# NATIONAL STATE MODELS FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS

*Аннотация: 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.*

*Ключевые слова: Международное право, психологические операции, международные отношения, внешняя политика, международные конфликты, технологии управления конфликтами, организация объединенных наций, безопасность, военные союзы, вооруженные конфликты*

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 (including conflicts) with other ethnic groups.

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.

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.

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 politi-

cal 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.

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

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).