

Early Warning in the Cognitive Domain: Anticipating Strategic Influence Operations Against Democratic Systems

Security & Defence

EU Institutions & Governance

Digital Policy & Technology

Luis Vaz

Instituto Português de Administração de Marketing (IPAM), Lisboa, Portugal

luisvaz@universidadeeuropeia.pt | ORCID: orcid.org/0009-0007-4702-2900

Published by European Governance Lab, September 2026

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

European warning systems were built to spot discrete crises, military mobilisation and visible escalation, yet strategic competition increasingly unfolds through gradual influence operations that condition the informational and cognitive environment below conflict thresholds. This paper introduces **cognitive early warning**: an anticipatory approach that tracks emerging trajectories of influence, such as narrative convergence, coordinated amplification and the alignment of informational pressure with political, economic or diplomatic moves, before they become visible crises. It shows why current systems struggle: signals are incremental and ambiguous, data volumes exceed analytical capacity, relevant indicators are scattered across intelligence, strategic communications, diplomatic and cyber bodies, and institutions rightly hesitate to attribute without strong evidence. The paper proposes an operational framework combining horizon scanning, cross-domain indicator analysis, narrative and temporal analysis, and coordination between EU INTCEN, EEAS StratCom and national services. It recommends dedicated cognitive warning cells, structured OSINT at the core of strategic warning, shared cognitive-domain indicators, stronger cross-domain analytical fusion and institutionalised anticipatory analysis. The central message is that Europe needs better integration and interpretation of existing capabilities more than new collection.

Abstract

European warning systems remain largely structured to detect discrete crises, military mobilisation, and observable escalation indicators. However, contemporary strategic competition increasingly unfolds through gradual influence operations designed to shape the informational and cognitive environment below traditional conflict thresholds. This paper argues that existing strategic warning frameworks are insufficiently adapted to detect cumulative cognitive pressure operating through narrative convergence, information amplification, and cross-domain influence activity. It introduces the concept of cognitive early warning: an anticipatory analytical approach focused on identifying emerging trajectories of cognitive influence before they crystallise into visible political or security crises. The paper examines why existing warning systems struggle to detect gradual informational conditioning and outlines an operational framework combining horizon scanning, cross-domain indicators, narrative analysis, and institutional analytical fusion. It concludes with policy recommendations aimed at strengthening anticipatory awareness capabilities within European intelligence and strategic communications architectures.

1. The Warning Problem

Traditional strategic warning systems were primarily developed to detect discrete crises, military mobilisation, and imminent escalation. Their analytical logic is largely event-oriented, seeking observable indicators that signal approaching conflict or geopolitical rupture. While these systems remain effective for conventional warning purposes, they are less suited to environments in which strategic competition unfolds gradually through persistent informational and cognitive pressure below traditional escalation thresholds.

Contemporary influence operations increasingly operate through narrative shaping, coordinated amplification, and cumulative informational effects rather than overt escalation (Rid, 2020; Mazarr, 2015). Digital platforms accelerate the circulation, amplification, and emotional intensity of information flows (Benkler et al., 2018; Singer and Brooking, 2018), and influence operations frequently aim less at persuasion than at fragmentation, uncertainty, and the erosion of shared interpretive frameworks (Wardle and Derakhshan, 2017).

Strategic warning systems therefore risk recognising cognitive influence operations only after their cumulative effects have already shaped political debate, institutional coordination, or public perception. The problem is not an absence of information, but the lack of analytical architectures capable of interpreting gradual cognitive pressure as a warning problem in its own right.

2. Cognitive Early Warning

This paper conceptualises cognitive early warning: an anticipatory analytical approach designed to detect cumulative influence activities intended to shape political perception, institutional behaviour, and decision-making environments before they crystallise into visible crises.

Unlike conventional strategic warning, cognitive early warning seeks to identify slow-moving patterns of influence operating across multiple domains simultaneously — narrative convergence across media ecosystems, coordinated amplification of polarising themes, synchronised messaging among state and non-state actors, or the gradual alignment of informational pressure with political, economic, or diplomatic developments.

Cognitive-domain competition rarely presents itself as a singular event. It operates through accumulation, ambiguity, and temporal dispersion. Cognitive early warning therefore differs from traditional indications-and-warning frameworks in three respects: it prioritises pattern recognition over event detection; it focuses on interactions between informational, political, social, and institutional signals; and it requires continuous monitoring of narrative dynamics rather than episodic crisis analysis.

It is also distinct from hybrid threat detection. While hybrid warning focuses on the coordination of military, cyber, economic, and political activities, cognitive early warning focuses specifically on how influence operations shape the decision-making environment itself. Its purpose is not to predict singular events with certainty, but to identify emerging trajectories of cognitive pressure before they become strategically consequential.

3. Why Existing Warning Systems Struggle

Contemporary warning systems remain structured around the detection of identifiable escalation indicators and observable operational preparation. Cognitive-domain competition presents a different challenge: influence operations rarely generate singular or unambiguous indicators, emerging incrementally across fragmented digital ecosystems where individual signals may appear attributable to ordinary political contestation.

This difficulty is intensified by the scale and velocity of contemporary information environments, which generate a volume of data exceeding the processing capacity of traditional analytical structures. Institutional fragmentation further complicates the problem: within the European context, relevant indicators are distributed across intelligence services, strategic communications units, diplomatic structures, and cyber agencies, each possessing partial visibility without a shared framework for integration.

Democratic institutions are also understandably cautious in attributing coordinated influence activity without high evidentiary confidence — yet this caution can delay recognition of cumulative cognitive pressure until its effects become politically visible. Traditional warning models are therefore methodologically misaligned with cognitive-domain competition, which requires analytical approaches capable of monitoring trajectories, convergence patterns, and cumulative informational effects over time.

4. Operationalising Cognitive Early Warning

Operationalising cognitive early warning requires analytical frameworks capable of detecting gradual and cumulative influence activity across multiple domains. The objective is enhanced anticipatory awareness rather than predictive precision.

4.1 Horizon Scanning and Information Environment Monitoring

The first component is continuous horizon scanning focused on evolving informational environments. Relevant indicators may include:

- rapid convergence of narratives across platforms and languages
- coordinated amplification of polarising themes
- synchronised messaging among state-linked and proxy actors
- persistent framing designed to erode institutional trust or political cohesion

Because much of this activity occurs in publicly accessible digital environments, structured OSINT capabilities become central to cognitive early warning.

4.2 Cross-Domain Indicator Analysis

Cognitive-domain competition rarely operates in isolation. Influence activity often coincides with political, economic, cyber, or diplomatic developments intended to reinforce uncertainty or intensify specific narratives.

Cross-domain analysis therefore becomes essential. Indicators may emerge through the simultaneous occurrence of:

- coordinated information campaigns
- cyber incidents targeting institutional credibility
- diplomatic signalling
- economic pressure or energy disruption
- increasing political polarisation around specific policy issues

Individually, such indicators may appear manageable or unrelated. Collectively, they may reveal attempts to shape the decision-making environment itself.

4.3 Narrative Convergence and Temporal Analysis

Traditional warning systems focus on observable escalation indicators. Cognitive early warning requires greater attention to narrative evolution over time.

This includes monitoring:

- how narratives spread across media ecosystems
- whether framing becomes increasingly aligned across actors
- how emotionally resonant themes evolve
- whether narratives begin influencing institutional debate or political positioning

Cognitive influence operations frequently rely on gradual normalisation rather than immediate persuasion. Their objective is often to shape the interpretive environment within which future decisions will later be made.

4.4 Institutional Architecture and Analytical Coordination

Operationalising cognitive early warning within Europe would require stronger coordination between institutions already involved in information monitoring and strategic analysis.

A feasible architecture could involve:

- EU INTCEN providing strategic analysis and intelligence fusion
- EEAS StratCom structures monitoring narrative dynamics and informational environments
- national intelligence services contributing contextual assessments and collection capabilities
- cyber and hybrid threat units integrating cross-domain indicators

Rather than creating entirely new institutions, cognitive early warning could build upon existing structures through improved coordination mechanisms and shared analytical frameworks.

5. Policy Recommendations

If cognitive-domain competition increasingly unfolds through cumulative informational conditioning, European warning systems require analytical capabilities designed to detect influence trajectories before they become strategically consequential.

5.1 Establish Dedicated Cognitive Warning Cells

The EU should develop dedicated cognitive warning cells focused on detecting cumulative influence activity and narrative convergence across multiple domains.

Operating through existing structures such as EU INTCEN and the EEAS Strategic Communications divisions, these cells would integrate intelligence analysis, OSINT monitoring, and strategic communications expertise.

5.2 Integrate Structured OSINT into Strategic Warning

Because cognitive influence activity largely unfolds in open-source environments, structured OSINT should become a central component of strategic warning processes rather than a supplementary capability.

This requires investment not only in collection tools but also in analytical methodologies capable of distinguishing between informational noise and coordinated influence activity.

5.3 Develop Shared Cognitive-Domain Indicators

European institutions should establish common analytical frameworks for identifying cognitive-domain indicators related to:

- narrative convergence
- coordinated amplification
- institutional trust erosion
- cross-domain synchronisation between informational and political developments

Shared frameworks would reduce fragmentation across institutions and facilitate more coherent anticipatory assessments.

5.4 Expand Cross-Domain Analytical Fusion

The EU should strengthen analytical fusion mechanisms integrating cyber, intelligence, diplomatic, economic, and informational analysis into unified warning assessments.

This could involve joint analytical exercises, integrated reporting mechanisms, and shared assessment protocols between intelligence and strategic communications units.

5.5 Institutionalise Anticipatory Analysis

European institutions should expand the use of:

- horizon scanning
- anticipatory analysis
- scenario-based warning exercises
- long-term narrative trend assessment

These approaches are particularly important in environments where influence operations seek to shape future decision contexts incrementally over time.

Taken together, these measures would improve the capacity of European institutions to recognise cumulative influence activity earlier, interpret fragmented indicators more coherently, and develop anticipatory awareness in environments characterised by persistent cognitive competition.

6. Conclusion

Strategic competition increasingly unfolds through gradual efforts to shape the informational and cognitive environment rather than through immediate escalation or identifiable crises. The concept of cognitive early warning reflects the need to adapt strategic warning frameworks to environments characterised by ambiguity, cumulative influence activity, and persistent informational competition.

The challenge is no longer simply identifying hostile actions, but recognising when the informational environment is being progressively conditioned in ways that may later shape political behaviour, institutional coordination, and strategic decision-making. Many relevant capabilities already exist across European intelligence, strategic communications, and open-source analysis structures. The central problem is fragmentation: indicators remain dispersed across institutional silos, analytical methods remain event-oriented, and cumulative informational dynamics fall outside traditional warning frameworks.

Strengthening cognitive early warning therefore depends less on expanding collection and more on improving integration, interpretation, and anticipatory analysis across institutional boundaries. In environments where influence operates continuously below traditional thresholds, the ability to recognise gradual shaping processes may become as important as the ability to detect imminent crises.

References

- Benkler, Y., Faris, R. and Roberts, H. (2018) *Network Propaganda: Manipulation, Disinformation, and Radicalization in American Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mazarr, M.J. (2015) *Mastering the Gray Zone: Understanding a Changing Era of Conflict*. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute and U.S. Army War College Press.
- Rid, T. (2020) *Active Measures: The Secret History of Disinformation and Political Warfare*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Singer, P.W. and Brooking, E.T. (2018) *LikeWar: The Weaponization of Social Media*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Wardle, C. and Derakhshan, H. (2017) *Information Disorder: Toward an Interdisciplinary Framework for Research and Policy Making*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.