

Eka BERAIA<sup>1</sup>

Caucasus International University, Georgia

ORCID: 0000-0001-5491-7672

DOI : 10.14746/ps.2025.1.3

Robert Mieczysław ROSZKOWSKI

Lt. Col. ret. Polish Armed Forces

ORCID: 0009-0002-5689-6072

## THE HYBRID WARFARE UNDER THE EURASIAN GEOPOLITICS – GEORGIAN CASE

### INTRODUCTION

Irregular activities are an integral part of hostilities against a defined state, national or international structure. This activity can be conducted both militarily and non-militarily. Hybrid ventures are also part of these irregular activities. Although they have been known since antiquity, technological advances have significantly increased both their capabilities and effectiveness. The last decades fully confirm this thesis.

A fundamental problem in considering hybrid activities is defining them. There is no single recognised formula defining this area of action. Documents formalising the issue, whether in the US, NATO, the Russian Federation or other countries in the Eurasian area, define hybrid operations in terms of specific areas of activity, geographical regions or a model of tactical and operational activities. Moreover, in general media message, hybridity is often confused with network-centric warfare (NCW). For the purposes of this article, it is therefore necessary to redefine what hybrid operations are and what distinguishes them from NCW.

Thus, starting from the basic dictionary term, a “hybrid” is a crossbreed. It should be assumed, therefore, that in the case of activities of interest to us, a “hybrid” is an element that has a main base part on which foreign components have been implemented, interacting with it and enhancing its capabilities (impact). An example would be the operation of a mechanised detachment reinforced with the following subdivisions: anti-aircraft, artillery, CBRN<sup>2</sup> and radio-electronic warfare. In such a configuration, this detachment can not only carry out ground operations, but also destroy air targets, disrupt enemy signal communications and using artillery, with appropriate munitions warheads, perform CBRN warfare strikes.

Whereas network-centric warfare are characterised by a multiplicity of based influencing factors, which, depending on the decision-making center, can occur in dif-

<sup>1</sup> This article is licensed under the Creative Commons – Attribution – ShareAlike 4.0 (CC-BY-SA 4.0) license.

Artykuł udostępniany jest na licencji Creative Commons – Uznanie autorstwa – Na tych samych warunkach 4.0 (CC-BY-SA 4.0).

<sup>2</sup> Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (weapon or defence).

ferent areas and at different intensities. The most important areas are political, social, cultural, economic and military (Olszyk, 2019: 83–85). At the same time, a number of hybrid elements may exist independently in these systems.

Hybrid and network-centric activity is all the more important, as the aforementioned activities can be initiated below the threshold of military activities, during and after their conclusion, in order to intensify the gains achieved.

The criteria outlined above will allow us to better understand the circumstances in which hybrid actions affect Eurasian security, with a particular focus on Georgia.

### **A BRIEF HISTORICAL CONTEXT, THE EVOLUTION OF HYBRID WARFARE TACTICS AND THEIR ADAPTATIONS IN MODERN CONFLICTS AND THEIR RELEVANCE IN CONTEMPORARY GEOPOLITICS WITH A FOCUS ON GEORGIA**

Although the term “hybrid warfare”<sup>3</sup> only appeared in the late 20th century, hybrid operations have been known since antiquity. Of particular note is the widely used psychological aspect with the use of elements of chemical and biological warfare, which were intended to have a destructive effect both on the enemy’s morale and directly on his troops, eliminating them from combat.<sup>4</sup> The drastic nature of these activities has not changed over the centuries. Another important area has been information activities focusing primarily on its acquisition, on disinformation and on the manipulation of information. The methods and techniques of warfare have evolved very slowly.

They were not significantly accelerated until the turn of the 20th century as a result of the rapid development of military technology and the consequent need to improve the technique of tactical and operational activities. The emergence of military branches and force types allowed for an increase in the possibilities of influence both about the military area and beyond it. At the same time, hybrid actions focused primarily on non-military activities, i.e. diversion, sabotage, indirect and direct impact on the economy of the opponent. The possibilities for hybrid actions by guerrilla units, non-state institutions (e.g. in the financial area) and the use of terrorist and criminal formations were developed.

However, the biggest breakthrough came at the end of the 20th century. The rapid development of new technologies, including the area of cyberspace, made possible a multifaceted and multidirectional impact on selected elements of a potential adversary’s infrastructure. Their high effectiveness makes them preferable to direct kinetic actions in certain situations. This has necessitated a reformulation of both the combat operations themselves and the activity around them. This evolution is seen by many scholars and military theorists as the formation of a new concept of fourth-generation warfare, in which hybrid and asymmetric operations will be of vital importance (Maisaia, 2023: 25–88).

In this area, the Russian Federation is making the most of its potential for destruction in its chosen areas. Particularly with regard to the former republics of the USSR.

<sup>3</sup> It is widely acknowledged that the term “Hybrid Warfare” was first coined by Frank Hoffman in 2007.

<sup>4</sup> Throwing incendiary charges into enemy territory as well as the carcasses of dead animals and soldiers to cause epidemics were very effective.

Moscow's advantage manifests itself in its superior knowledge of the cultural and historical conditions, that compound their action.

The beginning of Russian hybrid activity could already be observed during the Russo-Finnish War (1939–1940), although a clear refinement of this activity took place after V. V. Putin assumed the presidency in 2000. The refinement of elements of activity in this area took place during the actions in Chechnya (1999–2009), the aggression against Georgia (2008) or, to the full extent, currently in Ukraine. We could observe indirect activities, especially in the area of information activities, during the presidential elections in France (2017 and 2022) supporting the far-right candidate Marine Le Pen, or in the United States (2020) supporting the Republicans, while at the same time fighting strongly through fake news against the Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton.

The main characteristics of Russian hybrid actions are: modelling the information space for one's own needs, conflating national minorities with the majorities living in a given area, conflating political elites, financing groups lobbying the Kremlin's policy, economic pressures (sanctions, embargoes), intensifying the activities of special services in the area of interest, hacking actions in cyberspace (critical infrastructure, financial systems), diplomatic actions, building information networks, generating migration crises, and others. With the example of the annexation of Crimea, it is clear that Russia prefers primarily non-kinetic actions, with the participation of the armed forces itself being the final element of the operation (Marek, 2017: 33–37).

Virtually the entire spectrum of activities outlined above was used in the three phases of Russia's aggression against Georgia in 2008. These activities were observed both during the build-up phase of the crisis, its military phase and afterwards. These impacts continue to this day. Primarily in the area of information warfare, diplomatic activities, as well as support for the 'migration crises' in 2008 and after Russia's aggression against Ukraine in 2022, with the main aim of preventing Georgia's integration into NATO and the European Union, and to limit cooperation with the United States as much as possible.

In the build-up phase of the 2008 crisis, the "bordering" activities, the spread of fake news in the press and on local websites of the Ossetians and Abkhazians (disinformation and propaganda) that the Georgians wanted to annihilate them, also played a huge role. Introduction of troops into their territory, the building of bases and the unification of command systems with the two separatist republics were also part of hybrid warfare. In addition, the percentage of Russians that have flowed, and continue to flow, through Georgia as tourists and that have settled in Tbilisi is also important in shaping the country's policy with regard to Russian rhetoric. The latter should be taken very seriously in the context of the attack on Ukraine, where the pretext of persecuting the Russian minority was used to justify an attack on that country. Similar actions could also be redirected to Georgia, Moldova or the Baltic states (Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia).

## THE GEOPOLITICAL CONTEXT OF EURASIA

The beginning of the twenty-first century began very interestingly, because in reality, the geopolitical landscape has changed since the 1990s, or after the end of the

Cold War, until almost today. This is the time period when the world slowly shifted to a unipolar world dimension over time. One hegemonic power was emerging, which was largely perceived as a ruling actor, the main power. It was, a time when the emphasis was on the peripheral issues and not from the centre, because in the foreground there was not a big global crisis, but the crises existing in the former Soviet territories.

Attention needs to be focused on the transnational challenges, questionable external forces and environmental problems that have arisen in this period, as well as the impact of population growth, environmental degradation on economic growth, the growth of international trade, and especially the rapid technological advances that have jointly defined the era of globalization. The event was called. This era seemed to deny the need to think about a new multipolar world or to expect significant changes in social, economic or political forces.

Eurasia, spanning from the eastern borders of Europe to the western edges of Asia, is a complex and key domain in global geopolitics. Its deep-rooted historical narrative, distinctive cultural diversity, variety of resources, and strategic importance have continuously resonated with great powers throughout the ages, as scholars delve into Eurasia's multifaceted geopolitical landscape, scrutinizing the key elements, powerful obstacles, and dynamic forces currently shaping the region's trajectory and predicting its future prospects. In order to fully perceive and understand the modern geopolitical dynamics of Eurasia, it is necessary to analyse and understand its historical evolution and background. From the ancient time, when so called "Silk Road's" first traits were outlined it intricately linked distant civilizations to the vast empires of Rome, Byzantium, Persia and the Mongols, Since then Eurasia has earned and occupied as a bustling crossroads of cultures and the scene of complex power struggles, it has been formed as the distinguished, unique and different part of the world. The rise and fall of empires, the spread of beliefs and traditions, and the relentless pursuit of resources have played a crucial role in carving out the complex geopolitical contours of this vast region.

Eurasia is famous for its several, major geopolitical players whose actions and interactions greatly influence regional and global power dynamics. Russia, with its vast territories, enormous military power and historical ambitions, occupies a central role in the geopolitics of Eurasia. The complex web of relations it forms with neighbouring countries, especially Eastern European and Central Asian countries, serves as a region of concern with ambiguous intentions, complex foreign policy dynamics, as well as with natural resources (Marsden, 2021).

The rise of China as a global, growing economic giant has undoubtedly redefined the geopolitical landscape of Eurasia. Initiatives such as the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) have fuelled China's influence in Central Asia and beyond, challenging established power structures and fostering new alliances. Considering the other key players include Turkey, it has to be admitted that Turkey strategically links the continents of Europe and Asia, and Iran, with its geostrategic positioning and regional aspirations. Influential international Organizations such as the European Union (EU) and NATO also maintain significant stakes and engagements in Eurasia, particularly in relation to security dynamics, energy landscapes and complex trade relations. We should not lose sight of the fact that Eurasia is full of geopolitical "hotspots" where tensions, conflicts, rivalries and political turmoil and chaos converge. The Caucasus region, which includes countries such as Armenia,

Azerbaijan and Georgia, has been plagued by long-standing disputes, particularly the long-running conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh, which continues to reverberate throughout the region and affect its stability. Also, the occupation of the territory of Georgia by Russia, the fact that Georgians are experiencing internal migration in their own territory, they have abandoned their own houses and yards, cultural and heritage monuments, and they only watch from the “barbed wire fence” – the part of the homeland where the line of occupation illegally passed by Russia, where only the roofs of their houses are visible, where the graves of their ancestors remain and as well as their cherished cathedrals and religious centers, churches are “waiting for them to open the locked doors to pray.”

Central Asia, rich in energy resources and of great strategic importance, is another focal point where major powers, including Russia, China and the United States, are vying for influence. The protracted conflict in Afghanistan, with its far-reaching consequences for neighboring countries, further complicates the region’s already difficult geopolitical terrain. The Black Sea region, which includes countries such as Ukraine, Moldova and Romania, has become a theater of competition between Russia and Western powers, significantly affecting maritime security and vital energy transit routes (Madlovics, Magyar, 2023).

Eurasia’s geo-economic landscape is shaped by its vast natural endowment, which includes oil, gas, minerals and fertile lands suitable for agriculture. A labyrinthine network of energy pipelines crosses the region, intricately connecting suppliers to consumers and deeply affecting geopolitical lines. Fierce competition to dominate energy resources, infrastructure projects, and critical trade corridors, including the Northern Sea Route and the Suez Canal, underscores the complex geo-economic dimensions that define Eurasian geopolitics. Economic partnerships, investment inflows and complex trade agreements play a crucial role in shaping regional dynamics and delicately balancing power equations (Marsden, 2021).

Despite its enormous geopolitical importance, Eurasia faces a number of challenges that have a profound impact on its stability and development trajectory. Factors such as ethnic and religious diversity, historical grievances, unresolved conflicts, and external interventions all contribute to regional tensions and uncertainties, underscoring the complexity of the region’s geopolitical landscape.

In spite of the above mentioned challenges, Eurasia also has great opportunities for cooperation, economic integration and enhanced connectivity. Initiatives such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), the Eurasian Economic Union (EEU) and various regional infrastructure projects aim to promote cooperation by addressing common challenges.

## **ANALYSIS OF GEORGIA’S STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE IN EURASIA. EXAMINATION OF GEORGIA’S ALLIANCES, PARTNERSHIPS, AND CONFLICTS IN THE REGION**

Eurasia, with its diverse cultures, historical heritage and strategic importance, has been the main platform of geopolitical manoeuvres and power struggles throughout history. The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 dramatically changed the geo-

political landscape, leading to the emergence of new states and a reconfiguration of influence.

The United States, as a global superpower, has traditionally maintained close alliances in Eurasia, especially with Georgia. However, its involvement in Iraq, Afghanistan and other regions has diverted attention and resources, creating strategic vulnerabilities. This background set the stage for Russia to assert its influence more strongly in its perceived sphere of interest, including the former Soviet republics.

The Orange Revolution in Ukraine and Western support for Kosovo's independence further strained relations between Russia and Western powers. These events have highlighted various geopolitical aspirations, with Russia viewing Western interventions as an infringement on its strategic interests and security.

Russia's invasion of Georgia in 2008 was a turning point in Eurasian geopolitics, which highlighted the change in power dynamics and strategic interests in the region. Therefore, we explore the complexities of this conflict, its origins, motivations, and wider implications for regional and global politics. This brief war of August 2008 not only changed the geopolitics of Eurasia, but also had a broader impact on international relations, security dynamics, and regional stability. The conflict has brought to the fore several interrelated issues that go beyond the immediate geographic scope of the war (Beraia, 2021).

First, the invasion highlighted the evolution of conflict in the 21st century. It showed that conventional military interventions, even in relatively small countries as Georgia is, can have significant geopolitical consequences. This raised concerns about the use of force as "an instrument to achieve political ends" and highlighted the importance of diplomacy, conflict resolution mechanisms and international law in managing disputes. The second, the war highlighted the complexity of post-Soviet transitions and the challenges for the countries in the region which face such obstacles, as they forge ahead between competing geopolitical interests. For Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine, and other former Soviet republics, the invasion has awakened to the risks of geopolitical manoeuvring and the need for strong defence capabilities, alliances, and partnerships to protect their sovereignty and national interests. Moreover, the conflict has further exacerbated tensions between Russia and the West, contributing to a broader deterioration in relations characterized by mutual distrust, geopolitical competition and strategic rivalries. These dynamics played out not only in the European and Eurasian theatres, but also had global repercussions, influencing diplomatic strategies, security alliances, and multilateral institutions. The invasion of Georgia also had a significant impact on regional security architectures and mechanisms. It has led to a reassessment of existing security mechanisms, crisis response capabilities and conflict prevention strategies, followed by initiatives aimed at deepening cooperation, dialogue and confidence-building measures among regional actors (Kakachia, Lebanidze, 2020).

The war highlighted the interconnectedness of Eurasian security, energy, and economic interests. The region's role as a transit hub for energy resources underscores the need for diversified energy routes, infrastructure sustainability, and collaborative approaches to energy security. This nexus between geopolitics and energy further complicated the strategic calculations of states and emphasized the importance of energy diplomacy and strategic partnerships in mitigating risks and promoting stability. This

crucial moment in Georgia's reality turned to be a watershed moment that had far-reaching implications for Eurasian geopolitics and global affairs. It has led to a re-evaluation of traditional security paradigms, diplomatic strategies and international norms, underscoring the need for a comprehensive and cooperative approach to solving the complex challenges facing the region.

Russia's invasion of Georgia had many motives and strategic calculations. First of all, it aimed to respond to Western encroachment and establish a sphere of influence in the Caucasus region. The conflict in South Ossetia and Abkhazia served to establish control over territories with separatist tendencies, echoing Russia's position on Kosovo's independence.

Second, the invasion sought to demonstrate Russia's military capabilities and readiness, especially in the face of Western assurances and NATO expansion. By engaging in a conflict where Western powers were engaged elsewhere, Russia aimed to challenge the credibility of Western security guarantees and change regional power dynamics.

The invasion of Georgia had far-reaching consequences and varied responses from regional and global actors. The United States and European powers condemned Russia's actions, but were limited in their ability to intervene effectively due to ongoing commitments and strategic priorities elsewhere. The conflict has heightened tensions in the region, leading to increased militarization and strategic recalibration. Agreements between Eastern European countries and the United States on anti-missile defence systems reflected growing concerns about Russian assertiveness and the need for strategic deterrence (Beraia, 2021).

In addition, the conflict has highlighted the complexity of NATO expansion and security guarantees, which Russia views as a direct threat to its national security. The subsequent annexation of Crimea in 2014 and ongoing tensions in Eastern Europe have highlighted long-term geopolitical gaps and the challenges of managing regional stability.

The invasion of Georgia was a turning point in post-Soviet geopolitics, revealing an underlying power struggle, strategic calculations, and shifting alliances. Russia's assertiveness, along with Western responses, has changed regional dynamics and led to a reassessment of security paradigms. Furthermore, the Georgia conflict is a cautionary tale about the difficulties of managing geopolitical rivalries and ensuring regional stability. It underscores the need for nuanced diplomacy, conflict resolution mechanisms, and strategic dialogue to contain competing interests and prevent escalation that could have global consequences (Kakachia, Lebanidze, 2020).

Georgia is a unique country with its location. It shares borders with Armenia, Azerbaijan, Russia and Turkey, making it a crucial transit point for various economic activities. It serves as a key link for oil and gas pipelines originating in Azerbaijan and as a route for the transit of goods from Iran through Armenia to the European Union (EU). In addition, it facilitates trade between Armenia, Russia, Turkey and Azerbaijan.

The ongoing conflict in the Caucasus due to Russia's war against Ukraine has a direct impact on Georgia. As Russia's influence in the region declines, tensions between Armenia and Azerbaijan continue, and there are instances of Iranian military activity along Azerbaijan's border. This situation led to retaliatory military exercises between Azerbaijan and Turkey. Despite these challenges, Georgia managed to maintain neu-

trality and attempted to mediate between Armenia and Azerbaijan, albeit without significant success due to its limited influence as a mediator.

It has to be mentioned that the official granting of Georgia's candidate status by the European Union on December 14, 2023 has a prominent role in the future aspirations of Georgia and its establishment in the international arena. It has a great impact on the South Caucasus region. This event has strengthened Georgia's ambition to join the European Union and made its leadership in the region even more real. This accelerated push into the EU remains a shared decision among neighbouring countries. Turkey, as an EU candidate in its own capacity, has scepticism and concerns about Georgia's candidacy. Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan refrained from directly discussing Georgia's status, but pointed to a potential delay in the accession process for other candidates, including Ukraine and Moldova, which could signal a broader strategic reassessment (Kakachia, Lebanidze, 2020).

In contrast, Azerbaijan's reaction was mostly positive. President Ilham Aliyev congratulated and supported Georgia's efforts to join the European Union. Aliyev's comments point to future cooperation within the European framework, indicating a vision of a regional arrangement similar to the Benelux model.

However, dissenting voices emerged within Azerbaijan, expressing their doubts about Georgia's candidacy, namely, they highlight fears about potential changes in regional power dynamics. Armenia positively views Georgia's candidacy to the European Union, recognizing it as a deep concern and potentially paving the way for deepening cooperation between Yerevan and Brussels. There are indications that Armenia may play a behind-the-scenes role in lobbying for Georgia's candidate status, indicating a critical agreement between the two countries amid the geopolitical realities of development.

In response, Russia took a more provocative stance, which led to the organization of anti-European demonstrations by far-right groups inside Georgia. Despite these efforts, the Georgian Orthodox Church welcomed the European Union's decision to recognize it, thereby strengthening Tbilisi's influence on the global stage.

Essentially, Georgia's visit to the EU candidate represents a seismic change in regional geopolitics. Despite challenges and scepticism, particularly from much of Russia and certain segments of neighbouring countries, Georgia's strong and swift move into the EU underscores a broader redeployment of Western alliances in the South Caucasus.

Georgia's relationship with Russia is complicated. Although it remains vulnerable to potential conflicts with Russia, especially given President Putin's strategic calculations, current dynamics point to relatively cordial and economic relations. Georgia plays a crucial role in the region, maintaining friendly relations with neighbouring countries, which Russia considers a network of interconnected relations.

## CONCLUSION

To sum up, the study of hybrid warfare in the context of Eurasian geopolitics, focusing on the case of Georgia, has revealed a complex and dynamic landscape of strategies, challenges, and outcomes. As a result of the in-depth analysis of historical

events, geopolitical shifts and contemporary events, several main conclusions emerge.

First, hybrid warfare is a multidirectional approach that combines conventional military tactics with unconventional methods such as information warfare, economic coercion, and cyber operations. This fusion of strategies allows state and non-state actors to pursue their goals with greater agility and deniability, posing significant challenges to traditional security paradigms.

Second, the case of Georgia serves as a convincing illustration of the impact of hybrid warfare on regional stability and security. The 2008 Russia-Georgia war highlighted the inherent vulnerability of hybrid tactics, as well as the complex interplay between military power, political manoeuvring, and information campaigns in shaping conflict dynamics.

Furthermore, the emergence of new actors and technologies has further enhanced the complexities of hybrid warfare in the Eurasian context. The inclusion of non-state actors, proxy forces and cyber capabilities has blurred the lines between state and non-state actors, challenging traditional notions of sovereignty and security. The role of great powers such as Russia and China in using hybrid tactics to advance their geopolitical interests underscores the interconnectedness of regional and global security dynamics. Using hybrid warfare as a tool of coercion, influence, and destabilization requires a nuanced and adaptive approach to security and defence strategies. In response to these challenges, the importance of enhanced cooperation, intelligence sharing and resilience building measures among regional actors cannot be overstated. The development of comprehensive strategies that integrate military, diplomatic, economic and informational elements is necessary to effectively counter hybrid threats and protect regional stability.

In conclusion, the study of hybrid warfare within Eurasian geopolitics, focusing on the case of Georgia, highlights the evolving contemporary security challenges and the need for proactive and collaborative responses to navigate an increasingly complex global landscape.

## REFERENCES

*Achilles and Odysseus in modern warfare* (2008), <https://thestrategybridge.org/the-bridge/2015/12/5/achilles-and-odysseus-in-modern-warfare>.

Beraia E. (2021), *Hybrid Warfare: New Implications for NATO's Deterrence and Defense – Asymmetric Challenge*, IGI Global.

Buffalo D. L. (2006), *Defining asymmetric warfare*, "Land Warfare Papers", No. 58/December, Institute of Land Warfare, Virginia, <https://www.usa.org/land-warfare-papers> (12.04.2007).

Castillo G. (2005), *Domesticating the Cold War: Household Consumption as Propaganda in Marshall Plan Germany*, "Journal of Contemporary History", 40(2), 261–288, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30036324> (13.03.2021).

Chisem J. (2012), *U.S. Propaganda and the Cultural Cold War: E-International Relations*, [https://www.e-ir.info/2012/08/16/u-s-propaganda-and-the-cultural-cold-war/#\\_ftn6](https://www.e-ir.info/2012/08/16/u-s-propaganda-and-the-cultural-cold-war/#_ftn6) (17.06.2024).

Combs J. E., Nimmo D. (1999), *The New Propaganda: The Dictatorship of Palaver in Contemporary Politics*, New York.

*Crime Assessment – Trafficking of Human Beings into the European Union* (2003), “Europol”, [http://www.europol.eu.int/index.asp?page=publ\\_crimeassessmentTHB](http://www.europol.eu.int/index.asp?page=publ_crimeassessmentTHB).

Evans M. (2003), *From Kadesh to Kandahar: Military Theory and the Future of War*, “Naval War College Review”, Newport.

Friedman G. (2013), *Beyond the Post-Cold War word*, “Geopolitical weekly”, 13.04.2013.

Frank G. H. (2009), *Hybrid Threats: Reconceptualizing the Evolving Character of Modern Conflict*, “Strategic Forum”, No. 240.

Gartzke E. (2013), *The Myth of Cyberwar – Bringing War in Cyberspace Back Down to Earth*, “International Security”, Vol. 38, No. 2.

Hoffman F. G. (2009), *Hybrid Threats: Reconceptualizing the Evolving Character of Modern Conflict*, “Strategic Forum”, No. 240.

Kakachia K., Lebanidze B. (2020), *Georgia’s Foreign Policy and the Role of the EU and NATO: Between Strategic Partnerships and Domestic Political Choices*.

Madlovics B., Magyar B. (2023), *Russia’s Imperial Endeavour and Its Geopolitical Consequences, “The Russia-Ukraine War Volume”*, Central European University Press, Budapest–Vienna–New York.

Maisaia V. (2023), *Wojny czwartej generacji. Kontekst NATO i Kaukazu Południowego*, Mtsignobari, Tbilisi.

Marek M. (2017), *Próba analizy specyfiki rosyjskiej wojny hybrydowej*, in: *Konflikt hybrydowy na Ukrainie: aspekty teoretyczne i praktyczne*, (eds.) B. Pacek, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego, Piotrków Trybunalski.

Marsden M. (2021), *Beyond the Silk Roads Trade, Mobility and Geopolitics across Eurasia*, Cambridge University Press.

Olszyk S. (2019), *Koncepcja działań sieciocentrycznych – droga do sieciocentryczności*, “Rocznik Bezpieczeństwa Międzynarodowego”, Vol. 13, No. 1.

*Opinion the new ideology of the new cold war* (2014), “New York Times”, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/02/opinion/the-new-ideology-of-the-new-cold-war.html> (01.08.2014).

*Oxford hand books* (2015), <https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935307.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199935307-e-39?rskey=KJomPi&result=8> (07.11.2015).

*The shadow wars of the 21<sup>st</sup> century* (2014), <http://warontherocks.com/2014/07/the-shadow-wars-of-the-21st-century/>.

*U.N. has no definition of terrorism*” (2010), “Eye on the UN”, <http://www.eyeontheun.org/facts.asp?1=1&p=6> (17.12.2010).

## ABSTRACT

This comprehensive study focuses on the complicated landscape of hybrid warfare, providing a nuanced exploration of its evolving nature and paramount significance in contemporary geopolitics. Focused on Eurasian security, the research particularly highlights into the experiences of Georgia, offering a meticulous definition and conceptual framework for hybrid warfare. It traces the historical evolution of hybrid warfare tactics, unveiling their adaptation in modern conflicts. The study meticulously examines manifestations and implications within Georgia’s security dynamics, encompassing cyber-attacks, disinformation campaigns, and proxy warfare.

Expanding its scope, the research provides an overview of the broader Eurasian geopolitical landscape, unpacking regional power dynamics and exploring the strategic interests of major

actors such as Russia, NATO, and China. In a dedicated analysis of Georgia, the study explores the nation's strategic importance, alliances, and conflicts, shedding light on its multifaceted role within Eurasia.

The article also scrutinizes the implications of hybrid warfare on Eurasian security, assessing its impact on regional stability and security dynamics. The study highlights the challenges posed by hybrid warfare tactics, especially in the realms of cyber attacks and information warfare, to traditional security frameworks.

Shifting focus to international collaboration, the article evaluates the role of international organizations in deterring hybrid threats in the region as well as it intricates dynamics of hybrid warfare in Georgia within the broader context of Eurasian security. This research contributes valuable insights for scholars, policymakers, and practitioners grappling with the complex challenges presented by hybrid warfare in the contemporary geopolitical landscape.

**Keywords:** hybrid warfare, geopolitics, information warfare, security, proxy warfare

## WOJNA HYBRYDOWA W RAMACH GEOPOLITYKI EUROAZJATYCKIEJ. GRUZJA – STUDIUM PRZYPADKU

### STRESZCZENIE

To kompleksowe studium skupia się na skomplikowanym krajobrazie wojny hybrydowej, zapewniając precyzyjną eksplorację jej ewoluującej natury i nadzawanego znaczenia we współczesnej geopolityce. Koncentrując się na bezpieczeństwie euroazjatyckim, badanie szczególnie podkreśla doświadczenia Gruzji, przedstawiając dokładną definicję i ramy koncepcyjne wojny hybrydowej. Śledzi historyczną ewolucję taktyk wojny hybrydowej, ujawniając ich adaptację do współczesnych konfliktów. Skrupulatnie analizuje przejawy i implikacje w ramach zmieniającej się dynamiki bezpieczeństwa Gruzji obejmując: cyberataki, kampanie dezinformacyjne i wojny zastępco.

Rozszerzając swój zakres, zapewnia przegląd eurazjatyckiego krajobrazu geopolitycznego, ukazując regionalną dynamikę siły i definiując strategiczne interesy głównych aktorów, takich jak Rosja, NATO i Chiny. W analizie poświęconej Gruzji, ukazuje strategiczne znaczenie tego kraju, sojusze i konflikty, rzucając światło na jego wielopłaszczyznową i wielokierunkową rolę w Eurazji.

Artykuł podnosi również implikacje wojny hybrydowej dla bezpieczeństwa Eurazji, oceniając jej wpływ na stabilność i poziom bezpieczeństwa w regionie. Podkreśla wyzwania, jakie taktyka wojny hybrydowej, zwłaszcza w sferze cyberataków i wojny informacyjnej, stawia przed tradycyjnymi ramami bezpieczeństwa.

Skupiając się na współpracy międzynarodowej, autorzy oceniają także rolę organizacji międzynarodowych w powstrzymywaniu zagrożeń hybrydowych w regionie oraz przedstawiają dynamikę wojny hybrydowej w Gruzji w szerszym kontekście bezpieczeństwa euroazjatyckiego. Badania te wnoszą cenne spostrzeżenia dla naukowców, decydentów i praktyków zmagających się ze złożonymi wyzwaniami związanymi z wojną hybrydową we współczesnym krajobrazie geopolitycznym.

**Słowa kluczowe:** wojna hybrydowa, geopolityka, wojna informacyjna, bezpieczeństwo, wojna zastępco

