

**RPTSS 2017**  
**International Conference on Research Paradigm Transformation  
in Social Sciences**

**MANAGED SOCIAL CHAOS AS THE TECHNOLOGY OF  
EXPORT OF LIBERAL DEMOCRACY**

V.F. Nitsevich (a)\*, V.V. Moiseev (b), O. A. Sudorgin (c), S.N. Glagolev (d)

\*Corresponding author

(a) Moscow Automobile and Road State Technical University MADIMoscow, Russia117997, Leningrad Prospect, 64, dr.nitsevich@mail.ru

(b) Shukhov Belgorod State Technological University, 46 Kostyukova St., Belgorod, 308012, Russia, din\_prof@mail.ru

(c) Moscow Automobile and Road State Technical University MADIMoscow, Russia117997, Leningrad Prospect, 64

(d) Shukhov Belgorod State Technological University, 46 Kostyukova St., Belgorod, 308012, Russia, rector@intbel.ru

***Abstract***

The article deals with the theoretical aspects of technology export liberal democracy. Authors concrete examples show how the rapid imposition of "American-style democracy" with the use of soft and hard power of a world power in other countries and on different continents. The article stresses that liberal democracy can be approved and successfully function only under the condition that the dominant liberal ideology in the society and the political elite and civil society institutions are willing to voluntarily follow its basic principles, including such as the presence of regular channels of expression and representation interest and values of citizens in the form of parties, associations and independent media; separation of powers, ensuring an effective system of checks and balances, including independent judiciary and the rule of law, and others. Democracy, in a well-known sense, means the power of the people, but for a long time, since its inception in the Ancient World to the present day, this term and phenomenon have been filled with relevant content, received great theoretical diversity, and practice has already gone beyond the framework of existing theories. Nevertheless, especially in recent decades, there has been a rapid spread of a sample of "American democracy" - liberal on ideological foundations, which some authors consider "the only true". Thus, the researcher Lebedev T.P., analyzing a deeply liberal democracy, argues that "democracy is only a political device that carries the qualities of liberal democracy".

© 2018 Published by Future Academy [www.FutureAcademy.org.UK](http://www.FutureAcademy.org.UK)

**Keywords:** Liberal democracy, the United States, the export of democracy.



## 1. Introduction

The United States has developed a doctrine that, in all US-friendly states, a democratic system should be established, which will certainly make the world more predictable and safe. American politicians and political analysts who served them argued that democratic countries do not oppose each other. This concept was extended, first of all, to Western Europe and South-East Asia. A striking example of this is the examples of Germany and Japan, which show that the US military presence, supplemented by impressive financial assistance, helped build a democratic state in these countries with a market economy.

The United States, for its own national security, is interested in spreading democratic regimes around the world. According to Wilson's famous phrase, in order to protect Americans, the United States must change the world. And the best way to ensure security, he said, would not be protecting or isolating America from foreigners, but changing the political nature of the outside world. Despite the whole spectrum of "soft" and not very instruments that determine the subordination of one state to another, the last word, unfortunately, remains for brute force. To control both hemispheres, the United States during the Second World War continued to increase the navy rapidly. The goal was simple - to build a fleet that can dominate the "two oceans". At the same time, huge amounts of money were invested in the technical equipment and rearmament of aviation and other combat arms. The basis of the power of the US Army and Navy was and remains the developed economy, modern industry and innovative technologies, over which the best minds of America, Europe, Asia of other parts of the world worked in the United States for dollars. And the obtained atomic weapons (the first on the planet) made this country the most powerful military power.

As you know, the American generals were tasked with developing a plan for a nuclear war against the Soviets. The sharp deterioration in relations is also evidenced by the reluctance to give loans for the restoration of the USSR, the cessation of supplies under lend-lease. In London, at a session of foreign ministers, allied treaties were worked out with all countries, including from the former fascist camp. The struggle against the communist threat rose ever more loudly to the shield. Thus began the creation of a "power ring - political, economic and military" around the zone of influence of the USSR. The doctrine of "containment" of the same "liberation" blossomed, called for by the steel ring to strangle and uproot the obstacle before the world monopoly, such are the laws of the global market. It is worth noting that the American establishment neither in official nor in any other circles believed in the reality of Soviet aggression, but without it would have to give up the coveted prize, which was not discussed. It was necessary to create a monolithic coalition capable of crushing the enemy. The armature in this business was the built-in security system, with its outpost - the European power line. Since that time, the boundaries of the zone of American national security began to lie wherever American interests were at stake. The struggle unfolded for each piece of land, for every country located between the "east" and "west."

But in order to rule the world, only financial and economic and military means are not enough, political mechanisms and instruments were also needed. To support democratic movements in other countries and promote the idea of liberal democracy in the image and likeness of the United States, American politicians created a number of political tools: the US Agency for International Development

(USAID), Peace Corps, Union for Progress, Radio Free Europe , "National Endowment for Democracy", etc. In the opinion of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the 32nd President of the United States, the West European "great" countries had to withdraw from the Second World War, having lost their colonies and turned into medium-sized industrial states. To do this, it was necessary to consolidate the acquired financial and economic power of the United States and create levers of influence on these countries. This was done at the international Bretton Woods conference in 1944, which established the system of the gold currency standard, which consolidated the role of the world convertible currency for the dollar. The dollar became the settlement and reserve monetary unit, along with gold it was the guarantor of the cost of banknotes. At the same time, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) were established, which largely depended on the United States. The US economic power approached half of the world's gross product and made it possible to economically ensure the advancement of imperial ambitions to promote its model of democracy and its spread in the world (Viburnum, 2017).

In the postwar period, the US deployed active companies for economic assistance to countries - their allies, reviving their economic and military capabilities. At the initiative of the United States, a "Marshall Plan" was introduced that reinforced Western Europe, but did not extend to the countries of the socialist camp. At the same time, all this support was organized in such a way that, not least, the US itself had to strengthen itself. Of the \$ 13 billion, the "Marshall Plan" that Congress allocated to aid Europe, 2/3 was spent on the purchase of American goods. Another significant meaning of the "Marshall Plan" was that it pushed the integration processes of Western European countries. Such structures as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), the Council of Europe (CoE) began to appear. All this was aimed at cementing Western Europe and the creation on its territory of a single political and economic space - a monolithic bridgehead for the deployment of international forces of regional security (US armed forces)

In parallel with this, intensive work was underway to form a unified military-political association of Western countries. The union between Britain, France and the Benelux countries was the beginning of an economic and political unification with a "defensive bias" - the notorious Atlantic Alliance or the NATO bloc. In response, the countries of the socialist camp led by the USSR formed the Warsaw Treaty Organization (OVD). So the division of the world was fixed to the spheres of collective security, in each of which there was strict hierarchical subordination.

The victory of the people's revolution in China, other events that took place in the Far East, which was regarded by the American elite as an area of influence, also made higher circles of American democracy nervous. Having lost continental China, the United States and its allies needed to somehow compensate for this. This opportunity was provided by the Korean peninsula, Indochina and the Middle East. Therefore, in these regions the work on creating a network of military-political blocs in Asia and the Far East has become more active. The Korean War had a stimulating effect on the American economy and integration processes within the Western military bloc. During the war in Korea, up to \$ 30 billion was invested in US industry, i.e. more than during the entire Second World War.

In the direction of establishing influence in the Middle Asian region, the Iranian operation killed two birds with one stone: the Shah, obedient to the overseas masters, returned to power, and the American

tycoons controlled the oil industry in the region. The ownership of the overseas monopolies has passed 2.5 times more enterprises than in the first post-war years. The US Congress, having received at its disposal additional financial resources, began to allocate considerable sums for the support of Soviet dissidents and units formed from them. At the same time, the US and its allies began to impose sanctions on the various military and political blocs against the USSR and certain countries that were part of the socialist camp.

It is worth noting that on the way to world domination in the early twentieth century, the US was not confronted with economic or armed obstacles that were understandable to it, but with something new - an ideological challenge (ie, communism). The attempt to "persuade" with the help of physical strength not only failed, but led to opposite results - the formation of the military might of the Soviet Union, which achieved military parity with this powerful world power. In light of this, the American elite needed a different strategy and tactics to achieve the goal. And, as further events showed, she is able to cope with the task positively. The competitive advantage of the camp of Western countries was that thanks to a powerful economy and a flexible system of values, it could offer people personal comfort and personal freedom. It should be borne in mind that the rigid institution of the Soviet camp on the contrary caused rejection of many of its like-minded people.

In the first case, the broad masses of the population of other countries received a secure standard of living with a sense of belonging to the progressive world, whereas on the other side of the barricade, nothing but promises to live under communism, the bright future of all mankind, did not happen. As a result, over the course of several decades, by penetrating the worldview of opponents, feeding the channels of national, moral contradictions, cultivating the belief in "democratic values", Western states (the United States, Great Britain, France, partly Japan, etc.) to their own state structures. Unfortunately, there is nothing unusual in this. the game on simple instincts is always more effective than the noble delights of the mind.

With the collapse of the USSR at the end of the twentieth century, the world did not have a state of equal US and not ready to be friends with this power or to submit to their will. There was no state at that time capable of keeping the US from taking decisive action to "settle the world order". It was an era of a unipolar world with a well-known paradigm of the winner: whoever did not accept the values of the best order in the world - American liberal democracy - that enemy must be destroyed. This happened with Yugoslavia, whose leadership openly criticized the US administration for their hegemonic aspirations. Yugoslavia officially refused to join NATO and hoped to "monitor" the intervention of Western, primarily American, transnational corporations in its economy. Moreover, Yugoslavs could not help but be indignant at the "benefactions" rendered by the transnational corporations of neighboring Albania. Yugoslavia did not want this to happen to her (Martyinova, 2017).

The leadership of the Atlantic bloc claimed that only military intervention could prevent the destruction of the Albanian population. However, the true causes of the Balkan crisis are a tangle of factors: political, economic, national, reinforced and exacerbated by powerful external pressure, by the United States and a number of countries interested in the territorial redistribution of Europe. On 24 March 1999, NATO aircraft began bombing the territory of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY). The first missile strikes at the command of NATO Secretary General Javier Solana were carried out on the radar

installations of the Yugoslav Army located on the Montenegrin coast of the Adriatic Sea. At the same time, a military airfield several kilometers from Belgrade and large industrial facilities in the town of Pancevo, located less than twenty kilometers from the capital of the republic, were attacked at the same time. The media reported that NATO is conducting a "war for the establishment of democracy in the Balkans." These events can be considered a kind of reference point, after which the world changed.

In the military operation against Yugoslavia, which lasted 78 days, 19 NATO countries participated in one form or another. The North Atlantic alliance decided to launch an aggression after the failed negotiations with the Yugoslav leadership on the Kosovo and Metohija problem in the French city of Rambouillet and Paris in February and March 1999. There was a fact of violation of the foundations of international law by NATO countries. The bombing ceased on June 9, 1999 after the military and technical agreement on the withdrawal of troops and police from the Federal Yugoslavia from the territory of Kosovo and the deployment of international armed forces in the territory of the province was signed by the representatives of the FRY and NATO army in the Macedonian town of Kumanovo. A day later, the UN Security Council adopted an appropriate resolution on this issue under number 1244.

It should be noted that Russia and China, which have the right of veto in the UN Security Council, spoke out against the bombing of Yugoslavia. If we analyze the four resolutions of the UN Security Council on the bombings of a sovereign state, then they trace the commitment of all UN member states to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

The damage caused to the industrial, transport and civilian objects of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as a result of almost three-month bombing, according to various estimates, is measured in the amount of 60 to 100 billion dollars. The number of dead military and civilians has not yet been accurately established. It ranges from 1200 to 2500 people. "Only 800 children were killed. They bombed not only bridges, industrial enterprises, but also railway stations, hospitals, kindergartens, temples built in the Middle Ages," asserted Borislav Milosevic, in 1998-2001 the Yugoslav ambassador to Russia (Lebedeva, 2004; Viburnum, 2017). Such a high price was paid by the Yugoslav people for the purchase of liberal democracy in the American way.

In addition to the Yugoslav version of examples of exports of "democracy in American way" a lot. Here are just a few: 1983, Grenada. As a result of the military coup that took place in this small country in 1979, the left-radical New Jewel Movement came to power. On October 25, 1983, under the pretext of protecting 630 American medical students, as well as the "request" initiated by the White House, the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, US President Ronald Reagan ordered the launch of a military operation code-named "The outbreak of rage, in which nearly 8,000 US military personnel took part. As a result of the fighting, the government of Grenada, which the US disliked, was overthrown.

Obviously, the societies emerging or emerging from a totalitarian or authoritarian past (Iraq, Libya, etc.) are still far enough from the idea of liberalism to be successfully realized in them. This means that many modern states do not have bases for liberal democracy, where the export of "American democracy" was aimed.

A special place in the export of liberal democracy was occupied by the technology of "managing" social chaos, which was used in all attempts to impose its ideas from Belgrade to Kiev. According to the already approved by the White House scheme of loosening the political system to finance the opposition's

movement to the Ukrainian government, which was previously officially recognized by Washington as legitimate, it was spent, according to US Assistant Secretary of State Victoria Nuland, \$ 5 billion. Demonstrating unconcealed interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state, numerous "support groups" were sent to the Kiev Maydan in the person of US Senator McCain and several other politicians of the United States and Western Europe. Then, for the replenishment of the opposition movement to Ukraine, Western special services began sending detachments of militants from the Middle East and members of nationalist bands in Europe.

As a result of the American "export of democracy," wings spread and wings were "prepared" for the execution of orders from Washington not only by incoming "revolutionaries", but also by fascist elements of Western Ukraine, accomplices of terrorists in the person of D. Yarosh and other radicals. When this population of the autonomous republic of Crimea and a number of eastern regions decided to put an end to this basic structure, the main administrative and industrial facilities on the ground followed by the sharp reaction of the White House, expressed in particular in the organization of anti-Russian sanctions.

The management of social chaos turned out to be more successful, because firstly, such technology is carried out by internal forces; secondly, it does not create a military conflict directly between the state of the exporter and the state importer of liberal democracy; third, it creates the appearance of an internal need for liberal democracy on the part of of the population (the choice was made by the people themselves).

It is significant that social chaos has managerial and technological potential, which allows maintaining its state for a long time, until the goal of changing the existing regime is achieved. It is important to emphasize that the very phenomenon and the concept of "social chaos" have become the subject of close attention of scientists, especially those specializing in the applied nature of social knowledge. Without going into details of the scientific understanding of this concept because of its rather deep theoretical elaboration, it should be emphasized that the state of chaos is an unnatural state of society. Rather, societies may be in a state of chaos for a short time, for example, during the transition period (transit) according to the scheme: orderliness - chaos - a new order, as many researchers write. That's exactly what happened in 2014 when preparing a coup in Ukraine.

Thus, social chaos should be viewed as a state of society, in which there is a loss of the basic social classes, groups, individuals of value orientations, their identity. Protests, riots, revolutions - this is an indispensable attribute of the history of mankind, one of the mechanisms of its forward movement. The main subject of such processes, as a rule, is a large, outwardly unorganized group of people, who, depending on the scientific school, can be called either "crowd" or "mass". For sociologists, the crowd is a random accumulation of people (aggregation), rallied by emotional and temporal connections; for psychologists - a group, the cooperation within which is relatively random and temporary. Historians usually confuse the concepts of "crowd" and "masses of the people", although this is absolutely incorrect for the analysis of socio-political processes, including managed social chaos.

In 1992, the American geopolitician and diplomat Stephen Mann published in the journal of the National Military College in Washington the work "Theory of Chaos and Strategic Thinking", in which he combined the theory of managed social chaos with new geopolitical concepts of gaining excellence.

The author directly points out that proceeding from the national security strategy, it is first necessary to clearly define which states and peoples need to be infected with a special virus - the ideology of liberal democracy and respect for human rights. The article talks about the need for "creating chaos" in the enemy, and that the theory of chaos can encourage the US to pursue a realistic policy in an ever-changing era and open up the belated release of strategic thinking. Justifying the theory of managed social chaos, Stephen Mann wrote: "Our national security will have the best guarantees if we devote our efforts to fighting for the minds of countries and cultures that differ from ours. This is the only way to build a world order that will have a long period (although, as we see, one can never achieve absolute consistency) and will be globally advantageous. If we can not achieve such an ideological change all over the world, we will have sporadic periods of tranquility between catastrophic changes " (Stephen, 1992). Theoretical developments of this geopolitician and diplomat subsequently had direct relevance to the "color revolutions".

As the mechanisms designed to contribute to this goal, he calls "promoting democracy and market reforms" and "raising economic standards and resource needs that supplant ideology." According to S. Manu, there are the following means of creating chaos in one or another territory:

- promotion of liberal democracy;
- Support for market reforms;
- raising living standards among the population, especially the elite;
- ousting of traditional values and ideology.

However, in order for all these theoretical constructions to become an active political doctrine, it was necessary to develop an appropriate technical (technological) base, and, first of all, the information technologies available to the majority of the population. This happened in the early 2000s. Thanks to the achievements of IT-technologies, including cellular communication, Skype, Facebook, Google, LinkedIn, Twitter, iPad and other technical means of social communication, new generation networks were created that create further social development and increase opportunities for managed social chaos. From the tool, social networks have become the basis and cause for uniting people and creating communities (Sundijev, 2017).

In 2002, Howard Rheingold's book *The Clever Crowd: A New Social Revolution* was published (in Russia in Russian in 2006) (Howard, 2006), which initiated the spread of new forms of social organization based on mass use of information technologies. As always, the first "users" of new technologies are organized crime and intelligence agencies that organize the change of regimes in other countries. G. Rengold writes about several varieties of the "smart crowd", which received a rapid and global distribution. The most "simple" and most common of these is a flash mob (also a flash mob, flash mob or just a mob, in English flashmob is a "flash mob": flash is a flash, mob is a "crowd") - that is, a pre-planned mass action organized, as a rule, through modern social networks in which a large group of people suddenly appears in a public place, within a few minutes fulfills a pre-determined action, called a scenario, and then quickly diverges. Flashmob has no analogues in world history, although culturologically it is part of the performance communication along with performance, happening and fluxus. Participants in the flash mob movement proceed from the fact that any flashmob-action has standard rules. The most important of them are: apparent spontaneity of action; The script should bring

absurdity into what is happening, chaoticize it; Each participant must follow the script exactly; The actions of the participants should not cause an aggressive reaction from casual viewers. With regard to our topic, it is important to note that the development of the use of the flash mob in the "color revolutions" in the post-Soviet space has shown its high efficiency as a tool for changing the ruling regimes.

The second kind of managed social chaos is "shopping-riot" - mass riots organized through social networks, accompanied by looting, arson of buildings and cars for entertainment. According to Reingold, as soon as a sufficient number of people appeared in the network to join the groups, a qualitative leap took place. It is this that can explain the popularity of social networks in our time, when users began to unite in interests. They are used by political technologists to create managed social chaos in the chosen country.

The third kind of "smart crowd" is the so-called "peaceful riot", that is, political actions organized through social networks, which aim to delegitimize the current power in the eyes of the population and the world community (Kazmina, 2015). Technologies of controlled distemper, used in the "peaceful riot", are based on modern means of communication and social networks (Schumpeter, 1995; Kulikov, 2017). Participants in the "peaceful riot" suggest that in response to their actions, which although they are nonviolent, but do not lose their illegal nature, they will at best be detained, maybe beaten (these beatings can be proudly shown on air of domestic and Western TV channels). Unlike the "smart crowd" forms discussed above, this variety has a rather complex structure close to the structure of the traditional active crowd: about 10 percent are organizers (managers) coordinating the activities of the remaining participants in real time; about 30 percent - recruits, that is, hired for a fee participants. At least half of the recruits are militants, whose mission is to provoke violent conflicts with representatives of the authorities and law enforcement agencies. The remaining 60 percent are curious members of the Internet communities in which the preparation of this action was discussed, and their acquaintances. It is curious to achieve a key goal in the campaign - the provocation of power to force - become the basis for the formation of a panic crowd, whose actions are usually accompanied by victims (Sundijev, 2017).

Most of the organizers, as practice shows, have been trained in the programs of the Center for Practical Non-Violent Action and Strategies, CANVAS, based in Belgrade and organized by former activists of the Serbian Otpor. The organization was preparing activists of the Georgian "Khmara", the Ukrainian "Pora", the Egyptian "April 6" and "Kefaya". Currently CANVAS works with activists from more than 50 countries, in 12 of which there have been regime changes. The main difference between traditional and "smart" crowds consists in the forms of emergence: if the first needs a "shock stimulus" (a sudden event that directly affects the vital interests of the participants), the formation of the "smart crowd" is prepared by a lengthy discussion in network resources and mass media.

Analyzing the processes and events of the "Arab spring", "color revolutions", i.e. It is worth noting that, firstly, their main goal was the implantation of liberal democracy (often without regard for national, religious and cultural specifics); second, the key role in this export was played by the United States, thirdly, this export is characterized by some similar features, which make it possible to identify the technological component. Export of liberal democracy was carried out in these countries in almost the same scenario, which is described in sufficient detail by the American political scientist D. Sharpe. His



book "From Dictatorship to Democracy" was first published in Bangkok in 1993 by the Committee for the Restoration of Democracy in Burma (Sharpe, 1993). Later it was repeatedly reprinted in Serbia, Indonesia, Thailand and Ukraine. In the US, the book was published twice. It became a true bible of revolutionary activity. The opposition movements of Yugoslavia, Belarus, Georgia, Ukraine and many other countries sought practical inspiration in it. This book is of interest as a classic guide to action, detailing the tactics and strategy of subversive activities within totalitarian and authoritarian states.

According to Sharpe, a common feature of the examples of destruction or weakening of dictatorships is the decisive mass application of political disobedience on the part of the population and its institutions. The dictatorial regime has characteristics that make it very sensitive to skillfully applied political disobedience. According to his theory, the export of liberal democracy has at least three important socio-technological stages or periods.

1. Resistance to an authoritarian regime or totalitarian dictatorship. At this stage it is necessary to solve four tasks: a) to strengthen the oppressed population with determination, confidence and resistance; b) strengthen the independent social groups and institutions of the oppressed people; c) create a powerful internal resistance; d) prepare a reasonable strategic plan and skillfully implement it.

2. Depriving the political regime of support of the masses. According to D. Sharp, the deprivation of the dictatorial regime of political support from the army, the police, and the bureaucracy is a key stage. The destruction of the faith of these forces in the regime will allow for a change of power. The decisiveness and duration of protest actions should show that they threaten directly the ruling regime, and not the lives of representatives of the army, police and officials.

3. Changing the political regime. At this stage, democratic forces will be able to move from local protests to large-scale civil disobedience, which will force the dictatorial regime to withdraw from the political arena, and it will cease to exist. The formation of democracy will begin with the adoption of a constitution and the development of civil society.

## **2. Problem Statement**

In investigating the problems of managed democracy, the authors primarily focused on analyzing the forms and methods of planting (exporting) liberal democracy. The greatest interest of researchers was caused by such a problem as controlled social chaos. As shown by the analysis of modern methods used by the United States to implant liberal ideas, to prepare and perform so-called "color revolutions," American political technologists are increasingly using the technology of managed social chaos. American political strategist pointed to the need for decisive action in the course of political protest, stressing the danger of political dialogue and concessions to dictatorial regimes. "In the past, some people could try to resist," Jimmy Sharp writes. - There were short mass protests and demonstrations. There were bursts of emotion. In other cases, individuals and small groups could do impotent acts by asserting a principle or simply their disobedience. Despite the noble motives of such acts of resistance in the past been insufficient to overcome the fear of the people and their habit to obey, that is a prerequisite for the destruction of the dictatorship " (Sharpe, 1993).

The conclusion. Thus, policy analysis and technology export liberal democracy American-style shows clearly that the main purpose of the United States here is not in itself a liberal democracy, and the

formation on its basis and with the help of modern technologies such regimes and states, which would be loyal to the United States. In order to achieve its imperial ambitions of the United States overthrew the legitimate government as a result of the organized them "color" and "Arab revolutions", or threats to use military force, as was the case in the Middle East and North Africa, the Caucasus and Central Asia. Today, this technology is honed by Washington in Ukraine, Syria and other countries of the world.

As the political mechanisms designed to contribute to this goal, the US is widely used in exporting democracy in American way: controlled social chaos, military intervention and everything to "promote democracy and market reforms," the protection of human rights, etc. dogma.

In the organization of managed social chaos in a chosen country, political technologists from across the oceans apply already proven methods and means: the organization of ideological and political resistance to an authoritarian regime or totalitarian dictatorship through various kinds of paid protest actions, which are collected by the masses through propaganda campaigns and work in social networks . Thanks to these and other technologies for the export of liberal democracy, a coup in Ukraine was carried out with the displacement of the legally elected President V. Yanukovich in 2014, an attempted coup in Turkey in 2016, as well as a series of so-called "color revolutions" in various parts of the world . And all in the name of the notorious "national interests of the United States."

### **3. Research Questions**

Therefore, the main question of the study is the study of controlled chaos technologies, through which the US imposes a vision of liberal democracy and a political regime beneficial to a world power to a country that has become the target of political influence.

### **4. Purpose of the Study**

The aim of the study is to study the technologies of export of liberal democracy from the USA to other countries. Special attention is paid to the analysis of controlled chaos technology using modern IT tools, social networks, etc.]

### **5. Research Methods**

The research uses methods such as historical, institutional, comparative, systemic and others. Using the historical method, the authors cite numerous historical facts that testify to the intervention of the United States and its allies in the internal affairs of sovereign states. Thus, the article indicates in which years and in what countries occurred. For example, 1989, Panama. In the second half of the 1980s, in response to the foreign policy pursued by the government of this Latin American country and strengthening its ties with the countries of South and Central America, the White House attempted to organize a government coup that ended unsuccessfully. As a result, in December 1989, US President George HW Bush ordered the launch of a "Just Cause" military operation to replace the regime in that country with the participation of 25,000 American soldiers. During the military

operation, the US Army inflicted air and artillery strikes on urban areas, resulting in the destruction of civilian infrastructure, the Panamanian economy was harmed about \$ 1 billion.

2003, Iraq. Under the pretext that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction (which, by the way, was not found), as well as a hypothetical link between Saddam Hussein's regime and Al-Qaeda fabricated by Washington itself. As additional justifications Washington called "violations of democracy" and repression by the Iraqi authorities against their citizens. On March 20, 2003, the United States, together with the United Kingdom, without the sanction of the UN Security Council, launched a military campaign against Iraq. During the Iraq war, about 4,500 American servicemen were killed and more than 32,000 were injured, and up to 1.5 million civilians were injured. At present, Iraq remains the main source of instability in the Middle East.

2011, Libya. As a result of the "soft power" campaign organized by the White House to internationally condemn the Gaddafi regime, in March 2011 five American bombers dropped bombs for almost a hundred targets in Libya. In October 2011, the rebels (allegedly with the help of the Americans) tracked down the Libyan dictator, captured him and shot him without trial and investigation, after having been tortured.

The institutional method made it possible to identify those structures and authorities in the United States that developed and implemented the technology of exporting "liberal democracy," including technology controlled chaos.

To support democratic movements in other countries and promote the idea of liberal democracy in the image and likeness of the United States, American politicians created a number of political tools: the US Agency for International Development (USAID), Peace Corps, Union for Progress, Radio Free Europe, "National Democracy Fund", etc.

Thanks to the comparative method, the authors were able to analyze the foreign policy activities of US administrations, compare their methods and forms of exporting the ideology of liberal democracy to other states, identify common features and differences.

US politicians have come up with a political tool called "American democracy," and apply where there is a smell of oil, other natural resources that can be profit by changing the political regime in a particular country through controlled social chaos or other modern political technologies.

## **6. Findings**

There is an opinion that after the next presidential election, which was won by D. Trump, the US will continue to play a leading role in world politics, and they will pursue their goals in a similar way. Americans have come up with such a political tool as "American democracy" and apply it in areas of national interest around the world, where they will smell of oil, gold and diamonds, precious stones, other natural resources that can be profit by changing the political regime in that or another country with the help of managed social chaos or other modern political technology to establish its liberal democracy. The Americans say they will not rest until this American democracy is established everywhere. They keep on talking about some mythical democratic values, which they have in America very much, but in other countries so far they are sorely lacking, and they are ready to share the surplus of their democratic values, with the help of well-tried methods, including military interventions from the desires of those whom they

seek to "make happy." And in order not to be covered by the administration and political technologists of the United States, it is necessary to more effectively develop the national economy, modernize the style of public administration (Glagolev, Moiseev, 2016), strengthen the military-industrial potential of its country.

## 7. Conclusion

Thus, policy analysis and technology export liberal democracy American-style shows clearly that the main purpose of the United States here is not in itself a liberal democracy, and the formation on its basis and with the help of modern technologies such regimes and states, which would be loyal to the United States. In order to achieve its imperial ambitions of the United States overthrew the legitimate government as a result of the organized them "color" and "Arab revolutions", or threats to use military force, as was the case in the Middle East and North Africa, the Caucasus and Central Asia. Today, this technology is honed by Washington in Ukraine, Syria and other countries of the world.

As the political mechanisms designed to contribute to this goal, the US is widely used in exporting democracy in American way: controlled social chaos, military intervention and everything to "promote democracy and market reforms," the protection of human rights, etc. dogma.

In the organization of managed social chaos in a chosen country, political technologists from across the oceans apply already proven methods and means: the organization of ideological and political resistance to an authoritarian regime or totalitarian dictatorship through various kinds of paid protest actions, which are collected by the masses through propaganda campaigns and work in social networks . Thanks to these and other technologies for the export of liberal democracy, a coup in Ukraine was carried out with the displacement of the legally elected President V. Yanukovich in 2014, an attempted coup in Turkey in 2016, as well as a series of so-called "color revolutions" in various parts of the world . And all in the name of the notorious "national interests of the United States."

## Acknowledgments

The work is realized in the framework of the Belgorod State Technological University named after V.G. Shoukhov.

## References

- Glagolev, S.N., Moiseev, V.V., (2016). On the issue of the effectiveness of state regulation of the economy in a crisis, *Bulletin of BSTU. V.G. Shukhova*, 1, 204-208.
- Howard, R., (2006). *A Clever Crowd: A New Social Revolution*, Moscow: FAIR PRESS, 152 p.
- Lebedeva, T.P., (2004). Liberal Democracy as a Reference Point for Post-Totalitarian Transformations, *Polis. Political Studies*, 2, 76-84.
- Kazmina, O., (2015). Controlled chaos" - from theory to the social practice of the Russian "backwoods, *INTERACTION. Interview. Interpretation*, 10, 102-111.
- Kulikov, V., (2017). *Democracy in the American way*, Retrieved from <http://newsbook.name/lenta/demokratiya-po-amerikanski>
- Martynova, E., (2017). *Destruction of Yugoslavia: a history of conflict*, Retrieved from <http://www.srpska.ru/article.php?nid=11087>
- Schumpeter, J.A., (1995). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, Moscow: Economics, p. 540.

- Sharpe, D., (1993). *From dictatorship to democracy*. Bangkok, p. 262. Viburnum, S. (2017). *A nation that is admirable. A condensed account of the history of the emergence of global leadership of the United States of America*. Retrieved from <http://zavtra.ru/blogs/natsiya-vyizyvayuschaya-voshislenie>
- Stephen, M., (1992). "The theory of chaos and strategic thought," *Parameters*. Retrieved from <http://rpczmoskva.org.ru/k-svedeniyu/stiven-mann-teoriya-xaosa-i-strategicheskoe-myshlenie.html>
- Sundijev, I., (2017). *Managed chaos*, Retrieved from <http://svom.info/entry/262-upravlyaemyj-haos>