

Yavor Raychev
PhD Student
University of Granada
yavorraychev1988@gmail.com

UDC.355.4.01
355.4(470+571)

VALERIY GERASIMOV AND DOCTRINE ON HYBRID WAR

Abstract

Hybrid wars as a new generation of conflicts are largely discussed today. The purpose of this article is to analyze Gerasimov's doctrine, by interpreting its main aspects. The analysis is based on original empirical research of his publications.

Keywords: *doctrine, Gerasimov, hybrid, war, Russia*

In this paper I will argue that even if Gerasimov Doctrine is based on analysis of events, related to the Colorful Revolutions, Arab Spring and Syria, its main principles are applied in any hybrid activities, including against technologically advanced countries, like USA.

In order to do so, I first stay the ideas of Gerasimov, then I discuss if what he means under "hybrid wars" is the same that Western researchers mean and finally, I take a case study - this one of the Internet Research Agency (IRA), better known as a "troll factory", settled in Peterburg by a close friend of the Russian president - and acting against USA.

The ideas and theories for hybrid war, and as well the foreign policy concepts, doctrines for national security and the military doctrine of the country provide that framework, in which it is possible to easily understand the ideas of Valeriy Gerasimov. Very often the doctrine of the hybrid war is attributed precisely to him.

According BBC, Gen Gerasimov, 57, was born in the city of Kazan, on the Volga River and capital of the ethnic Tatars. He began his military career in 1977 with the Northern Group of Forces. After serving in the Far Eastern and Baltic Military Districts, he became chief of staff of the 58th Army in the North Caucasus Military District in 1999. The journalist Anna Politkovskaya, a vocal critic of the Chechen conflict who was murdered in 2006, to describe him as "a man who was able to preserve an officer's honor" during the war.¹ In 2001, at the height of the Chechen conflict, Gen Gerasimov was appointed commander of the 58th Army. In 2003-2005 he become chief of staff of the Far Eastern Military District. Later he went on to serve

¹ Cited by Profile: Russia's new military chief Valery Gerasimov. BBC, 9 November 2012, <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-20270111>

as commander of the military districts covering St Petersburg and Moscow, before becoming deputy chief of general staff. He was relieved of his duties in April 2012, becoming commander of the Central Military District.

The article which presents his main views in fact is a summary of his report, presented a bit earlier to the general assembly of the Academy of military sciences.

The 2,000-word article, “The Value of Science Is in the Foresight,” was published in the weekly Russian trade paper Military-Industrial Kurier on 26 February 2013.²

What is important to mention is that Gerasimov never uses the term “hybrid war” in it. Instead, he applies the term “indirect and asymmetric methods”, which was interpreted by Western scholars as hybrid war.

In the article gen. Gerasimov searches answer to several questions: What is the modern war? For what the army has to be prepared? How it should be armed? What forms and methods should be employed for the development of the armed forces?

The text begins with a claim that in XXI century the differences between wars are peace are blurred: “In the 21st century we have seen a tendency toward blurring the lines between the states of war and peace. Wars are no longer declared and, having begun, proceed according to an unfamiliar template”. The recent experience from the military conflicts has demonstrated that even stable and flourishing countries can succumb in few months or weeks to enemy aggression and become arena of chaos, humanitarian catastrophe and civil war.

Gerasimov gives the so-called events in the Arab Spring as example of the modern war. It is a war with different rules, where non-military means are used to achieve political and strategic goals and they have proven to be very effective. So far military has never been interested in such type of conflicts, but for the future they should become their main interest and will probably set the model for the future war.

According to the author, the change of rule consists in the wide application of political, economic, information, humanitarian and other similar measures, used together with the rebelling potential of the local population. Even when military measures are used, they are disguised. Gerasimov points out that “military means of a concealed character [is] ... carrying out actions of informational conflict and the actions of special-operations forces”. Together with this, he claims that “peacekeeping and crisis regulation” are also disguised military means.

Gerasimov tries as well to establish a connection between the technological advancement and the way the wars are carried out. According to him: “New information technologies have enabled significant reductions in the spatial, temporal, and informational gaps between forces and control organs. Frontal engagements of

² Герасимов, Валери. 2013. “The Value of Science Is in the Foresight,” Military-Industrial Kurier https://vpk-news.ru/sites/default/files/pdf/VPK_08_476.pdf

large formations of forces at the strategic and operational level are gradually becoming a thing of the past. Long-distance, contactless actions against the enemy are becoming the main means of achieving combat and operational goals. The defeat of the enemy's objects is conducted throughout the entire depth of his territory. The differences between strategic, operational, and tactical levels, as well as between offensive and defensive operations, are being erased. The application of high-precision weaponry is taking on a mass character. Weapons based on new physical principals and automatized systems are being actively incorporated into military activity”³

Gerasimov also mentions the importance and the role of the asymmetric activities in the modern war, which allow to achieve superiority over stronger enemy in the modern war. In this category, the author includes the use of Special Forces, the actions of the internal opposition and the information activities.

He distinguishes in the next way traditional from the new military methods:

Figure 1. The change of the characters of the armed fight. Achievement of political goals.

Traditional Military Methods

- Military action starts after strategic deployment (Declaration of War).
- Frontal clashes between large units consisting mostly of ground units.
- Defeat of manpower, firepower, taking control of Regions and borders to gain territorial control.
- Destruction of economic power and territorial Annexation.
- Combat operations on land, air and sea
- Management of troops by rigid hierarchy and Governance.

New Military Methods

- Military action starts by groups of troops during Peacetime (war is not declared at all).
- Non-contact clashes between highly Maneuverable interspecific fighting groups.
- Annihilation of the enemy's military and economic power by short-time precise strikes in Strategic military and civilian infrastructure.
- Massive use of high-precision weapons and special operations, robotics, and weapons that

³ Translation from Russian taken from “The ‘Gerasimov Doctrine’ and Russian Non-Linear War”, Dr. Mark Galeotti’s blog, <https://inmoscowsshadows.wordpress.com/2014/07/06/the-gerasimov-doctrine-and-russian-non-linear-war/>

use new physical principles (direct-energy

Weapons — lasers, shortwave radiation, etc.).

- Use of armed civilians (4 civilians to 1 military).

- Simultaneous strike on the enemy's units and

Facilities in all of the territory.

- Simultaneous battle on land, air, sea, and in the

Informational space.

- Use of asymmetric and indirect methods.

- Management of troops in a unified informational

sphere

Source: Gerasimov, V. Ценность науки в предвидении. Новые вызовы требуют переосмыслить формы и способы ведения боевых действий, 2013, accessed March 17, 2015, <http://www.vpknews>.

There are different views on Gerasimov's first article. Some people claim that it doesn't contain anything new and just openly states everything that the Russian army has always done. Other people think that it legitimizes the imperial policy of Putin. Molly K. McKew describes it in the following way: „The article is considered by many to be the most useful articulation of Russia's modern strategy, a vision of total warfare that places politics and war within the same spectrum of activities—philosophically, but also logistically. The approach is guerrilla, and waged on all fronts with a range of actors and tools—for example, hackers, media, businessmen, leaks and, yes, fake news, as well as conventional and asymmetric military means. Thanks to the internet and social media, the kinds of operations Soviet psy-ops teams once could only fantasize about—upending the domestic affairs of nations with information alone—are now plausible. The Gerasimov Doctrine builds a framework for these new tools, and declares that non-military tactics are not auxiliary to the use of force but the preferred way to win. That they are, in fact, the actual war. Chaos is the strategy the Kremlin pursues: Gerasimov specifies that the objective is to achieve an environment of permanent unrest and conflict within an enemy state.“⁴

⁴ MCKEW, MOLLY K. The Gerasimov Doctrine. Politico Magazine. September/October 2017. The Gerasimov Doctrine. 848

Roger N. McDermott argues in his article “Does Russia Have a Gerasimov Doctrine?” that Gerasimov ideas and intentions were largely misunderstood. The author claims that Western scholars failed to take into account the specific Russian approaches, traditions, uniqueness and context. Examples of these include:

- “Historically Russian army has avoided entering in a military conflict without careful preparation of the battlefield, which means conducting an analysis of the operational environment and making tangible efforts to shape it according to the requirements of the mission”⁵

- Russian officers are prone to examine the historical example of wars, especially the German invasion in Russia and the followed Great Patriotic War, in order to draw conclusions about the present-day and future operations and wars. This point is especially important for the Russian military thought and can be seen as well in Gerasimov, whose famous article which is widely believed to be the root of the “Russian hybrid warfare” is also within the historical framework of the Great Patriotic War and the need to be prepared for future conflicts in order not to be taken by surprise as it happened in 1941. As pointed out, one of the main tasks of the Russian military science is to gain foresight in terms of future conflicts. The historical framework of the Great Patriotic War, used by Gerasimov can also be explained by the context. The article comes shortly after the change of the Defense Minister, who was removed from office together with other high ranked military officers in a corruption scandal and by writing it, Gerasimov wanted to establish himself as a supportive to Sergey Shoygu and to appeal to other military officers in attempt to repair the damage in their relations followed the staff changes. The choice of media, *Voyenno Promyshlennyy Kuryer*, also suggest that the targeted audience is very limited. The journal is mainly of interest to Russian military theorists, and the choice to publish there and not in other military journals which are more spread in other circles, also speaks clearly of the purpose of the article.

According to McDermott, in his article Gerasimov does not speak about new approach for the Russian army. On the contrary, Gerasimov logic leads to Alexandr Svechin’s idea that “war is difficult to predict”. This is why Gen. Gerasimov spoke about the uniqueness of every conflict which requires understanding of the specific logic behind it. In this sense, rather than setting a new course for the Russian army (such as “Hybrid warfare doctrine”), he advices Russian politicians and military personnel to be open for new ideas and new “unconventional” approaches, which are not limited only to trying to catch up

<https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2017/09/05/gerasimov-doctrine-russia-foreign-policy-215538>

⁵ McDermott Roger. Does Russia Have a Gerasimov Doctrine? *Parameters* 46(1) Spring 2016

technologically other powers. He recommended measures aimed to produce countermeasures, able to expose enemy vulnerabilities.

McDermott argues that another argument of the misunderstanding of Gerasimov's article comes from Gerasimov itself. A main topic in his article are the "color revolutions" which are presented as foreign hybrid threats, sponsored from outside, leading to potential instability and government changes. Such revolutions are presented as major threat for Russia. The idea that the Ukrainian, Syrian and other revolutions which threw the countries in Civil War, is not new in Russia. But it is clear that this hybrid threats are presented as foreign. Gerasimov nowhere advises Russia to take similar approach, he speaks about the need to defend against them. In this sense the allegations of Russian support in protests in other countries as part of the "Russian hybrid war", stemming directly from the "Gerasimov Doctrine" are not true, or at least this is not what Gerasimov spoke about. Even if arguing that Russia needs to adopt hybrid model of warfare in order to counter the hybrid capabilities of the enemy, adopting a single model of warfare is contrary to the General Staff and Gerasimov culture and traditions, which would seek adaptive approaches custom-tailored for every particular case.

McDermott enumerated concrete good practices and learned lessons which the military army gained as experience from their enterprise in Donbas and Syria, which include "Establishing and retaining command and control over proxy forces", "Formulating and publicly articulating key strategic objectives", "Designing, implementing and managing a train-and-equip program for proxy forces" and so on. He also points out that instead of shaping the operations on a specific model such as "hybrid model", Russia once again shaped their operations according to the specific conditions. The destabilization of the Eastern Ukraine in the way it was carried out was made possible due to the specific cultural, linguistic, historical, governmental particularities of the Ukrainian government. Moscow's strategy in Donbas was different than the strategy used in Crimea and was different than the strategy used in Syria. The events in Donbas were characterized also by improvisation in the Donbas model was evident in the initial apparent support for "Novorossiia" and then public denial of such possibility. The specific cultural, linguistic and historical ties, the sympathy for the separatists in part of the local population, the corruption of the Ukrainian government and other similar factors make Ukraine unique case which can hardly be replicated elsewhere, therefore the adopted approach most likely will not be effective elsewhere.

McDermott concludes that the claim about the "New Gerasimov Doctrine" advocating hybrid warfare as sole approach is a result of using prism for analysis different than the Russian one. This generates lack of understandings about the Russian military dynamics on military operational and strategic levels, which can hamper the NATO and EU capabilities to counter the threat coming from Russia.

The anthropologist Vladimir Artyukh has a similar position. He claims that the introduction of the term by the military scholars did not bring significant results. However after the annexation of Crimea, according to the author, the term “hybrid war” has made a return in the media and in the official discourse of the Western countries and Ukraine, attempting to describe the strategy, attributed to Russia, in order to explain the conflict there. Artyukh claims that the article of Gerasimov is called for the first time “Russian military doctrine” by the journalist who writes often in Radio Free Europe Robert Coalson in 2014, who wrote in Facebook that Gerasimov’s article sheds light on the events in Ukraine⁶. Similar view has also Mark Galeotti, who comments the article and links it to the idea of hybrid war. According to him the ideas of Gerasimov about the “non-linear war” can be interpreted as hidden declaration of the new Russian doctrine. In June 2014 the Secretary General of NATO Anders Rasmussen accused Russia in conducting a hybrid war, defining it as a combination of military operations, operations under cover and disinformation. Ever since, many Russian actions have been labelled actions of hybrid war. His conclusion is that as long as the hybrid war is part of wider obsession for war against terrorism, any action which is opposite to the official one is being described as part of the bigger evil, which in the western case is the terrorism. Because of this the separatists in Donbass are classified terrorists by the Ukrainian government as terrorists. Identically, Russia described the events around the Maidan as “fascist”, which is the reincarnation of the evil, similar to what terrorism is, in the Russian psychology and discourse.

Another scientists however consider that article should be seen as a direct guidelines for the development of Russian military capabilities by 2020:

- 1) From direct destruction to direct influence;
- 2) From direct annihilation of the opponent to its inner decay;
- 3) From a war with weapons and technology to a culture war;
- 4) From a war with conventional forces to specially prepared forces and commercial irregular groupings;
- 5) From the traditional (3D) battleground to information/psychological warfare and war of perceptions;
- 6) From direct clashes to contactless war;
- 7) From a superficial and compartmented war to a total war, including the enemy’s internal side and base;
- 8) From war in the physical environment to a war in the human consciousness and in cyber-space;
- 9) From symmetric to asymmetric warfare by a combination of political, economic, information, technological, and ecological campaigns;

⁶ Цитирано по Владимир Артюх, Туман «гибридной войны»: почему вредно мыслить гибридно, Международен журнал September, <http://september.media/archives/294>

10) From war in a defined period of time, to a state of permanent war as the natural condition in national life. (*J. Bērziņš*. Russian New Generation Warfare is not Hybrid Warfare P. 44-45)

In 2016 Gerasimov published his second article called “The hybrid war requires high tech weapon and scientific argumentation”⁷. This is the first time the term “hybrid war” has been used and it is defined in the following way: “It is more than clear that the development of the technologies for armed fight is not the only reason for the improvement of the forms and the means for action of the army or other armed forces. Today, in the age of globalization, weakened national borders, development of communication, the most important factor remains the changed forms of international conflicts. In the modern conflicts it has become more important to apply a complex array of political, economic, information and other non-military means, made with strong back up of military means. This is the so-called hybrid wars”.

Gerasimov presents a developed description of their nature, underlining the following: “Their essence is not simply achieving political objectives with minimal use of military means against the enemy”. It happens mostly through undermining enemy’s military and economic potential, informational-psychological manipulation, active support for the internal opposition and partisan groups.

According to Gerasimov, this is possible thanks to the organization of “color revolutions”, which should lead to non-violent transition of power. The author is very critical about them: “Every color revolution is in its nature a form of coup d’état staged from outside. In their basis lay the information technologies, carrying manipulations on the protest potential of the local population, combined with other non-military means”. This is it, because with time every information resource has become a powerful weapon which use could allow any country to be shaken from inside in a matter of days.

Here, as it was in the previous article, the importance of the use of military means in addition to the upper mentioned strategy. He advices, in the course of hybrid war, to make use of force only if the situation requires it as a last resort, under the form of peacekeeping missions or similar. The conclusion is that “the indirect and asymmetric actions of the hybrid war will deprive the enemy of sovereignty without occupying its territory”.

Gerasimov also underlines that if the methods of the classic wars are well-known, the methods of the indirect war can only be guessed. Nevertheless, it is obvious, according to him, that “the state, victim of the hybrid war quickly falls into chaos, internal political crisis and economic collapse. The results of color

⁷ Герасимов, Валерий. «Гибридная война требует высокотехнологичного оружия и научного обоснования». 08.03.2016. Lifejournal. <http://alexandr-palkin.livejournal.com/4734100.html>

revolutions on the other hand are visible in the murders carried out on national or religious motivation, increased crime, and mass-immigration and so on”

The author puts as example few contemporary conflicts including the conflicts in Syria and Iraq, to convince us that the hybrid war is not a “future” war, it is already conducted – in reality, in every military conflict of today there is a combination of military and non-military means. Gerasimov tries to show the sequence of the events, which according to his opinion is the same for every conflict: the internal conflicts are transformed into violent or military actions of the opposition. These actions, with the help of foreign instructors, become organized. Later on, the terroristic organizations appear, with help from outside. It is interesting to observe that in any stage, the organizers from outside, always remain in shadows.

Gerasimov claims that important part of the hybrid war is the falsification of the events and the usage of the mass-media for this purpose. The effect of the mass-media, according to him, is equal with the effect of large scale use of military force.

The third article of Gerasimov appeared in March 2017 and was published under the title “Peace on the edge of the war”, again in the same newspaper⁸. According to him, the American classification of the wars divides them in traditional and non-traditional, and in the beginning of XX century another term was added – namely, hybrid wars. They are understood as actions during period, which can’t be classified neither as peace, nor as war. According to Gerasimov, the Russian scholars have established far more balanced approach to the classification of the modern conflicts, which accounts for bigger number of indicators. Gerasimov notes that neither in international agreements, nor in Russian official documents we can see clear definition of war. In the military doctrine of the Russian Federation, we can read that “war is a form of solution of inter-state or inner-state conflicts with the application of military force”. This is a serious point of discussion – if “military force” should be indispensable criterion for war.

Gerasimov underlines that the General Staff of the Russian army pays enough attention to this debate. Discussions over the problem were organized within the General Staff itself, and in the Security Council of the Russian Federation.

Another interesting claim of gen. Gerasimov is that we have adopted the term “hybrid war” too soon, after the experience of only few conflicts in the last decade such as the NATO operation in Yugoslavia, which opened the path for the wars without contact, or the operations in Libya and Syria, in which US and NATO applied “hybrid strategies” since those are usually not considered a form of aggression.

⁸ Герасимов, Валерий. Мир на гранях войны. Военно-промышленный курьер. № 10 (674), 15 март 2017 г. <https://vpk-news.ru/articles/35591>

Gerasimov admits that in the beginning of XXI century the transformation of the military conflicts is a fact. It is clear that the border between war and peace is blurred. The other side of the “hybrid war” is its perception in peace time, when there is no open military aggression against a country, but its national security and sovereignty are threatened and can be destroyed. In the same time the spectrum of reasons for use of military force is being expanded. Today more and more we can see how wars are being fought for economic interests of specific country or countries, but under the disguise of “defense of democracy” or democratic values. The non-military forms of war, through the technological advancement, become formidable and very dangerous means. The use of these means can lead to collapse of the bank system, economy, information, electricity or other systems, which are essential for any country. As example gen. Gerasimov gives the cyber-attacks on the Iranian energetic infrastructure in 2015. According to him, however, there is still no reason to give up on the use of military force in the wars, as in all of the upper mentioned conflicts the military force was used at some point, to some extent.

As we can see, the Russian understanding for hybrid wars has still a lot of undetermined points. One possible question is if the first article of Gerasimov can be regarded as fundamental, does it really promote a new military doctrine. Even if many Western scholars tend to agree with this point of view, we should still ask if the hybrid war of Russia is not a misunderstanding of its military efforts (Artyukh) or even a shock from Russia’s military might, which surprised the West (Hramchihin) or if “hybrid war” is not artificially constructed term which is interpreted outside of the specific cultural and historical context of the Russian army and society.

In my opinion the articles of Gerasimov might not represent necessary a new military doctrine, but the hybrid war conducted by Russia is a fact, that shall be demonstrated in next chapters. As we have noted in this chapter, ever since Yeltsin period, there is a trend towards denial of the values of the West and the perception of being a victim of the West, perception which can probably be related to the weakening of Russia after the dissolution of the USSR and the loss of its uncontested position as world power, but these processes are outside of the scope of this analysis.

Case study: Internet research agency (IRA)

As it was already said, based on the analysis of IRA I will try to demonstrate the application of the main principles of hybrid activity against technologically advanced country like USA.

What do we know about the Internet research agency?

The first data in the Russian press about the “Trolls factory” in Petersburg and Moscow, which worked on demand, in order to influence public opinion, appeared in 2013. In a journalistic investigation by Novaya Gazeta, it is claimed that in August, the same year, there were already recruitment announcements. The duties of people working there were limited to "raising the index of some articles" that present events or products. Who determined the tasks? "There will be orders. And we still know. There are a lot of events going on in politics and in business. Whatever they say, we do it."⁹

According to US Deputy Prosecutor Rod Rosenstein, the agency is a structured organization that has a multi-million-dollar budget, hundreds of employees and many “shell” companies through which it operates. Again, according to the same source, the organization has a graphic and financial department as well as departments for research and information optimization.¹⁰

In 2014, the organization created a US-oriented project, and in 2016 more than 80 people were involved in it. In turn, Russian media wrote that the agency is engaged in open-air propaganda, and that it is unofficially called the "Ministry of Truth" or "Troll Factory".

The agency was involved in internet propaganda and the staff was strictly controlled. Supervisors constantly watched the employees and discouraged them from talking with each other, cameras were everywhere. The work was organized in two shifts 12 hours each, seven days a week.

The allegations of the US Justice Department

On February 16, 2018, the US department of Justice accused for interference in the presidential election in 2016 13 Russian citizens and three companies. The US department of Justice emphasized that the interference in the presidential election is part of a larger operation - Project Lahta, which is not only limited to the United States.¹¹ They are charged for eight cases: the first is a conspiracy for fraud

⁹ [Александра Гармажапова](https://www.novayagazeta.ru/articles/2013/09/07/56253-gde-zhivut-trolli-i-kto-ih-kormit). 07 сентября 2013. Где живут тролли. И кто их кормит. <https://www.novayagazeta.ru/articles/2013/09/07/56253-gde-zhivut-trolli-i-kto-ih-kormit>

¹⁰ Годовой бюджет "Агентства интернет-исследований" составлял миллионы долларов – замгенпрокурора США. 16 февраля, 2018 <http://gordonua.com/news/worldnews/godovoy-byudzheth-agentstva-internet-issledovaniy-sostavlyal-milliony-dollarov-zamgenprokurora-ssha-232253.html>

¹¹ "Фабрика троллей" Пригожина похищала личные данные американцев и устраивала митинги во Флориде. Главное из обвинений минюста США. <http://gordonua.com/publications/fabrika-trolley-prigozhina-pohishchala-lichnye-dannye->

against all individuals and organizations. The second - a "conspiracy of mischief" against some officials and the agency as a whole. They open accounts with US banks using the personal data of real Americans without their consent (birth date, address, insurance number) and these accounts are used for money transfers between Russia and US for holding the shares. Six more cases concern the theft of personal data and are filed against other employees of the holding.

In October 2016, the United States officially blamed Russia for interference in the country's elections. In the "Joint Statement of the Department of Homeland Security and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence on Election", it was said: "The U.S. Intelligence Community (USIC) is confident that the Russian government has directed recent compromises of e-mails from US people and institutions, including from US political organizations. The recent disclosures of alleged hacked emails on sites like DCLeaks.com and WikiLeaks and the Guccifer 2.0 online persona are consistent with the methods and motivations of Russian-directed efforts. These thefts and disclosures are intended to interfere with the US election process. Such activity is not new to Moscow - the Russians have used similar tactics and techniques across Europe and Eurasia, for example, to influence public opinion there. We believe, based on the scope and sensitivity of these efforts, that only senior Russian officials could have authorized these activities. CIA came to the conclusion that Russia has really intervened in order to help Trump to achieve victory. Kremlin spokesman Dimitriy Peskov stated that these accusations are laughable.¹²

The US Treasury Department has expanded its sanctions against Russia, which was announced on March 15 on the official website of the agency.

How did they act?

The agency created accounts of fictional people on social networks, turning them into leaders of public opinion in the United States. They entered in contact with real Americans and ran in different cities campaigns in support of both Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. The task was to shape the agenda of the Americans, to influence their opinion, to be involved in discussion. According to one of the associates, "Primitive arguments are not accepted. That's why we need to know all the US issues - taxes, gay, sexual minorities, weapons. They give you a list of media you need to comment on and on which you should be monitoring. New York Times, Washington Post - there are hundreds of thousands of posts. You need to

amerikancev-i-ustraivala-mitingi-vo-floride-glavnoe-iz-obvineniy-minyusta-ssha-232350.html

¹² "Joint Statement from the Department Of Homeland Security and Office of the Director of National Intelligence on Election". <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2016/10/07/joint-statement-department-homeland-security-and-office-director-national>

review everything and to understand the general tendency, about what people argue about. And then you have to enter a dispute yourself by trying to “shake the boat”. For Russia you shouldn’t talk at all. Neither Russia nor Putin should be mentioned. Because Americans do not talk about it. They don’t care about Russia and Putin. We did not aim to turn the Americans against Russia. We aimed to turn them against their own government. To cause disorder, discontent, to lower Obama's rating. When elections began, we had instructions who is the better president for Russia, and who should be avoided”¹³

According to the US Justice Department, the agency’s main goal is "creating disagreement in the US and undermining public confidence in democracy."

The influence is done through social media, but without revealing the real nationality of the perpetrators - for this purpose, American IPs are used and VPNs are created.

Russians register hundreds of accounts on Facebook, Twitter and Instagram, using stolen or forged US documents or fictitious bank accounts. They position themselves as "politically and socially active Americans," create network groups, buy advertising, and recruit real Americans and pay them to participate in political campaigns and other related activities. These Americans do not realize that they are actually communicating with Russian citizens. On behalf of these Americans, Russians write posts on economic and foreign political issues concerning the United States. The work is done in two shifts to post everything in time, according to the time zone. The calendar of American holidays is used to write up-to-date texts. Activist groups are created in Facebook, Instagram and so on for migration, such as Secured Borders, for minorities rights Black Lives Matter (Blacktivist), United Muslims of America, Army of Jesus, and for regional activism – e.g South of Heart of Texas.

By 2016, many of groups created by the agency had a dozen members. The Russians also created tweeting accounts that are masked behind real people and NGOs from the United States. For example, the agency registers the TEN_GOP account, which is similar to the Republican branch of Tennessee - its true account is TNGOP. This fake account collected more than 100 000 subscribers. That same year, the intervention in the presidential campaign with material to support Trump and Clinton had begun. The slogans range from "Ohio wants a prison for Clinton" to "Hilary is Satan, her crimes and lies prove how evil she is." In the second half of 2016, the Russians were working to prevent minorities from

¹³ Годовой бюджет "Агентства интернет-исследований" составлял миллионы долларов – замгенпрокурора США. 16 февраля, 2018
<http://gordonua.com/news/worldnews/godovoy-byudzhnet-agentstva-internet-issledovaniy-sostavlyal-milliony-dollarov-zamgenprokurora-ssha-232253.html>

voting under influences such as "The noise and hatred for Trump mislead people and force blacks to vote for Hillary. We cannot choose the lesser of the two evils. It is better for us not to vote at all." Or "American Muslims boycott the current election, most of the US Muslims refuse to vote for Hillary Clinton because she wants to continue the war with Muslims in the Middle East and voted for the invasion of Iraq." (United Muslims of America, November.) Another method is to hold demonstrations in the United States. This kind of activity started in 2016. In order to hide their background, they presented themselves as activists who couldn't attend the event personally. In order to attract people, they used their own developed pages and ads. So, with the help of the account March_for_Trump, the Russians connected with real volunteer of Trump's campaign in New York City, who agreed to give them posters for their demonstration. An action to support Clinton was also held on July 9, 2016. The demonstration is rising with a poster, which is supposedly a Clinton quote: "I think the Shariah will be the new powerful direction of freedom for women." The Russians carried out events in support for the Trump in Florida, New York and Pennsylvania - the announcement of the event in the Florida was seen by 59 000 people, real Americans who paid for the presence, as well as for the purchase of megaphones and the production of printed materials. After the win of Trump, two more demonstrations were being held - one in his support and one against him - on November 12 in the NY. At the very end of July 2018, the FB identified and removed from the network 32 pages and accounts dealing with coordinated attempts to influence political processes in the United States. They reported on this on their official blog. „Today we removed 32 Pages and accounts from Facebook and Instagram because they were involved in coordinated inauthentic behavior. This kind of behavior is not allowed on Facebook because we don't want people or organizations creating networks of accounts to mislead others about who they are, or what they're doing. We're still in the very early stages of our investigation and don't have all the facts — including who may be behind this. But we are sharing what we know today given the connection between these bad actors and protests that are planned in Washington next week. We will update this post with more details when we have them, or if the facts we have change.“¹⁴

In order to get idea about the impact of the trolls, I will again quote Facebook: About two weeks ago we identified the first of eight Pages and 17 profiles on Facebook, as well as seven Instagram accounts, that violate our ban on coordinated inauthentic behavior. We removed all of them this morning once we'd completed our initial investigation... In total, more than 290,000 accounts followed

¹⁴ Removing Bad Actors on Facebook. 31.07.2018
<https://newsroom.fb.com/news/2018/07/removing-bad-actors-on-facebook/>
858

at least one of these Pages, the earliest of which was created in March 2017. The latest was created in May 2018.

The most followed Facebook Pages were “Aztlán Warriors,” “Black Elevation,” “Mindful Being,” and “Resisters.” The remaining Pages had between zero and 10 followers, and the Instagram accounts had zero followers.

There were more than 9,500 organic posts created by these accounts on Facebook, and one piece of content on Instagram.

They ran about 150 ads for approximately \$11,000 on Facebook and Instagram, paid for in US and Canadian dollars. The first ad was created in April 2017, and the last was created in June 2018.

The Pages created about 30 events since May 2017. About half had fewer than 100 accounts interested in attending. The largest had approximately 4,700 accounts interested in attending, and 1,400 users said that they would attend.

Conclusions

On the basis of the above mentioned, the next conclusions could be drawn:

1. The main principles of Gerasimov’s doctrine: undeclared war, implementation of new information technologies; fake news; intervention in election process of other states, are strictly applied in the hybrid activities against a technological developed country.
2. They challenge national security of an attacked states as far as disorient the population, influence public opinion and manipulate popular people’s actions.
3. They challenge the international security as far as can effect changes in international system that could undermine peace, cooperation and development
4. Hybrid actions of Russia aim the erosion of the confidence of voters to their government
5. Hybrid actions of Russia eventually are directed against values of Western civilization

Discussion

The current volume contains some shortages that hardly could be avoided. First of all, the case study has to do with only one country: USA. Second, there are almost no analytical materials on the topic, what means that I don’t have the chance to compare my conclusions with the conclusions of other authors. Third, the topic of new wars is quite new as a research topic, so, it is possible that my methodology is not the perfect one. Nevertheless, the theme of hybrid threats and wars will

become even more important in the future, thus any contribution to it could be seen as valuable.

REFERENCES

- "Фабрика троллей" Пригожина похищала личные данные американцев и устраивала митинги во Флориде. Главное из обвинений минюста США. <http://gordonua.com/publications/fabrika-trolley-prigozhina-pohishchala-lichnye-dannye-amerikancev-i-ustraivala-mitingi-vo-floride-glavnoe-iz-obvineniy-minyusta-ssha-232350.html>
- "Joint Statement from the Department Of Homeland Security and Office of the Director of National Intelligence on Election". <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2016/10/07/joint-statement-department-homeland-security-and-office-director-national>
- Cited by Владимир Артюх, *Туман «гибридной войны»: почему вредно мыслить гибридно*, Международен журнал September, <http://september.media/archives/294>, accessed on 9 July 2018.
- Cited by Profile: *Russia's new military chief Valery Gerasimov*. BBC, <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-20270111>, accessed on 9 November 2012.
- <https://newsroom.fb.com/news/2018/07/removing-bad-actors-on-facebook/>
- McDermott Roger. *Does Russia Have a Gerasimov Doctrine?* Parameters, 2016, vol. 1, pg. 46.
- МСКЕВ, MOLLY K. *The Gerasimov Doctrine*. Politico Magazine, September/October 2017. <https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2017/09/05/gerasimov-doctrine-russia-foreign-policy-215538>, accessed on 9 July 2018.
- Removing Bad Actors on Facebook. 31.07.2018
- Translation from Russian taken from "*The 'Gerasimov Doctrine' and Russian Non-Linear War*", Dr. Mark Galeotti's blog, <https://inmoscowsshadows.wordpress.com/2014/07/06/the-gerasimov-doctrine-and-russian-non-linear-war/>, accessed on 9 July 2018.

- Герасимов, Валери. *The Value of Science Is in the Foresight*, Military-Industrial Kurier https://vpk-news.ru/sites/default/files/pdf/VPK_08_476.pdf , accessed on 9 July 2018.
- Герасимов, Валерий. *Гибридная война требует высокотехнологичного оружия и научного обоснования*. 08.03.2016. Lifejournal. <http://alexandr-palkin.livejournal.com/4734100.html> ,accessed on 9 July 2018.
- Герасимов, Валерий. *Мир на гранях войны. Военно-промышленный курьер*. № 10 (674), 15 март 2017 г. <https://vpk-news.ru/articles/35591> , accessed on 9 July 2018.
- Годовой бюджет "Агентства интернет-исследований" составлял миллионы долларов – замгенпрокурора
- Маргажапова, Александра. 07 сентября 2013. Где живут тролли. И кто их кормит. <https://www.novayagazeta.ru/articles/2013/09/07/56253-gde-zhivut-trolli-i-kto-ih-kormit>