Hybrid Threats and New Conflicts in the International System

Aşkın İnci Sökmen Alaca[1]

Abstract

Within this international system in which states perceive either order or disorder relatively, in this post-modernity environment that states share with the actors beside other states, states are under many threats and risks that may result in their elimination from the system, or, in other words, "their collapse." Multiple complex threats or hybrid threats and the complexity, spread and vagueness of these threats constitute security problems. Threats related to security at three levels being individual, state and international system may create danger and risk for one another. The instabilities in the economic structure of the global system and environmental problems create security threats that concern humanity and states directly in the global dimension. That the civil war of a country becomes an international one with the participation of the participating parties, which is also a social security threat, has increased the probability of the occurrence of regional and world wars just as in the example of Ukraine and Syria. At the individual level, while "Lone Wolf" terrorists create both social and political security problems within the state, they may lead to crises that may turn into wars between two states just as in the example of the incident that led to World War I. Just as in the development of information technologies, these technological developments create a basis for suitable environments for non-state actors to achieve their targets while enabling control and war capabilities for states. This article will touch upon the analysis of the practical applications of the new hybrid threats and new conflicts in the international system.

Keywords: Hybrid Threats, New conflicts, Terrorism, Unrestricted warfare

---

[1]Assistant Professor at İstanbul Arel University, the department of International Relations. E mail : askinsokmen @arel.edu.tr

Introduction

We are now in the 21st century with a weaker world order and stability with the expectation that a wave will raise all new developing countries while dropping the USA, Japan, and Europe, among the power focuses of the world, where no global leadership exists. Within this international system in which states perceive either order or disorder relatively, in this post-modernity environment that states share with the actors beside other states, states are under many threats and risks that may result in their elimination from the system, or, in other words, "their collapse."Multiple complex threats and the complexity, spread and vagueness of these threats constitute security problems.

Threats related to security at three levels being individual, state and international system may create danger and risk for one another. The instabilities in the economic structure of the global system and environmental problems create security threats that concern humanity and states directly in the global dimension. That the civil war of a country becomes an international one with the participation of the participating parties, which is also a social security threat, has increased the probability of the occurrence of regional and world wars just as in the example of Ukraine and Syria.

At the individual level, while "*Lone Wolf*" terrorists create both social and political security problems within the state, they may lead to crises that may turn into wars between two states just as in the example of the incident that led to World War I. Just as in the development of information technologies, these technological developments create a basis for suitable environments for non-state actors to achieve their targets while enabling control and war capabilities for states. This article will touch upon the analysis of the practical applications of the new hybrid threats and the new conflicts in the international system.

New Security Agendas

Security studies which are one of the sub-disciplines of international discipline try to explain the new security challenges emerging in the international system with technological and cyclical developments with new approaches (constructivism, critical theory, and feminism, their differences in subject, perceptions of threats, etc.) on a theoretical ground.

The new approaches made security agenda broader and deeper. Following the great transformation in the international security field between the years 1989-90, non-military threats (economic problems, mass migration, pandemic diseases, environmental scarcity, etc.) broadened the security agenda.

The discussion of *"which security should have priority?"* on the subject in the security studies that are tried to be protected also deepened the security agenda. About the issue of "which security should have priority?", the orthodox security approach from the realist perspective revealed state-centric security which prioritized the existence,   integrity, and sovereignty of the state while post-cold war critical security studies revealed human-centric security which prioritized individual rights and freedoms. The security dialectic continuing around both approaches is related to two different objects (the state and the people) taken as a reference by the security concept and to internal and external threats to these two objects[2].

The human development report published by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 1984 led to a new *"human-centric"* security approach in the field of national/international security. The security of human approach, which is a new notion of security, was based on "freedom from fear and want" which had first been mentioned by US President Roosevelt and then added to the UN Convention on Human Rights. This approach aimed at making sovereign the idea that the security can be achieved not with the weapons but sustainable human development which means freedom from poverty, hunger, unemployment, epidemics, torture, social conflicts; the right to a fair trial and meet the basic needs, and freedom from discrimination. The UN report gathered the threats to the security in seven groups: economic, health, food, and personal, and community, environmental and political threats[3].

---

[2]Pauline Kerr, "The Evolving dialectic between state-centric and human-centric security" Working Paper 2003/2, Australian National University Department of International Relations Publication, http://www.hegoa.ehu.es/dossierra/seguridad/The_evolving_dialectic_between_state_centric_and_human_centr.pdfand "Human Security" in **Contemporary Security Studies, (**ed.) Alan Collins, Oxford University Press, Second Edition, 2010, pp.121-136.
[3]UNDP, **Human Development Report 1994**, New York: Oxford University Press, 1994, p.3, 24; See also Human Security Now Commission on Human Security, New York, 2003, http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/91BAEEDBA50C6907C1256D19006A9353-chs-security-may03.pdf; S. Tadjbakhsh and A. M. Chenoy, Human Security: Concepts and Implications, Routledge, 2006.

Copenhagen School[4] in security studies, Barry Buzan with the "*sectoral analysis*" and Ole Waever with the "*securitization*" concept made a contribution to critical security studies. Barry Buzan narrowed the objects under the name "*sectoral security*" referenced by security and divided them into five sectors[5]. He named the "*lenses*" that he used to explain a specific part when examining a holistic reality as "sectoral"[5]. In addition to economic, social, environmental and political security, military security which had been the main reference of the security during the Cold War was also included in these sectors.

Five sectors do not operate in isolation from each other. The military sector can affect all components of the state. Buzan created a synthesis of both human-centric and state-centric approaches. From a different angle, like several authors, he emphasized that state must be the main referent in the security analysis. In their "*Security: a New Framework for Analysis* (1998)" book, Buzan, Obe Waever and Jaap de Wilde also defended the opinion of the realists which is the traditional security approach by identifying the security concept as a matter of survival or the survival of the state[6].

Another contribution of the Copenhagen School to the international security studies is "*securitization /desecuritization*" concepts developed by Ole Waeverin the 1990s. Although it is not accepted to perceive any problem that is experienced as a security problem, any problem can become a security problem within a certain time period. It claims that any specific matter can be non-politicized, politicized or securitized. Securitization which is a process is described as the excessive politicization of the issue as well[7].

This process which is created by the government and political elite when creating security policies enables the preparation of the suitable ground for their own political ideology to identify internal and external enemies.

---

[4]Copenhagen School is a group formed by the scientists working for Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (COPRI) which was established by the Danish Parliament in 1985 to conduct research on peace and security issues. Academicians such as Barry Buzan, Ole Waever, Jaap de Wilde, Morten Kelstrup, Pierre Lemaitre and ElzbietaTromer are among these people.

[5]Barry Buzan, "New Patterns of Global Security in the Twenty-First Century ", **International Affairs**, Vol 67, No 3, 1991, pp.431-451;

[6] Ibid. 34-5

[7]Ole Waever, "Securitization and Desecuritization "in R. Lipshutz (ed), **On Security**, New York: Colombia University Press, pp.46-86.

In terms of new conceptualizations, it is possible to say that "human security-oriented" approach remained in the background as a result of today's developments. "Freedom from fear and want" started the protests referred to as "*the Arab Spring*" in the Middle East and North Africa in 2011, and the people living under dictatorial regimes demanded a transition to democracy.

It led to the emergence of new dangers in Libya and Syria which threatened the regional and global security, except Tunisia. Although the situation in Libya led to the application of Responsible for Protection (R2P) implementation for international community, the unstable situation in the country today created a safe haven for many terrorist organizations and warlords. An international armed intervention which was made with justified reasons did not stop illegal migration, trafficking in human beings, refugees, child soldiers and organized crime problems which are referred to as structural violence[8].

In other words, humanitarian intervention has not solved the problem which is responsible for protecting human security against structural violence. Similarly, the civil war currently ongoing in Syria, human security problems of refugees and asylum seekers escaping from the war have not been able to be solved by the international community. Although Russia and China's veto for R2P implementation at the UN Security Council would be considered as a reason, asylum seekers, and refugees coming to Europe through Greece became a threat which was securitized on the basis of the European identity factionalizing Arab and Muslim communities.

While Germany choosing to apply a moderate policy had a huge response from other member states in the European Union, more drastic measures were taken in countries such as Hungary and Slovakia. In fact, both the female and young population is an opportunity for refugees and asylum seekers in terms of emancipation and modernization in the social environment of Europe based on liberal values, the movements such as Germany-based Patriotic Europeans against the

---

[8] Structural Violence refers to a form of violence wherein some social structure or social institution may harm people by preventing them from meeting their basic needs. Johan Galtung, "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research", **Journal of Peace Research**, Vol 6, No. 3 (1969) pp.167-191.

Islamization of the West (Pegida[9]) organization led to an increase in racist attitudes towards Muslim immigrants and asylum seekers. PEGIDA movement made demonstrations in 14countries in January 2016 within the European Union consisting of 29 member states[10].

This rising xenophobia and the reasons on which islam ophobia is based are also directly connected with global terrorism activities happened. Terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda defined as Afghanistan-based global terror since 11 September 2001 and Islamic State(IS, formerly ISIS, ISIL) emerged in Syria and Iraq territories led to a perception of Islam as a religion letting and promoting the use of violence as a method for its worldview and political purposes.

Two terrorist incidents that took place in Paris in November and December 2015 led to further strengthening of this fear[11]. As also noted by David Baldwin (1997), sacrificing the "multiculturalism" value on which the EU is based was required to prevent the destruction of the state (he argues that pursuing security requires sacrificing other values) [11]. It is observed that state-centric security approach is now in front of the human-centric security approach about what security should be provided. It is observed that a relative perception based on religion has been adopted by Western Countries in terms of human security. (The West is different in sensing and identifying danger and threats to human security).

In terms of international security, anew comprehensive definition was conceptualized as "the Multi-Sum Security Principle" by Saudi Professor Nayef Al-Rodh. This principle is based on the symbiotic realism theory of international relations.

---

[9] PEGIDA was established in Dresden in Germany in 2014. The movement opposes what it considers the Islamization of the Western World and demands more restrictive immigration rules It also opened centersin Norway, Austria, Switzerland, Sweden, Italy, and Spain.

[10] **Daily Sabah** , "Pegida to organize anti Islam demonstrations in 14 European Countries" (January 24, 2016) http://www.dailysabah.com/europe/2016/01/25/pegida-to-organize-anti-islam-demonstrations-in-14-european-countries

[11]**France 24,** "French 2015 Terror Attacks a 'Dress Rehearsal 'for 2016, Experts Say". (January 11, 2016) http://www.france24.com/en/20160111-france-november-13-paris-attacks-terrorism-charlie-hebdo-intelligence-security

According to that theory, the unitary actors in global politics beyond state and non-state actors are in anon-conflictual competition that allows an absolute gain in a symbiotic realist framework.[12] International peace and security can only be attained through a governance structure that ensures a mutually beneficial (symbiotic) coexistence for all actors in the global system. The cooperative security interactions between states and cultures which are based on mutual win-win principle should be based on global justice.

According to it, global security has five dimensions: human, environmental, national, and transnational and Tran's cultural security. Therefore, without good governance, global security or the security of any state cannot be achieved.[13]The international security approach of Rodhan, which is close to the views of British School in terms of the importance given to the global justice and global governance concepts, can constitute an important criterion for assessing the results of the G-20 meeting. The orientation of the national interests of the states pursuing competition and power to the absolute gain does not seem realistic. The difference of opinion about the new regulations in the international economic system between the US and China and different strategies (such as the creation of alternative institutions to the IMF and the World Bank) confirms this.

In essence, security concept is state-oriented and continues to be seen as a struggle of the state to survive and maintain its superiority against the security risks and threats of the international system. Today, strategic security within the realist security approach, which is shaped by the military, economic, political and technological competition between the US and China-Russia that can be called as *the Cold War 2.0,* may be a more correct term for the international system. The ongoing hostilities and interventionism between the US and Russian Federation re-emerged by the Ukraine Crisis and the implementation of containment policy of the US against China in Asia show the zero-sum struggle in which one of the states builds its future on the counter-collapse scenario of the other.

---

[12] Nayef Al-Rodha, **Symbiotic Realism: A Theory of International Relations in an Instant and an Interdependent World,** Geneva Center for Security Policy, 2007.
[13] Nayef Al-Rodha, **Five Dimensions of Global Security: Proposal for a Multi –Sum Security Principle,** Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Economic embargo and isolate policies are applied against Russia, NATO's military presence along Russia's borders, including in the Baltic States and Eastern Europe has increased, the US continues to give military and financial support to the countries that have disagreements with China on the South China Sea. This situation was formalized by the updated national security documents of the US, Russia, and China in which these countries consider the others as a threat[14]. A multipolar international system is perceived by the US as a threat that can give a start to war while Russia and China, with a revisionist approach, see it as an opportunity to form a fair international system based on equality.

Europe has a prominent position in this struggle. A reluctant partnership in which a crisis of confidence is experienced shapes the relations between the US and Europe (except the UK) that form the transatlantic alliance. The mega deal, Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership agreement, which had been expected to be signed was boycotted by the protests attended by large masses in almost all European countries. Three million European citizens have signed a petition for their opposition, of which 500,000 were from Britain alone[15].

For the first time, the people of Europe see the US as a threat to their economic interests. While the events starting with 2008 economic crisis in the US revealed the greatest impact in Europe, it was the primary priority of Europe to get financial support from China as a savior country within the context of the Comprehensive Strategic Partnership which had been started with China.

---

[14]The White House, **USA National Security Strategy**,(February 6, 2015) pp.10, 35. https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2015_national_security_strategy.pdf; Reuters, "Putin names United States among threats in New Russian Security Strategy" (January 2, 2016)   http://www.cnbc.com/2016/01/02/putin-names-united-states-among-threats-in-new-russian-security-strategy.html; James Follows, " Just How Great a Threat Is China ?",**The Atlantic**, (June 4, 2015)   http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2015/06/about-the-china-threat-on-the-the-35th-of-may/394988/

[15]Graham Vanbergen, "Mass Protest Against TTIP Corporate Takeover: EU Commission Sanctions" Revolution Against Law", **Global Research**, (November 5, 2015), http://www.globalresearch.ca/mass-european-protest-against-ttip-corporate-takeover-eu-commission-sanctions-revolution-against-law/5486736

China's Silk Road Economic Belt project (so called "*One Belt One Road*") which is expected to be completed reveals a new way to further strengthening of trade ties with Europe which will be an alternative to the "*Silk Road Strategy Act*" of the US which was introduced in 1999 for Central Asia and South Caucasus on issues such as economic development, transportation, communication, border controls, reclamation of conflicts, democracy and civil society development[16]. The deepening of disagreements between the US and Europe in the Western-centric Global order can be seen as one of the most important historical breaks. Repetition of the basic crisis of the capitalist system, growing income inequality in the world that the left views started to gain importance in terms of alternative economic models accelerated the development to reduce the effectiveness of the US on economy and finance issues. It can be said that the adverse developments in the global system related to its power bring about a *hegemonic security*[17] problem for the US.

Hybrid Threats in the Global Security Environment

Today many defense analysts have agreed on that the future security environment will be a multi polar with inherent diversity and complexity. The future security dilemma will be based on hybrid threats. According to U.S. Army Training Circular (TC) 7-100[18], Hybrid threat is defined as a combination of regular forces, irregular forces and/or criminal elements all unified to achieve mutually benefitting effects. Multiple actors (nation state and non –state actors) and a range of diverse conflicts constitute hybrid threats. Power is also shifting to nontraditional actors and transnational concerns. In addition some hybrid threats will be a result of a state sponsoring non - state actor like Iran-Hezbollah terrorist organization. Media, technology, a state's social, political and military infrastructures can be used in hybrid threats.

---

[16] Shada Islam and Sophia Kablr, **EU-China Shaping A Shared Future**, Friends of Europe, Brussels, Spring 2015, pp.43-45,
http://www.friendsofeurope.org/media/uploads/2015/06/CHINA-BOOK-2015-WEB.pdf
[17] Barry Buzan and Lene Hansen, **The Evaluation of International Security Studies**, Cambridge University Press, 2009, p.52.
[18] U.S. Army Training Circular (TC) 7-100, HybridThreat (Washington, DC : U.S. Government Printing Office) 2010,
p.V.http://www.benning.army.mil/mssp/security%20topics/Potential%20Adversaries/content/pdf/tc7_100.pdf

Hybrid threats are not new. In the past, many states used all potential (regular and irregular forces together) to defend its enemies. Today they can take place in the economic, political, social and military domains. For example during the 2008 Russian-Georgian Conflict, Russia used many criminal elements in South Ossetia. Likewise Hezbollah employed mixed conventional capabilities (such as rockets and command-control networks) with irregular tactics (including information warfare, non-uniformed combatants and civilian) against Israel in 2006.

New Conflicts

Post-Cold War globalization had a serious impact on international security. Individuals, civil society organizations, the media, transnational corporations, terrorist groups and international criminal organizations formed an alternative power potential. Information technologies had a very important share in the development of this potential. Cyber war with computer and internet opportunities (robot soldiers, unmanned weapons, cyber-attacks, nanotechnology, and laser weapons) revealed an asymmetric power potential for countries having such technologies[19].

Cyber-attacks on critical system areas of the states are a continuation of the political struggle. Net wars are one of the new conflict areas, in which non-state groups, like terrorist groups, use network type organizational structure, doctrines, strategies and technologies in line with the information age. It is defined as a war of scattered small groups which, unlike in conventional war; plan their activities over a network[20]. Al-Qaeda terrorist organization which was settled on the world agenda after the terrorist attacks carried out on 11 September 2001 in the US adopts the network-based organizational model. The frightening characteristic of this terrorist organization called as global terrorism was that it had a terrorist network (networking) having links with different areas of the world. It facilitated the perception of Islam as a religion promoting the cultural violence by claiming that it started the conflict between the East and the West.

---

[19] Max Boot, **War Made New Weapons Warriors and The Making of The Modern World**, Gotham Books, 2006,s.430-9

[20] Arquilla John and Ronfeldt David," Netwar Revitised: The Fight for the Future Continues", R.Bunker (ed), Networks **Terrorism and Global Insurgency,** New York: Rout ledge Group, 2005. pp 8-20.

While technological developments re-format the areas of conflict, civil wars trigger multiple new armed struggles by gaining an international dimension. The Syrian Civil War that started in 2011 created the risks that can destroy the new world order with sectarian, regional and a new world war like black holes in space. It caused its conversion to a mutual power struggle of great states (the US-NATO members, Russia, and China) which intervened in the civil war and deepening of the conflict between Shiite and Sunni sects that started in 2003.

These civil wars causing the collapse of the countries located on the first and second peripheries of the world such as Liberia, Somalia, Iraq, Libya, and Syria as a result of the political interference of other great states are referred to as "state - disintegrating wars"[21]. These states which have failed or become fragile are in continuous crisis and create a great security risk for the international community.

A new threat posed by the civil war in Syria is the "*foreign fighters*" phenomenon. According to the UN Security Council Resolution 2178, foreign fighter terrorists are defined as "*individuals who travel to a state other than their state of residence or nationality for the purpose of the perpetration, planning, or preparation of, or participation in terrorist acts or the providing or receiving of terrorist training, including in connection with armed conflict*"[22]. These developments which are called "*The civilianization of armed conflict*" led to the increasing importance of non-state actors such as, "*refugee warriors*" or "*civilian augmentes*" in terms of international security and the national security of the states[23].

In other words, non-professional warriors and non-state actors are posing a greater threat to sovereign nations, making these warriors and actors more serious adversaries for every professional army. One of the reasons for this is that there can be foreign fighters among the refugees who are trying to reach Europe or already trying to live in various countries in Europe.

---

[21] Herfried Munkler, **New Wars**, UK : Polity Press, 2005, p.8
[22] **United Nations Security Council**, Resolution 2178, (September 24, 2014),p.2 http://www.un.org/en/sc/ctc/docs/2015/SCR%202178_2014_EN.pdf
[23] Andreas Wenger and Simon J. A. Mason, "The Civilianization of Armed Conflict: Trends and Implications" **International Review of Red Cross**, Volume 90, Number 872, December 2008.p. 836

Based on the data of London-based International Centre for the Study of Radicalization and Political Violence and New York-based Soufan Group, it is assumed that 20.000 warriors have come to Syria from 80 different countries of the world to war[24].The possibility that these individuals may go back to their country of origin led to the consideration that they may be threats in terms of "*individual terrorists* (Lone wolf[25]- lone individuals who are not part of terrorist organizations or state body, it might comprise of a wide variety of violent extremists[26]".

Since they are radicalized and feel stronger due to the military training they receive, there is a new possibility of a new attack[27]. On the other hand, that they have citizenship of various states includes the possibility of transforming the individual crimes into a war between two states. The government of the Republic of Serbia was forced to make a statement that they had no such an official policy due to the Serb snipers captured in terrorist groups in Cizre District located in the South Eastern region where Turkey's fight against terrorism continued[28].

The political consequences of this kind of individual assassinations that can cause the death of a key political actor of a country have a potential to create both regional and global security threats. These people can be transformed into the individuals that can be used by a third country or countries which want to start a war between two states or a regional war. The third reason is *the weaponization of migration*. Libya and Turkey use the migration as a pressure tool for their demands from the EU.

---

[24] Richard Barrett, **Foreign Fighters in Syria**, The Soufan Group Report, (June 2014): BBC News, "Battle For Iraq and Syria in Maps", (February 3, 2016)
http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-27838034
[25] See also detailed Ramon Spaaij, **Understanding Lone Wolf of Terrorism: Global Patterns, Motivations and Prevention**, New York : Springer, 2012, p.16.; Edwin Bakker and Beatrice de Graaf, Preventing Lone Wolf Terrorism Some CT Approaches Addressed", **Perspectives on Terrorism,** Vol 5, Issues 5-6 (2011),pp.443-50.
[26]**Euractiv,** "Islamic State Smuggling Terrorists among the migrants? Unlikely Say Experts", (August 28, 2015) http://www.euractiv.com/sections/global-europe/islamic-state-smuggling-terrorists-among-migrants-unlikely-say-experts-317160
[27] The Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Center, "Foreign Fighters in Syria", (December 2013)
[28]**Today's Zaman**, "Embassy Offers Help To Clarify Reports of Serbian Snipers in PKK", (January, 31, 2016) http://www.todayszaman.com/diplomacy_embassy-offers-help-to-clarify-reports-of-serbian-snipers-in-pkk_411059.html

Weaponization, which means the prevention of the migration in exchange for the fulfillment of the demands, is one of the conflicts between the states[29]. Finally, the problems emerging as a result of the migration may lead to the return of the socio-politic trauma which Europe had fallen into during World War II. Newly arrived refugees cause the problems to become more chronic in addition to the overall unemployment caused by the collapse of the economy due to the credit problems of the government in Greece, which is the gateway into Europe for those coming by sea[30]. The rise of *the Neo-Nazi activity* in the European Society[31], the re-appearance of red-wing terrorist organization Red Army Fraction(RAF) which is also known as the *Baader-Meinhof' Gang*[32] and the spread of racist and fascist organizations to all of Europe bear the characteristics of being the precursor of more serious security problems.

The basis of another crisis in which old conflicts are updated is based on the political competition among the major powers (the US-China-Russia) and their efforts to expand their spheres of influence. In "*Unrestricted Warfare*[33]", which is a book written by Qiao Liang and Wang Xiangsui who are two colonels in the People's Liberation Army of China, differently from Clausewitz an approach (i.e. the use of armed force to compel the enemy to submit to one's will), today's wars are defined as "*using all armed force or non-armed force, military and non-military, and lethal and non-lethal means to compel the enemy to accept one's interest*".

---

[29]Kelly M. Greenhill, "The Weaponization of Migration" in **Connectivity Wars Why Migration, Finance and Trade Are The Geo-Economic Battlegrounds of The Future**, (ed) Mark Leonard, EFCR, 2016, pp.76-83.

[30] Lauren Bird, "Fleeing Syria, Refugees Arrive to a Different Kind of Hell in Greece", **The Atlantic**, (May 3, 2013)
http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/05/fleeing-syria-refugees-arrive-to-a-different-kind-of-hell-in-greece/275531/

[31]Felicity Capon, "Neo-Nazi Activity On The Rise In Europe", Newsweek, (March 24, 2015)
http://europe.newsweek.com/neo-nazi-activity-rise-europe-316465

[32]Tom Wayke, "The Terrorists Who came Out of Retirement To Rob a Supermarket: German Police Blame Three Ageing Members Of Far –Left Red Army Faction For Botched", **Daily Mail,** (January 19, 2016) http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3406773/Return-Baader-Meinhof-German-police-blame-three-ageing-militants-far-left-Red-Army-Faction-botched-armed-robbery-supermarket.html

[33] Qiao Liang and Wang Xiangsui**, Unrestricted Warfare**, Beijing: PLA Literature and Arts Publishing House, February 1999, http://www.c4i.org/unrestricted.pdf, pp.8-15.

In accordance with the unrestricted warfare concept, China is in a struggle with the US using cyber warfare, information warfare, law fare (political action through transnational or non-governmental organizations) rather than economic warfare (trade and currency warfare) tactics. It is observed that China is implementing both economic warfare and law fare tactics through BRICS(Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) which was established to create "*the world without the West(especially the US)*" and Eurasian Economic Union (EEU), the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank(AIIB) and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization which were established by China to bear alternatives for IMF and the World Bank.

Espionage and attacks carried out in the cyber area generated from China also cause the crisis heightening tension between the US and China. The most important area of competition between the US and China is the struggle for the leadership of the world economy. That the center of world economy is Asia, China's state capitalism model which carried this country to the second place in world economic ranking and especially the flexible investment opportunities offered by China to the third-world countries or the Southern Hemisphere based on the principle of mutual win-win, China's target to make yuan, China's currency, a currency used in the trade and energy trading are the struggles in the economic warfare area.

The US is trying to protect the strength of the US Dollar in the world trade and energy markets while toughening the trade warfare through new trade agreements such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) in Asia (signed, aiming at weakening the leadership of China in Asia) and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) (expected to be signed) in order to maintain the status quo in the world economy. The rapid decline in China's growth rate and the presence of bad loans in the financial sector complicate China's ability to win the leadership in the leadership struggle.

However, that the world economy has not recovered yet from 2008 financial crisis, zero interest rates and the inefficiency of quantitative easing tools increase expectations of a new crisis and leave the future of the world economy in uncertainty and concerns. The negative view on the functioning of capitalism helped the left economic models to regain importance as alternatives and increased the discussion on the leadership of the US (especially for Europe).

Russia[34] that opposed US-led "*global order*" and the network of alliances in Europe and Asia together with China got its geopolitical gains by using *hybrid warfare* (combination of multiple conventional and unconventional tools of warfare) techniques during the Ukraine Crisis[35]. During the Ukraine Crisis, Russia realized the annexation of Crimea, which has strategically importance for Russia with its power to provide energy resources, civilian elements (little green men) and the political self-determination resolution of Crimean Parliament. During the implementation of this hybrid warfare, employment of civilians (or special-operations soldiers acting as civilians) in the vanguard of offensive military operations was designed to seize and hold territory.

Russia's tactic in Ukraine is also defined as "*civilianization*" of combat operations[36]. While Russia implements hybrid tactics to reach the targets in accordance with its foreign policy, *the color revolutions* within the social movements are indicated as the biggest threat to the new national security strategy[37]. Because of the fact that the practice of overthrowing legitimate political authorities becomes more widespread, and this process is used as a tool to overthrow the regimes controlled by Russia, it is seen as a means of asymmetric war. The realization of regime change through social movements or people power revolutions based on non-violent resistance (Green Revolution in Philippines in 1986, Rose Revolution in Georgia in 2003, Orange Revolution in Ukraine in 2004 and 2013 Maiden protests, Tulip Revolution in Kyrgyzstan in 2005, Cedar Revolution in Lebanon in 2005, Arab Springs in 2011, etc.) that replaced military coups, destructive terror and anarchic activities used during the ideological struggle between the US and the Soviet Union in the Cold War are seen as a threat as well. While Russia and China define the international system as a new polycentric world order, different national interests on economic, military, technological and political issues such as resources and trade routes, and the geopolitical competition cause the conflicts to emerge unexpectedly.

---

[34]See Oleg Barabanov, Timofey Bordachev, Fyodor Lukyanov, Andrey Sushentsov, Dmitry Suslov and Ivan Timofeev , War and Peace in the 21th Century International Stability and Balance of the New Type, **Valdai Discussion Club Report,** (October,2015)

[35]**Munich Security Report 2015** Collapsing Order, Reluctant Guardians,"Challenges: Hybrid Warfare Who is ready?", pp.34-35.

[36] Robert Haddick, "The Civilianization of War", **The National Interest**, (April 11, 2014), http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/the-civilianization-war-10229

[37]**Sputnik News,** "Russian National Security Strategy for 2016: Key updated Points", (January 2, 2016) http://sputniknews.com/russia/20160102/1032599111/russia-national-security-strategy.html

While the new alliance relationships are formed, inclusion/exclusion practices reveal the different balance of power. While "*Great U.S Power Again*!" slogan is observed as the most used one during 2016 US Presidential elections, the possibility of the new president's agenda of launching a regional or global war to re-establish this power and change the global balance of power will be one of the most emphasized topics.

These wars that may be called as hegemonic wars can re-establish the international dominance of the US in all areas. The chaos game in which Saudi Arabia economically weakens Russia by reducing oil prices can cause regional wars that can transform into close combat in the Black Sea, Baltic Sea, and North Pole Region. IS / ISIL / DAISH terrorist organization is seen as one of the major actors of regional instability in the Middle East, which suddenly emerged in the territory of Iraq and Syria, acts as a state and reinforces its dominance through territorial gains and weapons it seizes.

The moves (uncertainty of the borders, the collapse of the states, the increase in terrorist activities, etc.) made through the white ball (ISIL) towards other balls (states) on the billiard table (Iraq, Syria, Iran and Turkey which are threatened by this organization) can escalate the violence that can end up with the disappearance of these states from the regional or international system.

India's covert support to the separatist groups in Tibet and East Turkestan located between China and India, the problems between China and Taiwan, Philippines, Malaysia, Brunei on filling the South China Sea with artificial land masses have the risk to turn these problems into close combat. In these regional war areas for Russia and China, the US may prefer the strategy to provide support for rivals of these states by staying background of these wars without confronting with these two states directly. China and Russia, on the other hand, show the level of their military power by sending an implicit message through the states that are in alliance with them (such as Hydrogen Bomb test[38] of North Korea in January 2016 which is supported by China, that Iran supported by Russia couldl and the drone weapons of the US that Ukraine wanted to use in a possible war without being harmed in 2011[39]....).

---

[38]**BBC, "**North Korea Nuclear: State claims first Hydrogen Bomb Test", (January 6, 2016) http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-35240012
[39]**Russia today** (RT) "How Iran hacked Super Secret CIA Stealth Drone", (December 15, 2011) https://www.rt.com/usa/iran-drone-hack-stealth-943/

Although we argue that the support of the US that is the military and financial leader of the world for regional wars against the vision for an alternative world can re-determine the balance of power in the international system, the possible political instability (further escalation of violence against Latino and African-American Muslim individuals...) in the US may prevent the expected changes.

Conclusion

With regard to the international security studies, the 21st century represents a world where the crisis and conflicts in the former period take place again (Syrian refugee crisis, rising racial and religious reference ideological polarization (Islam and the West, Sunni-Shiite sectarian strife) which are similar to terrorism, regional wars, migration that took place during World War II) and the threats suc has Cold War 2.0 are more evident and expected. What is different today in the relations between the US, China, Russia and Europe led by Germany compared to the previous periods is that the difference of opinions is deepening within the US –Europe Alliance and that China sets foreign policy on the basis of a stronger strategic partnership with Russia.

In the international system, "savior nation" rhetoric developed by the US based on its security policies began to be questioned due to Iraq invasion in 2003 and 2008 economic crisis. *The War Against Terror (GWOT) doctrine* that was put into practice by the US after 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks increased the repression and pressure and produced a continuous insecurity in the international arena. When determining the threat perception and the concept to use power in the international system, the US may provide cover support for the regional wars in order to bring itself into a central and strong position again and weaken the rivals.

In such an international environment, state-centered strategically security issues gained importance while human security remained in the background. Refugees, new armed individual and group actors, associating Islam with cultural violence are among the new securitization issues. The issues related to the whole international system in the global governance area are discussed between the states at only forum level, and no common position is taken. It can be said that in this fight the war and peace paradox is more oriented toward war and a chaotic order in which all tactics of the unrestricted warfare are used is expected for the humanity.