

**Yurii Semenyuk***PhD in Political Sciences**National University of Defense of Ukraine**Kyiv, Ukraine**e-mail: snik71083@gmail.com**ORCID: 0000-0002-9415-4427*

## ORGANIZATIONAL WEAPONS

**Abstract.** *The article is devoted to organizational weapons. The history of their emergence and evolution is presented. It is shown that organizational weapons are based on special technologies of organizational management reflection: ordered sets of methods, models, programs, strategies, procedures, forms of implementation of management decisions which are constantly being improved, introduction of innovations, support of information, ideological and other necessary structural links, selection and training of personnel, planning, reporting and control, etc. It is determined that the objectives of the organizational weapons use are: creating an atmosphere of spirituality and immorality, negative attitude to cultural heritage; manipulation of the public consciousness of social groups to create political tension and chaos; destabilization of relations between political movements to provoke conflicts, aggravate political struggle; reduction of the level of information support of state and military authorities, negative impact on the process of strategic decision-making; disinformation of the population. The basis of organizational weapons is special technologies of organizational management reflection. These are orderly sets of methods (models, programs, strategies, procedures, forms) for implementing management decisions that are constantly being improved, introducing innovations, supporting information, ideological and other necessary structural links, recruiting and training personnel, planning, reporting and controlling, etc. Since the basis of any organizational system is made up of people whose motivation is based on physiological, social and information needs, the productive, properly calculated use of IA in a certain organizational environment (primarily, in the government) has a direct impact not only on the level of security of the state's organizational system, but also on the possibility of its existence. Thus, long-term massive information and moral and psychological influence of a destructive nature, passing through the consciousness of every citizen, poses a real threat to the existence of the nation as a whole due to the transformation of basic worldview, cultural and ideological attitudes, is changes in the internal organizational environment that determines the system of life of the state.*

**Keywords:** *organizational weapons, technologies, methods, influence, manipulation.*

### Introduction

**Statement of the problem.** The development of various types of weapons to destroy the enemy has a history that extends throughout the history of mankind. From neutron weapons of the 70s ("clean" bomb) to modern definitions of methods of warfare, which became more active after the beginning of the armed aggression of the Russian Federation (RF) against Ukraine in 2014, as undeclared, informational and psychological, network-centric, hybrid war. Such diversity is due to the actualization of various parameters of this phenomenon.

This paradigm has been supplemented in recent years with another definition of modern warfare – organizational, and hence the new term "organizational weapons" [1]. Therefore, the study of organizational weapons as a component of modern warfare is quite appropriate.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** In recent years, a number of studies by domestic and foreign experts have emerged, which examine individual aspects of conducting organizational warfare and the use of organizational weapons, etc. [2–10].

But, despite the existence of a certain number of scientific works on this problem, it should be noted that there is a need for implementation systems analysis the concept of organizational weapons as a component of hybrid war, as well as the study of the features of the use of these weapons under the conditions of the hybrid war of the Russian Federation against Ukraine [11].

**Purpose of the article** is to explore organizational weapons as a component of hybrid warfare.

### **Presentation of the main material**

One of the first authors to use the term “organizational weapons” (OW) was Philip Selznick in his book “Organizational Weapons. A Study of Bolshevik Strategy and Tactics” (1952 edition) [12]. He writes, in particular, that “organizational weapons exploit the source of power that is latent in every group. It is the ability of almost any routine activity to be manipulated for personal or political advantage.”

So, manipulation is a key word, as well as a key element of the OW. The modern theoretical basis of the OW began to take shape in the 20th century, its basis was the work on tectology – the science of organization and self-organization, which aims to systematize organizational experience. The idea of using the OW arose on the basis of Anglo-Saxon political mythology – the idea of a “second”, less bloody path to the transformation of society, as a reaction to the revolutionary upheavals of the early 20th century. and the emergence of nuclear weapons, which posed a real threat of total destruction.

It originated in 1967, when F. Emery, then director of the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations [3], developing the idea of the diversity of organizational weapons forms, noted that the “synergetics” of the “teenage swarm” at rock concerts could be effectively used to destroy nation-states by the end of the 1990s.

In the archives of the journal Human Relations, published by the Tavistock Institute, there is a report by F. Emery, “The Next Thirty Years: Concepts, Methods, and Predictions,” in that the potential of “angry youth” is viewed as a weapon of psychological defeat – “the hysteria of rebellion.”

As researchers note, the first test of the OW took place in France, where in 1958 the regime of personal power of General Charles de Gaulle was established. Having received extraordinary powers as Prime Minister, and later President, he carried out reforms of the state system, which became the basis of the Fifth Republic. The President-General also achieved considerable success in the field of economics. During his reign, there was a rapid growth of French industry, and the franc, the national currency, strengthened significantly. But the most famous foreign policy steps were taken by de Gaulle, who dreamed of a dominant role for France in the new Europe. In February 1966, the President announced the country's withdrawal from the NATO military organization.

The world oligarchy reacted extremely negatively to the reforms and launched an organizational war against Charles de Gaulle with the speeches of students. Their demands were chaotic: from the reform of higher education to the social revolution. On May 1, 1968, more than 100 thousand people took to the streets of Paris under peculiar slogans: “It is forbidden to forbid!”, “Be realistic – demand the impossible!”, “Everything – and immediately!”, “Forget everything you were taught – start dreaming!”.

A large number of people far from student age wandered among the groups of young rioters, giving advice on building barricades and tactics for fighting the police. The youth's agitation became increasingly aggressive. Dozens of barricades were erected in the Latin Quarter, Molotov cocktails exploded, and shots rang out. The rioters seized not only the Sorbonne, but also the Odeon theater, which became the headquarters of the so-called Committee of Revolutionary Action.

By the way, the “yellow vest” protests in France during 2018-2019 are very reminiscent of the above-mentioned events.

The term “organizational weapons” gained special development in the 80s of the last century in the works of Soviet scientists, developers of military organizational management systems S. Nikanorov and S. Solntsev. They called organizational weapons false-target programming, which reflects its deep essence: the aggressor country creates and sets erroneous

program settings in advance in its relations with the victim country, the implementation of which strengthens its position and weakens the enemy. The victim country does not consider these actions dangerous, they seem neutral or based on universal values.

Since the late 1990s, the use of organizational weapons and the conduct of organizational warfare have been viewed in the Russian Federation as a reaction to the new military-strategic situation [4].

However, the problem of OW in the Russian Federation gained real importance at the beginning of the 21st century.

Russian sources most fully describe this type of weapon, its definition, characteristics, methods, and countermeasures on the Izborsk Club website [5]. In particular, the club's website states that "organizational weapons are a system of organizational (intelligence, propaganda, psychological, informational, etc.) influences on the enemy, coordinated by goals, place, and time, that force him to move in the direction necessary for the other side".

It should be noted that the emphasis is on "making it move in the direction necessary for the other party." That is, when many think they are moving in the direction necessary, you move where the "invisible hand" leads you.

Another Russian researcher, a member of the Presidium of the Russian Criminological Association I. Sundiev, notes: "The use of organizational weapons reflects the historical trend of the transition from wars aimed at the destruction of the enemy to wars aimed at its "self-disorganization" and "self-disorientation" in order to preserve the existing resource base. In practice, this is carried out by applying a system of organizational (intelligence, propaganda, psychological, information, etc., coordinated in terms of goals, place and time) influences on the enemy, which force him to move in the direction necessary for the other side. With its help, it is possible to direct the enemy's policy into a strategic dead end, exhaust its economy with ineffective (unbearable) programs, slow down the development of weapons, distort the foundations of national culture, and create a "fifth column" among part of the population. As a result, an atmosphere of internal political, economic, and psychological chaos is created in the state" [6].

In turn, another researcher from the Russian city of St. Petersburg, P. Yunatskevich, argues that under OW it is necessary to understand certain social processes that are created by some social subjects to influence other social subjects [7; 8]. At the same time:

- influence – the ability of a social subject to create and prevent a threat (threat management and through threats). Provides various types of dominance, determines dignity, self-esteem, self-respect, etc.;
- social process – the way of existence of a social subject, its life activities carried out in interaction with other social subjects (in models of behavior management – it is convenient to represent a social subject as a process);
- social subject – an individual, groups of people and their associations, organizations, enterprises, states, corporations, etc., humanity as a whole.
- Therefore, we can state that the task of the OW, given our realities, is [9; 10]:
- creating an atmosphere of spiritual apathy and immorality, a negative attitude towards cultural heritage;
- manipulation of the public consciousness of social groups to create political tension and chaos;
- destabilization of relations between political movements to provoke conflicts and escalate political struggle;
- reduction in the level of information support for state and military administration bodies, negative impact on the process of strategic decision-making;
- disinformation of the population about the work of state bodies, their discrediting and undermining of authority;
- provocation of social, political, national and religious clashes;
- initiation of strikes, mass riots and other actions of socio-economic protest;

- undermining the international authority of the opponent state, discrediting its cooperation with other countries;
- causing damage to the vital interests of the opponent state in various areas.

Thus, the base of the OW are the special technologies of organizational management reflection. These are ordered sets of methods (models, programs, strategies, procedures, forms) for the implementation of constantly improving management decisions, the introduction of innovations, the support of informational, ideological and other necessary structural connections, the selection and training of personnel, planning, reporting and control, etc.

## Conclusions

Since the basis of any organizational system is people, whose motivation for activity is based on physiological, social and informational needs, the productive, correctly calculated use of OW in a certain organizational environment (primarily, a power environment) has a direct impact not only on the level of security of the state's organizational system, but also, in fact, on the possibility of its existence.

Therefore, the long-term massive informational and moral-psychological impact of a destructive nature, passing through the consciousness of every citizen, creates a real threat to the existence of the nation as a whole due to the transformation of basic worldviews, cultural and ideological attitudes, that is, changes in the internal organizational environment that determines the system of vital activity of the state.

## References

1. Gorbulin V. Surkov came up with the concept of “organizational weapons” against Ukraine. URL: <https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-politics/2171516-surkov-pridumav-koncepciu-organizacijnoi-zbroi-proti-ukraini-gorbulin.html> (date of access: 18.02.2025).
2. Selznick Philip. The Organizational Weapon. URL: <https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/reports/2006/R201.pdf> (accessed 18.01.2021).
3. Senchenko M., Senchenko O., Hastynshchikov V. Brain Centers of the World. Kyiv: Personal, 2015. 278 p.
4. Organizational weapons in hybrid warfare. URL: <https://matrix-info.com/2018/06/11/organizatsijna-zbroja-u-gibrydni-vijni/> (access date: 20.02.2025).
5. Slyusarenko A.V. New forms of interstate confrontation as a subject of research of modern military-scientific thought. *Military-scientific bulletin*. 2015. Is. 24. P. 173-186.
6. Semenyuk Yu.V., Taburets I.I. Organizational weapons as an element of hybrid warfare. *Military Intelligence Bulletin*. 2019. No. 55. P. 21–26.
7. Yunatskevich P.I. Organizational weapon. URL: <https://imi.ast.social/2010-10-17-20-47-06/120-organizatsionoe-oruzhie-v-xxi-veke.html> (access date: 22.02.2025).
8. Semenyuk Y.V. Organizational weapons as a special technology. *Scientific collection based on the materials of the XXV military-scientific conference of students and young scientists*. 2019. No. 36. P. 90.
9. Kompantseva L.F. Information vs. organizational wars: paradigm transformation. URL: <http://strat-com.co.ua/informatsijni-vs-organizatsijni-vijni-transformatsiya-paradigmi/> (access date: 28.04.2024).
10. Semenyuk Y.V., Moklyak S.P., Lysetsky Y.M. Intelligence activities and international relations. New realities and approaches: monograph; edited by Yu.M. Lysetsky. Kyiv: LAT&K, 2021. 160 with.