

Polemological Paradigm of Hybrid War Research

Roman Dodonov — Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University
(Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: dodonovr68@gmail.com

Hryhorii Kovalskyi — Reader in Philosophy
Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University
(Vinnitsya, Ukraine)

E-mail: kovalsky.g@donnu.edu.ua

Vera Dodonova — Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University
(Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: dodonovav@gmail.com

Maryna Kolinko — PhD, Assistant Professor
Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University
(Vinnitsya, Ukraine)

E-mail: m.colinko@donnu.edu.ua

This article is devoted to the methodological problems and manipulative mechanisms of hybrid warfare. Owing to the polemological (from πολέμιος — war and λόγος — study) approach the authors managed to systematize and summarize the theories of war and peace, clarify contemporary western concepts of warfare, outline the specifics of the Russian view on the hybrid war concept, assess the significance of information and manipulation technologies for hybrid wars, analyze a number of geopolitical and socio-cultural dimensions of modern hybrid wars. The polemology is a branch of science, which studies the nature of armed conflicts and wars, their role in time and space, cycles, intensity, scope, scale, and causative relations and their classification. Polemology deals with the wars and armed conflicts of the past, present and future. Novel hybrid wars take a respective place among them. They involve using all available warfare, regular and irregular, cyber and those allowing for the use of weapons of mass destruction, and also information, psychological and propaganda war using the latest information and media technologies. According to the classical approach, the state is the only subject of military actions, but today its role has changed dramatically under the influence of other political and economic supranational and trans-border factors. For the purpose of studying wars

© Dodonov, Roman, 2017

© Kovalskyi, Hryhorii, 2017

© Dodonova, Vera, 2017

© Kolinko, Maryna, 2017

and armed conflicts from the polemological perspective it means the need to focus on social changes in all the areas of human life, on considering various elements of the political, economic or even technological context, which influence the war as a social phenomenon.

Keywords: Polemology, Philosophy of War, Hybrid Warfare, Information Manipulative Technologies, Mass Consciousness, Mythology and Ideologies, Transgression

Introduction

In April 2017 the monograph, prepared by the international research team, entitled “*The Hybrid war: in verbo et in praxi*” was published [The Hybrid War, 2017]. The work is devoted to the methodological problems and manipulative mechanisms of hybrid warfare. The authors include Ukrainian and Polish researchers of theoretical war studies (Oleg Bazaluk, Volodymyr Mandragelya, Kateryna Novikova, Lykash Roman), information and manipulation technologies (Roman Dodonov, Vitaliy Biletskyi, Hryhorii Kovalskyi, Vira Dodonova, Alexander Shtokvysh), geopolitical and interfaith dimensions of hybrid wars (Volodymyr Hurzhy, Ryslan Khalikov, Maryna Kolinko). Most of them work at the Department of Philosophy of Vasyl Stus Donetsk National University, which became a victim of the hybrid aggression itself in October 2014 and had to move from Donetsk to Vinnytsya. This situation in many ways explains authors’ interest in the philosophy of war.

Only some generations of scientists happen to be able to witness and record the events, which may be the turning points in the world history. The authors of the monograph believe they must record schismogenesis and schism maturation, since this evolution once determined certain expectations of Ukrainian citizens, changed the motives of their behavior and led to the outburst of an armed conflict in Donbass. However, it is evident that the scope of theoretical and practical issues, considered in the monograph, is not limited to the problems of the hybrid war in the East of Ukraine.

Modern polemological (from Old Greek words πολέμιος — war and λόγος — study) research focuses predominantly on two areas: the analysis of the international system and the empirical studies of the phenomenon of war. The technological evolution of weapons, orientation on mass destruction and prolonged wars were indeed thought-provoking. On the one hand, the conditions of the mankind survival were rethought, on the other — unprecedented nuclear weapons holding by few great powers worldwide and technological aspects of the prolonged local conflicts were realized, e.g. in Arabic countries.

Theoretical studies of numerous researchers improved the awareness of the trends of further transformations of wars and their nature in the 21st century [Krevelde, 2005; Toffler & Toffler, 1993; Deleuze, 2010; Kaldor, 2012; Delanda, 2014; The War in Ukraine, 2015]. The product of the 21st century is the so-called *hybrid wars*, which are the symbiosis of destroying the military and political system of the opponent by blackmailing, bribing, subversions, defamation, information pressure, and the manipulations of public conscience. The combination of military and non-military techniques using the social protest potential is the core of the new generation wars.

A series of publications, dedicated to the hybrid war, have recently been published in Ukraine, too. Special attention should be paid to the collective monograph of the National Institute of Strategic Studies “The World Hybrid War: Ukrainian Front” edited by Volodymyr Gorbulin [The World Hybrid War, 2017], monograph “The Theory of War and Peace: The Geophilosophy of Europe” by Oleg Bazaluk [Bazaluk, 2017], “The conflict in the East of Ukraine in the mirror of social and philosophical reflection” by Roman Dodonov [Dodonov, 2016], “Hybrid aggression of Russia. Lessons for Europe” by Evgeny Magda [Magda, 2017].

Monograph “*The Hybrid War: in verbo et in praxi*”, which is actually to be reviewed in this paper, follows this intellectual tradition. Owing to the polemological approach the authors managed to systematize and summarize the theories of war and peace, clarify contemporary western concepts of warfare, outline the specifics of the Russian view on the hybrid war concept, assess the significance of information and manipulation technologies for hybrid wars, analyze a number of geopolitical and socio-cultural dimensions of modern hybrid wars.

Hybrid war concept in the context of evolution of the theory of war

The first part of the monograph “Polemology as a methodological basis for war studies” opens with the background of polemology basics written by Polish researchers *Lykash Roman* and *Kateryna Novikova* [The Hybrid War, 2017: 10-21]. In this context *polemology* is a branch of science, which looks into war, violence and conflicts. This term shows the general theory of war, aiming at the detection of hidden sources of human aggression and social patterns, which trigger wars to be unleashed.

The French sociologist Gaston Bouthoul has been considered the founder of polemology [Bouthoul, 1951]. He believed that to avoid wars the sociological analysis of various sources may reveal the symptoms, pointing at the beginning of confrontation in the society. In general, different scientists focus their work on the war analysis thus creating specific discourses, mixed theories, since war is a highly sophisticated social phenomenon. In the literature, it is possible to find various definitions of the field of polemology. This is a branch of science, which studies the nature of armed conflicts and wars, their role in time and space, cycles, intensity, scope, scale, and causative relations and their classification. Polemology deals with the wars and armed conflicts of the past, present and future. Novel hybrid wars take a respective place among them. They involve using all available warfare, regular and irregular, cyber and those allowing for the use of weapons of mass destruction, and also information, psychological and propaganda war using the latest information and media technologies.

At this moment, there is no generally accepted definition of the hybrid war. For example, Nathan Freier from Center for Strategic and International Studies, one of the founders of this concept, who used to serve in the US Department of Defense, singled out four major types of the hybrid war combating: traditional clashes of regular armed forces, guerilla war, catastrophic terror and destructive techniques that undermine the military benefits of the regular armed forces [Freier, 2009].

Polemological reasoning regarding the sense of a hybrid conflict is not only in confirming the significance of this threat for the international environment or in the need of thorough, detailed and complex research. Since territorial dimension of war has been replaced with a multi-dimensional, multi-level range of military and non-military actions, designed for simultaneous achievement of different aims, polemologists even began claiming that all the previous classifications and taxonomies of war and their actors had lost their weight and scientific value.

Among the additional factors, which suddenly appeared in the foreground, it is necessary to mention not only globalization or obvious effect of advanced technologies, but also their co-existence with the remnants of *conventional* wars. Hybridization may thus be considered as co-existence of many incompatible elements, as the primitive means of warfare and weapons are still used along with the military super-technologies, while the postmodern war co-exists with the combat not only for areas, but also for minds, identities and values. Polish

scientists Mirosław Banasik and Ryszard Parañanowicz stated that the hybrid nature may also be manifested “in the confrontation between Eastern destructive-parasite and Eastern Christian civilizations [Banasik & Parañanowicz, 2015: 7].

According to the classical approach, the state is the only subject of military actions, but today its role has changed dramatically under the influence of other political and economic supranational and trans-border factors. For the purpose of studying wars and armed conflicts from the polemological perspective it means the need to focus on social changes in all the areas of human life, on considering various elements of the political, economic or even technological context, which influence the war as a social phenomenon.

The task of establishing a universal theory of war and peace is set by *Oleg Bazaluk*, based on the general theory of evolution and geo-philosophical regularities. The history of creating civilization loci, the direction of their development, endless change of locus boundaries form the field studied by geo-philosophy and the scientific philosophical grounds for establishing the theory of war and peace. In most cases, the locus of civilization is understood as a specific political or social community (people, nation, state). The endlessness of localization is normally regarded as the types of civilizations and as the opposition of people, nations, and civilizations. Political and social organizations, different options of their interaction are merely a top visible part of the social framework, created by human mind. Undoubtedly, they partially reveal the features of forming the locus of civilization and the endless localization process, but in fact they are merely external manifestations of content, but not the content of a certain civilization locus itself. Thus, the “locus of civilization” is a continuous and nonlinearly more and more complicated psi-space with the total of its products prone to isolation on a separate geographical or imaginary (virtual) area.

Therefore, a war can be defined as a violent invasion of one psi-space to the locus of another psi-space, which causes significant changes in its expression, whereas peace can be understood as agreed interaction between psi-spaces, which means respect and promotion of each other’s manifestations. The methodology of geo-philosophy defines war and peace as endless and non-linear interaction among psi-spaces, which show up in the continuous change of location borders on the surface of the Earth.

The empirical grounds for the theory of war and peace comprise of the facts and regularities from the field of neurosciences, psychology and social philosophy; geo-philosophy; military history and the history of military art. Oleg Bazaluk lays the following axioms as the basis of the general theory of war and peace: a separate locus of civilization and the person have a single rhizome — evolving psyche; evolution is a continuous and non-linear complication of the substance structure, types of relations and habitats, which is subject to three factors and two reasons, universal for any material organization in the Universe. Hence, psi-space complication is also continuous, stepwise and compliant with the dominant principle; non-linear since it is a directed and hierarchical process; depending on the space, temporary and reproductive isolation; under the effect of the active source, laid in the basis of the psi-space neuron structures from time immemorial; provided survival of the fittest [Bazaluk, 2017; Bazaluk, 2017a; Bazaluk & Blazhevych, 2016].

The basics of the theory of war and peace include five principles [Bazaluk, 2017]:

1. The rhizome of aggressive manifestations of the psi-space is in the pathologies, which emerge as a result of continuous and non-linear complication of the structure and functions of neuron ensembles of the unconscious and the conscious.
2. Favourable, provoking and supportive physical-chemical factors of the environment influence the aggressive expressions of the psi-space.

3. Provided in the perception of the psi-space the locus of civilization shifted from geographical area to the condition of the world of historical ideas — it becomes sacred and invincible. Contemporary wars are the combat of ideas.

4. The fall and integration of the loci of civilization are directly related to the world of historical ideas updating and outdated.

5. The nature of psi-space endlessly and non-linearly encourages it to create the most comfortable conditions for the full implementation of the internal creative potential.

Thus, the evolution of the psi-space is the story of its manifestations in the locus and beyond it. The evolution of the psi-space and its manifestations is based on continuous and non-linear complication of the structure and functions of the neuron ensemble of the unconscious and conscious, as well as endless and non-linear complication of the physical and chemical favorable, provoking and supportive environmental factors. The psi-space complication is determined by universal factors and reasons for evolution. In this eternal and non-linear complication process war and peace are the manifestations of the psi-space, which enable to achieve a regular compromise between conflicting forces: the active part and the natural kindness (or complicated structure of the neuron ensembles of the unconscious and conscious and the environmental conditions). War and peace are the means of achieving a compromise between the complicated needs of the psi-space and possibilities of their satisfaction, between the declared idea, which unites the psi-space and the possibility of its implementation.

Modern concepts of warfare and insights into the hybrid war in Ukraine in the research of western experts are given in section by professor *Volodymyr Mandragelya* [The Hybrid War, 2017: 58-93]. According to him, one of the most successful definitions of the hybrid war belongs to Robert Newson — this is a combination of conventional, irregular and asymmetrical means, which include continuous manipulation of the political and ideological conflict, and also engagement of special armed forces and conventional troops, intelligence agents, political provokers, mass media representatives, economic blackmail; cyberattacks; proxy servers and surrogates, para-military, terrorist and criminal elements [Newson, 2014].

The *Volodymyr Mandragelya* concept considers the hybrid war in the context of the evolution of ideas on the warfare strategies. In particular, the Network-centric warfare / The Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA) concept rapidly entered the scientific discourse after the success of the coalition forces headed by the USA in the military operation against Iraq (1991), which had occupied Kuwait. The RMA features fundamental changes in the basics of warfare, which was the consequence of innovative application of new technologies along with radical changes in military doctrines, operative and organizational concepts. All these profoundly changed the nature and procedure of military operations. At the same time, contemporary experts frequently use the concept of “overrated technological optimism” in their assessment of the effectiveness of this concept. The armed conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq in the early 2000s proved that technological benefits are a necessary, but insufficient condition to achieve political aims.

The concept of the Fourth Generation War by William S. Lind bases on the statement of the loss of the state monopoly to violence, since there appear influential opponents like Al-Qaeda, Hamas, and Hezbollah. Here the world turns to the combat between cultures, but not countries only. The key reason for their outburst is understood by the researcher as the universal crisis of state legitimacy, which creates pre-conditions for domestic conflicts and civil wars [Lind, 2004].

The concept of the Sixth Generation War was developed by Russian major general Volodymyr Slipchenko and was grounded on the outcomes of the military actions of the USA and the NATO in Kosovo in 1999, where the western coalition troops managed not to lose nearly any lives. They are characterized by contactless military actions, application of high-precision and non-lethal weapons, other advanced technologies, computerization of armed combat.

The concept of counter-rebellion military actions became the consequence of summarizing the military actions of the USSR and the USA in Afghanistan and American troops in Iraq. Military victories, seizure of territories, removal from offices of the most notorious dictators, attempts to force and impose democratic principles in some societies failed. Accordingly, counter-rebellion military actions may be defined as comprehensive efforts of the military and civilians to simultaneously defeat rebellions and their main reasons.

The concept of asymmetrical military action became significant after terror attacks of Al-Qaeda on September 11, 2001 in the USA. Catastrophic attacks in New York and Washington were so expressive, that it was absolutely clear: conventional (traditional) warfare is in the past. To defeat a *novel* opponent it is required to use new forms and methods of counteraction, where the foreground is occupied by the active forms and methods of secret services activities, new means of technological control and observation.

The specifics of the Russian vision of the goals, content, measures and forms of hybrid war are discussed by *Roman Dodonov*. He affirms that the Russian military science critically reconsidered theoretical provisions of a number of western works — concepts of “a low-intensity conflict”, “degenerate”, “net-centric”, “non-linear”, “asymmetrical”, “surrogate” wars, “transformer war”, “nesting-doll war” etc. These notions also include the concept of a “hybrid war”, but in the dedicated literature Russian researchers avoid using this term, though actually they work in the respective conceptual framework [The Hybrid War, 2017: 94-133].

In the fullest way, the principles of the Russian invariant of the hybrid war concept were described in the so-called *Gerasimov doctrine*. It is characterized by the recognition of the role of non-military means to achieve strategic goals, as effective as military violence; shifting the accent towards political, economic, information, humanitarian activities carried out using public protest potential; aggressor technological effect on the public conscience, including information, in particular, cyberattacks. The transition to the open use of military force is, normally, at the final stage of the conflict — to confirm the success. Some elements of the above doctrine, naturally, operated before. Available historical experience of the Russian Empire fight for the psi-space of surrounding areas does not allow us to make a conclusion on the fundamental novelty of the hybrid war concept provisions, but in the conditions of the 21st century information society they were a consistent and foreseeable form of war transformation.

The Russian view on hybrid war significantly “mirrors” that of the American invariant. The latter features the focus on *color revolutions*, which are allegedly inspired by the USA worldwide, and the need of information combat and importance of peace-keeping operations. Having selected the well-known tactics that “offense is the best defense”, Russian propagandists fully shed responsibility for the aggressive behavior with the RF, shifting it to the USA and its allies in Europe. Therefore, when Russian mass media write about the hybrid war, they mean the war of the West against Russia.

Theoretical findings of the experts of the Russian Academy of Military Sciences found immediate practical approbation and respective correction during the conflicts on the post-

Soviet territory and the Middle East. The practice showed the effectiveness of Russia's use of the information combat techniques, which change and improve continuously. The intensity of the information influence of the Russian mass media on the opponent's psi-space provides grounds for incorrect idealization of this aspect and even the strive for identifying hybrid war exclusively with the information one.

Owing to large-scale hybrid activities opponent's psi-space bodies are affected, including public conscience, historical memory, image of historical justice etc. Actually a certain virtual reality is formed. It meets the interests of hybrid aggression. It is typical that the methodology, widely used by the Russian propaganda, was philosophically substantiated by post-modernistic thinkers. The initial protest of the postmodernism founders against the totality, rigid control of the state, imposition of the single narration was accompanied with the development of the basics of public ideal, where the pluralism of views would reign, and each minority would be assessed individually. In fact, these methodological findings transform into the propaganda weapon of the hybrid war. Thus, the in Russian military science the idea of the "hybrid" nature of modern wars has passed the full way from its conceptualization to the practical approbation and confirmation in strategic national documents.

Information and manipulation means of hybrid warfare

The second part of the work is dedicated to the discussion of the modern warfare instruments. The specific features of the information combat against Ukraine are described by *Hryhorii Kovalskyi*. The military aggression against Ukraine is called differently. From the theoretical warfare viewpoint it is a hybrid war, a "controlled chaos" war etc. On the other hand, the war gains the features of a "domestic political crisis" or a "civil war". Unavailable real assessment of the situation in Ukraine, confirmation of this reality legally prevents from fast settlement of social controversies, which are heated up externally, rapid settlement of the military aspect of the problem, quick overcoming the consequences in the environmental, economic, cultural, social, and other Ukrainian life domains. The use of some terms has also become an element of the hybrid war. The difference between the notion of a "conflict" and a "war" is in scaling the conflict, understanding international legal obligations by third persons and parties thereto. Therefore, these events should be referred to as the "war".

Clarification of the definitions of these notions will enable actual, and not imaginary understanding of the confrontation, methods of counteraction, methods of destruction, drivers and immediate participants of these processes, destructive not only for Ukraine but also for the global security space. Today the global community stays on the grounds of the concept of inviolability of national borders, specified in Yalta-Potsdam system of international relations. By signing, the Association Agreement with the EU Ukraine made its cultural and ideological choice of the civilization development direction. The new geopolitical reality of the post-Soviet space is Ukraine as the centre of consolidation and the source of European values for the western Eurasian territory. The establishment of the Ukrainian concept is based on the national features of the Ukrainian people [Kovalskyi, 2015].

External value orientation is on the other side of the military activities and assists in understanding the reasons of the conflict, bring it to the level of inter-civilization confrontation [Kovalskyi, 2017: 5-14]. The rapid development of the global society, the appearance of a great differentiated world of values, complication of value relations *person-person*, *person-state*, *state-state* have become a catalyst of the crisis of value orientations not only in Ukraine, but also in all Eastern Europe. Somewhere the crisis shows up being perverted in, e.g. indoctrination of criminal ethics, experiments with imposing the values, which are erroneous

and atypical of contemporary Ukrainian society. Deformed information is an instrument of recoding new senses in respective electoral groups. Changes in the connotation of terms, events and phenomena brought public discourse from the rational into the emotional domain, thus depriving it of the alternative assessment.

This topic is continued and deployed by *Vitaliy Biletskyi*, who analyzes the aggressor technological influence on public conscience based on the Eastern Ukrainian conflict [The Hybrid War, 2017: 175-236]. The key public conscience manipulation tool is in seeking to build and most powerfully translate an integrated information work — “the mythology of hybrid war”. Consisting of five basic interrelated basic elements, it forms either erroneous or mystified image of opposition forces, as well as the social background. At the same time mythology may actively change and assimilate any fact, event, politician’s statement etc. Being transformed, all these become parts of the mythology background — a mythologeme. This manipulation tool is translated and inspired in a number of ways, including the channels of delivering political myths, and technological tools of influencing public conscience. The channels are distorted to the dysfunction of the political propaganda social institutions of education, religion and arts.

However, the main information channel of hybrid wars is TV and other mass media, which do not provide for independent and free search for information by the recipient. Instead of the pluralistic information there is fabrication of non-existing *news*, comments on these simulacra and inspiration of the pre-set mythologemes. Thus, suggestion pursues two main principles — in the way preferred for the manipulator, but generally depressively, influence the language, thinking and public distress area. This destruction of the cultural core is addressed to a number of communities: the society of the victim state must, after manipulation, either significantly weaken the state, or loyally perceive the seizure of its land, or at least make minimum resistance. To implement these principles the channels of manipulation translate a wide range of means: rhetoric and linguistic, including, pre-language associative tools, whose continuous and insistent influence creates synergetic effect and the effective fields overlap.

The use of discourse in the warfare is discussed on the example of Donbass by professor *Vera Dodonova* [The Hybrid War, 2017: 237-272]. In the information discourse she pointed out the essential messages of the residents of Ukrainian occupied territories, which may be formulated as follows: legal voluntarism of the Ukrainian power and making decisions based on revolutionary practicability; unacceptable organization of the Ukrainian political domain and assault on the value constants of the “Russian World”; violation of the basic human right — the right to life: fire in towns, restriction of freedom of movement and the introduction of checkpoints to the ATO zone; in compliance with Minsk agreements by Ukraine; attack on sacred, mythologized events of the past; economic blockade of LNR / DNR; non-payment of pensions in the republics. The study of the Donbass claims against Ukraine, the analysis of their actual bases do not contradict the fact of aggression against Ukraine, the fact of interfering with internal affairs of an independent state, the fact of weapons and ammunition supplies to the territory of established republics, which continuously *heat* this conflict. However, the political actions of the Ukrainian leadership also include a lot of those, which do not promote fast settlement of the conflict. Rationalization of these claims will prevent their shift into the public unconscious and will help to build healthy relations in the future [Dodonova, 2015].

The subject of *Alexander Shtokvysh*’s research is the modern myth of the Great Victory and its manipulative potential [The Hybrid War, 2017: 273-321]. As a means of public

conscience manipulation, contemporary attributes of myth-making were considered. The aggressor mentally attacks Ukraine, applying a sophisticated system of public conscience manipulation using artificially revived myths, in particular, the one on the Great Victory. It transforms Ukrainians on temporarily controlled by it territories into an easily manageable political force, makes political vectors inside Ukraine chaotic, misinforms own people and global community by electronic mass media.

The described above mechanisms and techniques are individual cases and specific historic manifestations of general regularities of the hybrid warfare.

Polemological dimensions of hybrid wars since the beginning of 21st century

In the third part of the monograph authors move on to describing the general global polemological dimensions of hybrid wars of the 21st century. For example, the paper by *Ryslan Khalikov* deals with the features of geopolitical specifics of hybrid wars in the Middle East along with establishing religious and political coalitions, engagement information and manipulation tools, creation of geographical and ethnical borders by all the states involved [The Hybrid War, 2017: 323-338].

In particular, the scholar suggested considering the confrontation in Syria and Iraq, provided we step beyond the level of confrontation between the government and rebels, as the fight for the leadership in the Islamist project between Sunni, but secularized Turkey, and Shia, but secularized Iran. However, all the existing geopolitical projects (Western, Russian, Chinese, Islamist) to a certain extent ignore the principle of non-interference with the internal affairs of another country, because of which they rather easily decided to get involved in the Syrian conflict and turn it into the arena for global transformations, disregarding aspirations of the local population. It should be noted that despite anti-Western orientation of the Russian and Islamist projects they did not unite to fight against the West, but stand their own grounds, trying to ally with the West when beneficial for them. This may show the inability of each of these alternative projects to fight against the Western world by themselves, and also the unwillingness to have allies in this combat, which would mean to share the glory in case of the Victory. Instead, the West so far has enough forces to achieve its goals in any of its former colonies, though it is not able to fully control them any more.

Volodimir Hurzhy devoted his part to studying the ideologeme of the *Russian World* in modern hybrid wars [The Hybrid War, 2017: 339-362]. According to the scholar, the so-called “Russian spring” stays a highly painful fact of the recent past not only in the political but also in the scientific discourse. The world view and value potential of the Russian World may be used to mobilize anti-Western movements, giving them the grounds for theoretical substantiation of their own beliefs and non-practical development benchmarks. Currently the Russian dominant thought is that following the Western development model is not justified, the introduction of these senses will not ensure sustainable development of the country, since many western values may change in the upcoming years. In their works, Russian researchers and ideologists came to the conclusion that the RF has its history, despite being terrifying in parts, but it is its history that enables the country to understand itself and its civilization role in the global world.

The Russian World concept, which in this or that way played the self-identification role for the Moscow and Russian state in their relations with the West for centuries, has acquired a new form today. Revived after the devaluation of the communist ideology, this ideologeme has transformed a competitive tool in the game on the global arena. Whether this project in

its novel incarnation was intended to be the weapon of ideological and common wars (some evidence for this statement were given above), or whether it matured as a way of maintaining Russian identity and culture, but has turned today into an active religiously motivated alternative of the global development project, which was created by the West. It can well be expected that under any circumstances the way of thinking, which opens under the Russian World paradigm — considering its highly demanded in contemporary Russia consolidating resource and influence on the perception of current and interpretation of historic events — will stay an important factor in forming the Russian policy for the coming years.

The final part of the monograph, written by *Maryna Kolinko*, studies the life experience of the displaced persons in the conditions of the hybrid war in Donbass from the standpoint of the everyday routine transgression [The Hybrid War, 2017: 363-379]. The scholar defines transgression as a form of humane attitude. Transgression fits the society as various sociocultural practices and has to be implemented as human experience on the borderline of existence. It is required to know the risks, but not to “close doors” fearing the different, stay on the edge of friendliness and autonomy. Being civilized people, we deny xenophobia by default, but at times, we conceal our intolerance to the different by interpretation *pragmatism*, *rationalism* or *realism*, which is in fact a doubtful practice, which affects more than benefits. The principal difference between an internally displaced person and a refugee is in the absence or presence of a foreign citizenship. An internally displaced person is a citizen of Ukraine, while the status of a refugee in Ukraine may be granted to a foreign citizen. A refugee is the subject of international law, whereas the internally displaced person is the subject of the state migration legal relations.

The transgression, as a form of denying some reality, performs an important social function. It draws attention to the objection of the cultural subject to follow given norms, which restrict his or her freedom. Everyday conscience refers transgression to the marginal practices alongside amorality and law breaking, while the transgression agent is an asocial element, but this is an erroneous, simplified interpretation of the phenomenon. The transgression agent seeks to get beyond his or her cultural field to the common, towards the integral life, unlimited by mono-cultural rules, which is inaccessible in the domestic culture. The biggest danger of the home world restriction is when it is embraced with propaganda network of external aggressor and is subject to the active information treatment.

The transgressive experience of moving as taking an alternative way of their routine life opens understanding of their existence reality. The social meaning of the migrants’ transgressive experience is also in the fact that the mechanism of violation becomes a form of sociocultural order renovation. The IDPs’ movement encourages law democratization, leads to changes in the social structure. However, transgression agents may destructively influence the recipient culture as well: the growing crime rate, higher poverty level, providing dislocation of social marginal due to the military operations.

Conclusion

To realize the sense of hybrid wars, understood as a combination of conventional, irregular and asymmetrical means, which include continuous manipulation of political and ideological conflict, also engagement of special armed forces and conventional troops, intelligence agents, political provokers, mass media representatives, economic blackmail; cyberattacks; proxy servers and surrogates, para-military, terrorist and criminal elements, the authors applied elements of polemological paradigm. It enabled to formulate the provisions of the general theory of war and peace:

1. The regular process, based on universal factors and reasons for evolution, is the mosaic pattern of the anthroposphere, i.e. endless localization of the Earth space, which means its continuous presence over the humanity existence period.

2. Manifestations of the psi-space become more complicated along with the structures and functions of the very psi-space, including warfare and peace-making. Therefore, the attitude to war and peace and their resources are directly related to the degree of psi-space development and its manifestations.

3. War and peace are the main ways of extending the possibilities of the locus of civilization. For the continuous and non-linear complication of the internal structure and its manifestations, the psi-space often lacks material, labor, energy and information resources of its locus. To solve this problem the psi-space unleashes a war or uses peace prospects. In today's world, several ideological projects, seeking to gain the global scale, may be observed: Western secular (post-Christian) project oriented on liberal secular values; so-called Russian (Russian World ideology); so-called Chinese (related to the core values ideology); and the so-called Islamic one.

4. Aggression of the psi-space tends to be hugely intensified through the growth of its application. Experiments carried out by Stanley Milgram and Philip Zimbardo reveal the content of the Roman idea, concentrated in the saying by Roman historian Cornelius Nepon "*Si vis pacem, para bellum*". The impunity of aggression intensifies aggressive expression of the psi-space.

5. The role of leader in psi-space choosing either war or peace is crucial. The more powers in ruling the psi-space leaders have, the stronger psi-space development dependence is on the orientation of their creative potentials. The typology of political leaders by Machiavelli where *lions* and *foxes* are singled out and they correspond to the typical forms of behavior when settling issues — ether war or peace.

Thus, the hybrid form of the civilization expansion was chosen by the RF leaders deliberately, since the Russian society still has the feeling of the national defeat in the Cold War, USSR collapse and the loss of the great power status. The first victims of the hybrid aggression were the countries of the post-Soviet area, which are the RF closest neighbors. The goal was to destroy the ability of the state system to defend by widely using initiated public protest moods, introduction of *an information virus* in the value axiological element of the public conscience, discrediting military political leaders of the country etc. The concept of the Russian hybrid war invariant was documented in the Gerasimov doctrine. The strategy described in the doctrine provides for acknowledging the leading role of non-military means in achieving strategical aims; shifting emphases towards political, economic, information, humanitarian actions, implemented with public protest potential; aggressive technological influence on the public conscience, including information and cyberattacks. According to the doctrine, the transition to the open use of military force is at the final stage of the conflict, usually, under cover of peace-keeping.

References

- Banasik, Mirosław, and Ryszard Parafianowicz. Hybrid theory and practice. *Zeszyty Naukowe AON*. № 2(99) 2015: 5-25.
- Bazaluk, Oleg. *The Theory of War and Peace: The Geophilosophy of Europe*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017.
- Bazaluk, Oleg. The Problem of War and Peace: a Historical and Philosophical Analysis. In *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 18, 2017a: 85-103.

-
-
- Bazaluk, Oleg, and Tamara Blazhevych. The Philosophy of War and Peace. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 17, 2016: 12-25
- Bouthoul, Gaston. *Les guerres — Elements de polemologie*. Paris, Payot 1951.
- Delanda, Manuel. *War in the Era of Intelligent Machine*. Ekaterinburg, Moscow, Cabinet Scientist 2014.
- Deleuze, Gilles. Treatise on the Nomadology: The Machine of War. In the book: Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Felix. *Thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia*. Ekaterinburg, U-Faktoriya; Moscow, Astrel 2010: 587-716.
- Dodonov, Roman. Crisis, War or Conflict — how correctly to call events in the East of Ukraine? *Shkid*, № 2 (134) 2015: 107-112.
- Dodonov, Roman. Patterns of Deployment of Armed Conflicts at the end of the 20th-early 21st centuries. *Bulletin of Donetsk National University*. Series philosophical sciences. № 1. Vinnitsa 2016: 84-93.
- Dodonov, Roman. *The Conflict in the East of Ukraine in the Mirror of Social and Philosophical Reflection*. Vinnitsa, Globe Press 2016.
- Dodonov, Roman. Two Strategies to Resolve the Conflict in the Donbass. *Culturological Bulletin*, Zaporyzhzhya, 35, 2016: 72-79.
- Dodonov, Roman. World Experience of Post-Conflict Rehabilitation and Restoration in the Context of Events in the East of Ukraine. *Nova paradigma*. 129, 2016: 15-25.
- Dodonova, Vera. Conservative modernization of Russia and the socialist aberration of Donbass. *East Ukrainian Conflict in the Context of Global Transformation*. Vinnitsa, Nilan-LTD 2015: 174-184.
- Dodonova, Vera. Discourse of Insults and Abuse: Donbass's claims against Ukraine. *Bulletin of Donetsk National University*. Series philosophical sciences. Vinnitsa, 1, 2016: 93-109.
- Freier Nathan. The Defense Identity Crisis: It's a Hybrid World. In *Parameters*, 3 (39), 2009.
- Kaldor, Mary. *New and Old Wars: Organised Violence in a Global Era*. 3rd ed. Cambridge, Polity 2012.
- Kolinko, Maryna. Scopes and horizons of the home world. *Shid*, 2 (134), 2015: 97-101.
- Kovalskiy, Hryhorii. Axiological Plane of External Factors of Information Confrontation in Ukraine. *Intercultural Communication*, 1, 2017: 5-14.
- Kovalskiy, Hryhorii. Conflicts VS War: Fighting Information Concepts. *Gileya*, 113, 2016: 274-277.
- Kovalskiy, Hryhorii. *Traditionalist construct of Ukrainian society*. Donetsk-Vinnitsa, DonNU 2015.
- Kreveld, Martin van. *Transformation of war*. Moscow: Alpina Business Bus, 2005.
- Lind, William. *Understanding Fourth Generation War*. January 15 2004 <http://www.antiwar.com/lind/?articleid=1702>
- Magda, Evgeny. *Hybrid aggression of Russia. Lessons for Europe*. Kalamar, 2017.
- Newson, Robert A. Counter-Unconventional Warfare Is the Way of the Future. How Can We Get There? In *Janine Davidson Blogspot: Defense in Depth*. October 23 2014. <http://blogs.cfr.org/davidson/2014/10/23/counter-unconventional-warfare-is-the-way-of-the-future-how-can-we-get-there/>
- Strugatsky, Vasil. Aggressive Technological Influence on the Mass Consciousness Against the Background of the East-Ukrainian Conflict. Soil Preparation and First Myths. *Shid*, 3 (143), 2016: 101-109.
- The Hybrid War: in verbo et in praxi*. Vinnitsa, Nilan-LTD 2017.
- The War in Ukraine: Lessons for Europe*. Editors by Artis Pabriks and Andis Kudors. The
-

Centre for East European Policy Studies. University of Latvia. Rīga 2015.

The World Hybrid War: Ukrainian Front. Editors by Horbulin, Volodymyr. Kyiv: National Institute of Strategic Studies, 2017.

Toffler, Alvin, and Heidi Toffler. *War and Anti-War: Survival at the Dawn of the 21st Century.* Little Brown & Co, Boston, Massachusetts, U.S.A. 1993.