

WE DO NOT UNDERSTAND THE NATURE OF TERRORISM

Maxim Shevchenko



MAXIM SHEVCHENKO is a renowned publicist, TV anchorman and a member of the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation

I would simply avoid using the word ‘terrorism’ at all. It seems far-fetched, needless and excessively generalising to me. In this context, it is also used improperly as was previously the case with respect to the term ‘enemy of the people’. What does terrorism actually mean anyways? For example, why might some consider the Wikileaks site to be a terrorist entity? I would actually say that what American diplomats have written is, in essence, much more terrorist than what Julian Assange has done.

We are speaking about terrorism as if it were a phenomenon that has fallen from the sky or as if it is a manifestation of the human psyche, for instance. I suppose psychopaths do exist, and so do meteors that fall from the sky. However, terrorism is mainly produced by social and economic causes. In any place on the globe, terrorism exists not as a private initiative but as the result of some economic conflict, a territorial dispute or an unlawful use of military force by a government against its own people, just as happened in 1994 within Russia. It seems to me that our view is too narrow. Terrorism is not abating. How many people died in Iraq and Afghanistan in the course of this year

alone? How many people died in Palestine? Certainly a whole lot of people have died.

I would divide the notion of terrorism in two separate parts: one that is committed by private gangs or individuals and one that can be represented as state terrorism. State terrorism has not abated; rather, it has only taken on more subtle forms and has started to disguise itself by refined propaganda and PR-technologies that, for example, represent a bombardment of the peaceful population - almost like an act of humanism purportedly meant to rescue that population.

As for the mass media, in this context it is of no interest to anyone at all. **Julian Assange dealt a blow to the defiling press and this blow cannot be labelled as terrorism; rather, it is somewhat a restoration of justice or a restoration of the integrity of our worldview.** Obviously, there might be half a dozen, a dozen or more covert agendas hidden behind the figure of Julian Assange: he might actually be a puppet in the hands of special services, Masonic lodges or other entities. However, a fact remains a fact. It is not for nothing that many media outlets have eagerly grasped the Wikileaks revelations and have also started to disseminate such leaked messages around the world.

As a matter of fact, we do not understand the nature of terrorism at all. We categorise some operations carried out by the special services as terrorism and, at the same time, regard the actions of real terrorists as political operations. We do not have a holistic concept of reality.

Personally speaking, I am decidedly against use of the word ‘terrorism’. **There certainly are things that we can call terrorist acts, but there’s no such phenomenon as terrorism.** Let’s just say that there was a terrorist act in Beslan. However, the struggle of the Palestinian people is not actually terrorism but rather a national liberation struggle by a people for their rights. There are inhuman acts of blowing up peaceful citizens, as has happened in

Moscow and its subways, which were indeed terrorist acts, but an attack by an enemy’s armed forces cannot be considered as terrorism – instead, they are guerrilla actions or the struggles of national liberation movements, which, of course, can also be misguided with regard to their ultimate political aims.

The main political problem that the generation of the 2000s will pass on to the generation of the 2010s will be a crisis of the legitimacy of liberal power. Liberalism and all the electoral procedures are losing legitimacy in the eyes of the people, and the status of liberal elites is presently maintained almost solely by the mass media and propaganda technologies. The very idea of democracy as some sort of delegated procedure is losing significance. The question thus arises: what is the role of the people in this show? Supposedly they are those for whom the bureaucratic apparatus and the elected deputies should be speaking, but is it actually so? Then the main question turns out to be: what is power? Is it mere hypocrisy or real power that acts in the name of the people? Governmental authorities are using its resources in the interests of so-called development or so-called effectiveness, but it seems that people are standing in the way because people represents the need for expenditures and a social part in the budget, which means financial cuts in the so-called race for innovation and modernisation, not to mention the challenge to keep up with technological advancements. Democracy essentially becomes a hindrance in this regard.

This problem is of global nature. First of all, it is characteristic of the Western countries, which pronounced liberal democracy to be central to their perception of the world. The countries that have an authoritarian system as their foundation, such as China, for instance, are assuming leading positions due to a greater degree of manageability and a much greater share of social distribution. ■

Recorded by Ksenia Kolkunova