countries of social outcasts) are capable of demonstration their capability of being fairly flexible in changing their political course, while adapting to the conditions of the conflict.

The second important factor that is related to intergovernmental peculiarities is the information and psychological impact on a conflict – this is the level of development of national information and psychological technologies, the capability of a country to independently develop these technologies and test them out in real international conflicts, using modern day conflicts as a proving ground in the technological link of production, testing and perfection of expensive products, which are modern information psychological warfare technologies to influence both mass and individual consciousness.

In examining the first criterion (the political course), it is possible to come to the conclusion that, overall, a multitude of tactical combinations witnessed by the reaction of various counties to conflict situations can be combined into three main groups:

- political combinations, exercised with respect to conflicts among states that are leading an action foreign expansionist policy;

- political combinations, applied with respect to conflicts among states that are striving to support the existing balance, while allowing insignificant fluctuations relative to the state of balance;

- political combinations, used with respect to conflicts among states, whole political position in the international arena changes for the worse as a result of upsetting the existing balance of powers by the aggressor state.

We did not include in this list states whose political course is in the wake of one of the world leaders (e.g. in the wake of the USA), because in this case there cannot in all practical terms be any intergovernmental difference between them with respect to how to react to a conflict situation.

In the first case, the aggressor-state, regardless of whether it is totalitarian or democratic, conducts itself in the following behavior model:

- in the sphere of geopolitical interests of the aggressor-state a number of minor political and ethnic conflicts are initiated, which create political chaos, cripple, discredit or minimize the role of political institutions, supporting political stability, dividing and polarizing the various directions of political forces, and bring into its realm third-party participants;

- the aggressor-state enters into the political vacuum that has been created in the role of the sole arbiter, utilizing information psychological warfare technologies to manage the field of political conflicts.

An example of this behavior model is the USA in the Yugoslav conflict, as a result of which created a breeding ground for instability in the very center of Europe (and it was long-lasting, mind you), and the European Union refused to get dragged into this acute ethno-political conflict.

Here it is worth mentioning several nuances:

- the aggressor-state is not interested in mitigating all the political conflicts that have arisen: many conflicts simply do not represent a direct threat to it, and any others are seen by the aggressor as an object of political control and as an instrument of political influence, both over its competitors, as well as over its allies;

- the concept of conflict control stops being effective, if there is no plurality of individual conflicts, even in the case of escalation it does not have the potential great enough for political disorganization. Moreover, the more conflicts there are, the greater the number of instruments of political influence;

- political conflicts are convenient for masking the application of information psychological warfare technologies.

With respect to the role and place for technologies of information psychological influence in models of how an aggressor-state reacts in a conflict situation, the following can be noted:

- both conflict management technologies, in the basis of which lies the western concept "Crisis Management," and technologies to establishing manageable political chaos, which are based on using comprehensive technologies for informational-psychological impact on mass and individual consciousness of populations in conflict zones. However, the predominant reason for their use is to mitigate a conflict along the aggressor's terms;

- in practice the aggressor only uses information psychological technologies in crisis management, when either the goals of the aggressor have been achieved, or the crisis as an instrument of political control has been completely exhausted and has lost it practical value.

In the second case, the government striving to preserve the existing political balance generally adheres to the following models of behavior:

- avoid a political crisis and the destructive processes that flow from such a crisis into institutionalizes political process, i.e. build the transforming crisis into the political system of the region, in which the crisis arose, as if the crisis process was there from the start (in unstable regions the political system is constantly in flux, such that where yesterday there was reason for conflict, tomorrow it could become commonplace in the society's political organization);

- intertwine the political crisis with other processes in the region, that are relatively politically stable, ensuring, thereby mutually agreed up changes at a rate not exceeding the flow of stable political processes;

- introduce into the playing field of the conflict, rules of the political game adhered to by all parties of the conflict, excluding plunging into political chaos, even if it is managed chaos;

- place the conflict under the control of international organizations, by transforming them into official mediators to mitigate the conflict, and thereby avoiding a direct conflict with the interests of the aggressor or any other dominating power in the region.

It is impossible to solve all of these goals militarily, especially if the crisis has not shifted into a open military confrontation, but is coming close to it. Moreover politically speaking this is not wise, especially for countries lacking in crushing military might.

It is namely this category of states that are the primary object of international politics that favor the use of information psychological technologies to influence the crisis, including with the intent to mitigate political conflicts.

In order to change the direction in which the crisis is evolving, it is necessary to make corrections to the psychological of the populations living in the crisis zones, by having either purged or replaced the manipulative stereotypes that were introduced earlier, including ideological posturing, "anchoring" associations, ensuring voluntary submission to extremist forces. All of this is possible only with the help of information psychological warfare technologies focused on both mass and individual consciousness, on the capability of establishing a communications chain and by driving home the value of the information to the consciousness of each and every participant to the conflict, both through media channels and through a network of interpersonal, inter-group and through inter-class strata of communication.

Primarily, this effect is achieved by planting in the consciousness of the population of a particular type of conflict, differing from that which forms an official ideology of extremists, who are unleashing the conflict. The form the conflict takes can be noticeably different from reality, but the motivation that is formed in the consciousness engenders the kind of political action needed by the public, which will enable them to come out from under the control of extremists and creates the conditions need to a stable situation.

Examples of this sort of tactic can be found in Russia's policies in the Balkans, operations conducted by the special forces of the EU countries in Kosovo (e.g Belgium, France and Norway); the positions of France and Germany when the USA invaded Iraq, and others.

Note, the primary characteristic of government policy of the category of the countries being examined with respect to models of psychological impact on a conflict situation is that information psychological technologies are used by this particular group of country, specifically for the purpose of mitigating political conflicts, as different from states of the first group that conduct active expansionary policies.

In the third case, countries whose political situation is unstable, including because of a result of a crisis situation on its own territory or near its borders, overall behave in the following manner:

- The emergence of a crisis, and the shortage of time and material means related to it, leads to most efforts being dedicated to a direct opposition to the conflict and to providing resistance to efforts to escalate it, and, as a rule, crisis management under these conditions cannot even be considered.

- among information psychological technologies used, are, as a rule, methods that are simple and do not require lengthy preparation: this is primarily, political propaganda, rumors, and disinformation;

- the information is not disseminated to all layers of society, but rather to the leaders of certain opinions and their followers, i.e. targeted (there simply are not enough resources to do a mass outreach);

- subtle, multi-pronged combinations using information psychological warfare technologies are built only with regard to potential allies, their public and the leaders of international organizations, capable of serving a mediator-function;

- in the event of a direct threat of armed aggression it is possible to apply the principles of informational deterrence, from demonstrations of various threatening actions to using psychological government black mail (e.g. KPDR, the threat to use nuclear weapons).

As far as the capabilities of governments to independently develop information psychological warfare technologies and to try them out in real international conflicts goes, it can be noted that currently as the information psychological warfare technologies market is being formed, the following chain of events line up: leading countries-developers (such as the USA, South Korea) create psychological technologies (since they have the necessary volume of means and the intellectual potential to produce them), are testing them in real conflicts

and are then selling them as a commercial product to third-party countries. The fact that there is such large volumes of modern information psychological impact technologies makes it possible to sell them relatively cheaply and there is a guaranteed market place to countries striving to have the possibility to give an asymmetric response to the claims of their neighbors. Countries not capable of developing or obtaining such technologies are in need of psychological impact on crisis situations. They generally get by without the technological level of organization, are limited by means and methods for using information psychological impact. It is likely that the technological rift that exists between the producer countries and the consumers of these products will likely only grow over time.

Bibliography:
[1] Kozer, LA. Functions of Social Conflict// Social Conflict: Modern Studies edited by N.L. Polyakova. Moscow, 1991. pp.17-22
[2] Shtol' V.V. Role and Place for NATO in the System of European and International Security under Globalization. Moscow, Scientific book, 2006.
[3] Nai J. After Iraq: Power and Strategy of the USA. Moscow: "Russia in the Context of Global Policy". No 3, July – September 2003.