

THE MOSLEM WORLD: THEORETICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL PROBLEMS

DANILA KRYLOV. THE IMPACT OF REFLEXIVE CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES ON INCLUSIVE SECURITY ARCHITECTURE IN THE MIDDLE EAST. REFLECTION AND REFLECTIVE TECHNOLOGIES

*Keywords: reflexive governance;
Middle East; inclusive security architecture;
foreign policy; international relations;
Russia; Türkiye; Iran; Saudi Arabia; Israel.*

Danila Krylov,
Research Associate,
Department of Middle and Post-Soviet East,
INION RAN,
e-mail: danila-krylov@yandex.ru
SPIN code: 5422-5163
ORCID: 0000-0003-1982-4678

Citation: Krylov D. The Impact of Reflexive Control Technologies on Inclusive Security Architecture in the Middle East. Reflection and Reflective Technologies. // Russia and the Moslem World, 2024, № 1 (323), P. 120–137. DOI: 10.31249/rimm/2024.01.08

Abstract. The article is devoted to considering the influence of reflexive control technologies on the process of building inclusive security architecture in the Middle East. The author analyzes various types of reflexive control technologies. The situation and processes in the Middle East are characterized, as well as the peculiarities of the

functioning of the inclusive security architecture. Examples of the use of various reflexive control technologies by Türkiye, Iran, Saudi Arabia and Israel are given. A conclusion is drawn about the effectiveness of the use of reflexive control technologies by individual states in the Middle East within the framework of bilateral relations, as well as the advisability of Russia's use of reflexive control in relation to states and processes in the Middle East in order to achieve national interests and strategic objectives.

At the interdisciplinary level, the concept of “reflection” usually refers to the ability of a system to build models of itself, as well as other systems, while simultaneously seeing itself constructing similar models. In the context of control, reflexive activity can be considered within the framework of two scientific rationalities: classical and non-classical [1].

In classical scientific rationality, there is an ignorance of the reflexive activity of the object of control, since various modeling methods are used. However, this principle works primarily with technical systems and objects. The transfer and application of modeling methods in relation to social systems has shown some insufficiency and limitations. Nevertheless, similar principles continue to be actively used, for example, within the framework of classical game theory.

The emergence of non-classical scientific rationality made it possible to find new applications for reflexive control technologies. Thus, within the framework of the new paradigm, control is carried out in the “subject-subject” format. Within the framework of this article, “the object of control implies the party that carries out reflexive control, and the “subject of control” is the party in relation to whom control is carried out. Non-classical rationality is associated with a certain refusal to ignore the reflexive activity of the parties, and the activity itself has become a key attribute of the control objects being studied. As a result, the focus was on communicative reflection, which, among other

things, can be carried out using various reflexive technologies (theories).

It should be noted that the concepts of reflexive control were developed and substantiated primarily by Soviet and Russian scientists. As noted by T.L. Thomas, this concept is "alien" for the US [2]. At the same time, the armed forces and decision-makers in the USSR and modern Russia have used and are actively using reflexive technologies not only at the strategic and tactical levels in the military sphere, but also in domestic and foreign policy. In addition, if there were cooperation between Moscow and Washington in the field of reflexive control, then the paradigm of information war between two states could gradually change to the paradigm of partnership, albeit in the form of a controlled confrontation.

Major General N.I. Turco established a direct connection between information warfare and reflexive control, concluding that the latter is one of the means of waging the former. As a consequence, the use of reflexive control in all its diversity of capabilities, technologies and tools can be more significant and important, including in achieving military goals, than traditional combat military means, "fire power" [3]. Also, reflexive control can be used to achieve geopolitical dominance in certain regions or in the world as a whole, for example, as part of a containment policy, based on reflection in the sphere of subjects inflicting a possible unacceptable level of destruction [4].

As a result of research conducted by military and civilian scientists, three groups of reflexive activity technologies were identified: technologies of social regulation, technologies of controlled confrontation and technologies of reflexive control [5].

Technologies of social regulation include methods of organizing expedient practical activities that are aimed at achieving a given result by a social object of control [6]. Based on the complex nonlinear nature of the mechanism of social regulation, researchers have put forward the assumption that the basis for the implementation of this technology is a change

(including self-change) of interacting subjects under the influence of reflection [7]. There are a number of social regulations that can be applied in the implementation of the state's foreign policy. Moreover, they are most effective in situations involving influence on compatriots abroad (diaspora). Such regulations include, for example, value regulations that are used based on universal or ethnic values, historical memory and "national self-identification" [8]. Another form is traditional ritual regulations, focused on the traditions of groups, which make it possible to strengthen the unity of the diaspora and ensure the stability of the community as a social system. Socio-psychological regulations make it possible not only to strengthen existing ones, but also to form new values among individual groups. These regulations are related to issues of education and moral encouragement and should be built taking into account the characteristics of the psychology and characters of people [9]. Communication regulations imply a change in the nature and methods of communication and interaction with compatriots abroad. Comparative regulations are based on elements of comparison (comparative studies), juxtaposition, commensurate of people's behavior, their aspirations, goals, options for self-identification, and consciousness. Finally, symbolic regulations make it possible to control individuals and groups using both physical and various ideological symbols.

As for the technologies of controlled confrontation, historically the concept of "controlled confrontation" was developed and introduced into practical and scientific use by the Soviet and American psychologist and mathematician V.A. Lefebvre [10]. This group of reflexive technologies includes various methods of covert manipulation of the behavior of the subject of reflection, as a result of which this subject will independently make unfavorable decisions for him/herself, which will not be formalized with the legal guarantees necessary in such cases. Often, the subject will also assume responsibility for such actions independently, unilaterally [11]. Technologies of

controlled confrontation were actively used by the American leadership in relation to the Soviet Union / Russia, especially in those situations when the US proposed replacing official agreements and agreements with a compromise agreement, without requiring the Soviet / Russian side to officially sign them [12]. A striking example of the use of such technologies is the situation with the expansion of NATO to the East, despite the informal compromise agreements reached between the West and the Soviet Union in 1990 during negotiations on the unification of Germany [13]. Since there was no discussion between NATO member countries on this issue and no collective decision was made, and also due to the absence of an official signed document, the North Atlantic Alliance had for many years acted based on its own interests and violated the agreements reached, regularly declaring that there were no agreements ever [14]. At the same time, this form of control is incompatible with the "bureaucratic method" [15]. The effectiveness of a controlled confrontation decreases when one of the parties tries to force the other to sign a document. An even greater reduction in the effectiveness activity was noted by researchers during the intervention of the so-called ghostly subject, i.e. a hidden control subject whose strategy, goals and objectives, as well as whose interests and values are unidentifiable and who secretly seizes the initiative using a similar control model [16].

From the point of view of Lefebvre and subsequent researchers, the system of controlled confrontation is built on mathematical static models of reflection [17], which creates difficulties when working with social models that are extremely hard (if not at the level of impossible) to be assessed logically and substantiated mathematically, especially within the framework of political systems. Thus, despite the theoretical and historical justification, practical application and logical simplicity, the very concept of conflict control within the framework of international relations and world politics makes it possible to describe certain

ongoing processes and evaluate them, but cannot serve as a basis for adoption similar decisions.

As for reflexive control technologies, they include not only the control of reflexive activity, but also the imitation of reflexive activity, and reflexive programming. One of the conceptual results of the development of the set of these technologies was the emergence of the theory of “reflexive games” [18]. These include a group of open-type games, during which each participant tries to implement his own control strategy, using reflexive approaches. In these games, analysis and calculation of the options and consequences of various forms of social interaction are important [19].

Technologies for reflexive activity simulation include methods for simulating reflexive processes and structures, reflexive programming, the decision-making process, as well as tools that allow revealing the facts of reflexive control. Reflexive programming is considered to be the use of various systems and mechanisms for managing reflexive structures, technologies and processes. Programming also makes it possible to both block and stimulate reflection (both in general and reflexive control in particular). In addition, this technology allows you to create two unique states of reflection: “pulsating” and “virtual”. The first refers to a situation in which the object of control finds itself in a situation where current information about the nature of the effectiveness of the reflexive control model is dynamically changing. This is followed by a lack of understanding about the real development of the situation, the lack of the ability to verify information, as well as errors in assessing the results of reflection, which leads to the incorrect application of control methods. “Virtual reflection” is a state of the subject of control, in which the latter is not able to specifically and reliably determine who specifically, within the framework of reflexive control, makes decisions or influences their adoption [20].

As for activity control, it consists of transmitting information from an object to a subject, which is the basis for

decision-making. There are various forms of reflexive control, including simple, counter and double. For example, within the framework of double reflexive control, situations arise in which the subject carries out (as he believes) “revealing” of control attempts and sends the object a simulation, which is aimed at confirming the effectiveness of the technology. In this case, the object can distinguish the imitative nature of this data and, thus, use it to form adequate conclusions based on the results of using technologies [21]. If we complicate the reflection model, a situation may arise in which the object will initially lay down in his control program the factor of “opening” and the subject’s attempts to distort information and carry out counter control. In a simplified form, such a system can be characterized through the expression “I know that he knows that I know that he knows...”, in which “I” is the object that carries out reflexive control, “he” is the subject in relation to whom reflexive control is carried out, and the verb “knows” reflects the process of reflexive activity (both in the form of control, and imitation or programming). Thus, reflection can be repeated many times and focus on the mutual reaction of the object and subject to the actions being performed.

Situation in the Middle East and Inclusive Security Architecture

At the present stage, the Middle East region is one of the cornerstones forming the modern system of international relations, and an important link in the field of global energy and economic policy. At the same time, this region is traditionally characterized by an extremely high level of conflict, and the processes occurring in it affect not only neighboring regions, but also influence the global system as a whole.

The collapse of the bipolar system of international relations, which followed the formal end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union, led to the intensification of internal political

conflicts in the Middle East and to their internationalization [22]. Existing contradictions within individual countries are aggravated not only by complex interstate relations within the region and the active influence of external actors, but also by the lack of effective security architectures (at the regional level or uniting several neighboring ones), which would have the potential, capabilities and political willpower sufficient to actually reduce the intensity of conflicts.

Frequent conflicts, military-political and socio-economic crises cause constant changes in the balance of power at the regional and cross-regional levels. As of May 2023, five cross-regional centers of power have formed and strengthened their influence in the region: Egypt, Israel, Iran, Saudi Arabia and Türkiye. Two of these states (Türkiye and Iran) are currently, among other things, guarantor states of the Astana process, which is the basis for resolving one of the three largest regional crises – the Syrian one. Moreover, each of these centers of power plays its own role and exerts its own influence on regional processes, having not only lines of cooperation, but also confrontation with each other center state.

As for the Russian Federation, it is actively promoting its interests and values in the Middle East, preventing the destabilizing influence of world powers on regional processes and interference in the sovereign affairs of Middle Eastern states. To this end, since 2017, Moscow has been actively developing inclusive security architecture in the Middle East [23]. Currently, this structure largely affects the Syrian tension zone and is being built with the aim of resolving the Syrian conflict. Nevertheless, in the future, especially if the number of key states – member of the architecture expands, it is possible that the influence of this structure will spread to the entire Middle East region. The inclusiveness of the structure presupposes the involvement of all parties interested and ready for dialogue on equal terms, as well as the focus not so much on imposing certain decisions on the part of one hegemonic country, but on finding a compromise

between all participants and making mutually acceptable decisions [24]. Inclusive security architecture in the Middle East currently includes three states: Russia, Iran and Türkiye. Among the other states that represent cross-regional centers of power, only Egypt has the least influence and interest in the tension zone around Syria (compared to similar ones in Palestine, Libya or Yemen). As a result, Cairo, unlike Riyadh and Tel Aviv, is minimally involved in the functioning of the security architecture at the present stage.

Application of Reflexive Technologies by Middle Eastern states in the Context of an Inclusive Security Architecture

The states of the region are actively using various combinations of reflexive technologies. One of the striking examples is the Republic of Türkiye, which uses them to achieve its goals in the ideological and value sphere, using elements of Islamic and Türkiye discourse [25], in order to spread its values and image abroad [26]. For example, Ankara provides humanitarian assistance to neighboring countries, including through the Türkiye Cooperation and Coordination Agency (TİKA; Türk İşbirliği ve Koordinasyon Ajansı Başkanlığı). Most of the actions it carries out relate to technologies of social regulation. Thus, symbolic and socio-psychological regulations are actively used in relation to Islamic communities, and communicative, comparative and traditional ritual regulations are used in relation to Türkiye peoples. Simple reflexive control is used in the work of various Türkiye funds, centers and agencies, for example, when involving them in Ankara's military maneuvers [27].

Thus, the arsenal of opportunities even within one individual country is extremely wide. In this regard, firstly, when considering the political actions of states through the prism of reflexive control technologies, this study examined exclusively Iran, Türkiye, Saudi Arabia and Israel. Secondly, due to the

impossibility of covering the entire diversity of the multidirectional foreign policy of each state, the main attention was paid to the processes that influence the inclusive security architecture built by Russia in the Middle East. Thirdly, since the number of various actions exceeds the number of main groups of technologies, the examples of reflexive control presented below will be given in relation to the technologies used.

Technologies of social regulation (symbolic and communicative) are actively used by Türkiye and Saudi Arabia as part of the promotion of their national interests, especially in the religious sphere. Thus, Ankara actively supports the activities of the Moslem Brotherhood group, banned in Russia. At the same time, Riyadh, which has recognized this organization as terrorist (together with some other Arab states) [28], is both an object and a subject of reflection: Saudi Arabia uses this occasion as a cornerstone element in consolidating around itself those who advocate against the banned Moslem Brotherhood (for example, Egypt), but at the same time is the subject of simultaneous reflexive control on the part of Türkiye, improving its relations with Qatar, which shares its position on this issue. Thus, each country strengthens its own position in the region and forms coalitions: Saudi Arabia provides financial assistance to Egypt, which in return supports Riyadh in Libya and Yemen; Türkiye carries out military cooperation with Qatar and creates military bases on its territory, and Qatar responds politically, as well as informationally supports Ankara, including through mass media (Al Jazeera).

Another example of the use of social regulation technologies (symbolic and communicative) is the propaganda and psychological aspects of the Iranian-Israeli confrontation. Thus, Tel Aviv uses various aggressive political statements addressed to Tehran [29] in order to obtain a negative and harsh response. This is used not only to unite its own population against an external threat, but also to demonstrate to the international community the danger allegedly emanating from

Iran, as well as to possibly discredit and worsen Tehran's position at the international level, for example, in the area of possible achievement in the future of a new Joint comprehensive plan of action on Iran's nuclear program [30].

Conflict control technologies do not have such striking examples, since the states of the region strive to conclude real and valid bilateral agreements. Nevertheless, the individual actions of Saudi Arabia and Israel to normalize relations can be indirectly attributed to this form of reflection. Earlier in September 2020, the Israeli side had already signed agreements with the United Arab Emirates and Bahrain [31]. Each side cannot openly acknowledge the implementation of such steps towards political dialogue, since there is an unresolved Palestinian-Israeli issue, within which the positions of Riyadh and Tel Aviv are diametrically opposed. However, economic processes force in some cases to make certain compromises. In this regard, the parties actively use conflict control to obtain maximum benefits from unofficial informal contacts and achieve certain agreements without legally formalized agreements.

Most often, countries in the Middle East region use the tools of simple, counter and double reflexive control. Thus, Tel Aviv actively uses this type of technology in the situation related to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Provoking the Palestinian public and the Hamas group, as happened in the situation with blocking access to Al-Aqsa in May 2022, or Israel's confrontation with the radical Islamic Jihad group (a banned organization) in the Gaza Strip in May 2023, lead to a violent counter-reaction and attempts to resist. This, in turn, allows Israel to justify military spending on maintaining a high level of military forces and developing technologies, as well as conducting military operations in the Gaza Strip to combat the threat posed by armed Palestinian groups. Thus, Israel does not allow them to strengthen themselves and take control of the situation.

Saudi Arabia (KSA) also uses reflexive control in the foreign policy arena, for example, in its desire to manipulate world powers, using the oil and gas sector, OPEC/OPEC+ and oil supplies through the Persian Gulf as leverage. Understanding that the US is withdrawing troops from the region, including with the aim of creating a more controlled regime and weakening the KSA, Riyadh carries out counter reflexive control through price regulation and certain requirements in the field of security and arms supplies, taking into account that Washington and its allies in Europe cannot completely abandon oil supplies from the Persian Gulf countries.

Nevertheless, the events of 2022 and the first half of 2023 demonstrate that this control has a second level, at which the US creates legal obstacles to the reflexive control of the KSA, for example, through the adoption of the Oil Prohibition and Export Cartel Act (NOPEC) [32]. If Riyadh can respond in such a way that the White House again has to make decisions that leave the US with even fewer possible options for the development of events, limit Washington and create future difficulties in relations with the monarchies of the Persian Gulf and members of OPEC, then the Saudi Arabia will demonstrate the effective use of multi-level reflexive control technologies.

The main task of reflexive control, regardless of the technologies and methods used, is to influence the enemy, its plans (both military and political), as well as its understanding of the situation. Thus, from the military point of view, this concept is more related to the concept of “military art” than “military science”, and requires an understanding of the “internal nature”, concepts, ideas and values of the enemy [33]. As a result, these technologies may in the future become one of the key elements in conducting both individual information operations and

information warfare in general, especially in the ideological and value sphere.

At the same time, the information war, in which Russia takes an active part and which is an element of the total war of the West against the Russian world [34], is also being waged in the Middle East. Some actions of Western opponents are not so much directed against Moscow directly, but are aimed at weakening the positions and influence of the Kremlin [35] in the region, as well as destabilizing the situation in the Middle Eastern subsystem. Some of these actions contain elements of reflexive control technologies that influence as well the functioning of the inclusive security architecture being built by Russia. In this regard, in the future, Moscow itself will have to become an active and proactive object of reflexive control in order, through soft manipulations and the use of internal and external contradictions in the region, to direct the decision-making process in the states of the Middle East region in the direction that will be most acceptable and beneficial for Russian Federation.

References

1. Lepsky V.E. Control technologies in information wars (from classics to post-non-classics). – Moscow: Cogito-Center Publishing House, 2016. – 160 p.
2. Thomas T.L. Reflexive control in Russia: theory and military applications // Reflexive processes and control. – 2002. – T. 2, No. 1. – P. 71–89.
3. Prokhozhev A.A., Turko N.I. Fundamentals of information warfare // Report on the conference “Systems Analysis on the Threshold of the 21st Century: Theory and Practice”. – February 1996. – 251 p.
4. Turko N.I., Modestov S.A. Reflexive control of the development of strategic forces as a mechanism of modern geopolitics // Report on the conference “Systems Analysis on the Threshold of the 21st Century: Theory and Practice”. – February 1996. – P. 366.
5. Lepsky V.E. The types of reflexive control // Materials of the 4th All-Union Congress of the Society of Psychologists. – Tbilisi: METSNIEREB, 1971. – P. 371–372.
6. Chepinitskaya P.R. Technologies of social regulation in reflexive control research by the Russian foreign diaspora // Theory and practice of social development. – 2011. – No. 3. – P. 78–80.

-
7. Danakin N.S., Dyatchenko L.Ya., Speransky V.I. Mechanisms of social regulation in conflict control technology // Socio-political journal. – 1998. – No. 3. – P. 151–162.
 8. Mnatsakanyan M.O. Nations and nationalism // Social psychology of national life. – Moscow: Unity-Dana, 2004. – 368 p.
 9. Chepitskaya P.R. Technologies of social regulation in reflexive control research by the Russian foreign diaspora // Theory and practice of social development. – 2011. – No. 3. – P. 78–80.
 10. Lefevre V.A. Miscalculations of peacekeeping // Reflexive processes and control. – 2002. – T. 2, No. 2. – P. 48–51.
 11. Denisov A.A., Denisova E.V. A brief outline of the basics of controlled confrontation // Information wars. – 2014. – No. 1 (29). – P. 24–33.
 12. Lefevre V.A. Miscalculations of peacekeeping // Reflexive processes and control. – 2002. – T. 2, No. 2. – P. 48–51.
 13. Op-Ed: Russia's got a point: The U.S. broke a NATO promise // Los Angeles Times. – 05/30/2016. – URL: <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-shiffrinson-russia-us-nato-deal--20160530-snap-story.html> (date of access: 04/27/2023).
 14. Stoltenberg does not believe that NATO has broken its promise not to expand east // RIA Novosti. – 02/20/2022. – URL: <https://ria.ru/20220220/nato-1773853357.html> (access date: 04/27/2023).
 15. Denisov A.A., Denisova E.V. A brief outline of the basics of controlled confrontation // Information wars. – 2014. – No. 1 (29). – P. 24–33.
 16. Denisov A.A. "Ghost" subjects in the control of modern military and political conflict // State Service. – 2010. – No. 2 (64). – P. 67–70.
 17. Denisov A.A. Fundamentals of metrological support for conflict control in a geocentric theater // Information wars. – 2011. – No. 3. – P. 33–44.
 18. Lefevre V.A. Lectures on the theory of reflexive games. – Moscow: Cogito-Center, 2009. – 218 p.
 19. Novikov D.A., Chkhartishvili A.G. Reflective games. – Moscow: Sinteg, 2003. – 149 p.
 20. Lepsky V.E., Stepanov A.M. Features of reflexive processes in cult organizations // Reflexive processes and control. – 2002. – No. 2. – P. 59–72.
 21. Lefevre V.A. Conflicting structures. – Moscow: Higher School, 1967. – p. 86.
 22. Savicheva E.M. On the issue of the geopolitical situation in the Middle East: interaction of regional and global trends // Bulletin of the Russian Peoples' Friendship University. Series: International relations. – 2014. – No. 3. – P. 14–21.
 23. Naumkin V., Kuznetsov V. Middle East: towards an architecture of new stability? // Report of the Valdai International Discussion Club. – February 2020. – 23 p.

24. Krylov D.S. Inclusive security architecture in the Middle East: features of functioning and prospects for expansion // *International relations*. – 2021. – No. 3. – P. 1-14. – DOI: 10.7256/2454-0641.2021.3.36184.
25. Avatkov V.A. The ideological and value factor in Türkiye foreign policy // *Bulletin of MGIMO University*. – 2019. – No. 12 (4). – P. 113-129. – DOI: 10.24833/2071-8160-2019-4-67-113-129.
26. Druzhilovsky S.B. Türkiye: the habit of managing // *Russia in global politics*. – 2005. – V. 3, No. 6. – P. 48-61.
27. Avatkov V.A., Krylov D.S. Reflexive control in the implementation of Türkiye Republic of cross-regional policy of “soft power” // “Questions of History”. – 2020. – No. 8. – P. 131-152. – DOI: 10.31166/VoprosyIstorii202008Statyi05
28. Abueish T. Moslem Brotherhood is a terrorist group: Saudi Arabia’s Council of Senior Scholars // *Al Arabiya English*. – 11.11.2020. – URL: <https://english.alarabiya.net/News/gulf/2020/11/11/Muslim-Brotherhood-is-a-terrorist-group-Saudi-Arabia-s-Council-of-Senior-Scholars> (date of access: 04.27.2023).
29. The Israeli Prime Minister called for interrupting negotiations with Iran due to “nuclear blackmail” // *TASS*. – 02.12.2021. – URL: <https://tass.ru/mezhdunarodnaya-panorama/13091269> (date of access: 04/27/2023).
30. Britain and Israel want to work together to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear power // *Regnum*. – November 29, 2021. – URL: <https://regnum.ru/news/polit/3435367.html> (date of access: 04/27/2023).
31. Israel, UAE and Bahrain sign US-brokered normalization deals // *Al Jazeera*. – 10/15/2020. – URL: <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2020/9/15/israel-uae-and-bahrain-sign-us-brokered-normalisation-deals> (date of access: 04/27/2023).
32. The United States intends to declare war on the OPEC oil cartel and risks defeat // *Expert*. – 05/05/2022 – URL: <https://expert.ru/turbopages.org/expert.ru/s/2022/05/5/opek/> (date of access: 04/27/2023).
33. Thomas T.L. Reflexive control in Russia: theory and military applications // *Reflexive processes and control*. – 2002. – Vol. 2, No. 1. – P. 71-89.
34. Lavrov said that the West declared total war on the entire Russian world // *TASS*. – 05/27/2022. – URL: <https://tass.ru/politika/14747463> (date of access: 04/27/2023).
35. Vorobiev S.V. Indirect actions of the United States in the confrontation with Russia of the past and the future in the post-Soviet space // *Middle and post-Soviet East*. – 2023. – No. 1 (1). – P. 39-49. – DOI: 10.31249/j.2949-2408.2023.01.03.

Notes

1. Avatkov V.A. The ideological and value factor in Türkiye foreign policy // Bulletin of MGIMO University. – 2019. – No. 12 (4). – P. 113–129. – DOI: 10.24833/2071-8160-2019-4-67-113-129
2. Avatkov V.A., Krylov D.S. Reflexive control in the implementation of the cross-regional “soft power” policy by the Republic of Türkiye // “Questions of History”. – 2020. – No. 8. – P. 131–152. – DOI: 10.31166/Voprosy Istorii202008 Statyi05
3. Britain and Israel want to work together to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear power // Regnum. – November 29, 2021. – URL: <https://regnum.ru/news/polit/3435367.html> (date of access: 04/27/2023).
4. Vorobyov S.V. Indirect actions of the United States in the confrontation with Russia of the past and future in the post-Soviet space // Middle and post-Soviet East. – 2023. – No. 1 (1). – P. 39–49. – DOI: 10.31249/j.2949-2408.2023.01.03
5. Danakin N.S., Dyatchenko L.Ya., Speransky V.I. Mechanisms of social regulation in conflict control technology // Socio-political journal. – 1998. – No. 3. – P. 151–162.
6. Denisov A.A. “Ghost” subjects in the control of modern military and political conflict // State Service. – 2010. – No. 2 (64). – P. 67–70.
7. Denisov A.A. Fundamentals of metrological support for conflict control in a geocentric theater. // Information wars. – 2011. – No. 3. – P. 33–44.
8. Denisov A.A., Denisova E.V. A brief outline of the foundations of controlled confrontation // Information Wars. – 2014. – No. 1 (29). – P. 24–33.
9. Druzhilovsky S.B. Türkiye: the habit of managing // Russia in global politics. – 2005. – T. 3, No. 6. – P. 48–61.
10. Krylov D.S. Inclusive security architecture in the Middle East: features of functioning and prospects for expansion // International relations. – 2021. – No. 3. – P. 1–14. – DOI: 10.7256/2454-0641.2021.3.36184.
11. Lavrov said that the West declared total war on the entire Russian world // TASS. – 05/27/2022. – URL: <https://tass.ru/politika/14747463> (date of access: 04/27/2023).
12. Lepsky V.E. The types of reflexive control // Materials of the 4th All-Union Congress of the Society of Psychologists. – Tbilisi: METSNIEREB, 1971. – P. 371–372.
13. Lepsky V.E. Control technologies in information wars (from classics to post-non-classics). – Moscow: Cogito-Center, 2016. – P. 160
14. Lepsky V.E., Stepanov A.M. Features of reflexive processes in cult organizations // Reflexive processes and control. – 2002. – No. 2. – P. 59–72.
15. Lefevre V.A. Conflicting structures. – Moscow: Higher School, 1967. – 86 p.

16. Lefevre V.A. Lectures on the theory of reflexive games. – Moscow: Cogito-Center, 2009. – P. 218.
17. Lefevre V.A. Miscalculations of peacekeeping // Reflexive processes and control. – 2002. – Vol. 2, No. 2. – P. 48–51.
18. Mnatsakanyan M.O. Nations and nationalism // Social psychology of national life. – Moscow: Unity-Dana, 2004. – 368 p.
19. Naumkin V., Kuznetsov V. Middle East: towards an architecture of new stability? // Report of the Valdai International Discussion Club. – February 2020. – P. 23.
20. Novikov D.A., Chkhartishvili A.G. Reflective games. – Moscow: Sinteg, 2003. – 149 p.
21. Israeli Prime Minister called for interrupting negotiations with Iran due to “nuclear blackmail” // TASS. – 02.12.2021. – URL: <https://tass.ru/mezhdunarodnaya-panorama/13091269> (date of access: 04/27/2023).
22. Prokhozhev A.A., Turko N.I. Fundamentals of information warfare // Report on the conference “Systems Analysis on the Threshold of the 21st Century: Theory and Practice”. – February 1996. – P. 251.
23. Savicheva E.M. The issue of the geopolitical situation in the Middle East: interaction of regional and global trends // Bulletin of the Russian Peoples' Friendship University. Series: International relations. – 2014. – No. 3. – P. 14–21.
24. Stoltenberg does not believe that NATO has broken its promise not to expand east // RIA Novosti. – 02/20/2022. – URL: <https://ria.ru/20220220/nato-1773853357.html> (date of access: 04/27/2023).
25. The United States intends to declare war on the OPEC oil cartel and risks defeat // Expert. – 05/05/2022 – URL: <https://expert.ru/turbopages.org/expert.ru/s/2022/05/5/opek/> (date of access: 04/27/2023).
26. Thomas T.L. Reflexive control in Russia: theory and military applications // Reflexive processes and control. – 2002. – T. 2, No. 1. – P. 71–89.
27. Turko N.I., Modestov S.A. Reflexive control of the development of strategic forces as a mechanism of modern geopolitics // Report on the conference “Systems Analysis on the Threshold of the 21st Century: Theory and Practice.” – February 1996. – P. 366.
28. Chepinitetskaya P.R. Technologies of social regulation in the reflexive control of the Russian foreign diaspora // Theory and practice of social development. – 2011. – No. 3. – P. 78–80.
29. Abueish T. Moslem Brotherhood is a terrorist group: Saudi Arabia's Council of Senior Scholars // Al Arabiya English. – 11.11.2020. – URL: <https://english.alarabiya.net/News/gulf/2020/11/11/Muslim-Brotherhood-is-a-terrorist-group-Saudi-Arabia-s-Council-of-Senior-Scholars> (date of access: 04/27/2023).

-
- ³⁰. Israel, UAE and Bahrain sign US-brokered normalization deals // Al Jazeera. – 15.10.2020. – URL: <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2020/9/15/israel-uae-and-bahrain-sign-us-brokered-normalisation-deals> (date of access: 04/27/2023).
- ³¹. Op-Ed: Russia's got a point: The U.S. broke a NATO promise // Los Angeles Times. – 05/30/2016. – URL: <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-shiffrinson-russia-us-nato-deal--20160530-snap-story.html> (date of access: 04/27/2023).

Received: 28.12.2023.

Accepted for publication: 11.01.2024.