

CHAOS THEORY, GLOBAL SYSTEMIC CHANGE, AND HYBRID WARS

Andrew Korybko

*Information Agency “Sputnik”, The Peoples’ Friendship University of Russia,
Moscow, Russia*

Hamsa Haddad

MGIMO University, Moscow, Russia

<p>Article history:</p> <p><i>Received:</i> 24 March 2016</p> <p><i>Received in revised form:</i> 19 September 2016</p> <p><i>Accepted:</i> 30 September 2016</p>	<p>Abstract: The global system is being rocked by the dueling ambitions of two competing blocs, with the US and its allies fighting to reinforce their unipolar system while Russia and its partners struggle to forge a multipolar future. The rapidity and scope with which events are unfolding makes it overwhelming for the casual observer to make sense of all of the complex processes currently at play, and truth be told, it’s understandable that all of this can appear confusing. In an attempt to clarify the present state of global affairs and forecast the direction that it’s all headed in, the article begins by explaining the nature of chaos theory and describing how it’s applicable to conceptualizing contemporary international relations. Afterwards, the idea of “chaos sequencing” is proposed, which in essence is a model that can be used in understanding the process of chaotic change. Following that, the article addresses the topic of global systemic change and includes the most relevant examples for how this relates to the present day. Next, the research combines these two aforementioned elements (chaos theory and global systemic change) and presents a forward-looking geopolitical analysis that incorporates cutting-edge Hybrid War theory and aims to put the New Cold War into its proper perspective. Finally, the article ends on a suggestive note in encouraging analysts to study the authors’ conceptualization of Hybrid War in order to better prepare themselves for understanding and responding to forthcoming international events.</p>
<p>About the authors:</p> <p><i>Andrew Korybko (Poland)</i>, Political Observer, Information Agency “Sputnik”, Member of Expert Council, Institute for Strategic Research and Predictions, The Peoples’ Friendship University of Russia;</p> <p>e-mail: korybko.e@my.mgimo.ru</p> <p><i>Hamsa Haddad (Syria)</i>, MA in International Affairs (MGIMO University), Independent Researcher</p> <p>e-mail: haddad.h@my.mgimo.ru</p>	
<p>Key words:</p> <p>chaos theory; color revolutions; unconventional wars; regime change; One Belt One Road (New Silk Roads); Middle East; regime change; global system</p>	

The global system is being rocked by the dueling ambitions of two competing blocs, with the US and its allies fighting to reinforce their unipolar system while Russia and its partners struggle to forge a multipolar future. The rapidity and scope with which events are unfolding makes it overwhelming for the casual observer to make sense of all of the complex processes currently at play, and truth be told, it’s understandable that all of this can appear confusing. Part of the reason why it’s difficult for people to follow what’s happening across

the world nowadays is because many current events are literally the embodiment of chaos theory. It’s not incidental that “creative chaos” was unleashed against the world either, since the manifestation of this strategy is inherently challenging to predict and always succeeds in surprising the target... and sometimes even the initiator themselves.

In an attempt to clarify the present state of global affairs and forecast the direction that it’s all headed in, the article begins by explaining the nature of chaos theory and describing how

it's applicable to conceptualizing contemporary international relations. Afterwards, the idea of "chaos sequencing" is proposed, which in essence is a model that can be used in understanding the process of chaotic change. Following that, the article addresses the topic of global systemic change and includes the most relevant examples for how this relates to the present day. Next, the research combines these two aforementioned elements (chaos theory and global systemic change) and presents a forward-looking geopolitical analysis that aims to put the New Cold War into its proper perspective. Finally, the article ends on a suggestive note in encouraging analysts to study the authors' conceptualization of Hybrid War in order to better prepare themselves for understanding and responding to forthcoming international events.

The nature of chaos theory

Theoretical background

Chaos theory has lately become a fashionable topic to discuss, but few commentators truly understand what they're speaking about. So that the reader is on the same page as the authors, it's advisable to reference Steven Mann's 1992 work on "Chaos Theory and Strategic Thought".¹ The US diplomat understands chaos as being "non-linear dynamics" that apply to "systems with very large numbers of shifting parts" (i.e. society or war), and he proposes that it's possible to identify a semblance of order in "weakly chaotic systems". Furthermore, Mann theorizes that the catalyzed process of chaos is largely dependent on and influenced by the system's initial conditions. These observations collectively form the basis of the authors' examination into the nature of chaos theory and the manner in which it's viewed by its practitioners.

Practical understanding

Applying Mann's teachings, it's evident that all systems in the world have some sort

of order and internal patterns, even if these are inherently 'disorderly' (difficult for observers to understand) by nature. It logically follows that if one can figure out how these systems operate, then they can be in a better position to predict how they'll react whenever a disruptive factor is introduced to offset their normal functioning. Additionally, acquiring insight into a system's existing order dispels the presumption that the subject is "chaotic", since chaos is essentially the perception that actors have to complex systems that they don't understand. When the systemic order is changing and in flux, that's when it appears to be most chaotic and challenging to comprehend, owing mostly to the multiplicity of simultaneously active variables that are impacting on events. Additionally, once a system begins undergoing externally triggered change, it becomes difficult to predict all of the other factors that might get involved as well, thereby instigating a more traditionally "chaotic" state of affairs worthy of that description.

Order and disorder

Nevertheless, despite the assumed unpredictability of chaotically changing systems, if the initiator of the systemic change is aware of the extant said system's nature and vulnerabilities and capable of guiding and forecasting it during the manufactured/prompted transition to a new system (the "chaotic sequence" that will be described soon in the work), then the very concept of "chaos" proves ephemeral and is replaced by relative (operative word) order and control. The transition/chaotic sequence appears "chaotic" (not understood) to many of its participants and outsiders, but it is largely under the escalation domination of the initiator and understood by them and any knowledgeable observers.

Regardless of the degree of relative control and understanding that the initiators exercise over these processes in general, the chaos sequence is of such a nature due to its multitude of concurrently active parts that it truly is a proverbial Pandora's Box. Many unexpected developments could transpire that throw off the predicted course of events and make the initiators lose control of the scenario(s) that they unleashed, with pertinent thematic examples being the intervention of another

¹ Mann, Steven R. Chaos Theory in Strategic Thought // *Parameters*, 1992. P. 62. Cited: M.S.G. Nitzschke. United States Marine Corps Vietnam: A Complex Adaptive Perspective. Mann, Steven R. Chaos Theory and Strategic Thought // *Parameters* (US Army War College Quarterly), 1992, Vol. XXII, pp. 54-68.

independently motivated external actor, an unforeseen breakdown of the targeted system's inner workings, and/or the unpredicted rise of an assertive intra-systemic force that totally offsets the situational trajectory.

Geopolitical application

In the theoretical sense, the given system is the victimized state that's targeted for regime change and/or Identity Federalism, and the "chaotic variables" that are tinkered with by the aggressor state are typically the overlapping matrix of its ethnic groups, religious adherents, history, socio-economic disparities, and physical and administrative geography. The chaotic sequence is usually triggered by any kind of intentional move by an external force to interfere within the targeted system, and this is typically manifested through a coup, a Color Revolution and/or Unconventional War (the combination of which is conceptualized by one of the authors as Hybrid War), economic warfare, soft power offensive, etc. The unforeseen events that could transpire to throw off the initiator's scenario forecast are foreign interventions of any type, the targeted state's abrupt collapse or rapid descent into failed state status, and/or the rise of prominent non-state actors within the battlespace.

In practical terms, the War on Syria is a perfect case study of the abovementioned geopolitical concepts in action. The US sought to manufacture a regime change in Syria in order to undermine the proposed Friendship Pipeline between Iran, Iraq, and Syria and replace it with the rejected Qatari-Turkish pipeline that would transit through the country instead. As a means of achieving this goal, the US organized the "Arab Spring" Color Revolution events which quickly descended into a preplanned Unconventional War back-up plan (Hybrid War) after the soft coup push miserably failed in toppling the democratically elected and legitimate authorities. Throughout the course of the chaos sequence, the US lost operational control over most of the processes that it had initiated, and this is most clearly seen through the Russian anti-terrorist intervention in the country, the collapse of state governance in eastern Syria, and the rise of Daesh (formerly a US proxy group that eventually became unmanageable).

The Chaos sequence

Inter-systemic transitions usually proceed according to the following model:

Systemic Retention → *Subversion* → *Disruption* → *(Re)Direction* → *Systemic Change*

The subsequent subsections will explain each of the constituent phases of this process:

Systemic retention

All systems naturally change and evolve to varying degrees with time, especially those that involve living and social organisms such as people (e.g. states), but it's equally natural for the system to seek to retain itself and push back against any external forces that seek to interferingly catalyze this process. In the examined context, the state reinforces itself by innovating various methods to increase its efficiency, properly responding to the needs and will of the citizenry, and crafting defenses against foreign aggression (both conventional and unconventional, military and informational, respectively), et al.

Subversion

This is the first step that an external actor takes in trying to undermine the targeted system's workings. Subversion is a lot less dramatic than Disruption, and it's theoretically possible that this sequential stage might even be completely bypassed. In the event that it's applied to some extent or another, it proceeds according to a gradual, lengthy, and moderately intense progression. Modern-day examples of subversion include aggressive soft power activities such as the organization of Color Revolution cadre and the destabilizing promotion of "Western values" over those of the targeted state. Another form that this could take is the economic one through the erection of restrictive import tariffs and discriminatory legislative-administrative practices against a selected state's commercial goods and services (de-facto sanctions).

Disruption

Systemic disruptions are dramatic events that act as the initiator of the forthcoming transitional phase. These used to be famines, disease

outbreaks, and military invasions, but nowadays they are more commonly actualized through Color Revolutions, Unconventional Wars, and Economic/Sanctions Wars. When a disruption is deliberately commenced by an external party (i.e. American-organized regime change movements), it aims to unbalance the said system and create a strategic opening for changing it in accordance to the aggressor's desired vision. However, the onset of the disruptive transition opens up an intensely competitive phase in which the targeted system and its faithful representatives actively struggle against the interfering power and its chaotic agents.

(Re)Direction

Per the above, this is the phase whereby the system enters into an existential battle for its survival. The target and its associates fight to retain their status and are opposed by the revisionist forces that were unleashed by the externally aggressive party. The system and its supporters endeavor to redirect the transitioning (or "chaotic", if they're not clearly understood) events in such a way that they no longer pose a threat to their existing positions and consequently reinforce the original system, although it might ultimately be necessary for the establishment to enact various technical 'tweaks' ("reforms") as a concession to the internal anti-systemic elements and/or to proactively defend itself from any future repeat of the disruptive scenario. On the other hand, the hostile forces are conspiring to direct the disruptive events that they spawned so that they ultimately succeed in overthrowing the targeted system and ushering in a new replacement.

Systemic change

This is the final phase of the chaos sequence, but it isn't an inevitable one that all attempted inter-systemic transitions will automatically reach. As a result of dynamic factors stemming from the previous phase of systemic redirection, it's entirely possible for a beleaguered state to successfully repel the aggression against it and return to its original condition, albeit, as was earlier mentioned, with possible 'tweaks' ("reforms") that largely allow it to retain and possibly even strengthen its previous model.

Global systemic change

The Chaos Sequence is a very useful model in increasing one's understanding of contemporary international relations, and after having introduced this integral concept to the reader, it's now appropriate to explain its relevance to the present-day international system.

Present origins

The end of World War II saw the establishment of the Yalta Order which was theoretically centered on the United Nations. In practice, however, bipolarity between the USSR and the US reigned, and this state of affairs remained constant until the end of the Cold War in 1989 and the dissolution of the Soviet Union two years afterwards. During this time, however, the US sought to subvert the Yalta Order's de-facto bipolar nature through Nixon's outreach to China and Washington's efforts to consecrate a trilateral arrangement that would ultimately work against Moscow's interests. This plan was scrapped after 1991 when the US initiated the Washington Order, or in other words, its unipolar full-spectrum hegemony all across the world. While it never fully realized all of its objectives in this regard, it came dangerously close at the end of the 1990's when it appeared as though the US would attain unrivaled and indefinite dominance over the entirety of global affairs.

Try as it might, however, the US wasn't able to totally extinguish Russia and China's aspirations to return to the Yalta Order, and both of these Eurasian Great Powers worked hard to retain the previous order to the best of their capabilities during this time. Despite having a strong overlap of vision in supporting international law and owning a stake in the theoretically equitable (but obviously imperfect) United Nations-centric system, Moscow and Beijing did not comprehensively intensify their 1997 strategic partnership with one another until after the combined pressures of EuroMaidan, the Pivot to Asia, and each of their resultant regional consequences engendered an undeniable acknowledgement that both of them were thrust into the same defensive side of the New Cold War. It's only been recently that Russia and China have strategically synergized

with one another in repelling the US' aggression, defending the Yalta Order, and it could even be said, spearheading the creation of a new Ufa Order that will soon be described.

Disruptions

In its efforts to spread the sphere of its Washington Order dominance all throughout the world, the US carried out a series of large-scale systemic disruptions as a means of permanently offsetting the Yalta Order and facilitating its envisioned unipolar successor. The following list should be read as a brief collection of the most relevant events, but it is by no means absolutely comprehensive in its scope:

* 2001 – Invasion of Afghanistan: The US attempted to expand the Washington Order into Central Asia, the soft underbelly connecting the multipolar Eurasian Great Powers of Russia, China, and Iran.

* 2002 – ABM Treaty Withdraw: Washington withdrew from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and has since moved forward with macro-systemically destabilizing projects such as the “Global Anti-Missile Defense Shield” and “Prompt Global Strike”, both of which are predicated on neutralizing Russia and China's nuclear second-strike capability and thus eventually giving the US the unrestrained possibility of ‘safely’ carrying out a nuclear first strike on either of them.

* 2003 – Invasion of Iraq: The US moved to repeat the structural template that it had rolled out in Afghanistan two years prior in attempting to expand the Washington Order into the Mideast, the geostrategic connective juncture between Europe, Africa, and South and Central Asia, which is perhaps the most pivotal region in the entire world for an aspiring global hegemon to control.

* 2003–2005 – Color Revolutions: The political technology that was first practiced during the 1989 “Spring of Nations” and the 2000 “Bulldozer Revolution” in Serbia had been standardized and perfected to the point where the US felt comfortable enough unleashing this improved asymmetrical weapon against Russia's Near Abroad periphery in Georgia, Ukraine, and Kyrgyzstan, and against Syria vis-à-vis Lebanon's “Cedar Revolution”.

* 2008 – The Great Recession: There's no convincing proof that the global economic

slowdown was preplanned by the US, and it thus represents one of the few earlier-mentioned examples of ‘naturally occurring’ or ‘unintentional’ systemic disruptions.

* 2011 – “Arab Spring” Theater-Wide Color Revolutions: The US undertook a massive power play modeled off of the 1989 “Spring of Nations” whereby it tried to use Hybrid Wars (the transition from Color Revolutions to Unconventional Wars in promotion of regime change objectives) to bring to power a transnational Muslim Brotherhood government stretching throughout the Mideast and North Africa and which would be used to “counter” Iran, unbalance Russia, and reject China.

* 2011 – Pivot To Asia: Then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton announced that the US would be refocusing 60% of its overseas military forces to the Asia-Pacific theater with the unstated objective of “containing” China (or in other words, disrupting its regional security).

* 2013 – EuroMaidan Urban Terrorism: The US viciously deployed its “Arab Spring”-style Hybrid Warfare hordes in the ancient cradle of Russian Civilization in order to overthrow the Ukrainian government and replace it with ultra-nationalist elements that would be violently hostile to Moscow's interests, thereby inflicting a traumatic blow on the Russian psyche and informally declaring the New Cold War.

Retentions

Concurrent with the US' efforts to destructively promote the Washington Order, Russia responded by engaging in its own actions to reinforce the Yalta Order:

* 2000–2008 – The First And Second Putin Presidencies: President Putin successfully ended the federal intervention in Chechnya, regained state sovereignty from the 1990s-era oligarchic factions, and engaged in a wide measure of various domestic and international endeavors that ultimately restored Russia's overall stability and returned it to a position of Great Power strength.

* 2008 – Russian-Georgian War: Russia decisively intervened in coercing Georgia to peace after the latter was encouraged by the US to kill Russian peacekeepers and invade South Ossetia and Abkhazia, and the global impact of Moscow's decision was to resolutely push back

against the US' aggression for the first time since the end of the Cold War.

* 2013 – The Syrian Chemical Weapons Agreement: Russia's diplomatic intervention after the Ghouta false-flag chemical weapons attack saved Syria from destruction and provided the US with a face saving means for backing down from its previously stated 'red line', all to the effect of proving that Russia was more than capable of directly confronting the US on the global arena.

* 2014 – Crimea's Reunification: In a brilliant response to the US' Hybrid War in Ukraine, Russia was able to reverse the chaotic momentum that Washington unleashed against its interests and regain valuable geostrategic ground, importantly also showing the world that multipolar Great Powers can in fact successfully redirect US-unleashed systemic transitioning ("chaotic") events to their favor if they truly understand all of the variables at play.

* 2015 – Anti-Terrorist Intervention In Syria: Capitalizing off of the positive momentum that it had earlier achieved in standing up to the US regarding Syria's chemical weapons and Crimea's reunification, Russia heeded its Mideast ally's call to militarily assist in the War on Terrorism and unprecedentedly shocked the unipolar establishment by waging a pragmatic campaign in what was hitherto assumed to be the US' exclusive military domain.

The Ufa order

Russia's string of multipolar successes has emboldened it and its likeminded partners to proactively move forward with the construction of a new global system, tentatively titled by the authors as the Ufa Order. To explain, the 2015 Ufa Summits saw the SCO and BRICS countries gather in the centrally positioned Russian city to unveil an exciting vision of the future that they collectively hope to build.

The SCO formally expanded for the first time in its history to include the South Asian states of India and Pakistan, and it also welcomed into its arms a handful of new dialogue partner and observer state members all along the Eurasian periphery. Of particular note, the SCO also robustly expanded its existing security-strategic responsibilities to include economic ones as well, declaring that

it aims to function as an integral component of China's East-West connective infrastructure projects (the One Belt One Road).

Correspondingly, the BRICS Summit that immediately preceded the SCO one concluded with the Ufa Declaration² between its five participants, whereby each of these civilizational powers agreed to pursue a polycentric and multipolar future in coordination with one another. In line with this, the New Development Bank (commonly referred to simply as the BRICS Bank) and the Currency Reserve Pool entered into force, and the BRICS states agreed to move forward with de-dollarization by prioritizing the use of their respective national currencies.

Taken together, the two Ufa Summits provide a glimpse at the multipolar world system that Russia and its partners are working to build, and the Ufa Order is the mirror opposite of Washington Order that the US would like to impose into practice. At this point in time, one can accurately declare that the unipolar and multipolar spheres are both actively partaking in the construction of competing world orders, and this global rivalry inevitably takes on easily discernable geopolitical contours.

Geopolitics of Chaos theory and global systemic change

As the research progresses to examining the geopolitical matrix between chaos theory and global systemic change, it's necessary to first discuss the structural dichotomies between the unipolar and multipolar world visions. Understanding the fundamental differences between these two spheres will enable the reader to more easily identify the specific geopolitical zones that are forecast to become objects of their rivalry.

Clashing contrasts

Russia and the rest of the multipolar world represent the "continental" forces of geopolitical thought, putting them in opposition to the US-led "maritime" actors.

² VII BRICS Summit: 2015 Ufa Declaration / BRICS Information Centre. July 9, 2015. Mode of access: http://www.brics.utoronto.ca/docs/150709-ufa-declaration_en.html

Whereas Russia and its partners value stability and are dead-set against the utilization of “creative chaos” for any purpose, the US and its allies see certain strategic opportunities in weaponizing chaos theory as a means of selectively destabilizing their adversaries. This crucial differentiating factor puts them on separate ends of the chaos spectrum and clearly categorizes Russia and the US into victims and aggressors, respectively.

In practical terms, the multipolar sphere strives to fulfill its stated macrosystemic goals via the Chinese-spearheaded One Belt One Road project, which altogether wants to build multilaterally beneficial corridors of trade and development in order to connect the world in a multipolar network of complex structural interdependence. On the other hand, the unipolar sphere favors the promulgation of restrictive “free trade” agreements such as the TTIP and TPP and wants to sabotage and/or control the One Belt One Road via a series of Hybrid Wars that disrupt these multipolar transnational connective projects via externally provoked identity conflicts (ethnic, religious, regional, political, etc.) within pivotal transit states.

The determining factor in whether a One Belt One Road-affiliated transit state succumbs to the US’ Hybrid War intrigue or remains a stable multipolar partner is the strength of its Democratic Security institutions. This emerging field of study was proposed by one of the authors in May 2015 when describing how the Republic of Macedonia was able to successfully fend off the Hybrid War attempt against it at that time. It focuses on harnessing the patriotic elements within the state (civilian population, information services, NGOs, etc.) so that they unite in multilaterally repelling the externally organized regime change threat against their government.

Hybrid war hot spots

Systemically speaking, all states are vulnerable to Hybrid War, but one of the authors’ previously cited texts about the “Law of Hybrid War” predicts that they are most likely to be externally provoked in pivotal transit states that facilitate Chinese-driven multipolar transnational connective infrastructure projects (or “New Silk Roads”). The case of the Mideast

is a separate matter entirely because it was targeted prior to the 2013 announcement of the One Belt One Road project. Instead of trying to sabotage interdependent infrastructure projects that had yet to even be conceptualized, the US sowed chaos throughout the Mideast as a means of denying this prized international position to any of its competitors (i.e. the “Wolfowitz Doctrine”) after it became painfully obvious that the Pentagon’s conventional occupation of the region was insufficient for exercising full control over it.

To simplify the explanation, the War on Iraq and subsequent American occupation were supposed to give the US a geostrategic citadel through which it could simultaneously exercise power against Europe, South and Central Asia, and North and East Africa, but it ultimately ended up being a miserable and costly failure. In response, the US found it more advantageous to refrain from large-scale invasions and occupations and instead resort to proxy armies (“moderate rebel” terrorists) and ‘Lead From Behind’ coalitions to indirectly do its dirty work for it. In the present situation, the US wants to internally partition Syria via the thinly veiled objective of “federalization” so as to set into motion a regional chain reaction that will fulfill Ralph Peters’ divide-and-rule “Blood Borders” plan³ and bring into fruition the “New Middle East”⁴ that former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice vaguely alluded to in 2006.

Returning back to the topic of predicting the next Hybrid Wars and other American-directed chaotic events in the world, it’s necessary to emphasize that China’s One Belt One Road project (the spine of the multipolar Ufa Order) is globally encompassing and involves every continent. That being said, it’s possible to pinpoint five broad geographic areas and a handful of specific projects that will likely be targeted by the US’ destabilizing designs:

³ Peters, Ralph. *Blood Borders // Armed Forces Journal*, 2006. Mode of access: <http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/blood-borders/>

⁴ Rice, Condoleezza. *Secretary Rice Holds a News Conference // The Washington Post*, July 21, 2006. Mode of access: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/07/21/AR2006072100889.html>

* The Greater Heartland – The former Soviet republics of Central Asia, Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan comprise this macroregion and it is crucially positioned for the most part right between Russia and China. Beijing’s high-speed rail projects through Central Asia and on to Europe will inevitably pass through Russia as well, and China is also interested in building similar routes to connect itself with the burgeoning economy of Iran and the Pakistani port of Gwadar. Additionally, China receives a significant proportion of its natural gas imports from Central Asia, so it has a vested stake in the region’s stability, which conversely makes it an even more attractive target for the US’ schemes. More than likely, a tumultuous leadership transition in any of the former Soviet states (but especially and most likely in Uzbekistan) might be the spark that sets the whole region ablaze.

* The Balkans – China plans to build a high-speed railroad from Budapest to the Greek port of Piraeus via Belgrade and Skopje, and this “Balkan Silk Road” will represent a massive influx of multipolar influence into the heart of Europe. Additionally, Russia had previously entertained plans to build the Turkish Stream Pipeline (also called “Balkan Stream”) through the region for the very same purposes, although it’s presently suspended owing to Turkey’s aggression against Russia in Syria. Nevertheless, these complementary projects share the same bottleneck dependency on the Republic of Macedonia and Serbia, the former of which has already been targeted by a recent round of externally organized unrest and the latter is one of the US’ former battlegrounds. Predictably, they’re both at risk of once more falling victim to the US’ regime change policies.

* Mainland ASEAN – China desperately needs to avoid the stranglehold of militarily blackmailing influence that the US holds over the Strait of Malacca, and it has accordingly set its sights on building a high-speed railroad (the “ASEAN Silk Road”) between its southern city of Kunming and Singapore, with the possibility of branching off a line to Thailand’s Indian Ocean coast. Originally, China had hoped that Myanmar would fulfill this goal and offer a much more direct

and convenient route, but the soft regime change scenario that’s been progressively unfolding in the neighboring state led to a massive reduction of Chinese influence and scuttled its hopes for the planned \$20 billion railroad through there to Kyaukpyu. As it stands, the world’s most populous country is disproportionately dependent on the stability of one of Asia’s smallest ones (Laos) and also on its most coup-prone (Thailand) in order to offset the geostrategic vulnerability that it has on the Strait of Malacca.

* Transoceanic Belt Of African States – Africa’s Atlantic and Indian Ocean coasts aren’t connected with one another except via a sinewy transport matrix in its Southern Cone. What China is seeking to do is change all of that by directly connecting some of the continent’s largest and most prospectively promising economies. On the east coast, it wants to build a north-south network of interconnected railroad projects by linking up the presently separate component parts of the Ethiopia-Djibouti Railroad, the LAPSSET Corridor, the East African Railway Master Plan, and the modernization of the already decades-old TANZARA Railroad, the combined effect of which would link Ethiopia with Tanzania and all of the East African Community states in between. In terms of east-west connectivity, the destruction of South Sudan, the Central African Republic, and Boko Haram’s rise in the Lake Chad area precludes for the short term the viability of any similar projects connecting Ethiopia with Nigeria, but Tanzania and Angola could easily be brought together via improvised interconnections in Zambia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the newly refurbished Benguela Railroad in Angola. Accordingly, all of these states are susceptible to Hybrid Wars, but an outbreak of conflict in any of the East African states would snip China’s plans in the bud.

* Nicaraguan Canal And The Interoceanic Railroad – One of the most impressive geo-engineering missions in modern history is China’s project to build a canal across Nicaragua. This would be much larger than its Panama counterpart and importantly not under the influence of the US, although it raises the prospect that Washington might

counter by encouraging violent separatism along Nicaragua's autonomous and formerly Contra-infested North and South Caribbean Coast Regions (traditionally known as the "Mosquito Coast"). In South America, Beijing would like to build an Interoceanic Railroad between Brazil and Peru, possibly even crossing through Bolivia, which would connect the former's economically productive Atlantic Coast with the latter's Pacific port of Ilo, conveniently passing through the agriculturally rich Central-West region and the resource-rich Amazon one along the way. If the project happens to run through Bolivia, then this Andean state would undoubtedly serve as the weakest one in this transnational construction, but even without its participation, there's a high likelihood that Brazil's endemic political dysfunction will be manipulated by the US in order to service its agenda.

The imperative for hybrid war studies

With the research just about concluded, it's appropriate to review some of the key points that were touched upon in the present work. The study has proven that the US launched a New Cold War against Russia and China in order to prevent them from actualizing their vision of a multipolar world order, or what the authors have tentatively titled the Ufa Order. The US wants to promote its Washington Order of unipolarity throughout its entire sphere of influence, denying its competitors the ability to freely trade with its subjects via the prospective implementation of the restrictive TTIP and TPP agreements. Furthermore, in order to offset Moscow and Beijing, Washington has escalated its existing subversive policies to the climactic level of Hybrid War, thereby unleashing extraordinarily disruptive forces through the phased development of Color Revolutions into Unconventional Wars. While previously perfected in the Mideast, this dangerous asymmetrical weapon was unleashed against Ukraine in 2014 and now appears poised for use against other pivotal transit states along Russia and China's transnational connective infrastructure network. Mostly, however, with Beijing taking the lead in tangibly constructing

the Ufa Order via its One Belt One Road strategy all across the world, this will unmistakably result in the US and China facing off in a series of nasty proxy wars in the future, with the potential to indirectly involve Russia if this takes place in the shared underbelly of Central Asia.

To return to the opening theme of this article, the inter-systemic transition sequence between the existing (Yalta) and new (Washington and Ufa) world orders naturally appears "chaotic" if most of the simultaneously active parts aren't understood (or are misunderstood) by the participants and observers. However, knowledge of the most essential working parts and their related processes can enormously aid others in making sense of the transitory sequence and dispelling the confusing myth of "chaos". In turn, the enlightened actors would automatically be in a better position to predict and defend against any forthcoming aggression that could be waged against them, whether it be of the 20th century conventional type or the 21st century asymmetrical one (e.g. Color Revolutions and Unconventional Wars). Accepting that it's much more likely that the US will apply its Hybrid War toolkit a lot more frequently than it will its conventional counterpart, owing mostly to considerations about cost commitment and strategic flexibility, it can be surmised that researchers would gain plenty by learning this method of war and becoming experts in this field.

This, however, is a lot easier said than done, since Hybrid War is of such a nature that it involves the holistic study of many different subjects. It's therefore advisable that Russian experts immediately commission work into the field of syncretic studies and strive to understand the interlinking vulnerabilities of relevant transit states' ethnic, religious, historical, socio-economic, and physical and administrative geographic factors in order to master their understanding of Hybrid War. Only when one truly thinks like an American Hybrid War strategist does will they be able to identify systemic weaknesses in their targeted state or region of specialty and be able to more effectively devise custom Democratic

Security solutions for defending their partners. Until that time arrives and while the Russian expert community struggles to understand the essence of the threat that they're up against, all

of the US' moves against their country and its Chinese ally's interests will hopelessly appear as nothing more than undecipherable "chaos" that's impossible for them to counter.

References:

Korybko, Andrew. Democratic Security in Macedonia: Between Brussels and Moscow // *Oriental Review*, May 25, 2015. Mode of access: <http://orientalreview.org/2015/05/25/democratic-security-in-macedonia-between-brussels-and-moscow/>

Korybko, Andrew. Identity Federalism: From "E Pluribus Unum" to "E Unum Pluribus" / National Institute for Research of Global Security. February 29, 2016. Mode of access: <http://niiglob.ru/en/publications/articles/591-part-i-identity-federalism-from-e-pluribus-unum-to-e-unum-pluribus.html>

Korybko, Andrew. Lead from Behind: How Unipolarity Is Adapting to Multipolarity // *Sputnik News*. February 2, 2015. Mode of access: <http://sputniknews.com/columnists/20150129/1017517136.html>

Korybko, Andrew. The Law of Hybrid War // *Oriental Review*, March 4, 2016. Mode of access: <http://orientalreview.org/2016/03/04/hybrid-wars-1-the-law-of-hybrid-warfare/>

Korybko, Andrew. Hybrid Wars: the Indirect Adaptive Approach to Regime Change. Moscow: Institute For

Strategic Studies and Predictions, 2015. The People's Friendship University of Russia, August 22, 2015. Mode of access: <http://orientalreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/AK-Hybrid-Wars-updated.pdf>

Mann, Steven R. Chaos Theory in Strategic Thought // *Parameters*, 1992. P. 62. Cited: M.S.G. Nitzschke. United States Marine Corps Vietnam: A Complex Adaptive Perspective. Mann, Steven R. Chaos Theory and Strategic Thought // *Parameters* (US Army War College Quarterly), 1992, Vol. XXII, pp. 54-68.

Peters, Ralph. Blood Borders // *Armed Forces Journal*, 2006. Mode of access: <http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/blood-borders/>

Rice, Condoleeza. Secretary Rice Holds a News Conference // *The Washington Post*, July 21, 2006. Mode of access: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/07/21/AR2006072100889.html>

VII BRICS Summit: 2015 Ufa Declaration / BRICS Information Centre. July 9, 2015. Mode of access: http://www.brics.utoronto.ca/docs/150709-ufa-declaration_en.html

[http://dx.doi.org/10.18611/2221-3279-2016-7-4\(25\)-25-35](http://dx.doi.org/10.18611/2221-3279-2016-7-4(25)-25-35)

ТЕОРИЯ ХАОСА, ИЗМЕНЕНИЕ МИРОВОЙ СИСТЕМЫ И ГИБРИДНЫЕ ВОЙНЫ

Эндрю Корыбко

Информационное агентство «Спутник», РУДН, г. Москва, Россия

Хамса Хаддад

МГИМО МИД России, г. Москва, Россия

<p>Информация о статье: <i>Поступила в редакцию:</i> 24 марта 2016 г. <i>Поступила в доработанном варианте:</i> 19 сентября 2016 г. <i>Принята к печати:</i> 30 сентября 2016 г.</p>	<p>Аннотация: Мировую систему раскачивают схлестнувшиеся друг с другом амбиции двух соперничающих блоков: США и их союзников, бьющихся за укрепление своей однополярной системы, и России с партнерами, стремящимися выстроить многополярный мир будущего. Скорость и масштаб развития событий ошеломляют стороннего наблюдателя, пытающегося разобраться во всех протекающих в настоящее время сложных процессах, и по правде говоря, понятно, что во всем этом можно запутаться. В попытке прояснить нынешнее состояние мировой политики и спрогнозировать направление ее развития, в начале статьи объясняется природа теории хаоса и описывается ее применение к формулированию концепции современных международных отношений. Далее вводится понятие «определение последовательности эволюции хаоса», которое по сути является моделью для понимания процесса хаотических изменений. Затем авторы обращаются к теме изменения мировой системы, включая наиболее значимые примеры того, как это изменение связано с сегодняшней действительностью. Далее, исследование объединяет два вышеупомянутых элемента (теорию хаоса и изменение мировой системы) и представляет перспективный геополитический анализ, который включает передовую теорию гибридной войны и нацелен на рассмотрение новой холодной войны в объективном контексте. Статью завершает предложение аналитикам изучить предложенную авторами концептуализацию гибридной войны, чтобы лучше подготовиться к пониманию и реагированию на грядущие события международной жизни.</p>
<p>Об авторах: Э. Корыбко (Польша), политический обозреватель, информационное агентство «Спутник»; член экспертного совета Института стратегических исследований и прогнозов, РУДН e-mail: korybko.e@my.mgimo.ru Х. Хаддад (Сирия), магистр, МГИМО МИД России, независимый исследователь e-mail: haddad.h@my.mgimo.ru</p>	
<p>Ключевые слова: теория хаоса; цветная революция; нетрадиционные войны; смена режима; «Один пояс, один путь» (новый Шелковый путь); Ближний Восток; мировая система.</p>	

Для цитирования: Korybko, Andrew; Haddad, Hamsa. Chaos Theory, Global Systemic Change, and Hybrid Wars // *Сравнительная политика*. – 2016. – №4. – С. 25-35.

For citation: Korybko, Andrew; Haddad, Hamsa. Chaos Theory, Global Systemic Change, and Hybrid Wars // *Comparative Politics Russia*, 2016, No.4, pp. 25-35.

DOI: 10.18611/2221-3279-2016-7-4(25)-25-35

DOI: 10.18611/2221-3279-2016-7-4(25)-25-25