MICHAELA ZÁTURECZKÁ[1]

Global Terrorism as a Part of Military Science

Abstract

The aim of this work is to highlight the importance of countering terrorism on a global scale. Terrorism has an ability to extremely adapt to new conditions. It is open to technological progress, but it does not give up on its traditional forms in order to promote political, religious, moral or ethnic interests. Combining traditional forms of terrorism with modern technology can generate an interesting picture of the scope and overall potential of current terrorism in 21st century.

Global terrorism, due to its nature, belongs to the current global problems of humanity. It triggers global consequences. Globalization and its' deepening reciprocity, also contributes to deepening of mutual vulnerability. Damaging a defined enemy, even geographically distant, is easier for global operational terrorists than ever before.

Therefore, understanding terrorism as an integral part of military science is a key to countering terrorist activities efficiently. Importance of accepting certain traits of warfare when it comes to activities carried out by terrorist organisations is undeniable. By this means, it is necessary to create a new outlooks when dealing with terrorist activities.

Keywords: global terrorism, investigative, diplomatic, military responses, soft target, counter-terrorism

INTRODUCTION

The meaning of terrorism has changed very frequently and fairy substantially over the past 200 years. Defining the term „terrorism" is remarkably difficult due to it's ever changing nature and form that it takes over the time. Some experts claim that terrorism, a phenomenon that takes up so many forms, can be explained by many different interpretations. Edmund Burke was among the first to use the term, which he invoked to describe Robespierre's "Reign of Terror," a strategy aimed at stifling opponents and controlling the masses after the French Revolution. He used terrifying means – tens of thousands were executed at the guillotine, and hundreds of thousands of others were shot or left to die in prisons – in the name of virtuous democratic ideals, as an instrument of social control by

---

[1] Armed Forces Academy of general Milan Rastislav Štefánik in Liptovský Mikuláš, Slovakia, 1st Degree Private, E-mail: zatureczka.michaela@gmail.com

the state to restore order in a climate of anarchy. This somewhat positive connotation of terrorism remained largely until the 1930s, when the term became used to connote repression of the masses by totalitarian states, including Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Stalinist Russia.

The modern usage of the term, developed in the mid-twentieth century, regards terrorism as a tool of ethnic and religious fanatics to serve political ends, such as liberation from an alien occupying group, or simply to exact righteous vengeance against a group labeled as a threat or enemy.

Despite multiple attempts to define terrorism, there is no general agreement on the precise interpretation. This socio-pathological phenomenon has an explicitly complicated background. Forms of terrorism are still in move and evolving. This depends on the country's internal political situation, external relations with other countries and the funding available to individual terrorist organizations.

For the purposes of my work, I would like to use this definition of terrorism:

> *Terrorism is the premeditated and unlawful use or threatened use of violence against a noncombatant population or target having symbolic significance, with the aim of either inducing political change through intimidation and destabilization or destroying a population identified as an enemy.*

1. GLOBAL TERRORISM

Global terrorism, due to its nature, belongs to the current global problems of humanity. It triggers global consequences. Globalization and its' deepening reciprocity, also contributes to deepening of mutual vulnerability. Damaging a defined enemy, even geographically distant, is easier for global operational terrorists than ever before. The current globalization process allows the creation of those groups of subversive terrorism, whose ideological and religious doctrines form a platform for mutual co-operation.

The roots of global terrorist activities lay within internal political situation of problematic, especially third world, countries. Consequently, the follow ups are negative external reactions to countries that interfere. Interfering countries could be those who are bordering with the one having internal political issues, or geopolitically significant states such as United States, Russian Federation and even some European countries under NATO flag. Interference or active support in overthrowing governments and supporting revolutions leads to broadening chaos and victimization. The response does not stay internal, but it clears a path to countries geograpically distant in order to strike a powerful response in form of terror attacks.

In order to explain the rise of global terrorism, we need to understand that every actions has a resulting reaction to it.

1.1 TERRORISM AND CRIME

Acts of terror are almost always criminal acts too. They involve the violation of a local or national criminal statute.

This fact has practical implications:

– state and local justice agencies are responsible for protecting communities against all forms of crime
– agencies are responsible for homeland and international security
– criminal statutes and intervention policies ensure that the public is protected against terrorism.

Terrorists are relateable to other violent criminals in many ways. They inflict harm on innocent people and both national and private property. Their actions and outcomes of those actions are always with an intent in order to commit crimes with an instrumental goal in mind. They are predominantly young and male, aware that they are breaking the law, but not dissuaded by the law from committing their acts. Typically they are disrespectful of social norms, order, and systems of social control. They often operate in small irregular teams to overwhelm targets of opportunity. In addition, they tend to operate outside of predictable patterns to minimize the possibility of detection and prevention by law enforcement officials, citizens and authorities.

Nevertheless, terrorists are different from criminals in at least three important respects.

– they tend to do crimes that are more serious than most violent crimes
– they aim quite purposefully to inflict fear in a large target population
– they do so typically to serve an extremist political agenda, justifying their acts as supportive of a larger social goal, often with the hope of winning recruits to their cause.

These differences are profound, especially to the extent that terrorists succeed in drawing in others to a massive, sustained campaign of violence against a civil population. Common street criminals may be more reintegrated into a neighborhood without a risk to the community than terrorists, who aim to destroy a large group of innocent people or an entire population. Even when terrorists violate the same laws as nonterrorist criminal offenders, it may be appropriate to impose more severe sanctions against them to protect society against the more harmful attacks that they have expressed a strong motivation to commit. Terrorism is, after all, a close relative of hate crime, which also receives more severe sanctions than crimes that are otherwise similar to it.

1.2 TERRORISM AND WAR

Warfare among tribes is surely as old as the inclination of humans to actually form these tribes. At various points in the early development of the human species, individuals turned from the exclusive use of weapons for plain hunting to their use in defense of life and property against aggression from other wild animals and aggressive individuals. As the time

went on they began to organize in bigger groups in order to ensure and improve defense abilities of a clan or tribe's territory or to conquer and occupy.

With the rise of the nationstate, this process took place on a larger, more organized scale that had to ensure the ability to protect a whole population. Warfare became a formal process to be used following the failure of peaceful persuasion – in the words of von Clausewitz, "the continuation of policy with the admixture of other means". By ,,those means" he meant more aggressive and threatening forms of persuasion that could be applied upon a reluctant nation.

Modern war involves the formal declaration between two or more sovereign nationstates to engage in hostility. This process is based on a discussion between both sides and an agreement to engage militarily into the conflict.

In warfare, military actions operate under rules that are quite different from the legal rocedure that governs the conduct of law enforcement agents.

The differences show up at three important stages:

– pursuit
– capture
– sanction.

The law limits the behavior of criminal justice agents in each of these three aspects of the justice process, imposing considerably greater restraints than do codes of military conduct. Criminal justice and military conduct are understood as separate due to the differences with dealing with a regular criminal and a prisoner of war. Therefore, these three stages are dealing with an enemy combatant differently.

At the pursuit stage, an enemy combatant is fair game for eradication on a field of battle, whereas crime suspects cannot be killed unless they pose an immediate threat to others, even if they are fleeing from the scene of an offence.

After their capture, prisoners of war are detained at camps that are bound by codes of humane treatment, whereas the criminal justice system typically releases the suspect on bond or recognizance.

At the sanction stage, combatants are often killed if they do not surrender, and they can be imprisoned for as long as the war continues, whereas the criminal justice system rarely executes offenders, and the burden is on the prosecutor to prove the guilt of the suspect beyond a reasonable doubt. Criminal justice sanctions are typically announced by the judge at the time of sentencing; prisoners of war are imprisoned for indefinite periods.

In those three stages it is clear, that the codes of military conduct allow actions against enemy combatants, later prisoners of war, that are more violent in nature than the conduct of law enforcement allows against regular criminals.

But what about the "war on terror"? Isn't that a war too? Haven't the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq been essential components of this war on terror? Didn't al Qaeda declare war on the United States? Didn't Goege Bush Jr. declared the same statement against al Qaeda right after 9/11?

The answers to these questions reside in an important distinction: between war as a formal concept and "war" as a rhetorical device to generate political support for a cause.

 If war is truly a matter between sovereign states, and a particular group of terrorists do not act as agents of any nation, then country by any form of law has no formal power to wage war against them. It can act against them in many of the same ways as if against a state, but it cannot enact a war against terrorists.

The war on terror is, to be sure, more than mere rhetoric. Several interventions – military, legislative, and administrative – have been associatedwith it. A major military intervention was launched in Afghanistan in 2001to overthrow the Taliban regime, and another in Iraq in 2003 to remove weapons of mass destruction and topple Saddam Hussein from power.

But as philosopher Ronald Dworkin noted, *"We can conquer Kabuland Baghdad, but there is no place called Terror where the terrorists live."*

Nor is there a President of Terror with whom a formal peace treaty can be signed at the end of the so called ‚war".

The question arises when we imput into this implication a terrorist organisation ISIS (Islamic State). They inofficialy, but clearly declared themselves as a rising‚‚nation" with an intention to dramatically expand in near future. They were willing to put energy and money for military training and equipment in order to create ‚‚an army" of Islamic State warriors. They showed many signs of a rising threat that was comparable to a nation, even though not official, declaring a war in name of terror. What is more dangerous, is the fact that these people are highly ideologicaly driven and by those means they could be more dangerous and unpredictable to deal with. One thing is to fight against someone driven for a nation or a country. Other thing is to fight in an irregular war fought by people that are mainly driven by an ideology literally „ready to sacrifice everything and to die for".

However much we may dislike poverty, crime, drugs, and terrorism, and however much it may energize us in the short term to take action against them by elevating the cause rhetorically to the level of "warfare," wars against concepts tend generally to frustrate the public over the long term.

A nation can wage a successful campaign of defense against terrorists, but not warfare against it. Over the long term, waging an unwinnable war against terrorism may serve to dispirit the public and weaken its sustained resolve for security. It may do even worse: it may strengthen the hand of the terrorists by legitimatizing their cause as one involving "warriors," rather than criminals.

2. SOFT TARGET TERRORIST ATTACKS

A "soft target" is a person or thing that is relatively unprotected or vulnerable, especially to military or terrorist attack. Soft targets are places which support community and economic prosperity, where people congregate to study, shop, dine, conduct business, be entertained, worship, or travel. In general, they are open to facilitate access and thus have little or no security in order to be accessible to the public.

HADTUDOMÁNYI SZEMLE

Attacks against soft targets are attractive because soft targets have operational characteristics that make them vulnerable and easy to exploit, thereby ensuring higher success. To accomplish this objective, the layout of these venues must fulfill certain criteria, including an inviting atmosphere for visitors that is usually open and spacious.

Terrorist groups are almost exclusively choosing soft targets as their victims in order to induce casualities alongside with a powerful resonating response from the rest of the world. Attacks against soft targets with high civilian losses can generate global media attention that magnifies the terrorist groups' cause, satisfies their supporters, and attracts new recruits.

We know that ISIS has publicly called on its followers to drive trucks into crowds. Indeed, the power of social media to influence, recruit and radicalize across spectrums and ideologies is also part of our new normal.

Attacks on "soft targets" are often committed by individual terrorists, who become radicalized to commit acts of violence, including through the Internet. Terrorist groups continue to use social media and other technologies to attract new supporters and continue their terrorist activities. In this regard, special attention shoul be paid to countering thespread of terrorist ideology, wherever it manifests.

Protecting softt argets is complex.

The challenge is how to tailor both visible and invisible security measures and apply resources judiciously, thus decreasing the likelihood and consequences of an attack while reinforcing the confidence of the public.

This includes:

- recognize any unusual interest or questions about security procedures, including access controls, delivery gates, alarms, doors, gates, cameras and locks
- awarness of unusual incidents such as multiple fire alarms or fake emergency calls to the same location (this could indicate a test on the ability to respond to terrorist activity)
- being conscious of any car parked in the same area or location over multiple days and efforts to avoid surveillance cameras
- alertness to an unusual interest in hours of operation, security guards, and other employees
- increasing security awareness among staff (security guards, cleaning staff, maintenance and contractors)
- perform active and unpredictable patrolling in internal and external areas, particularly before and during special events and holidays
- conducting pre-employment screening of new personnel and existing staff to identify any derogatory information
- installing and utilizing CCTV systems to help identify planning activity.

3. RESPONSES TO TERRORIST ACTIVITIES

Terrorism with it's unpredictable presence is a silent executioner of democratic values in our society. Responding to a threat that is invisible and it's escalation has a both rapid and unexpected outcome is more difficult than dealing with criminality overall. Investigating a terrorist attack is blurred by many factors such as high casualities, possible damaged done to the environment and subsequent psychological responses. Therefore, investigators find themselves in a slightly different, more difficult position, due to the fact that national security is being seriously threatened.

3.1. INVESTIGATIVE RESPONSES

After the initial shock, serious terrorist attacks are usually countered quickly by a mix of investigative and diplomatic activities and, in some cases, a military response. Responding to terrorist attacks quickly is a key factor in early detection of exact locations and sources of attackers. Investigation of such an act goes way beyond analysing the crime scene. motives. In this case the motive is a well known factor that lead to an escalation of a terrorist attack. The first objective is to establish the main source of the attack and then to mobilize power against the terrorists both to deal with immediate threats and deter any possible future attacks. To achieve this first objective, standard crime scene forensic analysis is used to establish the profile of the attacker or attackers.

Investigative methods include the following:

- search and photographic documentation of the scene
- recovery of evidence
- chemical analysis of explosives
- ballistics tests to establish the precise location and impact of the explosion
- methods to determine the identity of the bomber
- analysis of earlier intelligence reports of suspected individuals and groups involved
- analysis of prerecorded confession tapes of suicide bombers
- interrogation of suspected collaborators
- interviews of witnesses
- analyses of telephone records, bank and credit card data, receipts, and computer files.

3.2. DIPLOMATIC RESPONSES

The 2001 terrorist attack on United States soil caused Americans to notice the need for security against terrorism as they never had before. In times of relative calm, a diplomatic approach to the prevention of terrorism seems more viable than a military response.

To begin with, formal diplomatic contacts with terrorists are generally incompatible with both diplomacy and terrorism, as terrorists operate typically outside of formal state authority and often make themselves inaccessible. Operating on a dimplomatic level with terrorists

that do not respect formal state authority, democratic values and law in general could be very dangerous and there wouldn't be any valuable outcome when it comes to preserving national security.

Due to the casualities and causes that involve an escalation of a terrorist attack, there is no ground for any diplomacy at all.

Moreover, states threatened or attacked by terrorists are in a disapproval in means of legitimizing or honoring their assailants by establishing diplomatic relationships with them.

One can imagine diplomats meeting informally with terrorists to obtain information that might be useful as intelligence. Such information may not be reliable at all and may be designed to misrepresent the facts and mislead rather than inform. What we need to understand is that the main goal of terrorists is to primarily mislead and therefore succeed in a terrorist attack. Negotiations in this case are completely useless and overwhelmingly dangerous. The prospect of meeting with terrorists for purposes of negotiation is generally questionable in any case, as terrorists rarely can be trusted to keep agreements that could compromise their own schemes and designs.

Diplomacy plays a more important role when conducted among sovereign nations that have either been attacked by terrorists or that see themselves as likely candidates for future terrorist attacks.

The primary goal of diplomacy in these cases is to organize actions against terrorists so that they can be brought to justice and so that subsequent acts of terrorism can be prevented.

3.3. MILITARY RESPONSES

The use of military force against terrorism can achieve both tactical and strategic gains – by removing immediate terrorist threats in the short term and deterring future attacks over the long term.

Military intervention could conceivably succeed in reducing the long-term chances of terrorism by the removal of dictators or regimes whose acts have clearly worsened the conditions that feed the expansion of terrorist organisations. Subsequently supporting the rise of governments that create conditions less hospitable to terrorism is a key factor in changing the political and social climate of third world countries. These changes are achieved by military activities, namely enabling operations or peacekeeping operations.

However, military force applied directly against terrorists raises other prospects that can have more serious longterm consequences.

One such problem is strategic: even when military force succeeds in producing short-term security gains, it can produce lasting setbacks by creating sympathy for the terrorists and their cause, thus feeding the clash of civilizations.

One such an example is the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003, initiated and conducted in the name of its „war on terror".

Articulated objectives of victory over the terrorists were not achieved. In this case there was seen a carnage to women, children and elderly populations in the weaker nation and

perceptions through media. It meant that the invading armies did not exercise sufficient concern about casualties to innocents caught in the crossfire.

Another problem relates to the adaptive capacity of terrorists. Terrorists do not have the resources to wage conventional warfare against a technologically sophisticated opponent, so they wage asymmetric warfare, fighting without uniforms, situating themselves in populated civilian areas, and violating other rules of warfare to which sovereign nations are bound. This is what makes their actions highly unpredictable and gives them an opportunity to infiltrate and strike right at the most weakest and vulnerable spots.

Moreover, the terrorists' use of human shields in densely populated areas, urban guerrilla warfare techniques, and kidnapping and assassination of soldiers and dissidents allowed them to neutralize the strengths of better equipped foot soldiers by drawing them into deadly ambushes where are placed improvised explosive devices or suicide bombers.

Military hard power is, however, widely accepted on both moral and utilitarian grounds as necessary to counter aggression, especially aggression against innocents.

Terrorism clearly qualifies for the application of such power, as long as that force is applied according to basic rules of ethics.

To wage the ,,war on terror" according to basic rules of ethics against terrorists and succeed at the same time is unbelievably difficult. Therefore, finding effectivness by creating a military strategy uniquely adapted to the needs of countering terrrorism should be necessary.

CONCLUSION

With the rise of IS and the recent attacks in France and Germany, many are asking what world powers are doing to fight terror. Counter-terrorism is the name given to the collective efforts to combat terrorism – acts of violence carried out in the name of an organisation or religion, or against an ideology.

Terrorism should be percieved both externaly and internaly. The main reason is the presence of foreign terrorist fighters (FTFs) whos activities are being enhanced by the high influx of unidentified migrants from MENA (Middle East and North Africa) countries. Foreign terrorist fighters are motivated to spread radical jihadist ideology all across the EU in order to increase the number of their members. This leads to manipulation of people that are being completely influenced by their ideology and are willing to carry out terrorist attacks resulting in high casualities and a powerful public response.

Creating new approaches in prevention of terrorist attacks is the ultimate medicine in maintaining national and international security. To react both preventivelly and effectively should help to constrain terrorist attacks from happening at all. Having an ability to recognize and target a potential terrorist in time should be the number one priority for most of the countries not only in United States, but undoubtedly in Europe too.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. BOBBITT, P. *Terror and consent: The wars for the twenty-first century.* Alfred A. Knope New York, 2008.
2. FROST, B. *Terrorism, crime and public policy.* Cambridge university press, 2009.
3. SVIATKO, M. *Globálny terorizmus*. Euroatlantické centrum, 2005. ISBN 80-969306-0-5.
4. KAVICKÝ, V., JANGL, Š., GAŠPIERIK, L. *Terorizmus: Hrozba doby.* Citadella, 2015.
5. ALLHOFF, F. *Terrorism: Ticking time bombs and torture.* The University of Chicago, Chicago and London, 2012. ISBN-13: 978-0-226-01483-8.
6. Available on the Internet: https://www.nbcnews.com/think/opinion/rise-soft-target-terror-attacks-symptom-police-success-ncna816616