

A. Grytsenko¹, T. Burlai^{2*}, O. Borzenko³

Institute for Economics and Forecasting, the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine;

¹and.gryt@gmail.com, ²biv2008@ukr.net, ³slozko2003@ukr.net

¹<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5030-864X>,

²<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4530-9151>,

³<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1017-5942>

¹Scopus Author ID: 57205432570, ³Scopus Author ID: 57208315150

³Researcher ID: 0782819

Societal Consequences of Modern Hybrid Warfare in Political-Economic and Institutional Discourse

Abstract

Object: to reveal the features of the societal approach to the study of the modern hybrid war consequences, a striking example of which is the Russian invasion of Ukraine in February 2022, based on the study of the reflection of changes in social reality in the unity of political-economic, sociological and institutional discourses.

Methods: ascension from the abstract to the concrete; dialectical; logical-historical; fractal method of institutional economics; structural-functional and world-systems analysis.

Findings: the current Russian-Ukrainian war has clear signs of a modern hybrid war generated by the global-local hybrid system “peace — war” and combines a whole complex of means: military-political, economic, cybernetic, etc. On the basis of the combination of political-economic, sociological (in a broad sense) and institutional discourses, it is substantiated that the main components of the “peace — war” hybrid system from the point of view of the societal relations transformation are: armed-military, financial-economic and informational-spiritual components. It is shown that through the channels of world perception and positioning they lead to changes in behavioural patterns, through which the response of the actors is carried out, changing the already changing reality. This leads to the closure of changes in social reality through the behaviour of subjects on themselves, gives integrity and acceleration to societal processes.

Conclusions: the feature of the societal approach is revealed only on the basis of a combination of political-economic (which opens up the possibility of tracing chains of cause-and-effect relationships), sociological in a broad sense (allowing you to look at society as a whole in the unity of its components and measure them) and institutional (giving the key to understanding changes in rules and norms of social life) approaches. This feature consists, in contrast to the social approach (fixing the structural and functional structure of social reality), in the study of social transformations, which actualizes the problems of interaction and reflexivity of social structures and functions.

In the conditions of martial law, the role of the trust institution as a defining and integral construct of the socio-economic system’s institutional architectonics, embodied both in trust in the state and power structures, and in trust in new institutions born of hybrid war. The societal approach opens up the possibility of a new look at the problems of the Ukrainian post-war reconstruction, taking into account both the objective logic of social transformations and the need to increase social activity in institutional transformations that involve the formation of a new development model in the European socio-economic space.

Keywords: societal system, political-economic discourse, hybrid threats, modern hybrid warfare, military shocks, institutions, reconstructive economic recovery.

Introduction

The peculiarity of the modern hybrid war waged by Russia against Ukraine on February 24, 2022, lies in the fact that even after the end of the military phase (hostilities) the hybrid war will continue, only with different, unconventional methods. In order to effectively counteract this with the tools of state policy, Ukraine needs to have a clear theoretical understanding of the effects of such a hybrid war on the societies of the warring parties and their partners.

According to our assumption within the framework of political economy, the societal consequences of modern hybrid warfare are determined by a number of exogenous and endogenous factors. Among the most influential such factors, we hypothetically single out:

* Corresponding author’s e-mail biv2008@ukr.net

– socio-historical context of conducting hybrid war. The Russian invasion of Ukraine became a consequence and accelerator of global processes of breaking the existing and forming a New World Order in the 21st century;

– the state of the global macroeconomic situation. The factor of “cascading crises” affects the formation and redistribution of hybrid wars resources;

– the level of institutional development of the actor countries. The configuration of economic, social and institutional parameters is important, as well as the degree of involvement of actor countries in powerful integration associations (such as the European Union).

The testing of these scientific hypotheses formed the ground of our research.

Literature Review

The theory of societal evolution was based on the scientific developments by Keller A.G. (1915), Sorokin P.A. (1962), Sumner W. (1959) and Parsons T. (1965).

The characteristics of modern hybrid threats (wars) are studied in researches of Mattis J. N. & Hoffman F. (2005), Smith H. (2017), Bilal A. (2021) and also Caliskan M. & Liégeois M. (2021). An analysis of hybrid wars conducted in the post-Soviet space has been carried out by Polese A., Kevlihan R., and Beacháin D.Ó. (2016). Mason Clark's research is focused on the current Russian hybrid war.

Research of Gourinchas P. -O. provides an understanding of current “tectonic shifts” in geoeconomics and geopolitics. The features of the crisis in the societal processes’ context are explored by Hall S.M. (2022).

The scientific works by Grytsenko A. (2022a, 2022b, 2023) objectively examines the hybrid system “peace — war” as a modern form of the changing world order and its societal aspects. Lehne S. (February 2023) substantiated what kind of world order will be formed after the Russian-Ukrainian war. Yaremenko O. (2019) comprehensively studied the preconditions, mechanisms and consequences of institutional destruction in the economy. Also, Artyomova T. (2020) substantiated the institutional foundations of the economy of trust.

Kazakh scientists Syzdykova E. Zh., Lambekova A.N. et al. (2022), as also Makhmutova M. (2023) and others explored the issue of macroeconomic and institutional development of their state.

Ukrainian scientists Heyets V. (2023), Blyzniuk V. & Yatsenko, L. D. (2022), Borzenko O. (2022, 2023), Burlai T. et al. (2022), Kostytsia & Burlay (2023) and others analysed the various negative consequences of the war in Ukraine and post-war societal outcomes.

Methods

Our research is based on the application of an interdisciplinary approach and complementary methods, primarily methods of political economy, statistics and sociology. The method of ascension from the abstract to the concrete is applied, it revealed the essence of modern hybrid wars as a form of solving the internal contradictions of the modern stage of global development.

In substantiating the impact of the current process of the formation of the New World Order on the societal consequences of hybrid wars, dialectical and logical-historical methods are used. The influence of modern hybrid warfare on the societal development is studied from the point of view of a systemic approach to the consideration of the socioeconomic and institutional processes.

The research used a methodology of institutionalism theory to characterize institutional destruction as one of the long-term societal consequences of hybrid warfare. The specified methodology is also allowed to justify the modern financial mechanisms necessary to overcome the negative social consequences of this war.

Results

The current stage of global historical dynamics, marked by the formation of a new “multipolar” world order and the rapid development of the latest technologies (from genetic engineering to digital and artificial intelligence), has a number of features in the security context that have relevant consequences for social dynamics. One of these features is the rapid transition of states and regions of the world, especially Europe, from fairly stable cooperation to deep systemic confrontation by historical standards. While within a few decades after the end of the Second World War, an extensive institutional structure of global governance was formed, and virtually all international institutions within it, starting with the UN General Assembly, made significant and for a certain period of time effective efforts to maintain global peace and security, promote progressive economic growth and sustainable development, and solve global problems facing humanity.

For example, the OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-First Century, adopted in 2003, stated that “threats to security and stability in the OSCE area are more likely today to take the form of negative, destabilizing consequences of events affecting the politico-military, economic, environmental and human dimensions than of any major armed conflict”. Less than twenty years later, the UN Secretary-General's thematic report of 2022 already emphasized that the global “peace and security architecture is under enormous strain, as evidenced by the recent war in Ukraine. The simultaneously emerging threats, geostrategic competition and systemic inequalities are having devastating consequences, not only for people caught in the violence” (United Nations, 2022, p. 10). The hybrid nature of the contemporary threats identified in this report appears to be another feature of the current stage of global development. To a large extent, this hybridity is due to the rapid development of high-speed communication technologies, processing of large amounts of data, state-of-the-art weapons, mass (dis)information and psychosocial influence, etc. and the simultaneous intensification of geo-economic and geopolitical rivalry, in which these technologies are used by players to win.

As recent years and events showed, an acute problem for the development of both individual societies and the world as a whole is that most hybrid threats and risks have a clear tendency to steadily increase and spread, which accordingly accumulates conflict potential between different (inter)acting players and alliances, and is the breeding ground for modern hybrid warfare — a multicomponent phenomenon of the global-local “peace — war” system (IEF NASU, 2022a, p. 25–34, 358–363).

In terms of security and defence, the concepts of hybrid threats and hybrid warfare are closely related. Thus, according to NATO experts, hybrid threats combine military and non-military, as well as covert and overt means, including disinformation, cyberattacks, financial and economic pressure, and the use of irregular armed groups and regular armed forces. The danger lies in the fact that the creation of hybrid threats, including with the help of such new technologies as artificial intelligence, media fakes or cryptocurrencies, contributes to the disintegration of society, undermines democratic institutions, and blurs the boundaries between war and peace (NATO, April, 2021). At the same time, hybrid warfare has two special features. The first is the blurring of the line between war and peace — a situation in which it is difficult to identify or distinguish the threshold of war. And the second is high level of uncertainty that makes it difficult or impossible to identify the targets, players or instruments of hybrid threats — often the targeted country is unable to develop an appropriate strategy and policy to counter the enemy, as it is either unable to recognize a hybrid attack or cannot identify the state that carries out or sponsors it (Bilal, 2021).

The study of the phenomenon of modern hybrid warfare, especially in terms of assessing its societal (in other words, those related to the development of society as a whole) consequences, is of great interest to scholars, managers and politicians. The study of the phenomenon of hybrid warfare and its societal consequences became especially relevant in connection with Russia's invasion of Ukraine on 24 February 2022, which is a telling example of modern hybrid warfare.

The relevance of studying the social consequences of modern hybrid warfare, of which the current Russian invasion of Ukraine is a representative example, is due to several reasons.

Firstly, it is the extraordinary scale of the destructive impact of this war on Ukraine and the objectively growing need for resources to overcome the devastating consequences, compensate for material losses and restore lost human capital in the context of ongoing hostilities. According to the UNHCR, in the first year of the war, the number of affected people in Ukraine exceeded 21.3 million (52 % of the pre-war population) and today more than 17.6 million Ukrainians are in dire need of humanitarian assistance (UNHCR, February 2023, p. 7). During this period, the total number of Ukrainian citizens who were displaced in various forms due to the hostilities reached 19.3 million, including 5.4 million who officially became internally displaced persons (IDPs), more than 8.0 million who have the status of war refugees abroad, and another 5.5 million Ukrainians returned from abroad to their places of habitual residence, although many of their homes were destroyed or damaged (IOM Ukraine, March 2023, p. 2–3).

According to a consolidated estimate by the UN, the World Bank Group, the European Commission and the Government of Ukraine, as of 24 February 2023, the direct economic losses of the Ukrainian state related to the war amounted to more than USD 135 billion, indirect losses, losses of transport, energy and social infrastructure, etc. amounted to almost USD 290 billion, and the country's total need for funds for post-war recovery and reconstruction exceeded USD 411 billion (European Commission, March 2023), which is 2.6 times higher than the nominal GDP in 2022.

Secondly, the war in Ukraine became a powerful trigger for a new global crisis, which followed the crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and is gradually spreading to more and more countries. Since mid-

2022, Europe faced an energy crisis, and many regions of the world have faced a food and cost-of-living crisis. Experts reasonably believe that these and other global crises of our time are cascading, which leads to a synergy of their negative impact and is a clear sign of the breakdown of the current world order (the format of which no longer allows for the overcoming of one global crisis before the onset of another) and the formation of a new world order. In fact, the war in Ukraine is a local manifestation of a global conflict taking place in a new hybrid system of “peace — war”, which has become a modern form of world order change, in which the results of hybrid wars are directly determined by the civilizational, economic, information and digital component (Grytsenko, 2022a), and require in-depth analysis to develop a long-term anti-crisis strategy for the state.

Thirdly, the study of the social consequences of modern hybrid warfare is important not only for Ukraine, as an official candidate for EU membership, but also for the European Union itself. The Russian invasion forced its leaders to adopt the EU's Strategic Compass for Security and Defence for the period up to 2030 in March 2022, and in June of the same year to urgently revise the Framework for a coordinated EU response to hybrid campaigns, as well as to significantly increase spending on security policy and coordinate it even more closely with NATO, often at the expense of their own economic and even geopolitical interests.

In addition, given the current reformatting of the concept of regional integration, which is taking place in the context of responding to the change in the current world order (Butorina, Borko, 2022), we can state that the war in Ukraine has significantly changed the established European integration model, putting security and defence priorities in the forefront rather than economic ones. This will objectively require the EU to make appropriate institutional and macro-financial changes and revise its European enlargement policy, which will in one way or another affect the speed of Ukraine's EU membership.

Thus, the theoretical and practical significance of scientific research on the main consequences of modern hybrid warfare, assessed in terms of the societal system, which in the classical sociological definition is a system of relations and processes considered at the level of society as a whole, seems quite reasonable. In particular, in traditional sociological discourse, the societal system is considered to be a social system that includes the functional interaction of its main structures: economic, social, ideological and political (Sociological Dictionary, 2014, p. 418–419).

The concept of the societal: a generalised vision in political economy discourse

Russia's invasion of Ukraine divided global space-time into “before” and “after”. The world began to change significantly at an unprecedented rate. These changes gave rise to many new, unknown and incomprehensible things. However, they were not the result of a random coincidence — they reflected patterns and trends that were developing over time and were associated with periodic changes in world orders. The consequences of these changes are global in nature and affect all social relations, all players and spheres of activity. Our study deals with the societal consequences of modern hybrid warfare. Therefore, first of all, it is necessary to define the two basic concepts of “hybrid warfare” and “societal consequences” for studying this problem. This determines the specificity of the subject, boundaries, directions and methods of research.

The concept of hybrid warfare is now actively used in various discourses, academic publications, information cases, social media communication, etc. Its use in Ukrainian on the Internet exceeds 210 thousand, and in English — more than 246 million references (data as of 14.04.2023). Despite this, the authors who are engaged in a scientific approach to the study of this phenomenon note that “hybrid warfare remains a controversial concept and there is no universally accepted definition” (Bilal, 2021).

Elements of hybrid warfare always existed (Caliskan, Liégeois, 2021). Back in the VI — V centuries BC, the ancient Chinese thinker and strategist Sun Tzu wrote in his treatise “The Art of War” that “to conquer the enemy army without bringing it to battle is the true pinnacle of superiority”. However, hybrid warfare as an independent phenomenon, the importance of which is constantly growing, began to be studied only at the beginning of the twenty-first century. In 2005, Lieutenant General J. N. Mattis and Lieutenant Colonel F. Hoffman published an article entitled “Wars of the Future: The Rise of Hybrid Warfare” (2005), in which they drew attention to non-traditional challenges and threats and the need to look for new combinations of technologies and tactics to win. The authors wrote that we are facing “a combination of new approaches — a fusion of different ways and means of warfare. We call this unprecedented synthesis hybrid warfare”. Murat Caliskan and Michel Liégeois (2021) explored “the meaning of hybrid warfare from a NATO perspective, based on detailed interviews with NATO officials with extensive knowledge and experience of the concept”.

The interpretation of hybrid warfare has a wide range: from its understanding as the use of unconventional military actions to the understanding of confrontation without armed conflict at all. All of them reflect certain aspects of objective reality. But the focus on the concept of war leaves aside the opposite concept of peace, which is also changing along with the blurring of the concept of war. Peace is also becoming hybrid and contains a number of characteristics related to hybrid warfare. On this basis, it can be argued that the concept of a hybrid peace-war system corresponds to the current reality (Grytsenko, 2022a).

If earlier peace came after war, and vice versa, war put an end to peace, now they combined in space and time to form a hybrid system that is not sufficient to be characterized as a hybrid war alone. In terms of our research, this means that the social consequences are the result of the impact of the hybrid peace-war system, not just hybrid warfare, which not only broadens the field of study but also changes psychological and behavioural patterns. It is one thing when a person understands that the war will end soon, and peaceful life will return, but it is another when a situation of uncertainty and periodic destabilizing influences becomes new, normal. This necessitates a restructuring of the worldview, psychological attitudes and value orientations.

In a new round of the historical spiral, we are returning to the primitive state of society, when war was not yet separated from peace, work from leisure, but rather the general process of community life, which included armed conflicts, hunting for prey, and satisfaction of consumer needs. Uncertainty was normal. When people went hunting, for example, they were not sure whether they would get food or become food for predators. Nowadays, uncertainty has a different content and form, but its essence did not change.

The second key concept in our study is “societal consequences”. First of all, it is necessary to clarify the content of the category “societal” and its differences from the category “social”. There are different points of view on the content and differences in the meaning of these concepts. This is compounded by certain language specifics and scientific traditions. Thus, in German, Ukrainian, and Russian, the concepts of public (*gesellschaftlich* in German and *общественное* in Russian) and social (*sozial* in German and *социальное* in Russian) are distinguished. In English, these meanings are combined in the term social. Scientific traditions are obviously related to the historical specifics of cognition of new realities in different countries.

The categories “public”, “social” and “societal” are primarily associated with sociology in the broad sense as a science of society. But they are also used in other social sciences: philosophy, economics, political science, psychology, etc. The concept of the societal emerged later than the concept of the social and on its basis. Summarising the complex history of the development of this concept and the history of research into the process of its cognition, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- the emergence of the concept of the societal in the late nineteenth century — early twentieth century is associated with the need for a deeper understanding of society through the interconnection of its structural elements, due to the development of social structuring of society and its contradictions inherent in the capitalism of those times;
- this situation has actualized the study of, on the one hand, the organizational aspects of life and interaction of social structures (A. Keller (1915), W. Sumner (1959), on the other hand, the integrity of the social system (P. Sorokin (1962); T. Parsons (1965));
- the essence of the category “societal” should be sought in the interaction of society as a whole and its structural elements (social groups, strata, civil formations, etc.), in the coincidence of the processes of representation of the integrity of society in individual (group) action and integration of the individual into the social.

In our opinion, in order to uncover the societal consequences of a hybrid war, it is necessary to go beyond the sociological discourse in which societal analysis naturally originated and developed, and include in the study political and economic approaches that allow, based on the method of ascent from the abstract to the concrete, to identify the logical chains of fundamental causal-investigative connections, and institutional approaches that make it possible, on the basis of the fractal method of similarity of the whole and its elements (social norms and rules, on the one hand, and the behavior of individuals, on the other), to deconstruct some and construct other rules and norms that are adequate to the logic of changing the social reality. This allows both to reveal the features of the societal approach and to realize its own potentialities, consisting in a holistic understanding of society in its structural and functional transformations, which have received acceleration and actualization of dynamic characteristics due to entry of the hybrid system “peace — war” into the acute phase of the hybrid war.

In view of the above, in our study, societal consequences will be understood as the acquisition by society of a form of interaction with its players in which the cognition of social realities, deconstruction of exist-

ing and construction of new social norms and realities becomes an interactive process that combines all its components in space and time. This implies that our further research should include the study of the impact of the hybrid peace-war system on the consciousness and worldview of social players, as well as on changes in norms, institutions, behavioural patterns and social reality itself.

There are three important links in this societal process: 1) world perception, 2) positioning and 3) behavioural changes. The latter affect reality and the circle is closed. The dynamism of these processes turns the circle into a spiral not only in the change of generations, but also in the life of one generation. Given the contradictory and conflicting reality of the hybrid “peace — war” system, this tears the public consciousness into conflicting, often irreconcilable networks with their own assessments, their own truth, their own heroes and criminals.

The worldview transforms the real features of the hybrid “peace — war” system into characteristics of people's consciousness and thinking. The *armed and military component* of this system leads to the militarization of consciousness. People constantly think about the war, follow the events, worry about their loved ones, etc.

The *financial and economic component* of the hybrid “peace — war” system, due to changes in the financial conditions of life, economizes consciousness, leading to two opposite results. Those who decreased cash incomes and increased expenses due to inflation are forced to constantly take care of this and save money. And those who had the opportunity to significantly increase their incomes due to martial law and military operations also became focused on increasing their incomes, and their thinking also became more economical.

The *information and spiritual component* of hybrid warfare fragments public consciousness. People receive different and contradictory information that they cannot verify or rationally comprehend, and therefore are forced to focus on positions that are mentally close to them.

Institutional dimension of the social consequences of the hybrid war in Ukraine

In the theoretical plane, it is advisable to take the phenomenon of emergent institutional order, which was hypothetically (and in the terms of their time) presented by representatives of classical economic theory, as a basis for considering the institutional dimension of the societal consequences caused by hybrid warfare. Modern theoretical economists consider the concept of *emergence* as a situation in which a general positive effect unexpectedly arises as a result of strategic interaction of selfish individuals. In economic realities, the phenomenon of emergent institutional order means that the defining components of emergent order present in market processes are due to the influence of institutions, not the rationality of individuals alone (Ivashuk, 2016, 73–74, 77). In the “era of digitalisation”, the *emergent institutional order* is becoming an integral component of the formation of the institutional architectonics of the modern information and network economy (IEF NASU, 2021).

Thus, the role of economic and other social institutions is very important, and their interconnection and mutual influence with the social consequences of war is extremely close. The quality of institutions or their destruction directly determines certain consequences, and these, in turn, affect the transformation/formation of institutional phenomena. A simplified example is the impact of the institution of politics on the events of 2014 in Donbas, which led to the emergence of completely new social institutions for Ukraine at that time: the institution of volunteering (formed on the basis of providing public assistance to ATO participants) and the institution of forced resettlement (formed on the basis of the state and host local communities' support for internally displaced persons from Donbas and Crimea).

In the context of the institutional dimension of the consequences of Russia's armed aggression, an assessment of the societal values of the Ukrainian population during the war, made by experts from the Institute of Sociology of the NAS of Ukraine, is indicative (Institute of Sociology of the NASU, 2022, p. 274–283). The researchers selected 11 societal values representing the desired or necessary emergent properties of social interaction between different social groups, and each of these values is important for the functioning of society or its components. In the surveys conducted in July 2022, respondents — citizens of Ukraine — indicated which of these values, in their opinion, the state could temporarily neglect during the war and which could not. The assessment of the balance of their answers (the difference between positive and negative) became the basis for prioritizing the social values of Ukrainians during the period of war (Table).

Table. Gradation of social values of Ukrainians during the war, based on the results of sociological surveys in July 2022

№	Social value, assessed by respondents	Share of respondents' answers to the question whether the state can temporarily (for the duration of the war) disregard the relevant value, %		Balance of answers, p.p.
		“yes”	“no”	
1	Security (<i>protection of society members from internal destructive processes (crime, environmental problems, discrimination, etc.)</i>)	11,3	82,3	71,0
2	Power (<i>defence of the state's position in international politics at the regional or global level</i>)	15,9	77,3	61,4
3	Order (<i>prevention of sharp confrontation between different social groups in society, as well as between social groups and the state</i>)	17,2	71,0	53,8
4	Regulatory compliance (<i>adherence to legal laws and regulatory procedures in all areas subject to relevant regulation</i>)	19,7	70,6	50,9
5	Equality (<i>ensuring equal basic rights and opportunities (in education, social protection and healthcare) for representatives of all social groups</i>)	21,0	64,5	43,5
6	Freedom (<i>minimization of state interference in the life of society, its individual groups and individuals</i>)	35,7	47,3	11,6
7	Stability (<i>maintaining the standards of living achieved in society</i>)	40,3	48,0	7,7
8	Independence (<i>solving state-building issues without interference from external political forces</i>)	39,8	44,2	4,4

Note—compiled by the authors on the basis of research: (Dembitskiy, 2022, 275, 277–279).

As table shows, the most important social values for citizens of war-torn Ukraine are security, strength, order, normativity and equality. At the same time, a relative majority of Ukrainians believe that due to the war, the state may temporarily neglect the values of diversity, development (in the sense of approximation to the standards of leading countries) and selectivity. The explanation for this, as sociologists rightly point out, is the natural need of people to preserve life and physical survival. Within the framework of the theory of institutionalism, the data in table can be interpreted as an objective and subjective understanding by people that only the state (as the basic institution of social organization) through the relevant power structures and competences can ensure such survival. Indeed, no self-organization of citizens or volunteering can be a full-fledged alternative to organizing the army's conduct of hostilities, evacuating civilians from the sites of shelling or frontline areas, restoring destroyed energy and other infrastructure, relocating enterprises, institutions and social facilities, providing statutory social benefits and assistance, etc.

In martial law, along with the institution of the state, the institution of trust plays a key role, which in the coordinates of the socio-economic system is considered a defining and integral construct of the institutional architecture of economic space-time (IEF NASU, 2020). A characteristic feature of wartime in Ukraine is the rapid growth of institutional trust of the population — this is the conclusion of the all-Ukrainian public opinion poll “Dynamics of Trust in Social Institutions in 2021–2022” conducted by the Kyiv International Institute of Sociology (January 2023).

In particular, this Institute's experts found that the Armed Forces continue to enjoy the highest level of trust in Ukraine, and between December 2021 and December 2022, the level of trust increased from 72% to 96%. During the first year of the war, trust in the President of Ukraine increased many times over — from 27% to 84% and in volunteers — from 68% to 84%; there was a significant improvement in trust in other Ukrainian law enforcement agencies, such as the Security Service of Ukraine (from 29% to 63%) and the National Police (from 30% to 58%); and the perception of the Government and Parliament improved significantly. It was noted that increased trust in Ukraine's political leadership and law enforcement agencies in

times of war is one of the evidences of citizens' unity in critical circumstances, and solidarity and social cohesion determine the military success of the state (Kyiv International Institute of Sociology, January 2023). In the institutional aspect, it is important that in the course of the military clash with Russia, trust in the country's top leadership is growing — according to polls conducted in February 2023, 91% of Ukrainians already gave a positive assessment of the President of Ukraine, 53% of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, and 41% of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, respectively (Sociological group “Rating”, March 2023).

In the context of societal development under the shocks of war and post-war recovery of Ukraine, the quality of institutions and its institutional potential play an extremely important role. Studying the war-related transformations of Ukrainian society and its post-war prospects, sociologists focus on the institutional level of changes in Ukraine, in particular, the formation of a new quality of such social phenomena as inter-regional interaction and cohesion, which contributes to national unity, and also objectively point out the urgent need to eliminate institutional destruction in the state after the end of the Russian-Ukrainian war, associated with manifestations of archaic bureaucratic practices, nepotism, eastern methods of holding power through the suppression of the opposition, high state corruption and criminalization of society (*Round table “Ukrainian society after the victory”*, 2022, p. 180, 185–186).

Given the government's policy of strengthening support for national business in times of war, the institutionalisation of domestic representative employers' associations, and relevant academic research, it can be assumed that the reaction to the shocks of war was the formation of an institutional framework for a new economic model that should be implemented in the interests of Ukraine's effective reconstruction in the post-war period (IEF NASU, 2022b). Namely, a model focused on sustainable development and full integration into the EU into the EU and the world space.

Discussions

The shocks experiences by the world economy as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and the Russian invasion of Ukraine are in the focus of the OECD (December 2022), World Bank (April 2023) and the International Monetary Fund (April 2023). Assessing the potential shock impact of the Russian invasion on the EU, the European Commission (May 2022) suggests using the “vulnerability matrix” and the European Council (February 2023) constantly monitors the impact of the Russian-Ukrainian War on EU markets.

According to the consolidated assessment of the United Nations (March 2023), the World Bank Group, the European Commission and the Ukrainian Government, as of February 24, 2023 (that is, for the first year of the war), direct economic losses of the Ukrainian state related to the war amounted to more than \$135 billion, indirect losses, losses of transport, energy and social infrastructure, etc. — almost \$290 billion, and the country's total need for funds for post-war recovery and reconstruction during the next ten years exceeded \$411 billion. Theoretical and applied scientific studies on the social consequences of a full-scale hybrid war against Ukraine are very relevant in the context of countering modern hybrid threats and ensuring effective post-war recovery of the country. At the same time, Ukraine should rely on such strategic documents as:

- Association Agreement between the European Union and its Member States, of the one part, and Ukraine, of the other part, ratified in September 2014;
- Parametric Approach to the Post-War Economic Recovery of Ukraine, presented by the Prime Minister of Ukraine at the Davos Forum on May 25, 2022;
- Initial Recovery and Development Plan of Ukraine, presented on July 4, 2022 at the International Ukraine Recovery Conference in Lugano.

It is advisable to focus further research on the study of the network effects of the fragmentation of societal consciousness and behavioural patterns in local and global dimensions. These effects generate significant contradictions of varying intensity, including targeting the destruction of the enemy network, which creates risks and threats to further societal development and requires an urgent response by society.

Conclusions

The modern hybrid war of Russia against Ukraine is unprecedented in the European newest history and requires a theoretical comprehension and development of a state policy adequate to the new realities.

The main components of the hybrid system “peace — war” from the point of view of the transformation of societal relations are: armed-military, financial-economic and informational-spiritual components.

The institutional dimension of the Russian invasion societal consequences shows significant changes in the worldview, positioning and behaviour of people, simultaneous strengthening of cohesion in countering external challenges and contradictions and conflicts in relation to internal problems.

Today, Ukraine needs to overcome the key institutional destruction accumulated in the previous period of development and during the war, as well as create an institutional basis for a new economic model capable of forming an integrative vector of Ukrainian effective reconstructive recovery in the post-war period and its full further integration into the European and world space.

Complementary Data

The article was prepared within the framework of the project “Societal Consequences of Modern Hybrid Warfare: the Case of Ukraine after the Russian invasion on February 24, 2022”, which is carried out with the financial support of the Independent Social Research Foundation (Netherlands, <https://www.isrf.org/>). The presented scientific results are solely the authors and do not reflect the position or views of this Foundation.

References

- Artyomova, T. (2020). Institutional foundations of the economy of trust. In: *Trust in the institutional architectonics of economic space-time*: in 2 volumes. T. 1. *Trust in the socio-economic system*, pp. 172–220. SO “Institute for Economics and Forecasting of the NAS of Ukraine”, Kyiv. ISBN 978-966-316-476-2. Retrieved from <https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/server/api/core/bitstreams/b3a1a814-2005-40f7-88d7-5b91df9062e5/content> Bilal, A. (2021). Hybrid warfare — new threats, complexity, and “trust” as the antidote. *NATO Review*. Retrieved from <https://www.nato.int/docu/review/articles/2021/11/30/hybrid-warfare-new-threats-complexity-and-trust-as-the-antidote/index.html>
- Blyzniuk, V. V. & Yatsenko, L. D. (2022). The labor market of Ukraine in the conditions of war. In: *The Russian-Ukrainian war (2014–2022): historical, political, cultural-educational, religious, economic, and legal aspects*: Scientific monograph. Latvia, Riga: “Baltija Publishing”, P. 1106–1113. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-223-4-137>. Retrieved from <http://baltijapublishing.lv/omp/index.php/bp/catalog/view/237/6356/13392-1> [in Ukrainian].
- Borzenko, O. (2022). Financial support for the post-war recovery of the national economy. The potential of international cooperation. In: *Recovery and reconstruction of the post-war economy of Ukraine*: scientific report. SO “Institute for Economics and Forecasting of the NAS of Ukraine”, Kyiv, pp. 245–254. ISBN 978-966-02-9984-9. Retrieved from <http://ief.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Vidnovlennja-ta-rekonstrukcja-povojennoji-economiky.pdf> [in Ukrainian].
- Borzenko, O. (2023). The war in Ukraine, climate change and viral infections: impact on geo-economic shifts in the global economy. *Economy of Ukraine*, No. 4, pp. 55–64. Retrieved from http://economyukr.org.ua/?page_id=774&aid=619
- Burlai, T., Kostrytsya, V. et al. (2022). The EU's newest social quality policy: a useful experience for Ukraine's post-war reconstruction. *Economic theory*, No. 3, pp. 89–119. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/etet2022.03.089> Butorina, O. V. & Borko, Y. A. (2022). Benefits of regional integration: revision of the concept. *Modern Europe*, No. 1, P. 5–20. DOI: 10.31857/S0201708322010016
- Caliskan, M. & Liégeois, M. (2021). The concept of “hybrid warfare” undermines NATO's strategic thinking: insights from interviews with NATO officials. *Small Wars & Insurgencies*, Vol. 32. Is. 2, pp. 295–319. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09592318.2020.1860374>
- Dembitskyi, S. (2022). Attitudes towards social values during the war: the liberal-democratic vector of Ukraine's development. In: *Ukrainian society in times of war. 2022*: a collective monograph. Eds. By E. Holovakha, S. Makeiev. Kyiv. Institute of Sociology of the NASU. 2022. ISBN 978-966-02-9993-7. Retrieved from <https://i-soc.com.ua/assets/files/monitoring/maket-vijna...2022dlya-tipografiiivse.pdf> [in Ukrainian].
- European Commission (May 2022). Spring 2022 Economic Forecast: Russian invasion tests EU economic resilience. *Institutional Paper*, No. 173, P 185. Retrieved from https://economy-finance.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2022-05/ip173_en.pdf
- European Commission (March, 2023). Updated Ukraine Recovery and Reconstruction Needs Assessment. Retrieved from https://neighbourhood-enlargement.ec.europa.eu/news/updated-ukraine-recovery-and-reconstruction-needs-assessment-2023-03-23_en
- European Council (February 2023). Impact of Russia's invasion of Ukraine on the markets: EU response. Retrieved from <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/policies/eu-response-ukraine-invasion/impact-of-russia-s-invasion-of-ukraine-on-the-markets-eu-response/>
- Grytsenko, A. (2022a). Hybrid system “peace — war” as a modern form of the changing world order. *Proceeding Book of the Second International Symposium on the Study of War*. Economic Development and Social Research Institute, Ankara, May 20–21, 2022, pp. 67–73. Ankara: IKSAD Publishing House. ISBN: 978-625-8323-07-82.
- Grytsenko, A. (2022b). Ukraine in the dimension of the new world order formation. In: *Recovery and reconstruction of the post-war economy of Ukraine*: scientific report. SO “Institute for Economics and Forecasting of the NAS of Ukraine”, Kyiv, pp. 13–23. ISBN 978-966-02-9984-9. Retrieved from <http://ief.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Vidnovlennja-ta-rekonstrukcja-povojennoji-economiky.pdf> [in Ukrainian].

- Grytsenko, A. A. (2023). Peculiarities of the societal approach to the consequences of hybrid war analysis. *The 3rd International scientific and practical conference "European scientific congress" (April 17–19, 2023)*. Barca Academy Publishing, Madrid, Spain, pp. 323–329. ISBN 978-84-15927-34-1. Retrieved from <https://sci-conf.com.ua/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/EUROPEAN-SCIENTIFIC-CONGRESS-17-19.04.23.pdf> [in Ukrainian].
- Hall, S. M. (2022). The social life of crisis. *ISRF Bulletin*. Issue XXV, pp. 15–25. Independent Social Research Foundation. Retrieved from <https://www.isrf.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/ISRF-Bulletin-XXV.pdf>
- Heyets, V. (2023). On the question of theory and practice of social quality policy in post-war Ukraine. *Economy of Ukraine*, No. 4, pp. 3–22. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/economyukr.2023.04.003> [in Ukrainian].
- IEF NASU (2020). *Trust in the Institutional Architecture of Space-Time*: in 2 vols. K., 2020. Vol. 1. *Trust in the socio-economic system*. Eds. by Grytsenko A.A. Institute for Economics and Forecasting of the NAS of Ukraine (IEF NASU). ISBN 978-966-316-476-2.
- IEF NASU (2021). *Formation of the institutional architectonics of the information and network economy*: a monograph. Eds. by Grytsenko A.A. Institute for Economics and Forecasting of the NAS of Ukraine (IEF NASU); SSI "Academy of Financial Management". ISBN 978-966-02-9756-2 [in Ukrainian].
- IEF NASU (2022a). *Economic Contradictions of Globalisation and Localization in the Context of Hybrid War and Post-War Reconstruction*: a monograph. Eds. by Grytsenko A.A. Institute for Economics and Forecasting of the NAS of Ukraine (IEF NASU). Kyiv. ISBN 978-617-14-0023-8. Retrieved from <http://ief.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Ec-superech-globaliz-ta-localiz-v-umomah-gibryd-viyny.pdf> [in Ukrainian].
- IEF NASU (2022b). Recovery and reconstruction of the post-war economy of Ukraine: scientific report. Institute for Economics and Forecasting of the NAS of Ukraine (IEF NASU). Kyiv. ISBN 978-966-02-9984-9. Retrieved from <http://ief.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Vidnovlennja-ta-reonstrukcja-povojennoji-economiky.pdf> [in Ukrainian].
- International Monetary Fund (April 2023). Amid war, Ukraine is maintaining macroeconomic stability and embarking on reforms. Retrieved from <https://www.imf.org/en/News/Articles/2023/04/05/cf-amid-war-ukraine-is-maintaining-macroeconomic-stability-and-embarking-on-reforms#>
- IOM Ukraine (March 2023). The crisis in Ukraine 2022–2023: a year of response. Retrieved from <https://ukraine.iom.int/sites/g/files/tmzbd1861/files/documents/2023-03/IOM%20Ukraine%20Regional%20Response%201%20Year%20Special%20Report%20Ukr.pdf>
- Ivashuk, Y. (2016). Emergent institutional order in the economy and its behavioural foundations. *Economic theory*, No. 3, p. 69–81. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/etet2016.03.069>
- Keller, A. G. (1915). *Societal evolution: a study of the evolutionary basis of the science of society*. New York: Macmillan Co. Publishing. Retrieved from <https://ia804704.us.archive.org/19/items/cu31924032560090/cu31924032560090.pdf>
- Kostrysia, V. & Burlay, T. (2023). Social priorities of development in the context of modern geo-economic transformations. *Fundamental shifts in geo-economic systems of the world*: international collection of scientific works. SO "Institute for Economics and Forecasting of the NAS of Ukraine", Kyiv, pp. 101–107. Retrieved from <http://ief.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Fundamental-shifts-in-geo-economic-systems-of-the-world.pdf>
- Kyiv International Institute of Sociology (January 2023). Dynamics of trust in social institutions in 2021–2022. Retrieved from <https://kiis.com.ua/?lang=ukr&cat=reports&id=1174&page=4>
- Lehne, S. (February 2023). After Russia's war against Ukraine: what kind of world order? Brussels: Carnegie Europe. Retrieved from <https://carnegieeurope.eu/2023/02/28/after-russia-s-war-against-ukraine-what-kind-of-world-order-pub-89130>
- Makhmutova, M. (2023). Priorities of Kazakh economy: reducing inflation and developing responsible fiscal policy. *Fundamental shifts in geo-economic systems of the world*: international collection of scientific works. SO "Institute for Economics and Forecasting of the NAS of Ukraine", Kyiv, pp. 75–78. Retrieved from <http://ief.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Fundamental-shifts-in-geo-economic-systems-of-the-world.pdf>
- Mattis, J. N. & Hoffman, F. (2005). Future Warfare: The Rise of Hybrid Wars. *The U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings*. Vol. 131/11/1,233. Retrieved from <https://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2005/november/future-warfare-rise-hybrid-wars>
- NATO (April, 2021). What is NATO doing to address hybrid threats? North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO). Retrieved from https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_183004.htm
- OECD (December 2022). Rebuilding Ukraine by reinforcing regional and municipal governance. 338 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1787/63a6b479-en>
- Parsons, T. (1965). *Theories of society: foundations of modern sociological theory*. Free Press of Glencoe Publishing.
- Polese, A., Kevlihan, R. & Beacháin, D. Ó. (2016). Introduction: hybrid warfare in post-Soviet spaces, is there a logic behind? *Small Wars & Insurgencies*, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 361–366. DOI: 10.1080/09592318.2016.1151660
- Round table "Ukrainian society after the victory" (2022). *Sociology: theory, methods, marketing*, No. 4, p. 179–192. <http://stmm.in.ua/archive/ukr/2022-4/16.pdf>

- Smith, H. (2017). In the era of hybrid threats: Power of the powerful or power of the “weak”? *Hybrid CoE Strategic Analysis, No. 1*. European Centre of Excellence for Countering Hybrid Threats, October 2017. Retrieved from <https://www.hybridcoe.fi/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Strategic-Analysis-1-Smith.pdf>
- Sociological Dictionary (2014). The societal system. Eds. by Osipov G.V., Moskvichev L.N. Moscow: INFRA M — NORMA Publishing Group.
- Sociological Group “Rating” (March 2023). All-Ukrainian survey by the International Republican Institute (IRI): February 2023. Retrieved from https://ratinggroup.ua/files/ratinggroup/reg_files/ukr-23-ns-01-ukr_for_public_-_final.pdf
- Sorokin, P. A. (1962). Society, culture and personality: their structure and dynamics. New York, Cooper Square Publishers.
- Sumner, W. G. (1959). Folkways: a study of the sociological importance of usages, manners, customs, mores, and morals. Mineola, New York: Dover Publications. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/folkwaysstudyofs1906sumn/page/n7/mode/2up?ref=ol&view=theater>
- Syzdykova, E. Zh., Lambekova, A. N. et al. (2022). Gross value added: influence of extensive factors by the example of the number of employed in the economy. *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Economy series, No. 2(106)*, pp. 302–312. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31489/2022Ec2/302-312>.
- UNHCR (February 2023). Ukraine: Humanitarian Response Plan 2023. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). Retrieved from <https://www.unhcr.org/ua/wp-content/uploads/sites/38/2023/02/Ukraine-Humanitarian-Response-Plan-February-2023-UK.pdf> [in Ukrainian].
- United Nations (2022). Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization: 2022 (A/77/1, Seventy-seventh Session). New York. ISBN: 978-92-1002127-2. Retrieved from <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3987317?ln=en>
- United Nations (March 2023). Ukraine: rapid damage and needs assessment (February 2022 — February 2023). 132 p. Retrieved from: <https://ukraine.un.org/sites/default/files/2023-03/P1801740d1177f03c0ab180057556615497.pdf>
- World Bank (April 2023). Weak growth, high inflation, and a cost-of-living crisis. Europe and Central Asia Economic Update (Spring). 108 p. DOI: 10.1596/978-1-4648-1982-7.
- Yaremenko, O. (2019). Institutional destruction in the economy: preconditions, mechanisms, consequences. *Economic theory, No. 3*, pp. 60–72. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/et2019.03.060>.

А. Гриценко, Т. Бурлай, Е. Борзенко

**Қазіргі гибридітік соғыстың социеталдық салдары
саяси, экономикалық және институционалдық дискурста**

Аңдатпа

Мақсаты: Саяси-экономикалық, әлеуметтік-логикалық және институционалдық дискурстардың бірлігіндегі әлеуметтік шындықтағы өзгерістердің көрінісін зерттеу негізінде 2022 жылдың ақпанында Ресейдің Украинаға басып кіруі болып табылатын қазіргі гибридітік соғыстың салдарын зерттеуге әлеуметтік көзқарастың ерекшеліктерін ашу.

Әдісі: Дерексізден нақтыға көтерілу; диалектикалық; логикалық-тарихи; институционалдық экономиканың фракталдық әдісі; құрылымдық-функционалдық және әлемдік-жүйелік талдау.

Қорытынды: Қазіргі Ресей-Украина соғысында «бейбітшілік — соғыс» жаһандық-жергілікті гибридітік жүйесі тудырған және құралдардың тұтас кешенін біріктіретін заманауи гибридітік соғыстың айқын белгілері бар: әскери-саяси, экономикалық, кибернетикалық және т.б. Саяси, экономикалық, әлеуметтанулық (кең мағынада) және институционалдық дискурстардың үйлесімі, қоғамдық қатынастарды өзгерту тұрғысынан алғанда «бейбітшілік — соғыс» гибридітік жүйенің негізгі құрамдас бөліктері мыналар екендігі негізделді: әскери-милитаризм, қаржылық-экономикалық және ақпараттық-рухани құрамдас бөліктер. Дүниені қабылдау және позициялау арналары арқылы паттерннің тәртіптік өзгеруіне әкелетіні көрсетілген, яғни қазірдің өзінде өзгеріп жатқан шындықты өзгерту арқылы акторлар жауабы жүзеге асырылады. Бұл субъектілердің өзіне деген тәртібі арқылы әлеуметтік шындықтағы өзгерістердің тұйықталуына әкеледі, социеталды процестерге тұтастық пен жеделдету береді.

Тұжырымдама: Социеталды тәсілдің ерекшелігі тек саяси және экономикалық (себеп-салдарлық байланыстар тізбегін қадағалау мүмкіндігін ашады), кең мағынада әлеуметтанулық (қоғамға оның құрамдас бөліктерінің бірлігінде тұтастай карауға және оларды өлшеуге мүмкіндік береді) және институционалдық (әлеуметтік өмірдің ережелері мен нормаларындағы өзгерістерді түсінудің мәнін ашатын) көзқарастардың үйлесімі негізінде анықталады және әлеуметтік тәсілдің айырмашылығы (әлеуметтік шындықтың құрылымдық-функционалдық құрылымын бекітеді) бұл әлеуметтік құрылымдар мен функциялардың өзара әрекеттесуі мен рефлексивтілікті мәселелерін өзектендіруден тұрады.

Соғыс жағдайында мемлекеттік және билік құрылымдарына деген сенімде де, гибридітік соғыстан туындаған жаңа институттарға деген сенімде де жүзеге асырылатын әлеуметтік-экономикалық жүйенің институционалдық архитектурасының анықтаушы және ажырамас құрылымы ретінде сенім институтының рөлі кү-

шейтіледі. Социеталды тәсіл Украинаның соғыстан кейінгі қалпына келу мәселелеріне жаңа көзқарастың мүмкіндіктерін ашады, бұл әлеуметтік өзгерістердің объективті логикасын да, еуропалық әлеуметтік-экономикалық кеңістікте дамудың жаңа моделін қалыптастыруды көздейтін институционалдық өзгерістердегі әлеуметтік белсенділікті арттыру қажеттілігін де ескереді.

Кілт сөздер: әлеуметтік жүйе, саяси және экономикалық дискурс, гибриді қауіптер, заманауи гибридітік соғыс, әскери күйзеліс, институттар, экономиканы қалпына келтіру.

А. Гриценко, Т. Бурлай, Е. Борзенко

Социетальные последствия современной гибридной войны в политико-экономическом и институциональном дискурсе

Аннотация

Цель: Раскрыть особенности социетального подхода к исследованию последствий современной гибридной войны, ярким примером которой является вторжение России в Украину в феврале 2022 года, на основе изучения отражения изменений в социальной реальности в единстве политико-экономического, социологического и институционального дискурсов.

Методы: Восхождение от абстрактного к конкретному; диалектический; логико-исторический; фрактальный метод институциональной экономики; структурно-функциональный и мир-системный анализ.

Результаты: Нынешняя российско-украинская война имеет явные признаки современной гибридной войны, порожденной глобально-локальной гибридной системой «мир–война» и сочетающей в себе целый комплекс средств: военно-политических, экономических, кибернетических и др. На основании сочетания политико-экономического, социологического (в широком смысле) и институционального дискурсов обосновано, что основными компонентами гибридной системы «мир–война» с точки зрения трансформации общественных отношений являются: военно-милитарная, финансово-экономическая и информационно-духовная составляющие. Показано, что они через каналы мировосприятия и позиционирования приводят к изменениям поведенческих паттернов, посредством которых осуществляется ответная реакция акторов, изменяющая уже изменяющуюся реальность. Это приводит к замыканию изменений социальной реальности через поведение субъектов на себя, придает целостность и ускорение социетальным процессам.

Выводы: Особенность социетального подхода обнаруживается только на основе сочетания политико-экономического (открывающего возможность проследить цепочки причинно-следственных связей), социологического в широком смысле (позволяющего посмотреть на общество как целое в единстве его составляющих и измерять их) и институционального (дающего ключ к пониманию изменений правил и норм общественной жизни) подходов и состоит, в отличие от социального подхода (фиксирующего структурно-функциональное строение социальной реальности), в изучении социальных превращений, что актуализирует проблемы взаимодействия и рефлексивности социальных структур и функций.

В условиях военного положения усиливается роль института доверия как определяющего и неотъемлемого конструкта институциональной архитектуры социально-экономической системы, воплощенного как в доверии к государственным и властным структурам, так и в доверии к новым институтам, порожденным гибридной войной. Социетальный подход открывает возможности нового взгляда на проблемы послевоенного восстановления Украины, учитывающего как объективную логику социальных трансформаций, так и необходимость повышения социальной активности в институциональных преобразованиях, предполагающих формирование новой модели развития в европейском социально-экономическом пространстве.

Ключевые слова: социетальная система, политико-экономический дискурс, гибридные угрозы, современная гибридная война, военные шоки, институты, реконструктивное восстановление экономики.