

MASS AND INDIVIDUAL TERROR

Nigora Safarova Olimovna

Doctor of philosophy Director of Philosophy
Navoi Pedagogical Institute Navoi
Republic of Uzbekistan

Abstract

«Aggression since the early history of mankind as well as its sociality has been the main means to survive». In the course of evolution it does not fade but gets the nature of violence to satisfy, first of all, biological and social requirements in the status of self-affirmation and prestige. So, terrorism is an intelligent phenomenon. At the same time it is clear that violence causes serious destructive consequences: death of people destruction of material values, dehumanization of social relation. However it has stopped very few people. The most simple explanation of violence in a socio-political life starts with the following logic: Human life and the life of a society is regulated by a set of laws and rules. These regulations essentially influence the activity of subjects of politics Extreme and the most rigid determinations appear in the form of violence. The violence in politics takes place as its natural display, when, in order to achieve political goals, all forms of political activity become ineffective. We will expand: it refers not only to politics but to the way of achieving political goals. The sources of violence are seen in the biosocial human nature.

Keywords: Individual organized, individual spontaneous, political ideology, mass organized, mass unorganized, Long terror, extreme violence, organized violence, mass violence, Individually violence.

Introduction

Violence as a way of compulsion is to this or that extent inherent in any society. So the violence of the state over its citizens is approved of. On the other hand, however violence carried out against the state by a single person or a group of terrorists is also the way of compulsion to execute some regulations which are now necessary to terrorists. Senseless violence, violence for the sake of violence is a pathological symptom, the psychiatric diagnosis which can't be logical. It can't even go under the logic of terror. From the point of view of psychology terror is, first of all, the condition of horror as a result of violence. Acts of terrorism are primarily acts of violence. Taking the important place in a political history of mankind since the most ancient times up to now violence has been considered by subjects of politics to be one of the cores though extreme but inevitable, not so desirable theoretically, but rather convenient practically means of achieving, purposes. «If tyrannical character of the Athenian domination over their allies is admitted by Perikl in his speech, then in the speech of Kleon, terror, peculiar to tyranny is being declared as the only possible way to preserve this domination and in the ultimatum of the Athenian representatives to the inhabitants of a small island of Melos is frankly proclaimed as profession de foi tyrants – their belief in the right of strong people to have all power as if this right is sanctioned by nature itself»[1].

Violence as a socio-political phenomenon is treated as an application of various forms of compulsion to achieve and preserve economic and political domination. Certainly, violence can be classified on different bases-on degree of cruelty, ways of substantiation, the relation of the society to the acts of violence, etc . However, all these attempts have too private, unduly certain character to be a science. It is clear that a parametrical way is more constructive. At the given stage, taking into account all the restrictions, the most productive and profound is considered the typology, based on the usage of at least two parametres-coordinates. The first is an important quantitative parametre – the number of participants, that is, the type of the subject of violence-mass (group, collective) or individual. In some cases the violence is carried out by a group, an organization or by a mass.

In others – by a single person. The second basic coordinate is the degree of the organization of violence. In one case-it is well-organized, in the other-spontaneously, unpredictably. The usage of even two of such basic coordinates gives the chance to systematize some acts of violence displays and to point out four main types of violence: mass (collective) organized, mass (spontaneous) unorganized, individual organized, individual spontaneous. We will estimate them in a general view. Mass (collective, group) organized violence legitimized by a state (in the name of a society) is carried out by the army or militia- social institutes created by people especially for this purpose. In the extreme forms of total dictatorship such violence leads to state terrorism.

Mass, spontaneous, primarily unorganized by anyone violence is usually aimed against the state and social institutes—they are, as a rule, all kinds of uprisings, strikes and other spontaneous mass actions of the kind. In extreme forms of revolutions and strikes such violence sometimes leads to anti-state and anti-social terror. Individually organized violence includes both tyranny of a monarch over citizens, and on the contrary, individual terror against monarchs, tsar-killers, in particular. It is always based on postulation of different rights and values of people. So, in the time of slavery it was a complete right of a master over his slaves, including their lives. Under feudalism it was the right “of the first night” and the right of cruel punishment (up to killing) their people. In a modern society it may be the right of workers of law institutions to express violence in relations with criminals. For a terrorist it is the declaration of the right to distrust or even to murder for the sake of achievement of their goals or some ideals.

Individual, spontaneous violence includes extremely a wide range of phenomena: from the habitual everyday hooliganism to violation of human dignity of subordinates by their chief, and, on the contrary—murder of a chief, from quite banal “dedovshchina” in the army to the strikes of criminals in prisons. Even though to limit violence consideration only to the most significant, its socio-political kinds, excluding other kinds of violence, all the same there is inevitably a considerable set of variants of classification of only these kinds of violence. Violence is subdivided on spheres of action (state and interstate) in relation to the power (state, non-state anti-state), on the source of initiative (defensive, reciprocal and offensively) on the number of victims (highly intensive, strong, having low or average intensity) under the social characteristics (class, ethnic, religious) on the orientation and social depth of political consequences (progressive or reactionary, reformist or radical) on the way of influence (demonstrative and instrumental) on the used means (armed and unaided) and so on. Accordingly all these kinds of typology are applicable also to extreme violent measures—to acts of terrorism.

“Social sources of violence are well-known for a long time. First of all it is unequal position of groups and individuals in the stratification system of a society, connected with the distribution of social benefits. Any group always aspires to raise its status, to expand the volume of benefits it uses” [2].

It is known that social inequality generates extremist forms of behaviour, including violence and terror. It is clear that while the stratification system of a society is relatively balanced, violence arises more seldom. Break in the balance causes the growth of violence up to revolts, strikes and revolutions. “The break in the balance is caused by two main processes: sharp deterioration of the social status of these or those groups or the interrupted social mobility” [3]. Status decrease leads to the rupture between claims and real achievements, to the growth of negative mass moods which is expressed in the growth of protest and violence. Blocking of ascending social mobility and also desire to violently overcome the unexpected blockade, social shifts breaking the balance of stratification system cause the resistance of certain groups, which, within the limits of the given forms of imperious relations, cannot find ways of expressing and protecting their interests, except the violent ones. It is promoted by the crisis of the system of values and standards and also by the dominating political culture and traditional morals. This mechanism defines peculiar features of realization of violence in a society and in interstate relations.

From the point of view of psychology terror is first of all, the state of horror which appears as a result of violence, the activity connected with application of violence differs by a special originality. “First of all its feature is the high emotional intensity defined by a considerable share of risk. On the one hand, subjects of violence are usually guided by strong emotions and feelings reaching a high degree of the display: it is anger, fury, hatred, despair” [4]. On the other hand the consequences of violence cause a corresponding emotional reaction and the violation of human dignity of the victims of violence causes not only pain, sorrow but also the reciprocal hatred and the thirst of revenge. “The object of political violence submits to an imperious will only in case of its assurance that the danger of application of violence to it has a real character. Therefore violence threat should be accompanied by its periodical application. It is severely but true” [5]. Though there is also another point of view: threat is more terrible than its execution.

However, the violence generating terror is effective only for the solution of tactical problems. In the strategic plan, sooner or later it leads to psychological exhaustion: people get tired of being afraid and then a long terror seldom happens to be effective. Anyway never happens to be constant. Any violence should be proved – the nature of human thinking demands it. “Especially it is related to political violence. Certainly the relation of a society and a state to violence is defined by many reasons – history and cultural traditions of the people, a certain political and economic situation, personal qualities of those who have power, the level of development or structures of the civil society or on the contrary” [6].

However abstracting from concrete conditions and features of this or that country, it is possible to allocate some factors promoting the fact that violence becomes not extreme but a necessary action and norm and a part of official political ideology of the state. The relation of a democratic state to violence is connected with such sight at the person. It is supposed to be only as an exclusive measure in relation to minority of the population. “The mass political violence is essentially rejected. An opposite view on a person, disbelief that people are inclined to voluntarily follow the standard norms of behaviour and they are silly and aggressive by nature, of course leads to a conclusion about the necessity to constrain the destructive tendencies inherent in people by force or threat to apply it” [7]. The consequence of such approach is justification of political violence and, as a whole, orientation to dictatorship. Really, if to agree that historical process is chaotic and leads to destruction and death, the violent measures used to resist such chaos and destruction can be perceived not only as quite comprehensive but also as even humane and necessary and the accompanying violence to the victim – as inevitable.

A certain mechanism of terror consists of periodical violence. Because of the fact that terrorists use violence regularly, citizens become confident that this violence can be applied at any moment to any of them. So there is a mass threat of stability and safety and that is why horror extends very quickly. Further on it is necessary for terrorists to support the horror periodically by new acts of terrorism, empirically finding out what the duration of the psychological inertia of horror caused by violence can be. “Regular rough and extreme violence, long terror are capable to create such atmosphere of general fear which will paralyze will and ability to resistance and cause some kind of consciousness transformation” [8]. Chronic terror conducts to the formation of some kind of internal habit of automatic submission to repressive influence.

References

1. Safarova N.O. Terrorism. –Toshkent, 2009.–270.
2. Münkler H. Angriff als beste Verteidigung? Sicherheitsdoktrinen in der asymmetrischen Konstellation // Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft – 2003 – №3 – 22–37.
3. Waldmann, P.Terrorismus. Provokation der Macht.–München: Gerling, 1998.- 223.
4. Horgan J. The Psychology of Terrorism. – New York: Routledge, 2005.
5. Laqueur W. The new terrorism : fanaticism and the arms of mass destruction. – New York: Oxford University Press, 1999; Laquer W. Krieg dem Westen. – München: Propyläen, 2003; Laqueur W. The Age of Terrorism. – Boston: Little, Brown, 1987.
6. Drake C.J.M. The Role of Ideology in Terrorists' Target Selection // Terrorism and Political Violence –1998 – Volume 10 – №.2 – P.53–85.
7. Drake C.J.M. The Role of Ideology in Terrorists' Target Selection // Terrorism and Political Violence –1998 – Volume 10 – №.2 – P.53–85.
8. Waldmann, P.Terrorismus. Provokation der Macht.–München: Gerling, 1998.- 223
9. Rote Armee Fraktion. Texte und Materialien zur Geschichte der RAF. – Berlin: ID-Verlag, 1997.
10. Kaufmann. Skew-Tolerant Circuit. Paperback. Publishers, 2000–237