

MEĐUNARODNI NAUČNI SKUP
INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

**„DANI ARČIBALDA RAJSA“
“ARCHIBALD REISS DAYS”**

Beograd, 7-9. novembar 2017.

Belgrade, 7-9 November 2017

**TEMATSKI ZBORNİK RADOVA
MEĐUNARODNOG ZNAČAJA**

**THEMATIC CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
OF INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE**

**TOM I
VOLUME I**

Kriminalističko-policijska akademija
Beograd, 2017
Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies
Belgrade, 2017

HYBRID SECURITY THREATS AND CONTEMPORARY APPROACH TO NATIONAL SECURITY

Miroslav Mitrović, Ph.D.¹

Ministry of Defense of Republic of Serbia, Strategic Research Institute

Abstract: Globalization with all its effects, as well as actual relations on international security arena, rising of conflicts, existing of nonlinear and asymmetric security threats, indicates that contemporary world present a stage of acting forms for developed security challenges, risks and threats. Namely, we are bear witness that states and non-state actors mostly practice unconventional forms of conflict, in purpose of achievement they own interests. Common concept of contemporary security paradigm with general unconventional forms of security violation is labeled as hybrid security threat, and theirs applied forms is recognized as hybrid warfare. In the contemporary global security paradigm, actualization of hybrid forms of state security endangering, shouldn't be overlooked. Scholars, as well as practitioners have demanding assignment regarding the contribute answering to the questions: What is hybrid warfare? Which are the forms and recognized area of hybrid security threats exposing? How to manage National Security and Defense System for successful preparation forward the hybrid security threats? Meaning of this paper is, to upon of wide base of scientific, scholar and analytic documents, as well as analysis of possible generic preconditions for existing of hybrid security threats, to contribute for the creation and development of possible contemporary approach to national security, which could be effective against possible occurrences of hybrid attacks.

Keywords: Hybrid warfare, national security and defense, contemporary security environment.

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary international relations indicate globalization as main driver of global security changing. Namely, globalization should be overlooked through its positive as well as negative effects. Modern economy and neo-liberal concept are recognized as main globalization generator², with direct consequences in severance of international and global economy. Also, we are faced with rising of influence of non-state or under-state power based institutions and groups³. Main characteristic of existing approach to the global market is continuously devising for new, and spreading of existing markets, fragmentation of national economies behalf of interest of global players. Globalization is led by multinational corporations and that is subordinate to its interests⁴ and its negative effects support numerous crises and conflicts all around globe. Namely, in last two decades, due to the impact of globalization, vanishing of ideological

1 mitrovicmm@gmail.com

2 Katarina Štrbac, Miroslav Mitrović, (2012), "Interdisciplinarni pristup naukama bezbednosti i odbrane", Politička revija, broj 3/2012.

3 Robert Cox, (1996), "Perspektive of Globalization" in ed. Mittelman, J.H., *Globalization-critical reflections*, London, Lynne Rienner Publisher.inc., p. 22-23.

4 Štrbac, Mitrović, (2012), p. 282.

differences, developing of technology, communication and mass media, the previous geopolitical scene disappeared, as well as conditions for the prevailing of traditional warfare. It can be said that “global markets depend on international power structure”⁵. By its nature, globalization emphasizes the increased movement across the border in all forms of capital, labor, goods, and ideas, but also all forms of non-linear, hybrid and asymmetric threats. Geopolitical environment, conducted with collision of ambitions and interests of out-of-state power centers, which through institutions of state, international organizations or non-governmental organizations express their interest, potentially leads to the conflicts. General characteristics of contemporary conflicts are low intensity and unspecific forms of exposing. In academic and analytical comments, actual security threats and risks are frequently termed as hybrid security threats.

CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL ORIGINS OF HYBRID WARFARE CONSIDERATION

Hybrid warfare is a term widely spread in everyday colloquial discussions, but the idea and the concept of hybrid warfare are not completely new. Namely, Sun Tzu emphasized that the implementation of indirect forms of warfare is one of the most effective ways to fight against the enemy⁶. This concept involves achieving the benefits of defeating the enemy, without direct involvement of its own military effectives and resources. Contemporary elaborations of the war as the theory of conflict is conditionally divide of conventional wars in several generations⁷:

- 1st generation prevails and determines the characteristics of the so-called “Napoleonic” wars and wars which had been acting during the nineteenth century, where the primacy of the army mostly had prevailed abundance in the conflict and the human potential;
- 2nd generation, which is tentatively placed in the time around the First World War (the first decade of the twentieth century), where prevail was on the side of innovation technologies and technical arms, and the focus of firepower;
- 3rd generation, the era of World War II until the mid-80s of the twentieth century, where the predominant component represented the ability to maneuver;
- 4th generation, which is coordinated and concurrent use of non-violent and violent form of civil protest, combined with the use of special operations with intensive use of political, economic and social instruments, like cracking down on the opponent’s fighting ability, morality and system of organization. According to this theory, the classic conflict countries have become a relic of the past.

In addition, some authors have developed a theory of the 6th generation wars⁸ and Asymmetrical warfare⁹. Actualization of the concept by Western authors is raised since 2014, after the annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation, where this action is identified with the postulates of “hybrid warfare”. At the same time, the Russian authors in their works, sought to “color revolution” in connection with the hybrid warfare concept. Taking the foregoing into

5 Džozef Naj, (2006)., *Kako razumeti međunarodne odnose*, Stubovi kulture, Beograd, , p. 251.

6 John Watson, “Sun Tzu’s Art of War - Chapter 3: Attack by Stratagem”. <http://suntzusaid.com/book/3>./12/02/2017>.

7 Bettina Renz., Hanna Smith, (2016) *Russia And Hybrid Warfare –Going Beyond The Label*, Finnish Prime Minister’s Office, Government’s analysis, p. 5.

8 Владимир Слипченко, (1999), *Война будущего*. Moscow: Московский Общественный Научный Фонд.

9 Miroslav Mitrović, “Hibridno ratovanje i asimetrične bezbednosne pretnje”, Beograd:Vojno delo, 2/2017.

consideration, it could be said that current geopolitical scene represents a polygon of hybrid warfare, concept which is very close to 4th generation wars, primarily due to the fact of engaging non-military means, such as diplomacy, economy, energy, information and intensive use of media. Considering contemporary analysis and critical observation, we could conclude that hybrid warfare is not *de-facto* conducted as war in conventional understandings, but mostly as concept of actual, geopolitical clash of interests¹⁰.

According to theories¹¹, hybrid warfare embodies whole range of various models of the conflicts, which are being carried out with conventional and unconventional tactics and engaged forces, including violence and civil unrest and criminal activity. Hart¹² conclude, that is much longer, more expensive and unproductive form of direct engagement of the armed capacity, than a more effective, strategic indirect access to various forms of action, which effectively destroys the psychological and physical balance and opponents achieved his retreat and defeat. In short, hybrid warfare is based on the discovery and articulation of hybrid risks thought threats, in order to accelerate weaknesses of targeting state, with purpose of achievement of their own interests, without (or with minimal) usage of direct military power. In further elaboration, it will be introduced correlation of hybrid concept of warfare with Chaos and Network-centric management theories.

Chaos theory and hybrid warfare conduct a common starting point of terms understanding. The fluidity and other characteristics of the hybrid warfare, indicate a possible identification of this phenomenon with the theory of controlled chaos. Korybko¹³ though, that is possible to achieve the strategic goals of a hybrid warfare, through the "under chaos" management chain. The starting point for this theory is work of Man¹⁴, by which essence of chaos contains nonlinear dynamic system applications, with a large number of variables entities. In chaos process, a subject interacts in a nonlinear system, periodically taking on a balanced form, which can be described as organized chaos. The chaos was caused by the initial variables, which, by specific conditions could be proximately accurately defined in the specific situation and environment. By this approach, "sub-chaos" which is created in frame of controlled environment, could be managed by the chaos management strategy, in order to achieve declared interest. Initial variables of chaos, according the Man, are: The initial shape or format of system; Understanding of the structure of the system; Connection between entities within the system and conflicting energies of individual entities. The applications of this concept of managing with controlled chaos are evident in contemporary international conflicts which could be recognized in works of Darius¹⁵ and Shahskov¹⁶.

Network-centric warfare theory also has direct relation to the frame of understanding of Hybrid warfare. According to some authors, network-centric warfare is a form of the conflict on the social level, which is different from the classical, so cold, "Clausewitz's", methods of warfare, in which the protagonists use network forms of organization and doctrines, strategically and technically based on modern, information technologies. Actors of these conflicts could be national or international organizations, small groups or individuals who communicate, coordinate and synchronize their campaigns in a harmonized manner, often without sol-

10 Timothy McCulloh, Richard Johnson, (2016), *Hybrid Warfare*, Tampa, JSOU.

11 Frank G. Hofman, (2007) *Conflict in the 21st Century-The Rise of Hybrid Wars*, Potomac Institute for Policy Studies, p 8.

12 Liddell Hart, (1954), "The Strategy of Indirect Approach." National War College Internet Archive, 1954.

13 Andrew Korybko, (2015), *Hybrid Wars: the indirect adaptive approach to regime change*, Moscow, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, p 23.

14 Steven Mann, (1992) "Chaos Theory and Strategic Thought", *Parameters*, Autumn 1992.

15 Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya, (2014), "Iraq and Syria are Burning, "Constructive Chaos" and America's Broader Strategy to Conquer Eurasia." *GlobalResearch.ca*, June 2014.

16 Sergei Shahskov, (2011) "The theory of 'manageable chaos' put into practice." *Strategic Culture Foundation*, 1 Mar. 2011.

id central management. In fact, the predominant way for the implementation of its objectives, the subject of implementation of network centric warfare is based on the use of soft power, especially in media operations and management of the public perceptions. Analyses of this concept could be found in the works such were made by Cebrowski & Garstka¹⁷ and Leonid¹⁸.

CONTEMPORARY RECOGNITION OF HYBRID WARFARE

Implementation of hybrid concept as contemporary warfare, could be recognized since 1989, when Lind comment that "Psychological operations may become the dominant operational and strategic weapon in the forms of media / information intervention ... (and) main target will be enemy population's support of its government and the war. Television news may become a more powerful operational weapon than armored divisions"¹⁹. Other US authors, characterized Hybrid warfare as the participation of elements of irregular armed forces and private military "companies" in military operations, especially in the implementation of indirect and asymmetric operations²⁰. At the national level, the US pays great attention for development of the Hybrid warfare concept. In the US Military Strategy²¹ hybrid war is recognized as conflict placed between conventional (nation-state) and asymmetric (non-state), with purpose to increase the ambiguity, complicate and deliberate process of decision-making and coordination and the ineffectual response. US strategic documents assumes the legitimacy of organizing and implementation of special, closed ("covert") or black ("blackops") operations and activities, in aim to make a political and economic influence, as well as military resulted activities out of US territory, especially, when is estimated that the open engagement of the state administration (open military involvement and engagement), would not be well accepted from US interior public.²² US doctrinal manuals for the engagement of Special Forces recognize unconventional and special operations.²³ Further more, the principles of hybrid warfare are elaborate even in the basic manual training, with recognition that the current conflict couldn't be solved only by military means. On contrary, attribute of success in contemporary warfare, by the manuals, require engagement of all available national capacity, such as diplomatic, informational, military and economic. This is practical application of the concept of *Full spectrum operations* as the basic operating concept of the US Armed Forces²⁴.

On the other hand, the analysis of the Russian strategic documents, appears to the very carefully analyzes of the hybrid warfare doctrine. Towards the Russian military doctrine from 2010, modern warfare is described as integrated involvement of military forces and resources which do not have a military character²⁵. It also emphasizes the application of measures of informational warfare in order to achieve political objectives without the direct involvement of military forces, with the aim of shaping the desired response of world's public opinion, in

17 Arthur Cebrowski, John Garstka, (1998), *Network-Centric Warfare: Its Origin and Future*, U.S. Naval Institute.

18 Leonid Savin, (2011), "Network Centric Strategies in the Arab Spring", Open Revolt!, 29 Dec. 2011.

19 William Lind, Keith Nightengale, John Schmitt, Joseph Sutton, Colonel Gary Wilson. (1989), "The Changing Face of War: Into the Fourth Generation", *Marine Corps Gazette*, Oct. 1989, p. 24.

20 Michael Kofman, Roger McDermott, (2015), "No Return to Cold War in Russia's New Military Doctrine," *Eurasia Review*, February 3, 2015.

21 US Joint Chiefs of Staff, (2015), *National Military Strategy of USA*, p 4.

22 Aki J. Peritz, Eric Rosenbach, (2009), *Covert Action*, Belfer Centre Memorandum, Harvard, July 2009.

23 Headquarters Department of the Army, (2010), *TC 18-01 Special Forces Unconventional Warfare*, Washington, DC.

24 Headquarters, Department of the Army, (2008), *Field Manual No. 3-0: Operations*, Washington, DC.

25 *Военная доктрина Российской Федерации*, (2010), Москва,

relation to the involvement of the armed forces. Military doctrinal documents from 2014 declared necessity of providing of special forms of modern conflicts, in which Russia will apply the integrated operation of military and political, economic, informational and other non-military activities²⁶. As one of the steps towards an institutional approach to organizing and managing hybrid operation is the establishment of the National Center for security management within the Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation²⁷, in 2014.

HYBRID SECURITY THREATS AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Taking into account that Hybrid warfare has strategic influence to the national interests of conflicting parties, it's noticeable that in addition to psychological consequences of hybrid warfare, it is certainly associated with the real, physical, resources and infrastructural devastation of the country. Also, could be noticed a dual approach to the effects of economic, energy and financial instruments of pressure on a particular country. General characteristics of hybrid wars, whether it is called "colored revolutions", various forms of economic or energy sanctions, support and escalation of different extremism or separatism, is that it loses a clear distinction between soldiers and civilians, as well as organized violence, terror and war.

Practically, hybrid warfare is a form of manifestation of strategic initiatives, and every state which has ambitions to become a great, global power has a necessity to implement strategy approach regarding the national defense, in order to preserve or achieve dominance in a variable and dynamic geopolitical arena.

Taking into account all above mentioned features of hybrid forms of warfare, it could be underlined a group of indicators, or potential challenges for national security as: dysfunctional state, the lack of state sovereignty, the existence of frozen conflicts, unresolved territorial disputes, the presence of arbitration or control of territory by supranational entities, ethnic and religious problems, separatism, extremism, unemployment, the existence of general poverty, long-term dissatisfaction of population with the political and social solutions in leading the country, corruption, powerful criminal elements, institutions with separate centers of power and governance, etc. In the correlation to listed indicators, looking through the scope of hybrid application forms, we could distinguish four basic pillars of hybrid concept of security violation:

- Special and psychological operations - limited time performance, high intensity with very high direct effects. Engaging armed forces within the framework of special and psychological operations, as part of a hybrid concept of war, could be found in the contents of conceptual documents of the US administration. Namely, in the form of irregular warfare conducted by the US Armed Forces, are recognized: the anti-rebel operations, information operations, counter terrorism, unconventional warfare, foreign internal defense (support of other countries in the aggression from outside), stability operations, security transition, and reconstruction, strategic communication, psychological warfare, information operations, civil-military operations, intelligence and counterintelligence operations²⁸.

- Economic, energy and political pressures – actions of variable duration and intensity, depending of the interaction, relationship and buck effects which could be affected to the side who use pressure. Effects depends of economic and energy capacity of the state which is object of the pressure, and mutual interdependence of the state (or supranational entity)

²⁶ Военная доктрина Российской Федерации, (2014), Москва,.

²⁷ Национальный центр управления обороной Российской Федерации, http://structure.mil.ru/structure/ministry_of_defence/details.htm?id=11206@egOrganization/:10.03.2017.

²⁸ Department of Defense of US Government, (2007), *Irregular Warfare (IW)-Joint Operating Concept (IOC)*, 2007, Washington, DC, p. 7.

which apply pressure and the state which is the object of acts. Direct effects distress the complete object state, including its military power, and indirect could be expressed through the increase of poverty, expressing public dissatisfaction, collective apathy, losing of support for the state leadership, civilian protests and riots and so on. The complexity of hybrid forms of endangering national security in the energy and economic field stems rise from the fact, that this area impose negative impacts to the entire state structure, compromising its functional capacity, encouraging the internal instability and public dissatisfaction, rise the sense of frustration among the population, etc.²⁹

- Information, media, Internet and its platforms - variable intensity activities, depending on the phase of others forms/fields implementation. Time of submission is usually long-term and depends of the goals and the phase of implementation of other hybrid activities. Usually is implemented by synchronized way, with common synergistic performance of multiple instruments and with a strong variable dynamics. The essence of achievement in this field is the penetration and changes of public opinion, as well as, the introduction of doubt, uncertainty and fear. Strong influence on public opinion is based upon on spreading of a diametrically opposed views and perceptions, different or changed interpretations of the same events, which are broadcasted extensively through various media (radio, television, Internet, social networks, etc.). In process are used instruments of propaganda, half-truths, organized "spontaneously" group attitudes (especially via social networking platforms), "internet trolling;"³⁰, "spinning", etc.

- Public diplomacy-low-intensity, very long-term-oriented, comprehensive hybrid operation tool, which makes it more diverse activities in the sphere of social life. In the early papers, public diplomacy is explained as an activity that "...deals with the influence on public attitudes in relation to the formulation and realization of foreign policy. Includes international relations beyond traditional diplomacy; handles relations public opinion in other countries; [An instrument of] the interaction of interests of individual interest groups and states; delivering analysis and opinions concerning foreign policy and the impact on its implementation; [Instrument for] communications between professional services, such as diplomats and foreign correspondents; [Represents] the process of intercultural communication"³¹. From inception to date, the essence of public diplomacy has not lost its primary purpose: to influence the creation of relation with a country outside the operation of the channel classic diplomacy has been reduced by applying the broadest model of communication at the level of society. In addition, public diplomacy is directly linked to the concept of soft power, which is processed by Nye, in a way that, according to him, among other things, soft power is based on intangible and indirect impacts such as culture, social values and ideology³². In short, it can be concluded that public diplomacy activities from the ranks of the broadest corps of social life: culture, education, education, religion, entertainment industry, non-governmental organizations, political movements and associations, civil initiatives and others that are undertaken to influence public the opinion of a state.

29 Miroslav Mitrović, (2017), "Ekonomski i energetske aspekti hibridnog ugrožavanja nacionalne bezbednosti", Vojno delo, 6/2017.

30 NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence, (2011), *Internet Trolling as a hybrid warfare tool: the case of Latvia*.

31 Murrow Center, "What is Public Diplomacy?" <http://fletcher.tufts.edu/Murrow/Diplomacy.html>/10.11.2016.

32 Joseph S. Nye, Jr., (1990), "The misleading metaphor of decline," *The Atlantic Monthly*, March 1990.

CONCLUSIONS

Previous analysis, indicate that the hybrid forms of security threats are presence and vivid as concept, which is developed and implemented in contemporary global security environment. Conflicts which are raised and managed as hybrid concept could have dynamic, synergy based and flexible application forms of special units, guerrillas, psychological operations, civil unrest, various forms of internal revolution, economic, diplomatic and political, informational and media campaign. Usage of all listed above, with possible event variations, depends of strategic declared aims and contemporary geopolitical relations. Operational usage of hybrid concept have aim to achieve strategy predominance and to disrupting the national security system of the aimed state. Implementation of concept of hybrid security threats concept in colloquial discussions is recognized as "Hybrid warfare".

Analysis of main pillows of implementation, indicate that the various type of hybrid security threats, are implemented intertwined, and that the action, time and target are conditioned. Also, it is noticeable that the intensity and time of realization are not identical and actions which contribute to hybrid nature of phenomena. For example, special operations have the strongest intensity, but the time is very limited. On the other hand, public diplomacy has very long-term implementation agenda, based on the nature of the used soft power instruments. Economic and energy instruments have variable intensity and duration, depending by the attitude of the desired aims as well as the effect, but also, its correlate wit their own economic and energy interests. The media and the Internet as a means of communication, as well contemporary used social networks, have supporting and catalyst role. The analysis of the field of action, possible means of enforcement as well as the holders or the protagonists, indicate that the basic characteristics of hybrid warfare are: comprehensiveness, flexibility and asymmetry.

As prevention and response to potential threats hybrid, based on the identified indicators, forms and range of operation, as well as the instruments of implementation, it is possible to distinct out the necessity of establishing the favorite state's conditions:

- Stable internal political scene with developed democracy instruments and functional state administration, with an efficient judiciary and police;
- Strong foreign policy integrity and a real authority in international relations with a strategically built relationships based on common interests;
- Long term developed and stable economy with the requisite degree of energy sovereignty;
- Tracking and understanding the origin of extremism with developed mechanisms for its control, as well as systematic struggle with organized crime;
- Dialogue and cooperation with neighboring countries, especially in ethnically and religiously mixed regions as well as developed a dialogue with ethnic minorities and their proportional participation in social and political life;
- Education and training of the population for raising the general level of awareness, reducing the influence of media and information manipulation;
- Efforts to establish reciprocity in the development and implementation of public diplomacy;
- Application of knowledge and experience in the development of defense doctrine and the permanent training and education of personnel in connection with the current hybrid forms of warfare;

In short, functional, developed and systematic organized state, which objectively considered their opportunities, challenges, risks and threats, and engages the necessary resources to eliminate them, suppression or prevention, has a real opportunity to become potentially difficult and demanding object for possible hybrid operations.

REFERENCES

1. Cebrowski Arthur, Garstka John, (1998), *Network-Centric Warfare: Its Origin and Future*, U.S. Naval Institute.
2. Cox Robert, (1996), "Perspektive of Globalization" in ed. Mittelman, J.H., *Globalization-critical reflections*, Lynne Rienner Publisher.
3. Darius Mahdi N., (2014), "Iraq and Syria are Burning, "Constructive Chaos" and America's Broader Strategy to Conquer Eurasia." *GlobalResearch.ca*.
4. Department of Defense of US Government, (2007), *Irregular Warfare (IW)-Joint Operating Concept (JOC)*, 2007, Washington, DC.
5. Hart Liddell, (1954), "The Strategy of Indirect Approach." National War College Internet Archive, 1954.
6. Headquarters Department of the Arm, (2010), *TC 18-01 Special Forces Unconventional Warfare*, Washington, DC.
7. Headquarters, Department of the Army, (2008), *Field Manual No. 3-0: Operations*, Washington, DC.
8. Hofman Frank G., (2007) *Conflict in the 21st Century-The Rise of Hibrid Wars*, Potomac Institute for Policy Studies.
9. Joseph S. Nye, Jr., (1990), "The misleading metaphor of decline," *The Atlantic Monthly*, March 1990.
10. Kofman Michael, McDermott Roger, (2015), "No Return to Cold War in Russia's New Military Doctrine," *Eurasia Review*.
11. Korybko Andrew, (2015), *Hybrid Wars: the indirect adaptive approach to regime change*, Moscow, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia.
12. Lind William, Nightengale Keith, Schmitt John, Sutton Joseph, Wilson Gary, (1989), "The Changing Face of War: Into the Fourth Generation", *Marine Corps Gazette*.
13. Mann Steven, (1992) "Chaos Theory and Strategic Thought", *Parameters*, Autumn 1992.
14. McCulloh Timothy, Johnson Richard, (2016), *Hybrid Warfare*, Tampa, JSOU.
15. Mitrović Miroslav, (2017), "Ekonomski i energetske aspekti hibridnog ugrožavanja nacionalne bezbednosti", *Vojno delo*, 3/2017.
16. Mitrović Miroslav, "Hibridno ratovanje i asimetrične bezbednosne pretnje", *Beograd: Vojno delo*, 2/2017.
17. Murrow Center, "What is Public Diplomacy?", Retrived from: <http://fletcher.tufts.edu/Murrow/Diplomacy.html>/10.11.2016.
18. Naj Džozef, (2006)., *Kako razumeti međunarodne odnose*, Stubovi kulture, Beograd.
19. NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence, (2011), *Internet Trolling as a hybrid warfare tool: the case of Latvia*.
20. Peritz Aki J., Rosenbach Eric, (2009), *Covert Action*, Belfer Centre Memorandum.
21. Renz Bettina., Smith Hanna, (2016) *Russia And Hybrid Warfare –Going Beyond The Label*, Finnish PMO.
22. Savin Leonid, (2011), "Network Centric Strategies in the Arab Spring", *Open Revolt!*
23. Shahskov Sergei, (2011) "The theory of 'manageable chaos' put into practice." *Strategic Culture Foundation*.

24. Štrbac Katarina, Mitrović Miroslav, (2012), "Interdisciplinarni pristup naukama bezbednosti i odbrane", Politička revija, broj 3/2012.
25. US Joint Chiefs of Staff, (2015), *National Military Strategy of USA*.
26. Watson John, "Sun Tzu's Art of War - Chapter 3: Attack by Stratagem". <http://suntzusaid.com/book/3> >./12/02/2017.
27. Военная доктрина Российской Федерации, (2010), Москва.
28. Военная доктрина Российской Федерации, (2014), Москва.
29. Национальный центр управления обороной Российской Федерации, http://structure.mil.ru/structure/ministry_of_defence/details.htm?id=11206@egOrganization/:10.03.2017.
30. Слипченко Владимир, (1999), *Война будущего*. Moscow: Московский Общественный Научный Фонд.