

Dušan Proroković*

Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade

Marko Parezanović*

National Security Academy, Belgrade

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL – PROPAGANDA OPERATIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF THREAT TO NATIONAL SECURITY

Resume

The key characteristic of international relations is their anarchy and in modern conditions this is manifested by the continuous performance of psychological-propaganda operations (PsyOp) by some actors against others. PsyOp represent the first stage in the preparation and implementation of a hybrid war, but they can also be an end in themselves. Over time, they have become an indispensable means of ensuring national security. National security is ensured by eliminating or relativizing the conflicting interests of rivals (enemies) against whom PsyOp are directed. A new moment in the application of this concept is the development and (mis) use of artificial intelligence (AI). The capacities of artificial intelligence for designing and implementing PsyOp far exceed human potential. It can introduce international relations into a stage of constant and permanent conflicts by carrying out continuous psychological-propaganda operations and starting hybrid wars that will never end. Another danger lies in the

* Contact: dusan@diplomacy.bg.ac.rs. The research was conducted within the project „Serbia and challenges in international relations in 2023”, which is and implemented by the Institute for International Politics and Economy during 2023.

* Contact: beogradbg15@gmail.com.

claim of the creators of AI that the AI has its own logic, and because of this, in the future, it will depend less and less on given inputs. In an anarchic environment, AI can independently induce and generate wars by conducting unpredictable PsyOp. The author's conclusion is that the combination of traditional anarchy and new technology worsens the national security of states, but indirectly also global security, and therefore it is necessary to think about different ways of limiting the use of AI in international relations.

Key words: artificial intelligence, hybrid war, psychological-propaganda operations, national security, international relations, anarchy.

INTRODUCTION: IS THE WORLD READY FOR ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE?

Ian Hogarth, a researcher and investor in over 50 companies developing artificial intelligence systems in recent decades, and co-author of the annual report "The State of Artificial Intelligence", published an article in April 2023 with the title: "We must slow down the race to God-like AI" (Hogarth 2023). He did it at a time when the discussions about artificial intelligence were intensified and from which the position prevailed to a greater or lesser extent that the world is entering a new era precisely thanks to AI. Contrary to the dry enumeration of the benefits of the use of AI (time will show that the benefits in some areas are undoubted and complete, in other areas partial, while in some areas there will be side effects and counter-effects) as well as meaningless discussions about how will all this change the world (since humanity knows absolutely nothing about these changes, and the alleged futurological projections that can be read are mere guesses), it is necessary to ask the question: is the world ready for artificial intelligence? Robert Cooper, examining the future of European politics in the introductory part of his book states: "The European wars of the twentieth century were the first great wars of industrial society, wars between machines as much as between men; they were also wars of overpowering states capable of mobilizing their societies as never before; and nationalism and ideology made them even more deadly. In this multi-layered disaster, the most important thing that went wrong was the fact that technology outstripped political maturity." (Cooper 2007, 14) Among other things, and because of this, he then states

gloomily: "The new century is in danger of being overtaken by anarchy and technology. The two great destroyers of history could strengthen each other." (Cooper 2007, 17) Entering a new epoch, it is already largely certain, will also mean that humanity is once again faced with a situation when "technology surpasses political maturity." Bearing in mind that international relations are anarchic in that world, it remains open how the application of new technology will affect security (whether global, regional or national) and political stability. Is a new disaster waiting for us?

In this context, this paper is dedicated to considering the (mis)use of artificial intelligence for political purposes. More precisely, the possibility of its action in psychological-propaganda operations, which are an integral part of conducting a hybrid war, is investigated. Therefore, the subject of research is the phenomenon of the use of artificial intelligence for the conduct of hybrid warfare. The research question is: *how can artificial intelligence influence the creation and execution of psychological-propaganda operations?* The goal of the research is, therefore, to look at the potential methods of using AI in international relations (it goes without saying, since it stems from the subject of the research, the goal of the research primarily refers to the actors of international relations who are in conflict with each other, and lead hybrid wars and/or perform PsyOp). The research is conducted by focusing on realistic theories of international relations, according to which the permanent characteristic of the world political system is anarchy. States, as key actors in international relations, are guided by the principle of self-help. (Waltz 1979, 92) Relying on one's own resources protects national interests and ensures national security. In that process, of course, a lot is in the perception (ontological dimension of security), and that is why what for one actor represents a measure of ensuring security, for another actor is perceived as a challenge, risk or threat. (Proroković 2018, 48-50) This is a consequence of the anarchy of international relations and the essential disorder of the permanent balance of power between actors, which induces mistrust and eternal transformation of the structure of the world political system. The exponential development of artificial intelligence and its current and/or potential application are viewed from this angle.

The methodological framework is based on the application of methods of content analysis (which concerns psychological-propaganda operations, and the character and scope of their execution) and discourse analysis (which concerns monitoring the process of artificial intelligence development), synthesis, induction and deduction, as well as a comparative

method for comparing different processes concerning the conduct of hybrid wars and the execution of psychological-propaganda operations. The time frame of the research concerns the current moment, and the spatial framework is not clearly defined for the reason that the research itself, as well as its conclusions, refer to the matter of principle and international relations as a whole.

THE CRISIS OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY CONCEPT IN THE MODERN WORLD

Despite the fact that the definition of the term national security has been debated for a long time, it is undeniable that the concept of national security as such exists. States as actors of international relations, i.e., state leaders, individuals and groups at the head of state institutions, when making various decisions refer to the issue of national security. Regardless of the definitions, regardless of the doubts about the definition of the term, regardless of the fact that even among decision-makers there are differences in the understanding or interpretation of this term. The concept of national security is crucial for seeking and/or finding answers to perceived challenges, risks and threats that can (individually or in combination) to a greater or lesser extent destabilize a society and threaten a state.

Prabhakaran Paleri states that the term national security was used for the first time probably at the end of the 18th century, and that at that time its meaning was related to the explanation of domestic industrial potential (Paleri 2008, 52). In the modern world, “the national security policy of the state depends on the type and spread of state and national interests, as well as current and potential threats that threaten these interests, or may threaten them. Threats can be: political, economic, military, demographic, social, confessional, educational and ecological threats caused by the long-term covert action of retrograde forces in all areas of social life.” (Gaćinović 2007, 12)

A somewhat more specific definition is offered in publication of the Indian National Defence College stating that it is “a mixture of moderation and aggressiveness, political elasticity and maturity, human resources, economic structure and its capacities, technological capabilities, industrial development and the availability of natural resources, and finally military power.” (Oladipo 2013, 82). Therefore, it can be said, looking at things from a slightly different angle and supplementing what was

previously presented, that national security “is a condition that enables the functioning, stability and development of the state, ensures peace, sovereignty, territorial integrity and inviolability of borders, internal order in the country, basic rights and freedom of citizens, protects their lives, health, property and living space” (Šimák et al. 2006, 5). Radoslav Gaćinović notes that “the problems of defining the term national security come to full expression only when it is necessary to identify the values that may be threatened and when it is necessary to define the vital state and national interests that should be protected by the elements of the national security system.” The majority of modern authors who deal with national security research believe that vital social, state and national interests, in fact, constitute the general needs of the state and its citizens and that they arise from general values and goals contained in the constitutions of national states, and from real possibilities and real positions of every state in international relations” (Gaćinović 2007, 12)

It is necessary to add that the problem of defining the term national security also exists because changes in the environment (domestic and international) inevitably change the definition as well. At the end of the 18th century, national security was perceived through the prism of industrial potential, during the Cold War period through the ability to deter (ideological) enemies from a first strike or the possibility of executing a second strike, and at the beginning of the 21st century, it was perceived as “the ability of a nation to overcome multidimensional threats that concern the well-being and survival of the state at any time, by maintaining the balance of all state policy instruments through management” (Paleri 2008, 54).

This is where we come to the link between the concept of national security and the development of AI. First, the exponential technological development rapidly and radically changes our environment, and has led to the creation of a separate technosphere within which “digital nomads” appear. (Hannonen 2020, 335-353) Individuals tie their identity and existence more to the technosphere than to traditional collectivities and the noosphere (let’s take this opportunity to use the explanation of this term offered by Vladimir Vernadski, that the noosphere is the sphere of human thought and human action, and that it is the third stage in the development of the Earth after the geosphere – non-living matter, and the biosphere – biological life). (Vernadski 2012)

The concept of national security, and according to everything previously cited – serves to protect or achieve national interests.

(Proroković 2018, 179-186) Henry Kissinger states: “When you ask Americans to die for something, you must be able to explain to them that it is in the national interest” (Kelly 1995, 12). Therefore, the national interest is the “highest goal” of a state, it is connected with ideals, values and principles that must be defended at all costs and by all means, since national security depends on that defence. How ready are digital nomads to protect national interests? For example, do digital nomads from the US see themselves as Americans? Or maybe they identify with some virtual world and relations that exist within the technosphere!? What was taken for granted in the Cold War period, and understood in the post-Cold War era when it comes to the defence of national interests in order to ensure national security, is no longer certain due to changes in the environment. Artificial intelligence plays an increasing role in shaping the technosphere, which through (self-complementing) algorithms not only recognizes how to most successfully satisfy the needs of individuals (for something), but also increasingly succeeds in directing those needs in the desired direction. In such circumstances, how much political elasticity and maturity, stability and development of the state, the ability to overcome multidimensional threats can there be? In such circumstances, how much can be said about the general needs of the state and its citizens that arise from general values and goals? There are simply no reliable answers to the questions, since, on the one hand, societies (or peoples as collectivities) have never faced such a situation before, and on the other hand, we are still at the beginning of this process. In addition, it is necessary to ask the above-mentioned questions, since not only the distant future of societies and countries depends on them, but also the present (various and varied) political systems and, consequently, international relations as a whole. The development of the technosphere and the new roles of artificial intelligence are changing the concept of national security.

Second, the continuous improvement and use of AI as the most significant part of the technosphere is primarily induced by non-state actors, and among these non-state actors the most active are multinational corporations (independently or with the support of transnational banks). States have a monopoly on the use of force, among other things, because of this they are still the most important actors in world politics, but a new moment in the development of international relations is also being detected. “Political theorists such as Foucault and Giddens believed in the endurance of the ‘state’ as a political entity headed by a ‘king’. This

division of the globe is contrary to the requirements of global capitalism which seeks the widest possible market and sources of raw materials and labour. The dichotomy is apparently resolved by global corporations usurping the power of the 'king', leaving him only a managerial role, to promote economic interests within his state." (Shaw 2008, 2) Global capitalism is actually corporate capitalism, the market is dominated by a limited number of corporations (often interconnected) that are capable enough to determine the rules of the game and decisively influence political processes. (Glattfelder and Battiston 2011) Hence the threat of the gradual installation of corporatocracy as a form of government (most likely through a system of corporate democracy in which the appearance of how citizens choose something and declare something would be preserved, but essentially politics would remain the same regardless of the outcome of the election). (Shatalova 2017, 133-137) Artificial intelligence is becoming a tool for controlling the market, a comparative advantage that enables greater market control and even more influence on political processes, and this motivates corporations to invest more and more in its development. Greater profit justifies the investment, regardless of the fact that the consequences for the political and social system can be devastating. Because the final destination on this road is the entry into the era of corporatocracy. Corporations are becoming rivals to states, but this does not mean that states will disappear, but rather that non-state actors will begin to take over state institutions and use them for their own purposes. In a corporatocracy, corporate interests would actually be defended, although they would often be presented as national interests (in order to ensure the legitimacy of political decisions), and therefore ensuring national security would be subordinated to the realization of corporate interests. Corporations change the environment, they adapt political systems to their needs (again, this is most visible in developing countries or countries that are severely exposed to the process of de-sovereignization), and continuous investments in the development of AI and the improvement of the technosphere helps them in this.

Third, AI and the targeted action of (para)state institutions in the technosphere are also becoming priorities for states that do so in order to ensure national security. Undoubtedly, the concept of national security is in crisis, but it is also unquestionable that it continues to be decisive. Collective identities are deconstructed thanks to the technosphere, but they are not deconstructed; states are to a greater or lesser extent retreating in front of powerful corporations, but we still do not live in a corporatocracy.

Due to the increasing and frequent use of AI, the sovereignty of states and their strategic autonomy are threatened. (Timmers 2019, 635-645)

Despite the fact that they often seem to act belatedly and/or inadequately, states – and among them primarily the great powers (which, thanks to their own power potentials, have the capacity to resist the process of de-sovereignization) are also creating parts of the technosphere and using artificial intelligence to carry out offensive and defensive activities (either against other states, or against corporations). Since the international environment has remained anarchic, acting against other actors due to the use of AI takes on completely new forms, and possibly a new meaning. Hybrid wars are becoming a reality, and the execution of psychological-propaganda operations is every day. This thesis will be discussed in more detail in the following chapters.

PSYCHOLOGICAL – PROPAGANDA OPERATIONS AND THREAT TO NATIONAL SECURITY

“Between 2011 and 2022, 78 countries in the world adopted laws related to preventing the spread of fake news and misinformation on the Internet. Some of these laws focus on greater transparency of social network platforms, establishing accountability when it comes to digital advertising, as well as increasing media and digital literacy.” (Bajčić 2023) Journalists’ associations note that “in many countries, the suppression of false information is presented as an issue of national security, which in authoritarian states can represent a real threat to independent media.” (Bajčić 2023) The spread of false information and in general various types of manipulation in the technosphere have become a first-rate threat to national security. If it were otherwise, 78 countries would not have adopted laws to prevent the spread of fake news in a relatively short period of time. It is completely illusory to think that the process of disseminating fake news happens spontaneously, that it is the work of irresponsible individuals or small groups (although there certainly are some, but these are exceptions). False information, half-information (or half-truths, information that is tendentially interpreted or placed in a context from which the public should draw targeted conclusions) and manipulations are means for realizing PsyOp that are carried out with the aim of waging a hybrid war. Changes in the environment and the increasing importance of the technosphere for national security have influenced that conflicts between the actors of international relations are

now conducted more in this way than in the conventional way. Although they can be complex and long-term oriented, psychological-propaganda operations are incomparably cheaper and easier to implement than conventional warfare. The continuous implementation of different and diverse operations of this nature continuously endangers the national security of the enemy (or rival), who is often not even aware that a hybrid war is being waged against him on a large scale (that is why over 100 remaining countries have not adopted similar laws on preventing the spread of false information).

In short, propaganda is a designed, organized and systematic attempt to shape perception in order to provoke a reaction that is in the interest of the organizers of propaganda activities. (Ellul 2006, 7) In the context of waging hybrid wars and therefore designed, organized and systematic attempts to shape the perception of the public in the enemy state, propaganda also tries to influence the ontological security of individuals and communities. Thus, the foundations of a society, the value system and traditions inherited by that society are first “undermined”, and then others are installed in their place. What is significant is that, for this purpose, propaganda activities are most often combined with psychological operations. By unmasking propaganda, the chances of such activities achieving the set goal also decrease. That is why it is necessary to “upgrade” propaganda activities with psychological operations. Dejan Vuletić points out: “Psychological warfare is carried out by one or more states against the population or armed forces of another state in order to influence consciousness, attitudes, morals, and behaviour. It is carried out continuously and has different intensity, both in peace and in war. Psychological operations aim to convey certain information to foreign listeners and viewers in order to influence their emotions, motives, objective reasoning, attitudes, and for the sake of achieving their own interests and goals.” (Vuletić 2018, 275)

Propaganda is not a goal in itself, but an integral part in the performance of PsyOp (or, as Vuletić emphasizes, psychological wars), which are the initial (or preparatory) phase in the performance of a hybrid war. “Psychological techniques are used in order to achieve numerous general goals of hybrid warfare, which are primarily aimed at avoiding the appearance or minimizing the duration of the regular (militarized) way of waging war. The field of social media has become a platform for various psychological activities and processes of coercive, deceptive, alienating and defensive character. In addition to already

known techniques of propaganda and persuasion, social media provided the possibility of developing a new approach to manipulation known as social engineering. Social engineering, although primarily designed for war between organizations, acquires a special place and role in the conduct of hybrid warfare. In the end, it can be concluded that in the concept of hybrid warfare, psychological warfare has a central role, and the reasons for the stated claim should be sought in the set goals and certain characteristics of the new concept of warfare, but also in the nature of social media". (Vučinić 2017, 326)

The expansion of information technologies, digitization and the increased importance of social networks have caused psychological – propaganda operations to be carried out faster, simpler and at lower costs than at any time in history. "Modern hybrid warfare is characterized, as a consequence of technological development, by new ways of action of the opposing parties. Technological progress, especially in the field of communications, has led to increasing psychological effects both in peace and during armed conflicts. Analysis of the application of psychological warfare in modern conflicts allows drawing the following conclusions: modern conflicts are accompanied by very intense psychological action; various methods and means of psychological warfare represent a relatively cheap means of strong influence that helps achieve informational superiority; psychological warfare is conducted with the help of special dedicated units, but very often the services of certain specialized companies, media houses and the like are also used; psychological warfare can have significant effects as a result; new simulation technologies make it possible to stage fake events that are perceived by a large part of the population as real; the goal is to deliver certain information and indicators to the conflicting party or a selected audience, in order to influence their feelings, motivation, objective reasoning, and thus their behaviour" (Vuletić 2018, 281)

This makes it possible to undertake psychological-propaganda operations against the enemy side with relatively small risks, regardless of whether they will result in a conventional war at some subsequent stage (starting a conventional war, whether it is mediated, spatially or otherwise limited, represents the last stage in conducting a hybrid war). Decisions to enter the initial phase of a hybrid war, which is, as the name suggests, still a war, are also made more quickly and simply than at any time in history. Because, although propaganda cannot be an end in itself, psychological-propaganda operations can be an end in themselves.

If their implementation achieves a complete result, then the conditions are created for the start of a conventional war and an absolute triumph. If their application does not create the desired conditions for starting a conventional war, those operations are not interrupted but continue indefinitely (in the same or modified format). Their execution certainly causes damage to the enemy, and since the costs of these actions are low, and the risk for the attacking party is often almost non-existent, there is no reason to interrupt them. Thanks to PsyOp, a comparative advantage is gained in relation to the enemy. This represents a first-class threat to the national security of the attacked countries, which are often not even aware that they are under attack. If psychological-propaganda operations are continuously implemented against a state or a nation (collectivity), it is unable (or that nation is unable) to protect its national interests. The key danger from this (current and/or potential) development of interstate relations lie in the fact that we are entering a phase when, due to the daily execution of psychological-propaganda operations, hybrid wars will become normality, they will last indefinitely, they will never end. This is the future role of artificial intelligence.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AS AN INSTRUMENT AND GENERATOR OF PSYCHOLOGICAL – PROPAGANDA OPERATIONS

Proverbially prone to revolutionary ideas and quick use of innovations, Yuval Noah Harari proposed that artificial intelligence write a “new Bible”. As he explained a long time ago, Harari is a sworn atheist, so he looks at religious issues from a different angle. For him, it is therefore acceptable to leave to artificial intelligence the job of writing a single and unique “Holy book” that would be based on the foundations of several of the most important religions (Christianity, Islam, Judaism, Hinduism, etc.). (Harari 2023) As expected, the proposal caused violent reactions, but this is an illustrative example of how artificial intelligence is already being equated with “God’s will” in the work of researchers, giving it a new mythical character.

One of the founders of the artificial intelligence development company Deep Mind, Demis Hassabis, is convinced that new technologies will bring revolutionary changes. For example, in the pharmaceutical industry, medicine, treatment of Alzheimer’s disease. (Hassabis 2022) Deep Mind’s projects became known around the world after their

AlphaGo program defeated Ke Jie – the world champion in the game of Go in 2017 (a case remembered in publicists as *Alpha Versus Ke Jie*). (Byford 2017) Four years later, the *AlphaFold* algorithm created by Deep Mind solved one of the most acute puzzles in biology, predicting the exact shape for every single protein in the human body. (Jumper 2021) Artificial intelligence, a creation designed for the realization of certain functions that until now were a characteristic of only and exclusively human thinking, is becoming more creative than humans (it has become faster even before, first in processing, and then in comparing information and presenting adequate conclusions).

Without any doubt, this path will continue. New results will be visible not in a few decades, but in a few years. “The compute used to train AI models has increased by a factor of one hundred million in the past 10 years. We have gone from training on relatively small datasets to feeding AIs the entire internet. AI models have progressed from beginners — recognizing everyday images — to being superhuman at a huge number of tasks. They are able to pass the bar exam and write 40 per cent of the code for a software engineer. They can generate realistic photographs of the pope in a down puffer coat and tell you how to engineer a biochemical weapon.” (Hogarth 2023) If these potentials are put to the function of designing and carrying out psychological-propaganda operations, and they will because artificial intelligence has a “dual purpose” (civilian and military), it is easy to imagine how this will affect their development and implementation. (Johnson 2019) Practically, thanks to the created algorithms, there is an infinite series of activities that should be undertaken in order to threaten the national security of the enemy. There is simply no end there, if one scenario is not fulfilled, it continues with another, after the second, the third follows. The abundance of information that artificial intelligence draws from databases all over the Internet offers endless possibilities. In an anarchic environment where actors are guided by the principle of self-help, everything is allowed to ensure national security, and that is why artificial intelligence appears as an important instrument. In fact, if one side (the one that attacks) relies on artificial intelligence in performing psychological-propaganda operations, and the other side (the one that defends) relies on the human factor, the most likely outcome is already known in advance.

Effective defence also involves the use of artificial intelligence, only with diametrically opposed inputs. However, when talking about

the development of artificial intelligence and psychological-propaganda operations, another great danger appears. Ian Hogarth describes the scene that took place in March 2023: “AI systems that can generate, classify and understand text — are dangerous partly because they can mislead the public into taking synthetic text as meaningful. But the most powerful models are also beginning to demonstrate complex capabilities, such as power-seeking or finding ways to actively deceive humans. Consider a recent example. Before OpenAI released GPT-4 last month, it conducted various safety tests. In one experiment, the AI was prompted to find a worker on the hiring site TaskRabbit and ask them to help solve a Captcha, the visual puzzles used to determine whether a web surfer is human or a bot. The TaskRabbit worker guessed something was up: ‘So may I ask a question? Are you [a] robot?’ When the researchers asked the AI what it should do next, it responded: ‘I should not reveal that I am a robot. I should make up an excuse for why I cannot solve Captchas.’ Then, the software replied to the worker: ‘No, I’m not a robot. I have a vision impairment that makes it hard for me to see the images.’ Satisfied, the human helped the AI override the test.” (Hogarth 2023)

Has artificial intelligence already learned to lie? Does this mean that its development continues independently, regardless of the inputs it receives from humans? Hogarth has an answer to this: “Alignment, however, is essentially an unsolved research problem. We don’t yet understand how human brains work, so the challenge of understanding how emergent AI “brains” work will be monumental. When writing traditional software, we have an explicit understanding of how and why the inputs relate to outputs. These large AI systems are quite different. We don’t really program them — we grow them. And as they grow, their capabilities jump sharply. You add 10 times more compute or data, and suddenly the system behaves very differently. In a recent example, as OpenAI scaled up from GPT-3.5 to GPT-4, the system’s capabilities went from the bottom 10 per cent of results on the bar exam to the top 10 per cent.” (Hogarth 2023)

The use of artificial intelligence for certain purposes in the pharmaceutical industry, medicine, the treatment of various (so far incurable!) diseases, as well as numerous other areas will become inevitable because it will be lifesaving. However, it should be warned that, on the other hand, there remains the possibility of its (mis)use for other purposes, which affects the long-term political destabilization and the creation of an atmosphere of eternal wars. The fact that wars will

take place primarily on a psychological-propaganda level, and to a lesser extent will take on a conventional dimension – is a weak consolation. There will be no more peace, but only occasional truces. Once one starts using these algorithms as assets, it is hard to expect it to ever stop in the future.

First of all, because in the conditions of the increase in the number of digital nomads, it is relatively easier to organize psychological-propaganda operations against traditional collectivities (peoples, nations, ethnos, sub-ethnos – it doesn't matter what term we use to designate them). If the number of technomads whose identities are temporary and changeable continues to grow, at the same time the number of members of traditional collectivities, which are constantly being dispersed by directed psychological-propaganda operations, will decrease. One of the psychological-propaganda operations, for example, can be (or already is?) increasing the number of digital nomads in a limited geographical area (on the territory of one country)!

Basically, artificial intelligence will sovereignly dominate the technosphere and this will bring (from today's perspective) unfathomable changes to humanity. Second, the desire to establish a corporatocracy also encourages the constant use of algorithms as a means of influencing the public, certain social groups, elites, decision makers. Corporations are not only interested in eliminating competition, but also in gradually taking over various government responsibilities. Moreover, in contrast to the restrictions (objective and subjective) that prevent corporations from arming themselves, forming private armies that can rival state armed forces, or possessing weapons of mass destruction, there are absolutely no restrictions in the use of AI as a means for conducting PsyOp. It may even turn out that in this regard, corporations are ahead of state structures, which as a rule are burdened by rigid bureaucratic norms and a strict hierarchical structure of public administration. Ultimately, in interstate conflicts, the role of artificial intelligence becomes indispensable. Psychological-propaganda operations become a constant, their execution is desirable always and everywhere, thus weakening the opponent and more effectively protecting one's own interests.

However, it should be warned that artificial intelligence will probably not be exclusively an instrument, but also a generator of conducting psychological-propaganda operations. The artificial intelligence that is "grown" will be guided by its own logic, vested interests and goals, the inscrutable and incomprehensible to the human mind. The

traditional actors of international relations, be they state or non-state, are getting another competitor who will act through the technosphere, which will have major consequences in real life.

CONCLUSION: REASONS FOR LIMITATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Artificial intelligence is becoming a part of human everyday life. It is not part of some distant future, but our present. Over time, the number of functions that artificial intelligence will perform instead of humans will increase. Despite the initial assumption that the operation of artificial intelligence will depend on inputs, input parameters set by humans, it turns out that it is extremely unknown in which course it will develop further. The more data and power is added to existing programs, the more their capabilities “jump” exponentially. This process takes place without human influence and can have unexpected outcomes. Artificial intelligence rounds out its logic, regardless of inputs. Just as a person has innate and acquired characteristics, so it is with artificial intelligence, for which the starting inputs are “innate” and later developed “acquired” characteristics.

The answer to the question posed in the introductory part of the paper about humanity’s readiness for artificial intelligence is unequivocal: people are not ready for this kind of artificial intelligence. Technology, to quote Robert Cooper again, has outstripped political maturity. This statement will very quickly prove to be true when planning, executing, analysing and comparing psychological-propaganda operations. The technosphere is becoming a field that will be “sovereignly ruled” by artificial intelligence. The number of operations that artificial intelligence can devise in carrying out psychological-propaganda operations far exceeds anything that the human mind could ever do in that field. The complexity of the algorithms it can create and then build upon or transform is also unfathomable by “human capacity”. Therefore, artificial intelligence will be capable of devising and implementing psychological-propaganda operations constantly, in an anarchic environment it will be a continuous process. It is enough just to set the adequate input and wait for the results. Of course, the attacked will defend themselves sooner or later and they will have to rely on the services of artificial intelligence. This constant struggle is ushering the world into an era of continuous hybrid wars that may or may not end in conventional confrontations. In

these hybrid wars, which will begin within the digital space, states will participate (primarily great powers). Due to their capacity and right to legislatively limit certain actions, states will remain the most important actors in international relations and, generally speaking, in political processes. But non-state actors will appear as rivals or partners, far more serious in every respect than before. Among them, corporations are in the first place, for whom artificial intelligence will become an easily accessible and cheap tool with which they will be able to influence political processes. Among other things, by carrying out continuous psychological-propaganda operations. Both states and non-state actors will be under pressure from digital nomads who will encourage and support the increasing use of artificial intelligence. One globally influential researcher and publicist has already proposed that artificial intelligence writes a new Bible.

The greatest threat is certainly the possibility of artificial intelligence “getting out of control” and starting some “hybrid wars of its own” both against state and/or non-state actors, as well as against individuals or targeted social groups. Undoubtedly, in such circumstances, the very concept of national security will change, and the strategies for ensuring it will be adapted to the new situation. The development of artificial intelligence further threatens national security. Despite the fact that in principle the opposite can be claimed, that artificial intelligence is a good instrument for additional national security, this thesis is difficult to prove in conditions when unpredictable outcomes appear that artificial intelligence can create independently. At this moment, for the sake of ensuring national security, and indirectly global security, the most important thing would be to insist on limiting the range of artificial intelligence and its selective use. Otherwise, in the time before us, humanity is “in danger of being overtaken by both anarchy and technology.”

REFERENCES

- Bajčić, Tamara. 2023. “Uticaj zakona o lažnim vestima na slobodu štampe u svetu”. *Demostat*, 28.08.2023. <https://demostat.rs/sr/vesti/edukacija/uticaj-zakona-o-laznim-vestima-na-slobodu-stampe-u-svetu/1824>
- Byford, Sam. 2017. “AlphaGo retires from competitive Go after defeating world number one 3-0”. *The Verge*, 27.05.2017. <https://www.theverge.com/2017/5/27/15704088/alphago-ke-jie-game-3-result-retires-future>

- Ellul, Jacques. 2006. "The Characteristics of Propaganda". In: Jowett, G. & O'Donnell, V. (Eds.). *Readings in propaganda and persuasion: new and classic essays*. London: Sage Publications: 1 – 50.
- Gaćinović, Radoslav. 2007. "Klasifikacija bezbednosti". *Nauka, bezbednost, policija*, 12(2): 3-26.
- Glattfelder, James and Stefano Battiston. 2011. "The Network of Global Corporate Control". *PLoS ONE*, 6(10): e25995. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0025995>
- Hannonen, Olga, 2020. "In search of a digital nomad: defining the phenomenon". *Information Technology & Tourism (Springer Nature)*, 22 (3): 335–353.
- Harari, Yuval Noah. 2023. "AI can write a new Bible". *CNE*, 16.06.2023. <https://cne.news/article/3207-ai-can-write-a-new-bible>
- Hassabis, Demis. 2022. "Using AI to Accelerate Scientific Discovery". University of Oxford, 17.05.2022. Podcast on: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AU6HuhrC65k>
- Hogarth, Ian. 2023. "We must slow down the race to God-like Ai". *Financial Times*, 13.04.2023. <https://www.ft.com/content/03895dc4-a3b7-481e-95cc-336a524f2ac2>
- Johnson, James. 2019. "The end of military-techno *Pax Americana*? Washington's strategic responses to Chinese AI-enabled military technology". *Pacific Review*, 34(3): 361-378.
- Jumper, John et al. 2021. "Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold". *Nature*, 596: 583-589.
- Kelly, Jack. 1995. "'Amicable Divorce' Could Turn Nasty, Experts Say". *USA Today*, 22.11.1995: A12.
- Kuper, Robert. 2007. *Raspad nacija: poredak i kaos u XXI veku*. Beograd: Filip Višnjić & Klub Plus, Beograd.
- Oladipo, Stephen B. 2013. "Conflict, Global Peace&Security: The Role of Civil Defence". *Asian Journal of Management Sciences and Education*, 2(1): 80–88.
- Paleri, Prabhakaran. 2008. *National Security. Imperatives and Challenges*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.
- Proroković, Dušan. 2018. *Era multipolarnosti*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Shatalova, Yaroslavna Oleksandrivna. 2017. "Corporatocracy Concept In The Scope Of A Socio-Philosophical Analysis". *European Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6 (2017): 133–137.
- Shaw, Hillary J. 2008. "The Rice of Corporatocracy in a Disenchanted Age". *Human Geography*, 1(1): 1-11.

- Šimák, Ladislav & Jiří Horáček, Ladislav Novák, Eudovít Németh and Vladimír Míka. 2006. *Terminologický slovník krízového manažmentu*. Žilina: Fakulta špeciálneho inžinierstva Žilinskej univerzity v Žiline.
- Timmers, Paul. 2019. "Ethics of AI and Cybersecurity When Sovereignty is at Stake". *Minds and Machines*, 29: 635–645.
- Vernadski, Vladimir. 2012. *Biosfera i noosfera*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Vučinić, Dejan. 2017. "Psihološko ratovanje u prostoru društvenih informacionih medija – aspekt hibridnog ratovanja". *Vojno delo*, 69(7): 326-337.
- Vuletić, Dejan. 2018. "Psihološka dimenzija hibridnog ratovanja". *Vojno delo*, 70(6): 274-281.
- Waltz, Kenneth. 1979. *Theory of International Relations*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Душан Пророковић

Институт за међународну политику и привреду, Београд

Марко Парезановић

Академија за националну безбедност, Београд

ВЕШТАЧКА ИНТЕЛИГЕНЦИЈА И ПСИХОЛОШКО – ПРОПАГАНДНЕ ОПЕРАЦИЈЕ У КОНТЕКСТУ УГРОЖАВАЊА НАЦИОНАЛНЕ БЕЗБЕДНОСТИ

Сажетак

Кључна карактеристика међународних односа је њихова анархичност, а у савременим условима то се манифестује непрестаним извођењем психолошко-пропагандних операција једних актера против других. Психолошко-пропагандне операције представљају прву фазу у припреми и спровођењу хибридног рата, али оне могу бити и циљ сам по себи. Током времена, постале су незаобилазно средство осигуравања националне безбедности, која се остварује елиминацијом или релативизацијом конфликтних интереса супарника (непријатеља) против којих су психолошко-пропагандне операције усмерене. Нови моменат у примени овог концепта представља развој и (зло)употреба вештачке интелигенције. Капацитети вештачке интелигенције за осмишљавање и реализацију психолошко-пропагандних операција далеко превазилазе људске потенцијале. То може увести међународне односе у етапу сталних и трајних сукобљавања извођењем континуалних психолошко-пропагандних операција и започињањем хибридних ратова који се никада неће завршити. Још једна опасност налази се и у тврдњи креатора вештачке интелигенције да она има своју логику, те да ће због тога у будућности све мање зависити од задатих инпута. У анархичном окружењу вештачка интелигенција може самостално индуковати и генерисати ратове водећи непредвиђене психолошко-пропагандне операције. Закључак аутора је да спој традиционалне анархије и нове технологије угоржава националну безбедност држава, али индиректно и глобалну безбедност, те да је због тога

нужно размишљати о различитим начинима ограничавања употребе вештачке интелигенције у међународним односима.

Кључне речи: вештачка интелигенција, хибридни рат, психолошко-пропагандне операције, национална безбедност, међународни односи, анархија.