

**RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
INSTITUTE FOR SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION
IN SOCIAL SCIENCES**

INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL STUDIES

**RUSSIA
AND
THE MOSLEM WORLD
2016 – 9 (291)**

SCIENCE-INFORMATION BULLETIN

**Moscow
2016**

ББК 66.3; 66.4; 86.38
УДК 297

Centre for Global and Regional Studies

Velihan Mirzehanov – Director of Publications

Elena Dmitrieva – Editor-in-Chief

Editorial Board:

Vasiliy Belozarov, Olga Bibikova (First Deputy Editor-in-Chief), *Shamil Kashaf, Alexei Malashenko, Dina Malysheva, Aziz Niyazi* (Deputy Editor-in-Chief), *Valentina Schensnovich* (Executive Secretary), *Natalia Ginesina* (Managing editor, Translator), *Yevgeni Khazanov* (Translator)

УДК 297 **Russia and the Moslem World:** Science
Information Bulletin / INION RAS, Centre for
Global and Regional Studies. – Moscow, 2016. –
N 9 (291). – 60 p.
ISSN 1072-6403

The published scientific materials on the current political, social and religious issues concerning the relations between Russia and the global Islamic Ummah as well as Muslim countries are represented in the form of articles, reviews and abstracts.

ББК 66.3; 66.4; 86.38

ISSN 1072-6403

ИНИОН РАН, 2016

CONTENTS

MODERN RUSSIA: IDEOLOGY, POLITICS, CULTURE AND RELIGION

2016.09.001. R. Grinberg. Economy of Modern Russia: State, Problems and Prospects. General Results of Systemic Transformation	5
2016.09.002. V. Makarenko. Social Figures and the Power-Management Staff of the Russian Society	9

PLACE AND ROLE OF ISLAM IN REGIONS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, THE CAUCASUS AND CENTRAL ASIA

<i>I. Dobaev. Reasons, Factors and Forms of Politicization and Radicalization of Islam, Formation of Modern Terrorism in the World and in Russia // The Article was Written by the Author for the Bulletin "Russia and the Moslem World"</i>	<i>13</i>
2016.09.003. R. Starchenko. The State National Policy: Crimean Tatar Aspect	35

ISLAM IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

<i>A. Tsurkan. Russian Military Operation in Syria: the Prospects for Russian-American Cooperation and the Possible Consequences of the Struggle Against Islamic adicalism // The Article was Written by the Author for the Bulletin "Russia and the Moslem World"</i>	<i>38</i>
--	-----------

2016.09.004. E. Satanovskiy. Between Crisis and Catastrophe. The Middle East and the Future of the World	52
---	----

**THE MOSLEM WORLD: THEORETICAL
AND PHILOSOPHICAL PROBLEMS**

2016.09.005. G. Mirsky. Phenomenon of ISIS	56
--	----

MODERN RUSSIA: IDEOLOGY, POLITICS, CULTURE AND RELIGION

2016.09.001. R. GRINBERG. ECONOMY OF MODERN RUSSIA: STATE, PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS. GENERAL RESULTS OF SYSTEMIC TRANSFORMATION // *"The Age of Globalization"*, Moscow, 2015, № 1, pp. 166–182.

Keywords: economy, systemic transformation, market economy, modernization, investments manufacturing, engineering, deindustrialization and reindustrialization of economy, Western sanctions.

R. Grinberg,

Dr. Sc. (Economics), Institute of Economics,
Russian Academy of Sciences

R. Grinberg, the author of the abstracted article, notes that very powerful objective factors continue to affect the performance of domestic reforms, complicating the implementation of systemic transformation in Russia, to a greater extent even than for the former CMEA partners. Socialist existence lasted 40 ears in Central and Eastern Europe and was imposed from without, in most cases, but socialism prevailed in Russia for over 70 years and was not "an imported product", but entirely domestic. Russian reformers performed the task for the system transformation with the rapid decay of the previously unified state, in contrast to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

Super centralized economy system plus the multi-ethnicity of the population of the former Soviet Union have facilitated significantly realization of the ideas of national economic separatism in the conditions of democratization of public life, which ignores the reasons of economic feasibility. The disintegration of the common economic space rather impeded than facilitated the transition to a market economy of each of the sovereign Republic of the former Soviet Union, and Russia was not an exception here. The huge burden of exaggerated military-industrial complex of Russia at the start of the reform was a serious challenge for the restructuring of its economy.

R. Grinberg states that the disappointing results of the systemic transformation in Russia are “man-made” in the first place and are predetermined by specific unfavorable starting conditions only in the second one. The reformers believed that the proposed transformation of radical option would give rapid and sustained increase in the efficiency. But the reality turned out to be different.

Even 1990 level has not been achieved in nearly 25-year period on the major socio-economic indicators. The trend of primitivization of the Russian economy was observed over the years. Decrease in quality of the economic dynamics has occurred, regardless of whether it was negative (in the 90s) or positive (in the “fat” zero years).

The structure of industrial production in Russia has got a clear raw-material orientation during the reform years. The share of fuel and energy complex in the total volume of industrial production has increased by almost three times, the share of investment complex has halved. The share in machine building and metal in industrial production was only 14% in 2013, which is 3–4 times lower than in the developed countries.

The structure not only industrial production but also foreign trade, especially exports, has been subjected to primitivization. While 85% of the country's commodity export falls on the mineral resources, metals, wood, then the share of

production that determine scientific and technical progress in it (engineering and metalworking), has declined from 20 to 5%. There has been a significant deterioration in the quality of assets – the basic framework of economic development: the wear has reached 50%.

There has been a physical and moral depreciation of fixed assets, especially their active part, while maintaining the volume of fixed assets during the reform years in an unprecedented reduction of investment in fixed assets. As a result, the country loses competitiveness in technology and high-tech products on the world market. The share of Russia is now less than 1% of the world market of high technology products (for comparison, the U.S. – 36%, Japan – 30%).

Our technical and technological bases are behind the base of developed countries, for 17–20 years. Processing industries, especially engineering, determining scientific and technical progress in the industry have been fully degraded. The remaining capacity of processing industries are used around 50% at present, and even less – for a number of industries. The main factors limiting the growth of production are: the uncertainty of the economic situation in the country, lack of demand in the domestic market and the high level of taxation.

The share of investment in the development of mechanical engineering and metal in the structure of the total investment in fixed assets in 1990–2013 was reduced by 3.3 times – from 8.3% in 1990 to 2.5% in 2013. At the same time, the total investment in fixed assets in the specified the period of the year decreased, and in 2013 were only 73.7% of the 1990 level.

Scientific and technological progress is not claimed, and innovative development is underestimated in the Russian economy, the low level of domestic expenditure on R & D (1.12% of Russia's GDP, and the same in the developed Western countries is 3–4 times higher) and extremely low level of science funding from the federal budget (0.56% of GDP, against 4–6% in the developed countries and 4% according to the current law

of the Russian federal) indicate. The continuing decline in production in high-tech industries and the reduction of public spending on science and technology have led to a drastic reduction of scientific personnel, and hence to a reduction in research and development. Modernization of the economy and the success of industrial policy in general, proclaimed in government circles depend on the revival of the domestic engineering industry.

The balanced economic development can be achieved, if at least 25–30% will fall on mechanical engineering share in the structure of industrial production. The costs for the most promising innovations should prevail.

Today, the country faces a choice: either the continuation of deindustrialization, and the slide in the area of “technological backwater”, or a sharp leap in the field of re-industrialization. Obviously, it is impossible to manage without a powerful and systematic state activity now. Out of the crisis will require the development of a new economic model, another model of state regulation.

The concept of economic socio-dynamics (R. Grinberg developed jointly with A. Rubinstein)¹, radically changes the concept of “public activity”: a place of “state intervention” is occupied with equal participation of the state in the economic life of the country, and the place of negative “fiscal drag” is replaced by socially sound and reasonable public expenditure on the implementation of the public interest, which are investments in human capital. The state should give a strong impetus to the initial investment for modernization. A prerequisite of its success is the active participation in this process of private business sector that should “pick up” and develop this initial impulse, which requires the use of public-private partnership mechanisms. This kind of a partnership should be based not on the volitional effort on the part of the government, but the economic interest in it of a certain critical mass of the business layer. Otherwise, the government's efforts in this direction will lead very limited

results for the national economy, or will be used by foreign competitors. This kind of interest among Russian businessmen is absent today, as a rule. The fact is that the main instrument of competition for domestic entrepreneurs is not a technological and organizational modernization, but the protection of someone occupying one or another significant position.

The initiation and implementation of structural policies by the state and massive funding of infrastructure projects in the harsh conditions of Western sanctions is uncontested imperative. There are industrial enclaves in Russia, which are able to approach on efficiency and equity to foreign analogues, and it is necessary to focus on such sectors.

References

- ¹ R. Greenberg, A. Rubinstein. Osnovaniya smeshannoy ekonomiki. Ekonomicheskaya sotsiodinamika. [Grounds for Mixed Economy. Economic Sociodynamics.] – Moscow.: IE RAS, 2008.

The author of the abstract – V. Schensnovich

2016.09.002. V. MAKARENKO. SOCIAL FIGURES AND THE POWER-MANAGEMENT STAFF OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIETY // *Gumanitarniy Yuga Rossii, Rostov-on-Don, 2015. – № 1. – P. 33–44.*

Keywords: social figures, government, society, the elite, “dominant minority”, intellectuals, oligarchic clans.

V. Makarenko,

Dr. Sc.(politics), Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor,
Director of the Center for Political Conceptology,
Southern Federal University (Rostov-on-Don)

The author refers to the concept of Alasdair Chalmers MacIntyre¹, according to which the Aesthete, the Manager and the Therapist are typical figures of the contemporary society. Prototype of the esthete dates back to aristocracy of the past

centuries. The Aesthete has transformed into the total consumer during the last century. Prototype of the Manager goes back to the Prussian officer. Figure of the Therapist goes to the representatives of the legal and spiritual (ideological) social classes that are trying to heal the social mores. The field of activity of social figures is limited by the desire to achieve a “consensus” with anyone. Scope of activity appears to them as a complex of facts, means to achieve goals. As a result, the value of truth is replaced by the value of success in the modern society – economic, organizational, managerial, psychological, political, ideological. M. Hardt and A. Negri revealed that new figures have emerged in economic and political life: the hegemony of finance and banks have created “an indebted”; the control over information has generated “a media-dependent”; the security mode has constructed a figure of “supervised”, decomposition of democracy has created a depoliticized figure of “represented”².

There is a continuous gathering of information today. Supervision is enhanced in certain places (railway stations, streets, employment bureaus, clinics, government offices, schools, shops). Purchases by credit card are tracked, calls on the mobile phone are intercepted, technology of surveillance has penetrated deeply into society. There are two types of actors in the supervised society: prisoners and guards. In recent decades, there is fading and withering away of the state institutions and civil society. Participation structures have become invisible (they are often controlled by criminal or lobby). “Represented” acts in a society without intellect, and “media clowns” manipulate it.

Studying the situation in Russia, the researcher cited the opinion of N. Kozlova³ that the Soviet “samples” consist of small and big bosses, their dumb servants and ideological lackeys. There is no figure of the citizen as an active participant in the political life among them. Structure and properties of the groups of “nomenclature functionaries” and intellectuals, formed in the Soviet era, and the post-Soviet successors of theirs⁴ described in the sociological study of “Levada-Center”.

The main difference between “the Russian elite” (people whom “the authorities appointed” to be elite) from what is accepted in the modernized, legal and public governmental systems of the Western type, is that only the public authorities are involved in the acquisition and formation of the elite. Therefore V. Makarenko proposes to use the concept of dominated minority developed by R. Dal⁵, instead of the “elite” category. The Soviet and post-Soviet dominant minority is a state bureaucracy and its fractions. It forms the result of decomposition of the totalitarian regime. It keeps in touch with the authorities and management, as well as the agencies involved in reproduction of the regime (the education system, etc.), social control, the so-called law enforcement agencies (courts, prosecutors, police, security services). The main functions of the ruling minority is a branch directive management, personnel control, legitimization of the regime carried out by the information restrictions, promotion, public relations, convictions, but not goal-setting, policy discussion or criticism. Hence there is a tendency to closure of power from society. “Dominant minority” does not perform any of the most important functional roles of the elite. “Real policy” is done “under the carpet” in the corridors of power as a permanent compromise between the interests of oligarchic clans approximated to authorities.

The current regime in Russia, concludes the author, is held on a mixture of mass apathy and distancing of the population from the policy in conjunction with the conditional support of the numerically small group, which won due to its proximity to power or because of the link with the distribution mechanisms of the former system – state, semi-state, or fused with the state business structures. These groups are characterized by loyalty to the regime and dependence on it high corruption, constantly increasing due to the centralization of state control over the society, satisfaction with their situation and optimistic prospects. Approximately 10–15% of the adult population belongs to these groups. This refers to the groups of “the supreme will”

performers, through the renunciation of the relevant values and behaviors, on the transfer of functions of “goal-setting” and the representation of the group ideals, targets, interests to the highest power. This means primitivization of social structure of society, archaization of the social order, restoration of the mechanism of lowering the quality of policy and management. These processes occur through the selection of certain human types. Summarising the answers of respondents, we can say, that there are types of workaholic, bureaucrat, technocrat, gray executor-functionary of, toadies, careerist, idealist, and others in the post-Soviet situation. The type of passive timeserver, lacking merits and knowledge, is taken “to Top”. This type is produced from the current “centralism” and acts as “glue” between the authorities and the mass. Thus, the heirs of the Soviet society in the social and political spheres are not able to adequately respond to the universal social phenomena and processes.

References

- ¹ V. Makarenko. Glavnye ideologi sovremennosti. [The Main Ideology of our Time.] – Rostov-na-Donu, 2000. – 480 p.
- ² M. Hardt, A. Negri. Subektivnye figury krizisa. [Subjective figures of crisis] // “Siniy divan” 2014, № 19. – Pp. 85–104.
- ³ N. Kozlova. Sovetskiy yudi: Stseny iz istorii. [Soviet people: Scenes from the History.] – Moskva, 2005. – 527 p.
- ⁴ L. Gudkov, B. Dubinin, Yu. Levada. Problema elity v segodnyashney Rossii: Razmyshleniya nad rezul'tatami sotsiologicheskogo issledovaniya. [The problem of the elite in today's Russia: Reflections on the results of sociological research.] – Moskva, 2007. – 372 p.
- ⁵ V. Makarenko. “Demokraticeskaya vselennaya”: zametki o knige Roberta Dahlya. [“Democratic Universe”: Notes on the Book by Robert Dahl] // Politicheskaya kontseptologiya: zhurnal metadistsiplinarnykh issledovaniy. 2011. № 3. URL: <http://politconcept.sfedu.ru/2011.3/03.pdf> (reference date: 22.08.2013.)

The author of the abstract – V. Schensnovich

PLACE AND ROLE OF ISLAM IN REGIONS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, THE CAUCASUS AND CENTRAL ASIA

I. DOBAEV. REASONS, FACTORS AND FORMS OF POLITICIZATION AND RADICALIZATION OF ISLAM, FORMATION OF MODERN TERRORISM IN THE WORLD AND IN RUSSIA // *The Article was Written by the Author for the Bulletin "Russia and the Moslem World"*

Keywords: innovations, modernization, technological renewal, industrial revolution, process of colonization, invasion of the islamic world, anticolonial protest, process of decolonization, military coup, Islamic revolution.

I. Dobaev,

Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor,

Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don

The scientific revolution of the 16th century gave the Europeans a greater control over the environment than anyone before. There have been new discoveries in science, medicine, navigation, agriculture and industry. None of them was decisive, but their cumulative effect was a radical one. By the early 17th century innovations have acquired such a scale, that the progress seemed irreversible: the discovery in one area often led to new developments in the other. The modernization entailed social, intellectual and other changes to the time of completion of the industrial revolution of the 19th century, which occurred as a

result of technological renewal of society. The progressive character of Western society and its industrialized economy meant that it should be expanded continuously. New markets were needed. As soon as the actual Western countries became filled, then they had to be sought in other international regions. As a result, Western countries have started the process of colonization. The Islamic world was so great and strategically well located, that it was the first subjected to a universal, systematic colonization of the West – in the Middle East, South and Southeast Asia, a substantial part of Africa.

According to Karen Armstrong, the world-famous writer, journalist and expert on world religions, the European invasion of the Islamic world was started in Mughal India. British merchants established themselves in Bengal in the second half of the 18th century. Economic plundering of Bengal led to the establishment of British rule through agreements or military conquests across India in the late 18th – early 19th centuries, except for the Indus Valley, which was conquered in the middle of the 19th century. Subsequently, the European powers colonized one Islamic country after another one. France invaded Algeria in 1830, Britain – Aden nine years later. Tunisia was occupied in 1881, Egypt – in 1882, Sudan – in 1889, and Libya and Morocco – in 1912. Sykes – Picot divided the territory of the dying Ottoman Empire between Britain and France in 1916. Britain and France have established protectorates and mandates in Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Iraq and Transjordan on the end of the war. The Arabs regarded it as arbitrariness, since Europeans first promised independence to the Arab areas of the Ottoman Empire¹.

Anti-colonial protest of local people has put on the green color of Islam during this period, the emergence and gradual institutionalization of the modern Islamist movement took place. Students Islamists have established a non-governmental religious-political organization “Muslim Brotherhood” in Egypt in December 1928, which could be called the first modern

structure of radical islamists. There were foreign branches of Egyptian "Brotherhood" in the 30-40s in the Middle East. These branches have become autonomous organizations without sufficient experience of political activity and trained human resources after the dissolution of the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, and therefore unable to develop a large-scale struggle for the practical realization of their political ideas. But today independent and gain experience organization "Muslim Brothers" exist in many Muslim countries: Saudi Arabia, Syria, Jordan, the Palestinian Authority, Kuwait, Sudan, Tunisia, Morocco, etc. "Brothers" have become the active participants in the political life in a number of muslim countries - Jordan and Sudan, Egypt and Afghanistan, etc. At the same time, an extremist wing has appeared, which is now represented by a variety of groups, unleashed terror against the regimes in Muslim countries².

The Second World War initiated a process of decolonization throughout the world, including Muslim countries. However, the West has often continued to manage their economies, oil production, or resources such as the Suez Canal, even after some of the Arab East countries became independent.

However, the post-war partition of the world has officially secured the position of the U.S., which made a broad expansion in the Middle East at the expense of its main ally Britain. The main objective for the U.S. were huge oil reserves, especially in the Persian Gulf, an exceptional strategic importance of which has become apparent during the last war and in the postwar years. In this regard, the Americans made efforts to strengthen their influence in the region by supporting the monarchy of the Arabian Peninsula, trying to strengthen their position in Iran and Iraq. In the summer of 1953 the U.S. and British intelligence agencies organized a coup in Iran, which brought to power a pro-American regime of the Shah Pahlavi dynasty and opened access to Iranian oil. Americans have enjoyed a serious influence in Iraq

until the revolution in that country in 1958, which led to anti-American government "Baathist" regime.

But the Americans acted inconsiderately and defiantly throughout the Middle East, North Africa, regardless of the traditions and values of the local muslim population. Anti-American sentiment began to grow in the region. In 1978, mass political demonstrations began against the ruling monarchy in Iran, unexpected for many, including the Americans. Its overthrow and the declaration of Iran as an islamic republic in February 1979, its withdrawal from CENTO military pact, the seizure of the U.S. embassy in Tehran by young islamic activists – all this has weakened the U.S. position in the region³. The clerical regime came to power in Iran, which was not only created by the government of the islamic model, but also took up the export of ideas and practices of "islamic revolution" beyond his country.

There were religious-political organizations under the influence of "islamic revolution" in Iran, and its subsequent export to other muslim countries, as a result of such a new policy of the Iranian authorities in the Middle East. The most convincing example is the palestinian "Jihad Islami" and the lebanese "Hezbollah". In April 1978 a pro-Soviet regime of Taraki came to power in a military coup in Afghanistan, and in December 1979 the Soviet leadership introduced a "limited military contingent" to the territory of a friendly state, as a result of provocation of Americans intending to solve the "Afghan problem" by military means. It should be stressed that the leaders of the new regime in Kabul, including Amin, repeatedly requested to Moscow. The Soviet military presence (December 27, 1979 – February 15, 1989) had the geopolitical consequences of global importance. It aggravated the civil war in Afghanistan, mobilized the armed opposition to the regime strengthened the radical islamic elements, and provoked, coordination of anti-Soviet activities of a number of countries and international organizations. Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Iran and other islamic countries, along with the U.S., its Western allies and China took part in these diplomatic,

financial, undercover and military operations and information warfare against the Soviet Union, which led to rapid increase of the role of "the islamic factor" in the regional and global politics, politicization and radicalization. Combat operations, of the Soviet troops in Afghanistan have been presented to the world as "godless communism war against Islam" for the first time after the military operations in Central Asia in 1920–1930⁴.

It should be emphasized that the Islamist groups in Afghanistan, appeared in the youth and student community even during the reign of the last king of Afghanistan, Zahir Shah (1933–1973), developed in the years of the republican leadership of Daud Khan (1973–1978), and played a significant role in the fight against the local "Marxist" regime and the Soviet presence in the country. The most famous and important Afghan factions were "brothers", later transformed into Islamic parties – "Islamic Party of Afghanistan", headed by Mr. Pashtun Hekmatyar and "Jamiat-e Islami" which leader became the Tajik Rabbani. The radical islamic movement was not monolithic in Afghanistan initially, but skimmed along ethnic lines "pashtuns – not pashtuns." Fundamentalist ideology of "pure Islam", which has been brought from the outside into Afghanistan territory during the "jihad" was necessary to overcome this condition.

The Islamic expeditionary corps numbering about 25 thousand people was formed during the Afghan war, which was led by "Bureau Service Mujahideen" ("Khidamat Maktab al-Mujahidin") in Afghanistan. Its first leader was Abdullah Azzam, a palestinian, and after his death – the notorious Osama bin Laden. Afterwards these fighters became known as "arab-afghans". Later, the organization "Al Qaeda" ("Basis") emerged on the basis of the structure of "arab-afghans".

The foreign mojaheds were brought up in the ideology of the spirit, clothed in the form of the concept of "likes and dislikes" ("Al-Valea wa al-bara"), based on ideological constructs developed in the 18th century by M. Ibn Abd al-Wahhab in the Arabian Nejd (Najd – now one of the provinces of the Kingdom

of Saudi Arabia)⁵. The main provisions of this concept were the general muslim concepts – takfir (charge of kufr, i.e. disbelief) and jihad (holy war for the faith), but interpreted in a peculiar way. Not only all non-muslims, but also those muslims “who are subject to incorrect, communicate with them, do not agree with the ideas of the wahhabis, for example, with their interpretation of jihad” are the “enemies of Islam” under the “takfir” in isolation from the muslim orthodoxy⁶. “Jihad” was interpreted by them in the narrow sense only – as an armed struggle against “enemies of islam”⁷. The idea of takfir in wahhabit sense was needed to justify the armed struggle of mojaheds against the muslims who defended the regime of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan with weapons in hands.

In February 1989, after withdrawal of the Soviet troops, Afghanistan almost immediately plunged into a bloody struggle between various mojaheds factions for power, to which they came in 1992 as a result of the fall of the pro-Soviet regime of Najibullah. In 1994, numerous students of Pakistani Deobandi madrassas, talibs-militants, came to replace them. In the autumn of 1996, talibs, defeating mojaheds, created a new state – the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan, headed by the “Amer al-Momineen” (“Commander of the Faithful” – the title of caliph) Mullah Omar, throwing the country for several centuries ago in its socio-economic and political development. They conquered most of Afghanistan, controlling most of the provinces in whole or in part, and in 2001 their power was extended to 95% of the country already Usama bin Laden and his mojaheds – “Arab-Afghans” settled on the Afghan territory by that time. Analysis of the 1990 events shows, that the governments of countries, from whence “Afghans” were, did everything possible to prevent them from settling homeland. As a result, “Afghans” have begun to return to Pakistan and Afghanistan – in the territory controlled by the movement “Taliban”⁸. In February 1998, Osama bin Laden brought together a number of extremist Islamist groups around the “Al Qaeda” in Kandahar, creating “World Islamic Front for

the fight against the Jews and Crusaders”, became famous as the “World Front for Jihad”⁹, relying on support of the “Taliban”. “World Jihad Front” was not too rigid hierarchical structure of radical Islamists, which included groups on the network principle. Thus, there was a powerful and dangerous wahhabi-Taliban alliance.

Today it is no secret that the Taliban movement was created by Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and the U.S. Americans supported the “Taliban” actively enough at first, but the position of radical Islamists has become increasingly marginal in the international arena. Granting of asylum to Osama bin Laden, who prepared the attacks of September 11, 2001, became the formal reason of the American invasion to Afghanistan. The military operation in Afghanistan Enduring Freedom has been recognized as an unqualified success by the U.S. administration, many Western experts and the media. However, the U.S. military and allied troops are in Afghanistan almost 15 years, and during this period have not been able to solve the “Afghan problem”.

The complex process of fragmentation of the terrorist movement has taken place in the region and in the world during this period. A new kind of terrorism is threatening the world, and its driving force is the network structure consisting of fanatics¹⁰. Modern terrorist movement can be represented as a combination of a number of clusters of radical Islamists, organized over a network. Each of these clusters is composed of many networked terrorist groups, which are connected by common ideologies and goals. The activities of terrorist groups do not stop, and sometimes even increases in spite of the elimination of Osama bin Laden in May 2011. It is hardly possible to speak seriously about the success in the fight against terrorism and drug trafficking in the country, evaluating the activities of the US and its NATO allies in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan from 2001 to the present time. Quite the contrary, the number of terrorist attacks, the number of extremist networks that are capable of creating the terrorist threat has increased over the period of stay of foreign

troops in Afghanistan. Foreign troops that refused to deal with the problem of the cultivation and distribution of opiates, allowed terrorist organizations to have a steady income from the sale of narcotic drugs¹¹. Moreover, at the present time, the Taliban control most of the territory of Afghanistan once again, after the withdrawal of the bulk of the US military and its allies out of the country. The true organizers of the terrorist attacks in Washington and New York in 2001 have not been established yet. It follows that the main purpose of the introduction of troops of the U.S. and its allies in Afghanistan were the geopolitical imperatives and intentions of geopolitical restructuring of the region within the framework of a major geopolitical project "The Greater Middle East", sounded by the Americans. It is not surprising, therefore, that the US military presence in Afghanistan will remain for an indefinite time and after the main withdrawal of the occupying troops, as noted by the representatives of the highest military circles of the U.S.¹²

The modern Iraq war can be explained by geopolitical reasons. The collapse of the Soviet Union has destroyed a bipolar structure of international relations by giving a free hand to its geopolitical opponents almost everywhere, including muslim countries. Operation "Desert Storm" took place from 17 January to 3 March 1991 in response to the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq, provoked by the Americans and finished off a quick liberation of Kuwait and the actual abolition of the control of Baghdad over Iraqi Kurdistan. The U.S. and UK have launched "Operation Desert Fox" after Baghdad refused to allow UN inspectors into the country in August 1998; and the aim of this operation was to destroy the military facilities in Iraq. Air raids have become regular. However, Washington did not seek to overthrow the regime initially, since only the coming to power of Shiites could be an alternative to the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein. The Americans made this decisive step only in March 2003, when the U.S. was able to win the war and to overthrow the regime of Saddam Hussein in less than a month. However, the Americans

had to solve two major problems at once: to deal with terrorism and to organize the political process within Iraq.

Iraqi insurgents have become serious and experienced opponents during the conflict, and the U.S. troops were not ready for a confrontation with them. Militant terrorists used more and more powerful explosives, designed along the lines of those that have been adopted by "Hezbollah" in south Lebanon, and that led to an increase in human and material losses of the U.S. army. The Americans carried out the rearrangement in order to avoid this trend. They have deduced troops into specially created military bases outside the city suburbs, turned into real fortresses under siege. At the same time, the movements of troops and reducing the number of attacks into settlements have been limited in order to reduce losses among the troops. Pinpoint strikes have been concentrated on the "Sunni triangle" and insurgent zones, mainly along the joint borders with Syria.

As for the change of the political system in Iraq, the regions were reorganized (the north – Kurdish, in the south and south-east – the Shiites) after the collapse of the authoritarian regime of Saddam Hussein, received some autonomy due to the interference of the U.S. and its allies. The U.S. counted on their support, and hopes were justified, as a whole. After the elections in January 2005, which resulted in a majority in the National Assembly went to Shiites and Kurds, the referendum held on 15 October 2005, approved a new constitution, proclaimed Iraq a decentralized federal government, the province of which received considerable autonomy, as opposed to a weakened center. A state based on ethnic and religious contradictions, can not be strong, and may even collapse in the future. The Americans consider the vector of development of the situation in Iraq as a positive and withdrew its troops from the country, although the US military presence is still preserved there. Despite this, the terrorist groups in Iraq continue to operate, taking all the new life of its citizens, and there is no end in sight. At the same time, foreign mojaheds who fought in Iraq, began to gather in new "hot spots", which

appeared in the region in connection with the reformatory itching of the American establishment, aimed at reformatting the "Greater Middle East" by inspiration of "color revolutions" there.

The dramatic events that began with mass protests in Tunis in December 2010 and called "Arab Spring", have been made possible due to the accumulation of a critical mass of internal conflict-factors in many countries of North Africa and the Middle East, first of all¹³. In our opinion, the "Arab Spring" is a chain of "color revolutions" – pro-Western, and more often – pro-U.S. coups-inspired into one country or another, using the tools of network wars, into the interests of the West (the U.S.). An external actor is an important subject of "color coups" relying on Western and pro-Western non-governmental organizations established in a given country. The external "actor" have an impact on the transformation and organized a wide public and diplomatic support to the putschists in all known "color revolutions" even as an observer. He participated directly or indirectly in neutralizing the authorities (forcing to give up active resistance), and in stimulating and organizing opposition activities¹⁴. The spectrum of its activities is quite wide: from conducting information wars – through the use of economic incentives and sanctions – up to direct participation in hostilities. All these elements of "network war" were used in the course of restructuring of the Arab East by the West.

The growing influence of political Islam has been a feature of social and political processes in the Middle East and North Africa since the 1970s. Now the Islamists proved to be the most organized force, which apply for the definition of the future of the region¹⁵. Severe deformation of regional political process has emerged as a result of the elimination of the secular regime of Saddam Hussein in Iraq, a Palestinian Islamist quasi-state under Hamas authority in the Gaza Strip, the increased popularity of the Shiite "Hezbollah" in Lebanon, the elimination of secular regimes in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya during the "Arab Spring" and a serious weakening of the positions of Bashar Assad in Syria. The

situation is aggravated by the presence of long-standing problems, including: conflicts between Palestine and Israel, North and South Sudan, Kurdish separatism, the tension in Afghanistan (which has steadily intensified after the withdrawal of the bulk of the U.S. troops), instability in Pakistan, etc.

It should be recognized that the processes, caused by the Arab Spring, are in constant dynamics. There is destruction of the old power structures and powerful extension to the forefront of political Islam in our time¹⁶.

The islamist party "Nahda" ("Revival") won the most seats (90 of 217) as a result of free parliamentary elections in Tunis (the first after the overthrow of Ben Ali), held on 23 October 2011. Recently Salafists (Islamic fundamentalists), claim to political leadership, requiring the construction of an Islamic state and the introduction of Shariah law, and strengthen their influence in the country. Islamization causes a rift in Tunisian society, part of which is dissatisfied with the Islamization of social and political life and the rejection of the planned results of the secularist reforms carried out under previous regimes.

In Egypt, "Muslim Brotherhood" has become the most organized and influential political force after the collapse of the regime of President Hosni Mubarak, positioning themselves as moderate Islamists, their political program proclaims the general democratic goals. In November 2011 "Freedom and Justice Party", i.e. the political wing of the "Muslim Brotherhood", received the largest number of seats (42%) in the parliamentary elections, and the second place was taken by the party of "An-Nur", representing the Salafi movement (later Parliament was dissolved on the initiative of the military and the decision of the Constitutional Court of Egypt). Mohammed Mursi, one of the leaders of the "Muslim Brotherhood", the chairman of "Freedom and Justice Party" won the presidential election in 2012. M. Mursi actually took over the functions of both the executive and legislative powers until the election of a new parliament. Egypt did not become an Islamist state only because of the strong

position of the Egyptian military. Now the movement of "Brothers" is banned, and M. Mursi is under arrest and investigation.

In 2011, protest demonstrations of Libya against the 42-year reign of Colonel Muammar Gaddafi escalated into an armed rebellion, inspired from abroad and actively supported by the naval blockade and air strikes of NATO. Then, Special units of NATO and some Arab countries took part in the overthrow of the Gaddafi regime. A considerable number of mercenaries from Arab countries, Afghanistan and Pakistan, as well as muslims in Europe have been in the ranks of the Libyan "rebels". In July 2012, parliamentary elections were held in Libya, and won "Union of national forces" headed by Mahmoud Jibril, and the second place was taken by the Islamists from the "Party of Justice and Construction" - the local movement of "Muslim Brotherhood". Many of the "rebels" profess radical Islamism, and they feel comfortable enough in Libya now. At the same time, the new regime is not able to control the situation in the country completely, because the real power belongs to the leaders of clans and tribal formations and armed groups. Thus, the overthrow of the regime of Gaddafi has turned into the disintegration of Libya, strengthening radical Islam and its spread to neighboring regions, on Mali in particular. Clan groupings of the Tuaregs have created an independent Islamic state, where sharia predominated, in part of the country. This formation was supported by radical Islamist groups, including "Al-Qaeda of the Islamic Maghreb" (AQIM), acting in Algeria¹⁷. The civil conflict has been lasted in Syria since March 2011, where armed groups opposed to the Assad regime. Many of them are mercenaries from the Arab-Muslim countries and the Muslim diaspora in Europe, including the militants of "Al-Qaeda". The Persian Gulf monarchies, Turkey and the leading NATO countries are actively assisting in their training, financing and arming. There is a center for the training of Syrian militants in Turkey, where the Turkish officers are engaged in military training. Gunmen financed by

Qatar and Saudi Arabia. CIA officers are involved in the distribution of weapons¹⁸. The well-known terrorist group, which controls part of the territory of Iraq and Syria, under the name of “Islamic State” (ISIS) is one of 19 such structures.

ISIS was created in 2006 during the occupation of Iraq, by the troops, of the U.S. and its allies. This Sunni Islamist group was called “Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant” (LIH) at the time, and aimed to struggle against occupying forces (the Levant is a Latin translation of the Arabic place name al-Sham, indicating modern Syria, Lebanon, Palestine and part of Jordan) . Some formations ISIS has entered the Syrian territory and joined the armed Syrian opposition against the government army. The militants of ISIS captured part of the remote province of Raqqa, where announced the introduction of Sharia. The NATO Member Countries, and the Persian Gulf monarchies supported activities of ISIS, as well as other opposition forces.

In August 2014 the militants ISIS (using the discontent of the Sunni tribes in the north of Iraq, with predominance of Shiites in the country's leadership) intervened in the conflict between the Sunni community and the government of Nouri al-Maliki, and undertook a successful attack into Iraq, capturing a number of cities, including Mosul. ISIS started to practice repression and terror against ethnic and religious minorities (the Kurds, Shiite Muslims, Yazidis, Christians) in the occupied areas. ISIS militants tried to extend their offensive in Lebanon, Jordan threatened. After some time, this terrorist group declared “Islamic State” (ISIS) in the occupied territories of Iraq and Syria, and the leader of ISIS, Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi was announced the head²⁰.

The ISIS militants launched an offensive in the region of Iraqi Kurdistan oil fields, but were stopped by Kurdish armed groups “Peshmerga”. Leading NATO countries led by the U.S. expressed their support for the Kurds in their confrontation with ISIS and began to supply military equipment to Iraqi Kurdistan, which has received broad autonomy after the collapse of the Saddam Hussein regime, and de facto (but not de jure) is an

independent public education. Currently, the U.S., EU and Israel have actually pushed the Kurds to independence, planning to transform a future sovereign Kurdish state in the influential pro-Western force in the region. The military and political support of the West is also caused by the fact that representations of many Western companies are located in the city of Arbil, capital of Kurdistan.

As a result, Washington and London have declared the beginning of the bombing of the territories controlled by ISIS, as well as the creation of a coalition of 40 states to combat this grouping (initiators excluded Iran and Syria's participation in the coalition). At the same time the US bombard positions of ISIS not only in Iraq, but Syria, without informing the public authorities of these countries. Thus, all the actions of the U.S. confirm the immutability of the goals of American policy in the region: the overthrow of the Assad regime in Syria, bringing the forces, hostile to Tehran and Damascus, to power in Iraq, the maximum weakening of Iran and the Shiite movement of "Hezbollah" in Lebanon, and the movement of "jihad" to the Russian borders in the future. Washington hoped that the Ukrainian crisis of 2013 would divert forces of Moscow and limit its ability to maintain friendly governments in the Middle East.

However, the units of the Military Space Forces of Russia have been deployed in Syria in September 2015, which did not allow the West (led by the U.S.) to implement its geopolitical and geostrategic goals in the region. The Assad regime has been persevered, moreover, has made impressive progress. However, this circumstance has forced geopolitical opponents, of Russia to intensify its efforts in the region, which delays the resolution of conflict. Russian-Turkish relations have been sharply deteriorated.

Thus, the "revolutionary" events in the Middle East and North Africa have dramatically increased the degree of Islamic factor", changing the geopolitical configuration in the region. The overthrow of the secular regimes in Tunisia, Egypt and Libya, as a result of "Arab revolutions" (supported from the outside), the

tragic events in Syria and in other regions of the “Islamic world” opened the way to power not only the moderate Islamists like Tunisia “Al-Nahda” and the Egyptian “Muslim Brotherhood”, but also their more radical followers, ranging from the Egyptian “Al-Nour” and up to the various groups “Al-Qaeda” and of ISIS. The liberalization of social and political life and the weakening of the secular institutions of power have allowed the radical fundamentalists to declare themselves as a political force claiming to power. No wonder the current leader of “Al Qaeda” Ayman al-Zawahiri, calls on all Arab and Islamic countries, especially Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, to follow the example of Tunisia and Egypt. He advises not to stop, and seek not only the change of government, but also the establishment of Sharia orders²¹.

As for Russia, the first territories inhabited by Muslims were joined in the 16th century – Kazan (1552) Astrakhan (1556) and Siberian (1589) khanates – the pieces of the Golden Horde once mighty. One of the main Islamic centers – Caucasus (North Caucasus and Transcaucasia) – became part of the Russian Empire rather late – in 20–80 years of the 19th century, and Central Asia was joined to Russia in the last third of the 19th century.

Joining the Caucasus to Russia was dictated by religious and moral considerations (the salvation of the Christian peoples of the Caucasus from destruction), and military-strategic situation of the Caucasus as a barrier to the expansion of the UK and its tool – Turkey, as well as a bridgehead for Russia to complete its natural geopolitical development as a European, as well as a world power (Constantinople, the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles). The economic aspect has not played any significant role for Russia in the development of events in the Caucasus in the 18th – I half of the 19th century, although it was taken into account in the perspective by the Russian power sub-elites²².

The Russian-Turkish wars of the second half of the 18th century led not only to accession of the Crimea to Russia, but also for the transition of the Caucasus and Northern Black Sea in Russia's sphere of influence. Subsequently, two Russian-

Persian (1804–1813), Russian-Turkish (1806–1812) and the Patriotic War determined the actual status of a superpower at the time for the Russian Empire. The Bucharest (1812), The Gulistan (1813), the Turkmanchay (1828) and Andrianopolsky (1829) peace treaties consolidated transition of the Caucasus under Russian jurisdiction in international legal terms.

The violent reaction of the UK for joining the Caucasus had pushed Russia to force the establishment of control over the region and the introduction of the military and the civil administration of the empire. This was one of the causes of the Caucasian war (1817–1864) where Russia had to fight not only with the Imam of Shamil and the Adygs of the Northwest Caucasus, but also the intervention of the Ottoman Empire, Great Britain, Poland, Hungary and other European revolutionaries and adventurers²³.

The Caucasian war proceeded fiercely in the eastern part of the North Caucasus region, where it was carried out under the slogan of gazavat (gazavat is a combat jihad). Of course, the role of Islam was dramatically enhanced in the political life of the North Caucasian highlanders in that period, and there was a strong movement in the North-East Caucasus, which became known as the “Caucasian Muridism”, and reached its peak under Imam Shamil. During the Caucasian war Shamil created even a theocratic state – Imamate on the part of the territory of modern Dagestan and Chechnya, which ceased to exist simultaneously with the capture of Imam Shamil in 1859.

However, it should be noted that certain fixed forms of ethno-religious extremism and terrorism, even before and after the completion of the Caucasian War in the North Caucasus: raiding system; kidnappings for ransom or sale; armed separatism and calls for jihad (after completion of the Caucasian War); political banditry (1920–1930-s); ethnic collaboration, creation and participation of mountain troops on the side of Nazi Germany²⁴.

Activation of “Islamic factor” took place on the eve and as a result of revolutions of 1917 (February and October) and the

ensuing civil war. Proponents of sharia intensified at that time in the North Caucasus, whose leaders have advocated the creation of an Islamic state on the type of the Imamate of Shamil. Sheikh N. Gotsinsky and Sheikh Uzun Haji were especially active in the issue of implementation of the idea of the Imamate. As a result, in August 1917, Sheikh N. Gotsinsky was elected to Imam of Dagestan and Chechnya in the second congress of the mountain peoples and began to establish a religious monarchy in Chechnya and Dagestan in alliance with Sheikh Uzun-Haji. In the autumn of 1919, Sheikh proclaimed Chechnya and the north-western part of Dagestan as "North Caucasian Emirate." However, this project was not viable and collapsed soon as Soviet power was established in the North Caucasus.

Events had evolved dramatically in the course of the civil war in Central Asia. The Soviet power was established there after the revolutionary events of 1917, and the counter-revolutionary separatist actions of the local muslim nobles, tried to create "Kokand autonomy" in the Ferghana Valley, was put down in January 1918. However, this movement could not be completely localized, and as a result the Bolsheviks were soon faced with the broad movement of the rebels – Basmachis, the ideological basis of which were pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism (Kazakhs, Kyrgyzes, Uzbeks and Turkmens – Turkic peoples; the Tajiks – Iranian branch of the Indo-Europeans, and all of them are Muslim, mostly Sunni)²⁵.

In 1919–1920 the resistance movement spread to virtually the whole of Central Asia, arousing religious fanaticism and acting under the slogan of "the holy war against the infidels." Leaders of armed groups were aimed at the separation of Turkestan from Soviet Russia and the restoration of the medieval feudal system here. The main forces of basmachis were defeated by the Red Army in the early 1920s, but the bandits and their Western backers managed to get away from the final defeat. In 1924–1925 they were reorganized, with the active assistance of the United Kingdom, received the central management under the leadership of the British secret service agent, Uzbek, Ibrahim Bey,

a nuker of the former Emir of Bukhara. He was supported, trained, supplied weapons, ammunition and equipment by a number of foreign intelligence services, especially the UK. The basmachis went into Afghanistan after losses in the fighting with the Red Army, where kindred ethnic groups – the Tajiks, Uzbeks, Turkmens lived (and live now). The Iranian territory was used to a much lesser extent in the same order. They restored power there, replenished their squads with men and weapons, obtained comprehensive assistance, primarily from the British. Consequently, the Soviet government took tough political pressure on Afghanistan in the second half of 1920 and the Afghan emir Amanullah Khan sharply limited assistance for the bandits, forcing some of them to leave the country. It happened a rebellion supported by the British in late 1928 in Afghanistan, and the power in the country was invaded by Bacha-i Saqao, an ethnic Tajik, an adventurer, with whom “the best spy of all time,” a colonel of the British Intelligence, Lawrence of Arabia, worked personally. In this regard, the Red Army troops crossed the Afghan border twice (in April 1929 and in June 1930), destroying the basmachi units and their support infrastructure throughout the north of Afghanistan. Bacha-i Saqao was overthrown and killed. King Nadir Shah, who came to power, disarmed a part of the basmaches units, after a hard Soviet ultimatum, and the cavalry of the Turkmen nomads (who were well paid by the Afghan government²⁶, with the Soviet money apparently), caused a surprise attack on bases of irreconcilable Ibrahim – bek in the spring 1931. The mood of the Central Asian population had changed by this time; its representatives began to engage actively in the volunteer corps to combat the robber bands and bandits were perceived in the public consciousness not as “basmachis” (robbers) already but as “dushmanies” (enemies) and “shaytans” (demons). Only then the basmachi movement began to fade. However, their individual attacks were recorded up until 1939–1940. The last basmachi groups disappeared after signing an agreement on cease-subversion from Iran and Afghanistan

between the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom in 1942²⁷, that underlines once again the geopolitical conditionality of the basmachi movement on the territory of Soviet Central Asia.

“Islamic factor” was used extensively in various separatist projects aimed at Russia split, its dismemberment, weakening, the deprivation of its ability to influence the global processes in the period between the First and Second World Wars as well as during the last world war. There have always been external sponsors of separatism in the geopolitical space of the Russian state, the forces that raised the flag of separatism in difficult times for our country – the Civil and then the Great Patriotic War. A significant role was played by a certain part of the post-revolutionary emigration from the USSR, including muslim, which was used in some European and Asian countries²⁸. Another surge of separatism under the banner of Islam was fixed after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. The separatist-oriented elites, headed by a former Soviet general Dzhokhar Dudayev, which came to power in Chechnya, headed for the power output from Russia and the formation of their own independent state. The internationalization of the radical Salafi movement in the region was triggered by the events in Chechnya in 1994–1996 under the slogan of “restoring constitutional order”. This period was marked by the massive participation of militants from Pakistan, Afghanistan, Turkey and other Muslim countries on the side of separatists in military actions in Chechnya.

The Chechen Republic in 1996–1999 has become a testing ground of terrorism and extremism, shelter murderers, traders of “human beings”, drugs and weapons, hid behind the religion of Islam. This circumstance determined the invasion of bands of local and foreign terrorists in August 1999 into the territory of the Republic of Dagestan. In autumn 1999 “Campaign against terrorism” in Chechnya was started, that passed through a number of important evolutionary stages: from the front of battles – assault on Grozny was the apogee, and up to resolving the conflict by forces of the Chechens themselves. That led to positive

results and the counter-terrorist operation in Chechnya was officially completed in April 2009.

Meanwhile, in spite of real progress in the reconstruction of Chechnya, the situation appears to be far from the ideal one²⁹. "Resistance" was transformed in part into "guerilla warfare" and partly into mobile and loosely connected network of terrorist groups based on an ideological doctrine of radical Islam as a result of the defeat of the separatists in Chechnya, the spread of the Salafi movement in the other republics of the North Caucasus³⁰. This process intensified in 2007 when, Doku Umarov, has launched a new network geopolitical project "Caucasus Emirate"³¹, which is degraded after neutralization of Umarov in late 2013, and most of the gangs of radical Islamists pledging allegiance to "Islamic state".

Thus, there was a steady process of politicization and radicalization of Islam and Islamic groups in the Russian post-Soviet period, under strong external influence. This process is exacerbated by the weakness and fragmentation of the traditional and the official Russian Islam, the implementation of the separatist projects in some regions of the country. At the same time stable radical Salafi groups have emerged and matured, that passed institutionalization, in some North Caucasus republics, under the influence of radical Islamic doctrine and military operations in the North Caucasus. Subsequently, there was a process of "spreading jihad" almost across the North Caucasus and preconditions have been formed to create the radical Salafi groups in the Volga region, the Urals and in Western Siberia, as well as their appearance in the "muslim enclaves" in Russian cities over the last decade. The return of the Crimea in the "home port" in 2014 was accompanied by the activation of "Crimean Tatar factor", which is inspired by geopolitical opponents of Russia – Turkey and the West. This requires an adequate assessment of the current situation and taking effective measures to block the destructive activities of radical nationalist and Islamist groups in the Russian Crimea.

Literature

1. Armstrong K. Islam: Kratkaya istoriya ot nachala do nashih dney [K. Armstrong. Islam: A Brief History from the Beginning to the Present Day]. – Moskva, 2011. – P. 201–203.
2. Dobaev I.P. Politicheskie instituty islamskogo mira: ideologiya I praktika [I.P. Dobaev. The Political Institutions of the Islamic World: the #deology and Practice]. – Rostov na Donu, 2001.
3. Dobaev I.P. Kavkazskiy makroregion v fokuse geopoliticheskikh interesov mirovyh derzhav: istoriya I sovremennost. [I.P. Dobaev. Caucasian macro-region in the focus of geopolitical interests of world powers: Past and Present]. – Rostov na Donu, 2007. – 31 p.
4. Ibid. – 33 p.
5. Dobaev I.P. Ideologicheskie konstrukty radikalnogo islamizma [I.P. Dobaev. The ideological constructs of radical islamizm] // Gumanitarniy Yuga Rossii. – 2015. – № 2. – P. 121–129.
6. Ignatenko A.A. Samoopredelenie islamskogo mira. [A.A. Ignatenko. Self-Determination of the Islamic World] // Islam I politika. – Moskva, 2001. – 14 p.
7. Dobaev I.P., Kruglov A.Yu. Ideologicheskie osnovy radikalnogo islamizma [I.P. Dobaev, A.Y. Kruglov. The Ideological Foundations of Radical Islam] // Filosofiya Prava. – 2015. – № 2 (69). – P. 15–19.
8. Ignatenko A.A. Decree. [A.A. Ignatenko. Decree]. – 15 p.
9. Dobaev I.P. Politicheskie instituty islamskogo mira: ideologiya I praktika.
10. [I.P. Dobaev. The political Institutions of the Islamic World: The Ideology and Practice.] – Rostov na Donu, 2001. – 64 p.
11. Marc Sageman. Setevye struktury terrorizma. [Marc Sageman. Terror Networks.] – Moskva, 2008. – 7 p.
12. Dyakonova M.A. Sovremennoe polozhenie Afganistana v 21 veke [M.A. Dyakonova. Modern position of Afghanistan in the 21st century] // Gosudarstvennoe I munitsipalnoe pravlenie. Uchenye zapiski SKAGS. – 2012. – № 2. – 205 p.
13. Amerika ne boresya s ugrozami terrorizma I narkotikov. Ona ih sozdaet! [America is not Fighting the Threats of Terrorism and Drugs. It Creates Them!] [ElectronicResource]. URL: <http://army-news.ru/> (reference date 21.09.2013.)
14. Shlikov P. Blizhnevostochnaya politika Turtsii v kontekste “arabskoy vesny” [P. Shlikov. Turkey's Middle East Policy in the Context of the “Arab Spring”] [electronic resource]. – URL: <http://perspektivy.info> (reference date of 07.12.2012.)
15. Dobaev I.P., Dobaev A.I. Terrorizm I antiterroristicheskaya deyatel'nost v Rossiyskoy Federatsii [I.P. Dobaev, A.I. Dobaev. Terrorism and anti-terror operations in the Russian Federation.] – Rostov na Donu, 2011. – 115 p.

16. A. Demchenko "Arabskaya vesna" I politika Rossii v blizhnevostochnom regione. [A. Demchenko. "Arab Spring" and Russia's Policy in the Middle East.] [Electronic Resource]. – URL: <http://perspektivy.info> (reference date of 15.09.2012).
17. Dolgov B.V. Razvitie "arabskoy vesny": predvaritelnye itogi. [B.V. Dolgov. Development of the "Arab Spring": Preliminary Results] [electronic resource]. – URL: <http://perspektivy.info> (reference date of 02.11.2012.)
18. Dolgov B.V. Ukaz. [B.V. Dolgov. Decree.]
19. Ibid.
20. Dobaev I.P. Geopoliticheskie interesy mirovyh derzhav v Chernomorsko-Kaspiyskom regione: vyzovy I ugrozy natsionalnoy bezopasnosti Rossii [I.P. Dobaev. The Geopolitical Interests of the World Powers in the Black Sea-Caspian Region: Challenges and Threats to National Security of Russia] // Chernomorsko-Kaspiyskiy Region: vyzovy I ugrozy natsionalnoy bezopasnosti Rossii v usloviyah geopoliticheskoy, georeligioznoy i geoekonomicheskoy konkurentsii. – Rostov na Donu, 2015. – P. 75–77.
21. Dobaev I.P. Discursionnye praktiki Russiyskoin geopoliticheskoi identifikatsii v contextt globalizatscii i regionalizatscii. [I.P. Dobaev. Discursive Practices of the Geopolitical Identification of Russia in the Context of Globalization and Regionalization] [electronic resource]. – URL: www.geopolitika.ru (reference date 21.04.2014.)
22. The Texts of Ayman al-Zawahiri. [Electronic resource]. – URL: http://news.siteintelgroup.com/component/customproperties/?cp_leaders=zawahiri (reference date: 20.06.2011.)
23. Chernous V.V. Tsihotskiy S.E. Kavkazskiy vopros kak geopoliticheskaya problema: istoriya I sovremennost. [V.V. Chernous, S.E. Tsihotskiy. Caucasian Issue as a Geopolitical #roblem: Past and Present] // Caucasus: the Problems of Geo-politics and National and State Interests of Russia. – Rostov na Donu, 1998. – 12 p.
24. Ibid. – 13 p.
25. Novikov D.V. Etno-religioznyy ekstremizm na Severnom Kavkaze: metody protivodeystviya (politiko-pravovoy aspekt) [D.V. Novikov. Ethnoreligious Extremism in the North Caucasus: Methods of Counteraction (political-legal aspect)]: the Abstract of the Thesis of the Candidate of Sciences (watered). – Rostov na Donu, 2002. – P. 16–19.
26. See more about this: A.I. Zevelev, Yu.A. Polyakov, A.I. Chugunov. Basmachestvo: vzniknoenie suschnost, krah. [Zevelev A.I., Polyakov Yu., Chugunov A.I. Basmachi.: The occurrence, nature, crash]. Moskva, 1981. Shumov S.A., Andreev A.R. Basmachestvo. [S.A. Shumov, A.R. Andreev. Basmachis.] – Moskva, 2005.
27. Boyko V.S. Sredneaziatskaya emigratsiya na zaklyuchitelnom etape grazhdanskoi voyny v Afganistane (1930–1931). [V.S. Boyko. Central Asian

- immigration in the final stages of the civil war in Afghanistan (1930–1931).] [Electronic resource]. – URL: <http://new.hist.asu.ru/biblio/V3/226-235.pdf>
28. See: A.I. Zevelev and others. .Damie V. Basmachtskoe dvizhenie. [V. Dame. Basmach Movement.] [Electronic resource]. – URL: <http://www.krugosvet.ru/articles/120/1012074/1012074a1.htm>
29. Sotskov L.F. Neizvestnyy separatizm: na sluzhbe SD I Abvera [L.F. Sotskov. Unknown Separatism: in the Service of SD and Abwehr] – Moskva, 2003.
30. Dobaev I.P., Dobaev A.I., Nemchina V.I. Geopolitika I terrorizm epohi postmoderna. [I.P. Dobaev, A.I. Dobaev, V.I. Nemchina. Geopolitics and terrorism in the postmodern era.] / Ed. Dobaeva I.P. – Rostov na Donu, 2015. – P. 313–337.
31. Dobaev I.P. Radikalizatsiya islama v sovremennoy Rossii. [I.P. Dobaev. The radicalization of Islam in modern Russia.] – Moskva – Rostov na Donu, 2014. – P. 133–157.
32. Anisimova N.A., Dobaev I.P. Setevye struktury terrorizma yf Sevevnom Kavkaze [N.A. Anisimova, I.P. Dobaev. Networking Terrorists in the North Caucasus] / Ed. Dobaev I.P. – Rostov na Donu, 2016.

2016.09.003. R. STARCHENKO. THE STATE NATIONAL POLICY: CRIMEAN TATAR ASPECT // *“Vestnik Rossiyskoy Natsii”*, Moscow, 2016, number 1, P. 159–171.

Keywords: the Russian national policy, the Crimea multinational region, ethno-political situation, the Crimean Tatars, the status of the Crimean Tatar language, places of compact residence, social security.

R. Starchenko,

Ph.D. (Hist.), Acting Deputy Director of the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology named after N.N. Miklouho-Maclay, RAS

The author highlights the main vectors of the Russian national policy in the Crimea towards the Crimean Tatar people. The national policy in Russia is regulated by a set of laws, but the ethno-political situation in the Crimea required operational decisions at the time that went beyond the existing legal framework of the Russian Federation in 2014.

The author notes that more than 90% of the population in the Crimea multinational region consists of three groups: the Russians, the Ukrainians and the Crimean Tatars. The relationships between the representatives of these nationalities have a major impact on the formation of the ethno-political situation on the peninsula. One of the most important tasks for the Russian authorities was to provide interethnic peace in the region after the transfer of Crimea to Russia in the spring of 2014.

A significant factor of threat of exacerbation of ethnic tensions was the unresolved problems of the Crimean Tatars, when the Crimea was a part of Ukraine, such as the registration of the ownership of land (squatting), rehabilitation of the deported, the status of the Crimean Tatar language, investments in the places of compact residence, social security.

The author notes that the State Committee for international relations and deported citizens of the Republic of Crimea was established to provide legal protection of the socio-economic and ethno-cultural rights of the repressed peoples living in the Republic of Crimea.

The Crimean Tatars (as well as other peoples, deported from the Crimea during the Stalin period, and then returned to the peninsula) have been waiting for the rehabilitation of the Ukrainian government for 23 years after the collapse of the Soviet Union and Ukraine gained independence status, but that has never happened. In Russia, the law "On the Rehabilitation of Victims of Political Repression" has been acted since 1991.

The rehabilitated Crimean Tatars have acquired the right to various benefits (increase in their pension, payment of utility bills), as well as the opportunity to get into the property land with buildings located on it. The author writes that the process of registration of the ownership of land with residential buildings was not a mass during the stay of the Crimea within Ukraine due to the heavy expenses and the large number of bureaucratic difficulties. The Republican government of the Crimea adopted a

law, granting the right to the residents (subjected to deportation and recognized rehabilitated) to get free land in the property.

More than 700 billion rubles of investments is allocated to the economy of the Crimea, including in infrastructure projects for water supply, electrification, gasification, road construction in the areas of compact residence of the Crimean Tatar population.

The author writes about the importance of legally prescribed measures in support of the Crimean Tatar culture and national media. The federal target program includes funding for more than 10 billion rubles for the measures aimed at the national, cultural and spiritual revival of the Armenian, Bulgarian, Greek, Crimean Tatar and German peoples.

The Republic of Crimea is the only region of Russia, where three languages have status of the state: Russian, Ukrainian and Crimean Tatar. For the first time in the modern history of the Crimea, the Crimean Tatar language has gained the status of the state on the territory of the republic, that is confirmed in Article 19 of the Constitution of the republic. Basic education should be in Russian, but there is a right of the residents of the republic to study in the Ukrainian and the Crimean Tatar languages on the territory of the republic of Crimea according to the law.

The author notes that an important component of the state national policy in the Crimea is the support of the national media. It was decided to establish a public broadcasting company of the Crimean Tatar in accordance with the Decree of the Head of the Republic of Crimea.

The main celebrations for the Muslim Eid al-Fitr and Eid al-Adha, were declared non-working public holidays in the Republic of Crimea. The Crimean authorities pay special attention to the organization of events dedicated to the memorable dates of the peoples the Crimea, including the Crimean Tatars.

The author of the abstract – N. Ginesina

ISLAM IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

A. TSURKAN. RUSSIAN MILITARY OPERATION IN SYRIA: THE PROSPECTS FOR RUSSIAN-AMERICAN CO-OPERATION AND THE POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES OF THE STRUGGLE AGAINST ISLAMIC RADICALISM // *The article is written for publication in the Bulletin "Russia and the Muslim world"*

Keywords: Russian aerospace forces, military operation, struggle against Islamic radicalism, armed conflict, ISIS militants, to coordinate airstrikes, the U.S. sanctions, Russian and coalition operations, local armed groups, to destroy illegal oil sales channels.

A. Tsurkan,

Ph. D. (Political Science), the Center for Analysis of the Middle East Conflicts (Institute for the U.S. and Canadian Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences).

Participation of Russian aerospace forces in a military operation against the terrorist group ISIS, prohibited on the territory of Russia, was the objective reality of today. Almost every day, the Russian Defense Ministry publishes on its website information about dozens of combat sorties and hundreds of the broken objects of terrorists simultaneously denying the facts of committing airstrikes on positions of moderate Syrian opposition forces and civilian objects, which appear regularly in the Western and Arab press. The Ministry of Defense even organized a press

tour for foreign journalists to the airbase Hmeymim for this purpose.

The real preconditions, as well as declarations of intent to conduct an independent struggle against Islamic radicalism in Syria was not observed practically until the final decision on Russia's participation in the armed conflict as an independent actor. This decision virtually coincided with the actual start of the operation. Of course, the Russian political establishment and expert community have always been concerned about the serious threat posed by "Islamic State". Our country meets the same challenges posed by ISIS, that other members of the international community: ideological indoctrination, recruitment and transportation of human resources for participation in the fighting on the side of the militants; direct terrorist threats against high-ranking officials, citizens, and the Russian Federation; perspective of returning the militants – Russian citizens to their homeland after the end of hostilities in Syria, Iraq, Yemen, etc. However, Moscow has not entered into an international coalition of 65 countries against ISIS (which worked from August 2014), highlighting the fact that there was no agreement with the UN Security Council. The possibility of Moscow's participation was highly improbable in the midst of sanctions blockade of Russia by the U.S. and other Western members of the coalition. However, there was no aspiration.

The Russian proposal on the fight against ISIS, which has been replicated to world community through diplomatic channels since the summer of 2015 and until recently, it was made at a meeting with the head of the Foreign Ministry, of the official Damascus. Moscow's position to support the official Damascus is different from the position of the coalition of 65 countries, including the United States. The essence of the proposal was as follows: the creation of a broad anti-terrorist front on an agreed international legal basis with the involvement of all parties fighting against ISIS. Thus the attempt to include in the negotiating process "irreconcilable" enemies – al-Assad and

members of the anti - ISIS coalition has been sounded, giving a legitimate status to the first, in the framework of the antiterrorist track and contrary to the American concept of non-perception of him. A number of domestic experts on Islam are impressed by the Russian position in support of Assad's regime, as the alternative is the prospect of the Islamization of Syria. However, Russia's military participation was not expected for this scenario, excluding armament of the Syrian army in accordance with the current inter-state contracts. On the contrary, President Putin, and then, Foreign Minister Lavrov spoke of inexpediency of joining of new participants into the war, Russia was assigned an honorable role but intermediary one.

The real moment of change of Russian foreign policy paradigm on this issue remained in the shadows for the general public, as well as an explanation of the incentive mechanism of decision making.

Reports on the escalation of the Russian military presence in the area of the base of material support for the Russian Navy in Tartous, and the expanded group of Russian fighter-bombers at the airport in Latakia began to appear in the media from mid-September 2015. Russian President issued a decree on the use of Russian armed forces outside its territory to the Federation Council of Federal Assembly of the RF, which was adopted unanimously on September 30, after the meeting of Vladimir Putin and Barack Obama at the UN General Assembly, September 29, 2015. Air and Space Forces of Russia actively conduct the bombing of Syrian territory from the same date. According to the official website of the Ministry of Defence of the Russian Federation, it has already carried out 5662 sorties, including 145 sorties of aircrafts of strategic missile-carrying and the long-range bombers and were produced launches of 97 cruise missiles on January 15 of this year, and in conjunction with the ground-based military operation of the Armed Forces of Syria has led to their control over the 217 settlements (1040.7 sq. km area). For comparison, from August 2014, the International anti-

ISIS coalition has launched 9782 airstrikes on the positions of ISIS in Syria and Iraq as of 19 January this year, killing a total of 20352 targets as of January 10 this year.

On the one hand, the question arises: why is the effort of the Russian side, if the motivation is traced poorly? On the other hand, this military operation is presented as a task of primary importance from the moment of its beginning in the Russian media and the rhetoric of public officials. Moreover, the beginning of Russian air strikes on Syrian territory that is not under the control of government troops, coincided exactly with the lull in the Ukrainian conflict – the beginning of withdrawal of armaments in the Donbass and the launch of a political process, with certain reservations. TV footage of fighting in Ukraine was replaced by occasional references to the return of the population of Donetsk and Luhansk to civilian life. In this connection, it can be argued that the Ukrainian question is almost completely lost its dominant role in the information broadcast, partly losing its Syrian issue. This scenario shows its relative effectiveness for domestic (Russian) consumption.

At the same time, the official Moscow traditionally refers to the request of Assad regarding the provision of military assistance to Syria in the decision about the beginning of the air strikes, which gives legitimacy to Russia's military operation in contrast to the operation of 65 countries of the coalition bombing of Syrian territory. However, the information message about the query of Syrian party is dates back to September 30, 2015, whereas the consultations between Vladimir Putin and Barack Obama were held the previous day. Of course the form of the reached agreement on the participation of Moscow in the Syrian conflict is unknown, but the issue was discussed by the two leaders, which is obviously based on the dynamics of previous consultations between the Russian and the U.S. parties.

Thus, the intensification of Russia – the U.S. contacts, on the Iranian problem can be traced since May 2015. The impetus was the visit of the U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry in Sochi, where

he was admitted to Russian President Vladimir Putin. June 26, 2015 there was a telephone conversation between Vladimir Putin and Barack Obama, during which the situation in Syria and the strategy of the struggle against "Islamic state" was discussed, as well as the order was given for the organization of the Russian-American meeting at ministerial level, which took place on 30 June. Sergei Lavrov and Jim Carrey held a series of meetings and telephone conversations after that, where the Russian side has promoted the presidential initiative on forming a united front to fight ISIS, if guided by the official website of the Russian Foreign Ministry. But finally Russia is not embedded in the existing the U.S. - led coalition, but acts as an independent actor, creating a separate information structure with the participation of the official Syria, Iran and, partly, Iraq - Information center for the coordination of the fight against "Islamic state" with headquarters in Baghdad.

As for the beginning of the Russian military operation in Syria, Moscow's expectations with regard to the resumption of the U.S. - Russian cooperation, interrupted by the difference of the two countries to the Ukrainian crisis and poured out in the diversified support opposing sides, have played a significant role. After joining the Crimea to Russia at the beginning of April 2014, the U.S. (referring to the ongoing violations of Ukrainian sovereignty and territorial integrity on the part of Russia) has announced the suspension of the work of the Russian - U.S. Bilateral Presidential Commission, in which a wide range of issues has been decided for common agenda since 2009, bringing relations between Russia and the US on the level of almost full institutionalization.

The fact of the suspension of the Commission on the initiative of the American side has caused ambiguous reaction in the Russian public space, despite the obvious contradictions between Russia and the United States. All statements of the political establishment were limited to disbelief that the situation will lead to real cessation of the dialogue. Despite the suspension

of institutional mechanisms of cooperation, the dialogue between the two countries has not been stopped, but it is either in the format of international relations (quartets, triples contact groups, etc.), or in the form of one-time contacts at present. And the discussion of the situation in Ukraine has played a dominant role in terms of one-time contacts in the framework of consultations between Moscow and Washington from April 2014 – by May 2015.

Themes on the fight against ISIS in discussions of Russia and the United States contributed to the expansion of the current agenda of Russian-American dialogue, displacing Ukrainian question, although without removing it completely. In particular, an intensive exchange of views between Moscow and Washington on Syria did not prevent the prolongation and expansion of the U.S. sanctions against Russia in August – September and November – December 2015, Moscow promises regularly to take countermeasures. Therefore, there is a conclusion that the Syrian-playing cards to reduce tensions in Ukraine is a strategy aimed not only at the domestic but also the foreign policy of Russia.

Bet on Syria is made on the basis of two fundamental issues.

Firstly, Russia is involved in the international processes on Syria, as it has taken a position different from that of Washington to support the Assad regime. Moscow supports the official Damascus, which makes it automatically, if not a party to the conflict, it takes one step with the international community, including the United States, supporting the opposition. Thus, there is a clear rivalry between the two directions of foreign policy, according to which a direct dialogue is necessary in order to avoid escalation.

Secondly, it is clear that global problems are taken into account, for example, Islamic radicalism. Moscow and Washington are faced with a common threat, which leads to a dialogue between the two countries. The threat has arisen in

connection with the activation of the “Islamic state”, including the process of recruiting and sending human resources to fight in the ranks of ISIS on a commercial scale, its terrorist activities, as well as the corresponding appeal of the organization against the citizens of Russia and the United States. Moscow's fight against “Islamic State” is entirely consistent with the interests of Washington's national security in this context, taking into account that the negative consequences for its actions will affect solely on Russia.

Russia expected resumption of partnership with the U.S. in the process of Syrian settlement. And, indeed, quite an intensive dialogue on Syria carried out with the Americans. It was an agreement on the direct, communication channel to coordinate airstrikes when applied at the beginning of the Russian military operation as the foreign ministries and military agencies. But according to the rhetoric of Sergey Lavrov, it becomes clear that there is no real coordination between the Russian military and coalition forces.

Moscow again made an attempt to deepen cooperation with Washington after the incidents with dangerous convergence of military aircraft of the two countries in the skies over Syria, 6 and 10 October 2015. The result was the preparation and signing of the Memorandum on the prevention of incidents and ensuring aviation safety during operations in Syria between the Ministry of Defense, Russia and the Pentagon on October 20 2015. However, the document was exclusively a military-technical nature and a real resumption of cooperation between the two countries is not expected, as evidenced by Washington's refusal to receive a delegation of military experts headed by Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev of Russia, as well as the statements of the American side of the impossibility to send a delegation of own similar to Moscow. After the incident with the Russian Su-24 bomber, shot down by Turkey in November 24, 2015, the Russian Foreign Ministry relayed the message that the United States assumed responsibility for all anti - ISIS coalition by the

signing of the above-mentioned memorandum. While official Washington stressed the bilateral nature of the paper and urged other members of the coalition to sign the relevant documents with the Russian Federation.

It seems that Washington's total mistrust towards our country is a real obstacle to the coordination of Russian and the U.S. operations. Russian commitment to support the current Syrian regime, a guarantor of security and the only alternative to a complete Islamization of Syria, is not fully consistent with the position of the anti-ISIS coalition, resulting in reluctance to share data about the locations of military forces. As mentioned above, according to the American press, Russia does airstrikes on positions of moderate Syrian forces. Moreover, October 22, the U.S. permanent representative to the UN Samantha Power said that the Russian air strikes in Syria constitute interference, which only enhances the "Islamic state." Strategy and tactics of the Military Space Forces of Russia is the support and coordination with the Syrian army, even if similar populist statements of the U.S. officials are not counted, and the facts of the bombing of the opposition will be ignored, or enter into ideological debate about which the armed forces can be considered "moderate". The result is a strengthening of the position of the official Damascus, "in Syria, the transition of previously lost territories under its control, and giving greater the vitality of Assad's regime, which is contrary to focus on the change of power in Syria, at least 65 other countries.

Some kind of consultations between Russia and the United States remain. As of January 14, there were about 17 phone calls and a series of meetings between Sergey Lavrov and John Kerry after the decision on the beginning of Russian bombing Syrian territory; there was an exchange of views on the situation in Syria during these meetings. In addition, the prospects for Russian diplomatic efforts on Syria are stored in the framework of Vienna process to resolve the situation in the country, which began October 30, 2015.

Moscow is trying to solve at least two important tactical and strategic objectives in the format of the meetings of the international "Syrian Support Group" (running with the participation of delegations from China, Egypt, the European Union, France, Germany, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Oman, Qatar, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, UAE, UK, UN and US):

- To coordinate and approve the list of terrorist organizations in Syria, which would allow Russia to get rid of the accusations of causing air strikes on Syrian opposition forces;

- To start a political process in Syria, with the participation of official Damascus for the purpose of legitimating the current Syrian regime.

Now it is difficult to make predictions on the success of this international scenario of Syrian settlement. Despite the fact that the contact group established a timeframe for the second question, at least, (meeting in the Syrian political forces should take place on January 25 this year in Geneva) the position on Assad of our American partners remains unchanged. As for the separation of the Syrian rebel movement on the oppositional, and terroristic, then, there is a feeling of a complete loss of control of the anti - ISIS coalition over the situation with the illegal armed groups. This opinion was repeatedly expressed by both Russian and American experts. But under the circumstances, international basis of cooperation on Syria seems more perspective variant for both Russia and the US as a priority to bilateral ties.

The chosen form of dialogue (the contact group) is able to make amends for the existing contradictions in the presence of the political will of participants, and with the maximum "saving face". Such a scenario of international cooperation exists for a long time and has proven its effectiveness in practice (negotiations on the Iranian nuclear program; solution to the issue of chemical weapons in Syria, etc.), where Russia managed to achieve some diplomatic victories. Moreover, all participants of the process, including Russia and the United States are

satisfied with such a scenario. There is already a certain “fatigue” on the Syrian issue and the desire to move forward on the way of settlement. The more that such military intervention of Moscow in the fight against ISIS has shaken Washington's monopoly on the leadership of the anti-terrorist operation in the region, as well as strengthened the American domestic political discourse on the correct tactics of its own government to minimize this threat.

Characters of Russian and coalition operations in Syria differ significantly on the basis of quantitative indicators on sorties, and hit targets statistics. Russia has reported about more than 5500 air strikes of over 3.5 months of its air campaign, which shows an impressive dynamics and tempo adopted by the Russian side initially, in comparison with the 9500 air strikes of anti-ISIS coalition for more than a year on the territories of the two states – Iraq and Syria. On the other hand, we should not lose sight of the fact of absence an official mandate to carry out military operations directly in Syrian airspace for the coalition of 65 countries, as well as a legitimate ally in the territory of this state. This significantly limits the possibility of coalition against ISIS on the Syrian track. For example, only 3266 of more than 9.5 thousand air strikes are fallen on the territory of Syria. The United States also practicing dropping weapons from aircraft , which are often fallen to the militants of the “Islamic state” on the territory of Syria, (under the control of the “moderate” opposition, according to the U.S.), and sending small local armed groups that have passed the preliminary military training, as the main tactics for Syria. It is clear that such actions are subjected to harsh criticism both in Russia and in the United States.

At the same time Moscow positions its involvement in the Syrian conflict as a factor contributing to the intensification of the activities of the coalition forces to combat terrorism within the framework of their operations. One may agree with this only partly – 20352 stricken sites as of January 10 this year against 10,684 as of August 7, 2015 shows a serious intensification of military activity. It noted a significant increase in the bombing

in order to destroy illegal oil sales channels by the ISIS militants. If the anti-ISIS coalition reported 196 oil infrastructure objects of destroyed the terrorists as of August 7, 2015 before the decision to hold the Russian military operation, it is reported on the destruction of, 1170 such objects at present, therefore, a significant dynamics of growth of such bombing can be traced. However, Russian and American interpretations of the recipients of the “black” oil market are quite different. If Moscow accuses the Turkish side in the supply of oil to the ISIS, Washington accuses the official Damascus with indirect Russian support in this matter. In particular, the U.S. accused the former president of the Republic of Kalmykia, Kirsan Ilyumzhinov and Mudalala Khoury, a Syrian by origin, and the Russian bank “Russian Financial Alliance”, and other foreign companies, associated with these entities, in the financial ties with the Assad regime. Regarding the bombing of Syrian territory, the initiative has been fully transferred to the Russian side, considering that the number of airstrikes has increased slightly since the start of the military campaign of the Aerospace forces of Russia – with 3266 as of 19 January this year, against 2,381 as of August 20, 2015.

However, the presence of an alternative point of view on the nature and future of the “Islamic state” in general could be called one of the most interesting differences between the Russian and the U.S. operations against the ISIS. Americans, seriously have attended to a question about the necessity of involvement of their own state in the Middle East affairs in recent years (the result of this activity is very doubtful), put forward theories about the exaggerated threat of the ISIS. An article, as an illustrative example of the given direction of political thought has been published in the U.S. journal “Foreign affairs”, where the Islamic State is positioned as a revolutionary authority, unable to expand in the long term projections due to geopolitical realities and historical experiences. Consequently, the US strategy in such circumstances, according to the author, should be limited to a maximum minimization of their own involvement in the fight

against this unit, concentrating only on the elimination of ISIS opportunities for expansion in the short term. Motivation is to avoid serious inevitable civilian casualties, which will automatically lead to the deterioration of the United States' image in the Islamic world.

Thus, in the case of the adoption of such a position of Washington on the official level, it is possible to expect the change of behavior patterns in relation to the "Islamic state" from the United States, as has already happened in relation to the Taliban. Washington, in due time, stopped calling them terrorists: it is now illegal armed groups. As a result, understanding that the negotiations with the "Taliban" is the actual help to war criminals for "naturalization" in the new Afghanistan exists simultaneously with the recognition of the need to resolve this conflict; moreover, the movement continues to fight for the territory, using the absence of the international coalition forces there now. It is probable that Americans will have to act against the ISIS in the same way. This explains their weak military operation to combat terrorism, in part, as it appears in the Russian media. Of course, there will be no similar changes in the United States position towards the ISIS until the end of the Obama administration.

Unlike the U.S., Russia decisively carries out its military operation in Syria, not worrying about the country's image in the Muslim world. More precisely, the Russian representation of the Islamic world in the matter is somewhat different from the Western. The term "Islamic World" (or Muslim world) for official Moscow comes down to the official regimes in the appropriate countries, with the vast majority of Islamic population, whereas the presence of the "Arab street" is ignored. Meanwhile, the "Arab street" has become a major catalyst for the processes in the "Muslim world", leading to the destabilization of the region, - the events of the "Arab Spring". Moscow persistently ignores the fact that the initial conflict in line with the "Arab Spring" was held in Syria between the official Damascus

and the “Arab Street” in 2011. And, eventually, the same conditional “Arab street” is the main supplier of human resources for the terrorist organizations.

The Islamic world might not be able to forgive the Russian military operation in Syria, it will be capable of turning into a completely different forms. Objectively, civilian casualties can not be avoided during the bombings in a campaign against terrorism within the boundaries of settlements, and the like, which is certainly a negative impact on the attitude of the Muslim Ummah to our country. According to the human rights organization “Human Rights Watch”, a total of 59 civilians, including 33 children, were killed as a result of only two (presumably) Russian air strikes in the northern part of the province of Homs. Picture is a disappointing one, given that statistics is presented for the victims of only one day.

Another serious aspect has become a fatwa of religious leaders in Saudi Arabia calling for the Islamic countries to unite in the fight against the Assad regime in Syria and its Russian and Iranian patrons. Despite the statement of the Mufti of Moscow and Central Russia, Albir Krganov that a similar fatwa of international character can be approved only by the head of a state or the supreme spiritual person for its legitimization, it is clear that both the Saudi authorities and the local population of the Kingdom agree with Moscow's accusation of the military operation in support of the Syrian government, but do not fight against the ISIS. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that Saudi Arabia's permanent representative to the UN, Abdullah al-Moallem called on Russia to stop the military operation in Syria because of the Russian Federation Air Force Space applied airstrikes on positions, where there were no militants of the Islamic state. Thus, the Saudi fatwa could be the unofficial state opinion as a whole, which puts it on a completely different level, not to mention the possible consequences of its appeal at all.

One should not forget about the threats more than once sounded in Russian address by the ISIS. The ISIS militants have

released a video of accusations of Moscow in supporting the Assad regime by supplying weapons to him and promised to send the weapons to V. Putin personally, long before the Russian military operation in Syria. Also, the Islamic State conducted executions of Russian “spies” on the camera. The last video was posted on December 2, 2015. In the end, the ISIS has claimed responsibility for the attack on board the Russian aircraft in the skies over Egypt, which killed 224 people.

In addition, according to the intelligence agencies, about 2 thousand citizens of Russia are fighting in the ranks of the Islamic State, and according to some experts' estimates, their number is closer to 5 thousand. As stated in the investigation of “Novaya Gazeta”, leaving some of them were, if not organized, then encouraged by the FSB of Russia in order to weaken the terrorist underground in our country. The main issues on the medium and long-term prospects in this regard: the possible return of militants in Russia and intensification of terrorist activities in the North Caucasus and other Russian regions.

There are concerns about the merger of the Russian terrorist underground with the Islamic state and its continued functioning under the auspices of this organization. In this vein, the leaders of the militants began to swear allegiance to the leader of the ISIS Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi since late November 2014. The apogee of this process was the message of bringing such an oath “in full force” of militants belonging to the structural units of the Caucasus Emirate, dated June 21, 2015. In turn, several days later, the Islamic State announced the creation of the Kadar Wilayat (province) in the North Caucasus, which includes Chechnya, Ingushetia, Dagestan and Kabardino-Balkaria, under the leadership of the Dagestani militant Abu Muhammad.

Thus, it can be concluded that the risk of a terrorist threat to Russia posed by ISIS, has always existed, regardless of the direct involvement of our country in the events in Syria. Nevertheless, the military operation increases the risk that is already supported by the fact of the terrorist attack in the skies over Egypt, although

the direct involvement of the Islamic State has not been proved yet. At the same time, the intensification of the bombing is not able to cope with the radical ideology of the terrorists. Based on a retrospective analysis of the recent anti-terrorist operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, etc., the leaving of the militants to underground is the maximum that can be achieved, while maintaining all the possibilities for them to carry out terrorist activities. Accordingly, the risk of a terrorist threat directly on Russian territory in both short term and medium one, will remain at a high level, and the prospects for a decent completion of the military operation – rather vague, in conjunction with the inevitable deterioration of the image of Russia in the eyes of the wider Islamic world. It seems that the final withdrawal of Russia from Syria will be very similar on the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan in 1989, the only significant difference is that there is no ground forces of our country in this area, in this case.

2016.09.004. E. SATANOVSKIY. BETWEEN CRISIS AND CATASTROPHE. THE MIDDLE EAST AND THE FUTURE OF THE WORLD // *“Rossiya v globalnoy politike”*, Moscow, 2015, Volume 13, № 6, November / December, P. 38–49.

Keywords: redistribution of territories, the main actors, the balance of forces, the modern world order, war of civilizations, area of instability.

E. Satanovskiy,
president of the Middle East Institute

The author analyzes the current situation and potential prospects of development of the Middle East (ME) and its periphery: the African and the European, Central Asian and the Transcaucasus.

At the beginning of the article the author delves into the history of the redistribution of territories, the Middle East,

according to the Russian-British agreement of 1907, the fate of the Ottoman Porte after the Sykes-Picot agreement, and that the U.S. role in the Middle East was unimportant, the main actors were Britain and France. During the 20th century, the world has been rapidly changed. The Soviet Union appeared instead of the Russian Empire, in the 20th century colonial British and French empires collapsed, The Soviet Union collapsed in the late 20th century. The author believes that the world is moving to the balance of forces, which was typical of the 17-18 centuries, but with clear geopolitical amended.

The author characterizes the modern world order, assuming that positions of the West become weak, while the position of the East and the South, are enhanced. Russia is balancing between them. China, India, Turkey and Iran are now returning to their original positions in the international arena, but Japan and South Korea have returned much earlier in the club of the economic elite.

Latin American states, the U.S., Canada and Australia - occupy their niche in the world system. The United States New actors is trying to maintain a monopoly on the status of the global hegemon, engaging in a local war after another, and losing once again, leave, leaving behind chaos.

According to the author, there is a war of civilizations, there is no final victory of liberal western democracy and it is not expected. Globalization does not promise anything good for Europe: millions of migrants from Africa and the Middle East are already living in the EU countries, tens of millions are ready to move closer to the European social benefits. They do not intend to assimilate, but are eager to bend the Old World under their standards. Europe has no shortage or in right-wing radicals of all kinds, or in Islamists, becoming a field for radicals confrontations. The author believes that the ratio of indigenous and "alien" population of the EU will change fundamentally by 2050 if migration rates will remain the same.

The author expresses the opinion, based on the historical experience of Russia, that shocks will expect the country in the

30s, or maximum in the 40s years of the current century. However, the article is not about Russia, but of the current situation and potential prospects of the development of the Middle East (ME) and its periphery: Africa and Europe, Central Asia and the Caucasus. Everything in the world is connected and the connection appears faster than in the past.

Turkey pursued multiple objectives in a European refugee crisis, that has been provoked by it: partially relieve Turkey of more than three million of refugees residing on its territory; Erdogan sought to get money from Brussels, putting pressure on the EU when shifting the problem of refugees on Europe; He tried to push the European members of NATO to strike at the troops of Bashar al-Assad. This situation shows how the Western world is vulnerable to the processes occurring in the Middle East.

The author notes that the “Arab Spring” has gone on recession in all countries of the region – Egypt, Tunisia, Libya, Yemen, where authoritarian rulers were replaced, and not representatives of the liberal-democratic circles, but Islamists. The project of overthrowing B. Assad has every chance to fail with the support provided to him from Iran and actions of the Russian Aerospace Forces. Two military-political and economic alliances were formed in the region, Turkey – Qatar and Egypt – Saudi Arabia.

The author believes that the main problems of the Middle East today is this: a course that President Erdogan will choose after the victory of his party in the parliamentary elections, the prospects for the development of Afghanistan, as well as “the Central Asian Spring”, further fate of the Islamist radical groups after the start of actions of the Russian Aerospace Forces in Syria.

The author analyzes the probability of collision between Russia and Turkey; Prospects for “Pipeline wars” in Central Asia, and the development of relations between the former Central Asian republics of the USSR and the countries of the Middle East, China, Russia and the US; The political and economic situation in the countries of Central Asia.

The author raised the issue of nuclear cooperation in the region and making the Middle East into a “nuclear-free zone, the cooperation of Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, the confrontation between Pakistan and India, and keeping the nuclear balance. According to the author, the agreement of non-aggression between Israel and Iran could be the best way to ensure security in the region. However, Iran is clearly not ready to accept it in the foreseeable future, unlike Israel. The author noted the failure of the Israeli-Palestinian “peace settlement”. Positions of the sides were totally and completely incompatible, although they were so initially. This catastrophic situation of refugees, including Arabic, can lead to the unification of programs to support them in the near future by the international community, depriving the Palestinians’ status “first class among the refugees.”

All of these countries and territories are another area of instability. The same can be said about the African periphery of the Middle East – the Sahara and the Sahel, their separatist and radical Islamist movements destabilize the area from Morocco to Mauritania, and a significant part of Black Africa. The only “good” news about the Middle East, is that the Balkans and the Caucasus is just an oasis of calm in comparison with the Sahel and the Af-Pak.

Dismantling of the Schengen area due to refugees traveling to Germany through the Balkans, can be the beginning of the end of the European Union. The Caucasus is affected by Turkey and Iran, as well as the confrontation between Washington and Brussels, on the one hand, and Moscow – on the other. According to the author, the situation today is quite stable, it could be worse, if we refer to issue of slavery in Iraq, Sudan, Mauritania and the genocide of Christians in Syria and Iraq, and the Kurdish Yazidi in Iraq. This is the difference between crisis and catastrophe.

The author of the abstract – N. Ginesina

THE MOSLEM WORLD: THEORETICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL PROBLEMS

2016.09.005. G. MIRSKY. PHENOMENON OF ISIS // *Zapad-Vostok-Rossiia. Yearbook. IMEMO RAS, Moscow, 2015. – P. 106–110. (Abstract.)*

Keywords: Islam, Islamism, ISIS, "Islamic State" Caliphate, extremism, terrorism, radicalism, jihad, fundamentalism, "Salafis", the Koran, the Sunnis, the Shiites, the West, the Arab East, Wahhabism, Osama bin Laden, Barack Obama T. Erdogan.

G. Mirsky,

Dr. Sc.(History), chief research associate,
IMEMO RAS

The world has faced with the danger of a global scale, writes G. Mirsky. This is an extreme radical Islamism or transnational jihadism and the actual implementation of this danger – the organization "Islamic State" (ISIS). Its symbol is the Caliphate, proclaimed after the invasion of ISIS militants into Iraq from Syria and attracting Islamic radicals like a magnet. Ideas of radical Islamists are popular among Muslim youth. People from more than 80 countries have rushed to the territory of Iraq controlled by ISIS. Thousands of Europeans have accepted Islam, they go to fight in the Arab East.

The author defines the distinction between Islam and Islamism. Islam is a religion and lifestyle, the basis of an entire civilization, the element of identity of hundreds of millions of

people, generating solidarity of the global Muslim community. Islamism is a political movement, based on a radical ideology, the essence of which – fundamentalism, i.e. the belief that all the troubles of the Muslim world are going from oblivion of the foundations of “pure, righteous, true Islam of the ancestors”, from attempts to absorb alien values and a secular order of society, unacceptable to Muslims. A cohort of Islamists practitioners, fighters against “Western aggressors and corrupting influence of the pernicious West” has grown under the theoretical cover of the fundamentalists ideas (in Arabic – “Salafi” from the word “Salaf” i.e. ancestors.). The scientist reveals the failure of the theory of “the war of Islam against Christianity” because Islamists believe Western society is not Christian, but godless, immoral and depraved.

G. Mirsky writes that erroneous and unsound is the opinion about the radicals, extremists and, ultimately, terrorists, as if they were destitute and desperate people from poor countries. In fact they almost always come from wealthy families who have received a good education. Thus, about 40% of the volunteers who came from Arab countries to fight in the ranks of the “Islamic state”, are the young people of Tunisia, where the population is not starving and best educated in the Arab world. The hopes were not realized, that successful economic development would prevent the spread of extremism and terrorism. Those are mistaken who believe it would be pointless to “go in terror”, if people get a good job and decent living conditions. Higher education does not become a barrier to assimilation of extremist ideas.

It should be borne in mind that Islamist ideology is based on the universally recognized basic values of Islam that attracts Muslims from different countries into the ranks of the “Islamic state”, for example. So, all Muslims agree that only their community is special, genuine (in the Koran says: “You are the best of communities, created for the human race”) and it must dominate the world, but in reality, the Americans – infidels –

manage all actually. Consequently, there is great injustice and the followers of bin Laden's fight for its elimination. The struggle against the secular model of society imposed by the West follows directly from the Sharia too, not allowing categorically the actual (not formal) equality of women with men and the existence of areas of life beyond the control of religion in general.

The roots of radical Islam, the author points out – in some of the basic organic regulations of Islam, but distorted and adapted to the needs of violence and terror. “Al-Qaeda” was born on this ideological basis, as an organization of Arab volunteers who came to Afghanistan to fight against the Soviet forces, which were introduced in the country in late 1979, in order to assist the revolutionary government. The war was waged under the slogan “Jihad”, “holy war against infidels”, and “Al Qaeda” has received substantial support from the United States and Pakistan. After the end of the Afghan war, Osama bin Laden set up several subsidiary groups, one of them helped the Sunnis in Iraq in 2003, lost power as a result of American intervention. Her first name was “al-Qaida in Iraq”, the second was the “Islamic state in Iraq”, the third – ISIL (Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant), the fourth – just “Islamic State”, ISIS, i.e. Caliphate.

Most supporters of jihad, “holy war”, belong to the Wahhabi direction of Sunni Islam. This sect is extremely intolerant, pursues Shiites with extreme hatred. The Sunnis of Iraq believe that the Sunnis of Syria are their fellow believers, but the Shia of Iraq – strangers to them, even if they are not enemies, underlines the scientist. The center of gravity in Iraq and Syria has moved from the state level to the local community, often even at the level of the sect. People already feel like their ancestors, Mosul Sunni or Alawite from Aleppo. The difference is that the powerful imperial power was over all of them in the past, prevented wars between their communities. It is impossible to understand today, why the excesses of extremist “of Islamic state” do not cause much indignation among the Sunni population of Iraq and Syria, without awareness of the importance of the Sunni-Shiite conflict.

The purpose of the Sunni Islamist-jihadists is to establish their authority in key countries of the Islamic world – Saudi Arabia (the birthplace of the Prophet), Pakistan, Iraq, Syria, Palestine, Turkey, Egypt, Algeria. If the power of militant and intolerant Islamists is established there, it will be Caliphate for many Muslim radicals. All this will be resolved in Iraq. But the war in Iraq can not be won without a victory in Syria. In fact, this is an extensive war. There are several wars in Syria: the first – between the Assad regime and the opposition, developed into a confrontation between the Sunni majority and the Alawite minority; the second – between the moderate pro-Western opposition and radical jihadists; the third – between radicals themselves (“Nusra Front” against ISIS); the fourth – between the Kurdish militia and ISIS); and the fifth, regional – between the U.S., Saudi Arabia and the Sunni states on the one hand, and Iran and the Lebanese Shiites – on the other. Turkey is playing a double game. President Erdogan puts pressure on Obama, so that he remembers a common goal – the overthrow of Assad during the fight against ISIS, but the U.S. president legitimately fears that this will bring victory of jihadists. All fighting forces do not trust each other. The well-known formula of “my enemy's enemy – my friend” does not work in this region. ISIS extremists are the main threat to the West nowadays. Their arrival in Syria has proven advantageous for Assad, as it is paradoxical. They not only scare the population, making the president a “lesser evil”, even to those Sunnis who hate him, but do not allow the West to provide significant assistance to the opposition. Barack Obama can not send anti-aircraft and anti-tank missiles to the rebels – they need the most, and that is because the weapons fall into the hands of jihadists. Barack Obama can not help to take power in Damascus those who are faithful to the precepts of bin Laden, i.e. kill Americans wherever they are caught, G. Mirsky concludes. But he can not look like a defender of the Shiites, so as not to alienate the Sunnis, ruling in 20 Arab countries out of 21 (the Shiites are in the majority in only four of the 57 Muslim countries).

The author of the abstract – V. Schensnovich

**РОССИЯ
И
МУСУЛЬМАНСКИЙ МИР
2016 – 9 (291)**

Научно-информационный бюллетень

Содержит материалы по текущим политическим,
социальным и религиозным вопросам

Дизайн М.Б. Шнайдерман

Компьютерная верстка Е.Е. Мамаева

Гигиеническое заключение

№ 77.99.6.953.П.5008.8.99 от 23.08.1999 г.

Подписано к печати 10/X-2016 г. Формат 60х84/16

Бум. офсетная № 1. Печать офсетная. Свободная цена

Усл. печ. л. 3,5 Уч.-изд. л. 3,0

Тираж 300 экз. Заказ № 149

**Институт научной информации
по общественным наукам РАН,
Нахимовский проспект, д. 51/21,
Москва, В-418, ГСП-7, 117997**

**Отдел маркетинга и распространения
информационных изданий
Тел. (925) 517-36-91
E-mail: inion@bk.ru**

**E-mail: ani-2000@list.ru
(по вопросам распространения изданий)**

Отпечатано в ИНИОН РАН
Нахимовский пр-кт, д. 51/21
Москва В-418, ГСП-7, 117997
042(02)9