

DOI 10.52363/2414-5866-2023-2-24

УДК 342.95 + 351.74

Novikov V., Training Research and Production Centre of National University of Civil Protection of Ukraine, Kharkiv

*Новіков В. О., здобувач, ННВЦ НУЦЗУ, м. Харків,
ORCID: 0009-0002-6494-3975*

THEORETICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FEATURES OF THE MODERN DEFINITION OF THE CONCEPT OF HYBRID WAR

ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ Й ІНСТИТУЦІЙНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ СУЧАСНОГО ВИЗНАЧЕННЯ КОНЦЕПЦІЇ ГІБРИДНОЇ ВІЙНИ

У статті вивчається концепція гібридної війни, яка стала особливо актуальною після загострення відносин між Україною та РФ через повномасштабну агресію з боку останньої. Визначено, що до особливостей цієї концепції відносять комбінування традиційних й іррегулярних методів протистояння. На основі критичного аналізу доктринальних документів та експертних оцінок зроблено висновок, що дане поняття не має усталеного визначення ні у теоретичній, ні в інституційній площинах. На прикладі операції у Криму 2014 р. показано, що концепція гібридної війни використовується для її ототожнення із зовнішньою політикою держави, що відзначається мілітаристським характером.

Ключові слова: гібридна війна, військова доктрина, іррегулярна війна, нетрадиційна війна, загрози безпеці.

The article studies the concept of hybrid war, which became especially relevant after the aggravation of relations between Ukraine and the Russian Federation due to full-scale aggression by the latter. It was determined that the features of this concept include combining traditional and irregular methods of confrontation. Based on a critical analysis of doctrinal documents and expert assessments, it was concluded that this concept does not have an established definition either in the theoretical or in the institutional planes. Using the example of the operation in Crimea in 2014, it is shown that the concept of hybrid war is used to identify it with the foreign policy of the state, which is characterized by a militaristic character.

Key words: hybrid war, military doctrine, irregular war, unconventional war, security threats.

Problem statement. The term "hybrid war" was originally used to characterize the concept of "armed conflicts", which cannot be classified as either traditional or irregular, as they use different forms and methods of armed and unarmed warfare. According to F. Hoffman, the new trend of waging war eliminates the boundaries between previously known types of wars [4, p. 7].

As you know, increased attention to hybrid wars took place after the Second Lebanon War (2006) between Israel and Hezbollah, when the term came into circulation and was used both by politicians and the military. After 2014 (after the annexation of Crimea), the term hybrid war was used even more widely. It is this term that is increasingly used to describe Russia's full-scale aggression. At the same time, the term "hybrid war" is used both to define specific episodes, such as "color revolutions", and to describe the foreign policy of states (actually, Russian policy towards Ukraine or the Baltic states is increasingly called a hybrid war) [5].

At the NATO Warsaw Summit (2016), hybrid war was actively discussed, and it was even announced that a special strategy and substantive plans for its implementation would be created in the future, which relate to NATO's role in countering hybrid war [6]. However, it was discussed that the main responsibilities of countering hybrid threats still remain with our state. The Alliance was offered to consider the application of Art. 5 of the Treaty on Collective Defense for such cases. Thus, in Western countries, there is a trend towards a gradual equating of the concepts of "war", "hybrid war" and "military aggression". If it succeeds, then there will be legitimate grounds for using force against the state that creates a hybrid threat or a hybrid war. This raises the question of how to comprehensively define the concept of "hybrid war", how new is this concept in military affairs, how is the concept of hybrid war interpreted at the level of military doctrines, what place does hybrid war occupy in modern politics. All this determines the relevance of the chosen research topic.

Recent research and publications analysis. The problems of ensuring national security during the war period were studied by domestic and foreign scientists V. Abramov, U. Vakka, O. Vasylyshyn, M. Davidson, S. Dombrovska, I. Kekish, O. Kryukov, F. Miles, N. Nyzhnyk, O. Parkhomenko-Kutsevil, A. Pomazou-Ponomarenko, G. Sytnyk, V. Torychny, F. Hoffman and others. [1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 11; 12]. At the same time, external aggression has reached such a scale that it threatens the entire security system of Ukraine (social, economic, informational, ecological, etc.), characterized by atypicality and hybridity. Considering this, it is important to study the features of the formation of the concept of hybrid war.

Paper objective. The purpose of the article is the scientific and theoretical definition of the features of the modern concept of hybrid warfare.

Paper main body. Discussing hybrid methods of combat, American experts emphasize a qualitatively new stage in the evolution of wars. This novelty consists, according to F. Hoffman, in the fact that future conflicts will have a mixed nature in terms of the use of traditional and irregular methods of warfare [4]. However, the anal-

ysis of doctrinal documents of the United States of America shows that it is premature to talk about the emergence of the concept of hybrid wars as a new form of confrontation, since the Pentagon has not developed an official definition. In the Charter of Special Operations Forces of 2008, the term "hybrid" is used when interpreting the content of irregular wars, defining the idea of combining irregular, subversive acts of action to undermine or harm the influence of the United States and its strategic partners [7, p. 1-5]. Therefore, the term "hybrid" in combination with the terms "threat", "opposition" and "war" is also mentioned in other documents when describing the complexity of modern conflicts and the need to adapt the armed forces to them.

In addition, in the 2010 Quadrennial Review of Defense Policy, the term "hybrid warfare" is used to denote such features of modern military conflict as increased complexity, multiplicity of participants, including terrorist and criminal groups, asymmetric actions of the adversary, and, in general, the erosion of traditional ideas about the forms conflicts [8, p. 8]. On this basis, we can note that the "hybrid threat" is used in the most general form - as an antonym of the conventional threat.

So, the term does not yet have an independent and specific meaning, but in many respects it is close to the definition of the concept of "irregular wars". They are precisely defined in the doctrinal documents as a "power struggle between the state and non-state actors for legitimacy and influence over the population. Irregular war prefers indirect and asymmetric actions, although it can include a full range of military and other means to harm the power, influence and political will of the enemy" [9, p. 6]. The term "irregular war" has an ambiguous interpretation, because it is used in two meanings: 1) as a type of direct armed conflict (synonymous with low-intensity conflict); 2) as less intensive than armed conflict, the method of confrontation (terrorism, counter-terrorism, etc.). In the latter case, it is not always possible to prove their affiliation to a specific state, and these actions themselves may go beyond international law [ibid.].

The vagueness of the term "hybrid war" leads to the fact that the same conflict is evaluated differently by different military and civilian agencies. As you know, the Russian war with Georgia in 2008 is called a traditional war by the representatives of the special operations forces and the ground forces, and the representatives of the air forces call it a hybrid war, meaning a combination of traditional and non-traditional means and methods of combat. In addition, it is believed that hybrid wars are a more complex and intensive variant of irregular warfare. In this context, at this stage of the research, we can note that the interpretation of "hybrid war" through the prism of the triad of "unconventional war", "irregular war" and "special type of conflicts" will be appropriate. According to the researchers, there are no significant differences between irregular and hybrid wars, we can only talk about different interpretations associated with different interpretations of the same signs. We can make an intermediate conclusion that "hybridity" means some innovative combinations of methods of confrontation, which were primarily associated mainly with irregular warfare.

In parallel with the term "hybrid war" it is also possible to use the corresponding term "full spectrum operations" [10, p. 14-15]. The idea of "full spectrum operations" was proposed at the end of the 1990s as one of the areas of reform of the US armed forces, which was then actively promoted by Defense Secretary D. Rumsfeld [ibid.]. "Full spectrum" includes the following qualities:

- the ability of regular forces to conduct operations of various scales;
- equally effective use of military and non-military tools;
- readiness to reflect unforeseen threats;
- the ability to achieve a comprehensive advantage over any potential opponent

[11].

Such universal functions of "full-spectrum operations" are capable of acquiring, subject to the introduction into military affairs of the achievements of high-precision weapons and other components belonging to the so-called "revolution in military affairs." Thus, the concept of "full spectrum" is used both to characterize threats and to respond to them precisely in those aspects that today are included in the concept of hybrid threats and wars. Later, the concept of full-spectrum operations became a component of the concept of "joint/interspecies operations" (joint operations). Within the latter concept, emphasis is placed on the combination of interspecies interaction and on the neutralization of a virtually unlimited range of threats. However, such an ambitious task has not yet been solved in practice.

Thus, in scientific publications you can find different supporters of one or another concept of hybrid wars, who draw attention to the fact that the use of this term complicates military-political analysis, military planning, and especially the study of the experience of past wars. To this can be added the problem of inclusivity: hybrid warfare potentially includes any methods and means of struggle, which makes it difficult to determine the specifics of hybrid warfare as opposed to politics or other activities. Not only the term "hybrid war", but also "irregular war" as opposed to traditional war, are causing remarks by American experts. Irregularity is associated with rarity, deviation from the norm, non-systematic relatively less importance. However, this is a somewhat conditional opposition, which is possible only in analytical constructions, since history clearly shows that in most wars for centuries, both traditional and irregular methods of fighting were used together [12]. Their opposition like "either-or" makes it difficult to determine the relationship in practical use, and the introduction of another, at the same time vaguely defined term "hybrid wars" only exacerbates this problem. On this basis, we can recommend the use of synergistic and institutional approaches to the definition of the concept of "hybrid war". These approaches allow us to assert the importance of considering this type of war from the standpoint of the influence of certain factors that pose a threat to the security system of an individual state or a certain group of states, the guarantee and support of which (the security system) is a priority task of various public institutions under any circumstances conditions of their functioning.

Conclusions. Thus, the peculiarities of the concept of hybrid war have been revealed, which allow us to state the following: this concept has not yet acquired a single generally recognized characteristic, neither in theory nor in practice. It is noted that at the doctrinal level, innovations in the methods of defining unconventional war are associated with a change in the spectrum of threats and actors of the conflict, which form the quality that makes the war not just irregular, but hybrid. It was found that another feature of hybrid wars is their long-term nature, which requires a preventive and long-term policy of countermeasures organized at the state level. However, at the level of planning and conducting operations, the participants, methods and means of unconventional warfare remain key, which once again indicates that the concept of hybrid warfare is still in its infancy. Therefore, the researchers propose to call the method of countering the US hybrid threats from Russia, Iran and China "countering unconventional wars". Taking into account the fact that hybrid threats are of a long-term nature, it can be argued that in a few decades the doctrine of countering unconventional wars will be able to be given the status "as part of the US and NATO security strategy". In addition, it is proposed to apply synergistic and institutional approaches to the characterization of the concept of "hybrid war".

Referances:

1. Abramov V.I., Sytnyk G.P., Smolyanyuk V.F. Global and national security [Hlobal'na ta natsional'na bezpeka]. Kyiv: NADU. 2016. Print.
2. Vasylyshyn O., Tytor V., Kekish I. National security of the state: features of provision in the martial law regime [Natsional'na bezpeka derzhavy: osoblyvosti zabezpechennya u rezhymi voyennoho stanu]. URL: <http://econa.wunu.edu.ua/index.php/econa/article/view/3047>.
3. Pomaza-Ponomarenko A.L. "National security", [in:] Legislation of Ukraine: monograph [«Natsional'na bezpeka», [in:] Zakonodavstvo Ukrayiny : monohrafiya]. Kharkiv: NUTSZ of Ukraine, 2018. 168 p. Print.
4. Hoffman F. Conflict in the 21th Century: the Rise of Hybrid Wars. URL: http://www.projectwhitehorse.com/pdfs/HybridWar_0108.pdf.
5. Caryl C. If You Want to See Russian Information Warfare at its Worst, Visit These Countries. URL: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/democracy-post/wp/2017/04/05/if-you-want-to-see-russian-information-warfare-at-its-worst-visit-these-countries/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.4b778df7877f.
6. Statement on the Results of Meeting on the Highest Level in Warsaw, 9 July 2016, statement 72. URL: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_133169.htm?selectedLocale=ru.
7. FM 3-05.130. Army Special Operations Forces Unconventional Warfare, Washington, Department of the Army. URL: <https://fas.org/irp/doddir/army/fm3-05-130.pdf>.
8. Quadrennial Defense Review Report. Washington, Department of Defense, 2010. URL: <https://comw.org/qdr/fulltext/1002QDR2010.pdf>.
9. Irregular Warfare. Joint Operating Concept. Washington, Department of Defense,

2007. URL: https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/dod/iw-joc_v1_2007.pdf.
10. Hybrid Warfare. Briefing to the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities. Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives. September 10, 2010. URL: <https://www.gao.gov/assets/100/97053.pdf>.
11. Miles F. Asymmetric warfare: an historical perspective. Carlisle Barracks, U. S. Army War College, 1999. 47 p. Print.
12. Vacca W., Davidson M. The Regularity of Irregular Warfare. Parameters, 2011, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 18-34. Print.

Список використаних джерел:

1. Абрамов В.І., Ситник Г.П., Смоляннюк В.Ф. Глобальна та національна безпека. Київ: НАДУ. 2016.
2. Василишин О., Титор В., Кекіш І. Національна безпека держави: особливості забезпечення у режимі воєнного стану. URL: <http://econa.wunu.edu.ua/index.php/econa/article/view/3047>.
3. Помаза-Пономаренко А.Л. «Національна безпека», [in:] Законодавство України : монографія. Харків: НУЦЗ України, 2018. 168 с.
4. Hoffman F. Conflict in the 21th Century: the Rise of Hybrid Wars. URL: http://www.projectwhitehorse.com/pdfs/HybridWar_0108.pdf.
5. Caryl C. If You Want to See Russian Information Warfare at its Worst, Visit These Countries. URL: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/democracy-post/wp/2017/04/05/if-you-want-to-see-russian-information-warfare-at-its-worst-visit-these-countries/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.4b778df7877f.
6. Statement on the Results of Meeting on the Highest Level in Warsaw, 9 July 2016, statement 72. URL: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_133169.htm?selectedLocale=ru.
7. FM 3-05.130. Army Special Operations Forces Unconventional Warfare, Washington, Department of the Army. URL: <https://fas.org/irp/doddir/army/fm3-05-130.pdf>.
8. Quadrennial Defense Review Report. Washington, Department of Defense, 2010. URL: <https://comw.org/qdr/fulltext/1002QDR2010.pdf>.
9. Irregular Warfare. Joint Operating Concept. Washington, Department of Defense, 2007. URL: https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/dod/iw-joc_v1_2007.pdf.
10. Hybrid Warfare. Briefing to the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities. Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives. September 10, 2010. URL: <https://www.gao.gov/assets/100/97053.pdf>.
11. Miles F. Asymmetric warfare: an historical perspective. Carlisle Barracks, U. S. Army War College, 1999. 47 p.
12. Vacca W., Davidson M. The Regularity of Irregular Warfare. Parameters, 2011, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 18-34.