Marko Đorđević*

Ministry of Interior, Belgrade, Republic of Serbia

Milan Miljković**

The School of National Defence,
University of Defence, Belgrade, Republic of Serbia

THE NEXUS BETWEEN HYBRID WARFARE AND CONTEMPORARY TERRORISM

Abstract

The topic of this paper is the perception of terrorism as a content of hybrid warfare. Regardless of current disagreements among the theoreticians on whether the "hybrid war" is a contemporary form of warfare or, in fact, an "old phenomenon in a new guise", it is a fact that this phenomenon implies the synergic application of different elements and components of hard and soft power through various violent and non-violent contents, certainly including terrorism as well, to destabilize the legal order, cultural and value foundations of the attacked state and society. Bearing in mind that, in contemporary research, terrorism was only examined on the level of hybrid warfare actors, and taking into account the complexity of effects a terrorist activity has on the state and society against which it is conducted, a need emerges for a deeper examination of the significance of the place and role this form of political violence in hybrid warfare contents. In this regard, the research question in this paper is related to the nexus of these two phenomena, not only regarding actors but also the dimensions

─────────────
* E-mail address: marko.djordjevic83@gmail.com; ORCID: 0009-0003-4086-2510.
** E-mail address: svircevic1995@gmail.com; ORCID: 0000-0003-2449-3228.

and phases of conducting hybrid warfare. By using the analytical framework of the hybrid warfare concept used by the security bodies of the European Union to protect against such threats, the authors conclude that terrorism, due to its complex nature and wide-ranging effects, as well as the actors partaking in it, can be conducted with an adequate degree of escalation in the stages of preparation, destabilization and coercion, as the final stage. The effects of terrorism spill over from the informational and social dimensions to the security and political dimensions, creating the desired impact of destructive action against the attacked state, thus pointing to a deeper connection between these two phenomena.

Keywords: terrorism, hybrid warfare, actors, dimensions, implementation phases

INTRODUCTION

Led by the survival reflexes, the urge for security and political ambitions, throughout history, man has implemented numerous positive knowledge and achievements into destructive acts, thus creating violent strategies, tactics, methods and means for their expansionist aspirations. Considering all the circumstances, hybrid warfare results from the implementation of historical warfare experiences and comprehensive civilizational development of all fields of social actions into a unique, contemporary concept of warfare, which should potentiate the final win with minimal losses.

Starting from Clausewitz's attitude that war has an independent condition and form in each historical period (Klauzevic 1951, 42), we can state that hybrid war, as a contemporary form and/or concept of warfare, has marked the conflicts of the 21st century through the doctrines and strategies of military planners based on synchronization of soft and hard power, directed towards a unique synergic goal. It is important to stress that the goals of contemporary wars are not priority-oriented towards the physical destruction of the defensive and security potentials of the enemy. They encompass the breakdown

of their will to fight even before the war, that is, the submission of the will of the entire society of the enemy state to their interests and goals. Because of that, we can state that hybrid warfare has a pronounced psychological component embodied in various armed and non-armed effects, including terrorist activity as well.

Starting from the fact that terrorism represents a complex activity which, besides a physical one, was a psychological component as well, reflected through inciting fear of a possible sudden attack, this form of political violence finds its application in the common perception of hybrid warfare. The dispute over whether hybrid warfare is a contemporary phenomenon or a historically ubiquitous phenomenon is present in the academic community, as is the consideration of terrorism as its content. In this paper, the authors will attempt to ease this deficiency through the analysis of the complex nature of terrorism as one of the activities of hybrid warfare, terrorist organizations as non-state actors of hybrid activities, their role in the phases of conducting hybrid warfare, possible effects of terrorist activities in various dimensions of its conducts. The analytical framework of the concept of hybrid warfare, implemented by the security bodies of the European Union to protect against such threats, will be used.

THEORETICAL DEFINITION OF THE PHENOMENON OF TERRORISM AND ITS FORMS OF MANIFESTATION

Although there is a consensus in the scientific community that terrorism represents a form of violence used for political purposes, even today, there is no officially adopted and globally accepted definition of this phenomenon. The reason for its inexistence is the complexity of the forms of manifestation of terrorism, as well as the political interests of the failure to define it. That is what leaves space for different political calculations regarding whether some organizations and their modus operandi fall under terrorism or whether they are entities recognized by international law, such as guerilla or partisan formations and insurgent armies, that is, rebel groups whose activities are deemed illegal by the national criminal legislation.

The etymology of the term "terrorism" comes from the Latin words *terrere* (meaning intimidation) and *terror-terroris* (translated as a great fear of terror), etymologically originating from the Indo-European word *ter* (Mijalković, Bajagić and Popović Mančević 2023, 281). From the etymological aspect, we can gain insight into the direction of defining terrorism, its domains, spheres of influence, carriers of terrorist activities, the methodological framework of actions, and the final goals this form of political violence supposedly fulfils.

Scientific research defines terrorism in two ways – reactive and proactive. In the former case, we are speaking of defining terrorism through its forms of manifestation, such as planting bombs, assassinations, hijackings, taking hostages, etc. The latter case defines terrorism through its deeper analysis, starting from the driving motives, causes, goals, the links of terrorism with other security threats, etc. (Mijalković et al. 2023, 281). Both academic and administrative definitions define the phenomenon of terrorism. Scientists of scientific and educational institutions develop academic definitions, while administrative definitions are created within the framework of various national and international organizations and institutions for their needs. Numerous theoreticians of academician definitions of terrorism, such as John Tuckrach, Leonard Weinberg, Walter Lacker, Alex Schmid, etc., agree that the essential elements of this phenomenon are as follows: 1) violence as a method, 2) governments and citizens as legitimate targets, and 3) causing fear and extorting political or social changes as a goal of terrorist activity (Đorđević 2015). On the other hand, administrative definitions, created as a product of the needs of some institutions, serve their needs, thus exhibiting certain shortcomings due to political stances, generality or over-normativity, or due to being based on one specific situation because of which this definition is inapplicable concerning some others (30–35).

Terrorism represents an organized and systemic use of violence by institutions, organizations or individuals that are supposed to cause the emergence of fear and insecurity among the selected social groups, nations in their entirety and carriers of political powers, intending to reach ideological and/or political goals and interests (Coady 2021, 34–45). The goal and interests of terrorist groups, led by a charismatic

leader(s) with foreign political, economic and political help, are the starting point for the classification of this phenomenon, which can fundamentally be divided into internal (homegrown) and external terrorism. Internal terrorism is linked to ethnic, religious or political tensions and antagonisms within one state and directed against its legal and political order, that is, its national values, goals and interests. A typical example of internal terrorism is depicted in the actions of the so-called "Kosovo Liberation Army" (KLA), a product of the Great Albanian irredentists from the territory of the Serbian southern province Kosovo and Metohija. Its actions were directed primarily against the state of Serbia, Serbian and non-Albanian population, that is, against Albanians who respected the constitutional and legal order of the Republic of Serbia. The overspill of terrorism outside national borders transforms internal terrorism into external (international), which represents a broader ideological (political or religious) ambition of different state and non-state subjects (Israeli and Dimitrovska 2021, 228–232). The most known example of an international terrorist organization is definitely "Al Qaeda", an organization which emerged during the Afghan war, based on the ideology of radical Islam and global jihad against the Jews and the Christians to create a world Islamic state – Ummah, based on religious Islamic law – Sharia. Besides internal and external, terrorism can also be classified according to the carriers of the terrorist action, their number, goals and political orientation, according to methods and terrorist action influence sphere (Mijalković et al. 2023, 281).

No matter the form of terrorism we are speaking of, its essence remains unchanged, depicted in its final goals and methods of fulfilling them, the complexity of carriers of terrorist activities and the message it should reflect. Precisely, terrorist collectivities can be state and non-state subjects who secretly plan, prepare, organize, and then conduct brutal armed attacks of lower or higher intensity and range against selected and non-selected targets to endanger social order and destabilize the society by causing the state of continued fear. This method of violent political action sends a message of determination of terrorist collectivities in the realization of their goals by all means, including violent ones. In complex international relations, this form

of political violence gives the desired results in cooperation with other non-conventional and subversive activities applied by different centers of political and economic powers during the realization of their interests, no matter the fact whether we are speaking of state or non-state subjects.

The previously listed characteristics of terrorism highlight its potential to have a powerful impact on internal and international security. Through various violent activities, terrorist organizations fulfil their primary and secondary effects on the energy, information, social, security, legal and political dimensions on a national and international level, which points to the probity of the initial hypothesis regarding the benefits of terrorism for conducting hybrid warfare.

DEFINITION AND CONTENTS OF HYBRID WARFARE

The statement that "a man knows of wars since he knows of himself as a man and a representative of the human species", made by academician Vladeta Jerotić (Simeunović 2009, 282), depicts war as an integral element of social action but also the human nature itself, the best. On the other hand, Carl von Clausewitz points to the fact that forces condition warfare and the means of their actors, that is, by the adoption of forms and conditions of wars that are independent in each historical period (Klauzevic et al. 1952, 47). Based on that, we can conclude that warfare is a social phenomenon, an integral component of the overall civilizational development, which continually evolves and, in a concrete historical period, represents a superb form of its existence. From this point of view, we can also examine hybrid warfare. According to its contents and realization method, it represents the "four plus" generation war, developed and implemented since the nineties of the 20th century to the present (Nikolić and Mitrović 2022, 52).

Different opinions and perceptions of hybrid warfare, like in the case of the phenomenon of terrorism, have conditioned the lack of a generally accepted definition of this phenomenon. There are different opinions among the home-based, Euro-Asian and Euro-Atlantic authors of military, political and economic thoughts. Frank

Goffman, the author who significantly contributed to understanding the term hybrid warfare, stands out because he believes that hybrid warfare represents "a threat any opponent can use". He assesses that it can be conducted "simultaneously and adaptively, by engaging conventional weapons, irregular tactics, terrorism and criminal activities in combat space, to fulfil their political goals" (Cvetković, Kovač, and Joksimović 2019, 334). Robert Newson gives primacy in his definition to the methods and strengths of hybrid warfare, deeming that it represents "a combination of conventional, irregular and asymmetric methods, which implies continued manipulation of political and ideological conflict, as well as the engagement of special armed forces, conventional troops, intelligence agents, political provocateurs, media representatives, economic blackmail, cyber-attacks, paramilitary, terrorist and criminal elements". A group of Czech authors, Kříž, Bechná and Števkov, focus in their definition on the classification of the use of methods, especially on non-military methods of application, stressing the role of the state in such conflicts. They believe that "a hybrid war is an armed conflict conducted with the combination of non-military means to force the enemy with synergic effect to partake in steps he would not partake in otherwise. At least one side of the conflict is the state. The main role plays the use of non-military methods, such as psychological operations and propaganda, economic sanctions, embargo, criminal activities, terrorist activities and other subversive activities, etc., which are being conducted against the entire society, and especially against political structures, state organs, economy, the morale of the people and armed forces" (Cvetković et al. 2019, 334–335).

Chinese authors Wang Xiangsui and Qiao Liang, both colonels of the Chinese Armed Forces, in their work "Unrestricted Warfare: China's Master Plan to Destroy America " perceive victory over the enemy through synchronized application of all available potentials. In concretum, this implies synchronization of combat and non-combat actions, called the "cocktail" method when applied simultaneously. Xiangsui and Liang base their hybrid strategy of the synergy of military and non-military activities on the historical military heritage, dominated by the teachings of the ancient Chinese military thinker Sun Tzu Wu

and the lessons learned from the manoeuvers of Alexander the Great. This knowledge speaks of victories of the weaker side over militarily more superior adversaries through the engagement of combined forces and maximal use of their abilities in line with the situation on the battlefield (Nikolić 2017, 122–130).

According to the opinion of numerous Western military theoreticians, the leading role in the creation of Russian hybrid military doctrine is taken by the army general Valery Vasilyevich Gerasimov (*Валерий Васильевич Герасимов*). The Western theoreticians base their statements on Gerasimov's attitudes presented in his article "The Value of Science is in the Foresight", published in 2013 in Military-Industrial Courier military journal (Gerasimov 2013). This article provides an analysis of experiences gathered from a series of revolutions, collectively called "Arab Spring", are analysed, based on which Gerasimov pointed out the existence of traditional patterns of warfare as well as a pronounced tendency to erase the line between war and peace. Gerasimov stresses that the power of a prosperous state is not a guarantee of prevention via destructive processes that can collapse its legal and defensive system, that is, which can expose it to the actions of foreign armed and intelligence subjects (Chernoperov and Suleimanova 2021, 35).

A group of European experts provided one definition in a joint study on combatting hybrid warfare. They defined it as the synchronized use of numerous different instruments of power directed (tailored, designed) according to specific, concrete vulnerabilities in the entire spectre of social life, having a synergic effect (Monaghan, Cullen and Wegge 2019).

According to NATO, hybrid warfare represents a contemporary concept of warfare based on the implementation of specific techniques which exceed but do not exclude the use of kinetic force. The stress of this hybrid concept is on non-military actions in which information technology is present. Non-state subjects emerge as the immediate carriers of hybrid contents besides state subjects. In this way, the set goals can be achieved without an armed conflict, i.e., through armed interventions of a lesser extent with minimal human losses among the attacking side (Bilal 2021).

The actuality of these threats is confirmed by the fact that the European Union (EU) Security Strategy from 2020–2025, adopted by the European Commission, besides organized crime and terrorism, identifies hybrid threats directed towards EU countries as threats to security as well (European Commission [EC], 2020).

Based on different interpretations of the phenomenon of hybrid warfare, we can conclude that we are speaking of a specific conflict reflected in special non-military and military activities, that is, the synchronization of non-conventional and conventional actions carried out by non-state and state subjects, without any temporal or spatial limitations (Mitrović and Nikolić 2022, 27). By that, we can examine the beginnings of this specific form of warfare.

The Cold War period was marked by *proxy* wars in which indirectly participated the countries of *Rimland* and *Heartland* (USA, USSR) in an attempt to achieve geopolitical and global economic dominance (Arsalan 2021). The wars in Vietnam and Afghanistan represent authentic stages of actions of indirect participants and their ideological allies through non-conventional and conventional actions, reflected through an open war, limited military intervention, intelligence actions, special military and non-military operations, information warfare, psychological operations, uprisings, guerilla warfare, terrorism, violent demonstrations, riots, disturbances, political, economic and military pressures, coups d'état, assassinations, etc. In contemporary history, hybrid actions were also intensively implemented in the Balkan Peninsula, in concretum concerning the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, namely the Republic of Serbia. However, taking into consideration the complexity and the nature of hybrid warfare, as well as its bearers, its emergence can be linked to the US-Cuba relations after the Cuban revolution. The revolutionary regime of Fidel Castro in Cuba became a threat to the US interests in Latin America, because of which the US undertook a series of subversive, non-conventional actions against Cuba, intending to violently change the government in this country (Krstić, 2017). This set the foundation of hybrid warfare, which manifested as the synchronized application of political, economic and military pressures, secret military operations, organization of a coup, intelligence actions, psychological and information war, guerilla

actions and other subversive contents planned and realized by CIA within special operations codenamed "Zapata", "Northwoods" and "Mongoose".

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE NEXUS OF TERRORISM AND HYBRID WARFARE

Academic circles of the European Union, in cooperation with security experts, have agreed on the analytical concept of hybrid threats based on four main aspects of the analysis, which together contribute to a better understanding of the landscape of this threat (Giannopoulos, Smith and Theocharidou 2020, 15). Accordingly, they list the following aspects of the analytical concept: actors of hybrid warfare and their strategic goals, domains towards which hybrid threats are directed, tools used by hybrid warfare actors and phases of realization of hybrid threats and warfare.

Terrorist organizations as actors of hybrid warfare

When Frank Hoffman talks about the actors of hybrid warfare, he says that "both states and a variety of non-state actors can conduct hybrid wars. These activities can be conducted separately or even in the same unit. Still, generally speaking, they are operationally and tactically directed and coordinated within the main combat space to achieve synergic effects in physical and psychological dimensions of a conflict" (Hofman 2010, 444). Ronald O'Rourke somewhat supports Hoffman's attitude, listing the main three groups of hybrid actors: "1) revisionist forces, 2) transnational organizations and 3) rogue states" (O'Rourke 2016).

One of the first uses of the hybrid warfare concept is related to *non-state actors* in proxy wars. While examining the First Chechen War (1994–1996), William Nemeth singled out the fusion of modern technology and political theory with traditional ideologies and customs of the decentralised society, leading to a unique method of warfare. Nemeth then called this concept hybrid warfare (Nemeth 2002). Inspired by Nemeth, Hoffman introduced the concept of hybrid warfare into

public debate in 2005 (Mattis and Hoffman 2005) through the example of a low-intensity conflict between Iran and Israel via Hezbollah.

The engagement of non-state subjects against other states represents a secret and covert activity intended to prevent alarming the national security system of the attacked state and its reaction. In this way, linking the attack with non-state (terrorist, insurgent, criminal, rebel) collectivities is prevented, thus avoiding international condemnation and responsibility. The activities and networks of non-state subjects represent hybrid threats in the territory of the country in which they exist. Activities of criminal organizations, for example, can use threats, violence and intimidation to pressure and cause harm to strategically significant groups and individuals in specific political circumstances to achieve some goal, that is, to use corruption, smuggling, drug trafficking, grey economy to threaten the social and economic stability of the country (Mattis and Hoffman 2005).

The non-state actors integrated into the selected group or state represent the multiplier of force, an integral part of the increasing hybrid threats. In this case, the hybridity is characterized by a broad spectrum of different non-state factors, including rebel or terrorist networks, organized criminal groups, social groups such as clans, tribes or ethnic groups, and ideologically or religiously motivated organizations, which can be covertly or openly, supported by other states or legitimate organizations (Schroefl and Kaufman 2014).

Hybrid warfare is conducted by specialized subjects implementing carefully selected strategies, with the use of perfid tools, techniques and methods, due to which the ability to detect hybrid threats is quite limited. The knowledge of the initiator of harmful elements will be of the most significant importance for determining the response and the method of opposition to these threats in the future. Because of that, researchers mustn't focus solely on current events linked with states in the domain of hybrid threats. Moreover, it is significant to understand better the diversity of hybrid threats to respond to all fickle manifestations of future security challenges and thus limit their influence.

Terrorist actions through hybrid warfare domains and tools

Activities related to hybrid threats and warfare are being carried out against various domains using different tools, each targeting one or more specific domain fields. The actions are carried out against the adversary's vulnerabilities, the cracks in their systems or the existing opportunities. Therefore, it is necessary to identify critical functions and interest fields and make them more resistant, thus contributing to eliminating or reducing hybrid threats. Critical domains and fields are instruments of national power whose logic emerges from the military science of Western states.

A terrorist activity directed towards one domain, when examined through an analytical framework, achieves first and second-order effects on other domains, that is, fields (Cullen 2019).

The domain of critical infrastructure, conceived as a priority in the essential supply and service chains, is an attractive target for terrorists to intimidate and pressure. Some of the targets of terrorist activities would be as follows: (a) destruction of key parts of the infrastructure, (b) degradation of quality of the offered goods and services, (c) impact on demand, putting the infrastructure under pressure, (d) increased economic costs, (e) causing one-sided dependence from the enemy actor, (f) limitation of access to key resources, necessary for functioning (raw materials, technology, expertise, etc.). (Giannopoulos et al. 2020, 27)

The cyber and information dimensions represent areas of connection in the complex hybrid battlefield, which is why they have a vital and specific role. Cyberspace represents a domain of military, political, economic and any other form of action, as well as a platform for psychological propaganda and information warfare, terrorist activity, and intelligence-security activities, representing an integral part of hybrid activities. With its characteristics, cyberspace offers vast possibilities for covert action of different subjects, no matter their nature (state or non-state), because of which it is defined as a critical domain (Giannopoulos et al. 2020, 28). Therefore, the information and cyber domains are closely connected to the social domain. Through intelligence operations and information manipulation, it is possible to

influence public opinion and thus undermine the social and political stability of the attacked state (33). The defence capabilities of a country and its military power are the cornerstone of its existence and projection of power. This perspective highlights the military-defence domain. Because of this, the possible terrorist targets are strictly military potentials, and their exposure to terrorist attacks could have multiple blowbacks. Besides causing reputational damage in the international community, threatening a country's military power can exert pressure on it. In some cases, it can also be the mode of preparation of the field for upcoming military operations. With a series of economically demanding measures directed towards protecting one's potential, an increase in expenses occurs, thus implicitly putting economic pressure (29).

The social and cultural cleavages represent a crack in a country's national security, as various political agendas may prosper from them. That is why the social domain is of exquisite significance for hybrid actions, especially in situations of vast unemployment, poverty, low level of education, etc., which are all topics of social debate. These situations condition economic crises, social injustices, irregular migration, corruption, the emergence of terrorism, and other destructive occurrences. The final goal of these crises is to widen the internal discord, thus easing hybrid actions (Giannopoulos et al. 2020, 30).

The political domain includes those actors, institutions and organizations which govern the application of various forms of political influence and power. These actors can use their political domain to influence another state to create conditions for hybrid actions. The political domain tools influence political parties and individuals, that is, democratic processes in society. Since political power is present in internal and external plans, the political domain is firmly related to diplomacy, and the link between politics and diplomacy is often called "a two-level game". Of course, the link with public administration exists, through which internal politics is implemented or/and created (Putnam 1988).

The previously mentioned features of different domains suitable for hybrid warfare point to terrorism due to the broad effects of actions, representing a suitable activity conducted by state and non-state actors of hybrid warfare by applying terrorist activities which effects of actions overspill from physical dimension, including critical infrastructure as well, to information and social dimension, security and political, thus creating the desired synergic effect of destructive action against the attacked state.

Terrorist action within the phases of conducting hybrid warfare

The offensive hybrid threats principally manifest in three phases: preparation, destabilization and coercion (Giannopoulos et al. 2020, 36). The first two phases are designated as probably non-armed, and the third one is a possibly armed phase, during which we expect terrorist activities.

The preparation phase includes the detection, analysis and assessment of a specific state's strategic economic, social, political and infrastructural weaknesses. It also involves allocating and developing resources to address these identified vulnerabilities. The resources were conceived in traditional activities such as diplomacy, which applies the so-called "soft persuasion" through non-governmental organizations, opposition political parties, informal social groups, media presence, support to separatist movements and other anti-state actions. The preparation of forces and means, as well as planning their effect on specific weaknesses, without operationalization of plans, is an integral part of this phase (Giannopoulos et al. 2020, 37).

The destabilization phase involves efforts to devastate the victim state society where, depending on the goal, projected forms of endangering security are implemented. The most common are the non-armed contents of subversive actions directed towards thwarting legal order. With these techniques, the aggressor state reduces the spending of its resources, thus avoiding international community condemnation and achieving strategic interests without a conventional armed conflict. During this phase, intensive information operations are underway as

a form of intelligence support to paralyze the decision-maker, cause fear and dissatisfaction with the central government, reducing the possible resistance of local armed forces and police units by declining their morale. The intensity of these activities may vary depending on the situation. If the desired outcomes are not achieved, these efforts can be escalated to create favourable conditions for setting an armed conflict in motion, i.e., conducting terrorism as a precursor to rebellion (Giannopoulos et al. 2020, 40).

By entering the coercion phase, hybrid threats are transformed into hybrid warfare, which includes the use of armed and unarmed actions. Even though it relies on strategic domains such as politics, diplomacy, intelligence services, information, military, economy, technology, culture, legal domain, social domain, public service, cyberspace and space, hybrid war influences force as its definitive element. From terrorism, sabotage and subversion to guerilla war, conventional war, and even nuclear domain, all possible levels of escalation can be included or even combined (Giannopoulos et al. 2020, 41).

HYBRID ASPECTS OF TERRORISM

Starting from the assumption that hybrid warfare represents a synchronized application of different armed and non-armed, conventional, non-conventional and subversive actions in all fields of social actions until the final goal is reached, terrorism as a complex and brutal political violence can and does indeed have its place among hybrid threats, that is, within hybrid warfare contents. The parameters determining terrorism as a content of hybrid war are its actors, ideology and radicalization level, secretive nature, actions through a structured and hierarchical organization, transnational domains, and adverse security-defensive, economic and political effects as consequences of its manifestation.

The practice of the use of terrorism as a tool for reaching political goals appeared during the Cold War in the aspiration of the Warshaw/NATO alliance towards ensuring or establishing its geopolitical supremacy and remains present. Such asymmetric actions imply comprehensive logistical and military-political aid to some political

structures and social groups, ready to partake in violent action to fulfil their interests and goals (Milošević 2018, 65). The complexity of hybrid warfare enables its implementation to state (democratic and non-democratic regimes) and various non-state structures (corporations, supranational political organizations, military alliances, informal groups, megacorporations, etc.) against the systemic weaknesses of the adversary, concerning which they act destructively to the level needed for imposing one's own will. The past practice showed that the carriers of terrorist activities are predominantly non-state subjects whose goals are more or less compatible with the goal of the state "sponsoring" terrorism (hegemon). KLA is an example of the instrumentalization of the Great Albanian aspirations by the collective West in the realization of their common goal, which is crushing the Serbian state through its territorial breakdown, economic weakening, social stratification, social crises, historical revisionism and other negative consequences (Bjelajac 2019, 15–25). Further exploitment of such a state would enable the fulfilment of geopolitical goals of the collective West in levying their absolute influence in the Balkans and making a step closer to the realization of the Great Albanian project in this region (Beriša 2014, 66–71). By creating the so-called Greater Albania as a territorial entity or a confederation of Albanian internationally recognized and self-proclaimed states, the collective West would further secure its geopolitical position in this part of Europe, following the Austro-Hungarian model.

Readiness for every form of political violence, and thus terrorism as well, implies that its potential carriers exist in an environment contaminated by an extreme ideology, as well as that they are prone to radicalization to the level of readiness to conduct violent acts. Following that, for hybrid warfare, the potential terrorists can be recruited among the members of extreme fan groups, right or left-oriented informal movements (associations and political parties) and individuals, minority ethnic and/or religious communities, among the refugee population, organized crime groups, religious sects (Đorić 2021, 51–56). In synergy with other hybrid contents, financing, training, armament and political support to terrorists recruited from the previously mentioned milieu would be an introduction to a larger-scale

conflict as an armed rebellion, guerilla, or infrequently an uprising, that is, to the internationalization of the problem. The hegemons conduct media campaigns and resort to different deception techniques, in which they, at the same time, delegitimize the legitimate holders of power by representing them as non-democratic and repressive to raise a terrorist organization to the level of liberation armies or freedom fighters in the eyes of the international community. This would create conditions for foreign mediation to resolve the crisis, diplomatic-political actions and the potential win at the "green table" or some form of military intervention in case of failure of political mediation. After the defeat of KLA in anti-terrorist operations in Kosovo and Metohija in mid-1998, the Yugoslav government was exposed to military threats and political pressures of the collective West and thus forced into an agreement regarding the withdrawal of its military forces from the territory of Kosmet. The agreement also included the arrival of the OSCE verification mission into the province, while NATO acquired the rights to aerial surveillance of its territory. The reduced security effectiveness and resources in Kosmet, the presence of verifiers and NATO aerial surveillance enabled easier preparation of the upcoming aggression against FRY, as well as rehabilitation, reorganization, aid and support to KLA actions, which had its role and purpose in the plans of NATO strategists regarding the upcoming military operations (Lazarević 2020, 21–34).

Terrorism as a materialization of extremism (Đorić, Borojević-Car and Marković 2020, 42–43) represents a covert activity in all its phases. Covert actions should prevent the discovery of the intentions and goals of terrorists and remove all obstacles in the selection of the attack object, preparation, planning and organization of a terrorist act. However, the clandestiveness in action prevents the identification of the states linked with terrorist groups, representing its economic, political and logistical base within its hybrid actions. In this sense, the clandestiveness protects the channels and methodology of armament and equipping, countries of origin of instructors who conduct training of terrorists, location where it is carried out, financing method, contacts with foreign intelligence services, etc. The clandestine activities of terrorist organizations are also contributed to by their organizational

structure, which differs from organization to organization, coexisting with their goals and contemporary technical achievements, especially in information technology. Maybe the most complex approach to organization is the hybrid organizational structure, created from a multitude of cells which can "swarm", that is, reappear throughout the world and thus create an entire network, making the terrorist organization transnational, that is, international (Mijalković and Bajagić 2012, 356–361). We should not neglect to say that the majority of terrorist organizations include intelligence elements and unique political bodies. For the needs of terrorist organizations, they conduct various intelligence activities, similar to intelligence agencies of national states. The capability of terrorists to engage in intelligence activities allows them to wage hybrid wars independently. Their success is mainly dependent on covert intelligence operations. The organizational structure, thus, is also essential for clandestine linking the "hybrid aggressor" state through intelligence services with terrorist organizations and their synergic actions towards achieving the imagined goals.

The continued anti-terrorist fight draws the total resources of a country and endangers its political and economic rating on the global political scene. Economic spending on special security occasions caused by anti-terrorist operations can significantly deviate from the ones provided for in the national budgets. On the foreign policy plan, the consequences of terrorism are reflected in disintegration, complex integration and denial of access to certain international political and economic institutions and organizations, which can lead to the introduction of some form of sanctions, limited military interventions which endanger the integrity and wholeness of a country, etc. Terrorism itself can be the reason for military interventionism under the accusation that the state methodically does not suppress terrorism or finances it, that is, is not able to do so with its security capacities (Stajić and Mirković 2021, 402–403). For hybrid warfare, terrorism can be a direct or indirect means of creating the predicted consequences or opening the possibility for deepening hybrid warfare through the use of other hybrid contents.

Terrorism can also be used as an instrument of psychological operations of general, unique or singular domains of influence. Through violent acts against non-selected and selected targets, terrorists achieve psychological effects, predominantly against the civilian population (Miljković 2008, 100). The sense of insecurity and fear, distrust in the ability of the state apparatus to protect security, and the change in life habits are reflected through pressuring the government to make concessions to terrorists, change an internal or external political course, that is, undertake some other steps that are not in line with national interests and goals.

CONCLUSION

Hybrid warfare is constructed to seek for state weaknesses in political, military, economic, social, infrastructural, information and other domains, and conduct activities within the said dimension by the use of suitable actors and tools.

The complexity of terrorism, that is, the effects caused by this form of political violence, have determined it to be a content of hybrid warfare since the first moment of development of this concept. Spectacular, planned and systemic physical violence leaves harsh psychological consequences among the selected and non-selected social groups, reflected through dread, fear, hesitance, defeatism and uncertainty, due to which terrorism has a physical and psychological dimension within hybrid warfare. The psychological effect terrorism achieves among the broader population of the attacked society can be deemed a form of psychological war which should ensure the change in attitudes, opinions and wishes among the majority of the population following the goals of the centers of political power initiating the hybrid actions. Violent terrorist acts have visible consequences on economic and political stability and the international reputation of a state.

The organizational structure and domains of actions of terrorist collectivities are a significant element of the hybridity of terrorism. A complex and well-organized terrorist organization enables the actors of hybrid warfare to covertly and successfully connect and instrumentalize their goals. The influence is that much grander if the organization is present outside the national borders of a state exposed to hybrid activity through terrorism.

Terrorism, due to its complex nature and wide effects of actions, represents a suitable activity conducted by state and non-state actors of hybrid warfare, applying it with adequate level of escalation in the phases of preparation, destabilization and coercion, as a final phase, by attacking the critical infrastructure and other objects, thus endangering national economy, conducting operations as proxy forces, using social and cultural cleavages in societies, joining the migration flows, placing and spreading some messages and proclamations in the media, the effects of which spill over into different spheres of the attacked state.

How and in which segment of hybrid warfare terrorism materializes will depend on numerous different circumstances. It is important to stress that this phenomenon cannot be deemed hybrid warfare without synchronization with other hybrid contents, primarily psychological propaganda, information actions, and economic and political pressures. Only when synchronized with other hybrid content does terrorism achieve its goal, reflected in weakening the defence capacities, economic exhaustion of a country and creation of a social crisis in a society, i.e., as a part of preparatory operations for the upcoming armed operations of conventional character. Finally, we can conclude that there is a deeper nexus between these two phenomena, not only through the well-known attitude that terrorist organizations can be one of the hybrid warfare actors, as well as that there is a possibility of having mutual goals with other actors, but also that this deeper connection is being achieved through numerous dimensions and phases of hybrid warfare conduct.

REFERENCES

Beriša, Hatidža. 2014. *Koncept Velike Albanije kao pretnja nacionalnoj bezbednosti Republike Srbije*. Beograd: Zadužbina Andrejević.

Bilal, Arsalan. 2021. "Hybrid Warfare–New Threats, Complexity, and 'Trust' as the Antidote." *NATO Review*. November 30, 2021. https://www.nato.int/docu/review/articles/2021/11/30/hybrid-warfare-new-threats-complexity-and-trust-as-the-antidote/index.html.

Bjelajac, Mile. 2019. "Prikrivanje i razotkrivanje pravih razloga za rat 1999. na Kosovu i Metohiji." *Politika nacionalne bezbednosti* 16 (1): 13–36. DOI: 10.22182/pnb.1612019.1.

Chernoperov, Lvovich Vasily, and Umus Ildyrymovna Suleimanova. 2021. "Hybrid war: prerequisites for emergence, concepts, essence of the goal, tools, legal issues, risks." *Noospheric studies* 3: 33–46.

Coady, C. A. J. 2021. *The Meaning of Terrorism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cvetković, Nenad, i Mitar Kovač. 2019. „Pojam hibridnog rata." *Vojno delo* 71 (7): 323–343. DOI: 10.5937/vojdelo1907323C.

Đorđević, Branislav, ur. 2015. *Savremeni terorizam*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik i Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu.

Đorić, Marija, Kristina Brajović Car, i Aleksnadra Marković. 2020. *Nasilni ekstremizam: multidisciplinarni pristup*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije.

Đorić, Marija. 2021. *Ekstremizam i nova realnost: Svet u doba koronavirusa*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije.

European Commission [EC]. 2020. "EU Security Union Strategy: connecting the dots in a new security ecosystem." *European Commission*. July 24, 2020. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_20_1379.

Klauzevic, Karl. 1951. *O ratu*. Beograd: Grafičko preduzeće „Vuk Karadžić".

Gerasimov, Valery. "The Value of Science is in the Foresight." *Military-Industrial Kurier*. February 26, 2013. https://www.vpk-news.ru/articles/14632.

Giannopoulos, Georgios, Hanna Smith, and Marianthi Theocharidou. 2020. *The Landscape of Hybrid Threats: A conceptual model*. Helsinki: European Commision, Hybrid CoE.

Hoffman, Frank. 2010. "Hybrid Threats: Neither Omnipotent nor Unbeatable." *Orbis* 54 (3): 441–455. DOI: 10.1016/J.ORBIS.2010.04.009.

Israeli, Raphael, and Ana Dimitrovska. 2021. *Political, Social and Religious Studies of the Balkans – Volume II – Radical Islam in the Western Balkans*. Durham: *Strategic Book Publishing & Rights Agency.*

Krstić, Marko. 2017. „Tajne akcije – 'alternativni pravci' delovanja obaveštajnih službi." *Vojno delo* 69 (3): 119–133. DOI: 10.5937/vojdelo1703119K.

Lazarević, Vladimir. 2020. Heroizam i čovečnost pripadnika Treće armije i Prištinskog korpusa u odbrani zemlje od NATO agresije." U *Odbrana od NATO agresije – 20 godina posle*, ur. Jovanka Šaranović i Snežana Đokić, 21–33. Beograd: Univerzitet odbrane, Medija centar „Odbrana".

Mattis, James, and Frank Hoffman. 2005. "Future Warfare: The Rise of Hybrid Wars." *U.S. Naval Institute*. Last accessed February 10, 2025. https://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2005/november/future-warfare-rise-hybrid-wars.

Mijalković, Saša, i Mladen Bajagić. 2012. *Organizovani kriminal i terorizam*. Beograd: Kriminalističko-policijska akademija.

Mijalković, Saša, Mladen Bajagić, i Marija Popović Mančević. 2023. *Organizovani kriminal i terorizam*. Beograd: Kriminalističko-policijski univerzitet.

Monaghan, Sean, Patrick Cullen, and Njord Wegge. 2019. "Countering Hybrid Warfare Project: Countering Hybrid Warfare." *Multinational Capability Development Campaign*. Last accessed February 10, 2025. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5c8141e2e5274a2a51ac0b34/concepts_mcdc_countering_hybrid_warfare.pdf.

Milošević, Davor. 2018. „Hibridni rat – Posledica Hladnog rata." U *Hibridno ratovanje – Dilema koncepta savremenih sukoba*, ur. Nebojša Nikolić, 63–76. Beograd: Institut za strategijska istraživanja.

Miljković, Milan. 2008. „Savremene psihološke operacije oružanih snaga." *Vojno delo* 60 (3): 98–121.

Mitrović, Miroslav, i Nebojša Nikolić. 2022. *Hibridni rat*. Beograd: Medija centar „Odbrana".

Nemeth, William. 2002. "Future War and Chechnya: A Case for Hybrid Warfare." MA Thesis. Naval Postgraduate School. U.S.

Nikolić, Nebojša. 2017. „Neograničeni rat - Kineska percepcija savremenog ratovanja." *Vojno delo* 69 (6): 293–303. DOI: 10.5937/vojdelo1706293N.

O'Rourke, Ronald. 2016. "A Shift in the International Security Environment: Potential Implications for

Defense–Issues for US Congress." *Congressional Research Service*. June 8, 2016. https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/20181024_R43838_ fd72c9a2f744419b3ff915ddc881ed7ce74caddf.pdf.

Putnam, D. Robert. 1988. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games." *International Organization* 42 (3): 427–460.

Simeunović, Dragan. 2002. *Teorija* politike, rider, I deo. Beograd: Udruženje „Nauka i društvo".

Schroefl, Josef., and Stuart J. Kaufman. 2014. "Hybrid Actors, Tactical Variety: Rethinking Asymmetric and Hybrid War." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 37 (10): 862–880. DOI: 10.1080/1057610X.2014.941 435.

Stajić, Ljubomir, i Vladan M. Mirković. 2021. „Nova uloga terorizma danas." U *Zbornik radova Pravnog fakulteta u Novom Sadu*, ur. Slobodan Orlović, 395–413. Novi Sad: Pravni fakultet univerziteta u Novom Sadu.