

*V. Zagorovska, student*

*V. Zahurska-Antoniuk, PhD in Political Sciences, As. Prof., research advisor*

*S. Kobzar, Senior Lecturer, language advisor*

*Zhytomyr State Technological University*

## **HYBRID WAR: NATURE AND STRUCTURE OF THE PHENOMENON**

The traditional understanding of the classical war formed in our civic consciousness by upbringing and education, has always had patriotic and historical orientation. We imagine a war as a process of confrontation of two parties located on opposite sides of the front. The enemy invades our land, we win it back and continue to live.

Currently, however, new forms of war as the armed conflict of the countries appear and are implemented. What does a hybrid war mean? This is the confrontation, which arises as a consequence of technological development, technical growth of defensive tools level, offensive weapons, in other words, technologies of warfare.

Specifics of the armed conflict, as well as the place and role of the military argument in politics, are naturally determined by the development level of society and technology. The process of sophistication of weapons and methods of warfare occurs in waves and is synchronous with the evolution of social organization and consciousness.

The information society generates peculiar forms of confrontation, and it does not have to be armed or open. Considerable attention is given to the analysis of the development of warfare forms and methods in modern and future wars (conflicts) in national and international scientific publications on military subjects.

This is due to their rapid development, which is considered by most experts as the emergence of new generation wars, and the need to determine the strategy of the states armed protection organization.

The author of the concept of a new war is Frank G. Hoffman, a former marine corps officer, scientific officer of the Ministry of defense of the USA, a great theorist in the field of armed conflicts and military-political strategy [1].

Today the topic of *hybrid wars* is already widely covered in the media, and is the subject of special studies. In particular, these studies were conducted by renowned world-class experts, including Frank Hoffman, Daniel T. Lasica, George Davis and David Kilcullen (USA) and Frank van Kappen (the Netherlands).

Journalist Frank Hoffman defines hybrid warfare as any action of the enemy, that instantly and coherently uses a complex combination of authorized weapons, guerrilla warfare, terrorism and criminal behaviour on the battlefield to achieve political goals.

Michael Isherwood in the book *Air power for hybrid war*, which was published by the Mitchell Institute of the Association of the U.S. air force in 2009, gives the following interpretation of the *hybrid war*: it is the war that erases the difference between a pure conventional war and a typical irregular one [5].

Nathan Fryer from the Strategic and International Studies Center was one of the key individuals who identified the threat, which a hybrid war contains: 1) traditional; 2) non-standard; 3) catastrophic terrorism; 4) explosive, when technology is used to counter the superiority in military power.

Characteristic features of *hybrid wars* are the following: aggression without a formal Declaration of war; the concealment of the aggressor of their participation in the conflict; the widespread use of irregular armed formations (including formations disguised as civilians); the disregard of the international norms of warfare, current agreements and arrangements by the aggressor; mutual measures of political and economic pressure (for the formal preservation of ties between the two countries); wide propaganda and counter-propaganda with the use of *dirty* information technology; conflict in cyberspace.

In any case, the country-aggressor must be ready to meet with a rebuff from the object of aggression, and the fact that the latter will have the support of other countries and international organizations (including political, economic, informational and military assistance and the imposition of sanctions against the aggressor).

Given the above stated, as well as available experience, the typical *hybrid war* consists of three main stages.

1. The first stage is preparatory. In the preparatory phase (which can last for several years) the leadership of the aggressor country actively involving the security services, take measures for the creation of ideological, political and military prerequisites for future aggression.

2. The second stage is active. At the active stage (it usually lasts about one year) covert aggression against the selected country is conducted, with the purpose of achieving the objectives.

3. The third stage is the final. At the final stage (duration is not limited) the aggressor strengthens its positions in the country-object of the aggression.

Nowadays this term has three branches. Hybridity may relate primarily to military situations and conditions; secondly, to the strategy and tactics of the enemy; thirdly, to the type of forces that the state should create and maintain [4].

In such type of war three types of weapons are used: model-organizational weapons; information weapons (conceptual, methodological, and chronological weapons); material weapons (economic weapons, conventional weapons of destruction and weapons of genocide) [5].

In 2004, on request of NATO a *Multiple Futures* study was carried out to identify trends in the field of international security in general and warfare in particular. In the final report hybrid war was also discussed. As noted by retired Major General Frank van Kappen, this term has many definitions. Further, the discussion was reduced to a purely military aspect and the definition of a hybrid war as a mixture of classical warfare with the use of irregular armed formations. Non-state performers combat missions "can do things that the state itself cannot do, because any state has the obligation to adhere to the Geneva Convention and the Hague Convention on the laws of war on land, and to the agreements with other countries. All the dirty work can be shifted on the shoulders of non-state groups". Psychological and informational aspects are in the field of view of the NATO specialist. So, he stressed that the world

community is placed before the fait accompli of aggression and rejection of naming it actually the aggressor. In the short term, this is a very winning tactic [3].

It is worth noting that the idea of hybrid warfare is not new. Military history is replete with examples of asymmetric wars with non-linear tactics and irregular forces, which are the older analogs of the modern hybrid warfare. One may recall Napoleon's war in Spain or the war in Vietnam. Actually, the war in general is not exclusively a confrontation on the battlefield, it includes elements of economic and psychological confrontation, the guerrilla. The ratio and the degree of influence of these components on the overall result, their role and place in the particular confrontation is determined by the level of society development and the spirit of the era. Wars and armed conflicts are spatial and temporal processes, which are based on a variety of contradictions, and the use of multi-scale military forces on the certain areas to achieve certain goals.

In the history of the world there are many examples of *hybrid wars*: the war in Karabakh, the Russian-Georgian war of 2008, the Russian-Ukrainian war of 2014-2015.

Armed aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine has become a long-term factor of influence on Ukrainian political, economic, military and social reality. The main goal of the Russian Federation against Ukraine is to weaken and decentralize our state, to bring to power Pro-Russian, Russia-guide government, to derail its European course, returning Ukraine under the control of the Russian Federation [4].

Russia's *hybrid war* against Ukraine is trying to solve several pressing geopolitical challenges.

First, to get rid of a competitor for influence in the post-Soviet space, because only our country among all the post-Soviet states has the potential to compete with Russia in this matter.

Secondly, the hypothetical defeat of Ukraine will significantly demoralize a number of countries in Central and Eastern Europe.

Thirdly, Ukraine irrationally used the potential obtained after becoming independent.

Now Russia is trying to implement the second phase of the *hybrid war* against Ukraine and at the same time (after reaching Minsk agreements) to perform certain elements of the third stage.

Russia uses Eastern Ukraine as a large polygon, which perfects in practice new methods and means of warfare. And it is hard not to agree with the President of Lithuania Dalia Grybauskaite that "Ukraine is now fighting for the sake of the whole world, for all of us. If a terrorist state that is conducting an open aggression against its neighbor is not stopped, it will spread to Europe and beyond."

So, hybrid war is a modern phenomenon. It combines completely different types and ways of warfare that are applied in a coordinated manner to achieve common goals. Scientific advances and technology allow us to wage war in a variety of forms even without its declaration or even without following legitimate standards. The state-aggressor is not an aggressor state, because it does not officially declare the war, but by the hands of others it leads the war. Experts call hybrid war the type of conflict that will increasingly be applied in the twenty-first century.

On a theoretical level a number of concepts of the new generation wars have already been developed. They are space wars, information wars, network wars, cyber-wars which are based on information technology. One of the clearest examples of the new generation war is Russia's hybrid war against Ukraine.

The basis for winning in a hybrid war is good governance in all the components of national security and not just military. Every citizen should be proud of Ukraine. We need to use the phenomenon of Russian-Ukrainian patriotism, which should act as a hidden reserve to relieve tension in an arc of bilingualism, and the promotion of dialogue between different parts of our great country.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Daniel T. Lasica. [Strategic Implications of Hybrid War: A Theory of Victory](#) — School of Advanced Military Studies, 2009.
2. Горбунов В. Н., Богданов С. А. О характере вооруженной борьбы в XXI веке / В. Н.Горбунов, С. А. Богданов // Воен. мысль.— 2009.— № 3.— С. 2–25. 6.
3. Корнієнко С. Путін веде в Україні гібридну війну – генерал Каппен [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.radiosvoboda.org/content/article/25363591.html>.
4. Незалежний аналітичний центр геополітичних досліджень – Електронний ресурс – Режим доступу: <http://bintel.com.ua/uk/article/gibrid-war/>.
5. Савин Л. Гибридная война. / Информационно-аналитический портал Геополитика. 27 янв. 2015 – [Електронный ресурс] / Режим доступу: <http://geopolitica.ru/article/gibridnaya-voyna#.VazC1qTtmko>.