

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2022.6.18>

NOWOCZESNE STRATEGIE KOMUNIKACJI POKOJOWEJ

*Iva Pavlenko**kandydat nauk filozoficznych, docent, docent Katedry Socjologii
Zaporoskiego Uniwersytetu Narodowego (Zaporoże, Ukraina)*

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9994-6477

iva.fsu@gmail.com

Adnotacja. Celem artykułu jest określenie cech wpływu zjawiska wojny na charakter komunikacji pokojowej. Ujawniono wzajemne powiązania wojny i pokoju w formach takich jak świat ekologiczny/wojna, świat gospodarczy/wojna, świat społeczny/wojna, świat polityczny/wojna, świat wojskowo-techniczny/wojna, świat duchowy i kulturowy/wojna. Autor zidentyfikował cechy różnych rodzajów współczesnych wojen: „wojna sprawiedliwa/ niesprawiedliwa”, wojna informacyjna, wojna hybrydowa, wojna rzeczywista, wojna integralna, wojna wewnętrzna/zewnętrzna. Udowodniono, że wojna ma na celu walkę, deformację, zniszczenie, a pokój – osiedlenie się, organizację, harmonizację, tworzenie. Wraz z dominacją wojny wewnętrznej, a mianowicie kierowaniem całością elementów państwowych, komponentów lub powiązań między nimi w celu walki, dezorganizacji i niszczenia systemów wewnętrznych, osiąga się pokój wewnętrzny, który charakteryzuje się organizacją połączenia elementów, komponentów lub powiązań między nimi, mający na celu koordynację zarówno procesu, jak i stanu w systemie. W związku z tym dominacja wojny zewnętrznej – skupienie się na walce kombinacji elementów państwowych, komponentów lub powiązań między nimi, dezorganizacja i zniszczenie systemów z zewnątrz, co prowadzi do osiągnięcia świata zewnętrznego, który charakteryzuje się organizacją kombinacji elementów składowych lub powiązań między nimi, ma na celu koordynację zarówno procesu, jak i stanu systemu zewnętrznego. W ten sposób pokój i wojna wyróżniają się skupieniem. Świat wewnętrzny i zewnętrzny mogą nie harmonizować, konflikt wewnętrzny może być w pełni zgodny ze światem zewnętrznym i odwrotnie.

Słowa kluczowe: sprawiedliwa wojna, niesprawiedliwa wojna, wojna informacyjna, wojna hybrydowa, prawdziwa wojna, wojna integralna, wojna wewnętrzna, wojna zagraniczna.

MODERN STRATEGIES FOR PEACEKEEPING COMMUNICATION

*Iva Pavlenko**PhD, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Department of Sociology
Zaporizhzhia National University (Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine)*

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9994-6477

iva.fsu@gmail.com

Abstract. The article is aimed to define the peculiarities of the impact of the war phenomenon on the character of peacekeeping communications. It was revealed the relationship between war and peace in such forms as ecological peace/war, economic peace/war, social peace/war, political peace/war, military-technical peace/war, spiritual and cultural peace/war. The author defined features of different types of modern wars: “just / unjust war”, informational war, hybrid war, real war, integral war, internal / external war. It is stated that the war is aimed at fighting, deformation, destruction, and peace is aimed at settlement, organization, harmonization, creation. When the internal war is dominated, namely, the channeling of the sum of the state elements, components or connections between them to fight, disorganize and destroy internal systems, the internal peace is reached, which is characterized by the organization of a combination of elements, components or connections between them, aimed at coordination of both the process and the state inside the system. Accordingly, domination of external war – the channeling of a combination of state elements, components or connections between them to fight, misorganization and destruction of systems from outside leads to achievement of external peace, which is characterized by organization of a combination of elements, components or connections between them, aimed at coordination of both process and state of external system. Thus, peace and war differ in their direction. The internal and external peace may not be harmonized, the internal conflict can be fully in agreement with the external peace, and vice versa.

Key words: just war, unjust war, informational war, hybrid war, real war, integral war, internal war, external war.

СУЧАСНІ СТРАТЕГІЇ МИРОТВОРЧОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ

*Іва Павленко**кандидат філософських наук, доцент, доцент кафедри соціології
Запорізького національного університету (Запоріжжя, Україна)*

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9994-6477

iva.fsu@gmail.com

Анотація. Метою статті є визначення особливостей впливу явища війни на характер миротворчих комунікацій. Розкрито взаємозв'язок війни та миру в таких формах, як екологічний мир/війна, економічний мир/війна,

соціальний мир/війна, політичний мир/війна, військово-технічний мир/війна, духовний і культурний мир/війна. Автор визначив особливості різних видів сучасних війн: «справедлива/несправедлива війна», інформаційна війна, гібридна війна, реальна війна, інтегральна війна, внутрішня/зовнішня війна. Доведено, що війна спрямована на боротьбу, деформацію, руйнування, а мир – на врегулювання, організацію, гармонізацію, творення. При домінуванні внутрішньої війни, а саме спрямуванні сукупності державних елементів, компонентів або зв'язків між ними для боротьби, дезорганізації та руйнування внутрішніх систем, досягається внутрішній мир, який характеризується організацією поєднання елементів, компоненти або зв'язки між ними, спрямовані на координацію як процесу, так і стану всередині системи. Відповідно домінування зовнішньої війни – спрямування на боротьбу комбінації державних елементів, компонентів або зв'язків між ними, дезорганізація та руйнування систем ззовні, що призводить до досягнення зовнішнього миру, який характеризується організацією комбінації елементів, складових або зв'язків між ними, спрямовані на координацію як процесу, так і стану зовнішньої системи. Таким чином, мир і війна відрізняються своєю спрямованістю. Внутрішній і зовнішній мир можуть не гармонізувати, внутрішній конфлікт може повністю узгоджуватися із зовнішнім миром, і навпаки.

Ключові слова: справедлива війна, несправедлива війна, інформаційна війна, гібридна війна, реальна війна, інтегральна війна, внутрішня війна, зовнішня війна.

Introduction. In today's globalized world, various processes are emerging that destabilize the world political, economic and social systems. Through the struggle of countries for natural resources, attempts to gain leadership in the world the world community sometimes forget about the consequences of ineffective management and inadequate attention to the priority problems: prevention of global and local wars by consolidated strategic means and the world's warning of large-scale conflicts, as well as stable support for peace on Earth. Violence breeds more violence in societies with civil war experience. This actualizes the concept of political, social and economic violence and shows how civil war creates conditions in which violence with different goals, such as self-trial, rebellion, group violence and xenophobia can coexist and prosper. Examples from South Africa, Northern Ireland, Lebanon, and Syria show the symbiosis between different forms of violence and show how the culture of war can be preserved even after it is over. That is why the problem of the relationship between the phenomenon of war and peacekeeping communications is urgent.

A comprehensive approach to the study of the problem of war and peace, presented by K. Clausewitz, in particular, in his conceptualization of the concept of an integral war, E. Waid, R. Kouin, L. White, who studied the peculiarities of military and peacekeeping activities, H. Terni-Hay, which carried out the expansion of the world development in the opposite processes of chaos and order, V. Sagatovsky, who studied the peace as a whole system, A. Pershits, Y. Semenov, V. Schnirelman, who analyzed the functions of war, I. Panarin, who studied the complex nature of the information war, etc.

Thus, the purpose of the article is to define the peculiarities of the impact of the war phenomenon on the character of peacekeeping communications.

When we examine the peace in development, we identify two opposite directions: progress that can be expressed in modernizing the economy, growth, positive reconstruction of social life, improvement, emergence of a new quality of social life, and regress due to deterioration of the general situation in society, the archaization of all spheres of social life. In the social world, there are mutual transitions of progress and regression, chaos and order, war and peace, organization and disintegration, governance and self-organization. If the values of war are more than the values of peace in the activities of most actors, the situation changes to the negative side of disintegration.

If there is a transition of one attribute quality to another, the state of the social world changes. For example, peaceful coexistence after military actions is possible, if one of the parties has received the desired conditions of coexistence; exhausted contradictions; forced or natural consent of the parties; military actions are suspended despite serious contradictions, but none of the parties is profitable use of military force. Thus, depending on the change of the measure, the change of quantitative and qualitative characteristics of the phenomenon, the world of war can become the world of peace, the world of existence can turn into the world of development, etc.

In the modern world, the concept of humanity is aimed at the development of human rights and freedoms, prevention of wars, settlement of conflicts by diplomatic means without material and physical losses, thus strengthening the values of life. At the same time, technologies for peace development and war development are forming. The achievements of scientific and technological progress, which are created for the sake of peace and security of society, lead to stimulation of rapid evolution of military business. But the military measures are interrelated with peace measures, they are aimed at achieving a peaceful world and ending military actions. Therefore, such processes take place in dialectical unity and struggle.

The concept of peace-centrism is embodied in civil society as the aspiration and actions of society to meet their needs, achieve a decent life with an emphasis on spiritual and material values. War-centrism emphasizes the role of the state in the social world, because of which there is a danger of totalitarian factor in society, change of spiritual and material values to direct development of military-industrial complex and transformation of humanitarian orientation of life to military. If relations between civil society and the state are not harmonized, there is a struggle between peace- and war-centrism, one side of the society strategy is absolutized, as a result of this, all elements of the system are destructed, and thus the social world system as a whole.

The essence and types of war

War should be considered as a complex socio-political phenomenon, which includes a combination of different types of struggle: political, economic, military, informational and other, which is started by between states or social systems (Slipchenko, 2005:4). The definition shows that regardless of the type of struggle the form of expression

does not change – there is a confrontation, confrontation between the parties, which often goes into an armed conflict, and sometimes in a war, and the causes of the struggle may be political, economic, social, cultural, ethnic and other contradictions between the countries or social systems within the country (civil war).

One of the types of war that has been indicated by K. Clausewitz is an integral war – not only the defeat of the enemy's armed forces, but also its complete extermination, enslaving, elimination it as a nation (The philosophy of war, 1995:18). At the same time, the war is not to kill only. The initial goal is victory, and the final goal is peace, restoration of harmony (The philosophy of war, 1995:17). Thus, the peace is a natural form of social world for humanity. The peace promotes spiritual, psychological, economic, political recovery of the state.

We consider the problem of a fair war is significant, which is revealed in the works of G. Jomini, K. Marx, F. Engels, P. Sorokin, M. Golovin, A. Svychin and others. They argue that sometimes, in order to achieve justice, one must go the most difficult and destructive way – violence (Lautkene, 2011). From the point of these positions' view, violence is supposedly a fair instrument for achieving peace. In our opinion, such justification of “a just war” is an aggressor's weapon, which is trying to justify its violent actions – as it was done by V. Putin in February 2022.

If the war is waged in the name of the state and nation, and the purpose is to protect higher spiritual values, it is defined as “just war”. If the war does not meet the interests and needs of the state and the nation, it does not meet the demands of higher justice and is called “unjust war” (The philosophy of war, 1995:14). Thus, if the importance of the state needs is idealized, war can be justified as an expression of love for the country, protection of the values of the state and the nation. C. Montesqu e said that the most brutal tyrant is the one that stands under the banner of legality and justice.

Together with the destructive, disorganizational character, the war, in fact, is the most important act of the creative beginning (The philosophy of war, 1995:95). Therefore, if the war occurs in the event of a world rebuild, when the archaic system prevents society from developing, then military action has a positive impact. They build a world order – the formation of a peaceful structure of the world and aimed at peaceful settlement.

Historically, the war played a negative role in the formation of society through economic, demographic, cultural and other losses after the end of hostilities, and positive, through the resolution of strategic issues, the transition to a higher level of social development, the liberation of the country from the aggressor, the destruction of the dictatorial regime, etc. E. Waid indicates the following functions of war: economic (access to resources), demographic (demographic balance), punitive (restoration of social order), psychological (internal tension transfer from outside) (War and peace, 1994: 30). Analyzing the above functions, we note that the economic function is not about resource achieving only, but political status also. In our opinion, the economic function is characterized by protection of all spheres of life of society.

Only the example of the demographic function shows the ecological function of war as elimination of anthropogenic Earth transfer and establishment of demographic balance. However, the term “balance” is more correct to use in relation to the previous economic function, because due to the self-organizing specificity of natural processes, the balance can be maintained only in an artificial way – the extension of the forces of society to its death or expansion of the populated territory through the accumulation of people.

E. Waid highlighted the punitive function, which is to restore social order. But in the society, both order and chaos are present, the emphasis on one social process is shifting research into the area of metaphysics. The absolutization of the forced social order breeds a dictatorial regime in the country. Interaction of chaos and order is necessary for functioning of society in conditions of war and peace. Moreover, the war is characterized by the restoration of chaos, the destabilization of society, and the disintegration of world processes.

Psychological function, according to E. Waid, is to carry the internal voltage outside the limits of the system. However, it violates the emitted qualities of the world system. Internal links of elements are deformed, become weak, there is a threat of destruction of the whole system. Because of economic, demographic, political and psychological problems, the standard of living is decreasing, and the internal social tension is increasing, the output is military actions, violation of the old regime in the country for the restoration of decent life of the population.

In the joint work of A. Pershitz, Y. Semenov, V. Shnirelman analyzed various studies of war and considered this phenomenon applying three criteria:

1. Organizational and structural criteria – the war is a form of inter-group violence, up to the intention of killing one (War and peace, 1994:48).

2. Legacy-target criteria – continuing the line of L. White, regarding the definition of war as a struggle between social organisms, certain nations for survival, for receiving and using land resources, for rich fields, etc. According to this criterion, scientists applied to works of B. Malinovsky, who, rephrasing German military theorist K. Clausewitz, wrote that “war is an armed clash between two independent political units with the use of organized military force for the purpose of conducting tribal or state policy” (War and peace, 1994:51).

3. Military-technical criteria – was developed by American anthropologist H. Terni-Hay, who for the division of war into original and real, introduced the concept of “military horizon”, i.e. tactical operations, use of a series of various combat actions, presence of military leadership and clear idea of group reasons and purposes of war (War and peace, 1994:53).

As for the first criterion, it is determined that war is a form of inter-group violence, that is, a way of showing its content. Violence is characterized by aggression, but not only physical, as the murder of one another, but also psychological, which is expressed as an informational, psychological war. This definition describes the scale of action as an inter-group collision, but here it should be pointed out that wars can be global, between countries

and continents. If there is agreement, gradually disappears contradictions, violence, and the exit from the confrontation becomes an agreement, an agreement of parties, the measure of development of the world passes to the organization, order, harmony, which are essential features of the peace. There is a transformation of both sides of the process, an exchange of qualities and appearance of new features of elements and components of the system. In our opinion, the cited study of the phenomenon of war on organizational and structural criteria is imperfect, because the organization is built here only in the structure, accordingly, there is no important functional content and genetic direction of the research.

On the second criterion, L. White focused on war over resources, over territory, bypassing political, social, cultural and other aspects. Development resources in the war are opened. If they are blocked it will make military actions impossible, reduce combat capacity and lead to the end of military actions and the processes of building, organization and arrangement of peace will dominate. Different from L. White's point of view is position of B. Malinovsky, who thinks that the war's goal is to introduce a new ideology, a new state policy. If one side accepts the ideology of another, sometimes contradicted with the traditional views of the first, but thus the source of conflict is being leveled, the war is going to the extent of peace, through the implementation of the agreement, the agreement of the parties. Both definitions set the goal and expected consequences of the war. In our opinion, attention is also needed to the opposite – spontaneous, spontaneous and self-organizing behavior, which influences the activity and further processes. Moreover, the cause criteria should be considered in unity with the consequences.

According to the third criterion, the development of components of the military horizon determines two types of war. For the primitive war there was a small territory of military actions, speed, almost complete absence of a strict military organization, only tactical tasks were solved and social and ritualistic psychological goals were prevailing over economic and political ones. With the evolution of social relations and clustering, the war has become an instrument for achieving strategic goals. When goals are achieved, destructive processes of war cease to be actual, there is a change of state, transformation of processes in society: “Disorganization – organization”, “war – peace”.

Modern types of war

One type of war is a “real” war – a confrontation between two or more autonomous groups, which causes society-sanctioned long-term armed actions in which the whole group or some part with an aim to improve its material, social, political or psychological state, or, in general, chances of survival (War and peace, 1994:57). Therefore, it should be noted that the war may have a different character: the war has a rational character, which is carried out through the society sanctioned, coordinated and organized military actions; the target character of the war is connected with material, social, political or psychological interests; the technical character is shown in the development and application of the new weapon. The technical sphere has a relationship with the scientific sphere. With the development of the scientific and technical sphere of the war, the resource base was expanded by new advanced weapon of mass destruction.

Another characteristic feature of the XXI century is the introduction of its technologies in all spheres of human life: science, production, everyday life. Information civilization is formed, which defines new forms of war and peace, the latter is considered as a world order; there is a new division of labor with the professions connected with information technologies, information processes build new economic relations – search for clients and sales of goods are guided through the Internet, consumption and exchange of information is arrive. In the XXI century the main means of modern world policy, the dominant way to achieve spiritual, political and economic power is the information war. Such a war is defined as a way of creating an information flow management system for the purpose of organization of noosphere and world information and psychological space in own interests (Panarin, 2006: 3).

Today an information war is considered as information-intellectual and is conducted on new fronts: cultural, civilizational, ethnic, religious (Panarin, 2006: 3).

Thus, through globalization in the modern world, information flows become fast and have a strong influence on the consciousness of people and all spheres of society. The information war is seen as a system, which means that it is rational and directed at the organization of the world information space. Thus, the information war is a driving factor for more radical actions and large-scale conflicts.

At the forefront of the country's defense potential are not large numbers of troops on the basis of living force, but the use of high-precision weapons and weapons on new physical principles with information resistance. The aim of destruction is the economy of countries, not the political system. Because of the informational nature of the new war, the geostrategic situation in the world is changing and the global problem of strengthening peace and security of states is emerging.

At the present stage of the specific-historical development of the social world are distinguished by hybrid and network wars. American researcher G. Greg sees a modern hybrid war as a new type of combat operations – a hybrid of irregular and regular combat actions. Hybrid wars have mixed the volatility of the usual war with tactics and fanaticism of irregular. The conflict sides are highly adaptive and equipped with high-tech weapons, such as high-precision guided missiles (Greg, 2008).

Network as a new way of social structuring permeates all hierarchical levels of social systems, sometimes ruining them, but in most cases preserving the traditional structure, involving, however, its components to new networks, which are not characterized by hierarchy, in the functioning of network communities there is no strict regulation, etc. (Chaika, 2013: 247). Therefore, the network war is characterized by a gentle military policy, a horizontal type of power and management relations, civil forms of confrontation prevailing and is not supported by hierarchical connections of actors.

The hybrid war embodies a mixture of confrontation in all spheres of society's life with the involvement of terrorist forces. It appears as an open or covert aggression of one country against another with information resistance and propaganda. The process is changing the configuration of war: economic – informational – state – civil – terrorist struggle. It has a military-local character due to accumulation of some territories of the country, on which military actions with the informational influence of each side are carried out. Thus, a hybrid war has hidden types of confrontation. Hybrid and network actors of war influence their types depending on various natural and human factors.

The study of the impact of war on peacekeeping communications allows to determine such statements. The social world, whose development is conditioned by the dialectic contradictions of war and peace, is not a system if it lacks integrity, is not shaped by social, integrated relationships, but only differentiated social relations, which are connected to separate elements of the system. Since the change of the state of the social world (such as “peace-war”, “chaos-order”, “governance-self-organization”) covers all spheres of social life, affects ecology, economy, politics, culture, the military-technical sphere and society as a whole, determines the course of events in the state, and the integrity of the world is conditioned by its viability, – it is necessary to turn to consideration of concrete developments of social world development by spheres of life of society.

Relationship between war and peace

The relationship between war and peace is manifested in the following different ways:

1. Ecological peace/war – can perform recreational, natural, technical, ecological-monitoring and health care function. The ecological war takes place in order to protect and properly use natural resources and recreational areas of the country, to introduce modern, ecologically safe resource and energy-saving technologies into production, to develop technologies of waste processing and utilization, to implement a complex of state measures for ecological safety of the country. This type of war is being carried out to reduce the negative impact of global environmental problems on the state of ecological security of the country, to expand its participation in international cooperation on these issues, as well as to implement a set of measures that guarantee the ecological safety of nuclear and chemical facilities and reliable radiation protection of the population. That is, if the ecological state of the country does not meet the public needs for environmental safety of life, there is a distortion in the existing system, which is aimed at changing the state. When ecological, socio-ecological, resource-ecological, exogenous and technogenic safety is achieved, ecological balance of the country is created, as well as effective use of natural resources and recreational zones is introduced, system of ecological safety is organized in both biological and social spheres (social ecology of society) – a new state is created, which is defined as ecological peace.

2. Economic peace/war is primarily implemented in internal economic and external economic functions. The war of this kind is aimed at establishing economic processes of production, consumption, exchange and distribution, achieving the security of private and state enterprises, ensuring coordinated relations between the state and the market, between private and state-owned economic entities, establishing trade and economic relations with foreign countries, developing business partnerships and cooperation in the international economic sphere. The economic peace arises when the economic security and economic balance of the country is achieved through effective economic functions of war.

3. Social peace/war – is being carried out to ensure decent living conditions of people, social groups, classes, stratum, communities, social organizations, society as a whole, their free development and equal opportunities for all citizens, assistance to socially vulnerable groups of the population. Moreover, the reasons and course of military actions are influenced by the social-demographic crisis. Accordingly, when the proper living conditions of a person, social groups, communities, classes, stratum are formed, social organizations, society as a whole, their social well-being and free development have been achieved, the socio-demographic crisis has been overcome, the protection of all segments of the population has been protected, peace is arrived.

4. Political peace/war – performs state-administrative, legal, civil-public and foreign-political functions. Because of the contradictions between civil society and the state, political parties are trying to gain state power in all ways, and public associations are protesting against totalitarianism and include self-organizing regulators of the public level. When the barriers are demolished to build a democratic civil society, to provide social protection to individuals, to establish the rule of law and order, and to achieve the freedom of society, it can be argued that war is being waged to ensure peace, to recognize the independence of the country by both neighboring states and the world community, and the rule of law and order.

5. Military-technical peace/war – realizes informational, technical, military functions. The peace in dialectical unity with the war in this context is expressed as an achievement of information, technical and military security of the country, namely – citizens of the country are provided with truthful information, use of preventive means for prevention of information war, military equipment is used only for training of a capable army. At the absolutization of military and technical sphere in the country there arises violence of the state over all members of society. That's why the necessary task of both state structures and self-organized associations is to develop mechanisms for prevention of such situation.

6. The spiritual and cultural peace/war embodies the functions of designing the transformation of the meaning, values, norms, ideas, beliefs and so on in social relations. The spiritual and cultural war destroys the outdated barriers to develop social relations in art (literature, painting, music, architecture, cinema, theater, etc.), or vice versa, is conducted for preservation of spiritual and cultural values of the nation. Sometimes the war is the destruction of the spiritual and cultural life of people. The spiritual and cultural peace is the result of the struggle of society for the formation of an integral national spiritual and cultural space, which leads to the consolidation of the state and society.

Conclusions

Thus, the above classification defines that the result and the end of the war is peace, but the processes that characterize these phenomena have different orientation. The war is aimed at fighting, deformation, destruction, and peace is aimed at settlement, organization, harmonization, creation. Therefore, it is expedient to define differentiation of concrete social world in the classification of relations between war and peace in its direction. When the internal war is dominated, namely, the channeling of the sum of the state elements, components or connections between them to fight, disorganize and destroy internal systems, the internal peace is reached, which is characterized by the organization of a combination of elements, components or connections between them, aimed at coordination of both the process and the state inside the system. Accordingly, domination of external war – the channeling of a combination of state elements, components or connections between them to fight, misorganization and destruction of systems from outside leads to achievement of external peace, which is characterized by organization of a combination of elements, components or connections between them, aimed at coordination of both process and state of external system. Thus, peace and war differ in their direction. The internal and external peace may not be harmonized, the internal conflict can be fully in agreement with the external peace, and vice versa.

Список використаних джерел:

1. Война и мир в ранней истории человечества / ред.: А. Першиц, Ю. Семенов, В. Шнилерман. Москва : Ин-т этнологии и антропологии, 1994. 419 с.
2. Люткене Г. В. Современные концепции войны : философско-политологический анализ : дисс. ... канд. полит. спец. 23.00.01. Москва: Воен. ун-т, 2011. 175 с.
3. Панарин И. Н. Информационная война и политика. Москва : Поколение, 2006. 553 с.
4. Слипченко В. Война будущего (прогностический анализ). Москва : Объед. гуманит. изд-во, 2005. 290 с.
5. Философия войны / сост., авт. предисл. и прил. И. В. Домнин ; общ. ред. А. Б. Григорьев. Москва : Изд. центр «Анкил- Воин», 1995. 220 с.
6. Чайка І. Ю. Феномен інформаційної єдності: соціально-філософський аналіз : монографія. Запоріжжя : КСК-Альянс, 2013. 330 с.
7. Greg G. Hybrid Wars. Government Executive. URL: <http://www.govexec.com/magazine/features/2008/05/hybrid-wars/26799/>

References:

1. Voyna i mir v ranney istorii chelovechestva [War and peace in early human history]: sochineniya (1994) / A. Pershits, Y. Semenov, V. Shnirelman. Moscow : In-t etnologii i antropologii Rossiyskoy Akademii Nauk. Vol. 1. [in Russian].
2. Lyutkene G. V. (2011). Sovremennyye kontseptsii voyni: filosofsko-politologicheskyy analiz [Modern concepts of war: philosophical and political analysis]: avtoref. dis. na soiskanie uchen. stepeni kand. polit. nauk : spets. 23.00.0. Moscow [in Russian].
3. Panarin I. N. (2006). Informatsionnaya voyna i geopolitika [Information warfare and geopolitics]. Moscow : Pokolenie [in Russian].
4. Slipchenko V. (2005). Voyna buduschego (prognosticheskiy analiz) [War of the future (predictive analysis)]: monografiya. Moscow : Ob'edinennoe gumanitarnoe izd-vo [in Russian].
5. Filosofiya voyni [The philosophy of war] : sbornik (1995). Sost., avt. predisl. i pril. I.V. Domnin ; pod obsch. red. A.B. Grigoreva. Moscow : Ankil-Voin [in Russian].
6. Chaika I.Y. (2013). Fenomen informatsiinoi yednosti: sotsialno-filosofskiy analiz : monohrafiia. [The phenomenon of information unity: socio-philosophical analysis]. Zaporizhzhia : KSK-Alians [in Ukrainian].
7. Greg G. (2008). Hybrid Wars. Government Executive. URL: <http://www.govexec.com/magazine/features/2008/05/hybrid-wars/26799/> [in English].