



Revista Moldovenească de Drept Internațional și Relații Internaționale /  
Moldavian Journal of International Law and International Relations /  
Молдавский журнал международного права и международных отношений

2022, Issue 2, Volume 17, Pages 79-89.

ISSN 1857-1999 EISSN 2345-1963

Submitted: 15. 01. 2022 | Accepted: 15.05. 2022 | Published: 15.06. 2022

**TRIBUNA DISCUȚIONALĂ  
THE TRIBUNE OF DISCUSSION  
ДИСКУССИОННАЯ ТРИБУНА**

**“ANCIENT FOREIGN” POLICY TOOLS IN NEW CLOTHS**

**"INSTRUMENTE ANTICE" DE POLITICĂ EXTERNĂ ÎN HAINE NOI**

**“ДРЕВНИЕ ИНСТРУМЕНТЫ” ВНЕШНЕЙ ПОЛИТИКИ В НОВЫХ ОДЕЖДАХ**

BRHLÍKOVÁ Radoslava\* / BRHLÍKOVÁ Radoslava / БРИЛИКОВА Радослава

**ABSTRACT:**

**“ANCIENT FOREIGN” POLICY TOOLS IN NEW CLOTHS**

*This article discusses the old tools used by foreign policy of a state and looks on them from the point of view of new notions in a changing international and security environment. It analysis old concepts of enemy demonization and propaganda in connection with new conceptions of hybrid war and fake news or disinformation. The article argues and is based on the hypothesis that these old and new concepts are the same, just our language became more sophisticated.*

**Keywords:** (foreign policy, tools, propaganda, hybrid war, image of an enemy, mirror view, demonization)

**JEL Classification:** K33, F52, F53

**REZUMAT:**

**"INSTRUMENTE ANTICE" DE POLITICĂ EXTERNĂ ÎN HAINE NOI**

*Acest articol analizează instrumentele vechi utilizate de politica externă a unui stat și le privește din punctul de vedere al noilor Noțiuni într-un mediu internațional și de securitate în schimbare. Analizează concepte vechi de demonizare și propagandă inamică în legătură cu noi concepții de război hibrid și știri false sau dezinformare. Articolul argumentează și se bazează pe ipoteza că aceste concepte vechi și noi sunt aceleași, doar limba noastră a devenit mai sofisticată.*

**Cuvinte cheie:** (politică externă, instrumente, propagandă, război hibrid, imaginea unui inamic, vedere în oglindă, demonizare).

**JEL Classification:** K33, F52, F53

**CZU:** 327.39

---

\* **Mgr. BRHLÍKOVÁ Radoslava - Ph.D.**, Senior Lecturer, Department of Political Science and Eurasian studies, Faculty of Arts, Constantine The Philosopher University in Nitra (Nitra, Slovak Republic). / **BRHLÍKOVÁ Radoslava**, Dr. în științe, Lector superior, Catedra de Științe Politice și Studii Eurasiatice, Facultatea de Arte, Universitatea Constantin Filozoful din Nitra (Nitra, Republica Slovacă). / **БРИЛИКОВА Радослава** - Доктор философии, старший преподаватель Кафедры политологии и евразийских исследований Факультета искусств Университета Константина Философа в Нитре (Нитра, Словацкая Республика). E-mail: [rbrhlikova@ukf.sk](mailto:rbrhlikova@ukf.sk)

## РЕЗЮМЕ:

## “ДРЕВНИЕ ИНСТРУМЕНТЫ” ВНЕШНЕЙ ПОЛИТИКИ В НОВЫХ ОДЕЖДАХ

В этой статье рассматриваются старые инструменты, используемые внешней политикой государства, и рассматриваются они с точки зрения новых понятий в меняющейся международной обстановке и обстановке безопасности. В нем анализируются старые концепции демонизации и пропаганды врага в связи с новыми концепциями гибридной войны и фальшивых новостей или дезинформации. В статье утверждается и основывается на гипотезе, что эти старые и новые понятия - одно и то же, просто наш язык стал более упрощенным.

**Ключевые слова:** (внешняя политика, инструменты, пропаганда, гибридная война, образ врага, зеркальный взгляд, демонизация).

**JEL Classification:** K33, F52, F53

**УДК:** 327.39

### Introduction

The beginning of the 21st century is characterized by a fundamental changes in the international environment. Bipolar world has been replaced by unipolar. The hegemon, the United states of America, took lead and dominated international relations under the idea of *New world order* and *World policeman*. This hegemonic position was gradually abused from the side of the USA. After short euphoria from the end of spiral arms race, USA and its will to power and control returned the language of the cold war with new cover words and arms race back with even greater intensity. This arrogance revived old rivalry and triggered changes in the distribution of power. Theory says that international and security interstate relations are socially constructed what means that the outcome of foreign and security policy depends on its perception and interpretation by the its actors. It is not rational, nor logical outcome. In European context that leads to inertial security culture as the result of mutual influence of foreigne policy and security discourses under the obvious leadership of the USA which treats its partners as governor towards its vasslas pursuing its interests, whether there is Republican or Democratic president in the White House.

As a norm we have accepted the violations of international law coverd by the challenges to human rights protection, so called “*double meter*” view (what can I do, other one can not do at all) and sticking as “fake news”everyting what differs from our point of view, we allowed media manipulation and trolling, raising the military budgets and perception of otherness, relativization of values and authority. Concepts as post-truth, post-factuality, populism, unipolarity, shared interests, mass migration, “*moderate opposition*” or “*moderate terrorism*”, images of core and periphery, mainstream and alternative, cyber threats and hybrid wars, all these are phenomena that affect nowadays international security environmnt and thus the fromulation of national interests of states. The common denominator of these fundamental shifts in policy is globalization whose negative consequences have begun to exceed. Globalization is a synonymous for complex interdependence of different subsystems associated with the acceleration of the crossborder interactions between world policy actors – both public and private. The monopoly of the state for these transaction falls, resulting in a reviewing of its position and tasks in the international system. The dominant and decisive processes in this system became economic relations and economic processes and key role and impact took over new transnational economic actors – in addition to international organizations – transnational corporations which – with the help and sources of declining (in terms of authority) nation state and concentration of the capital build up new colonial and slave system, which we can call as neo neocolonialism and neofeudalism and neoimperialism and neonormalisation. In such situation we can see the state as a vassal of private companies which are sucking up the state and influence the creation of its legislation, rules and specific political decisions, and thus they

determine its national interest. This state of play leads to oligarchization of politics while maintaining the illusion of democracy which keeps the masses in relative peace and beliefs that the interests of the corporations are the national interest of their state.

In this context, to cover its failure, regress, incapability and decline state seeks for surrogate issues. The best strategy is to produce an enemy. History shows that such strategy works perfectly and under any circumstances. Producing an enemy means to turn and concentrate attention, emotions and actions from one who produces it (from the important issues which concern everyone) towards artificially created cover. Enemy is everyone who does not belong to us, it is everyone who does not belong to our group, who is alien, who is different. Umberto Eco once wrote that human being alone needs an enemy. To have an enemy is based on human nature and character. As Eco states that having an enemy is important not only for a clear definition of our identity, but also for us to have an obstacle by which we can measure our value system and prove our own value in overcoming it. It means that if we have no enemy, we need to make him (Eco, 2013:10). Differentness, otherness and diversity is natural as well as the phenomenon of identifying the enemy is, but the process of its production is what interests us here.

### Tools towards the enemy creation

The choice of political language is the key to enemy creation. The word is mightier than the sword, history teaches us. The word is the most powerful weapon. The weapon itself is only a tool of the word. History offers us countless pieces of evidence of that. The word only is the key towards the mobilization of any public – domestic or world. At the same time it is a tool for the necessary simplification of the decision-making processes (Brhlíková, 2017). With the word, with the right language we are able to defeat a political opponent more effectively than in a physical struggle. Opponent's physical destruction can easily result in the creation of a martyr, which can lead to public sympathy for him. Martyrdom of today is a strategy which was effectively used by many Islamist terrorist organizations by recruiting new suicide fighters. But martyrism as a policy tool works in domestic or international environment too. It is used and works even in so called "*western democracies*"<sup>1</sup> and is effective tool by organizing so called "*color revolutions*"<sup>2</sup>. That is why the neoliberal western establishment prefers word, prefers language and using or abusing of the media as a tool for elimination of the enemy by making jokes and mockery on him or instilling fear of him, to prevent his heroization and martyrization through his physical destruction.

Clear naming the enemy, listing all its negative qualities and comparing them to our "*good*" ones, creating the "*we – they*" perception and underlining its otherness and differences is the way how to win the audience support and to prepare the public for the possible conflict. This process we can define as the process of demonization the enemy which is a traditional technique and strategy used in all conflicts. The legitimacy of its using and confirmation of its validity is always up to the winner of the conflict. Often it uses verbal twists and images like "*evil empire*", "*axis of evil*", "*empire of darkness*", "*killer*", "*butcher from ...*" which sound like from fiction book. It is based on the premise that each side has „*a positive and benevolent image of itself, but holds a negative and hateful image of the enemy*“ (Krejčí, 1997: 385). The same can be used in reverse when there is a will to create from an enemy our friend describing it as "*moderate opposition*", "*biggest democracy*", "*our friend*" (*he's a villain, but he's ours*).

<sup>1</sup> There are discussions not only on academic level that European and North American states cannot be called democracies anymore. Technically they work on principles of democratic procedures but the real power is in the hands of small group of very rich people. It is oligarchy who decides.

<sup>2</sup> For example murder of Ján Kuciak and Martina Kušnírova in Slovakia led to an attempted coup and caused reconstruction of the government. It is still unclear who ordered the murder and what his motives were, although the executors had already been convicted. And in general view starts to prevail an opinion that the directors of such horrendous act come from outside, that they are external agents and their primer target was former Slovak government, and the act of murder was used as a detonator for the riots.

In the "we - they" perception we create a positive image of ourselves and a mirror image – negative - of the opponent, in which we assert ourselves. We continue to resist the changes in the opponent's behavior. We refuse to accept information that does not correspond to our perception of the opponent's image. We refuse to see the truth or reality and prefer to adapt it to our vision. Often we reinterpret the information and refuse to admit that the opponent may share the same values and worldviews. We prefer to close our minds to any questioning of our worldview.

Political science and theory of international relations in particular develops this method in the framework of cognitive approach, challenging the traditional basic concepts about the rationality of actors in politics. Tradition says that states are rational and only players in international relations. They act strictly rationally following their national interests. States rationally calculate the outcomes and make strictly rational decisions cleansed of emotions, prejudices and ideology. On the contrary, the cognitive approach is based on assumption that a statesman or politician responding to stimuli from the external environment, acts according to how s/he perceives this environment - based on his/her knowledge, experience and intellect. The statesman or politician not only defends the values s/he professes, but also actively responds and selects information, actively influences the environment and acts to solve problems<sup>1</sup>.

The technique of demonizing the enemy was fully applied during the 20th century in connection with the rivalry between the two blocs during the bipolar division of the world. At first it was Nazi Germany and the communist Soviet Union, later on communist Soviet Union together with communist China who became demonized, giving these countries maximum negative attributes. Vice versa these states jointly criticized and questioned the United States, likewise as the Shiites and Sunnis in the Muslim world are doing it today. During the Cold War, the main projection of the image of the enemy by using linguistic means in front of both domestic and foreign audiences took place between the USA and the Soviet Union and their blocs (Brhlíková, 2017).

This image is being used again in the Euro-Atlantic area today, with the current Russian Federation and the rapidly developing China becoming the subject of demonization. Propaganda is a tool for such strategy again, just we call it *dis-information or misinformation*<sup>2</sup> today, although the word "*propaganda*" is still used. It has proven to be the most effective tool in this process, especially in the age of social media and networking which support the fast and cheap delivery of any information. Its task is to disseminate opinions and information in such a way as to change the views of the audience, influence, provoke or strengthen certain attitudes or actions. Its accompanying phenomenon is a distortion of facts, what we call today *fake news*, while it tends to create the appearance of a higher goal, it uses human passions, fear and hatred. It works with human instincts and emotions. Its aim is to influence the public and to change the mindset of individuals, groups, the whole public opinion.

Usually, various individuals in leadership positions referred to as populists or leaders, church representatives, representatives of various interest organizations, political parties, civic associations, non-governmental organizations, as well as power institutions personified by government officials are associated with propaganda. Propaganda works with the use of selected rational arguments, compiled into purposeful statements with an emphasis on emotions, and thus through manipulation. It is an effective weapon, especially in war, where manipulation creates a mirror image of the enemy, which stimulates the darkest human emotions such as fear and hatred and create a strong motive for willingness to fight against the (newly formed) internal or external enemy, to kill and murder, eliminate him/her. It's

---

<sup>1</sup> Among all representatives of this approach, mention may be made in particular of O. Holsti (Cognitive Dynamics and the Image of the Enemy: Dulles and Russia, 1967), R. White (Nobody Wanted War: Misperceptions in Vietnam and Other Wars, 1968), R. Jervis (Perception and Misconceptions perception in international politics, 1976) and J. Steinbruner (Cybernetic decision theory, 1974).

<sup>2</sup> Disinformation is false information issued by a government organization to a rival power or the media.

impossible to avoid it in today's world. We meet it at every turn, whether in a political power struggle - in presidential campaigns or in an election campaign, or in various campaigns for or against something - the fight against vaccination, the fight against nuclear power plants, the fight for the rights of the LGBTI+ community, the fight against abortion, the fight for unborn children and much more<sup>1</sup>.

In principle, we distinguish three basic forms of propaganda, namely celebratory, gray and defamatory. The goal of celebratory propaganda is to create a favorable image of an individual, organization, ideology or government. The purpose of gray propaganda is the deliberate dissemination of inaccurate or false information in order to confuse the enemy and thereby cause him moral or material damage. The highest level is defamatory propaganda, the purpose of which is to create a more warlike enemy and attribute the worst qualities and intentions to him, and thus evoke in the domestic audience as well as in the world public repulsive attitudes and emotions of fear and hatred.

Krejčí (2018) wrote that Europe is facing double propaganda these days. First one is purely demagogic, embodied and represented by such politicians as former US president Donald Trump or UK prime minister Boris Johnson, characterized by an overexposed vocabulary and crude primitive requirements focused exclusively on "business" (Krejčí, 2018). The second type is a sophisticated Russophobic, China-phobic or US-phobic campaign. Krajčí states that politicians are trapped in both cases because if they believe in demagoguery or a sophisticated projection of Russian, Chinese, American or other dangers, they lose real image, real picture of a legitimate national interest (Krejčí, 2018). His statement can be verified by examining the fundamental interest of European Union. Its main and real interest is to create a Eurasian market. Why? Because the US market will have more and more domestic problems and will become more and more Asia oriented (what is clear already today, because US market depends on Asian market already today), which is natural, as there is a bigger market there, as in Europe, it is in EU's interest to follow the same path and not to fall into the trap of arguing with Russia, China on the one hand, and USA on the other. However, what we are seeing in today's Europe is that it has fallen into the trap of Russophobia, double standard policy, blind criticism, sanctions and irrationality. The mirror image pointing to Russia and China as evil, and propaganda formulated in this way have to cover up the fact that European democracies are not democracies anymore. Their democracy is ill. Their democracy is not for everyone. Their democracy satisfies the interests of individuals in the background, in shadow what reduces the confidence in state, public authorities, politicians and even in the EU. The original sense of democracy has been reduced to categories of observable behavior. Instead of that democracy meant the self-government of the people, it began to mean a struggle between competing elites over who would come to power through elections. Such a concentration of power in the hands of a small dominant group of personalities with the ability to organize and make decisions leads to oligarchization and bureaucratization of society. The pandemic Covid 19 even underlined this path and decline. In addition, the pandemic has led to the fragmentation and reduction of citizens' fundamental rights<sup>2</sup>. Numerous demonstrations of citizens across Europe can be taken as an evidence. Ruling establishment, instead of searching for solutions, peace and cooperation, blame Russia and China for their own failures and by using militant and assertive language, they increase international tensions. This tension can lead to great conflict as it happened

---

<sup>1</sup> The first propaganda competition arose between media magnates Joseph Pulitzer and William Randolph Hearst. This competition led to the outbreak of the Spanish-American War in 1898. For the first time was propaganda used consciously and deliberately in the First World War. It was perfected during 30's by Joseph Goebbels, who, as the head of the Ministry of Propaganda of the Third Reich, provoked aggressive hostility towards the Jewish population in public. He is the author of the statement: „A lie repeated a hundred times will become a truth! The bigger the lie, the louder it has to be shouted to the world! “. This statement is more valid today as ever before.

<sup>2</sup> Today, the right to an opinion is most at risk, which liberal governments - by calling it hoaxes - seek to limit by criminal law. The case of Julian Assange is a significant symbol of such a punishment of free opinion and the right to information.

several times in the past. But there is no objective reason for the great conflict, it's just an ideology - which Serbian director Emir Kusturica calls totalitarian democracy or sub-ideology (Kusturica, 2018) - and the needs to have an opponent or enemy for cultivation of a military-industrial complex what drives us into confrontation (Krejčí, 2018).

### **Fake news and hybrid warfare – old tools in new cloth**

With the creation of the so-called global village through the shrinking the world through the internet, we registered the changes in ways the propaganda is spread. They are no longer leaflets dropped from airships - zeppelins and planes over enemy territory, but through the Internet. With the help of internet, propaganda is able to reach people all over the world. The so-called fake news and hoaxes which are considered as one of the tools of so-called hybrid warfare, are spreading at lightning speed through internet and are able to reach wide audience at the same time regardless of time shifts and time zones. Fake news and hoaxes can be characterized as informational mystifications or deliberate dissemination of disinformation on social networks and in traditional media. Their aim is to mislead and spread propaganda for political or economic gain. The authors of such news use catchy headlines, fabricated facts, fictional stories. Their goal, or the goal of the clients of such news, is, of course, any profit. The more readers, the more media quotes and the more profits. The more readers, the more quotes for the media and the more profits.

The media of the 21st century makes a profit based on how often people visit a particular link on the web, whether or not they read it. Each click brings a profit, which is associated with the phenomenon of "*clickbait*", what means reading based on fake bait. The word clickbait itself has a negative connotation, as it is an endeavor of contempt, disparagement, slight, a negative attitude towards someone or something. It is a humiliating, degrading term, referring to such Internet sites, which aim is to raise money for advertising at any cost, even at the cost of fake news, low quality content, attractive images, sensational headlines that distort the content of the article (Bacisin, 2018). So the goal is not truth and high-quality content, but the effort to attract the maximum number of users for profit. The fact that it is possible to rent space on the Internet anonymously or to write under a pseudonym only makes it difficult to protect the audience from disinformation, hoax, slander, gossip, scamming and victimization. The profit and its maximalisation is the highest priority, truth is not necessary anymore.

The phenomenon of fake news is associated with a phenomenon which is called posttruth politics<sup>1</sup>. The editors of the Oxford Dictionaries declared it the international word of 2016 and defined it as „*relating to circumstances or indicating circumstances in which objective facts have less influence on shaping public opinion than appeal to emotions and personal assumptions*“ (Balász, 2016). This phenomenon works with emotions that have no connection to reality. It works with emotionally strong statements and words like "*negative*" or "*positive*", "*good*" or "*bad*", "*maybe*", "*very likely*", "*relative*", "*coup*", "*take-over*" and completely ignores contradictory facts, even mutually exclusive claims<sup>2</sup>. Its main feature is that participants in a communication campaign continue to repeat false information even when it is clear that the information does not correspond to the facts in the real world, or does not coincide at all with the facts provided by independent experts (Bačišin, 2018). The "objective truth" tested over the years, confirmed by generations before the beginning of the 21st century, is questioned and relativized. False and true information compete with each other.

Propaganda and fake news, as well as post-truth politics are tools of the so-called hybrid warfare, which has been discussed since about 2005 and is actually the application of various forms of conflict, waged by both the state and various non-state actors (Hoffman, 2009: 36). It encompasses a range of methods of combat, including conventional means and abilities,

<sup>1</sup> The term appeared in connection with the reaction to Brexit and Donald Trump's election campaign for the post of US president.

<sup>2</sup> This strategy was used during the Brexit campaign and led to the victory of the supporters of the withdrawal from the European Union. The same strategy was used in the case of Skripal poisoning.

irregular tactics and irregular formations, as well as criminal and terrorist acts, which include unrestricted violence, coercion, social unrest and disruption (Hoffman 2007: 8). It was Mattis and Hoffman in 2005 who emphasised the combination of conventional and unconventional strategies, methods, and tactics in contemporary warfare as well as the psychological or information-related aspects of modern conflicts and started to call it hybrid warfare (Mattis, Hoffman, 2005). Glenn added by claiming that it is an enemy who simultaneously and adaptably uses various combinations of political, economic, social and information means, as well as conventional, irregular, catastrophic, terrorist and subversive criminal methods of fighting (Glenn, 2009: 2).

In 2009, a similar definition was adopted at the Hybrid War Conference at Washington D.C. officially. This definition states that a hybrid threat is any adversary that simultaneously and adaptively applies a tailored mix of conventional, irregular, terrorist and criminal means and activities in the area of operation. Rather than an individual actor, it is an adversary or a threat consisting of a combination of state and non-state actors (US JFC HWC, 2009). Van Kappen adds and emphasizes that „*states that wage hybrid wars enter into agreements with non-state actors, fighters (mercenaries), private organizations and local groups, but strongly deny any communication with them. These actors can perform (implement) things (steps) that the state cannot afford to take. All dirty work can then be thrown on the shoulders of non-governmental organizations*“ (In UAP, 2015). On NATO web page, except stating that hybrid methods of warfare such as propaganda, deception, sabotage and other non-military tactics have long been used to destabilise adversaries, says that new in hybrid warfare is the speed, scale and intensity facilitated by rapid technological change and global interconnectivity. NATO sees the hybrid threats (not warfare) as combination of military and non-military as well as covert and overt means, including disinformation, cyber attacks, economic pressure, deployment of irregular armed groups and use of regular forces. According to NATO, hybrid methods are used to blur the lines between war and peace and attempt to sow doubt in the minds of target populations and the goal is to destabilise and undermine societies (NATO, 2021).

Some authors define hybrid warfare as a “*grey area*“ warfare which often exists just beneath the threshold of armed conflict. According to them it is designed to erode public confidence in civil society and democratic foundations, primarily through cyber attacks on critical infrastructure including energy or targeted disinformation methods, often over a sustained period of time and in conjunction with one another. In this regard, it poses a potential threat to sovereignty, as it gives nations, terrorist organisations and criminal actors relative anonymity via a low-cost, high-yield method to influence the politics and policies of other states. To put it simply, hybrid warfare entails an interplay or fusion of conventional as well as unconventional instruments of power and tools of subversion. These instruments or tools are blended in a synchronised manner to exploit the vulnerabilities of an antagonist and achieve synergistic effects. (Bilal, 2021; Dupuy, A. C., Nussbaum, D, Butrimas, V., Granitsas, A., 2021)

Friedman (2018) asserts that the Russian view of hybrid warfare differs from the American concept. While the American concept focuses mainly on armed conflict and terrorist groups, according to Russian experts, the main purpose of hybrid warfare is to transfer conflict from traditional military battlefields to alternative environments to harm or destroy the enemy by a combination of ideological, informational, economic or political methods leading to destabilization of society, civil conflict and social disintegration (Friedman, 2018, ps. 3-4). Gerasimov states that hybrid warfare is a war of a new generation in which traditional military methods and practices are replaced by a wide range of political, economic, information, international, humanitarian and other instruments. According to him, in the 21st century, a tendency is beginning to prevail when the boundaries between war and peace are blurred. Wars are not declared anymore, and if they start, they do not follow the usual pattern. Experiences from conflicts associated with the so-called colorful revolutions in North Africa, the Middle East (and at the present moment Kazakhstan in the Central Asia) point out that a prosperous

state could, in a few months, even days, become an arena of military struggle, a victim of foreign intervention, and a state of humanitarian catastrophe, chaos, and civil war (Gerasimov, 2013). In terms of casualties and damage, such a war can be as devastating as an armed conflict (Bačišin, 2015).

The difference between a state of war and a state of peace is thus blurred in the 21st century. There is a growing role for non-military means of achieving political and strategic goals that can be more effective than weapons. The emphasis is on political, economic and information measures using the pressure of a dissatisfied civilian population. Under the guise of peacekeeping operations to reconcile enemy parties, military forces are being used for other, covert purposes. Military operations are more dynamic, more active, tactical and operational breaks, that could be used by the enemy, are disappearing. Information technology has made it possible to reduce the space and time gap between soldiers and command. Influencing the enemy at a distance is the main way how to achieve the goal of the operation. Facilities of the enemy are destroyed throughout the depth of its territory, the distinction between strategic and tactical levels is blurring as well as between the offensive and defensive operations. There are used precision weapons and robotic systems, special forces soldiers, private armies and internal opposition forces to form a permanent front throughout the enemy state<sup>1</sup>. (Gerasimov, 2013).

The hybrid warfare strategy is a powerful and comprehensive way how to lead a conflict (Kouri, 2010). It is a combination of mobile warfare with diversionary actions, where the attacker tries to avoid clear identification and thus subsequent retaliation (Pindják, 2014). Here, the combat operations usually have a flexible and complex course and require a highly adaptable and flexible response (Montalbano, 2010). Large military formations are giving in to the deployment of small units, which can, thanks to sophisticated information systems, lead combat without significant operational breaks using robotic weapons, drones and drones, and parallel psychological, information and economic warfare. Often, armed forces with a peacekeeping mandate to calm the situation in a conflict area are camouflage for the occupying forces (Bačišin, 2015).

Beskid (2014) states that the hybrid war is not a war of front-line struggle, but a war of information, through which a proper image of reality is created, which the enemy conveys to consumers of content. Such a strategy can compensate for the superiority of the enemy in armed actions. This strategy uses information activities whose forms and methods change flexibly and adapt to how the dissemination of information is improved and accelerated. Its main tools are sabotage, information propaganda, deterioration of state sovereignty, guerrilla warfare, divers and bribed local criminal elements (Beskid, 2014, p. 30). So, an important part of hybrid warfare is the use of information influence, the forms of which are constantly improving. Targeted deployment of computer viruses, hacking into information systems, disinformation campaigns, discrediting and denigration - that is, demonization - the adversary, corruption, various hidden forms of influence, these are just some of the techniques of the current hybrid war.

There are many other authors and more definitions. They are more or less different but all agree that hybrid warfare is a combined use of conventional and unconventional methods of combat using by criminal elements to achieve given goal (Ivančík, 2016, p. 133). In a joint study, Vračar and Čurič stress that by the term hybrid war West refers to anything related to its fear of a strong and unpredictable Russia (Vračar, Čurič, 2018, p. 19). We can see that hybrid warfare remains a discussed and controversial concept and there is not one universally agreed definition of it. It lacks conceptual clarity and we can say that since year 2014 it became merely a catch-phrase or fashion word or buzzword that covers everything beyond the control of presentdays political and military establishment. Or it is everything that is firmly controlled by

---

<sup>1</sup> Gerasimov (2013) states that new ways of military operations have emerged in recent conflicts. They cannot be considered exclusively military. An example of this state is the operation in Libya, where a no-fly zone was created and a naval blockade was used. Private military companies were used there, and they worked closely with armed opposition units.



a particular state actor of international relations, but this actor cannot act so officially, because it would be labeled as a war crime and a violation of international law, as Julian Assange and its Wikileaks revealed.

### Conclusion

The nature of international relations and security remains the same. States are constantly engaging in zero-sum military and economic competitions, armed conflicts still seem necessary as they continue to pursue politics by other means, security dilemmas and balancing are constantly taking place. Demonization of the enemy or mirror image of the enemy as well as propaganda, usage of disinformation and hoaxes, even the hybrid warfare itself are always part of such relations. It can even be concluded that all the instruments mentioned are the content and elements of a hybrid war. That the concept of hybrid warfare covers all these tools. They are not new, many practitioners contend that they are as old as war itself. There is a lot of historical evidence of it, that these tools were used since the humankind invented the state. Eco (2013) described it very accurate in its essay. People have often resorted to various alternative ways of attacking the enemy. Examples are the wooden horse used in the Trojan War, which Homer described, or the digestion of wells recorded in ancient times in the Sumerians and Assyrians, as well as in the Middle Ages. Partisan wars and partisan actions for example during Napoleon wars contributed to his defeat or using of propaganda led to the outbreak of the Spanish-American War in 1898.

At the present, we are in the middle of a hybrid war, godfather of which is Russia according to some analysts. Others say that it is the West and its civilization who conduct it. Its target is once Ukraine or Syria or Yemen of Kazakhstan today, sometimes the European Union or public of individual states. Demonizing the enemy is in full swing. It has become the daily food of opinion-forming, mainstreaming liberal-right-wing media, backed by those who feel most threatened - the rich men of this world. Those people who have the means to keep the masses under control by their manipulation. They use all and any means for this, even war. Through the argument of the relevance of sources and the evaluation of reports, it began to be approached suspiciously to anyone whose opinion deviates from the liberal mainstream, even in one key domestic or foreign policy issue. Any deviation is punished by mockery and prnier and demonization. Social paranoia, born of a sense of threat and consequently awakened vigilance, reaches unseen peaks. And Covid 19 pandemia accelerates it.

### References

1. BAČIŠIN, V. (2015): *Hybridná vojna a jej hodnotenie*. Obrana, 1, s. 4-5, [Online] <[https://www.mosr.sk/data/disk/casopis/Obrana\\_01\\_2015.pdf](https://www.mosr.sk/data/disk/casopis/Obrana_01_2015.pdf)>
2. BAČIŠIN, V. (2018): *Fake, falošná správa, polopravda, lož 1. Diel*, [Online] <<https://financnenoviny.com/fake-alebo-falosna-sprava-polopravda-loz-1-diel/>>
3. BALÁSZ, M. (2016): *Postpravdivá politika ničí základy demokracie*. [Online] <http://marianbalazs.sk/postpravdiva-politika-nici-zaklady-demokracie/>
4. BESKID, J. (2014): *Vojna novej generácie realizovaná na Kryme*. AOS 2014, [online] <[http://www.aos.sk/struktura/katedry/kbo/NMB2014/Zbornik\\_NMB\\_2014.pdf](http://www.aos.sk/struktura/katedry/kbo/NMB2014/Zbornik_NMB_2014.pdf)>
5. BILAL, A. (2021): *Hybrid Warfare – New Threats, Complexity, and ‘Trust’ as the Antidote*. NATO Review - opinion, analysis and debate on security issues, 30 November 2021. [Online] <[https://www.nato.int/docu/review/articles/2021/11/30/hybrid-warfare-new-threats-complexity-and-trust-as-the-antidote/index.html?utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_campaign=NATO%20Review%20Hybrid%20Warfare&utm\\_content=NATO%20Review%20Hybrid%20Warfare+CID\\_6b8b9dbae0c7db4c795a42ffea7c6e5&utm\\_source=Email%20marketing%20software&utm\\_term=READ%20MORE](https://www.nato.int/docu/review/articles/2021/11/30/hybrid-warfare-new-threats-complexity-and-trust-as-the-antidote/index.html?utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=NATO%20Review%20Hybrid%20Warfare&utm_content=NATO%20Review%20Hybrid%20Warfare+CID_6b8b9dbae0c7db4c795a42ffea7c6e5&utm_source=Email%20marketing%20software&utm_term=READ%20MORE)>
6. BRHLÍKOVÁ, R. (2017): *Politická korektnosť v medzinárodných vzťahoch*, In. *Jazyk a politika : na pomedzí lingvistiky a politológie 2*. Zborník príspevkov z 2. ročníka

- medzinárodnej vedeckej konferencie v Bratislave dňa 22. 6. 2017. - Bratislava : Ekonóm, 2017. - ISBN 978-80-225-4424-5, s. 280-293.
7. DANIŠ, I. (2018): *Emir Kusturica: Mlčíme o zásadných veciach. Ako v komunizme.* [Online] <<https://zurnal.pravda.sk/rozhovory/clanok/478101-emir-kusturica-mlcime-o-zasadnych-veciach-ako-v-komunizme/>>
  8. DUPUY, A. C., NUSSBAUM, D, BUTRIMAS, V. , GRANITSAS, A. (2021): *Energy security in the era of hybrid warfare.* NATO Review - opinion, analysis and debate on security issues, 13 January 2021. [Online] <<https://www.nato.int/docu/review/articles/2021/01/13/energy-security-in-the-era-of-hybrid-warfare/index.html>>
  9. ECO, U. (2013): *Vyrobiť si nepriateľa a iné príležitostné písanky.* Bratislava: Slovart 2013, ISBN 978-80-556-0436-7
  10. FRIEDMAN, O. (2018): *Russian hybrid warfare.* 237s. ISBN 978-1-84904-881-1
  11. HOFFMAN, F. G. (2007): *Conflict in the 21st Century: The Rise of Hybrid Wars.* Potomac Institute for Policy Studies, 2007. [Online] <[http://www.potomacinstitute.org/images/stories/publications/potomac\\_hybridwar\\_0108.pdf](http://www.potomacinstitute.org/images/stories/publications/potomac_hybridwar_0108.pdf)>
  12. HOFFMAN, F. G. (2009): *Hybrid Warfare and Challenges.* In: Small Wars Journal, 2009. [Online] <[smallwarsjournal.com/documents/jfqhoffman.pdf](http://smallwarsjournal.com/documents/jfqhoffman.pdf)>
  13. GERASIMOV, V. V. (2013): *Cennost' nauki v predvideniji: Novyje vyzovy trebujut pereosmyslit' formy i sposobyvedenija bojevych dejstvij.* [Online] <<http://www.vpk-news.ru/articles/14632>>
  14. GLENN, R. W. (2009): *Thoughts on Hybrid Conflict.* In: Small Wars Journal , 2009. [Online] <<https://www.smallwarsjournal.com/blog/188-Glenn-R.-W.R.-W.R.-W.pdf>>
  15. IVANČÍK, R. (2016): *Hybridná vojna – vojna 21. storočia.* Kultura Bezpieczeństwa. Nauka-Praktyka-Refleksje nr 22, 2016. [Online] <[http://bazhum.muzhp.pl/media//files/Kultura\\_Bezpieczenstwa\\_Nauka\\_Praktyka\\_Refleksje/Kultura\\_Bezpieczenstwa\\_Nauka\\_Praktyka\\_Refleksje-r2016-t-n22/Kultura\\_Bezpieczenstwa\\_Nauka\\_Praktyka\\_Refleksje-r2016-t-n22-s205-239/Kultura\\_Bezpieczenstwa\\_Nauka\\_Praktyka\\_Refleksje-r2016-t-n22-s205-239.pdf](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl/media//files/Kultura_Bezpieczenstwa_Nauka_Praktyka_Refleksje/Kultura_Bezpieczenstwa_Nauka_Praktyka_Refleksje-r2016-t-n22/Kultura_Bezpieczenstwa_Nauka_Praktyka_Refleksje-r2016-t-n22-s205-239/Kultura_Bezpieczenstwa_Nauka_Praktyka_Refleksje-r2016-t-n22-s205-239.pdf)>
  16. KOURI, J. (2010): *War on Terrorism: Defining “hybrid warfare”* 16.09.2010. [Online] <<https://canadafreepress.com/article/war-on-terrorism-defining-hybrid-warfare>>
  17. KREJČÍ, O. (1996): *Mezinárodní politika.* 1996.
  18. KREJČÍ, O. (2018): *Ruské nebezpečí, je vybajene, propagande NATO už verí jen pár redaktorů v ČT. In Parlamentní listy.* [Online] <<https://www.parlamentnilisty.cz/arena/politologove/Ruske-nebezpeci-je-vybajene-propagande-NATO-uz-veri-jen-par-redaktoru-v-CT-Jde-o-americke-vojenske-ksefty-dokazuje-Oskar-Krejci-543739>>
  19. MATTIS, J. N., HOFFMAN, F. (2005): *Future Warfare: The Rise of Hybrid Wars.* US Naval institute. November 2005 Proceedings. [Online] <<https://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2005/november/future-warfare-rise-hybrid-wars>>
  20. MONTALBANO, E. (2010): *Auditors Find DoD Hasn't Defined Cyber Warfare.* darkreading.com, 14. 09. 2010. [Online] <<https://www.darkreading.com/risk-management/auditors-find-dod-hasnt-defined-cyber-warfare/d/d-id/1092427>>
  21. NATO (2021): *NATO's response to hybrid threats.* Last updated: 16 Mar. 2021 16:21. [Online] <[https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics\\_156338.htm?selectedLocale=en](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_156338.htm?selectedLocale=en)>
  22. PINDJÁK, P. (2014): *Deterring hybrid warfare: a chance for NATO and the EU to work together?* NATO, 18. 11. 2014. [Online] <<https://www.nato.int/docu/review/2014/Also-in-2014/Deterring-hybrid-warfare/EN/index.htm>>
  23. VRAČAR, M.S. – ČURČIĆ, M.T. (2018): *The evolution of European perception of the term „hybrid warfare“.* VOJNO DELO - INTERDISCIPLINARY SCIENTIFIC THEORETICAL JOURNAL, Vol. 70, Issue 1/2018, (January-February 2018), ISSN 0042-8426, DOI: 10.5937/vojdelo1801005V. [Online]

<[http://www.isi.mod.gov.rs/multimedia/dodaci/the\\_evolution\\_of\\_european\\_perception\\_of\\_the\\_term\\_h\\_1533882452.pdf](http://www.isi.mod.gov.rs/multimedia/dodaci/the_evolution_of_european_perception_of_the_term_h_1533882452.pdf)>

24. UAP. (2015): *Hybrid Warfare as a Key Instrument of Russian Revenge Geostrategy*. UaPosition, 2015. [Online] <<http://uaposition.com/analysis-opinion/hybrid-warfare-as-a-key-instrument-of-the-russian-revenge-geostrategy/>>

25. US JFC HWC. (2009): *Hybrid War Conference*. Washington D.C.: United States Joint Force Command, 24th February 2009.

Copyright©Radoslava BRHLÍKOVÁ, 2022.

**Contacts/ Контакты:**

**Mgr. Radoslava Brhliková, Ph.D.**

Department of Political Science and Eurasian studies

Faculty of Arts

Constantine the Philosopher

University in Nitra

Tr. A. Hlinku 1, 949 01, Nitra, Slovak Republic.

**Email Address:** [rbrhlikova@ukf.sk](mailto:rbrhlikova@ukf.sk)

<https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Radoslava-Brhlikova>