STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP IN HYBRID WARFARE

Laurențiu Mihail GRIGORE

“Nicolae Bălcescu” Land Forces Academy Sibiu, Roumania
lgrigore1@yahoo.co.uk

Abstract: *Strategic leadership is the most important action undertaken during a war and is therefore the main target of the opponent. Hybrid warfare is the war of the present and the future, and within it, the action against leadership is carried out according to new rules and has absolute priority. The working hypotheses validated in this article demonstrate that the influence of leadership begins with the process of forming command cadres and continues with the action of cyber attack on the technical management systems.*

Keywords: leadership, hybrid war, strategic, command and control, critical infrastructure

1. Introduction

In the revolutionary twentieth century, human society experienced two global wars, in which the confrontation took place in the classical environments: land, air and naval. Thus, from the perspective of decisive strategic operations, the First World War is an eminently land war, in which land actions decided the winner, and in World War II, the effort moves to the seas and oceans, rendering it the strategic naval characteristic.

World War III, expected in its classic form, should have been one in which air operations decide the winner. And yet, it did not happen, and the local wars, Korea, Vietnam, the Middle East, Yugoslavia, Gulf I and Gulf II, in which air operations decided the strategic end did not degenerate into a global military conflict.

2. Hybrid warfare analysis

In our analysis, we start from the hypothesis that the tendency of local conflicts to evolve globally remains, only

that it moved from the military sphere to the other confrontational environments of war (diplomatic, economic, imagological, psychological, etc.).

In this sense, Tiberiu Lazăr stated that "from the security perspective, while the twentieth century kept in the foreground the military dimension of threats, the present imposes a more visible hybrid dimension" [1].

It is well known that the mission of the military institution is to defend the state through military deterrence and military action, along with other social forces involved in supporting the war effort. However, in the context of the hybrid war, the role of the armed forces becomes secondary, and the military action becomes complementary to the other actions, and so we could conclude that it is losing its significance, that we can neglect or even eliminate it from the action schemes.

And yet, such a thing is not possible because:

- even if the economic, political, psychological actions, etc. increase in

intensity, the military action does not disappear from the equation of the hybrid war;

- coordinating, cooperating and leading at the strategic level of the war are the responsibilities of the armed forces, both through specific capability and through adequate trained and competent personnel;
- although it is complementary to the hybrid type actions, the armed struggle will be used mainly in order to discourage or consolidate the conquests in other fields;
- it is necessary that the preparation of the armed forces for the current and future war, of hybrid type, to be carried out in the conditions of interdepartmental action, in order to conduct, simultaneously or successively, the actions other than the military ones, including protection or cyber attack.

The military and politico-military leadership of a state involved in a war has been, is and will be the main target of the opponent's actions. An un conducted force cannot act coherently and therefore cannot fulfill the mission for which it was created. In the conditions of the hybrid war, this requirement becomes extremely important because by annihilating the leadership, the planned strategic goals are fully achieved.

3. Hypotheses

The working hypotheses to prove the above are:

1. The opponent will try to control the leadership in such a way that the decisions of the management in general and the high level management in particular do not produce the effects required by the strategic reality.

2. The technical system of command, control, computerized decision assistance and national and military infrastructures will become priority targets of the opponent.

The operationalization of the first hypothesis stating that "The adversary will try to control the leadership in such a way that the decisions of the management in

general and the high level management in particular do not produce the effects required by the strategic reality" consists in determining:

- a) the importance of strategic leadership in the desired final state of war;
- b) the levels of strategic management;
- c) the process of training leaders as a source of control over the results of military decisions at all levels of military art.

The military organization is a special type of organization through which the purposes for which it was established are achieved by armed struggle. Unlike other human actions, armed struggle involves the use of violence as a working tool and leadership is exercised exclusively by the commander, based on the principle of unity, a principle enshrined and specific to war. It follows that in terms of importance, leadership in general and strategic leadership in particular are key actions.

While in the classical war, the strategic leadership was a target of the fire attack system, in the hybrid war it becomes an objective of the utmost importance and action is taken long before the start of the armed aggression. In this sense, we consider that starting from the moment of defining it as an opponent, the strategic leadership will be acted upon with priority as follows:

- the persons who have the potential to be promoted in the military and political career will be identified, possibly even from the period of selection and training, and their recruitment will be primed from the perspective of becoming agents of influence (the agent of influence is that person who, through the position held in the management system, transparent or concealed, directs the decisions in favor of the declared or undeclared opponent);
- by compromising the military and politico-military leaders through influencing the population, corruption, and so on;
- by hindering the management activities through various ways, methods and specific

mechanisms both from within, through agents of influence, and from outside, through political and international mechanisms;

- by cyber, imagological and other attacks meant to generate disorganization in the management system;
- by other specific action of the hybrid war adapted to the national specifics.

Consecrated in theory, the levels of strategic leadership are divided into two: the politico-military level or the supreme, general level and the military level.

Strategic decision-making at the politico-military level is a product of the interaction between the political and the military factor. Thus, the strategic decision is influenced by the political system and corrected by the military reality. Through the hybrid action against a state, the decision of the politico-military level of the target state must be controlled and oriented towards the strategic interests of the aggressor state. Although it seems complicated and difficult to achieve, in democratic societies, people or parties favorable to the adversary can reach the political sphere and can boycott or guide the supreme decision.

„Strategic decision making in the public domain is placed in a specific context characterized by:

- *policy ambiguity;*
- *greater "vulnerability" to the participation and influence of the media, politicians and other agencies, as well as increased attention to these factors;*
- *artificial time constraints due to periodic electoral processes;*
- *unstable coalitions that can lead to stopping / eliminating particular policies or solutions*"[2].

The military level of strategic leadership is less vulnerable to hybrid actions, as military and patriotic education received in the training process by the officer corps reduces the risks of recruiting them as agents of influence.

However, a hybrid mode of action may be

possible by controlling this forming process. Thus, the process of education in general and staff training in particular will be the main target.

The ways and methods of action in this field can be:

- the control of the selection, recruitment and admission in the military education system and the bringing into the system of some persons "loyal to the opponent" who in the future can contribute to the vitiation of the leadership process;
- control through various mechanisms, of the curriculum and of the educational process in such a way that the training of military personnel is oriented in the wrong or useless directions;
- control of the teaching staff by influencing the university elections and bringing in the positions of academic leadership the least valuable, sympathetic or loyal to the opponent;
- control of the didactic logistics and of the material base destined to the formation of the professional and transversal competences;

The analysis and validation of the second hypothesis implies the identification of the directions of action through which the technical command and control system and the national and military critical infrastructures are priority targets in the hybrid war.

Thus, in the classical war, the lines of action are directed against:

- the transport infrastructure in order to block the strategic logistics system,
- the production capacities with military and civilian destination essential for the society;
- the material reserves and energy resources.

In addition to these directions, in the hybrid warfare the following are targeted:

- infrastructures that serve the control command system at the strategic political-military and military, operative and tactical level;
- the critical infrastructures that ensure

social and economic functioning in order to diminish the capacity for military, economic and social response;

- the hardware and software systems;
- the specialists serving technical communication and IT systems;
- the population as an essential factor in support of the leading political factor.

Cyber attacks are the main technical process of action and the security of cyber systems is the main process of reaction. The aggression against the command and control system and critical infrastructures becomes continuous, so it accompanies the hybrid action throughout it.

Hybrid warfare has become a reality in the contemporary world and a new way for states to achieve their strategic goals

without contradicting the provisions of international law. Due to the fact that the annihilation of political and military leadership begins long before military action, it becomes the key to success in future action.

4. Conclusions

The enemy is defeated when the strategic command is unable to lead, and if this happens before the start of military action it turns out that the effectiveness of hybrid warfare is enormous.

In conclusion, I believe that the hybrid war is the war of the future, and the future of the armed struggle is closely linked to the success of the hybrid actions.

References List

- [1] Tiberiu Lazăr, The hybrid war. Weapons and alarms, Intelligence magazine at your service, January 29, 2018, <https://intelligence.sri.ro/razboiul-hibrid-arme-si-alarme/>
- [2] Călin Hîntea, Cristina Mora, Strategic management in public administration, Transylvanian Journal of Administrative Sciences, IX, 2003, pp. 27