

THE POSSIBILITY OF ENGAGING HARD POWER IN COMBATING TERRORISM

Hatidža Beriša, PhD

School of Engineering Management, Belgrade, Serbia

Katarina Jonev

Anti-Human Trafficking IBSSA, Belgrade, Serbia

Željko Gajić

Abstract: Terrorism, as an enigma of instinct of extremism, of persons driven by ideology or of those eager to gain wealth in an incomprehensibly cruel way, is undoubtedly a global problem today. Society does not have an adequate response to this phenomenon, that is, on a cruel and uncompromising war terror.

The terrorist propaganda has created an atmosphere in which the individual does not feel free and safe. The fear of terrorism has entered all the parts of society, and the development of technology also marked a new era of terrorism.

Thus, starting from the fact that the main factor of terrorism is surprise, in modern times terrorism and fear of it have practically become part of everyday life. Because of terrorism, danger grows, like a genie from a bottle, and becomes far greater than its actual physical condition. Images of terrorism, in publicly accessible articles, newspaper caricatures, a variety of published books on the subject, usually portray giant weapons against skidding targets.

This paper aims to consider the challenges, but in the context of the effects and consequences associated with the sensibility of the role of hard power (in general), and hence its use in terms of challenges in the contemporary fight against terrorism with a brief overview of the place, role and mode of operation of the Serbian Armed Forces as part of the security apparatus.

Key words: security, hard power, force, terrorism, armed forces, fear, terror, danger, Serbian Army.

INTRODUCTION

Although terrorism has been known since the French Revolution, its unique definition does not exist. Because of the impossibility of defining this major problem of the modern world, many countries are creating their own definitions, so

that “terrorist” is actually a description that has never been accepted by any single individual or group. This name is attributed to them by others, primarily the governments of the attacking states. For example, the United States defines it as “calculated use or threat of violence in order to get into fear, with the aim of forcing or intimidating governments or societies” (Townshend, 2003: 4) or as “the use or threat of serious violence against any person or property, aimed at promoting a political, religious or ideological program of action.” (Simeunović, 2009: 37).

The main goal of terrorism is undoubtedly fear, that is, awe. The victim can be absolutely unimportant and irrelevant to perpetrators, while fear is intentional and important. Therefore, terrorism can also be analyzed as a method by which a particular organized group or party attempts to achieve its goals by the systemic use of violence. Thus terrorism does not differ only from the terror of the state, but also from mass violence or mass uprising.

Christopher C. Harmon warns that terrorism is always political, even when it shows some other motives (religious, economic or social). “Fiercely small groups, state agents and wider rebel movements that seek to achieve political and military goals that, in their estimation, are impossible to achieve at regular political forums or in the battlefield against the entire army, use terrorism, which today has become a well-known feature of the world politics and conflict” (Harmon, 2000:24).

This is precisely the point - that the global fight against terrorism is long and difficult, and that the most adequate response to this kind of “global monsters” can be achieved by security forces, among which the military is also deployed or engaged. As a part of the country’s security system, the army has an important role to play in fighting this phenomenon, and in itself, the phenomenon is the biggest challenge for it. Under certain circumstances, political and social conditions in society, the application of hard power (the use of military power) can also have negative consequences for future internal political relations and the realization of the rights and freedoms of citizens in a society that is affected by terrorism, or which is facing it (Nye, 2004: 12-16). Upon its implementation, hard (military) power might have an impact on the escalation of conflicts in this struggle, as well as the fact that its reactions encourage the creation of new terrorists.

THE APPLICATION OF HARD POWER IN FIGHTING TERRORISM

In the last few years, and even decades, it has been suggested that the role of military force in democratic societies should not be focused on internal threats. This has been manifested through several trends, giving the security of the borders of European countries into the hands of the internal security forces - the police, as well as reducing the active composition of the army and rejecting recruitment in a large number of countries. The countries of Western Europe, that is the EU,

have introduced a trend of demilitarization of states, focusing on internal security and the building of external military capability as part of the system of collective security (Moulson, 2015). However, with more frequent terrorist attacks, some of which led to a large number of victims, the need for engaging military forces, or their appearance on the streets (Paris, Brussels, Berlin, etc.), also arose.

In parallel with this, the questions arise: what kind of challenge this is for military forces and is the army necessary in countering terrorism?

Modern security challenges posed by terrorism are increasingly being manifested as uneasy challenges, risks and threats to security. In the changed field and approach to security at the beginning of the 21st century, it is clear that most countries have put emphasis on new, unequal challenges, risks and threats to security (Beriša, 2018: 69). In preventing and remedying the consequences of these threats, a coordinated and efficient work of several state services from different levels of hierarchy is needed (Barker: 2003, 24).

In practice, it has been shown that countries that have benefited from low-intensity conflict management have had better success in the fight against terrorism than those countries that had deployed the military to escalate the situation into high-intensity conflicts. Recognizing the fact that the US and NATO have failed to defeat terrorism with the use of military force in Afghanistan, unless they have organized it or created it for higher goals in terms of global control and domination in the world in terms of managing certain vital resources, the question arises is such a strategy unsuitable and does a challenge like this exist as a real problem without borders and the expiry date?

The answer may be sought through the application of hard power in the form of the use of the army and its fight against terrorism against movements that are in many cases closely related to ethnic-nationalist and religious reasons, political struggles for supremacy, extreme groups seeking the division of power etc., where is terrorism just an asset, not an end in itself.

Therefore, there is a longstanding debate about whether terrorism is a criminal offense or an act of war and which is the real reason for the group that uses terror to define extreme violence against the state (Hoffman, 2000:7-12). The strategy that should be used in the fight against terrorism depends on how perceived this threat is perceived. So far, the priority forces in the fight against terrorism have been police. The reason for this is to solve the problem before its escalation, or maintaining a conflict, which in itself greatly facilitates work and does not require the strain of some additional trained forces. By contrast, military forces are engaged in cases of exceptional crises, as well as assistance and support to civilian authorities.

Although action in certain situations is within the jurisdiction of civilian authorities of the country, the army can be called upon in case of major crises and more serious problems, where terrorism is certainly. In circumstances where other forces and ways of protection and rescue systems are not sufficient for an adequate response, responsible military units ensure the participation of orga-

nizational units and military facilities to provide assistance in the fight against terrorism. In the event of an attack on military facilities and the escalation of terrorist activities, the army as the highest defense body can be used for the destruction and destruction of terrorist forces..

It is important to emphasize that terrorism as a phenomenon is not a routine event. It is a very harsh and stressful event that engulfs all actors and presents a complete surprise. It is precisely the component of unexpectedness that is the main cause of the inadequate or slow response of the holders of functions in this situation, among which the Army has its place and role. If all this is added to the time limit for the action and the pressure it carries, as well as the absence of necessary or precise information on the situation on the ground, decision-making is a serious challenge, thus impeding the need to act and which forces to engage in an adequate response .

Bearing in mind that the Army is organized unit in which the executive part is followed by a decision and command, it would be on that basis, if only these would be taken into account, be the most adequate response, reaction and use. That would then be an easily solved challenge. However, given that it is something crude and unpredictable, with an ambiguously defined vision of action and an adequate risk assessment, the engagement of the Army becomes imperative.

With the emergence of transnational terrorism that knows no boundaries, what happens in one country has a major impact on international relations. The use of the Armed Forces in the fight against terrorism can have implications, primarily on the state itself, and then on international relations. It is therefore necessary to really see if military engagement is more effective than the engagement of police forces, or is the organizational culture of the Army answers to challenges of contemporary terrorism.

At this point, it seems that the behavior of the terrorists imposes a military response. A large number of world theorists and analysts agree that this is exactly the goal of the terrorists. The generally accepted view is that the intention of the terrorists was to force Western democracies to sacrifice freedom at the expense of security. Accordingly, the very appearance of soldiers on the streets of Europe over the past years could be interpreted as the success of terrorists. Terrorists in this strategy apply some guerilla general principles, such as invoking the Army to apply disproportionate force and thereby causing collateral damage to the civilian population (Dimitrijević, 1982:16).

The use of military force in the fight against terrorism can have a positive impact on the temporary suppression of terrorism, but also the negative impact on civil society, state policy and the behavior of the Army itself. The military forces in the fight against terrorism must make a series of organizational changes, including the extension of their powers in the direction of policing. It is estimated that for the victory in the anti-terror campaign, state governments must mobilize ten times more troops than an estimated number of terrorists, which is practically

the mobilization and reconstruction of the state for the war. This can mean the militarization of civil society, which is by no means good (Hughes: 2011, 26).

Contrary to anti-suppression, counter-terrorism should in principle contain more defensive measures to reduce the ability of the terrorist group to adversely affect the country's population, such as the prohibition of political action, the presence of police in public places and the design of a psychological operation against terrorists. This is where the military intelligence sector should play the main role, ie the modernly equipped teams or individuals who use modern devices and equipment in providing accurate information in real time. It is also necessary to engage individuals or teams working on the gathering of knowledge. The goal is timely detection of the intent of the enemy forces, and in other emergency situations for the detection of various criminal activities.

Within the response to the challenges of terrorism as a phenomenon, efforts should be made to establish a balance between freedom and security, with the aim of showing that the conflict did not escalate. This is usually done through communication with the population, in order to prevent the intention of the terrorist group to gain sympathy for the population.

THE HARD POWER IN THE USE OF THE MILITARY FORCE IN THE FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM

In the fight against terrorism, countries can undergo two models: to pursue terrorists in accordance with the law on armed conflict or under national criminal law. "The first is inherent, it can be said of the luxury that applies to large countries that have greater credibility in the international community. They can afford to declare war on terror and treat it as a military threat. The other model is typical of small countries, restrictions in their criminal codes prevent the use of all available capacities, they consider terrorism as a criminal offense and prosecute terrorists as criminals under the criminal law of the country. Although this model is typical for small countries, it is also characteristic of liberal democracy" (Erbay, 2012:6).

Since the most important part of the integral system of protection and rescue are trained people in the composition of specialized, highly-equipped and trained services, which especially applies to members of the Army, but also to other state structures of countries, the analysis of multilingics within the scenario analysis is an effective tool for determining functional needs and the tasks of the Army in responding to a challenge that presents a catastrophic scenario, such as terrorism, as a form of non-threatening threat.

It is also important to emphasize here that the Army in countering terrorism must also place emphasis on critical infrastructure as one of the central issues of national security.

Critical infrastructure¹ can be damaged due to a variety of factors, which, as natural as it is, can be most seriously affected by terrorism. In addition to direct consequences, the destruction of critical infrastructure can, from a psychological point of view, lead to total public distrust in public institutions, which can undoubtedly be the target of terrorist acts.

SERBIAN MILITARY FORCE IN THE FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM

When it comes to our Army, designing needs is done on the basis of subjective and experienced assessments, but since there are no quantitative and measurable indicators of the use of the Army in various situations, the possible execution of exact ranking according to functional needs and tasks is more in the domain of theory (Pravo, 1999: 23-47).

According to the Doctrine of the Serbian Armed Forces, the Army does not develop special forces intended to support civilian authorities, but the existing ones are engaged, which, according to their basic purpose, can successfully carry out these tasks. In combat actions against terrorist forces, dedicated anti-terrorist units are engaged in accordance with their tasks and in the function of supporting other security forces (Serbian Army Doctrine).

Given that the consequences of terrorist acts are diverse and complex for people, animals, material goods and the environment, it is necessary to provide additional capacities for action, which is certainly a new challenge. In particular, it is necessary to provide bargaining forces, medical teams, firefighting teams, field clearing teams, decontamination teams, demining, etc.

In the case of terrorist threats, military forces can, in principle, be engaged in the execution of two types of operations. Those are:

1. Preventive deployment operations which can be carried out in peace and in a state of emergency in order to demonstrate a favorable impact on the elimination of security threats from terrorism without the use of armed forces, ensure the timely completion of the task of carrying out tasks and provide support to the state authorities in case of need for implementation armed forces. The effectiveness of preventive deployment operations depends to a large extent on the possession of timely and accurate intelligence. During military operations, military force is applied only in extreme necessity, but its application in the case of an escalation of armed violence against units of the Serbian Armed Forces or partners in the operation is not excluded.

2. Counter-Terrorism Operations - fighting operations performed in peace and armed conflict to support and assist civil authorities in disabling terrorist activities. In the case of an attack on military facilities and the escalation of

¹ Critical infrastructure includes many sectors of the economy, including the banking and financial sector, transport and distribution, energy, health, food supplies, communications, and other government functions and services.

terrorist activities, the Serbian Armed Forces can be used for the destruction of terrorist forces, regardless of the forces of the Ministry of Interior.

In the case of terrorist acts, the need for engagement of military units ranges from high to low. In most cases, the rapid and powerful engagement of military special anti-terrorist units is necessary, especially when military facilities are at risk, or it is a matter of major terrorist acts and the civil sector. Although they are the carrier of such actions by the special anti-terrorist unit of the Ministry of Interior, the military units represent a very serious force in the preventive sense, as well as in counterterrorism acts itself. Illustrative example of the use of the Army in a preventive sense is terrorist acts in Kosovo and Metohija or the engagement of NATO forces in Afghanistan. Both examples have shown that the operation of the Army must be well thought out, and the use of forces selective and well organized. From practice it has been shown that the use of excessive force does not produce the desired effects, which should be made before the operation itself.

Taking into account the fact that the Army of Serbia, beside the conflicts with the terrorists in Kosovo and the NATO aggression against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, did not in the later period have had major challenges or problems in countering terrorism, but that according to the challenges, risks and threats, worked out various scenarios of struggle against terrorism, it is estimated that the existing organization of the Serbian army in operational terms can deal with this type of threat. Technical capacities are relatively sufficient to respond to existing challenges, while operational procedures are not best “tuned” to cover all aspects of risk, which undoubtedly needs to be done.

EUROPEAN MILITARY FORCE IN FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM

On the other hand, many countries in Europe were directly under the terror of the terrorists, which led them to deepen the analysis and develop a strategy of direct fight against terrorism (Erbay, 2012:37). Thus, after the Paris attacks in 2015, France began to consider a national policy on the use of the army in the fight against terrorism on its territory. “In the fight against terrorism, France has hired more than 10,000 soldiers on the streets of large cities, with only about 5,000 soldiers deployed in Paris to patrol and secure important facilities. The citizens of Paris were accustomed to the presence of soldiers who were on the streets after launching Operation “Sentinel” after the attack on Charlie Ebdou in January 2015” (CNN News, 2015). Immediately after the attack in Paris, the army was also deployed in Belgium (Brussels) for reported threats and suspicions that terrorists were planning attacks in Belgium. “For the first time in 35 years, along with the police, hundreds of armed soldiers patrolled Brussels with the task of preventing terrorist attacks, while the authorities called on citizens to stay in their homes, proclaiming the highest level of threat” (Aljazeera news, 2015).

In this context, European countries, such as Germany and Austria, are considering the use of soldiers in state-wide missions to combat terrorism more effectively. In Germany, there are several reasons that limit the use of the army for missions in the interior: the German police have specialized in internal security training, which lasts for three years, while soldiers do not have this kind of training; the army has no police powers - for example, they must not arrest persons or carry out controls; the work of the police is within the jurisdiction of the German regions.

The question arises whether the use of the army in such restrictions would be useful. If multiple attacks occurred at the same time, it is questionable whether the army would respond more quickly than the police. In that case, soldiers could be used to secure large areas, not to disarm and disable attackers. It can be concluded that the use of the army within the country does not mean that it would replace the police, but would work with them to achieve a common goal, to overcome modern terrorism.

The positive side of the use of the army in the fight against terrorism is reflected in the possibility of rapidly neutralizing the existing threats and in the demonstration of the state that it will be firmly defended against future threats. In doing so, the army should be used in accordance with state laws and it should interact with units that are responsible for the fight against unconventional threats. The goal must be to keep the conflict at a low level of intensity so as not to cause further significant damage and there should be good coordination and synchronization of the military with the police force, which are usually better acquainted with the situation on the ground and with the population.

The most of European countries have chosen a police approach in the fight against terrorism, following experience that has proven to be more effective than the military one.

The negative consequences arising from the use of the army in the fight against terrorism can be: escalation of conflicts, the creation of new terrorists and granting more power to the army, which may pose a threat to democracy. The escalation of the conflict is manifested when the army enters the streets of cities and begins to act with greater power, which in the eyes of citizens means war. In an attempt to end the conflict urgently, too much force would be hired to inflict greater and unnecessary damage to the infrastructure. This could further trigger economic, social and political consequences, as well as the consequences for foreign policy. The problem with this use of the army is the linear establishment of a military organization against a threat that is non-linear, complex and involves different aspects of the social life of the country.

This means that if the military is not capable of an unconventional fight against terrorists, which are essentially irregular forces, there may be an adverse effect and escalation of the conflict. Therefore, in the fight against terrorism, in principle, the forces of special units could be used. The practice shows that the engagement of the army in the operations against terrorists in the country can cause a problem

with legitimacy, as well as the creation of new terrorists. Given the indiscriminate use of forces, there is collateral damage, which creates resentment and frustration of the population. If the population sympathizes with terrorists, it would also be possible for citizens to join the terrorist ranks.

Since there is a thin line between terror and rebellion, some terrorist groups build a political platform that would be portrayed as a legitimate force in protecting the rights of certain groups. When the state takes military action against terrorists, this can lead to the incitement to intensely recruit citizens in the ranks of terrorist groups. In this way, the army creates martyrs from terrorists and contributes to their even greater cohesion and popularity.

States that fight terrorism in accordance with the laws of armed conflict treat the fight against terrorism as a war and use all available capacities. This cannot be afforded by all countries because the international reaction to different countries varies depending on their political, economic and military power. Those countries that can afford to use the great forces treat terrorists as a national, regional or global threat and openly deploy armed forces to destroy them. But there is a risk of losing legitimacy in the fight against terrorism and condemning the country by the international community. The Russian Federation was faced with this situation in the time of Boris Yeltsin, during the First Chechen War, while fighting against terrorism on its territory. The Russian Federation was condemned by Western countries as an aggressor for the use of disproportionate force, because the Russian army caused significant collateral damage. Also, the same example was experienced by our country, which - while fighting against terrorist organizations in Kosovo and Metohija - was accused according to a similar scenario, and in turn, terrorists became rebels and then the liberation movement. This means that "in attempts to combat terrorism, states can use methods that result in consequences more harmful to democracy than terrorism itself" (Erbay, 2012: 12).

CONCLUSION

As far as it is concerned, the fight against terrorism is asymmetrical because "terrorists, as non-state actors, have incomparably smaller capacities in relation to the armies and police, for which terrorism undoubtedly poses a dangerous challenge. This gives them an advantage over the infamous military formations that can in a relatively easy way endanger the power and at the same time exploit their vulnerability" (Rykhtik, 2008:167). This is one of the reasons why many analyses indicate that military solutions in the fight against terrorism are not effective because the conflict only further intensifies, and the rise of terrorism leads to a classic rebellion.

The answer to the question whether the army can respond to a challenge such as terrorism is still unclear "because the military usually focuses on winning, while practice shows that it must focus on efficiency and, measurable with success, to reduce the destruction of infrastructure and occurrence of collateral

damage” (Rykhtik, 2008:171). What can be said is that the use of the army in the fight against terrorism can be both useful and harmful, regardless of whether the challenges posed to the army are real or not, while certainly thinking about the fact whether it is engaged within its country’s territory or outside national boundaries.

Comprehensively observing, it can be concluded that the use of the army in the fight against terrorism should be the last option of states. The price that a modern democratic society must pay can be an escalation of the conflict, limitation of freedom and the potential creation of new terrorists. On the other hand, it is necessary to re-examine the nature of terrorism as a phenomenon and try to solve the problem at the start or before it arises.

In the context of the above, events in the Middle East can be considered as a consequence of the military approach in the “long war” of the Western countries in the fight against terrorism, which may have been caused by the tendency of the great to rule or the weak and the poor to strengthen or if nothing else to draw attention to themselves, and put fear in the bones of others in the sense that it is seen that they exist as a dangerous mechanism. However, although experience shows that military access is less efficient and that it is better if the problem of terrorism is treated as a criminal offense, modern terrorism has functions that resemble a rebellion in which terrorist methods are used. This mutation of global threats to terrorism will inevitably affect the changing and sensitive role of the army in democratic countries, and as such, represent an outstanding challenge in engaging in a manner and under circumstances that are not clear enough.

REFERENCES

1. Aljazeera news, Army patrols deserted streets as Brussels on edge, available at: <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2015/11/army-patrols-deserted-streets-brussels-high-alert>
2. Barker, J.: *A terorizmus*, Budapest: HVG Kiadó Rt., 2003
3. Becker, Jo., Secret “Kill List” Proves a Test of Obama’s Principles and Will, N. Y. Times (May 29, 2012)
4. Beriša H, i autori “Terorizam -pretnja globalnoj bezbednosti”, Treća međunarodna konferencija «ne nasilje - jedinstven društveni odgovor», 25-27 05. 2018, Banja Luka.
5. CNN News, Security boosted as Europe scrambles to handle growing threats, 2015, <http://edition.cnn.com/>
6. Dimitrijević, V.: *Terorizam*, Beograd: Radnička štampa, 1982.
7. Erbay T., *The role of the military in counterterrorism: Unintended consequences*, Naval postgraduateschool, Monterey, California, 2012
8. Harmon C.”*Terrorism Today*”, Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2000

9. Hofman, B.: Unutrašnji terorizam, Beograd: Narodna knjiga – Alfa, 2000.
10. Hughes G., The military's role in counterterrorism: examples and implications for liberal democracies, Strategic studies institute, U.S. Army War college, 2011
11. Moulson G, German Cabinet Approves Military Intervention Against ISIS In Syria, The World Post, 2015
12. Rykhtik M., Asymmetric Threats and Counter-Terrorism Strategies in Russian National Counter-Terrorism Strategies, ebook National counter / terrorism strategies,
13. Simeunović, D.: Terorizam: opšti deo, Beograd: Parni fakultet Univerziteta, 2009. (Beograd: Dosije studio).
14. Townshend, C.: Terorizam, Sarajevo: „Šahinpašić“, 2003.
15. Terorizam i srodna krivična dela: teorija i praksa, Beograd: Savezno ministarstvo pravde: Časopis Pravo, 1999.