

Yurii Shyrobokov

Kharkiv National University named after Ivan Kozhedub Air Force

Kharkiv, Ukraine

DISPLAYS OF HOSTILITY AMONG POWs IN A HYBRID WAR

The article deals with the problem of military captivity. The basic characteristics of the psychological environment of hostility have been reviewed. The main types of displays of hostility among prisoners of war during hybrid war. The conditions of detention of prisoners in pits and cellars, which were characterized by: small size, large density of people, lack of hygiene, lighting, air circulation, beds, etc., have contributed to the displays of various types of hostility with characteristic strong negative reactions against the enemy, one's comrades and oneself. Prisoners of war experiencing overall distrust displayed hostility in the form of a willingness or desire to harm in various forms. In the conditions of feeling inferiority and envy, hostility is displayed. In the conditions of experiencing the sense of injustice, malevolence of the world, negative subjective evaluation of the future, hostility is displayed in the form of depression. The article deals with the psychological characteristics of worries of servicemen in conditions of capturing, transporting, interrogation, detention and exchanging of prisoners of war between different units.

Key words: serviceman, prisoners of war, hostility, anti-terrorist operation, hybrid war.

Statement of the problem in general.

The fighting, which is conducted in the course of the antiterrorist operation in the East of Ukraine, has all the signs of a “hybrid war” [17] the population of the Donetsk and Lugansk regions are experiencing the negative consequences that are characteristic of such armed confrontation. The growing hostility and aggression against members of the Armed Forces of Ukraine is characteristic of both servicemen of Russian Federation who are participants of the conflict and the civilian population of the Donbass region. The escalation of that hostility was

reinforced by: spreading slander and rumors about the “crimes” of the Armed forces of Ukraine [7; 18], the illegal actions of representatives of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine in the liberated territories [2], as well as provocations that militants, disguised as members of the Armed Forces of Ukraine, have committed against civilians [1; 16]

In addition, since the beginning of warfare the insurgents have equipped firing positions in residential buildings, schools, kindergartens, hospitals, there were frequent cases when representatives of illegal armed formations hid themselves behind children [3]. Also for the location of artillery, the militants chose the residential districts of settlements of the Luhansk and Donetsk regions. This forced the Ukrainian side to limit the choice of weapons and tactics of warfare. In the case of forced return fire on militants, the damage was caused to the civilian population. Information about each building destroyed by the Ukrainian side, any loss of civilian life was shown by the mass media of the Russian Federation [19], which led to increased hostility towards members of the Armed Forces of Ukraine.

The local population vented their hostility, aggressiveness, and anger on members of the Armed Forces of Ukraine who were captured in the zone of combat actions by having mob justice. The brutality with which the locals treated the prisoners of war, can be explained by the response to the attitude towards them from the side of the militants, a kind of transfer. According to A. Cabanes, and L. Nassa if the population is a victim of terror, then there is a risk that the crowd will act as the most brutal murderers and rapists. According to them, people can master the “sadistic madness” [8].

Thus, the use of illegal methods of warfare in the context of a hybrid war leads to escalation of hostility among servicemen who are participants of the conflict among civilians.

Analysis of recent research and publications.

The relationship between hostility and physical health which was discovered at the end of the last century has attracted much attention of scientists to this problem, both in our country and abroad [5; 26]. Analyzing all the directions of

scientific search, it is possible to allocate three basic approaches to the study of hostility. First, it is the medical study of hostility in various mental disorders [22]. Secondly, it is the study aimed at studying the influence of hostility on physical health [24]. Thirdly, it is applied research aimed at studying the behavioral displays of hostility [6; 10; 13; 21; 25].

The representatives of the third approach have provided a fairly wide range of behavioral and emotional correlates of hostility in their research. A. Buss allocates hostility as the cognitive component of the psyche in his research [23], J.C. Barefoot considers hostility as a complex education, which includes such external indicators as anger and aggression [21]. A number of authors have defined hostility as a personality trait or character trait [25]. T.W. Smith understands the range of negative attitudes, beliefs and assessments that can be applied to other people under the term of hostility [26]. V.N. Myasishev includes hostility to emotional relationships in his research. He notes that hostility is formed in the process of interaction with its object and then sets the bias of the perception of new objects [13]. Exploring the issue of hostility S. Kuznetsov and A. Abramov allocate its main characteristics: the total level of hostility, the degree of generalization; the degree of awareness; the degree of stability and structure, which includes the following components: cognitive, affective, and behavioral [10].

Exploring the issue of captivity in the years of the World War I, O. Nagornaya indicates the escalation of animosity among prisoners of war after returning home, due to the adjustment to the new situation, which was complicated by the destruction of habitual relations and hostility of former neighbors. So returnees actively turned to the experience of military captivity and used strategies learned in captivity: avoiding total control, active participation in the revolutionary events, the appeal to the image of victims of the former regime, a subtle resistance and active opposition to government. However, the conditions of formation of hostility among prisoners of war remain unclear [14].

V. Galitsky had noted in his studies of Finnish prisoners of war that the injection of a suspicious, hostile environment was mutual and matched the political objectives of each party. He notes that the vast majority of Finnish prisoners of war

showed a friendly attitude to the administration of the camps. Displays of open hostility to the Soviet Union were, in his opinion, extremely rare. However, the aspects of the escalation of hostility prisoners of war in terms of the deterioration of the detention regime are still unsolved [4].

Conducting the research of behavior of Soviet prisoners of war during World War II, O. Smyslov allocated the mass character of hostility, coming both from the administration of the camps and the prisoners. However, displays of hostility characteristic of these conditions are not sufficiently disclosed [20].

V. Kozlov singled out in his studies of the behavior of the Ukrainian nationalists in Soviet captivity that in conditions of total terror on prisoners of war typical for them to become a manifestation of the protest. Hostility to prisoners led to their Union in a hostile ethnic group. However, issues of different types of hostility remain considered not fully [9].

Thus, the problems of display, formation and escalation of different types of hostility among prisoners of war attention were not paid enough attention.

Selection of the previously unsolved parts of problem.

The problem of use of illegal forms of treatment of prisoners of war during military conflict was a subject of many studies of both domestic and foreign scientists [15]. However, aspects of the hostility of prisoners of war themselves in a hybrid war remain poorly understood [11]. The concept of the kinds of hostility which are typical for serviceman in captivity, the conditions for escalation from prisoners of war in contemporary armed conflict is missing, which stipulates the conducting of independent research of the expression of hostility among prisoners of war in a hybrid war.

Formulation of article goals: to identify the psychological conditions of an escalation of hostility and its types which are observed among prisoners of war in a hybrid war.

Methods of the research: analysis of the scientific literature, legislative and legal acts on the military captivity, the survey, summarizing the information received and data interpretation.

The main material of the study.

A survey conducted among the soldiers who survived captivity in the Luhansk and Donetsk regions (107) allowed us to determine that staying in the status of prisoner of war has its own conditions of formation of hostility and is characterized by certain forms.

According to 72 % of respondents, escalation of hostility from the military was intensified by the conditions of detention of prisoners in pits and cellars, which were characterized by: small size, large density of people, lack of hygiene, lighting, air circulation, beds, etc., which led to the displays of strong negative reactions against the enemy, one's comrades and oneself. The stay of prisoners of war in such conditions created an environment of aggression, which was directed on the enemy and one's comrades, who were suspected of collaboration with the enemy. In some cases, when collaborators were a majority, aggression was directed towards the members of the Armed Forces of Ukraine.

In this case, the hostility was displayed as an intense and prolonged animosity in which the negative attitude towards anyone was displayed active and openly as well as covertly. 49.5 % of respondents noted that the majority of prisoners have shown resistance, reasonable courage and caution. Such prisoners of war were generally characterized as having inherent passive-aggressive behavior. The psychological pressure of captivity strengthened their confidence, they encouraged others and provided psychological assistance to the weak, contributed to the adaptation of those who were captured recently. By helping others, they found a psychological resource of survival in captivity, which later contributed to rehabilitation work with them.

Another type of reaction according to 57.9 % of the respondents was displayed as the desire, the urge to harm someone who is perceived as the enemy. POWs with such a reaction were observed to have the high level of hostility, the tendency to attribute other objects and phenomena of negative qualities. According to 31.8 % of soldiers who survived captivity, with the prevalence of hostility the formation of negative attitudes towards new people was observed more frequently than the formation of positive ones, which contributed to the display of bias. According to most respondents (77.6 %), the basis for the formation of hostility

was distrust. Respondents indicate that the prisoners constantly tried to persuade to cooperate with representatives of the opposing side. The memoirs of former prisoners describe the open coercion to spy on their comrades in order to “earn points” to get priority in the exchange of prisoners of war. Such proposals led to the displays of distrust and hostility to all [12].

38.3 % of the respondents showed that the escalation of mistrust led to the fact that a hostile attitude could be inappropriately generalized, to the point that the prisoner perceived all people or outside influence as negative. Such escalation led to the formation of a hostile picture of the world, which greatly reduced the effectiveness of psychological assistance to servicemen who survived captivity.

In addition, a similar type of reaction of prisoners of war according to 46.7 % of the respondents was characterized as the perception of neutral or well-intentioned comrades as their personal enemies-those that directly threatened their own security without the objective reason for it. 43 % of respondents indicate that the problem arises when hostility becomes a sense, which defines this style of behavior of prisoners of war, which is characterized by a permanent suspicion and cynicism.

After returning from captivity such a hostile perception of the world becomes a constant feature, quality of the individual which complicates further work on their psychological rehabilitation.

Thus, prisoners of war experienced the hostility displayed in the form of a willingness or desire to do evil in the conditions of overall mistrust.

The vast majority of soldiers who survived captivity (71 %) noted that the most life-threatening form of the behavior of the prisoner is open aggression. Respondents indicate that aggressive prisoner can be killed or demonstratively tortured to scare other detainees.

According to soldiers who were kept in captivity, the massacre of prisoners suppressed psyche and behavior greatly. The sense of rejection and inferiority of prisoners was summoned by the representatives of the warring parties, with the usage of power influences. 6.5 % of the respondents, according to their testimony, experienced violent actions used against them. Such effects, in the opinion of most

respondents, led to a sustainable sense of shame among soldiers after return from captivity.

Endured torture, according to 13.1 % of the respondents, led to the displays of such negative reactions as envy and accordingly hostility to those who escaped this fate, this is especially true for those who survived mutilation, amputation and castration. Such feeling of envy was characterized by overall suspicion and negativity. This led to the attempts of those not able to help themselves to hurt others. In their opinion, torture of other prisoners if not redeemed their own suffering, at least, restored justice. So, there are cases known in the medicine where terminally ill wanted to infect other people out of envy to their health [6].

According to 45.8 % of soldiers who survived captivity, suspicion, negativity and jealousy become the basis of hostility, which is displayed as attempts to assert oneself at the expense of the object of envy. The hostility born of envy is directed at the elimination of injustice through the desire to destroy the superiority of another. It revealed itself in the propensity to make rude and painful comments, as well as mock the other prisoners more openly.

Soldiers who survived captivity note that some of the prisoners, driven by envy chose the side of the enemy, for obtaining the physical ability to “restore justice”. According to 18.7 % of the respondents, such prisoners agreed to shoot their comrades; participated in the abuse of colleagues; took part in the interrogation under the guise of helping the prisoners; tried to persuade prisoners to collaborate through violent action.

Hostile prisoners of war, according to the respondents did not just respond to a conflict situation more intensively, but rather provoked and created it in their attempt to assert themselves at the expense of their comrades. This is displayed in the tendency to attribute even neutral objects and situations negative qualities.

Thus, prisoners of war display hostility in the form of self-assertion through violence while having feelings of inferiority and envy.

The sense of inferiority which, according to respondents, is inherent in a prisoner of war after his experiences of torture, rape, blinding, amputations of

fingers or entire limbs, and even castration, led to severe depressive moods and suicidal acts.

Among the respondents, 62.6 % said that apathetic state is inherent in the psychological environment of military captivity. However, apathy is always interrupted by flashes of helpless anger. 27.1 % of military personnel said that the state of apathy was characteristic of them for the entire time of captivity. For these soldiers, the monotony of life in captivity, feelings of fear and helplessness was accompanied by infantile behavior, tearfulness, change of moods, emotional rapprochement with representatives of the warring parties and even collaborating with them.

The feeling of inability to cope with the new environment is typical of respondents who survived captivity and returned experiencing intense shame and guilt, and 1.9 % who indicated that they “broke down” and were forced to cooperate with representatives of the enemy side, constantly experienced a feeling of absolute hopelessness and despair.

According to 17.8 % of the respondents, such experiences led to a change in orientation of the hostility among the prisoners themselves. In their opinion, this hostility was expressed in attempts of self-accusation, self-abasement. The hostile attitude of some of the respondents explained suicide attempts and aggression. It happened that suicidal mood was caused by layering the hostility of the enemy, unfriendly colleagues and hostility directed at oneself.

According to the respondents, the basis of suicidal behavior was the sense of injustice, of malevolence of the world, the negative assessment of the subjective future.

Thus, prisoners of war displayed hostility in the form of depressive moods in the conditions of experiencing the sense of injustice, malevolence of the world, negative subjective evaluation of the future.

The conclusions of the study and prospects for further research:

1. The usage of illegal methods of warfare in the context of a hybrid war led to the escalation of hostility among all parties of the conflict, which contributed to the formation of different types of it among prisoners of war.

2. The conditions of detention of prisoners in pits and cellars, which were characterized by: small size, large density of people, lack of hygiene, lighting, air circulation, beds, etc., have contributed to the displays of various types of hostility with characteristic strong negative reactions against the enemy, one's comrades and oneself.

3. Prisoners of war experiencing overall distrust displayed hostility in the form of a willingness or desire to harm in various forms: reaction of intense and prolonged animosity; impulse to hurt someone who is perceived as the enemy; perception of neutral or well-intentioned comrades as their personal enemies.

4. In the conditions of feeling inferiority and envy, hostility is displayed in the form of self-assertion through violence by bullying and shootings one's comrades.

5. In the conditions of experiencing the sense of injustice, malevolence of the world, negative subjective evaluation of the future, hostility is displayed in the form of depression: apathy, self-aggression and suicidal behavior.

6. A promising direction for further scientific research, in our opinion, is the study of methods of diagnostics of hostility of military personnel in various types of modern captivity.

Conclusion. Thus, these indicators allow to objectively evaluate the reasons for the displays of different forms of hostility among soldiers who survived captivity for the identification of possibilities of conducting their medical and psychological rehabilitation. Based on the foregoing we can conclude about the prospects of the proposed research and about the possibility of its implementation in the course of the antiterrorist operation.

Conflict of interest: the author confirms that the submitted data does not contain conflict of interests.

Acknowledgements: the research was conducted with the support of the Ministry of Defense of Ukraine.

References

1. Боевики в форме ВСУ покажут росСМИ “зверства карателей” [Электронный ресурс] / Факты // Украина – Режим доступа:

<http://fakty.ictv.ua/ru/ukraine/20170308-rosiya-vydala-bojovukam-dnr-formu-zsu/>.

2. Бойцы Торнадо насильовали младенцев на глазах у матерей (фото, видео) [Электронный ресурс] / ВосходИнфо: Хроники руины // Преступления режима. – 08.08.2016 – Режим доступа: <http://voskhodinfo.su/hroniki-ruiny/prestupleniya-rezhima/7499-boycy-tornado-nasilovali-mladencev-na-glazah-u-materey-foto-video.html>.

3. В ОБСЕ рассказали о том, как боевики прикрываются детьми на Донбассе [Электронный ресурс] / Сегодня // Новости Донецка. – 31.08.2017. – Режим доступа: <http://www.segodnya.ua/regions/donetsk/v-obse-rasskazali-o-tom-kak-boeviki-prikryvayutsya-detmi-na-donbasse-1051689.html>.

4. Галицкий В.П. Финские военнопленные в лагерях НКВД (1939–1953гг.) [Текст] / В.П. Галицкий.– М.: Издательский дом “Грааль”, 1997. – кн. 1. – 248 с.

5. Ениколопов С.Н., Садовская А.В. Враждебность и проблема здоровья человека [Текст] / С.Н. Ениколопов, А.В. Садовская // Журнал неврологии и психиатрии им. Корсакова, 2000. – № 7. – С. 59–64.

6. Ильин Е.П. Психология зависти, враждебности, тщеславия [Текст] / Е.П. Ильин. – СПб.: Питер, 2004. – 370 с.

7. Історію про “розп’ятого хлопчика” для Першого каналу вигадала дружина бойовика ДНР [Электронный ресурс] / Факти Україна // Політика – 14.07.2014. – Режим доступа: <http://fakty.ictv.ua/ua/ukraine/polituka/20140714-1521089/>.

8. Кабанес О., Насс Л. Революционный невроз [Текст] / О. Кабанес, Л. Насс. – М, 1998. – С. 270.

9. Козлов В.А. Социум в неволе: конфликтная самоорганизация лагерного сообщества и кризис управления ГУЛАГом (конец 1920-х–начало 1950-х гг.) Статья 1 [Текст] / В.А. Козлов // Общественные науки и современность. – 2004. – №. 5. – С. 95–109.

10. Кузнецова С.О., Абрамова А.А. Враждебность и психическое здоровье [Электронный ресурс] / С.О. Кузнецова, А.А. Абрамова // Психология и право. – М.: ФГБОУ ВО “Московский государственный психолого-педагогический университет”, 2011. – №. 2. – С. 8. – Режим доступа: http://psyjournals.ru/psyandlaw/2011/n2/40886_full.shtml.
11. Магда Є. В.Гібридна війна: вижити і перемогти [Текст] / Є. В. Магда. – Х.: Віват, 2015. – 304 с.
12. Маркович В. Русский поп избивал пленных солдат железным крестом – рассказ киборга [Электронный ресурс] / Василь Маркович // Головні новості України. 3oko.net 16.04.2015. – Режим доступа: http://www.3oko.net/2015/08/blog-post_77.html.
13. Мясищев В.Н. Сознание как единство отражения действительности и отношения к ней человека [Текст] / В.Н. Мясищев // Проблемы сознания: материалы симпозиума. – М., 1966. – С. 126-132.
14. Нагорная О.С. “Другой военный опыт”: российские военнопленные Первой мировой войны в Германии [Текст] / О.С. Нагорная. – М. : 2010. – 440 с.
15. Нікітін Ю.В. Антитерористична операція як необхідна форма протидії злочинності та забезпечення безпеки суспільства [Текст] / Ю. В. Нікітін // Держава та регіони. Сер.: Право. – 2014. – № 2. – С. 132–136.
16. Под Мариуполем боевики в форме ВСУ штурмовали собственные позиции [Электронный ресурс] / dn.depo.ua // Depo. Донбас. – 23.03.2017. – Режим доступа: <https://dn.depo.ua/rus/mariupol/pid-mariupolem-boyoviki-u-formi-zsu-shturmuvali-vlasni-roziciji-20170323541921>.
17. Радковець Ю. Ознаки технологій “гібридної війни” в агресивних діях Росії проти України [Текст] / Ю. Радковець // Наука і оборона. – 2014. – N 3. – С. 36–42.

18. “Розіп'ятий хлопчик” переїхав у Маріуполь: В аеропорту міста діє “концтабір с розстрільними місцями” [Електронний ресурс] / dn.depo.ua // Depo. Донбас. – 12.09.2017. – Режим доступу: <https://dn.depo.ua/ukr/mariupol/rozp-yatiy-hlopchik-pereyihav-u-mariupol-v-aeroportu-mista-diye-konctabir-s-rozstrilnimi-miscyami-20170912638761>.
19. Сладков А. Обстрелы и новые жертвы: в Донбассе фиксируют военные преступления Киева [Електронний ресурс] / Александр Сладков // Вести. RU. – 19.06.2017. – Режим доступу: <http://www.vesti.ru/doc.html?id=2900783>
20. Смыслов О. “Плен. Жизнь и смерть в немецких лагерях” [Текст] / О.С. Смыслов. – М.: “Вече”. – 448 с.
21. Barefoot J.C. Developments in the measurement of hostility [Текст] / J.C. Barefoot // Hostility, coping and health / Friedman H. S. Washington: American Psychological Association, 1992. – P. 13–31.
22. Biaggio M.K., Godwin W.H. Relation of depression to anger and hostility constructs [Текст] / M.K. Biaggio, W.H. Godwin // Psychological Reports, 1987. – Vol. 61. – P. 87-90.
23. Buss A.H. The psychology of aggression [Текст] / A.H. Buss // New York: Willey, 1961. – P. 20.
24. Graves P.L., Thomas C.B. Themes of interaction in medical student's Rorschach responses as predictors of midlife health or disease [Текст] / P.L. Graves, C.B. Thomas // Psychosomatic Medicine, 1981. – Vol. 43. – P. 215–226.
25. Larkin K.T., Martin R.R., McClain C.E. Cynical Hostility and the Accuracy of Decoding Facial Expressions of Emotions [Текст] / K.T. Larkin, R.R. Martin, C.E. McClain // Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 2002. – Vol. 25(3). – P. 285–293.
26. Smith T.W. Hostility and health: Current status of a psychosomatic hypothesis [Текст] / T.W. Smith // Health psychology, 1992. – Vol. 11. – P. 139–150.