

IRYNA ZHYHLEI

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9529-6849>

SERGIY LEGENCHYK

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3975-1210>

OLENA SYVAK

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2799-3685>

Zhytomyr Polytechnic State University

HYBRID WAR AS A FORM OF MODERN INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS AND ITS IMPACT ON ACCOUNTING DEVELOPMENT

KEYWORDS: hybrid war, military operations, international conflict, development of accounting, Ukraine, occupied territories, assets of the enterprise

ABSTRACT: The article is devoted to the study of hybrid warfare, as well as its influence on the reflection of business transactions in the accounting system. The study was conducted using the following research methods: analysis; synthesis; logical method; systematization, comparison, generalization, historical method. As a result, the features inherent in modern hybrid wars, including Ukrainian-Russian, as well as the specifics of accounting that arise during hostilities with emphasis on accounting features in enterprises whose assets were under the direct influence of hostilities, in particular, in the uncontrolled territories of Luhansk and Donetsk regions of Ukraine.

1. Introduction

Wars and conflicts are indispensable companions of human history. It has been estimated that over the past five and a half millennia, humanity has gone through 15,000 wars and armed conflicts that claimed lives of more than three billion people (Hedges 2003, 176). Starting from 3600 BC and to this day only 292 years were peaceful, which is 5% of this chronological interval. Other 95% of the time mankind fought. Centuries pass, and security and stability are still the most important components of sovereign development of the states. Deployment of a military and political conflict in the East of Ukraine, which began in 2014 and continues to this day, has determined the need to investigate contemporary forms of international conflicts.

At the same time, modern conflicts do not paralyze, but considerably complicate the business activity, all indicators of which are formed in the accounting system.

The development of accounting as a separate functional science and as a practical activity depends directly on the actions and events that arise in its external environment. One of these factors that should be considered is the hostilities that affect most of the processes occurring in society, in particular, as a result of which there is a violation of traditional approaches to business activities, which significantly affects both the objects of accounting and the order of accounting organization at the enterprises as well. Conducting a hybrid war on the territory of Ukraine by the Russian Federation, predetermines the need for analysis of the trends in the development of accounting in the course of hostilities based on the study of existing historical experience and the rethinking of the importance of accounting as a means of ensuring the level of national security. After all, if in general to consider war as a separate factor of the external environment of the national accounting system, then we can state that in such complex for the country periods of time, scientists do not pay proper attention to the development of accounting, so the accounting system whether remains in the existing state without progressive changes, or vice versa, is partially degraded by its gradual simplification in order to fulfill the tasks put forward by users and dictated by conditions of wartime.

2. Methodology

The methodology of this research consists of general research methods of cognition: analysis; synthesis; logical method; systematization, comparison, generalization. The authors rely on general scientific system and axiological approaches to the study of social and economic processes which take place during hybrid warfare. The methodology of the study includes a review of scientific literature and open information sources, an analytical approach to solving the problem reflecting the information on the economic activity of enterprises in the accounting system during hostilities, including in the conditions of hybrid warfare. The historical method of research, which involves the study of the peculiarities of the development of accounting in the conditions of conducting hostilities in a chronological sequence is used.

3. Hybrid War as a Form of Modern International Conflicts

The most conflict-related regions of the world are the Middle and Middle East countries, as well as the African continent. It is worth noticing that all armed conflicts are related to the 4th generation of wars: a conflict characterized by erasing the differences between war and politics directly between the military and civilian population (Viyna 2018). More than half of the existing conflicts are linked

to the struggle for the territory, in all armed conflicts unconstitutional armed formations are engaged.

The American Centre for Peace Studies (CPS) has counted 36 wars since the beginning of 2017, with 28 states directly involved (including Afghanistan (36 years), Colombia (39 years), the Democratic Republic of the Congo (22 years), India (62 years), Iraq (34 years), Myanmar (66 years), Nigeria (17 years), Pakistan (17 years), Philippines (42 years), Somalia (26 years), Sudan (31 years) and Turkey (30 years) (Homon 2017). The peculiarity of modern armed conflicts is the “erosion” of the outlines of the military conflict and the involvement of non-military means (political, economic and humanitarian) that, in their usual state, are not directly related to the classical military confrontation. In fact, there is a world war in an “oppressive” regime characterized by extreme cruelty towards the civilian population.

Defining the international conflicts, its nature and main features has numerous variants within the limits of modern scientific approaches and is carried out on the basis of their classification. The provisions of the UN Charter make it possible to distinguish between two categories of international conflicts: 1) those that threaten international peace and security and 2) those that do not have signs of threats (Statut 2005), but the UN has not formulated general criteria for this classification. In the course of the analysis of scientific sources (Boulding 1962; Doronina 1981; Dougherty 2000; Wright 1955), the main components of international conflicts were identified (Table 1).

Table 1. Components of modern international conflicts by the sphere of action

Sphere of influence	Components of conflicts
Economic	control over resources; ownership of exclusive rights and values; support and change of the existing economic order
Political	possession or control of a certain territory; providing status and place in the hierarchy of international relations
Information	measures of propaganda influence on human consciousness; disinformation, intimidation (terror), initiation of aggressive emotional states, manipulation
Ideological, ethical, religious	incompatibility of values and ideas; ethnic discrimination; struggle for self-determination; religious contradictions

The blurriness and uncertainty of the nature of modern conflicts leads to the uncertainty of the relevant terminology: gray wars, unrestricted conflicts, asymmetric warfare, unconventional warfare, irregular warfare, compound warfare or hybrid warfare, etc. Moreover, it is not clear whether these types of conflicts are related to the fourth generation of wars or should we talk about the fifth generation.

In the XX-beginning of the XXI century the dynamics of a radical rethinking of the nature of the war, forms, methods, tools to achieve its goals has sharply accelerated. A special place among them belongs to the concept of hybrid war.

This concept should be considered in the context of modern international conflicts. In fact, the “hybrid war” is defined as incompatible concurrence, namely: a fragmentary and situational combination of different methods and theories of war, their integration into different spheres, especially political, religious, ideological, ethical, economic and informational. Today hybrid conflicts and hybrid threats are considered as an important feature of the internationally safe environment that is in a state of systemic crisis. At the same time, military and analytical communities lack unity in understanding the phenomenon of hybrid warfare.

The concept of “hybrid warfare” appeared in 2005 in Western scientific thought, but still this military-political phenomenon has many concepts and definitions. Discussions on hybrid threats and a hybrid method of military action arose on the wave of first generalizations of Hezbollah’s effective work during the second Lebanese war in 2006. For the first time, the mention of this term was highlighted in the speech of Lieutenant General James Mattis in 2005 (McCulloh 2013, 55). Together with F. Hoffman, analyzing the challenges of globalization of military science and technology, they came to the conclusion that future wars will be determined by hybrid methods and strategies (Mattis 2005).

But the turning point in recognizing the hybrid threat should be considered the release of defense review “Quadrennial Defense Review Report” (Quadrennial 2006) in the United States in 2006. Its authors convincingly proved the effectiveness of the hybrid war, and soon the entire Western military establishment, mainly in the United States, Britain and Israel, recognized this fact at the conceptual level, although without the appropriate consensus among politicians, academics and military experts in understanding this phenomenon.

Although it should be noted that the separate components of the hybrid war were observed at the end of the 20th century: in military campaigns against Iraq, in the Balkans, in Afghanistan, in Libya and in Syria. The leaders of the Russian Federation fully demonstrated openly the methods and technologies used in the hybrid war at various geographical destinations – during the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan over Nagorno-Karabakh, aggression (two wars) and the occupation of the Republic of Ichkeria (Chechnya), the military conflict in Moldova Transnistria, aggression against Georgia with the occupation of North Ossetia and Abkhazia, during the Russo-Georgian war. In fact, Ukraine is now in a state of war, the feature of which is its so-called “hybrid” nature (Radkovets’ 2014; Horbulin 2017; Smola 2015).

The search for answers to the challenges that Ukraine faces due to the hybrid war should begin with the study of the nature of the hybrid threat itself. After all, understanding the features and logic of the hybrid war will give the key to find out the weaknesses of this strategy.

The military-political phenomenon that has taken place in Ukraine since 2014, to date has many definitions and characteristics in the scientific and special

literature: “hybrid war”, “hybrid warfare”, “information warfare”, “Ukrainian and Russian war”, “kremlin aggression”, “information and psychological warfare”. During the analysis of the scientific literature it was discovered that the concept of “hybrid war” is interpreted from different points of view: 1) the main method in the asymmetric warfare, which is conducted on three conditional fronts – among the population of the conflict zone, the rear population and the international community; 2) a modern type of partisan war that combines modern technologies and methods of mobilization; 3) measures of a political, economic, informational nature without declaring a war to achieve foreign policy goals; 4) a military strategy that combines conventional warfare, small warfare and cyberwar; 5) an attack using nuclear, biological, chemical weapons, improvised weapons for terrorist attacks and information pressure.

At the moment, researchers note that the meaning of the concept of “hybrid war” is changing compared to the initial use. In the case of Russia and Ukraine, every specific element of this “hybrid war” is not new in nature and used in almost all the wars of the past, but the coherence and interconnection of these elements, the dynamism and flexibility of their application, as well as the increasing weight of the information factor, are unique. Moreover, the information factor in some cases becomes an independent component and is no less important than the military one. Each particular hybrid war has its own peculiarities and geopolitical context.

Actually, the hybrid war can be defined in the most general terms as a set of prepared in advance and operationally implemented actions of military, diplomatic, economic, informational character, aimed at achieving strategic goals. The components of the hybrid war include traditional and non-traditional threats, terrorism, and subversive actions when using the latest non-template technologies to counteract the superiority of the enemy in the armed forces. It is worth noting that the idea of a hybrid war is not new. Military history knows a lot of examples of asymmetric wars using nonlinear tactics and irregular armed formations that are more ancient counterparts of the modern hybrid war. The ratio and extent of the influence of these components on the overall result, their role and place in a particular confrontation is determined by the level of development of society.

A typical hybrid war consists of three main stages: preparatory, active and final. In Ukraine preparatory stage (beg. 2000-2013) was characterized by: 1) strengthening of Russian influence on the leaders of Ukraine; 2) the refusal of the Ukrainian authorities on the course for joining NATO and the EU; 3) the deepening of the split in Ukrainian society for supporters of the West and Russia; 4) reduction of trade and economic relations with the Russian Federation; 5) use of the energy factor as a tool of pressure on Ukraine; 6) refusal to sign the Association Agreement with the EU; 7) reorientation to Russia and Customs Union. During the active stage of hybrid war (end 2013-end 2014) the following events took place: 1) seizure of Crimea and further disintegration of Ukraine; 2) entering the Crimea

by Russian troops; 3) destabilization of the eastern and southern regions of Ukraine; 4) an increase in the number of troops near Ukrainian borders and in the occupied territories; 5) a large-scale information campaign of anti-Ukrainian orientation.

Final stage has been in progress since October 2014 and is still being observed: 1) support of the new government in the occupied territories by Russian Federation; 2) legalization of self-proclaimed state formations in case the country-aggressor does not recognize itself as a party of the conflict; 3) creation of conditions for ensuring the military presence of the aggressor in the country-object of aggression at a long-term / permanent basis.

The main features of the hybrid war in Ukraine are the destabilization of the country through the intensification of the internal conflict, attempts to destroy the state through a catastrophic destruction of economy and infrastructure.

In the report of J. Calha, "Hybrid Warfare: NATO's new Strategic Challenge?" (Calha 2015), when assessing the peculiarities of Russia's actions, it is emphasized that the Government of the Russian Federation is using the internal weakness of Ukraine due to, first of all, non-military methods (such as political, informational, economic intimidation and manipulation), which are supported by the threat of the use of regular troops.

The results of the analysis of contemporary international conflicts give grounds for asserting that they have the following features: 1) rising the role of political, economic, informational means during preparation and in the course of the conflict; 2) increasing the role of information-psychological operations in achieving the objectives of conflicts; 3) the creation of coalitions and multinational forces; 4) the dependence of the political decision on participation in the conflict on public opinion at the domestic and international levels; 5) continuous improvement of forms and methods of conducting armed struggle, in particular, asymmetric actions. Taking into account the above-mentioned, we agree with the position of representatives of the military sciences who use the English equivalent of the "hybrid war" to translate the term rather than "warfare", since the latter means "methods of warfare" (biological, chemical, etc.). Accordingly, the "hybrid war in Ukraine" is a kind of modern military conflict, which involves actions carried out by combining political, economic, informational, international-legal and military conflict scenarios in order to achieve military-strategic goals. It should also be noted that military force in this type of conflict is not decisive.

An analysis of the above-mentioned peculiarities of conducting modern "military-political conflicts" of the "hybrid type" provides grounds for confirmation of the presence of their influence on the safety of life of the civilian population and doing business. The consequences of modern "hybrid wars" include: direct losses among the civilian population, a large number of injured people; increasing the intensity of migration processes, increasing the number of refugees, internally displaced people and evacuated people; a decline in the economy, and, as a result,

a decline in living standards and social protection; damage and destruction of infrastructure objects; violation of the life support systems, the emergence of centers of defeat from secondary factors of the use of weapons (destruction of nuclear power plants, chemically hazardous objects, hydraulic structures), causing damage to the environment.

It is also worth noting the factors that may contribute to the development of the hybrid conflict. The example of Ukraine is, first of all, the existence of common borders with the aggressor and military bases located in its territory, the large number of national minorities that have close ties with the aggressor state, the economic dependence of the country on an aggressor state, as well as the administrative, political and military weakness of the country as a whole.

In the context of European integration processes, uncertainties and conflicts, and in the context of financial and economic crises, the international community is aware that further economic development must be based on a fundamentally different basis. It should be linked to increased control over risks, balancing financial and non-financial interests and should be geared towards sustainable development of the economy and society. One of the ways of solving the current situation in Ukraine is the implementation of the concept of social responsibility of business taking into account the risks that may arise during conflict times. At the same time, changes in doing business can not but affect the accounting system, as will be discussed below.

4. Areas of the development of accounting in the conditions of hostilities

The issue of accounting development in the context of hostilities is widely covered in the world accounting literature, both as an example of specific wars and by looking for commonalities in transforming the accounting system in times of military conflicts. In recent years, such studies have again become relevant in the context of a hybrid war against Ukraine.

The analysis of scientific publications allowed to distinguish 4 directions of development of accounting in the conditions of hostilities: 1) accounting at the subjects of the implementation of military operations (military units and elements); 2) accounting at the enterprises that perform a providing function during military conflicts; 3) accounting of property of enterprises, whose activities were directly influenced by military actions (lost or conquered); 4) accounting as a political tool in the conduct of military conflicts. In the conditions of hybrid war, the accounting of property of enterprises, whose activity was exposed to direct influence of military actions, which will be highlighted in detail, is especially relevant.

4.1. Accounting in military units in conditions of hostilities

During the war, the accounting and financial apparatus of military units, as state structures, functions under extremely difficult physical conditions, which necessitates the simplification of accounting and adjusting to existing conditions, which was envisaged, in particular, in documents regulating accounting in military units that were published in peacetime. Thus, the “Regulation on the management of the economy in particular military units” in 1904 (Zashchuk 1904, 32) noted the possibility of deviation from the traditional practice of reporting in wartime. In particular, it was allowed to: 1) prolong the reporting time for the funds received; 2) the head of the unit could implement the accounting policy without the consent of the regiment commander but for an amount not exceeding a thousand rubles; 3) the ability to increase the amount of advances issued at the discretion of the regiment commander.

Immediately during the hostilities more drastic changes in the accounting system are made. In particular, the practice of the first months of World War II showed that peacetime financial accounting forms used in military units were overly detailed and technically unfit for wartime conditions, and were therefore subject to realignment (Vedernykov 1947): a special accounting register was introduced – a control book, which was supposed to overcome the problem of the lack of own current accounts in military units and the need to reflect the receiving of money and government bonds; the introduction of a simple standard form of cash book, which replaced the cash journal and cash book of personal accounts.

One of the consequences of the war is the increasing proportion of women in accounting services. In particular, J. Black (Black 2006, 205), examining the role of women in the activities of the British military department of salary payment during the First World War, and analyzing the peculiarities of the historical development of the accounting profession, confirmed that widespread involvement of women in accounting procedures are an example of the proto-feminization of British bookkeeping. On the whole, this fact can be considered as the main reason for the increase in the number of female accountants in the postwar years in the USSR, where this figure reached 89% in 1985 (Narodnoe khoziaistvo 1987, 416).

4.2. A system of accounting at the enterprises that perform a securing function during military conflicts

The level of depth of changes in the accounting system in such a period depends on the features of military conflict, in particular, on the level of its impact on the economy of the country.

If this is a local conflict that does not significantly change the functioning of the national economy, then the national accounting system also does not undergo significant changes. There may be only a few changes in existing accounting techniques related to the companies activity that provide support to the army (for example, changes in the cost management methodology in Italian industry groups that sought to obtain price benefits for further participation in tenders and auctions conducted by the Ministry of Defense and the Italian Ministry of Ammunition during the First World War (Vollmers 2015); the creation and use of reserves by undertakings military production or suffering materially as a result of military action, as established in 1942 in the US Accounting Committee ARB 13 "Accounting for Special Reserves arising after the War" (Committee 1942).

If, however, the military conflict changes the basic principles of the functioning of the national economy, acquiring a country-wide scale (for example, gaining the status of a domestic war) and forcing a transition to a model of enterprise management with the needs of "war time", then under these conditions there is a change in the requirements for functioning of the national accounting system both at the level of the system of its regulation, as well as at the level of organization and methodology of functioning of a specific accounting system of the enterprise. The most typical example in this case is the system of Soviet accounting, which underwent significant changes during 1941-1943: war became the reason for the restructuring of accounting, which was reflected in its simplification and shortening of accounting reports, strengthening of operational control over economic expediency of expenditures incurred to the preserve socialist property, economical spending of money and materials (Mazdorov 1942, 155-156; Halperyn 1945, 226; Kashaev 1985, 17).

Thus, the most important function of accounting during the war is the control function, the performance of which created the preconditions for effective counteraction to the aggressor country, in particular, by increasing the efficiency of use of available resources and finding deep reserves of the national economy. As history has shown, this reorientation of accounting has yielded positive results, with the result that A. Djatej and R. Sarikas emphasize that accounting played an important role in the process of winning the Soviet Union in the war (Djatej 2009, 36).

During the war there was also a transformation of approaches to accounting organization, which was caused by a chronic shortage of trained accountants and a reduction in the amount of time allocated for the implementation of the accounting process: in the military years, group (cumulative) information on cash and bank transactions began to widely use, as well as procurement of inventory and payments with suppliers, shipment of inventory and payments with customers. The reconciliation of chronological and systematic registers, simplification

of the distribution of costs for maintenance and management, use of the coefficient method for determining the cost of certain types of products, etc. were recommended (Belousov 2010, 14).

In the same case, when a civil war takes place in the country, which is a form of decision-making of the contradictions that arise between different segments of the population, and which ends with the victory of the party proceeding to reform the country's economic structure, the accounting system also undergoes significant changes. The extent of such changes depends on the level of contradictions between the previous economic system and the newly created one that is implemented after the end of the civil war. Thus, as a result of the civil war in the United States (1861-1865), slavery was abolished (1865), which made it necessary to exclude from the accounting system the accounts used to record the slaves and make their valuation.

The result of the civil war in Russia (1917-1923) was the coming to power of the Bolshevik Party and the gradual establishment in the vast majority of its territory of Soviet power, which over the next ten years formed a model of "Soviet accounting", which was fundamentally different from accounting type of market at the theoretical, methodological and organizational level. The defining methodological feature of Soviet accounting was the transition to uniform regulation of accounting, which in general led to the formation of the concept of extended univariate accounting methodology (Lehenchuk 2017, 99).

4.3. Accounting for the assets of enterprises whose activities were directly influenced by hostilities (conquered or lost)

The conduct of hostilities between the armed forces of certain countries or political entities in most cases has economic preconditions, which is justified by the limited resources and unlimited needs of people. In some cases, the desire of war participants to seize the necessary resources or entire economic areas determined the nature of combat operations and the direction of the deployment of military aggression.

The most typical example of expropriation of property in the captured territories is the actions of Germany during the Second World War. Thus, during the years of occupation, the German troops looted and destroyed 38% of the national property of Poland, from France they took 63 million tons of coal, about 2 million tons of oil, from Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark and Norway, and other occupied countries, all stocks of strategic raw materials, industrial goods and foodstuffs, 80 million dollars of gold were exported from Austria, and 25 million dollars from the Czechoslovakia (Shifman 1964, 131-132). The expropriated property was exported from the occupied countries to Germany, where it was included in the assets of powerful German monopolies or public financial institutions.

A similar situation at the end of the Second World War was also found in the former Soviet territories, which were freed from the German occupation by the Soviet troops, as well as in the territories that were released but were not previously part of the USSR. In order to ensure the proper control and unification of this process, in April 1943, the Council of National Commissioners of the USSR issued Resolution No. 404 regulating the issues of accounting and use of nationalized, confiscated, depreciable and non-secure property (Sovet 1943).

When setting the new government on the territory captured by the war, as the result of the annexation of such a territory into another country or the creation of a new country by way of the unification of several territories, available enterprises and institutions normally it would be subject to nationalization. As a result of nationalization, these objects should be included in the assets of enterprises and institutions. The main problem with their accounting is the establishment of their real value, taking into account their real value, and the costs incurred for their delivery and transfer to their place of their further use.

Other participants of a military conflict who lose it on a temporary or permanent basis, also lose certain types of property, enterprises or territories, which should also be reflected in the accounting system of the appropriate level. In order to keep track of lost property during the Second World War at soviet enterprises, a separate section of the Chart of Accounts “Accounts defined in connection with wartime conditions” (in particular, the accounts “Fixed Assets Not Evacuated”; “Inventories Not Evacuated”; “Inventories Evacuated, But Not Arrived To The Destination”; “Expenses caused by evacuation”) was introduced (Mazdorov 1972, 157).

Today, in the conditions of temporary occupation of certain territories in the Donetsk and Luhansk region and the annexation of the Crimea, at domestic enterprises whose structural units stayed in these territories and over which management was stopped, such a method of accounting for lost property used during World War II in the Soviet accounting system is not used. For example, all nationalized property of DTEK ENERGY B.V., located in the occupied part of the Donetsk and Luhansk Regions and in the annexed Crimea, is included in the assets of this company, as evidenced by the published unaudited consolidated financial statement for the six months of 2018 (Dtek.com 2019). However, as stated in the Auditor’s report on financial statements of PJSC “DTEK KRYMENERGO” (Dtek.com 2017), on the value of non-current assets located in the temporarily occupied territory of Ukraine in 2015 a 100% impairment provision guided by the prudence principle and IAS 36 “Impairment of Assets” was accrued. As a result, as at 31.12.2016, net assets of PJSC “DTEK KRYMENERGO” made up a negative value of -1025951 thousand UAH. Already in September 2018, the media reported that “DTEK ENERGY B.V.” was being sued at international courts in the Russian Federation for expropriated property located on the territory of the annexed Crimea (DTEK 2018), indicating that the company was seeking reimbursement of incurred

losses. Accordingly, for the assets of “DTEK ENERGY B.V.”, which stayed in the occupied part of the Donetsk and Luhansk Regions and in the annexed Crimea, separate special accounts for their accounting are not used, and their value is adjusted on the basis of their level of depreciation.

In addition, under IFRS 36 “Impairment of Assets”, the usefulness of assets is reduced not only as a result of the loss of control over such assets, but also when specific assets lose their value in the event of breach of contract or termination. This situation today is common for the assets of the thermal power plants that are part of “DTEK ENERGY B.V.”, because after the loss of control over the mines, which were the main anthracite suppliers to them, their value needs to be revalued due to the loss of their value. This question is covered in more detail in the study of I. A. Iukhymenko-Nazaruk, I. V. Zhyhlei (Iukhymenko-Nazaruk 2017, 279-281; Zhyhlei 2017), and implies the use of neoinstitutional theory, in particular, requires the use of specific assets in accounting, which will justify ways of improving accounting estimates in a hybrid war.

4.4. Accounting as a political tool in the military conflicts

Traditionally, the accounting system is seen as a means of fixing the results of hostilities and as a means of informing the management of enterprises that support the entities that conduct war. In this approach, accounting performs a passive function from the point of view of its value during military conflicts. Unlike this approach, in the spirit of the representatives of the London School of Economics (E. Hopewood, P. Miller, A. Bimani, M. Bromwich, etc.), V. Fannell and M. Chvestyak suggested that accounting was a political tool, which can be used by actors in his organization to overcome political crises. That is, accounting is suggested not to be regarded as something derivative and secondary, necessary to reflect the existing economic reality, but as primary to the social processes and relationships that result from the functioning of accounting as a separate socio-economic institution.

According to the authors, to this day, for all nation-states, accounting for military operations has primarily served to achieve broader political goals. From the Crimean War to the War on Terror, accounting has been used to assert civilian control of the military, to introduce rational business practices in war, and to create visible and invisible reasons that must legitimize the use of force (Funnell 2015, 2). Through the implementation of the information function, accounting allows political elites to substantiate the causes of the need for the outbreak of military conflict, and through the control – to influence the subjects of military conflicts, thus, while affecting the deployment of hostilities.

5. Conclusions

The peculiarity of modern international relations is the steady tendency to strengthen the conflict-related potential due to the complexity and increase in the number of international, local and regional conflicts. A special place among them belongs to the so-called hybrid wars. Each particular «hybrid war» has its own peculiarities and geopolitical context. In the case of Russia and Ukraine, each specific component of this hybrid war is not new in nature and has been used in almost all the wars of the past, but the coherence and interconnection of these components, the dynamism and flexibility of their application, as well as the increasing weight of the information factor, are unique. Moreover, the information factor in some cases becomes an independent component and turns out to be no less important than the military. The correlation and extent of the influence of these components on the overall result, their role and place in a particular confrontation is determined by the level of development of society.

One of the environmental factors affecting the development of the national accounting system is military actions that affect both their direct participants and other actors whose activities are influenced by hostilities. On the basis of the analysis of scientific publications, four main directions of development of accounting in the context of conducting military operations are distinguished: 1) accounting at the subjects of the implementation of military operations; 2) accounting at the enterprises that perform a providing function during military conflicts; 3) accounting of property of enterprises, whose activities were directly influenced by military actions; 4) accounting as a political tool in the conduct of military conflicts.

In the conditions of military operations, the transformation of existing approaches to the organization of accounting in the direction of its simplification, as well as the adaptation of the methodology of accounting for assets and liabilities as a result of changing the normal conditions of operation of enterprises take place. Under conditions of hybrid warfare, the methodology of valuation of assets over which control has been lost, and the methodology for assessing specific assets, the performing of contracts whose functioning was endangered by the opportunistic behavior of counteragents or changes in the normative regulation of enterprises, are needed to be developed.

References

- BELOUSOV, A./ZELENYNA, A. (2010), *Osobennosti bukhgalterskogo ucheta v peryod velykoi otechestvennoi voynu*. In: *Vestnyk Stavropolskogo gosudarstvennogo unyversyteta*. 68, 13-17. [Белюсов, А./Зеленина, А. (2010), *Особенности бухгалтерского учета в период великой отечественной войны*. В: *Вестник Ставропольского государственного университета*. 68, 13-17].
- BLACK, J. (2006), *War, Women and Accounting: Female Staff in the UK Army Pay Department Offices, 1914-1920*. In: *Accounting, Business & Financial History*. 16(2), 195-218.

- BOULDING, K. (1962), *Conflict and defense: a general theory*. New York.
- САЛГА, J. (2015), *Hybrid Warfare: NATO's New Strategic Challenge? GENERAL REPORT*. [online] nato-pa.int. In: <https://www.nato-pa.int> [access: 17 XII 2019].
- Committee on Accounting Procedure. No 13 "Accounting for Special Reserves Arising Out of the War" (1942), In: *Accounting Research Bulletins*. I, 111-118.
- ДЯТЕЙ, А./SARIKAS, R. (2009), *The Second World War and Soviet accounting*. In: *Accounting history*. 14(1-2), 35-54.
- DORONINA, N. (1981), *Mezhdunarodnyy konflikt. O burzhuaznikh teoriyakh konflikta. Kriticheskiy analiz metodologii issledovaniy*. Moskva. [Доронина, Н. (1981), *Международный конфликт. О буржуазных теориях конфликта. Критический анализ методологии исследований*. Москва.]
- DOUGHERTY, J./PALTZGRAFF, R. (2000), *Contending Theories of International Relations*. New York.
- DTEK pozuyayet'sya v mizhnarodni sudy do Rosiyi za vkradene pid chas aneksiyi Krymu mayno (2018). In: <https://www.umoloda.kiev.ua/number/0/2006/126257/>. [DTEK позивається в міжнародні суди до Росії за вкрадене під час анексії Криму майно (2018). В: <https://www.umoloda.kiev.ua/number/0/2006/126257/>] [access: 8 VIII 2018].
- DTEK.COM (2017), *Audytors'kyu vysnovok shchodo finansovoyi zvitnosti PAT "DTEK Krymenerho"*. In: <https://dtek.com/content/files/auditorskiy-visnovok-schodo-finansovoi-zvitnosti-tovaristva-za-2016-rik.pdf>. [Dtek.com (2017), *Аудиторський висновок щодо фінансової звітності ПАТ "ДТЕК Крименерго"*. В: <https://dtek.com/content/files/auditorskiy-visnovok-schodo-finansovoi-zvitnosti-tovaristva-za-2016-rik.pdf>] [access: 20 II 2017].
- DTEK.COM (2019), *IH 2018 Results Corporate Presentation DTEK ENERGY B.V.W*. In: https://dtek.com/content/files/dtek_prez_irfy_new_2018-autumn_main_final.pdf [access: 17 I 2019].
- FUNNELL, W./CHWASTIAK, M. (2015), *Accounting at War: The Politics of Military Finance*. Routledge.
- HALPERYN, Y./КУРЯРЬСОВ, Н./ЛЕОНТ'ЄВ, Н. (1945), *Kurs teoryu bukhhalterskoho ucheta*. Moskva. [Гальперин, Я. М./Кипарисов, Н. А./Леонтьев, Н. А. (1945), *Курс теории бухгалтерского учета*. Москва.]
- HEDGES, C. (2003), *What Every Person Should Know About War*. New York.
- ГОМОН, D. (2017), *Svitova mapa viyn. De i za shcho s'ohodni voyuye lyudstvo*. In: https://espresso.tv/article/2017/07/24/khto_z_kym_i_za_scho_voyuye_sogodni_v_sviti. [Гомон, Д. (2017), *Світова мапа війн. Де і за що сьогодні воює людство*. В: https://espresso.tv/article/2017/07/24/khto_z_kym_i_za_scho_voyuye_sogodni_v_sviti] [access: 24 I 2017].
- ГОРБУЛІН, V. (2017), *Svitova hibrydna viyna: ukrayins'kyu front. Kyuyiv*. [Горбулін, В. (2017), *Світова гібридна війна: український фронт*. Київ.]
- ІУХНУМЕНКО-НАЗАРУК, I. (2017), *Rozvytok teorii i metodolohii bukhhalterskoho obliku v konteksti neoinstytutsiinoi teorii. Zhytomur*. [Юхименко-Назарук, І. А. (2017), *Розвиток теорії і методології бухгалтерського обліку в контексті неонституційної теорії*. Житомир.]
- КАШАЕВ, А./SHEIN, A. (1985), *Ob orhanyzatsyy bukhhalterskoho ucheta v peryod Velykoi Otechestvennoy voynu*. In: *Bukhhalterskiy uch. 5, 16-18*. [Кашаев, А. Н./Шейн, А. В. (1985), *Об организации бухгалтерского учета в период Великой Отечественной войны*. В: *Бухгалтерский учет*. 5, 16-18.]
- ЛЕНЕНЧУК, S. (2017), *Bahatovariantnist v bukhhalterskomu obliku: istoryko-teoretychni aspekty. Zhytomur*. [Легенчук, С. Ф. (2017), *Багатоваріантність в бухгалтерському обліку: історико-теоретичні аспекти*. Житомир].
- MATTIS, J./HOFFMAN, F. (2005), *Future Warfare: The Rise of Hybrid Wars*. In: *Proceedings Magazine*. 132/11/1, 233. In: <http://milnewstbay.pbworks.com/f/MattisFourBlockWarUSNINov2005.pdf> [access: 17 XII 2019].
- МАЗДОРОВ, V. (1972), *Istoriya rozvytyia bukhhalterskoho ucheta v SSSR: 1917-1972*. Moskva. [Маздоров, В. А. (1972), *История развития бухгалтерского учета в СССР: 1917-1972*. Москва.]
- МССУЛЛОН, T./JOHNSON, R. (2013), *Hybrid Warfare. Report 13-4. Joint Special Operations University*, 154. In: <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a591803.pdf> [access: VIII 2013].

- NARODNOE (1987), Narodnoe khoziaistvo SSSR za 70 let. Hosudarstvennui komytet SSSR po statystyke. Moskva. [Народное (1987), Народное хозяйство СССР за 70 лет. Государственный комитет СССР по статистике. Москва.]
- QUADRENNIAL DEFENSE REVIEW (2019), U.S. Department of Defense. In: <https://dod.defense.gov/News/Special-Reports/QDR> [access: 6 II 2019].
- RADKOVETS', Y. (2014), Oznaiky tekhnolohiy "hibrydnoyi viyny" v ahresyvykh diyakh Rosiyi proty Ukrainy. In: Nauka i oborona. 3, 36-42. [Радковець, Ю. І. (2014), Ознаки технологій "гібридної війни" в агресивних діях Росії проти України. В: Наука і оборона. 3, 36-42.]
- SHIFMAN, M. (1964), Voyna i ekonomika (vooruzhennoye vozdeystviye na ekonomiku vouyuyushchikh stran v pervoy i vtoroy mirovykh voynakh). Moskva. [Шифман, М. С. (1964), Война и экономика (вооруженное воздействие на экономику воюющих стран в первой и второй мировых войнах). Москва.]
- SMOLA, L. (2015), Aspekty neliniynoyi viyny v konteksti ukrayins'ko-rosiys'koho konfliktu na Donbasi. In: Naukovyy chasopys NPU imeni M. P. Drahomanova. 16, 74-78. [Смола, Л. Є. (2015), Аспекти нелінійної війни в контексті українсько-російського конфлікту на Донбасі. В: Науковий часопис НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова. 16, 74-78.]
- SOVET (1943), Sovet Narodnykh Komissarov SSSR. Ob utverzhdenii Polozheniya o poryadke ucheta i ispol'zovaniya natsionalizirovannogo, konfiskovannogo, vymorochnogo i beshozyajnoho ymushhestva. In: <http://docs.cntd.ru/document/901855443> [Совет (1943), Совет Народных Комиссаров СССР. Об утверждении Положения о порядке учета и использования национализированного, конфискованного, выморочного и бесхозяйного имущества. В: <http://docs.cntd.ru/document/901855443>.] [access: 24 IX 2018].
- STATUT (2005), Statut Orhanizatsiyi Ob'yednanykh Natsiy i Statut Mizhnarodnoho Sudu. In: http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_010. [Статут (2005), Статут Організації Об'єднаних Націй і Статут Міжнародного Суду (2005). В: http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_010.] [access: 16 IX 2018].
- VEDERNYKOV S./ROZENBERG E. (1947), Kurs bukhhaltenskoho ucheta dlia podgotovky schetovodov. Lviv. [Ведерников, С. С./Розенберг, Э. К. (1947), Курс бухгалтерского учета для подготовки счетоводов. Львов.]
- VIYNA (2018), Viyna chetvertogo pokolinnya. In: https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Війна_четвертого_покоління. [Війна (2018), Війна четвертого покоління. В: https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Війна_четвертого_покоління.] [access: 10 III 2018].
- VOLLMERS, G./ANTONELLI, V./D'ALESSIO, R. et al. (2015), Cost Accounting for War: Contracting Procedures and Cost-Plus Pricing in WWI Industrial Mobilization in Italy. In: European Accounting Review. 25(4), 735-769, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2634591> [access: 17 I 2019].
- WRIGHT, Q. (1955), The Study of International Relations. 1st ed. New York.
- ZASHCHUK, Y. (1904), Polozhenye ob upravlenyy khoziaistvom v otdelnukh chastiakh voisk. Varshava. [Защук, И. (1904), Положение об управлении хозяйством в отдельных частях войск. Варшава.]
- ZHYNLEI, I./LUKHUMENKO-NAZARUK, I. (2017), Rozvytok oblikovoyi ocinky spetsyfishnyh aktyviv. In: Problemy teorii i metodolohiyi bukhalters'koho obliku, kontrolyu i analizu. 3, 61-70. [Жиглей, І./Юхименко-Назарук, І. (2017), Розвиток облікової оцінки специфічних активів. В: Проблеми теорії та методології бухгалтерського обліку, контролю і аналізу. 3, 61-70.]

