

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)
International Scientific Journal
Theoretical & Applied Science
p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)
Year: 2023 Issue: 05 Volume: 121
Published: 28.05.2023 <http://T-Science.org>

Issue

Article



Natalya Sergeevna Rumyanskaya

Institute of Service and Entrepreneurship (branch) DSTU
Ph.D., Associate Professor

Artur Alexandrovich Blagorodov

Institute of Service and Entrepreneurship (branch) DSTU
master

Vladimir Timofeevich Prokhorov

Institute of Service and Entrepreneurship (branch) DSTU
Doctor of Technical Sciences, Professor, Shakhty, Russia

Natalya Vasilievna Tikhonova

Kazan National Research University
Doctor of Technical Sciences, Professor, Kazan, Tatarstan

Galina Yurievna Volkova

LLC TsPOSN «Orthomoda»
Doctor of Economics, Professor
Moscow, Russia

A SYSTEMATIC APPROACH TO THE FIGHT AGAINST TERROR AND TERRORISM IN THE REGIONS OF THE SOUTHERN FEDERAL DISTRICT AND THE NORTH CAUCASUS FEDERAL DISTRICT

Abstract: *in the article, the authors believe that no less significant than the problems of organizing an effective direct fight against terrorism remains the issue of the sustainability of the reproduction of terrorism. An analysis of the state of research on factors contributing to the sustainability of terrorism shows that this issue, despite all its relevance, is given disproportionately little attention. There are separate attempts to determine predominantly specific legal, economic, political circumstances, but there is no systematic approach to solving this issue. The factors of sustainability of the reproduction of terrorism are heterogeneous in nature, intensity of action, the authors have identified those of them that, by their social status, allow political control over them. Terror has degenerated into terrorism, and the world community is still.*

Key words: *terrorism, sustainability of reproduction, factors, social and cultural practice, education, systematic approach, terrorist struggle.*

Language: English

Citation: Rumyanskaya, N. S., et al. (2023). A systematic approach to the fight against terror and terrorism in the regions of the Southern Federal District and the North Caucasus Federal District. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 05 (121), 501-531.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-05-121-58>

Doi:  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2023.05.121.58>

Scopus ASCC: 2000.

Introduction

UDC327.53:517.72

The war with Ukraine has significantly exacerbated the need for a direct fight against

terrorism, especially in the regions of the Southern Federal District and the North Caucasus Federal District. Most of the losses from terrorism are the border areas of Russia - the Rostov, Belgorod, Bryansk, Voronezh and Kursk regions. Analysis of the

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

state of the reasons for the sharp increase in terror, we consider insufficient attention to the fight against it by the power structures of the regions of the Southern Federal District and the North Caucasus Federal District.

Scientific knowledge was further complicated by two circumstances - the development of terror into terrorism and the multi-social nature of the political essence of the terrorist struggle.

Terrorist struggle is a set of practical actions directed against the state and its policies in order to transform the existing socio-cultural architecture, therefore, counter-terrorism activities must also be practical. But the arguments for the effectiveness of the fight against terrorists are not developed in its most practical part, they are introduced into it by scientific and philosophical support. The basis for the success of the counter-terrorism struggle is laid by science and philosophy. Moreover, the "and" here should not so much separate scientific and philosophical research as emphasize the importance of their interaction.

The specifics of scientific knowledge should be understood not as something that opposes the general theory of knowledge of the world - philosophical studies of cognitive activity, but as a specification of the universal achievements of epistemology, in relation to the features of the subject of science and the socio-cultural problems solved by science. Features of knowledge in science are indisputable, it is important not to make them absolute. Science and philosophy have a common object of cognition and a single goal of cognition, they strive to understand that in the world that its nature has reliably hidden behind external manifestations. Mirror reflection also seems simple and clear, but it was worth doubting this external simplicity and optics was born as a very difficult branch of physics. Before I. Newton, they simply looked at the world: what is so special about it? And for its simplicity, they called it "white". Unaware of the origin of whiteness.

On the nature of light, quite well researched in science and fully used in practical application, one can clearly show the inevitability of a combination in moving towards the desired subject of knowledge - obtaining true knowledge of scientific and philosophical approaches. I would not like to plunge into the epistemological and methodological past, into the experiences of scientific separatism, when there were numerous attempts to oppose the advantages of scientific knowledge to philosophical ones. Philosophers also opposed philosophy, unable to understand the uniqueness of philosophical knowledge, and as a result, determined the quality of philosophical knowledge by the impossibility of verifying its truth by scientific procedures. Experience as an instrument of knowledge was reduced to an empirical form, which in itself was evidence of philosophical myopia.

Methodologically, scientific and philosophical knowledge really look different. The first is focused on the quality of the "private" and is formally capable of pushing aside questions of the "general". The second, on the contrary, seeks to discern in the particular the general as the material for constructing the universal architecture of the world. The problem of relations between the particular (single) and the general has a history of solution of several thousand years. The scholastics stubbornly engaged in it in the Middle Ages, but did not agree, which looked natural, because the process of delusion of the "nominalists" and "realists" began at the base. They, in the light of formal logic, divided the reality of the existence of "private" and "general", absolutizing their opposite.

G. Hegel was able to show the methodological defect of the previous interpretation of "private" and "general", presenting them as concepts reflecting the single nature of existence, dividing them only according to the way reality is manifested and stipulating the need for coexistence according to the "two in one" formula. This is where the most important postulate of the theory of knowledge about the interaction of the general and the particular, the philosophical and scientific approaches, comes from. The object of knowledge is common - the nature of movement, and objects differ, causing the need for interaction.

Without a combination of philosophical understanding of the process with scientific understanding, success will always be limited, especially when it comes to defining basic concepts. The philosophical approach helps to overcome the empiricism of scientific reflections and include scientific interpretation in the structure of a systematic approach to the object of knowledge. All backbone scientific concepts must undergo philosophical examination.

Behind the extensive discussion about the difference between terror and terrorism, researchers have clearly underestimated the fact that this difference really has to do with the practical struggle against terror and terrorism, solely within the framework of their common nature, that they pass into each other, adapting to specific historical circumstances. Even more surprising is the fact that terrorologists have not paid due attention to the facts of the sustainable reproduction of the terrorist struggle. If the economic and political conditions conducive to the development of terrorism are still somehow analyzed, then there are essentially no studies of non-specific facts. Therefore, we had to unwind and deepen that part of the introduction to the topic that determines the systemic position of these factors.

One of the most socio-politically destructive phenomena, despite the active opposition of states and social forces of creative potential, managed to turn from local expressions into a systemic formation,

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

acquire an international scale, from a danger to social progress and people's lives to become a real threat to the development of mankind and turn out to be at the threshold of a new round of the movement of its reality - transformation into total terrorism, ready to remove any restrictions from its struggle. At least for a process aimed at achieving political goals.

The history of the terrorist struggle raises many questions, three of which are of particular importance for understanding this history, namely:

question one: when and where does the history of terror begin? Respectable publications, called upon to place historical accents and determine the time of the birth of phenomena, prefer to avoid the question of the beginnings of terror. Which is not surprising. To take responsibility, you need to know: what is terror? Experts have already counted from 200 to 400 definitions of terrorism. Quantity never directly transforms into quality, the former quality is transformed into a new quality, or a new quality appears instead of the old one. Quantitative changes as they increase or decrease become factors of marked qualitative transitions. Hundreds of definitions of terror and terrorism are a sign of the lack of sufficient objectivity of knowledge about phenomena, the deficiency of which is eliminated through opinion and, as a rule, complicating the achievement of the desired result.

Objective knowledge may be one-sided, limited by temporal conditions, but it is objective, although relative. Opinion, however, only advances the cognitive process towards an objective assessment of the phenomena of reality. Authoritative publications - encyclopedias, explanatory dictionaries rightfully do not want to participate as subjects of discourse. Consciously, perhaps and subconsciously, on the basis of professional experience, they are waiting for ideas about the terrorist struggle to acquire the epistemological status of concepts and the subject of discourse becomes clear. Then it will be possible to determine the beginning of its history by time and place;

second question: how to explain the historical stability of the reproduction of the terrorist struggle? Against the terrorists, especially when the aggressiveness of their actions aimed at the places of concentration of people and their means of transportation, all social and professional forces were consolidated. Modern society, having a significant anti-terrorist potential, however, is not yet able to put an end to terrorists.

The history of terrorism continues, which indicates both the presence of factors for the sustainability of the reproduction of terrorism and the need to activate the reserves of the counter-terrorism struggle. To be effective, you need to be proactive. For this, it is necessary to know the enemy as he is, not in the form of general ideas, but to have his scientific understanding;

The third question is also directly related to the achievement of a scientific understanding of terrorism in the full scope of the objectivity of knowledge, free from ideologization and politicization: in what status will terrorism adapt to the conditions of struggle in the 21st century? The history of the terrorist struggle is structured and it has its own background - the stage of the formation of terror, the formation of its socio-political status; stage of terror with transformation into terrorism; stage of terrorism with transformation into international terrorism.

Main part

If in the methodological aspect scientific and philosophical knowledge look contradictory, then in the epistemological context they essentially belong to the general series. Cognition in science and philosophy is carried out in a specific form of concepts. Among the main causes of cognitive defects in scientific knowledge, in the first place is the misunderstanding of thinking. Instead of concepts, general ideas are used, which are associated with polymer interpretation of the content of key forms of knowledge.

Several hundred definitions of terror and terrorism in terrorism are not definitions of concepts. We have reviewed the main array of publications of terrologists and in none of them have we found the logical beginning of a definition in science - an analysis of the form of knowledge. The fact of the presence of a certain set of concepts without substantiation and selection of the initial features of the concept is declared. The concept is a form of knowledge that reflects the essence of the phenomenon, therefore, depending on its definition, which summarizes the basic features of the concept, the quality of knowledge about the object and its subject specification is found.

The consciousness of terrologists, at best, relies on the formal-logical characterization of the concept. G. Hegel called such knowledge corresponding to rational logic: "In rational logic, the concept is usually considered only as a simple form of thinking and, more precisely, as a general idea." G. Hegel did not identify the concept with the general idea. With a general idea, he compared the specifics of the concept present in Aristotelian logic. It is in it that the concept is defined as something identical to itself forever, "something dead, empty and abstract."

The rational interpretation of a concept, built on its identical reality, is convenient as a reference point of view. Each such concept has its own place on the "shelf" forever, but it contains a deadly flaw - it is not able to deny the changes that are actually taking place, turning over time into historical garbage, clogging the mind. According to G. Hegel, rational definitions of the concept "are final definitions". G. Hegel opposed the concept formed by the logic of speculative (dialectical) thinking to the rational concept as an

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

instrument of discourse within strictly limited conditions, in essence, a preparatory action for really significant cognition: "The concept as such contains, the philosopher noted, namely:

* the moment of universality, as a free relationship with oneself in its certainty;

* the moment of singularity, certainty, in which everything in common remains unclouded equal to itself;

* the moment of individuality as a reflection - into itself of the certainties of universality and particularity, a negative unity with itself.

The concept differs from the general idea by its universality. The systemic features of its content should exclude dissent in the essence of the definition, reflecting the nature of the object, and the high development potential of the knowledge of the essence contained in it, which guarantees the passage of knowledge from the universal to the special, from the special to the individual. The negation of the negation opens up the possibility of developing the content of the real concept as opposed to the rational one. "The forward movement of the concept," G. Hegel clarified, "is no longer either a transition or an appearance in another, but there is a development."

The concept as the highest form of knowledge is capable not only of its own development, but also of objectification into reality. If the Hegelian interpretation of the concept is cleared of the objective-idealistic superstructure, then the key idea will be revealed - only having reached the conceptual form, knowledge becomes adequate to the creative nature ("natura naturans") and opens up the prospect of transformation into a practical result, or lays down a system of deep theoretical description.

Science purposefully does not develop a theory of knowledge, it enriches it, therefore, without its participation, it is impossible to build a holistic theory of knowledge. G. Hegel, in the most abstract form in the theory of negation, pointed out the significance of the ascent from the general to the particular, from the abstract to the concrete. Neither at the level of generality, nor as a moment of particular development, the concept is free from content. "Free equality with oneself in certainty" is achieved when there is some content. Therefore, the question is relevant: where does it come from? The universal is identical, G. Hegel explained, exclusively in the sense that it contains both the special and the individual.

A subjectively formed concept is capable of containing in itself the special and the individual only as its content, formed by development. At the same time, it is reasonable to believe that for this the concept, already as a special form of knowledge, is potentially ripe for such an ascent. In painting, the preparation of the canvas occupies an important place, although it does not always belong directly to creativity. The canvas must be ready for creative

action. Something similar seems to occur in abstract thinking, for which it received its definition.

The form is formed in the process of thinking and in some of its state develops to the extent that allows it to be able, plunging into the process, to reflect, reproduce what is happening outside of it - in an abstract form from the required subject specificity. The history of the subjective concept begins with the "content-attitude" that limits cognitive activity. In the abstraction of the subjective concept, there is not only the denial of its own movement, shown by G. Hegel, but also the denial of what cannot be the content of the concept at any level of ascent.

Consciousness is accustomed by practice to understand the content of knowledge as a statement of something that constitutes the quality of the content of knowledge. The other side of the process of cognition - the denial in the formation of the concept of everything that does not correspond to this content, as a rule, is only implied. In relation to the formed concept, such a proportion of positive and negative is quite acceptable, which cannot be said about the process of concept genesis. It is at this stage very vulnerable, so falsifications are possible. It seems that the Afghan story of 2021 with the coming to power of the Taliban is applicable to the epistemological situation that has developed in terrology, in which the search for the desired definitions of terror, terrorism and derivative phenomena has clearly dragged on.

Terrologists, striving for the originality of their definitions, violate the requirements of the logic of concept formation. G. Hegel repeatedly testified that the subjective concept in the system of Aristotelian logic is similar to a general idea: "When they talk about a concept, usually only an abstract universality appears before our mental gaze, and, usually, therefore, the concept is defined as a general idea. It is extremely important both for cognition and for practical behavior that we do not confuse the bare general with the truly general, with the universal.

The policy of the state is capable of showing social and other aggressiveness, being repressive, but not terroristic. Similarity in the methods of political struggle between repressive-minded states and terrorists is not correct to consider as a sufficient sign of their identity. At the same time, one has to bear in mind that a certain level of coincidence of political interests can have a very serious transnational resonance, which terrorists, relying on their experience and real strength, are able to take advantage of. Hence their desire to wreak havoc everywhere.

Terrorist struggle is a typical example of a practical political form of counteracting the social policy of the state, it is distinguished by a practical goal, practical methods and means of action. Consequently, counter-terrorism activities should be just as practical across the spectrum. The paradox is that the winner in this practical confrontation will be

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHLI (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

the one who proves to be more convincing in organizing his struggle. Organization, in principle, also belongs to the practical part of the fight against the important amendment that the organization of the organization itself is a product of mental activity. Both sides in the struggle have significant practical capabilities, skills and techniques, and rely on existing social factors. Quantitative differences in this case do not play a decisive role. The intellectual and spiritual potential is of crucial importance. It is in theoretical understanding that reserves for the effectiveness of the counter-terrorist struggle are laid.

In understanding terror and terrorism, everything must be clear and true. Then the power of truth will overpower everything. It is not surprising that the organizers of the terrorist struggle, its ideologists and sponsors seek to confuse the political assessments of terrorism to the maximum, using the possibilities of the ideological factor, the imperfection of the epistemological equipment of the existing theoretical knowledge, the instability of psychological assessments with their conditional verifiability. The modern mass media are at the service of terrorists today, working not so much out of conviction as for substantial fees.

Of course, it is not rightful to reduce the reserves for the effectiveness of the counter-terrorist struggle only to the solution of cognitive tasks. Nevertheless, the well-known expression: “informed, therefore, armed”, must be brought into full compliance with the requirements of philosophy for the objectivity, comprehensiveness and specificity of knowledge. Knowledge must be not just correct, according to the conditions of formal logic, it must be true. Simply put, the content of the information should not consist of formal knowledge obtained by the correct use of inference-building procedures, it should be truly correct.

In its modern form, the theory of terror and terrorism is predominantly formed from general ideas and built on the basis of the correctness of conclusions from premises, most of which, at best, are conditionally consistent with true knowledge. In the modern theory of terror and terrorism, there is an intersubjective approach to determining knowledge for the truth of its content, which can be considered as progress towards the goal, but within the same range of subjective decisions.

The epistemological situation is further complicated by the fact that politics and ideology often actively intervene in the cognitive process. As a result, definitions and their analysis often turn out to be the product of an ideological struggle, as, for example, happened with the inclusion of legitimately created states in a number of subjects of terrorist struggle. This is possible only if the essential approach is explicitly replaced by the phenomenal one and the rules of even the most formal logic are violated.

A scientific concept, in contrast to a general idea, reflects the essence of a phenomenon; its definition is not reduced to correspondence with the manifestation of the essence in actions. The outwardly political aggressiveness of quite respectable states seeking to establish proper order outside their own statehood also contributes to the spread and complication of the understanding of terrorism. The Middle East turned out to be a place of concentration of terrorists not only because of the presence of internal contradictions in development. Under the pretext of restoring democratic legitimacy, a direct military invasion was launched into a number of countries forming the region. The occupation and the use of force on the territory of sovereign states have only made terrorism more active. The terrorist struggle from aggression, due to the changed political situation, appeared as a struggle against the invaders, significantly strengthening the social base. The terrorists have turned into the Mujahideen, remaining the same terrorists. Chaos is a product of the costs of politics and a prerequisite for distortions in the interpretation of terrorism.

Politics in the systemic sense is the same production, which does not happen without costs. Politicians, as well as production managers, are required to minimize losses. When politics leads to another increase in material and spiritual costs, then the order of political production disintegrates, giving way to disorder, and a time of crisis and default comes. However, chaos has a significant advantage over order, weakened and irrelevant. There is no need to change the order; in essence, it is no longer in existence. It is possible to concentrate forces on building the order that is the components of the program. Chaos is not another reality, not a parallel world created by “dark matter”, it is a kind of “constructor” that has fallen out of the box and scattered at random. Take and collect what you want, in accordance with the possibilities of the set. For social construction, the latter is determined by the need to combine social creativity with the historical potential that has been achieved. However, here, too, unrealizable promises can be used for some time to give significance to the goals of the struggle.

Resources comparable to the budgets of the world's leading powers are being spent on counterterrorism. Note that this is not a one-time cost. Each next turn of the struggle will require even more, and no one knows how many more of these turns on a long-twisted spiral. One thing is certain: there is no end in sight. In this connection, new problems arise: how can the effectiveness of the fight against terrorism be increased? What is the reason for its inefficiency? Why were the financial, logistical, organizational, professional and competence costs, which seemed to be sufficient to eliminate all terrorists, not only not enough to put an end to terrorist

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

actions, but even simply to prevent the terrorists from developing their struggle?

Answers to the above questions must be sought in the shortcomings of the systemic organization of counter-terrorist activities. First of all, in the structural construction of its dynamics. The state of the terrorist struggle serves as a basis for calling counter-terrorism activities a war against terrorists. A new type of war, when restrictions on violence do not apply to the enemy, but at the same time a war according to the basic rules of warfare.

The winner in combat operations is not the one who has more controllable forces, but the one who organizes his actions wisely, who knows how to quickly concentrate forces on the main directions in a mobile way, who knows his opponent better. The logic of problem solving again leads our reflection to the conclusion that we need to better understand what makes terror and its heirs, the terrorists, so persistently reproduced. It is also necessary to build a systematic relationship of concepts that reveal the essence of terror and terrorism. Only in this way can one overcome the diversity of existing ideas, free knowledge from the subjectivity of opinions, obtain objective grounds for theoretical understanding of the phenomenon of the terrorist struggle and form a program for an effective fight against terrorists, not only respond to their actions, but also get ahead of them, neutralizing them.

The main reserves of the desired effectiveness of the counter-terrorist struggle are currently concentrated in the scientific and philosophical knowledge of the object. Moreover, both of these approaches should be combined, which will allow to obtain a synergistic effect. In epistemological terms, the knowledge of terror and its development into terrorism is complicated by the peculiarity of the object.

Terrorism is a multi-social phenomenon of a unitary format, which has absorbed a variety of historical experience. Attempts by narrow specialists-historians, lawyers, political scientists, religious scholars, sociologists, to "bite through" this tough nut were doomed "a priori". The maximum that they were capable of was to "bite off" their piece and describe it separately. As a result, scientific knowledge entered a paradoxical state: the object was "bitten" from all sides, the resulting parts were conscientiously described according to the requirements of the technique of scientific special knowledge, and studied. However, they failed to combine the obtained special results into a general theory of terrorist struggle.

Within the limits of private scientific knowledge about the terrorist struggle, certain knowledge had the form of concepts, but they were not systemically connected, since knowledge did not reveal the essential level where the system-forming factors are located. What historians, political scientists, and

lawyers rightly considered to be concepts, in a systematic approach, were partly such. In the absence of a philosophical understanding of the phenomenon, most of the knowledge gained in the theory of terrorism remains just general ideas. They are significant only for providing scientific approaches to knowledge. The experience of developing a special scientific unit - "terrology" also did little to solve the problem, because the same historians, political scientists and lawyers turned out to be scientists-terrologists.

The way out of this situation must, as the history of science testifies, be sought in philosophy, and not only in the philosophy of science, but in philosophy as a whole. It is required to mobilize the dialectical understanding of the existing relations in the world and its cognition, reflected in the categorical analysis: the inclusion of philosophical achievements in the cognition in epistemological and methodological searches. In particular, the doctrine of the concepts and conditions of their formation; concretization of the dialectical method in a systematic approach.

Meanwhile, the conditions are conducive to achieving an understanding of the terrorist struggle as a systematically formed multi-social phenomenon of a unitary format. The quality of knowledge is determined by several factors. First of all, the object must be mature enough, revealed both within itself and in its external relations. Otherwise, the importance of subjectivity in reflection increases not only in the definition of methodological tools, but also at the level of forced assumptions, assumptions, etc. The maturity of a cognizable object determines the boundaries of subjective activity, serves as a guarantee against excessive costs of knowledge production in the form of a researcher's opinion. The objectivity of knowledge must be specific. The maturity of an object is also the maturity of its history, which is the source of the concreteness of objective knowledge.

To no lesser extent, the quality of knowledge depends on the ability to know consciousness itself. Consciousness conditionally reflects reality. The nature of knowledge and the method of its production by thinking are fundamentally united with the materiality of the world, being the properties of developed matter, but property and substrate, even within an object that is not capable of thinking, do not belong to the same kind.

A mechanical object has physical properties that are subject to a different form of motion of matter. The production of material goods is involved in the reproduction of the entire spectrum of human relations. A car is a vehicle and at the same time someone's property. Dialectical materialism therefore defines knowledge as a product of reflection, processed by thinking in its own way. Images of objects are formed in the mind based on the possibilities of thinking.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

For lawyers, who are more than all others in terrology, the example with which G. Hegel reconstructed the unity in the concept of the truth of the universal and the particular, concretizing the truly universal, is also interesting. J.-J. Rousseau emphasized the difference between the "general will" and "the will of all" in his "social contract theory". The state must be based on the principle of "universal will", which does not prevent it from being "the will of all". The definition of a concept cannot be one-sided, subordinate to any particular feature. Terrorologists are haunted by Robespierre, who identifies terror with the practice of violence. Violence is a defining characteristic not only of terror, but of many common notions. Little is added by the indication of the revolutionary direction of terror in Robespierre.

Practically cognitive conclusions follow from the "road map" of the ascent of the concept from the abstract to the concrete, brilliantly seen by G. Hegel. First of all, in the abstract beginning of the content of the concept, it is necessary to determine what, being loaded with concreteness, must withstand the entire path of ascent. At the end, it is necessary to have the beginning in a filmed form, obscured by the acquired specifics. The concept, developing, remains identical with itself. This is achieved through the core content of the concept. It is permanent.

The second conclusion is directly related to the definition of the content core. For G. Hegel, the whole history of the concept is self-sufficient. He is a consistent objective idealist. In the context of dialectical materialism, supported by the history of modern natural science, the formation and development of the concept is due to the interaction of rational thinking with the phenomena of objective reality. The concept is not primary, in it consciousness reflects the essence of these phenomena.

Nature and what arises in it as its development, the practical component of social life, continue to test "homo sapiens" for the stability of reproduction based on the transformations of the living environment. Reason has developed its abilities to the knowledge of essential relations. The concept has become a specific form of knowledge. Consequently, the core of the content of the concept is the essence of the highest order - the "essence of the essence". It is in it that the knowledge of the resistance of phenomena to reproduction is potentiated. Nature and social life are diverse and dynamic, therefore it is generally difficult to find the essence behind all this variety of changing phenomena, and the "essence of the essence" is all the more difficult. Cognition, seeking to reach the roots of ongoing processes, excludes impressionability and haste. There is a saying in Russia: "Hurry, make people laugh."

The third conclusion: the recognition of the universality of the concept is a kind of guarantee of its application to the entire volume of phenomena

determined by the content of the concept. There can be no exceptions here. If something is outside the brackets, then either there was an error in determining the content, or they didn't figure it out properly with what fell out of the general clip.

Fourth conclusion: the development of a concept does not refer to a change in its core. The core is system-forming properties, and development is the improvement of the system that is built by the features of the core.

Fifth conclusion: the concept is a product of production in which objectively changing reality interacts with the knowledge of "homo sapiens". Consequently, all the costs of cognition are either of an objective nature - the objects of cognition have not matured, not what needs to be determined, not considered comprehensively, or the culture of thinking has failed.

The historicism of the birth of the concept and all its subsequent development convinces us that there is no simple history of the concept, it is pointless to look for an example of a simple concept. The concept of "simplicity" itself is defined ambiguously. In fact, we are talking about different concepts. K. Popper, analyzing the concept of "simplicity", identified three different uses of it - in the aesthetic aspect, in the practical and epistemological. To the question why simplicity is valued so highly in the public consciousness, not to mention the professional scientific one, K Popper answered as follows: "To understand this, we do not need to accept either the principle of economy of thought, or any other principle of the same kind. When our goal is knowledge, simple statements should be valued over less simple ones, because they tell us more, because their empirical content is greater, and because they are better tested.

The desire for simplicity of expression is natural and can be useful in the production of new knowledge, or development that exists in a new continuation, however, it is necessary to use the method of simplification carefully, realizing where and to what extent this occurs. To simplify, apparently, the content of the concept is also allowed, but only when such a procedure does not concern the core of the content - the "essence of the essence". It is logical to start the analysis of the epistemological situation that has developed and steadily exists in terrorism not from the systemic status of "terror" and "terrorism", but from the content of these concepts, fixed in the definitions. Criterion - compliance of the definition with a real event. It should insert the phenomena under study into a system of opposition to the legitimate social order.

The universal conventional products of terrorist discussions are two features common to "terror" and "terrorism": the extreme to the point of insanity cruelty of means and methods and the struggle against the historically established order, again without regard to costs. Nevertheless, a priori terrorologists do not

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

simply distinguish between "terror" and "terrorism", they oppose them.

Of course, in the order of the version of "terror" can be derived from "terrorism", as well as "terrorism" from "terror". Both phenomena are more similar than different. Another thing is surprising: all domestic authors once joined the dialectical methodology. In our situation, it does not matter what sources they used - they read F. Engels, K. Marx, V.I. Lenin or G. Hegel. As a methodological basis of scientific knowledge, Hegelian dialectics, as a local version of the dialectics of the concept developed by him, differs only in the interpretation of the triad. Terrorologists should not hasten to confine themselves to the separation of "terror" and "terrorism", but use the urgent recommendation of dialectical thinking.

Already Heraclitus taught: "You cannot enter the same river twice." Using this thesis of Heraclitus. Aristotle explained: "Everything flows and is never the same." At the same time, Aristotle was not like-minded with Heraclitus and, in contrast to the dialectical understanding of the changes taking place in the world, he developed the logic of identity. The phenomenon for Aristotle does not change significantly. It remains the same. Terrorologists chose Aristotle's version and simply contrasted "terrorism" with "terror", deeming it inappropriate to look at them historically. For terrorologists, among whom there are also philosophers, one should delve deeper into the theory of knowledge, its dialectical model.

In proportion to the Heraclitean image of the flow of the river, only G. Hegel figured it out. The fact that you cannot enter this river twice does not reflect the essence of the movement. The essence of the movement is that no current is capable of making a river different and only different. The other must be different of this particular river. In the theory of the development of the concept of G. Hegel, this idea of the ancient Greek dialectician is contained. Terror and terrorism differ as manifestations of the terrorist struggle, its stages. They reflect the history of the movement, which was and will remain, in fact, what was born. I. Kant was the first to study human thinking as a tool, the use of which determines the quality of knowledge and the boundaries of knowledge. Following I. Kant, G. Hegel showed the instrumental reserves of our thinking, removed the taboo imposed by Aristotle on the consistency of thinking, explained the reason that stopped I. Kant is on the threshold of antinomy of thinking, but most importantly, G. Hegel convinced that the inconsistency of thinking inherent in human rationality is the means by which knowledge without boundaries is possible. Only through inconsistency, transitions of opposites within the framework of their development and unity, thinking can plunge into the very depths of a cognizable object.

K. Marx and F. Engels completed the formation of a dialectical methodology in cognition by extending

the dialectic of development from thinking to the material world, resolving the contradiction of the Hegelian understanding of dialectics. The circle is closed: knowledge of the contradictions of the objective and practical world was provided by dialectically built thinking. The laws of the world are reflected in the requirements of thinking for cognition.

The terrorist struggle and its history are parts of the contradictory development of reality. Their knowledge in any science will remain one-sided and ineffective in the practical spectrum. Here, a dialectical approach is required, which is used to a limited extent in private scientific knowledge, being forced out to the periphery by special methods and techniques. The inconsistency of the unity of the general and the particular in cognition is resolved within the boundaries of the dialectic of the general and the particular.

The specificity of the subject, which is the object of knowledge, dictates the choice of research methods. As long as the research is carried out in the light of objective originality, the procedure of cognition is conditioned by this originality. A lawyer must classify terrorism in accordance with its legal characteristics, and determine the punishment for terrorists based on the corpus delicti. However, already on the jurisprudential horizon, where everything seems to be strictly scheduled, within the professional community, it is easy to detect inconsistency in the assessment of the phenomenon itself, taken in general as a phenomenon of public life.

The specialized approach of scientific knowledge is potentially developing in two terms: as a final one, composed of coordinated actions, sorted into "shelves", fairly compared with a stable order, and as part of a general movement. Terror and terrorism throughout their history have simply been in the zone of special attention of those who develop laws that protect the individual and public order, and before terrorism was transformed into a transnational phenomenon, from a danger to a threat to social development, legal circles did not raise the question of the disproportionate application of the Criminal Code in relation to the actions of terrorists.

Nazism, fascism, racism, genocide - they were judged by special tribunals, de facto and de jure they were taken out of the brackets of crimes traditionally understood in the Criminal Code, because they were considered a threat not to the person, not to property, not to development, but to the existence of mankind. Apparently something in politics is holding back the promotion of unsatisfactory lawyers by dissolving terrorist crimes. The actions of all these extremist movements had a common focus - the destruction of as many innocent people as possible in order to generate total fear and make a person a slave to the imposed order.

The quality of knowledge also depends on the social relevance of the problem under study. Social

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

significance is not always accompanied by social relevance. Professionals see the problem better and are able to assess its systemic nature earlier. Their level of knowledge is higher, however, this advantage is often not enough to increase relevance to a social scale. Mass consciousness should be included in the cognitive process, but it reacts weakly to everything that has not taken on a proper practical scope.

It is a different matter when the object of knowledge is practically evaluated by "common sense" and has become nationally significant. Then, as they say in Russia, "the whole world is piling on the solution of the issue." The fight against terrorism until the last decades of the 20th century was the lot of specialists, for the mass consciousness it was exotic.

The situation changed radically with the collapse of the Soviet Union. A surge in terrorism was predicted, but few thought that terrorist practices would unfold so quickly and take on such a wide scale.

The reaction to the increased activity of terrorists was a comprehensive restructuring of counter-terrorist reality, part of which was the corresponding restructuring of scientific knowledge. The desire to understand terrorism and its systemic place in the world has borne fruit, but it is difficult to determine what is more in them - success or disappointment.

In the description of terror and terrorism and phenomenological assessments one can sense serious professional work. The essential characteristic of terrorism remains, as before, "terra incognita" for the most part, and without this, cognitive empiricism is doomed to move in the dark, to satisfy its own ambitions. Involuntarily, one has to recall hundreds of definitions, and the inconsistency of the characterization of terror in special international documents.

Returning from the analysis of the conditions for the knowledge of terrorism to the prospects for constructing a general theory of terror that satisfies the requirements of the practice of counter-terrorism struggle, we emphasize once again that the situation for solving the problem has matured both in objective and practical terms and in the epistemological proper. It is far from ideal, since there is still ideological pressure, which I would very much like to write down as the costs of the Cold War, but the war is a thing of the past. The ideological struggle has reached a new level. And what is interesting, if earlier it reflected two opposing approaches to social development - capitalist and socialist, then in the 21st century the essence of the contradiction has changed, perhaps temporarily, conditionally, because socialist ideals are closer to the social nature of man, they manifested themselves at the beginning of history "homo sapiens, reflected in world religions. Today, a contradiction has come to the fore in the very capitalist understanding of the fate of the world.

Historically, the interpretation of socialism has always been concrete and special. K. Marx, in order to

remove the inconsistency of understanding the socialist ideal, developed the concept of "human society", designed to overcome the conflicts of "civil society". Over time, classical - "industrial capitalism" revealed properties that are incompatible with the ideals of humanism and democracy. The question arose of new industrial systems based on the two pillars of social history - the creation of freedom of personal expression and the strengthening of solidarity in social relations.

World wars, compactly located in the first half of the last century, revealed the inevitability of the catastrophe of social progress in the event that the old political history continues. As a result, ideological searches intensified in the direction of determining a common springboard for development - a multi-socio-economic platform. To begin with, the idea of the convergence of a "multipolar world" appeared.

The idea that in order to get together and follow a common path, while maintaining your special place in the ranks, you first need to "sort it out". Even in the Bible there is a phrase: "A time to scatter stones, and a time to gather stones." Ideas that have been tested for thousands of years are already interesting in themselves and require new understanding. It is a sin to dismiss them as historical rubbish.

J. Galbraith spoke about the need to change the model of capitalism in the 1960s: "At the end of the 19th century and in the first decades of the 20th century, no topic was discussed more lively," wrote a well-known scientist and statesman, "than the question of the future of capitalism. It was considered proven that this economic system is in the process of development and will eventually turn into something different and, as one would like to think, into something better. J. Galbraith, as a politician and economist, tried to find the roots of the problem and saw them in the industrial system of bourgeois society, which was partly historically and logically correct.

Capitalism owes its flourishing to the industrial revolution, which created the scientific and technical basis for mass factory production, which necessitated the modern scale of the market economy. Let us not, however, underestimate the fact that the formation of the bourgeoisie and the concentration of capital were preconditions for the success of the Industrial Revolution itself.

J. Galbraith connected the future of capitalism with the prospect of industrialization of society. Since capitalism appeared as a condition for industrialization and development, and was formed as a superstructure on the industrial basis, the history of industrialization must determine the history of capitalism. At the same time, the scientist clearly noted: capitalism is not immanently connected with industrialization and in their relationship there is no simple dependence of the type: if there is "a", then there must be "b". There is socialist industrialization, in the future we can assume something else.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 3.939	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.771	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Capitalism, being a factor in industrialization and completing industrialization with a socio-political, cultural superstructure, must be ready to compete not only for superiority in the economy, but also in the entire modern spectrum of social order.

At one time, capitalism defeated feudalism with its mobility, the struggle for the democratization and humanization of social relations, made it possible for the masses of people to work, updated the education system, opened the people's access to education, cultural development, and built a healthcare system. In a word, it was thanks to the victory of capitalism that industrialization revealed the possibilities of individual freedom on the scale of citizenship, and citizenship itself rose to the level of independence from class division, making it a formal status element for the common people. Will not the departure of capitalism destroy social progress, to which capitalism's contribution is indisputable?

J. Galbraith, whose ideas were very popular in the middle of the last century, connected the fate of capitalism not only with industrialization, but also with the behavior of capitalism itself, the need for it to develop itself. Past merits have become the property of history, work is needed on historical experience. What was an achievement a hundred years ago is outdated.

The conclusion of J. Galbraith looks quite modern: "The future of the industrial system," he argued, "on the contrary, is not subject to discussion." Consequently, the economic basis built by capitalism is needed by history. Only social progress requires its transformation into a new social construction of the social superstructure. Democratic and humanistic demands are developing. The personality does not want to go to the new time with old baggage, with past submission to industrial canons. If capitalism wants to continue capitalist history, it will have to turn back to the industrial baggage and bring the industrial system into line with the specifics of social progress.

Does history demand a new capitalism? Whether the "new capitalism" will be the development of the old history, its next round in social progress, or a transitional phenomenon to non-capitalism, is determined not only by the logic of the history of mankind itself. The stage itself also plays a significant role. To what extent it will be historically mobile. While experts use the term "model of capitalism". Bourgeois ideology is conservative and still hopes that capitalism will be able to pass the test of historical compliance with the logic of historical progress, to carry out the necessary restructuring, primarily by modernizing the industrial system, which was once its historically significant brainchild.

The historical situation has indeed formed a very interesting one. The bourgeois industrial system is stalling, but so far it is holding on, relying on state support, which is not spelled out in bourgeois legislation, which separates business and social

policy, but exists in practice. There are many forecasts for how long society will put up with growing contradictions, but they are concrete in the general format of abstract reasoning. Capitalism fulfilled the task entrusted to it by history - it carried out industrialization, of course, making a move with the "horse". On the one hand, he laid the scientific, technical, socio-cultural and industrial basis for the continuation of historical development, and adjusted industrialization to suit his special interests in development.

A historical product cannot be an eternal companion of the one who produced it. Having formed, it begins its own history in development, moving away from the creator. G. Hegel defined this process as "alienation", and K. Marx supported the idea of "opposing the product to the creator" due to the universality of development.

The Creator gradually loses control over the produced phenomenon, the contradictions in which grow and come into conflict with the previous development. And finally, the time comes when the creator becomes dependent on his work. The egg begins to "teach" the chicken what to do and how to do it right. If, as J. Galbraith argued, we continue to proceed from the fact that the goals of the industrial system - the increase in output that accompanies the growth of consumption, technological progress, the dominance of those ideas about public policy that serve to strengthen the industrial system - exhaust all the tasks of human life everything that we live by will serve these purposes. Everything that is compatible with these purposes, we will have or we will be allowed to have; everything else will be unavailable.

Critically thinking specialists warned statesmen and those who serve them with their advice, research, and recommendations that systemically significant movements in social life cannot be evaluated from one side in an effort to obtain the required knowledge. One-sidedness in any of its expressions dooms the knowledge of complex systemic formations to false progress, sows confusion. As a result of his reflections on the policy towards the established industrial system in the United States, J. Galbraith leaves no chance for those who are trying to stick to the course laid at the beginning of the history of modern capitalism. The course of the existing industrial system leads capitalism to a dead end: "... Textbooks, teachers and economists in high government positions constantly warn that judgments about an economical life are not judgments about life in general," - wrote J. Galbraith. "But, despite these warnings, economic criteria are uncritically elevated to the rank of decisive criteria for the effectiveness of public policy.

The rate of growth of national income and gross national product, and together with the level of unemployment, are still, one might say, the only measure of social achievement. This is the modern criterion of good and evil. It is assumed that Saint

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Peter will ask the one who knocks at the gates of paradise, only one question: "What have you done to increase the national product? J. Galbraith's sarcasm is appropriate, because simplifying the understanding of systemic relations and reducing them to a flat form of representation distorts the reflection of objective reality and forms the one-dimensionality of human awareness of reality. In a word, it deforms the consciousness of the individual.

The personality loses its orientation in the labyrinth of social relations, the fulcrum goes out from under the feet, uncertainty replaces the past belief in a favorable prospect. Together with the consciousness, the mental perception of what is happening also sways to dangerous proportions. The business atmosphere prevailing in the United States before the Second World War, relatively calm during the war, prevented the invasion of existential sentiments that captured Western Europe. However, pragmatism is less stable in comparison with existentialism, it must be constantly reinforced with success. Making a few hundred million successful in a world where uncertainty has become the other side of life is very difficult.

Let us explain why we analyzed the concept in such detail. J. Galbraith about the "new industrialization". We were interested in J. Galbraith's understanding of the logic of historical development, his desire to include capitalism as one of the stages of development in social progress, to reveal the mechanism of the systemic inclusion of capitalism in social advancement. The value of J. Galbraith's idea of the status of industrialization can best be interpreted in the context of the main discovery of K. Marx - the doctrine of the mode of production. Based on the concept of "mode of production", K. Marx built the concept of "socio-economic formation" and presented social progress as a natural process of changing socio-economic formations.

At the same time, in Marxist literature, structural relations within the formation were described as direct: the mode of production determines the specifics of the economic basis on which the socio-political superstructure and the specifics of social consciousness are built. There were many considerations about how the basis determines the uniqueness of the construction of the superstructure, but even more of them was that simplification that the classics called "mechanistic" as opposed to "organic" connections. For example, the terrorist struggle from the beginning was a product of the noted relationships, but the question remained open: how exactly?

J. Galbraith concretized with the help of the concept of "industrialization" the historical mechanism that links the economic and socio-political movement. The mode of production indirectly affects social development through the products of its movement. The transition to industrial production was accompanied by a large-scale restructuring of the

organization of labor; industrialization required specific social and political security in the form of the development of education, culture, science, and ideology. It included them in its implementation, leaving a corresponding imprint as a "tax" on development. Terror was not a product of industrialization itself, but the specifics of the sociocultural and political accompaniment of industrialization contributed to the sustainability of the reproduction of the terrorist struggle.

It is impossible to define "terror" and "terrorism" outside the historical context. No fantasy will help here. Terror and terrorism are phenomena of a common history - two attempts to enter the same river of Heraclitus. The professional hitch of terrorologists at the origins of the ascent of the terrorist struggle slows down the whole process. Yu. S. Gorbunov is right: "The whole process of study has a single basis - the definition of the very concepts of "terror" and "terrorism", since all subsequent studies are based on these concepts or operate with them. The reliability of both the conducted research and the results obtained sometimes largely depends on their correct definition.

Having puzzled colleagues in terrorism, Yu. S. Gorbunov made an attempt to correct the situation, but the promotion turned out to be traditional. Instead of offering his innovative move, restoring history in cognition, he went the path beaten in modern social sciences - he carried out a description of the presence of historical reality, partially reproduced 300 definitions of terrorism, and brought the rest into groups. Terror, however, remained on the sidelines.

A phenomenon is a product of real history, a concept is a product of the cognition of this history, a definition of a concept is a product of reflection on the products of cognition. "Reflexive definitions must be understood and have meaning each in itself, apart from the opposite definitions," G. Hegel explained, clarifying, but since their identity is assumed in the concept, each of the moments can be understood directly only from the others and together with others". For G. Hegel's dialectic, definition is a process that is not carried out from outside, it must be determined by the self-movement of the concept. Instead, Yu. S. Gorbunov resorts to the technology of external description, which, provided that the application is adequate, can only expand the definition. The classification of the possibilities of approaches to definition from the outside will not interfere with the definition, but it will not advance towards the required knowledge. In the study of the concept of "terrorism". – writes the cited author, – several approaches to its definition are used: biological, linguistic, sociological, political, international law, criminal law". Let's add humanitarian, cultural studies to this list, and instead of defining the concept, we will get a description of the phenomenon reflected in private ideas about it.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 3.939	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.771	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Terror and terrorism are multi-social phenomena. The socio-economic and socio-cultural nature of the terrorist struggle is concentrated in the political orientation. For specialized subject-matter scientific research, the predominance of interest in what creates the existing originality of a phenomenon is characteristic. Terrorologists, as a rule, do not single out from the very beginning of the analysis the actualization of the distinction between terror and terrorism. With great interest they compare terrorism with extremism, war, partisan movements, sabotage work, rather than with terror. Appeals to the concept of "terrorist struggle" are rare and the term itself is used even less often, the complicated term "terrorist activity" is used more often.

As an example, let us again refer to a detailed article by Yu. S. Gorbunov, Doctor of Law, Professor. The author, defining the importance of differentiating the concepts of "terrorism" and "terror" for the practical application of the theory, rightly emphasizes the need to take into account that practical and effective counteraction to terrorism requires a definition that would allow identifying terrorism as such, delimiting it from complex phenomena, and declaring it criminal punishable."

Recall that the author declared in the title of the article the relevance of the distinction between "terrorism" and "terror". It is not clear why, while defining the central problem, he forgot to concretize among the phenomena related to terrorism - terror. Perhaps this happened by accident, but let's not forget that through accidents, necessity makes its way. Referring to the history of terror, Yu. S. Gorbunov prefers a play of terms, he is more sympathetic to use the term "political opponent" when defining the object of terrorist actions. The history of terror began precisely in the context of the political struggle against the existing state, its structures, representatives and politics. Terrorists fought for dominance and political reorganization in society.

Even the League of Nations in 1937 in the Convention "On the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism" defined terrorism as a criminal act directed against the state. For the adoption of the Convention, 24 signatories were not enough, but terrorologists, if they do not want to be dependent on the ideological struggle, it is important not a formal, but a real assessment of terrorism. The concept should reflect the essence of reality as it is. The problem of the political "essence of essences" and the first derivative of its solution is the definition of the totality of subjects of the terrorist struggle, the most vulnerable place in the terroristological concepts of terrorism. In order to somehow reduce the degree of tension, terrorologists are shifting research towards the technological component.

In a crisis epistemological situation, Russian terrorologists are interested not so much in the object of cognition and the improvement of the

methodological approach to it, but in the description of particular methods in cognition. The essence of the essence can be defined exclusively as an extremely abstract content that has a universal scale in space and time. Terror and terrorism are multi-social phenomena in nature and political in the way they manifest their nature. Therefore, the accumulated empirical experience of studying them in private cognitive practices - historical, legal, sociological, political, cultural, psychological, economic can only provide material for reflection. The reflection itself requires a philosophical scale. Necessary:

first, to transform general ideas into concepts;

secondly, to carry out the ascent from the abstract form of the concept, which reflects the universality of the content, to the concreteness of a particular concept, in order to then give the concept the appearance of a concrete certainty of a single phenomenon, to determine terror and terrorism in their systemic historical status.

Simplifying, we will explain: first it is important to define the concept of "terrorist struggle". It includes all its forms - individual actions, organized terror, terrorism, international terrorism, terrorist attacks. From the historical experience of the development of the terrorist struggle, trace the transition of terror into terrorism, distinguish them in essence, define terror and terrorism, and, in conclusion, describe the modern form of terrorism. In this combination, terror and terrorism will appear in their essential unity, but within it they will have a qualitatively different status. To advance cognition, one should compare not conceptual author's concepts, but concepts with what it objectively reproduces in consciousness. Only after achieving clarity in reflection, it makes sense to inspect the differences in views. The researcher must first be extremely objective,

Comparison presupposes an objective binding of reflection. Terrorologists have it in the form of recognition of the real signs of a terrorist struggle, but separately taken signs characterize the concept one-sidedly. In the concept, the features of the content coexist systematically and only in the system reveal the essence of the concept. The system-forming features are not even equal in total to the content system formed by them. A one-sided view may be useful in the working order, but it is highly likely that it will lead the researcher into a dead end of knowledge. Utility is by no means always a prelude to the truth of knowledge.

In epistemology, despite all the existing contradictions, thanks to historical discussions, a certain order has developed, embodied in requirements and restrictions. It is not the reality expressed in concepts that is determined, but the concept itself, that is, first it is necessary to determine the content of the concept in order to agree on its definition later. It is expedient to differentiate specific

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582	PIHII (Russia) = 3.939	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.771	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

phenomena in the light of the tasks of cognition on the basis of a concept that has been formed.

In those cases where there is no general professional recognition of the correspondence of the content of the concept to a certain phenomenon, the method of conventional consent is used to overcome disagreements. Analyzing the specifics of making conventional decisions. K. Popper believed: "For a conventionalist, the acceptance of universal statements is determined by the conventional principle of simplicity. Therefore, the conventionalist chooses the simplest scheme." For clarity. Popper compared the choice of a conventionalist to the verdict of a jury. The verdict "plays the role of a true statement about the fact." However, it is obvious that from the very fact of acceptance of this statement by the jury, its truth does not necessarily follow. This circumstance is fixed in the legislation, which allows for the annulment or revision of the verdict of the jury.

In contrast to the mandatory presence of a jury, terrorologists complicate the problem in the correspondence form of literary creation. So it is easier to feel the correctness of their judgments. There is no expert around. The possibilities of the jury are also limited, they act strictly individually during the trial, which does not prevent them from discussing the case outside. It is certainly important to have your own opinion on how the concepts of "terror" and "terrorism" should be defined, while not forgetting that in the absence of an objectively determined content of positions, your understanding remains a form of opinion, and not objective - true knowledge.

B. V. Sidorov gives a definition of terrorism from the Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language by S. I. Ozhegov and N. Yu. Shvedova: "Terrorism is the policy and practice of terror." And he absolutely legitimately asks: what is the need to form thinking contrary to the rules of logic? It is quite obvious that the definition of terrorism in terms of terror will inevitably lead to a definition of terror in terms of terrorism. Those who do this do not understand that a widespread and steadily reproducing socio-political phenomenon cannot but have its own, albeit contradictory, ideology. The reality of the history of terror shows that the policy of terror was not impromptu.

P. A. Kropotkin is a well-known scientist and ideologist of one of the directions of anarchism. Western Europe knew him well as a major figure in science and as a revolutionary. Prince P. A. Kropotkin, the ancestor of the Ruriks, was an active participant in that political movement of Russian youth, from which an organization of revolutionary terrorists was formed in the late 1870s. The memoirs of P. A. Kropotkin give a clear understanding of the fact of the formation of an ideological concept among terrorists. Moreover, it differed within itself, as the critical awareness of what exactly should be the fight

against the arbitrariness of the absolutism of monarchical rule for democratic change continued.

P. A. Kropotkin also named the time of the formation of the ideology of terror - the interval between 1875 and 1878. Back in the early 1870s, P. A. Kropotkin clarified, "more than once we discussed in our circle the need for a political struggle, but did not come to any result. The apathy and indifference of the wealthy classes were hopeless, and the irritation among the youth had not yet reached the tension that would be expressed six or seven years later by the struggle of the terrorists under the leadership of the executive committee. Not only that - such is the tragic irony of history - the very youth that Alexander II, in blind fear and rage, sent hundreds into exile and hard labor, guarded him in 1871-1878. The very socialist programs of the circles prevented a repetition of a new attempt on the tsar. The slogan of the time was:

"The domestic revolutionaries of the seventies of the XIX century hoped that with their help in Russia what would happen in France in the seventies and eighties of the XVIII century, when peasant uprisings in 1789 forced the royal government to convene the National Assembly. Readiness for terrorist actions in Russia until the end of the 1870s. showed only individuals. "Organized circles were stubbornly against this," emphasized P. A. Kropotkin.

There is only one way to cognize the essence - through its reflection in the form of a concept. The concept may already exist, or it needs to be formed, in our case, by joint efforts of scientific and philosophical research of the object - the terrorist struggle. A simple example from the past, present and future of all healthy earthlings will reveal to non-specialists the "secret" of the roadmap for solving any significant problem. The whole family - the parents of the unborn child, relatives - are looking forward to an important event when he should become the next inhabitant of our planet. Everyone is happy, but happy in different ways. There is a problem: who will be born - a boy or a girl? Someone would really like a boy, like Peter the Great, who was forced due to the lack of an heir, to change the understanding of the biological status of the heir to the throne. For the first time in the history of Russia, a woman was placed on the throne of the Russian Empire.

The mismatch of priorities does not necessarily manifest itself outwardly, but it very often takes place. The nature of the incomplete alignment of interests, as a rule, is the desire of Peter the Great - exclusively - in the level of knowledge of what is happening. In order for everyone to have the same desires, it is necessary to elevate the reflection to a conceptual form. Understand who and what a child is? Moreover, to understand, not only abstractly, distracting from the concreteness of the life situation, but, on the contrary, precisely in the context of its originality. Let us recall the Hegelian form of development of the concept - at first it is formed as a universal knowledge - "a child

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

in general"; then, as special knowledge, conditioned by the actual reality; after which it is embodied in a concept that reproduces a single phenomenon of a common series.

"Terror" and "terrorism" are concepts of a common series. They reflect an asocial form of struggle for the right to political arbitrariness. Understanding their specifics is possible only by developing the general concept of "terrorist struggle". There is no other way. It's time for the terrologists to stop making definitions outside of a definite system of reporting. It is strange that lawyers, when discussing the differences between terror and terrorism, do not ask the classic question: who needs to immerse professional thought in the abyss of legal disputes, instead of turning their thinking towards the history of the terrorist struggle, giving knowledge a vector of objectivity? Why not take as the initial concept "terrorist struggle" as a general reflection in the cognition of the objects sought. Everything concrete is the form of its organization - "special", according to G. Hegel, the stages of the development of the concept.

Terror, like any socio-political phenomenon, has historically evolved, adapting, on the one hand, to changing conditions of action, and, on the other hand, feeling the need to realize the accumulated potential and experience of struggle. The essence of the content of the concept of "terrorist struggle" remained the same all the time, causing the vector of development, that part of the content that is formed as a derivative of the "core", "essence of essences" under the influence of the historical process changed. The terrorist struggle was not born apart from the historical movement. Its autonomy was originally dependent on the flow of historical change. Within the framework of systemic cognition, the terrorist struggle throughout its entire length retained the status of a subsystem in the structure of the socio-political organization of society. What the terrorists try, with little success, to.

Those who did not realize this fell into dependence on the ideological factor, which worked well on a speculative assessment of changes in the world after the liquidation of the Soviet Union. The terrorist struggle in the policy of constructing a new world architecture has become a relevant factor for individual states seeking to clear the way for the sole rule of the world or in the regions. World history is not a decree for them, they regard historical experience, which has convincingly demonstrated the illusory nature of world domination, as imperfect, hoping to win, relying on their economic, military-political advantage, believing themselves invulnerable.

It is naive to perceive the stability of the reproduction of the terrorist struggle over the course of millennia as a historical convention, dreaming of subordinating it, making it a regulated instrument of political struggle for the division of the world and

subsequent domination over it. Terrorists, in principle, are not against temporary alliances that help them in solving their political, financial, image problems, but being vassals of wealthy gentlemen is not included in their plans. You need to know the history of the terrorist struggle. You can't tame terrorists, you can only reduce their activity through real concessions. And here ideology enters into politics, with the help of which they want to achieve partial interaction with the terrorist movement.

In the last 30 years, there has been a tendency to differentiate terrorist organizations into especially dangerous, dangerous and conditionally dangerous, with which it makes sense to negotiate. Such an ideological device is conditionally productive, because the essence of the terrorist struggle is one, moreover, terrorists, understanding the significance of consolidated actions, actively correlate their relations. Examples of cooperation will be explained by the fact that the terrorists arbitrarily recorded objectionable. "Entire countries, perhaps not with the most civilized (if not odious) regimes, argue A. V. Kiba and V. A. Fedorov, without good reason began to be considered as a hotbed of international terrorism and rank them among the "axes of evil "Deserving punishment (produced into terrorists - Yu. M.). With this approach, the real danger, the authors conclude.

A. V. Kiba and V. A. Fedorov, historians, rely not on discourse, but on historical reality, which allows them to give an objective assessment of the phenomena under study. Noteworthy is their analysis of the 1997 BES definitions of "terror" and "terrorism". It would be necessary only on this example to show the ideological pressure of those years. The 1990s were a time of publishing activity funded by the Soros Foundation. The authors, unfortunately, did not indicate the name of the publishing house that issued the BES, but the spirit of the definition, the confusion in concepts are features characteristic of all the works of the Open Society Foundation.

Unfortunately, well-known authors also fell into ideological traps. In the absence of clear signs of terror and terrorism, they recognized the state as the subject of the terrorist struggle, contrary to history and logic. Terror arose not in the form of a simple political struggle, for example, against statesmen or individual manifestations of politics. The terrorists started their fight as a way of political reorganization of the state. Throughout their struggle was against the state for power. One can argue about many signs of a terrorist struggle, besides the fact that terrorists have always been the principal enemies of the state, logically understanding that it is the backbone of the existing political system, which they hate so much. The state is enemy No. 1 of all terrorists.

If the consciousness of specialists is in the control of professional thinking, and the critical component of reflection is based on systemic

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 3.939	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.771	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

foundations, then the mass of the population, as in the distant past, is dominated by phenomena of mental perception of what is happening, reflecting not so much the process as the results. Social progress is quite noticeable, it has not changed the worldview significantly. Internal and external contradictions along the entire perimeter of public life did not ease the uncertainty of the 1950s and 1960s; The mental state in a generalized form did not acquire stability. This is actively used by destructive political forces.

We needed a thorough analysis of the development of the political and economic situation in the modern world in order to better understand the strange effect when the forces that oppose social progress increase in spite of the achievements of progress in different parts of the world. There are social advances, but they are not so significant, and on the inconsistency of positive changes where they are especially needed with what is being done in more prosperous places; the disproportionate distribution of the benefits received, the unhealthy desire for political domination, are not seriously affected. All sorts of adventurers, nationalists, adventurers for big money are actively speculating on this, but those who are commonly called terrorists pose the greatest threat.

Terrorists are not born. In order for hundreds of thousands of people to become terrorists, special circumstances are needed, and in order for terrorism to be reproduced sustainably, socio-economic, political and socio-cultural factors are required.

Terrorist actions did not belong to those that kept the people of the United States in suspense during the time of J. Galbraith, so he nowhere brought his detailed systematic analysis to the relevance of counter-terrorist actions. All this was ahead, but in what happened next, the forces identified by J. Galbraith in the 1960s in the industrial system were at work.

The systematic approach in cognition is especially effective when it is combined with the requirements of dialectical methodology: to analyze the phenomenon comprehensively, in development, remembering that the truth is always concrete. The industrial system, so professionally developed by J. Galbraith, was a progressive factor, but what was reasonable during the formation of industrial capitalism, over time, lost its original values of a progressive factor in a social and spiritual format, became a brake on progress in its main goal - to increase the conditions for free development of the individual in the context of the cumulative historical movement. The individual ceased to feel comfortable in the socio-economic movement, began to experience pressure from economic and political structures, and lost the taste of life. Naturally, hesitation, throwing began.

No matter how significant the social achievements of industrialization were, they, according to the place of industrialization in social

progress, remained subordinate to its main goal - the improvement of the individual by developing the conditions for its free formation. The most important of these conditions is the humanization and democratization of the social environment. A person must "breathe" the air of freedom, move freely, communicate, learn to be a person corresponding to the rationality of his modern reality, strive to make his rationality prudence. It is not necessary for this to be a believer in a supernatural intelligent substance. It is quite enough to believe in man and the prudence of mankind. The understanding of prudence also changes both historically and depending on the maturity of the reasonableness of a single individual. There can hardly be a coincidence here.

The system-forming factor in understanding prudence is the central ideas of Confucianism, Christianity, Buddhism, summarized by I. Kant in the formula: "another person cannot be a means for you to achieve your goals." Being the goal of history, man must always remain the goal in history itself. Only with such a status are people able to develop a system of social form of life and develop personally in society.

In a society built on mutual respect for the manifestation of personal independence, contradictions will cease to be irreconcilable, competition will become a competition in which everyone will win. It is no coincidence that one of the fundamental messages of the Olympic Games is the statement: "The main thing is not victory, but participation." Participation, unlike victory, realizes the idea of the Olympics - to stop, even for a while, all conflicts, to feel the price of peace. If a few weeks can be made peaceful, then peace in the world is possible in principle. The world is not a phantom, but a real reality. Of course, just wanting to live a reasonable human life is not enough. This requires the rationality of the structure of the entire system of human life.

J. Galbraith, one of the first citizens of the United States, tried to objectively understand the development prospects of the society that K. Marx opposed to "civilian", rightly explaining that its shortcomings are of a systemic nature and within the existing system of industrialization they are incorrigible. The American scholar was not a Marxist, but he strove to act within the framework of objective assessments of historical experience. J. Galbraith, like A. Smith, believed in capitalism, however, not in the one that was built, but in the systemic potential of capitalism. Once capitalism has built the existing system of industrialization, it is able to replace it with a new industrialization. What is significant in his theory of capitalism is that he understood capitalism as a historical phenomenon that creates history by systematizing key historical processes. Capitalism produces a systematizing factor.

In the teachings of J. Galbraith, capitalism is traditionally identified with a democratic society. The

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 3.939	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.771	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

"problems" of capitalism are judged in terms of their inhumanity. The originality of J. Galbraith's thinking, which opposes his apologetics of capitalism, lies in the fact that he allows the search for a new industrial system in a broad socio-economic format, recognizes the historical significance of convergence with the experience of socialist industrialization. Such thinkers are sorely lacking in our century, when the politics of politics were squeezed into the vise of narrow political relations, replacing the systematic approach in the political analysis of relations with narrowly professional ones. "specialists are like a flux: their fullness is one-sided."

It is important for us, with the help of critical reflection, to understand the reasons for the large-scale activity of the terrorist struggle towards the end of the 20th century. Terrorism could not have asserted itself so significantly, relying on its fanatical and hired fighters. The ideas of terrorists and the practical actions of terrorist organizations turned out, unfortunately, not alien to society and effective in the light of their impact on the psyche of the civilian population. In connection with what happened and continues, I would like to note the warning of critical specialists, whom the political state elite of the United States and Western Europe did not want to listen to.

The dominant ideology preferred to be guided in the interpretation of social progress by macro indicators of economic development, believing that the economy is not only the basis of social progress, but also its system-forming factor, like a "needle" into which the life of the "immortal koshchei" was encoded. With such an approach to it, human life is simplified to the life of well-organized free-range animals. It slowly, imperceptibly, like a cancerous tumor, destroys thinking, the will to act, corrupts the perception of the world.

J. Galbraith formulated the basic problems caused by the existing system of industrialization and called on the society to think. They are still relevant, so we will give them in the author's edition: "To what extent should beauty be sacrificed for the sake of increasing output. And what moral values of a civilized person must be sacrificed in order for goods to be successfully sold, for there is no evidence that pure and complete truth is as useful for this purpose as despotic control of the will of the consumer through intrusive advertising. And how broadly should education be adapted to the needs of production as opposed to the needs of education? And to what extent should discipline be imposed on people in the name of securing more production? And to what extent should one expose oneself to the risk of unleashing a war in order to achieve the creation of new technology? And how completely should a person subordinate his personality to an organization created to satisfy his needs?"

The system of industry, created by the development of industrial capitalism, is one of the

factors for the sustainability of the reproduction of terrorism, it turned out to be a social instrument for the formation of the one-dimensionality of the human personality, the basis of its moral and socio-cultural crisis. The personal crisis is resolved through the struggle against socio-economic and political obstacles, without much interest in choosing its means, or makes the person indifferent to the struggle of the forces characteristic of the social movement. The return of a deformed personality from a crisis to a full-fledged social life occurs much less frequently. R. Dorendorf, G. Simmel, L. Koser believe that terrorism is supported precisely as a form of expression of social conflicts, as a result of the awareness of the opposition in the interests between managing subjects and managed objects. The existing industrial system does not allow objects to mature into subjects, and then they try to make this transition on their own, resorting to illegitimate actions. W. Lacker identified six key psychotypes of terrorism.

As a manifestation of the crisis in a personal format, nihilism is reborn - a phenomenon justified in the past, when a person fought against obvious vices of social development: the absolutism of monarchies, serfdom, class privileges of conventional culture and, despite numerous victims, could not achieve a positive result. Modern nihilism has its roots not so much in the social arrangement of life as in the thinking of the individual himself, in his refusal to critically comprehend what is happening around.

Under the nihilism of the 21st century, supporters of a consumerist attitude to life skillfully sum up ideological support. Critics of the industrial system for the most part valued its producing function and rarely looked for a way out of the crisis of the system in a society of "general consumption", "post-industrial society", etc., well understanding the dependence of the consumer goods industry on the ability to first produce them in sufficient quantity, assortment and desired quality. Entertainment, arrangement of leisure, recreation, are significant, but not they, but work in the industry of industrial and household products, in science, education, health care, forms the social frame of the individual.

Their usefulness is in another way - to ensure the comfort of life and, if possible, to correct the reflection of the personality of reality. In addition, the availability of services is very unevenly distributed among consumers, exacerbating social contradictions, encouraging the masses to conclude: "everything is bad!". Nihilism is formed, first of all, as a sense of the world, a worldview, however, the primary, sensual state of nihilism is ready to develop into a system of worldview reflection of the world.

Nihilism has changed historically and nationally, keeping its essence invariant - to be one-sided in its assessment of the social movement. More than a hundred years ago, P.A. Kropotkin emphasized: "In Western Europe, nihilism is completely

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

misunderstood; in the press, for example, they constantly confuse it with terrorism and stubbornly call nihilism the revolutionary movement that broke out in Russia towards the end of the reign of Alexander II and ended in his tragic death. To confuse nihilism with terrorism is like confusing a philosophical movement, such as Stoicism or Positivism, with a political movement. First of all, nihilism declared war on the so-called conditional lies of cultural life... Nihilism recognized only one authority - reason. According to his philosophical concepts, the nihilist was a positivist, an atheist, an evolutionist in the spirit of G. Spencer, or a materialist. He spared.

To the opinion of P.A. Kropotkin should be listened to, but it was not the only one. Nihilists attracted the attention of I. Turgenev, I. Goncharov, N. Chernyshevsky. Each of them described this phenomenon in his own way, trying to reveal the human and social meaning and social significance. Ultimately, independently of each other, they came to a common conclusion about the one-sidedness of the critical thinking of nihilists. Over time, this vice of nihilism only intensified as it spread.

The activation of nihilism in modern times, its content monotony, makes this attitude towards the world socially dangerous. An older contemporary of J. Galbraith, a German sociologist, recognized as one of the founders of existentialism, K. Jaspers wrote: "Nihilism, powerless at the beginning of its individual manifestations, becomes over time the dominant type of thinking at the present time (mid-1950s), it seems even possible that the entire heritage of the past, beginning with the axial time, will be lost, that the history of mankind from Homer to Goethe will be forgotten. It sounds like a foresight, threatening humanity with death. Reinforcing the idea of the global danger of nihilism as a total denial, K. Jaspers clarifies: "The collapse of traditional values is revealed only in the fact that this revealing thinking becomes dominant." And then an important thought follows: "The era creates a theory of what it does. However, this theory itself soon turns into a means of strengthening the evil with which it fights.

Nihilism has degenerated into a theory of the denial of everything, which inevitably leads this doctrine to the search for an understanding of what can help overcome the stalemate within the framework of the main nihilistic idea. Denial is an effective means, but a means in the absence of a constructive goal is meaningless. Nihilism does not suggest the direction of the search - the simplification of the world, this is what makes nihilism a theory that decomposes consciousness. Consciousness afflicted with nihilism becomes another condition for the sustainable reproduction of terrorism.

The substitution of the concept of "simplicity" for the concept of "simplification" is a purely sophisticated operation. The terms almost coincide,

therefore, the correlation must retain its meaning, argue the nihilist theorists, and after them the consciousness of simple nihilists, subordinate to the general idea, will move. The easier it is for a nihilist, the less he has to think for himself. Modern nihilists have long turned the rationality of thinking into the ability of consciousness to consume finished products. Thinking is annoying. All misfortunes are attributed by nihilists to a certain phantom, the name of which we find either among historical formations that were once open to theoretical knowledge - capitalism, liberalism, Marxism, Christianity, etc. are to blame for everything. - that's the diagnosis. To Jaspers, who was, in fact, a hostage of Hitler during the entire time of the Nazi rule. The Nazis were not among the nihilists, but they began precisely with the denial of the work of their own great thinkers - Goethe, Kant, Hegel, Marx, arranging a demonstrative burning of their works in the form of public actions. The continuation of their ideological violence after Hitler's well-known book differed little in content from the idea of universal denial.

The simplification of knowledge under the guise of the thesis that "truth is simple" is in conflict with the history of human rationality. K. Jaspers clearly distinguished between "simplicity" and "simplification". "Simplicity," he explained, "is the image of the true. "Simplification" is violence taking the place of moderate simplicity. Simplicity allows for an infinite number of interpretations, it is a world in a small, filled and moving. Simplification is finite in its essence, it is a thread that moves us like puppets, it does not allow development, it is empty and motionless. Our time is the time of simplifications," K. Jaspers concluded.

It was hardly possible to foresee in the late 1940s that the installation of indoctrination on a simplified awareness serves not only to dehumanize thinking, helps to occupy understanding with consumer ideas, to absolutize individualism as a struggle against everyone, but also leads to the intensification of the terrorist struggle, was hardly possible. Mankind has gone through a period unprecedented in terms of concentration of violence, so consciousness still remained in captivity of this violence. Few people thought about the danger of terror itself at that time, but the terrorists and their sponsors, who remained in the shadow of the arbitrariness perpetrated by the Nazis and fascists, imagined the future in their own way. They were satisfied with the deformed mental state of the masses, simplistically assimilating what had happened, nihilism in the worldview, testifying to the denial of the past, present and uncertainty in the future. Sunset of old Europe victory over Nazism, fascism did not give stability to the vector of social movement for a future free from violence. There were still more questions about the structure of life than clear and reasoned answers.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIHII (Russia)	= 3.939	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.771	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Crisis symptoms of the development of thinking were not long in coming in the face of growing socio-economic and political contradictions. The creativity of thinking, apparently, reaches its highest values in the process of formation of a systemic nature by the movement. After the movement system has developed, its innovative features have appeared, the system is conserved, ensuring the stability of its functioning. Further, the system begins to absolutize its development within the framework of the developed principles and rules governing this process. To the signs of progress are added the defects of the system. The system requires modernization, in which not everyone is interested, contradictions are growing.

As the functioning of social systems in the relationship of the individual with society, their political, economic, socio-cultural accompaniment inevitably increases the signs of discontent: moral, technological and other nature. By this time, socially and economically significant subsystems, such as industrial ones, penetrate and subjugate various spheres of public life. First of all, spirituality suffers - an indicator of the quality of thinking. Simplification and nihilism leave no chance for freedom of movement of thoughts. Reflection is constrained by the usefulness of the action for the system. The freedom of thought of the ruling elite, shackled by the demands of the system, is being lost, and the political will is being weakened.

In the late 1940s, P. Sorokin, summing up his sociological and political research, came to a sad conclusion: "While I am writing these lines, a terrible disastrous storm is about to break out in the world around us. The very fate of mankind is balancing on the verge of life and death. The forces of a cruel and unrighteous social order that is fading into the past are violently sweeping away everything that opposes it. In the name of God, in the name of the values of progress and civilization, capitalism and communism, democracy and freedom, in the name of human dignity and under other slogans, they destroy these values themselves to the ground.

The Russian scientist, who became a professor at prestigious American universities, looked for the causes of the crisis in the spread of decadence, which simplified the essence of social relations, focusing on the pretentiousness of fantastic forms. "The soulless elite of the East and West and most of all mankind have not yet made the right choice," wrote P. Sorokin. Born in a decadent atmosphere without spirituality, they still believe, live and act according to the obsolete norms of this decaying social and cultural order. Instead of constructive creation, they continue fruitless attempts to solve problems with bombs and missiles. Instead of resolving conflicts following the Sermon on the Mount, there is still a show of force, mutual intimidation and extermination.

The modern industrial system is locally interested in the creative forces of the mind, but the

very thinking of people is rigidly built into this system and it needs it exactly in the form that satisfies the requirements of the system. The preparation of thinking is limited to the search for ready-made solutions. A person gradually ceases to think independently, losing the system-forming property of the mind. Evidence of the crisis of reasonableness of thinking is the minimization of the ability to be surprised. Surprise is an indicator of interest in reflection. The students of Aristotle's Lyceum were engaged in walking in groups in order to enjoy the freedom to reflect and argue. Aristotle himself taught that knowledge begins with wonder. IP Pavlov, studying the process of reflex connections of the organism with the environment at the level of animals, discovered a special type of reflex, calling it "research".

The "exploratory reflex" is significant as a tool for the subsequent organization of behavior. All signs of the quality of reflection in consciousness - abstraction, generalization with the help of the second signal system - words, anticipatory reflection - work in conjunction, creating conditions for the activity of thinking. Reducing the activity of consciousness to the search for ready-made solutions is an example of a simplified consumer understanding of thinking, an obvious desire to limit the creativity of thinking.

The orientation of ideology towards the consumer direction of education is an indicator of the crisis not only of the industrial system, but also of politics. This crisis is growing due to the spread of "advanced" experience to new states that have emerged after the collapse of the USSR. The Bologna agreements can be qualified as achievements of transnational cooperation. They contain many interesting solutions to complex problems, but they are developed in rich Western Europe. To successfully implement them, financial resources are needed, which are clearly beyond the strength of the countries of the Eastern part of the continent. There is information on the Internet that the financial capabilities of universities in the USA, Western Europe (Germany) and the Russian Federation are correlated in a ratio of 100:10:1. In the absence process of reflex connections of the organism with the environment at the level of animals, discovered a special type of reflex, calling it "research".

The "exploratory reflex" is significant as a tool for the subsequent organization of behavior. All signs of the quality of reflection in consciousness - abstraction, generalization of competencies is directly dependent on how well the personality is formed. The competence-based model of higher and secondary education organization is rational not in its own form, but as an application to the classical, proven for thousands of years, personal paradigm, which has always been costly materially, financially, culturally, professionally.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

The system-forming factor of personality-oriented enlightenment and education is objectively focused on the formation of the ability of creative thinking. At the same time, in the third millennium it is no longer modern to talk about thinking as the main goal of education, because thinking is only a tool for the self-education of consciousness, we should talk about the creativity of thinking, its ability to productively independent actions. Only in this case, the formation of all other abilities of the individual will be constructive-critical, innovative. The possibility of deformation of personal development is minimized, which will protect both the individual and society from destructive thinking and behavior.

The cruelty of the terrorist struggle is designed specifically for the deformed personality. The terrorist struggle is akin to the action of primitive art, popular at the beginning of the 20th century. The calculation is based on the ultimate simplification of the perception effect. Some terrorists must intimidate, suppress their will to resist, others must be forced to think in line with terrorists. Terrorists have a lot in common with Nazis and Fascists. All these political conceptions ideologically converge on the well-known position: the leader should think, the rest should only do what best suits their plans of struggle.

In reforming education, the focus is not on the philosophical potential of thinking, but on the decisive importance of methodological and technical skills in the search for knowledge. Pupils and students are taught not to think, but to remember. The spiritual leader of the Frankfurt School of Sociology, E. Fromm, noted: "If it is true that an intelligent person is, first of all, one who is able to be surprised, then this statement is a sad commentary on the mind of modern man. With all the virtues of our high literacy and universal education, we have lost this gift - the ability to wonder. It is assumed that everything is already known - if not to ourselves, then to some specialist who is supposed to know what we do not know. We think that it is most important to find the right answer, and asking the right question is not so essential.

Based on the history and logic of the terrorist struggle, the state can in no way be a social subject of either terror or terrorism. Even if the terrorists win, the state formed by them will not be a subject of terror on formal grounds, and in real history, having created a state, terrorists will be forced to change the emphasis and scale of their political actions. The Taliban has been designated a terrorist organization by the United Nations. The relevant decision was also made at the level of the UN member states. The policy of the Taliban, in a number of significant ways, fit the definition of a terrorist struggle.

However, even at the time when the organization was fighting against the limited continent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan and at war with the government of the DRA, it did not represent a completed classical form of the terrorist movement. In Afghanistan at the

end of the 20th century, there was a real civil war. Following the practice of recognizing as terrorist movements that did not have a full set of signs of the content of the concept of "terror" or "terrorism", without tension, "Makhnovists", "Petliurists" can be added to the number of terrorist organizations, but they are not inscribed in history as terrorists.

It is important for ideologists of the terrorist struggle itself, and those who express the more general interests of the policy of "controlled chaos" or "unipolar world", to leave the definitions of terror and terrorism in the form of incomplete certainty, so that it would be more convenient to use terrorists for provocations. We will not agree with the differentiation of terror into individual, group, state and collective, and in terms of goals - into criminal and political. Terror and terrorism are immanently political in nature and politically oriented, and until politicians and lawyers single out terrorist crimes in a special category, like Nazism, fascism, genocide, they will all be criminal.

The US surrendered Afghanistan to the Taliban. The Taliban for the second time formed the state administration of the country. What should the UN and other states do? USA, Germany, Great Britain are far beyond mountains, seas, oceans. In neighbors: Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Iran, Pakistan. The people of Afghanistan must be helped to restore the country, which was destroyed not without the participation of peacekeepers. The Taliban are aware of this, they are not going to fight again with their people - Pashtuns, Uzbeks, Tajiks, judging by official statements and visits. The world community should decide what type of terrorist struggle the Taliban belongs to and act accordingly.

If the "Taliban" is a terrorist movement of the "terrorism" type, then it is necessary to continue the fight against them uncompromisingly. At the same time dooming the people of the country to suffering, which is not humane and undemocratic. And if the Taliban is a terrorist organization of the "terror" type, then there is the prospect of its evolution. The UN backed the US assessment of the Taliban's connection to al-Qaeda, recruited by the CIA, bin Laden. The fact that the Taliban is not an organization of angels has been clear to everyone for a long time. But this confidence cannot serve as a basis for "stretching" the signs of the organization to the definition of "terrorist" such as "terrorism". The UN made a decision, history entrusted it to return to it again in new circumstances of historical reality. But this time it will be necessary to determine the status of the Taliban not by connections, but in accordance with real practice. The reality is that the Taliban have shown a willingness to fight IS.

Doctor of Law, Professor B. V. Sidorov proposed the following definition of "terrorism", specifying that he does this within the framework of a single general criminal law, but in fact, instead of

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

defining the concept, a description of a real movement was obtained: "Terrorism is the ideology and practice of intimidating the population through terror ..." The following is a listing of all types of acts united in the content of the concept of "terrorism". We are not experts in describing criminal activities. The general impression is that the author has succeeded in bringing together, at least, all that terrorists are capable of, so the practical legal value of the particular composition of the definition is undeniably significant. But the author could not resist the temptation to intervene in the relationship between "terrorism" and "terror" and participate in the discourse.

BV Sidorov distinguishes between terrorism and terror as a whole and part of a criminal phenomenon of political origin (at least in terms of scale). Terror is nothing but a method and means of carrying out terrorism. Behind the façade of the definition are both variants of a logical continuation: the possibility of the existence of terror as an autonomous political practice, and its absolute predicate dependence on terrorism in the context of an instrument of implementation.

As a result, the problem of defining terrorism is solved in the author's wording, but there is no "terror", because the author comes into clear conflict with history. Terror initially contained all the signs of a socio-political struggle: ideology, target certainty, methods of action and means. Such an obvious simplification in the characterization of terror makes the author's conclusion excessively arbitrary and subjective.

The researcher will easily pay attention to the fact that the reduction of terror to an auxiliary function of terrorism opens up the prospect for recognizing terror as a means of a different policy than terrorism, for example, state policy. It is no coincidence that terrorologists have a popular idea to distinguish between terror and terrorism depending on the social subject. The subject of terror is the state or its power structures, and terror is directed against the citizens of the country. Terrorism, on the other hand, is a weapon of subjects other than the state and serves as a means of "punishing" the state. Everything is simple and understandable, thanks to simplicity, but the fact that such a division of terror and terrorism contradicts the history of the terrorist movement and leads to the substitution of other concepts is not so significant.

S. I. Kuzina drew attention to the fact that in the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation there is no definition of terror, there is only a description of terrorism (Article 205), which can be qualified as recognition of the identity of these concepts in the context of criminal law. The definition of terrorism in the Federal Law "On Counteracting Terrorism" is interesting. We will give this definition in full, as it is the most capacious and accurate: "Terrorism is the ideology of violence and the practice of influencing decision-making by state authorities, local governments or international organizations,

associated with intimidation of the population and (or) other forms of illegal violent actions".

The reality of the escalation of the danger of terrorism into a threat to the global process of social development forced the General Session of the United Nations to accept the relevance of the counter-terrorism struggle. In 1972, the "Special Committee on International Terrorism" was formed, which failed to develop a generally acceptable definition of terrorism. After 22 years, the UN General Conference returns to the political interpretation of the fight against terrorism and in Resolution No. 49/60 "Measures to eliminate international terrorism" a definition of terrorism is given. "Terrorism is a criminal act aimed at or calculated to create a climate of terror among the general public, a group of persons or specific persons for political purposes, which under no circumstances can be justified by any considerations of political, philosophical, ideological, racial.

In official documents, the content of terrorism is due to the desire to improve its practical activities, therefore they try to avoid the possibility of discrepancies in the text. The said Resolution uses both sought-for terms: both "terrorism" and "terror". "Terrorism" is defined as a concept of a collective type, the content of which is disclosed in detail and a fundamental assessment is given of the attitude towards it as a movement that is incompatible neither with social progress in general, nor with humanistic and democratic ideals developed in social development. "Terrorism" as a phenomenon of political struggle is classified as extreme asocial actions, since it absolutizes violence against all people without exception, therefore, in terrorism inhumanity reaches its highest values. Simply put, terrorism is a lawlessness of violence.

The term "terror" is also used in the Resolution, but in a narrow sense - to characterize a special intensity of fear, madness. "Terror" is a state of hopelessness in the public mind, a crisis of hopes, a willingness to unconditionally submit to the plans of terrorists. Summarizing: "terror" is the price of terrorist actions, what needs to be created in order to achieve the ultimate goal - political and social reorganization in society. W. Lacker also defines terrorism as "the illegitimate use of force to achieve a political goal by threatening innocent people." If we ignore the details in the definition, W. Lacker's terrorism looks like an illegal force, the name of which is "terror".

Many terrorologists identify terror with the instrumental part of terrorism. The instrumentalist version of terror has an obvious weakness. Consciously or not quite, they restore Robespierre's interpretation of terror, simplifying the understanding of the latter. Robespierre had in mind terror not as a means of politics, but as the very policy of combating the enemies of revolutionary conquests. It is

Impact Factor:

SIRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

historically wrong to reduce terror to instruments of political struggle; it began as a way of political struggle based on specific methods and means. This is how its architecture should be presented.

The questions are different: has terror survived as a political force, or has history transformed it? Terrorism - the heir of terror or a form of political struggle parallel to terror? It is required to find out the degree of kinship of these two political movements, to solve the problem: how, exactly, terror and terrorism are connected - with the development of the terrorist struggle, or functionally. Such problems presuppose philosophical analysis. It is necessary to assess the situation historically, to what extent these versions fit into the process of social development, namely:

Firstly; epistemologically, what level the process of cognition has reached in scientific studies: whether it continues in the form of thinking with general ideas or has entered the circle of conceptual reflection of the desired phenomena;

secondly, methodologically - to what extent are dialectical methodology and modern methods of general scientific knowledge involved in the process of cognition, primarily, a systematic approach?

We will also have to give an ontological analysis of the discourse - how carried away the terrorologists in the discussion are by clarifying the advantages of their versions, leaving aside the socio-political nature of the analyzed phenomena.

The tasks defined above cannot be solved within the limits of a specialized scientific and professional research. Lawyers, political scientists, sociologists, psychologists and, even more so, linguists, consider the object in detail, each in his own way. The available philosophical generalizations are of interest to them in passing, and their own comprehensive works on the topic are clearly not enough, no monographs have been found at all. For some reason, philosophers did not consider the problem relevant, entrusting the analysis to narrow specialists. We do not pretend to solve all the problems put forward for discussion, but we can start the process of philosophical research. The relevance of clarifying the reasons for the effectiveness of the counter-terrorist struggle determines the inclusion of the main philosophical forces in it.

The problem of including philosophical reflection in any current topic is not so much in the complexity of the object, but in the inconsistency of philosophy itself. It has never been the cumulative achievement of like-minded people. On the contrary, all its achievements in the knowledge of the world and knowledge as a process are not the fruits of cooperation. It is a product of competitive struggle in thinking. At the same time, philosophy would not have been able to have two and a half thousand years of history if something like anchors did not exist in philosophical discourses, preserving the definite position of a ship.

Philosophy replaced mythology and religion, also based on myths and belief in them, at that historical time when it became clear that it was time for the mind to descend from the heights of fantasy to explore what exists next to man and with him. The development of civilization demanded knowledge capable of improving the resistant potential of "homo sapiens" by turning on the active forces of reality transformation. The progress of civil society needed to develop its stability and democracy as conditions for the free development of the individual. It was necessary with the help of reason to overcome the state of constant struggle provoked by the consciousness of national superiority. This could be done only by realizing the single path of civilized progress. This time of historical enlightenment of the universality of history, K. Jaspers called "Axial".

We repeated the truths that have become capital for the mind, they are known to everyone in the third millennium thanks to education, which generalizes and reproduces the cultural part of social advancement. The quality of politics, which politicians themselves still do not want to properly understand and appreciate, is determined practically through the quality of education, its readiness to arm the consciousness of the individual with conviction in the all-conquering power of human rationality, the highest manifestation of which, by right, is recognized as the spirituality of the thinking of the individual.

It remains to add to the conclusion of E. Fromm: not so much we have lost the ability to be surprised and ask questions, but the reformers of the tools of spiritual and intellectual development helped us. Of course, there is no reason to accuse them of complicity with terrorists or to consider them accomplices of terror, they fulfilled the requirements of the industrial system created by industrial capitalism. The system needs thinkers in a very limited number. The rest are screws and nuts, a detailed and completely replaceable product without any problems.

The evidence of a reversal in the history of education is alarming. It began with an attitude towards the development of a culture of thinking. Socrates taught his fellow citizens to think for free on the streets and squares according to a specially developed methodology. He equated the achievement of true knowledge by thinking with the birth of a child. Aristotle instructed: it is necessary to teach not thoughts, but to think. Confucius repeatedly repeated to his students: "... learning without reflection is useless."

Philosophical works are read by amateurs and professionals. Meanwhile, in the media, on the Internet, almost everyone is ready to be an expert in the field of the quality of the activity of consciousness. There is a lot of subjectivity in the interpretation of the basic concepts that describe a person. In particular, consciousness is replaced by thinking. Thinking is a special property of the developed central nervous

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

system, or simply the brain. Consciousness is a generating feature of the human personality. It is formed by the activity of thinking as a social subject. Thinking is a tool for improving consciousness, it cannot be identified with consciousness.

The process of development of thinking is extremely significant for consciousness and, ultimately, for the individual. Personality is an indicator of the level of socialization of a person. Whether a person is a terrorist or dedicates himself to the fight against terror is determined by the state of consciousness of the individual. That is why thinking throughout civilization, starting from Antiquity, was given special attention.

Mental activity is carried out at two levels: it can be aimed at the production of knowledge and at the consumption of knowledge. To have two methodologies as a basis - to comply with the requirements of the logic of consistency, to recognize only one of two opposing judgments as true, or to act in conditions of contradictions, resolving their relations in a synthesis.

G. Hegel introduced the formula of dialectical thinking - the triad, outwardly commensurate with the Christian idea of the triune God. God the Father formally opposes God the Son, but in essence there is no such contradiction, it is removed by God the Holy Spirit. Terrorists work successfully where thinking is simplified, and since in the simplified version thinking is organized by mass education, the terrorists have someone to count on, replenishing their ranks. Simplified - uncritical thinking potentially serves terrorists and is another factor in the sustainability of the reproduction of terrorism.

K. Jaspers, exploring the history of education, made a number of interesting generalizations: "In education as a form of life, its core is discipline as the ability to think, and the environment is education in the context of knowledge. Its material is the contemplation of the images of the past, the knowledge of the necessary significant views, the knowledge of things and the command of the language. Not a little, taking into account that a person should not just have all this as a sum, but make it a component of his being.

Knowledge is not enough. Formal knowledge, not comprehended by force, can only be capable of contemplating life. The real life of a person is based on the knowledge that has become her convictions. Conviction is not always true, although every conviction is born in experience - sensual, intellectual and practical. The condition of true conviction is the quality of the analysis of experience.

Experience should be comprehensive, verified at all stages of the process. A conviction built with all the necessary and sufficient procedures in mind is not limited by the knowledge of something recognized, personal, social group. A belief is a systemically built recognition by a social subject of an explanation of a

particular phenomenon that is significant for the manifestation of a person's vitality both as a unique reality and in a social group. It is the last step towards overcoming the difference between consciousness and reality. The next step should be the embodiment of the product of knowledge in practical action - the process of objectification of knowledge. Therefore, for the reproduction and promotion of terrorist ideas, it is so important to suppress the creativity of thinking.

The prerequisites for creative thinking were formed even before the birth of "homo sapiens". They participated in its formation, being part of the biological heritage. In addition to species reflexes inherent in all representatives of a given species and registered in heredity, the life of living beings is provided by conditioned reflexes that have been formed in individual and group experiments. They are not inherited, but are acquired in the presence of existence, through familiarization with the specifics of direct life experience - the circumstances of private existence. Conditioned reflexes correct the adaptation of the organism, built in species experience, and help the stability of protective adaptations. Over time, some conditioned reflexes turn into unconditioned ones, renewing and enriching the visual possibilities.

Creativity as the ability to think out of tune with everyone, not in the way that everything promotes the viability of an individual first, then a social, collective subject. It has been verified by the experience of evolution and "approved" by nature as a force for progress. The concept of "axial time" introduced by K. Jaspers to characterize that stage of the cultural evolution of "homo sapiens", when humanity realized at the initial stage the universality of its history, has no direct relation to our topic, but it is significant for understanding the history of "homo sapiens" itself. With the discovery of the unity of the historical path, the modern stage in the development of human rationality begins, which has not yet matured into a universal real history. There is already an understanding of universality, but it has been achieved as a contemplation of historical patterns; there is no universal conviction in it. In the same time, there are still many who want to continue "scattering stones." Those who see the meaning of history in the absolutization of the specifics of existence.

Recognition of a single history in no way means recognition of globalization. We are talking about integration processes of development that, under the conditions of systemic formations, preserve the specificity of movements, in the general system, of individual socially stable formations. Globalization is yet another attempt to falsify the dialectical understanding of development; therefore, it has the right to consider it as an ideological factor in supporting destructive political concepts, mainly of nationalist and religious persuasion. Globalization irritates and provokes the supporters of these views and beliefs to active resistance to the order that has

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

developed in the social process, which then becomes violence against truly creative historical processes.

Creativity is characteristic of all manifestations of thinking: intellectual, sensual, practical, which was brilliantly shown by the sculptor Rodin in his masterpiece - The Thinker. Rodin's "Thinker" bears little resemblance to a philosopher, a prophet, a scientist. This is a collective image of the creative thinking of a modern reasonable person. It is necessary to clearly place in the organization of education the accents defined in its thousand-year history. And above all, an assessment of the status of knowledge. The aphorism: "Informed, therefore, armed", is significant only in the most abstract interpretation. It needs a detailed explanation.

Objective knowledge is a product and weapon of thinking, but its interpretation and use depend not only on the objectivity of the content of knowledge, as a reflection of reality in thinking. What will be the interpretation of knowledge and how it will be used, decides the consciousness of the individual. Hence the conclusion: we do not want to distort the essence of knowledge, we must be responsible for the education of the individual and an adequate awareness of knowledge within social subjective formations. This is not about violence, but about the organization of thinking with the help of philosophical, scientific and religious heritage, tested and discussed by dozens of generations of thinkers.

K. Popper recalled: "At the London School of Economics, I had students from various parts of Africa, the Middle East, India, Southeast Asia, China, Japan, and I was convinced that all difficulties can be overcome with a minimum of perseverance shown by both sides. If there was an obstacle that was not so easy to overcome, it was usually the result of the forcible imposition of Western ideas. Dogmatic, uncritical teaching in poor Western-style schools and universities, and especially the absorption of Western verbiage and Western ideologies, have been, in my experience, far more serious obstacles to rational discussion than any divergence between cultures and languages.

From the outside, it seems that each river lays its own course, in fact, its course is due to the natural order. The river uses it, polishing separate sections of the path. Something comparable is happening in society. The individual will have to think and decide. The trick here is that a person educated within the limits of the achievements of science and philosophy, imprinted in the education program, will move through the labyrinth of knowledge with a source of light, but a simply literate or not quite literate person will move independently, hoping for random help. Incidental assistance to such subjects is most often ready to be provided by extremists who need fighters without reasoning. Extremists are sometimes called "soul-catchers", which is correct.

The weapon to protect true knowledge from falsification can only be systematically built and tested by social practice knowledge, knowledge in the form of understanding. To the above, we add that the history of science has entered the next round of development, which will have to significantly correct the usual cognitive ideas. From now on, the location of separately taken, including non-singular facts that contradict the description accepted in the theory, does not serve as a basis for refuting the theoretical interpretation of their nature and relations. In order to reasonably criticize the theory, it is necessary to bring these facts into a system and confirm the legitimacy of all the procedures used in cognition. Criticism has acquired a systemic character, the concept of "constructive criticism" has become more specific.

The systematic arrangement of knowledge made us take a fresh look at knowledge as the wealth of a "reasonable person". A new understanding of the value of knowledge is still a limitation associated with knowledge of the personality, its behavior and activities. Enlightenment and education in a mass manifestation lag behind both the actual transformations of reality and the development of an understanding of the value of knowledge in science and philosophy. Such a discrepancy does not contradict development to certain values, after which enlightenment and education, inadequate to real and cognitive progress, become a brake on progress, but such a discrepancy carries a special social danger as a factor on which various extremist movements, speculating precisely on defective knowledge. The greatest threat is just that, what modern designers of education are proud of, the absolutization of the process of formal familiarization with knowledge, and not the significance of their development by consciousness. Heraclitus two and a half thousand years ago already knew and instructed: "Much knowledge does not teach the mind."

The history of the Russian Federation at the end of the 20th – the initial decade of the current century is indicative. In the 1990s, social engineers decided to radically change the model of education in Russia. They liked the foreign experience of education, especially higher education, more. In addition, well-known financial speculators and schemers like Soros promised to help. Within ten years, domestic reformers managed, using powers of authority, to abandon the "holy trinity" of staging education around the entire perimeter - to "expel" ideology from education - to dehumanize; to minimize national traditions - to denationalize and "dissect" a person in education like a corpse in an anatomical room, decomposing it into competencies - to dehumanize. Competences from personality traits have acquired the status of substances. How these masters imagined to carry out the reverse process - to systematize competencies into a person, remained a mystery of their "sacred action". In essence, education was

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIHIQ (Russia)	= 3.939	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.771	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

“decapitated”, deprived of its sacred and personal meaning, having also received a European allowance for methodological expenses for its focus.

It is not surprising that it was during these decades that there was a surge in terrorist activity on the territory of the former USSR. The terrorists have taken advantage of the fruits of an intellectually and spiritually sequestered education. Figuratively speaking, they replaced the values of a disorganized personal consciousness with their primitive, but understandable surrogate tales. There was no one to organize mass active resistance to terrorists. Moreover, apparently, they have replenished the ranks of their bandits. At the same time, banditry in the country recalled the scale of its history during the period of the civil war.

To integrate into something more perfect is a natural thing. And in Russia, and in Western Europe, and in the USA, and in the East, valuable organizational experience has been formed in educational policy. Firstly, at any arbitrarily chosen time, except for the very beginning, we will have before us a product that has absorbed development, brushing aside which is the same as disconnecting from our history, that is, from ourselves, losing national self-sufficiency.

Secondly, history has long convinced everyone capable of normal thinking that it is being updated as a product of the struggle between the reasonable and the not quite, not quite reasonable and unreasonable. There has never been a perfect story, and there never can be. Hence the conclusion for all lovers of correcting the historical process: it is pointless to replace the continuation of national history with something else. This “something” can be an exclusively different national or transnational history in a local version. In Russia they say: “it makes no sense to change the awl for soap.” But national historical development is part of the world process, it goes on in the general system, and when there is a need to correct something, it is quite reasonable to try to correct the national experience at the expense of interesting and promising developments of the supranational or other national experience. “Social engineers” without engineering education and possession of dialectical thinking lead the reform to social tension, so desired by extremists of all kinds, including terrorists. Moreover, no one has yet punished such reformers in proportion to their deeds.

Creative thinking is at the same time a necessary condition for both social construction and in-depth systemic knowledge. Without creativity, it will not be possible to overcome the inconsistency of immersing thinking in the essence of things, there will not be a personal reasoned position in assessing an epistemological or practically significant situation. Extremists are well aware that the creative thinking of the individual is a kind of minefield for them. It can easily blow up their propaganda. Extremists do not

need obstacles, their calculation is based on the complete credulity of consciousness, the guarantee of which is uncritical consumer thinking.

Jaspers wrote to K: “What a person considers possible determines his inner attitude to what is happening and his behavior. The condition of his sociality is the ability to distinguish danger and treat it with due concern, while illusory representations and disguise of the real state of affairs lead to his death ... It is not anxiety caused by a threat to personal interests that can bring help, but, perhaps, a deep concern for fate fed by it person in general.” It is difficult to disagree with the German thinker, specifying that in order to achieve “deep concern for the fate of man in general”, one will have to rise above one’s own reality, overcome subjective egoism. Without the appropriate social experience, such an ascent is unlikely. On a mass scale, it can become a real possibility only through education.

At the end of reflections on the place and role in the cognition and construction of social images of creativity, it's time to recall that without participation in the reflection of creativity, it will not be possible to make the most important transition from general ideas to concepts - forms specific for comprehending the essence of phenomena. Creativity is a condition for the entry of consciousness into the world of science and philosophy. In turn, science and philosophy give orderliness and stability to the creative activity of consciousness, serve as a guarantee against psychic attacks of extremists. Once upon a time, the terrorist choice to fight was the product of individual persuasion, there was an individual form of terror. In modern times, terrorism is a politically organized phenomenon, richly financed by sponsors. In the ranks of the terrorists, those who came out of conviction can, of course, still be met, if you try, but in the mass there are ordinary mercenaries, deceived people, intimidated, serving not worldview ideals, but fighting with anyone and for anything for a reward. There is a degeneration of the spiritual component in the terrorist struggle, the ideology is simplified to one-dimensionality.

Social progress has pushed the terrorist struggle to the sidelines of social history, but victory over terrorism is still very far away, because terrorism is not an exclusively political phenomenon. There is a social component in its history and it remains transformed into asociality. Like all other movements aimed against the established historical order in social progress, terrorism actively speculates on the inconsistency of ways to resolve contradictions.

Contradictions are a manifestation of regularity; they have an objective nature. They cannot be canceled at will. The reality used by the terrorists has been and will be for a long time a “administrative superstructure” over social contradictions - the policy of resolving social contradictions. It is here that truly objective reality intersects, that which is “above the

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

forces of desire", with the reality created by human activity - the political reality of the art of managing the dynamics of contradictions. Terrorism will lose its power and become historical rubbish when managerial policy ceases to serve corporate, monopoly, nationalist interests. The question is formally simple: can the state be the way it was defined by the creators of the theory of "natural rights" and "social contract"?

Social phenomena carry the specifics of the social form of movement. In them, along with the dominance of objectivity, in contrast to the phenomena of natural origin, there are products and properties of human reality itself. History is not created by the "Objective Idea", its only creators are people, more precisely, human activity organized in social relations. The objective nature of social development acts indirectly through the genesis of human relations. The relations themselves are also objective as phenomena of society, but especially the order of their formation and change.

Contradictions remain the driving force behind the development of relations. The unity of history is the denial of identity in the construction of the movement of those who form this unity. Being cells of society and systems of their consolidation, people and all social subjects that unite people exist only as components of a single social organism. Differences are valid only within the integrity of the general system of society.

Organisms of natural origin change: they get sick, recover, die. The reasons for this are in the nature of the relationships between cells, organs, and systems. Relations are built between different formations, each of which simultaneously works for itself, reproducing itself, and for the overall system. The balance of "interests" is determined initially genetically, but phylogenetic attitudes are realized ontogenetically. Therefore, violations of the established natural order are possible, even in a purely spontaneous process, comprehensively determined.

In the objective process of the development of society, all forces are combined - spontaneous, conscious actions, subconscious regulators. The objectivity of progress will pave its way regardless of the conditions of resistance, only there will be much more obstacles on the way. Nevertheless, the forces that want to see their history in social progress, different from the single order of social development, are trying to use all available resources. They are aware of their alternativeness to the existing sociality and are ready to consciously act as they please, without rules, in spite of cultural restrictions.

Defining such behavior methodologically, it can be argued that their policy is built in the form of speculation and parasitism on the complexities of social development. They seek to strengthen the "contradictions-costs" of development, hoping to give their actions signs of social relevance. Even N. G.

Chernyshevsky noted that "social progress is not direct like Nevsky Prospekt." In moving along an unknown path, costs are as natural as achievements, all the more so based on the recognition of the interaction of opposites as the "locomotive" of progress. Instead of helping to overcome them, it is unnatural to seek to pervert, strengthen and turn them into factors of one's own reproduction. This is precisely the meaning of the modernized ideology of terrorism.

The organizers of terror are well aware that they need a considerable amount of time to shake up the existing order of the social movement. Therefore, the sustainability of the reproduction of terrorism remains so socially dangerous. Unfortunately, this threat is constantly overshadowed by the brutality of the actions of terrorists and the relevance of the direct counter-terrorism struggle.

Despite its socio-political odiousness, terrorism originated and passed its historical path as a social entity. He is a product of the very system of organization of the social movement with which he is fighting. The terrorists are not in a position to unfold social development in their own way, but it is within their power to slow down and sway the movement. It would be interesting to ask the leaders of the terrorist struggle: are they well aware of what will happen to them if they suddenly win?

The history of Afghanistan, Libya of our time convincingly demonstrates that the victorious terrorists will have to start all over again - other terrorists will stand up to fight them until social progress returns to its historical course. Such times are not typical of real history, but they were and got their name - "troubled times."

The degeneration of terrorism is due to systemic relations. Terrorism as a separate, self-sufficient political phenomenon, apparently, has already lost its relevance, but it has not lost its systemic value. Terrorism does not so much reproduce itself as its existence is supported by systemic factors, both specific and non-specific.

We decided to bring together the main problematic costs of social progress that contribute indirectly to the sustainability of terrorism. The factors of conscious support for terrorism are described in the literature, and for this reason we omit them, as well as the reasons contained in the nature of the socio-economic inconsistency of social progress. It remains to be added to the list below: firstly, everything that is reflected in it belongs exclusively to the sphere of the subjective human activity itself, that is, it is not constructed objectively outside of consciousness, but consciously through practical politics, is a product of political will. Secondly, the factors included in the list do not in themselves contribute to the reproduction of terrorism, they are dangerous precisely in conjunction with the terrorist struggle. There would be no terrorism these factors

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

would remain simply the costs of ineffective policies. True, with such a policy, most likely the place of terrorism was taken by another socially destructive movement.

It is the practical political activity of people, therefore, to look for the subjective reasons for the fact that people are divided into terrorists, those who fight with them, and the suffering majority, who do not want to live by the rules of terrorists, must be sought in human thoughts and feelings. In missed or planned defects in education, perversions of cultural heritage and cultural traditions. All reactionaries began their repressions with simplifications in the formation of the philosophical component.

But the terrorist struggle is a combination of practical actions. It is generated not only by the cultural deformation of personal formation, it is also a product of the practical contradictions of social development. Philosophers have always discussed the nature of the world and there has never been a case where the problem of the nature of things and phenomena was absent from philosophical reflection. Scientists, like philosophers, have an interest in the nature of phenomena. The description of the phenomenon for modern scientific knowledge is not enough, it is necessary to figure out what exactly manifests itself, to look inside the phenomenon, where the grounds and reasons for its formation are "hidden".

In the terrological literature available to us, there is a pronounced characterization of terror and terrorism; registration of their "complex" social nature is much less common, as a rule, without deciphering the concept of "complex". Meanwhile, the complexity of the nature of terror and terrorism is due to a very specific social composition - multi-sociality and a combination of different qualities of contradictions of objective origin. Terrorologists are passionate about what they are able to measure and describe with specialized professional tools, thinking clearly that it is simpler and more specific. In fact, they simplify the process of cognition, and this technique always involves costs. Instead of immersing himself in the real nature, the researcher leaves in the direction of particulars.

Recall that a concept differs from a representation, including a general one, by its universality. It, according to Hegelian terminology, also develops in a special way, preserving the invariability of the "essence of essences", its content, its core, around which all changes occur. Changes in the content of the concept resemble the physical basis of chemical processes, when electrons are displaced from their orbits, run away, are replaced with the constancy of the nucleus and the stability of its charge.

A large group of terrologists is of the opinion about the conflictological nature of terror and terrorism. Among them are well-known researchers of Western Europe and the USA: R. Dahrendorf, G. Simmel, L. Koser. Unfortunately, in the views of

terrorologists, who are convinced that the terrorist struggle is rooted in social contradictions, the contradictions themselves are interpreted in an overly abstract way, and the management theory scheme is used. Terrorologists contrast the subject and the object of control.

Terrorists appear as an expression of protest driven by a violation of the balance of interests in politics. What attracts in the conflictological version is that its developers strive to overcome the one-sidedness of assessments in the origin of terror. Managers also bear their own measure of responsibility for terrorist methods of struggle. From the structures of power, political will is required to regulate such conflicts; it is necessary by political means to exclude the possibility of their aggravation to violent forms.

The idea that the degree of reproduction of terrorist organizations and the nature of their actions are, albeit conditional, but indicators of the quality of socio-economic policy, is promising. In any case, state policy is directly related to the sustainability of the reproduction of terror, and this is not about the quality of the service of law enforcement agencies, but about the imbalance of politics in general, the lack of sociality of politics, and social distortions. We have already noted that the complexity of the fight against terrorists is due to the multi-social nature of terror and terrorism. The effectiveness of the counter-terrorism struggle depends not only on the experience, skill and courage of those who defend the gains of social progress, protect the life, health and honest labor of citizens.

To a much greater extent, it is tied to the political responsibility of the state itself, which is responsible for the timely political reaction to socio-economic disproportions in social development. The reproduction of the terrorist struggle presupposes a certain state of the economy, public mood, culture, and educational policy. All recognized thinkers over the past two centuries have warned about the need to strengthen educational activities in the direction of familiarizing not with the sum of knowledge, but with the development of its meaning by the individual.

Consciousness is not a wallet, not a bank account, it is an active tool, it needs to be improved in the context of independence of manifestation, taught to think. Consuming ready-made knowledge is futile. The systemic and non-systemic opposition constitute a legitimate (the second - conditionally) part of the political pressure on the authorities. Political extremism - the core of antisocial struggle - does not regulate its struggle by existing legislation, or, as repressive politics, adapts patterns through the necessary editions. Political extremism includes: terrorist struggle; neo-colonial politics; genocide; racism; fascism; Nazism; political repression; intervention; facts of military-political influence.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

The terrorist struggle is one of the forms of political reaction to the existing order in society, one of the ways to counteract the policy of the state, therefore it is advisable to consider it on a general scale in the system of opposition forces. This opens up the possibility of more accurately determining its socio-political status. In our opinion, developed on the basis of historical analysis and critical assimilation of already obtained theoretical results, the scheme of the systemic arrangement of political movements may look like the modern social order.

To the officially recognized concepts that divide the opposition political movement into "systemic" and "extra-systemic" opposition, we added the concept of "asocial extremist forces." Formally, "fascism", "Nazism", "racism", "terror", "terrorism" formed as forces opposed to the power policy, only when they came to power, they became an instrument of state policy from the opposition. These political movements, hidden behind symbolic and verbal support in our time, are radically different from the "systemic" and "extra-systemic" opposition. It would be wrong to put the asocial "opposition" in the general ranks of the opposition movement, either from a humanistic or democratic point of view. At the same time, antisocial types of struggle, on a formal basis, belong to the opposition.

Hegel's concept of the concept as developing knowledge from the abstract to the concrete was opposed to the empirical theory of knowledge of classical science, of which he was a contemporary. Already non-classical science essentially examined the value of inductive methods as basic in scientific knowledge. Post-classical science does not deny the importance of empirical experience, it has revised the appointment of experimental methods. If earlier, especially in the time of G. Hegel and I. Newton, everything in science began with the acquisition of empirical material, then in our time, theoretical systems thinking serves as the beginning. Terrology has emerged and is moving forward as an empirical science. The main, even more precisely, its general task is to develop scientific support for the effectiveness of the state-wide counter-terrorism policy. Why should it, in cooperation with related sciences, reveal the reasons and factors for the sustainability of the reproduction of the terrorist struggle and explain how it is possible to deprive terrorists of the foundations of existence - to cut off the socio-economic and socio-cultural roots of the movement. However, the empirical nature of terrology not only opposes it to theoretical or fundamental sciences. Whatever science is, it is science and obeys the peculiarities of scientific knowledge, must be in the trend of the general movement.

"Empirical sciences," K. Popper argued, "are systems of theories, so the logic of scientific knowledge can be defined as a theory of theories.

Scientific theories are universal statements. Theories are networks designed to capture what we call "the world" in order to comprehend and master it. We strive to make network cells smaller and smaller" [8, p. 82]. The conclusion of an authoritative expert of scientific knowledge should not be interpreted as an expression of distrust of experimental description, K. Popper simply testifies that in modern science empirical experience does not serve as the beginning of knowledge, it is itself under the control of reflection.

K. Popper was not a supporter of the development of scientific knowledge, the philosopher preferred the statement "the growth of scientific knowledge." The reason for refusing to recognize development and replacing it with growth is the lack of a clear criterion. We are interested that K. Popper in his own way confirmed the thesis of G. Hegel about the ascent of the general to the particular, the abstract to the concrete. Terrorologists, in energetically discussing the question: what is "terror" and "terrorism", surprisingly avoid that generalization, which, if successfully developed, will allow them to answer the above question.

The concept, or for starters, the general idea of "terrorist struggle" can stop the process of "digging" knowledge into the particular. Terrorologists are like miners digging deep into mines. It's time to expand knowledge upward. I. P. Pavlov was once asked about his assessment of the concept of Z. Freud's subconscious, he replied: Z. Freud is a great scientist, together we delve into the secrets of the activity of human consciousness. I was lucky, because I dug up to the light, and he dug deep, went into the subconscious. Three hundred definitions and a tendency to increase them, suggests that they operate without a source of light. The concept of "terrorist struggle", uniting all sides of terror, can "illuminate" terrorists.

What is the strength of the concept of "terrorist struggle"? In its systemic character and in historicism. The general series of terror and terrorism does not deprive them of their originality and at the same time attaches them to a single process. The commonality of the essence of terror and terrorism is difficult to deny, especially when knowledge is carried out at the level of an empirical description of phenomena. Even those who, contrary to the logic of the definition, contrast the subjects of terror and terrorism agree that both terror and terrorism are similar in terms of methods and means of action. Aggregate representation in the concept of "terrorist struggle" provides them with a systemic position in the content of a more general, in fact, universal concept.

The systemic value of the concept of "terrorist struggle" is determined by the presence in its content of two essential features that are universal for all types of terrorist actions. In particular, for "terror" and "terrorism" - the target setting to change the political

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

course of government and the specifics of the means of action - the most cruel methods for creating an atmosphere of fear. The first of them can be qualified as a necessary feature of the concept, the second as sufficient for the definition.

The real history of the terrorist struggle in Russia began after the Narodnik campaigns against the peasant masses and in connection with the new offensive of the reactionary government headed by Emperor Alexander II. But even then, the Executive Committee of Narodnaya Volya tried to take into account moral aspects in its actions.

In the context of the concept of "terrorist struggle", "terror" and "terrorism" are well distinguished in the dialectical interpretation of their difference as a state of opposites, due to their unity. "Terror" is a type of terrorist struggle that recognizes the need for cruelty in achieving the goal, but does not absolutize its significance. "Terrorism" in contrast to "terror" considers cruelty and fear as absolute and inevitable modes of action. The policy of the Taliban after the seizure of power gives reason to consider the Taliban as an example of a terrorist organization of the "terror" type, and ISIS as an organization of the "terrorism" type. The Taliban leaves room for political evolution under certain circumstances.

Determining the systemic status of terror and terrorism in the "terrorist struggle", we open up reserves for a more accurate forensic definition of them. A systematic description of terrorist activities requires a comprehensive historical and legal study of the phenomena involved.

Political opposition was formed along with the development of state policy. Terror, already in the initial period of its history, was heterogeneous in relation to the methods and means of struggle. Coming out of an archaic state, terror acquired a modern look, borrowing from its past the goal - the denial of the existing state and political structure, as well as methods with means. But, as historical experience shows, terror even in special times - "Jacobin", "white", turning around 180, losing its real essence of political opposition, terror as "quasi-terror" was still selective. Terror and oppositional struggle coincided until the first - terror modernized its essence, removing the moral restrictions of the struggle. The terrorist struggle appeared as a combination of "classical" terror and terrorism.

When, after another series of harsh repressions, the mood of the revolutionary youth regarding terrorist actions began to change, the organizations, solving problems of a moral nature, announced that the terrorist attack was a matter of conscience for each performer. Let us add to the text that the attempt on the life of the king and the grand dukes was canceled several times due to the threat to the life of those accompanying them. The behavior of the terrorists who killed Alexander II is indicative. Rysakov wounded the king and several Circassians from the

guards. With such a development of events, Grinevitsky should have joined. In order to act for sure and inflict a minimum of injuries to the cadets returning from the parade, he waited until Alexander II caught up with him, throwing an explosive device between him and himself. Another terrorist, confused, hid the bomb in his bosom and began to help the wounded.

Later, with the creation of the organization of the Social Revolutionaries, the moral approach to terror was simplified. Terror in Russia began to degenerate into terrorism. For Russia, this process fits into the last two decades of the 19th century. Of course, especially critical opponents of our version of the distinction between terror and terrorism in the context of the development of the terrorist struggle will find facts that do not fit into it, but they will have to balance their arguments with the requirements of the modern understanding of scientific methodology.

Non-specific socio-cultural factors of the reproduction of terrorism in modern times, in our opinion, are as follows:

1. Politics oriented by the ideology of simplified one-dimensional personality formation. The social ideal of the spiritual wealth of an enlightened person has sunk into oblivion along with the Enlightenment. Capitalism has created a modern model of industrialization that does not include spending on the comprehensive formation of personality, and outside of this, the formation of its cultural individuality is impossible. Creativity as a sign of personality is not denied, but the industrial system does not see relevance in creativity, therefore the policy is selective and does not provide for mass involvement in creativity.

2. The activation of nihilism is beneficial to the modern industrial system. Nihilism on a mass scale belongs to the ideological format of the manifestation of conscious life activity, political activity is not alien to it, although denial in nihilism is politically vague and therefore conditionally dangerous. Nihilism has lost its political and socio-cultural relevance. It can be qualified as a kind of transitional period in the formation of the worldview of the mass consciousness. At the same time, the specificity of negation in nihilism is socially dangerous, as it inhibits the design function of mass consciousness, hinders the development of a creative attitude to life, and contributes to the formation of a consumer approach to activity. Modern nihilism is an example of non-dialectical and extra-systemic use of the individual's right to critically evaluate social reality.

3. A policy aimed at a simplified development of thinking, an orientation in education to the ability to find ready-made solutions, and not to the ability to produce knowledge, is not commensurate with social progress. The final goal of social progress is not the creation of conditions for the development of the individual. Social progress is ultimately aimed at the

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIHII (Russia)	= 3.939	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.771	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

development of the individual himself. Social history is based on the rationality of the activity of the individual. The personality is given in history in three hypostases: as the original subject; as a tool for the development of society and as the goal of history. It is in this triad that the objective need of social history for humanism and democracy is built. Philosophers-humanists have long shown the dialectical essence of rationality, its ability not to deny, but to cognize and resolve the contradictions of development. Intelligence must be comprehensively disclosed in education, to actualize from potential strength into the actual creative ability of a person. Only a developed intelligence has a real prospect of becoming prudence. All the geniuses of pedagogical art taught not to be content with other people's thoughts, but to think independently. Thinking is the technology of knowledge production, skillful thinking is the key to the effectiveness of such production.

4. The industrial system built by capitalism, in the last century, turned from the specifics of production itself into a total social phenomenon. The modern industrial system not only slows down social progress, it discredits capitalism, creating in the public mind the impression of a historical dead end, not of what appeared in connection with it, but of itself. The industrial system cannot be identified with the mode of production; it also takes place in socialism. Nothing in the foreseeable future is presented as something non-industrial. Hence the conclusion: the reason for the deformation of social progress is not in the industrialization of social life. It lies in the mode and limits of industrialization. J. Galbraith was right when he spoke of the need for a "new" industrialization. Industrialization must be controlled by social development. The crisis of enlightenment education was inevitable in the context of the globalization of the current industrial system. She only invested in what she needed.

Conclusion

The past and the future have ceased to be the actuality of life. The present from the transitional time from the past to the future has acquired the meaning of absoluteness. The connection of times has broken. The meaning of life has been reduced to being in the present reality, a consumer attitude towards it is being cultivated. In social terms, the personality has lost its historical status, which served as a support for life and an incentive for development. A situation has arisen in which not rationality, and not even rationality, but sensuality has become the conductor of consciousness. Sensual thinking has its own arguments and its own criteria, which is very dangerous when it comes to solving social problems, which requires critical thinking that accumulates cultural heritage. The costs of cultural progress, the active promotion of simplified forms of cultural enlightenment, lend themselves as a creative search,

Crisis signs of spirituality are also manifested in the loss of interest in the value of creative thinking. The common belief that creativity is a private matter is a dangerous misconception. Creativity is an evolutionarily significant property of thinking, it is rooted in the nature of "homo sapiens". The peculiarity of human evolution is due to the new correlation of adaptations to the conditions of existence and the transformation of these conditions. Without the dominance of creativity in thinking, the construction of the noosphere is doomed to various kinds of costs.

The former, close to absolute value of adaptation, violated the principle of proportionality, and should have led the process of development of life forms to a dead end. It is unnatural that the "subject" of the relation was in the position of the defending object. In such a position, he was not initially what his evolution determined - a "subject". But evolution is a spontaneous process, so some time was necessary for the formation of the quality of subjectivity. The body received its position as a "subject" not by inheritance and not in the form of a divine gift, it earned it in the struggle, proving the right to life and its development.

Activity in relation to the conditions of life requires more than strength. You need resourcefulness and the ability to vary, look for solutions, acting ahead of the curve. Thinking has the necessary potential, but it must be constantly updated and improved. Creativity is the main tool for the evolutionary defense of a living organism at the stage of "homo sapiens". This is not just a naturally important condition for evolution; the guarantee of the continuation of evolution is embedded in the creativity of thinking. Learning to think creatively stands for the need to realize the potential of the quality of human thinking. Everything that impedes the realization of creativity, hinders social progress and should be qualified as an opposition to the realization of human nature. The weakening of the position of creativity turns a person into a puppet. Not surprising, that antisocial movements prefer precisely this kind of people. They are gullible because they lack creative protection.

The nature of the terrorist struggle is objective. Terrorists are born and reproduced by the contradictions of social progress. The essence of the terrorist struggle is political. History unequivocally confirms the fact that all terrorists struggle for political change, and, ultimately, for political power. It is important to add to this that the nature of the terrorist struggle determines its form of expression. Terror and terrorism are unitary phenomena. The differences in them are objectively determined, phenomenal. There is no "transport", "economic", "environmental", "technological", etc. terrorism, there is terrorism that is subject-oriented. Differences in terrorism - in the specifics determined by the object, which, on the one hand, requires a specialized approach, on the other hand, warns of the danger of

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIHII (Russia)	= 3.939	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.771	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

separating terrorists according to secondary characteristics, blurring the essence. We discussed this topic in detail in one of the journal publications.

A multi-social phenomenon always has many different reasons for formation, mainly these are contradictions in the practical basis of social development - economic depressions, defects in state policy, imbalance in interethnic relations, distortions in cultural and religious policy. The reasons themselves may not be sufficient to intensify terrorist actions, but they always reveal themselves as circumstances. Therefore, we believe it is important, along with the causes, to single out the factors-conditions that have matured to the state of complicity with the causal action - "active actions".

The factors contributing to the initiation of terrorist acts should also be divided into specific and non-specific. The former are directly involved in the process of terrorist activation and are described by terrorologists, the latter are analyzed by us in a parallel article published. And the last thing: the terrorist struggle, despite all its odiousness, is not an absolutely unique political phenomenon in terms of goals, methods and means, and cannot be one, being in a systemic status. It is unique in its holistic expression, while its individual features, to varying degrees of intensity, are characteristic of, or are capable of temporarily belonging to, other forms of political struggle.

In this regard, it is necessary to clearly and unambiguously, focusing on the history of social development, the essence of the movement, actions, policies, determine the composition of subjects that can be terrorist organizations. Otherwise, researchers of the desired phenomena will continue to violate the elementary requirements of logical sequence, contradicting their own statements or historical facts. Philosophers have repeatedly warned that the process of cognition is subjective within certain limits, going beyond which inevitably leads to subjectivism. It is impossible to replace concepts, using and absolutizing individual features of the content, it is necessary to consistently distinguish the "essence of the essence" from its manifestation in politics.

The most common desire of terrorologists to notice the concept of "political repression" is terror, calling them "state terror". Political repressions, of course, do not adorn a democratic state, but they are necessary due to extraordinary circumstances - a military attack, the international situation, the intensification of the modernization of the social structure. Almost all European states, the USA, the USSR, China, Great Britain went through political repressions, not to mention many African, South American and Asian states, where repressions were most often objectively conditioned by circumstances.

Assassination attempts on political leaders and statesmen were by no means always associated with a terrorist struggle. National liberation movements,

partisan actions were accompanied by methods and means very similar to terrorist ones, but excellent tasks were solved with their help. "Terror" is a concept that reflects a set of harsh violent actions with the aim of seizing power or forcing it to capitulate. Political domination is necessary for terrorists to radically reorganize the historically established architecture. We have already noted that before the transformation into terrorism, terrorist ideology did not absolutize the idea of "terror panicus", allowing certain moral restrictions for the implementation of terrorist acts, as evidenced by the history of the development of terror in Russia and Western Europe.

Subjects of terror: individual isolated individuals whose actions are conditionally terrorist, since they are not proportional to the ultimate goals; terrorist organizations; organized terrorists within non-terrorist organizations - a transitional phenomenon, temporary; consolidated terrorist organizations. Terrorism is the result of the absolutization of the goals, methods, and means of terrorists. The Subjects of Terrorism: Terrorist Organizations and Their Consolidated Forms The formula for the actions of terrorism is extremely simple: through the creation of an atmosphere of "terror panicus", destroy the existing state and establish its own social order. The etymology of "terror panicus", according to A. Schopenhauer, was revealed by Bacon of Verulan, correlating this form of fear with the ancient deity Pan.

Summarizing the analysis of the concepts of "terrorist struggle", "terror", "terrorism" in the context of their real history and interpretation in the concepts of terrorologists, let us pay attention not so much to the insufficiency of combining private scientific research with a philosophical approach, this miscalculation has already been discussed, but to two, in our opinion, general problems left on the sidelines of terrorist interests. The first of these is the sustainability of the reproduction of the terrorist struggle, without which neither terror into terrorism nor terrorism from a danger to a threat to the development of the world process could evolve. Terrorologists have focused their research on what is manifesting itself, instead of looking through the looking-glass, into the essence of the terrorist struggle. There are almost no special studies of the factors of sustainability of the reproduction of terrorism, but in vain.

The second problem is that the distortions in social progress between north and south, west and east are all too obvious, as well as the fact that, within the framework of national development, the redistribution of wealth created is disproportionate to labor contribution. Those who directly increase it are constantly at risk of recessions, crises, pandemics, natural disasters, and those who participate indirectly, increase capital, no matter what. In Russia there is a saying: "To whom is war, and to whom is mother dear." Most of the inhabitants of the planet feel

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

discomfort from living conditions, they want significant changes, but only a small part goes to the terrorists. How can this be explained? Fear of more fear? Very unlikely.

Sane people value life above adventurous ideas and actions. Unfortunately, the sustainability of common sense is relative, it must be supported by practical resources, and an adequate policy in the field of education and education. The instinct of sanity requires reinforcement in the form of beliefs built on the foundations of cultural development. A correct policy will make education the main factor in the stability of the attitude of consciousness to various kinds of ideological and political speculation on contradictions.

The terrorist struggle has a political essence, which must be understood as the fact that terrorist organizations are fighting against the government and its policies, on the other hand, the political essence of terror and terrorism indicates that they are ready to use the costs of state policy to their advantage. Head-to-head always fought from hopelessness. Apparently, terrorists can be defeated by joint efforts, relying on military superiority, but this evil cannot be eradicated. Terrorism is military-like in terms of means of struggle, but the essence of the terrorist struggle is political. Hence the general conclusion: it is necessary to improve political activity in all areas. First of all, to deprive terrorists of the opportunity to rely on non-specific socio-cultural factors.

References:

1. (2006). On countering terrorism: Federal Law of March 6, 2006 No. 35 FZ (as of July 6, 2016). *Collected Legislation of the Russian Federation*, 2006. No. 11. Art. 1146.
2. Hegel, G. (1974). *Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences*. T.1. Science of logic. (p.452). Moscow: Thought.
3. Popper, K. (1983). *Logic and the growth of scientific knowledge*. (p.606). Moscow: "Progress".
4. (1989). *Fragments of early Greek philosophers*. Part 1. (p.575). Moscow: "Nauka".
5. Gorbunov Yu.S. (2010). On the definition of the concepts of "terror" and "terrorism". *Journal of Russian Law*, No. 2, pp. 31-40.
6. Kiva, A.V., & Fedorov, V.A. (2003). *Anatomy of terrorism. Social sciences and modernity*. (pp. 130-142). Moscow.
7. Jaspers, K. (1991). *The meaning and purpose of history*. (p.527). Moscow: Politizdat.
8. (2008). *Fundamentals of the sociology of terrorism*. Collective monograph. Moscow.
9. Kuzina, S.I. (2010). Terror and terrorism: general and special. *Philosophy and Law*. Rostov-n/D. 2010. No. 4, pp. 36-40.
10. Sidorov, B.V. (2017). New in the definition of terrorism, international terrorism, a terrorist act and an act of international terrorism and the problem of improving Russian criminal legislation. *Bulletin of Economics, Law and Sociology*, No. 2, pp. 115-122.
11. Galbraith, J. (1969). *New industrial society*. Per. from English. (p.480). Moscow: Progress.
12. Kray, K. (2016). Communication aspect of terrorism - Polish view. Public administration. *Electronic Bulletin*. Issue #57, August 2016, pp. 234-246.