



DEVELOPMENT OF WARFARE AND COUNTER-TERRORISM

Kalin Krastev¹ Hristo Hristov²

¹*PhD STUDENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
- SOFIA INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND PhD TRAINING*

²*DEPARTMENT OF MANAGE SECURITY SYSTEM, FACULTY OF TECHNICAL
SCIENCES, KONSTANTIN PRES LAVSKY UNIVERSITY OF SHUMEN*

Abstract: *In the XX-th and early XXI-st century one phenomenon has more acutely occurred in social and political life and although it has been going along with human development over centuries, today it contraries to the objective needs of the time, gets alarming proportions and becomes the primary global problem. This phenomenon is terrorism. It changes its forms and it is attaining more and more dangerous character for people through spreading to more countries; it is creating new threats to national security and political stability of countries and international relations. Today terrorism is a form of undeclared war against civilization and freedom of democratic societies and countries.*

Key words: *warfare, terrorism, peace-imposing, peacekeeping operations, terrorist organization, humanitarian crisis.*

I. Introduction:

Historical changes in the international security environment and particularly the new security challenges, one of which is terrorism, have led to the development of military and associated changes in the armed forces, including the army. Terrorism is also evolving as becoming more and more comprehensive, multi-faceted and aggressive. Studying its nature, manifestations, organization, goals and objectives involves presumably an adequate response to public security system. As far as terrorism is using fighting methods and means to achieve its goals and objectives, it needs the military response to its challenges. Such a response is mainly the prerogative to the internal security authorities that in conjunction with the army forces together are putting into practice the tools of warfare. Nevertheless, the development of the military science provides the army structure with operational capabilities to successful counteraction to asymmetric threats of terrorism. This involves refinements of the combat activity through new approaches to solve the fundamental issues that characterize the functioning of the army structures.

They involve creating:

- New structural and functional models of specialized military units with the appropriate manning, weapons and training;
- Competent command units;
- An interaction with other national departments and international military units.

Social activities on the occasion of and in connection with the war as a social phenomenon refer to warfare.

Such a definition implies a broader reflexivity for this specific activity that we can rightly define as "living totality" [1]. It is important to note that in the process of combat activity's improvement is necessary to select the correct and proper strategy, according to L. Pashov is "Each action aiming to reach the goal is a way of using the resource, as well as each way of using active agents is called strategy" [2].

II. Contents:

Terrorist activity is illegal in accordance with international and domestic law of each country. Each terrorist act is one or another kind of criminal offence. Perpetrators of terrorist activities use modern technical devices and technologies; there is an existing threat related to the usage of super-powerful weapons and extremely dangerous devices, including nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. In recent years, terrorism presents itself as one of the major threats to the security of individual countries, regions and international security as a whole. Today the threat of terrorism has many dimensions. The fear psychosis as well as the feeling of instability that terrorism creates in the society inevitably influence upon the political, social and economic decisions in national, regional and global aspect. As a part of democratic world Bulgaria is facing a common problem with terrorism too. Acceptance of the country as a full member in NATO and the future membership in the European Union as well as signing a number of international agreements related to counteracting to terrorist activity, ratified by the Republic of Bulgaria, all together define its commitment to actively participate in the fight against terrorism. This is possible only with the mutual and joint efforts of all governmental bodies.

"Terrorism is performance, incitement or assisting a criminal act which purpose is to cause fear and uncertainty among its victims and society, to force them to do things desired by the perpetrators. The act adopts nature of international terrorism when it is prepared or committed in the territory of two or more countries."

In the contemporary information society the object of terrorist cyber attacks has become the electronic control systems of life-providing economic systems of the armed forces, other governmental bodies and the private

business sector. Most of the committed in cyberspace crimes are based on gaps and weaknesses in computer and network systems. [3]

The main characteristics of terrorism occur in several ways: 1) primordially the damage of one terrorist act has great scope and the objects of its content are characterized with great variety; 2) the coverage of the harmful impact is usually wider than the range of individuals on which the perpetrators want to influence directly; 3) the instruments for committing one terrorist act are highly varied (most commonly firearms and explosives are used); 4) it does not matter how great is the damage because it isn't the very purpose of the terrorist. For the terrorist is important to cause a psychological effect - fear, dread, anxiety, insecurity, etc., which in turn to force the society adopt a desired behavior or to make public perform an action that is the actual terrorist's aim.

We will agree with George Fotev that warfare is interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary knowledge. It is that because "The army and the war are studied by different sciences" [4] and "They present these actions as multidimensional and define them as a complex reality" [5]. One deduction based on the broadest understanding of warfare is the necessity of providing more operationalized conception of it. In brief manner it is represented by Karlfon Clausewitz – "Martial art is the art of conducting the war, while you succeed to use to the best advantage the resources in the fight, which you have just before" [6]

Clausewitz himself specifies the meaning put into this concept, comparing: military science contains knowledge – martial art requires creativity [7]. But this correlation allows us to validate it exactly as a deed, but not art.

Conducting a war through the usage of available resources requires knowledge and intellectual capabilities in order to manage the war properly as well as to create and make use of these resources.

Actually, Clausewitz believed that this given definition is a statement in a broad sense. Because warfare covers "... all activities aiming war, and in particular all related to the creation of armed force, i.e. those providing sets, weapons, armor and training" [8]. Prussian military theorist tells us that even we were looking for operationalization of the concept of warfare, it implicitly contains interdisciplinary knowledge. And yet, according to Clausewitz warfare in the strict sense is represented by "...being at war (which-BA.) that includes handling of fight and its conduct" [9].

This provokes deriving of the basic structural activities of warfare - tactics and strategy. "The first one learns how to use forces in the fighting, and the second one - how to use the fighting for the purpose of the war" [10].

The sophistication of warfare (fighting in a war) caused by industrial production after The First World War is the reason about the appearance of its third structural component - operational art. It occupies an intermediate position

towards tactics and strategy. In the spirit of Clausewitz it can be defined as an activity that teaches how forces are used to connect the fightings. In fact, these three main activities construct the object of warfare as a science [11]. Because the military science as a social activity presupposes knowledges as well as capabilities in the field of creativity. These knowledges and creativity aimed at forming an ability, summarized in the classic expression of Harold Lasswell – “management of violence”. For the realization of the “management of violence” is needed organization.

The primary public product of warfare is the army. It is the institution for exercising violence. Hence the role of the military as “an expert in intruding force under certain conditions” has appeared [12]. Admittedly, these are the terms of war. But the war suggests a variety of situations and relevant ways and approaches of warfare that need to be reflected in a systematic way and then classified by tactics, operational art and strategy. Because actually “the differences between the military commanders in antiquity and (nowadays’ – Bulgarian author) ... those who control the most powerful up-to-date weapons ... are in some sort rather due to current technology and resources than the methodology of their work “[13].

However, it should be noticed that namely the technology mediated methods, which are the management contrivances for combat activity conduct. [14]. This means that the subject area of warfare is inseparable from its technical system. It’s about consistency between the cognitive (subject) and technical rationality in the military, which in turn requires quite possible organizational rationality [15].

The starting point here is the enemy. In this case - terrorism. What is terrorism? Researchers of this social phenomenon have not reached the formulation of one general plausible definition yet. It seems that there is a consensus on its definition related to a trinity of objectives, means and objects. Systematization imposes: “The objective pursued by the terrorists is always political.

Means used by terrorists (violence or threat with violence) depend on the specific objectives of each terrorist act.

Objects of terrorist acts are people, vehicles and/or buildings where there are huge damages and a numerous toll of human life.” [16].

One important basic characteristic of terrorism is the display of “the syndrome of the consequences of violence”. This means that the objects of terrorist acts are not only the physical casualties and the material destruction but the society itself in which regular activity fear will dominate. From that point of view we can conclude that terrorism is a kind of “synthesis between war and theater, a dramatization of the most rejected violence i.e. the violence that is perpetrated on innocent people, demonstrated in front of public, aiming to create a mood of fear for political reasons” [17].

What is a terrorist organization? One structure–functioned approach of consideration claims that terrorist organizations are with centralized or decentralized structures.

Many researchers highlight the contemporary terrorists' organizations which are constructed on a cellular basis. Their structure includes: staff; illegal military groups; units for reconnaissance and information; psychological unit; logistics units. The presence of sympathizers should be noticed. The composition of each unit (cell) is from 5/6 to 9/10 people.

What is the tactics of terrorists? The researchers highlight three stages in one terrorist act: preparatory, organizational and technical stage as well as four types of tactical actions with a view to the method for achieving the defined aims: blasting (the threat to blow up) or using other dangerous objects; an ambush; an attack and temporary control of vehicles, buildings and places (parts of settlements) and the firing at an object from distance [18].

These general characteristics of the enemy i.e. the terrorist organization are the reason to deduce the affirmation that according to military this organization and battle modes of action don't come as a surprise. If there is some element of surprise at the current stage, it lies in the ingenious and original use of the artifacts of modern post-industrial information society. (It has already mentioned above that the differences between past times and nowadays are rather related to technologies and resources than the methodology of action!) Why? Obviously if there is a closer scrutiny at the classification of the tactical actions of terrorists, presented by researchers once as stages of one terrorist act and twice as a type of tactical maneuvers, you will notice that similar methodology is used by any resistance (partisan) movement against the current government organized power.

The similarities are obvious: each national resistance and/or guerrilla war has political objectives; the basic tactical approach is built on the „hit and run” principle expressed through the famous formula of Mao Tse-Tung: „The enemy attacks, we retreat. The enemy camps, we harrass it. The enemy shoots, we attack. The enemy retreats, we pursue it.” [19]; publicity of the shares; maximum price of the consequences of power etc.

At the same time the conduct of the resistance (guerrilla) wars “in most cases includes much of the phenomenon known as ... terrorism ...” [20] with or without terrorist techniques, one resistance (guerrilla) movement as well as one terrorist organization endeavors to apply the doctrine “La politique du pire”, which is nothing else but a policy of gradual deterioration of things, aimed to provoke widespread resentment and / or political crisis and at strategic level it aims to provoke a total collapse of the current “status quo”. Of course, we can't miss the basic substantial difference between the actions of the terrorist organization and the classic national resistance and / or guerrilla movement expressed by Fromkin: “Unlike the soldier, the partisan or the revolutionary, the terrorist ... is always in the paradoxical position to take actions, which have the

immediate physical consequences that are not particularly desired by him. An ordinary killer will kill someone because he wants that person to be dead while a terrorist will shoot someone, although he feels quite indifferent whether this person will live or die” [21].

This comparison between the resistance (guerrilla) and terrorist organizations is important. Because the used tactics is generally known. It's well-known in the military science in theory and in practice. It's not only the organizational rationality we have in mind i.e. the confrontation between military and resistance (guerrilla) formations. But first of all it's cognitive (subject) and technical rationality. What does it mean? At the stage of tactics since its nascent warfare has been developing and improving ways and means of action in symmetric and asymmetric order. Here we will focus on the asymmetry. In broad terms it means a lack of general basis to make comparison with regard to quantity, quality or actual (operational) capabilities. Obviously both resistance (guerrilla) and terrorist threats are asymmetric threats for the state and state's entities that are authorized to use violence. But since there is military science the capabilities of military units for actions under specific conditions and environments have been acquired requiring specialized purely military asymmetric and tactical actions and methods. These are enshrined in military statutes. We even recognize them in the whole types of standard combat support techniques such as reconnaissance with inbred to it ambushes and reconnaissance battle such as "hit, watch and run", engineering support and disguise. What about the tactical actions such as offensive and defense in town (village), in mountain-forested land, actions for dismantle nuclear land mine, deployment of troops outside the barracks, providing the security and defense for objectives by patrolling, etc., etc. etc. It's not necessary to mention the construction, preparation and armor of the special branch of armed forces for example landing. Under the conditions of today army forces are used in many operations distinguished from war: peace-imposing, peacekeeping, operations in humanitarian crises. They act as it is prescribed in the statutes that study the achievements of the military science. At the same time the inventive and original use of contemporary post-industrial information society's artifacts by terrorists is not ahead of the warfare development. Unfortunately it is an attempt for more adequate inserting the terrorist organizations in modern world. The development of warfare at this stage gives enough answers about possible threats because "... in the postmodern technical military systems there are intangible components which define a new paradigm that besides all explains radical disparities and incommensurability with earlier ..." [22] ones. It's worth noting the concepts of "The Future Of The Soldier", "Abilities to surf in a network" - [NEC], "Network centric warfare", the system [C4 ISTAR].

III. Conclusion:

In conclusion it must be said that „terrorists are civilians, not an army, therefore the most appropriate means for dealing with them are police forces, intelligence gathering and security measures, not tank brigades” [23]. Moreover, the police fully benefits from the achievements of the military.

IV. References:

- [1] George Fotev. Disciplinary structure of sociology, publishing house „East-West”, Sofia, 2006, page 95.
- [2] Pashov Lubomir, “Research of mathematical model for operations to determine risks for protections of critical infrastructure” a refereed Journal Scientific and Applied Research (Licensed in EBSCO, USA), ISSN 1314-6289, Vol.3, 2013, p. 98
- [3] Peter Boyanov "A taxonomy of the cyber attacks", A referred Journal Scientific and Applied Research (Licensed in EBSCO, USA), ISSN 1314-6289, Vol.3, 2013, p. 114
- [4] George Fotev, Disciplinary structure of sociology, publishing house „East-West”, Sofia, 2006, page 93.
- [5] George Fotev. Disciplinary structure of sociology, publishing house „East-West”, Sofia, 2006, page 96.
- [6] Clausewitz Karlfon. Theory of the Great War, publishing house “SOFI – P”, Sofia, 2001, page 136.
- [7] Clausewitz Karlfon. Theory of the Great War, publishing house “SOFI – P”, Sofia, 2001, pages 177-178.
- [8] Clausewitz Karlfon. Theory of the Great War, publishing house “SOFI – P”, Sofia, 2001,page 136.
- [9] Clausewitz Karlfon. Theory of the Great War, publishing house “SOFI – P”, Sofia, 2001,page 137.
- [10] Clausewitz Karlfon. Theory of the Great War, publishing house “SOFI – P”, Sofia, 2001,page 137.
- [11] Doykov Jordan. Political decision. Mechanism for decision-making in national security, publishing house “KOTA”, Sofia, 2007, pages 124-125.
- [12] Samuel Huntington. The soldier and the State, military publisher “St. George The Victor”, Sofia, 1998, page 25.
- [13] Gwynne Dyer. War. The publishing house “Horizon”, Sofia, 2005, pages 13-14.
- [14] Gwynne Dyer. War. The publishing house “Horizon”, Sofia, 2005,page 11.
- [15] George Fotev. Disciplinary structure of sociology, publishing house „East-West”, Sofia, 2006, pages 37 and 109.
- [16] Georgi Stoyanov. Terrorism. History and genesis, “Military Press” Ltd, Sofia, 2003, pages 16 and 17.

- [17] Hristo Popov. Terrorism. Psychosocial roots, consequences and interventions, "Military Press" Ltd, Sofia, 2005, page 22.
- [18] Georgi Stoyanov. Disciplinary structure of sociology, publishing house „East-West”, Sofia, 2006, pages 45-49.
- [19] Mao Tse-tung. "Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War ", vol.1, 1965.
- [20] Gwynne Dyer. War. The publishing house "Horizon", Sofia, 2005, page 422.
- [21] Fromkin D. The Strategy of Terror, Foreign Affairs, 53, July 1975, page 689.
- [22] George Fotev. Disciplinary structure of sociology, publishing house „East-West”, Sofia, 2006, page 110.
- [23] Gwynne Dyer. War. The publishing house "Horizon", Sofia, 2005, page 444.