

Copyright @ 2026 Exclusive Risk Assessment (www.rieas.gr) 24 January 2026, Athens, Greece. To use content from the Research Institute for European and American Studies (RIEAS) publication, anyone needs to obtain permission from the copyright holder, which is RIEAS in order to reproduce the content of the publication: Contact: secretary@rieas.gr

Hybrid Conflict Demands a New Security Paradigm

Demetrios Tsailas (ret Admiral)

(He has taught for many years, operational planning, strategy, and security, to senior officers at the Supreme Joint War College. He is a member and researcher of the Institute for National and International Security)

Copyright: @ 2025 Research Institute for European and American Studies (www.rieas.gr) Publication date: 24 January 2026

Note: The article reflects the opinion of the author and not necessarily the views of the Research Institute for European and American Studies

In the evolving landscape of international conflict, hybrid warfare has emerged as a defining feature of 21st-century statecraft. Though some analysts view it as a novel development, others rightly point out that hybrid tactics, the fusion of conventional military force with unconventional and subversive tools, have deep historical roots. What sets today's hybrid warfare apart is its unprecedented scale, speed, and strategic centrality in an era dominated by digital connectivity, information warfare, and cognitive manipulation.

Hybrid Warfare's Modern Turn

Modern hybrid conflict frequently operates below the threshold of open warfare. Its goal is deceptively simple yet profoundly destabilizing: to achieve political or strategic objectives without triggering a traditional military response. It is precisely this deniability that makes hybrid warfare so attractive to both authoritarian regimes and democratic states.

Copyright @ 2026 Exclusive Risk Assessment (www.rieas.gr) 24 January 2026, Athens, Greece. To use content from the Research Institute for European and American Studies (RIEAS) publication, anyone needs to obtain permission from the copyright holder, which is RIEAS in order to reproduce the content of the publication: Contact: secretary@rieas.gr

Two events illustrate its modern evolution. First, the repeated and often coordinated arrival of undocumented migrants across the Mediterranean, particularly through North Africa and into southern Europe, highlights the use of migration as a geopolitical tool. In countries such as Libya and Tunisia, where weak governance and security vacuums have allowed various actors to operate with impunity, there is mounting evidence that certain groups, including militias and traffickers with political motives, have leveraged human movement to generate instability. At times, European intelligence and humanitarian organizations have flagged cases where migration surges appeared to coincide with diplomatic tensions, suggesting a deliberate strategy to manipulate migratory flows for leverage in negotiations over aid, recognition, or sanctions relief. In Italy, Greece, and Malta, the resulting pressures on asylum systems and public services have had destabilizing political effects, fueling anti-immigrant sentiment and deepening social divisions. Though undeniably a humanitarian crisis, this dynamic also exemplifies how irregular migration can be instrumentalized in hybrid conflict to test and fracture European cohesion. Several instances have raised concerns about state or non-state actors deliberately facilitating these movements to exert pressure on European governments and test the resilience of their border policies. Though it was also a humanitarian crisis, analysts recognized it as a form of asymmetric pressure designed to destabilize European unity and institutions.

Second, Russia's 2014 annexation of Crimea stands as a textbook case of hybrid aggression executed with strategic precision. Moscow employed an intricate and layered approach that included the deployment of unmarked soldiers known as "little green men," a barrage of disinformation targeting both local and international audiences, and the mobilization of local proxies to stage political unrest. Simultaneously, Russia used economic leverage, such as energy dependency and trade disruption, to apply pressure on Ukraine and deter Western intervention. What made the operation particularly effective was its ambiguity: The Kremlin persistently denied involvement, framing the intervention as a grassroots uprising. This deliberate

Copyright @ 2026 Exclusive Risk Assessment (www.rieas.gr) 24 January 2026, Athens, Greece. To use content from the Research Institute for European and American Studies (RIEAS) publication, anyone needs to obtain permission from the copyright holder, which is RIEAS in order to reproduce the content of the publication: Contact: secretary@rieas.gr

obfuscation complicated international response mechanisms, creating hesitation within NATO and the EU. The Crimea case demonstrated how hybrid warfare could achieve territorial and political objectives swiftly and with minimal conventional military engagement, all while operating under the threshold of collective defense clauses. It set a precedent for future gray zone tactics, revealing the potency of hybrid tools in achieving strategic aims without crossing the bright lines of open war.

The Two Defining Traits of Hybrid Warfare

Hybrid warfare is defined by two core characteristics. First, it blurs the boundary between war and peace, challenging traditional conceptions of conflict that rely on clear declarations and visible confrontations. Hybrid tactics allow aggressors to destabilize societies and undermine governments without provoking a kinetic military response or invoking collective defense mechanisms. These methods are insidious precisely because they operate in a space where laws of war are unclear and norms are still evolving. Disinformation campaigns sow doubt and confusion, cyberattacks disable critical infrastructure and steal sensitive data, electoral interference manipulates democratic processes, and economic coercion creates dependency and leverage. Each of these tools operates in the shadows of legality and attribution, making them both highly effective and difficult to deter. This gray zone of conflict is now a permanent feature of the strategic landscape—one where actions may be invisible, effects are cumulative, and the line between attack and influence is deliberately obscured.

Second, hybrid operations thrive on ambiguity and plausible deniability, making them both strategically potent and legally evasive. By operating in the shadows and manipulating perception, hybrid actors can stall or splinter international responses, exploiting bureaucratic inertia and diplomatic caution. The murkiness surrounding attribution, often compounded by sophisticated disinformation and false flag operations, confounds intelligence assessments and stokes public skepticism.

Copyright @ 2026 Exclusive Risk Assessment (www.rieas.gr) 24 January 2026, Athens, Greece. To use content from the Research Institute for European and American Studies (RIEAS) publication, anyone needs to obtain permission from the copyright holder, which is RIEAS in order to reproduce the content of the publication: Contact: secretary@rieas.gr

Motives are concealed behind layers of narrative warfare, and the absence of visible aggression muddies the threshold for legitimate retaliation. In such conditions, democratic states, in particular, find it difficult to generate political consensus for action. Legal frameworks lag behind these novel tactics, and diplomatic channels struggle to assign blame without hard evidence. The result is strategic paralysis: a fog of war that descends long before a single shot is fired, numbing decision-making and allowing adversaries to advance their objectives unopposed.

A Shift in the Philosophy of War

This new strategic environment demands a reexamination of foundational concepts of war and conflict. Can war occur without combat? Can an adversary be neutralized without deploying conventional forces? Increasingly, the answer is yes. As Sun Tzu wrote, "The supreme art of war is to subdue the enemy without fighting."

Hybrid warfare is the modern embodiment of this timeless wisdom. It transforms war into a contest of perception, narrative, and legitimacy. Rather than seizing territory through force, hybrid actors aim to control the information space, reshape social realities, and erode the psychological foundations of power. In doing so, they undermine public confidence in institutions, foment distrust between citizens and governments, and exploit societal fractures to weaken state authority from within.

Clausewitz's enduring dictum that "war is the continuation of politics by other means" still holds, but the means have evolved far beyond traditional battlefields. In the digital age, influence, whether through viral disinformation, cultural manipulation, or strategic silence, can prove more decisive than firepower. Today, memes can rival missiles in strategic impact, and control over public narrative can tip the scales of geopolitical confrontation.

Copyright @ 2026 Exclusive Risk Assessment (www.rieas.gr) 24 January 2026, Athens, Greece. To use content from the Research Institute for European and American Studies (RIEAS) publication, anyone needs to obtain permission from the copyright holder, which is RIEAS in order to reproduce the content of the publication: Contact: secretary@rieas.gr

Understanding this shift is essential. Victory in hybrid conflict is not measured by territory gained, but by legitimacy eroded, alliances fractured, and trust dissolved. It is a slow, silent, and often invisible war—but one no less dangerous than its kinetic counterpart.

Undermining the Foundations of State Power

Hybrid warfare attacks states on two interconnected fronts. The first is functional—hybrid actors aim to systematically weaken a state’s capacity to operate across multiple domains. This approach involves exploiting vulnerabilities in the political, military, economic, social, informational, and infrastructure spheres, thereby eroding the state’s ability to respond effectively to any one threat.

For instance, in the cyber domain, sophisticated attacks on critical infrastructure, such as power grids, water supplies, or financial systems, can destabilize a nation by crippling its essential services. Russia’s 2007 cyberattack on Estonia is a prime example, where cyber warfare targeted government websites, banks, and media outlets, throwing the country into disarray and undermining its confidence in its digital infrastructure. Similarly, economic sanctions or trade restrictions, such as those imposed on Venezuela, can induce long-term economic strife, further straining political stability.

In the political realm, hybrid warfare can involve the manipulation of public opinion through disinformation campaigns that distort the facts, breed mistrust, and deepen political divides. A modern example of this is Russia’s involvement in the 2016 U.S. presidential election, where information warfare—via social media manipulation and the leaking of hacked materials—created social polarization and questioned the integrity of democratic processes.

In the social domain, hybrid warfare can foment unrest and disrupt social cohesion, with local or foreign actors orchestrating protests, labor strikes, or mass

Copyright @ 2026 Exclusive Risk Assessment (www.rieas.gr) 24 January 2026, Athens, Greece. To use content from the Research Institute for European and American Studies (RIEAS) publication, anyone needs to obtain permission from the copyright holder, which is RIEAS in order to reproduce the content of the publication: Contact: secretary@rieas.gr

migrations that place significant strain on governmental institutions. The migration crisis in Europe, where irregular migration flows were sometimes leveraged for political ends, offers an example of how such tactics can destabilize border control and political systems.

By attacking across these interconnected domains, hybrid warfare creates a strategic environment where the state is overwhelmed, unable to respond effectively to each individual challenge. The goal is not just to inflict direct damage but to weaken the state's overall resilience, making it less capable of organizing a unified defense and less likely to secure public support for military or political action.

The second front is ideological. Here, the aim is more insidious: to erode the bond between state and society. Democratic legitimacy rests on public trust. Hybrid operations, especially disinformation and influence campaigns, target that trust, aiming to delegitimize institutions, polarize public opinion, and sow internal discord. In open societies, where consent is more critical than coercion, the erosion of trust can lead to institutional paralysis and societal fragmentation.

Toward a New Strategic Imperative: Trust

Hybrid threats demand far more than conventional military deterrence. They require a fundamental shift in strategic thinking, one that prioritizes societal resilience as the cornerstone of national defense. At the heart of that resilience lies trust: trust in public institutions, in elected leadership, in democratic processes, and among citizens themselves.

Trust is not an abstract virtue; it is a tangible strategic asset. In an age where disinformation, cognitive manipulation, and perception warfare are used to fragment societies from within, the integrity of the social contract becomes a critical line of defense. When trust erodes—whether in the legitimacy of elections, the credibility of the media, or the impartiality of justice—societies become more susceptible to

Copyright @ 2026 Exclusive Risk Assessment (www.rieas.gr) 24 January 2026, Athens, Greece. To use content from the Research Institute for European and American Studies (RIEAS) publication, anyone needs to obtain permission from the copyright holder, which is RIEAS in order to reproduce the content of the publication: Contact: secretary@rieas.gr

external manipulation and internal polarization. Hybrid actors exploit this erosion to turn populations against themselves, hollowing out democracies without ever crossing a border.

Building and sustaining trust must, therefore, become a core objective of national security policy. This involves fostering transparency through open government practices, ensuring accountability at all levels of leadership, and promoting inclusive governance that reflects and respects societal diversity. It also requires the elevation of strategic communication—not merely to counter falsehoods but to shape truthful, compelling narratives that reinforce democratic legitimacy and civic cohesion.

Equally vital is the reinforcement of international alliances and partnerships grounded in mutual trust and shared values. In the face of hybrid threats that often span borders and domains, no single nation can stand alone. Collective resilience demands interoperable systems, joint threat assessments, coordinated responses, and the political will to defend democratic norms wherever they are threatened.

Trust is not a “soft” response, it is a strategic imperative. It is the connective tissue of democratic resilience. Without it, societies fracture; institutions falter; and deterrence fails. With it, nations can withstand pressure, absorb shocks, and adapt to the fluid threats of hybrid warfare. In this new paradigm of conflict, trust is not the reward for security, it is its precondition.

Conclusion: A New Warfighting Paradigm

The wars of the 21st century are unlikely to be declared through formal proclamations or waged through traditional military campaigns. They may unfold without a single missile launched or a uniformed soldier deployed. Yet their consequences are no less profound. Hybrid warfare has fundamentally redefined the

Copyright @ 2026 Exclusive Risk Assessment (www.rieas.gr) 24 January 2026, Athens, Greece. To use content from the Research Institute for European and American Studies (RIEAS) publication, anyone needs to obtain permission from the copyright holder, which is RIEAS in order to reproduce the content of the publication: Contact: secretary@rieas.gr

nature of conflict, redirecting the locus of confrontation from the battlefield to the spheres of information, identity, and perception.

In this emergent paradigm, the aim is not merely to vanquish opposing forces but to corrode the coherence of adversarial societies, to fragment their politics, weaken their institutions, and erode their sense of collective purpose. Hybrid actors seek not to win wars in the traditional sense, but to make resistance appear futile and governance untenable.

Responding effectively to this challenge requires democratic states to adopt a comprehensive approach that transcends conventional defense. The new strategic imperative must be rooted in holistic societal resilience, a sophisticated understanding of cognitive and informational vulnerabilities, and the fortification of public trust. National security policy must expand to include not only hard power but also the preservation of democratic legitimacy, civic education, and credible communication.

The fog of hybrid war is dense—filled with manufactured doubt, strategic distraction, and deliberate ambiguity. But clarity is possible. It begins with recognizing that resilience, cohesion, and trust are no longer peripheral concerns but central pillars of national defense. Strengthening the bonds that hold societies together is not merely a moral endeavor, it is a strategic necessity.

In the era of hybrid warfare, the measure of strength is not simply the ability to project power, but the capacity to absorb disruption, maintain cohesion, and uphold legitimacy. These are the battles of the present—and they will define the victories of the future.

References

Clarke, R. A., & Knake, R. K. (2010). *Cyber war: The next threat to national security and what to do about it*. HarperCollins.

Clausewitz, C. von. (1976). *On war* (M. Howard & P. Paret, Trans.). Princeton University Press.

European Union Agency for Cybersecurity. (2020). *ENISA threat landscape report 2020*. Publications Office of the European Union.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. Free Press.

Fukuyama, F. (2018). *Identity: The demand for dignity and the politics of resentment*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Galeotti, M. (2019). *We need to talk about Putin: How the West gets him wrong*. Ebury Press.

Greenhill, K. M. (2010). *Weapons of mass migration: Forced displacement, coercion, and foreign policy*. Cornell University Press.

Greenhill, K. M. (2016). Migration as a weapon in theory and practice. *Political Science Quarterly*.

Hoffman, F. G. (2014). Hybrid warfare and challenges. *Joint Force Quarterly*.

Libicki, M. C. (2009). *Cyberdeterrence and cyberwar*. RAND Corporation.

Mazarr, M. J. (2015). *Mastering the gray zone: Understanding a changing era of conflict*. RAND Corporation.

NATO (2021) *Resilience and Article 3*. NATO Headquarters.

NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence. (2017). *Hybrid threats: A strategic communications perspective*.

Nye, J. S., Jr. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. PublicAffairs.

Sun Tzu. (2005). *The art of war* (T. Cleary, Trans.). Shambhala Publications.