Christian Soldier of the Third Millennium and International Terrorism
Military, Political and Ethical Aspects, Limitations for the Use of Force
By Alphart von Horn, Dipl.Ing., Major General. (ret.)
17th September 2002

1. Introduction

Thank you for the invitation to El Escorial and the opportunity to contribute my presentation to the 2002 AMI General Assembly.
I am happy to be able to deliver and subsequently discuss a presentation with such an interested and well-informed audience.

As you will know I already delivered a briefing at your 2001 AMI General Assembly in Erfurt about the political, military and ethical aspects of international military operations. My briefing of today builds on this previous briefing and, in view of the current and future security-political developments, it will address the political, military and ethical problems of the fight against the international terrorism.

It is my objective to develop an ethical standards-based successful defence strategy against the current and future challenges of international terrorism.

In doing so, I will first analyse the nature of terrorism, draw conclusions and then derive suggestions for goals and ethical limits of an antiterrorism strategy. The observation of strict ethical values is essential in order not to stoop to the terrorists' level of immorality in the process of using military and civilian force.

As part of my presentation, I will also try to give you a basis for the work in your working groups.

2. The nature of terrorism
Analysis and evaluation

2.1 The situation after September 11, 2001

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 have perverted the image of Islam and severely shaken the feeling of security not only of Americans but also of the entire western world. Since then, the western world has been inundated with innumerable warnings of terror which partly aroused panic feelings of anxiety. Many but not all planned attacks could be identified and prevented. There is a real threat and the question arises whether these acts of terrorism are a terror campaign planned by one central authority or whether these acts have been committed by fanatic individual groups?

For the first time since the end of the Cold War, the western world is again fearful of an enemy who represents a direct threat to life and limb. The history of wars has not yet come to an end, even if we would wish it to be so. It was wrong to cater to consumerism at the expense of preventive security measures. The world has not become safer, on the contrary. It is more insecure than ever as it has become less predictable.

Terrorism represents a new threat of global dimensions. It not only threatens states but also world views, religions, cultures and economic potentials. Terrorism means a dangerous

internationalisation and privatisation of war. The time has come to reconsider our security policy and our ethical and moral conceptions of threat and war.

The media have painted a terrifying picture of the global terror organization of Al Qaida. In response to this threat, US President Bush has declared war on terrorism, created a worldwide alliance against terrorism and, as a first step, largely destroyed the Taliban regime in Afghanistan by military means. He has called a number of Arab states, Somalia and North Korea an "axis of evil" and also threatened them with war. Last but not least, through reorganization in early June 2002, he has created a new US Antiterrorism Department with 170,000 employees and declared that he considered a war against Iraq necessary.

While the antiterrorism campaign conducted by the USA and its allies against the Taliban in Afghanistan met with the sympathetic understanding of many moderate Muslims, the US intention to wage war against other Arab states has been perceived as the continuation of the crusader violence against the Muslim world. From the Muslim point of view, a process has been started at the global level which pursues the objective of suppressing and humiliating the Islamic states by the use of force as has been the case for many years at the regional level in Palestine with support from the USA.

The terrorist attacks of September 11 have led to a worldwide solidarity between many states, to include some Arab states, to fight terrorism. The question therefore arises whether this outcome was intended by Osama Bin Laden or whether this effect is not counterproductive for the Islamic cause. There is the possibility that the attack was not directed against the USA but was meant to provoke an US counterattack against hated Arabic regimes with the intention of weakening them and thus to paving the way for the foundation of true kingdoms of God.

Three conclusions can be drawn from the terrorist attacks of September 11:
1. The USA has declared the retaliation for the attacks of September 11 and the prevention of future attacks to be a military problem and must recognize now that it cannot solve all problems by military means even though it is the biggest military world power.
2. The Muslims themselves have been surprised by the tremendous effect of the attacks of September 11 and now believe that global terrorism is an efficient means to prevail against the West through the use of force.
3. There is the danger that we are getting into a spiral of uncontrollable violence and counter violence worldwide which will not help in solving the problems since it only fights the symptoms and not the causes.

2.2 Causes for terrorism

What are the causes for terrorism?
From the Muslim point of view, it was the crusades which started a process of permanent humiliation and powerlessness on the part of the Islamic states for which the Occident respectively the West was to blame. What they considered to be particularly unjust and wrong was the Jewish occupation of Palestine. Since this occupation has been accepted and supported by many western states, the West as a whole has been identified an enemy.

Unlike Jesus Christ, Muhammad did not die as a religious martyr on the cross. Muhammad was both a political leader and the founder of a religion. He did not perform miracles but had the vision to make the Islam to a definite and sole world religion. In spite of some successful foundations of Arabic empires, against the resistance of the Occident no progress could be

made in the direction of a powerful Islamic world religion. That has created a feeling of humiliation and powerlessness and a large potential of impatience and despair has developed.

In order to put an end to this feeling and to gain power and influence, the Islamic world is counting on a "holy war" which, according to extremists and fundamentalists, also includes terrorism. Against this background, the attacks of September 11 are considered by the Muslims as a potential end of their inferiority to the crusaders respectively to the West.

The western world must abandon its role of crusader and change its attitude which the Muslims perceive as disrespect and ignorance. The Muslims, in turn, have to overcome their traditional inferiority complex, they have to face reality and stop considering everything western as a threat. Such a change of attitude requires the ability of self-criticism on both sides which would open up the way to dialog. This is a difficult political and psychological problem which can and must be solved by the United Nations.

With a few exceptions, terrorists usually come from poor families with no prospects for a better life. Their only chance of winning social respect and financial support is to provide martyrs. These families are only too willing to make a member of their family a martyr. If one has nothing to lose, the thing that remains is only the hope for and belief in a distant paradise. In conjunction with poverty and great despair this develops an unrestricted willingness to believe and do everything in order to reach this paradise.

That is why terrorists are usually people whose desperate situation has made them susceptible to indoctrination, hatred and ruthless use of force. That is why they have an extremely negative image of their enemies and why they believe that the brutal elimination of their enemies is the only way to solve their problems.

The masterminds behind the terrorist attacks take advantage of this situation and deliberately misinterpret ideological, political and religious doctrines for their purposes in order to win supporters and motivate suicide bombers. It must be a real concern of all politicians but particularly of religious leaders to protect not only their own religion but also that of others from misuse. But there are in fact only very few identifiable initiatives pointing in this direction – at least among the leaders of Islam. This should give us food for thought and needs to be changed.

On the other hand, it must be taken into account that the western states, too, are responsible for some causes of terrorism. The western states have waged many wars all over the world, they have changed existing states or established new ones by simply changing the course of the borders and have established new democratic governments by use of force. The motives for doing this were a combination of ideals, economic advantages and attempts to assert their claim of power.

Today's world order and economic order are the result of this western policy and they are also the cause for many of the current tensions, crises, conflicts and wars with ethical, religious and national backgrounds. The non-western world now fears that the West will continue to interfere in this way even in the next 30 years due to its military superiority. This is the attitude ascribed to the United States and NATO in particular.

Against this background, it is understandable that the non-western states are trying to get access to weapons of mass destruction in order to be able to effectively deter the USA and the West from future interference. On the other hand, it is just as understandable that the United

States is not at all willing to accept such a development since terrorist attacks by weapons of mass destruction represent a vital threat to highly developed western states such as the United States. The United States considers this not only as a threat to its position as a military world power but also as a threat to the existing western type world order. That is why the President of the United States has called such countries "rogue states" or "criminal states" .

2.3 <u>Strategy and methods</u>

The power of terrorism is based on the insight that fear is worse than death. To frighten someone to death is more effective than killing him because a dead person cannot be frightened any more. Fear and permanent threat will wear down the enemy. Terrorism does not want to win. What the terrorists want in particular is destruction in order to build what the terrorists perceive as a better world from the ruins.

Terrorism does not directly aim at the enemy's instruments of power but at spreading fear, terror and insecurity in order to wear down the enemy psychologically and thereby achieve success by indirect means. The targets of terrorism are symbolic in nature. Individual persons will be attacked if these persons are of symbolic importance.

Terrorism uses the means and methods of asymmetric warfare. This asymmetry can have technical, psychological, ethical and strategic dimensions. It is characteristic of asymmetric warfare that highly developed states are particularly vulnerable to it and that it requires relatively small efforts to achieve great effects. Terrorism strives to turn its disadvantages in terms of quality and quantity into an advantage. It avoids fighting the enemy on equal terms by deliberately using means whose quality is totally different from those of its enemy.

The fighting methods used by terrorists are deliberately directed against innocent people and neutral parties and they are characterized by insidiousness, cruelty and extreme cynicism. The strategy of terrorism relies on the fact that ethical and religious scruples on the part of the opponent will either lead directly to his defeat or that the opponent will put himself legally and morally into the wrong by too rigorous use of force. In both cases, terrorism considers itself as the psychological winner.

What characterizes the use of terrorist force is that it can only be stopped by counter violence or the achievement of its political goals. This leads to the conclusion that he who fights more consistently and more relentlessly will have an advantage over a more irresolute opponent. And even in this respect, the terrorists think that the odds are on their side.

2.4 <u>Organization</u>

Islamic terror organizations are a combination of ideology, politics, religion and financial resources which together form a highly dangerous, critical mass. The cooperation between private sponsors and terrorists has led to a global privatisation of terrorist wars. It can be stated that small terrorist groups joined to form private "holding companies" under a single command and with an appropriate management. Different holdings finally merge into global networks whose leaders and sponsors pursue much wider goals than just the support of Islam in order to found the kingdom of God on earth.

We have to distinguish between state-organized terrorism and international terrorism. State-organized terrorism is the smaller problem since it can be countered by military forces and means. International terrorism, however, consists of autonomous terrorist cells difficult to

identify which are supported by particular states for a particular purpose but which are also independent of states due to the fact that they are able to ensure their funding through criminal activities. They are estimated to be 10,000 strong worldwide.

The funding of terrorist organizations also comes from private businessmen. These sponsors of terrorism are mainly Saudi Arabian businessmen who are not only pursuing unselfish, religious objectives but also political, economic and ideological objectives. In the meantime, we have learned that the majority of Osama Bin Laden's adherents and supporters belong to the Islamistic Saudi Arabian opposition which dispose of enormous financial means, to include worldwide influence and contacts. The fortune of the Al Qaida organization was recently estimated at approximately 5 billion dollars which is channelled to the respective terrorist groups through bogus firms.

The Saudi Arabian opposition wants to overthrow King Fahd and the Saudi Arabian dynasty since they are thought to be completely corrupt, too closely allied with the much-hated USA, responsible for the desecration of the holy places of Islam by the deployment of US forces and exert too much influence on the pilgrims during their visit of the holy places. Should the Saudi Arabian opposition succeed, there will be the threat of an Islamic revolution which will have dramatic consequences for the western world. Saudi Arabia has the biggest oil deposits in the world, which amount to an estimated 255 billion barrel.

2.5 <u>Ethics and morals</u>

September 11 has shown that international terrorism is a grave and extremely serious danger. There is no reason to continue playing down or underestimating the danger or to give ideological justifications. The risk of further terrorist attacks must be reduced by all available means. This does not only refer to an effective defence but also to an effective prevention. This will cause an ethical dilemma because, on the one hand, these preventive measures have to be as robust as possible and, on the other hand, no ethical principles must be violated.

This dilemma is of another quality than the generally known dilemma of soldiers at war. In combat, civilians may be injured or even killed if they are accidentally in the vicinity of the combatants who are being engaged. In the war against terrorism, terrorists will regularly use civilians as a shield not only to protect themselves but also to cause the death and injury of innocent civilians in order to exploit this for their propaganda purposes.

Mostly, terrorist activities are in stark contrast with their moral claims. Terrorists are obviously not able and also not willing to achieve their moral objectives through moral means. But ideologies and religion alone are not sufficient to make the world a better place. To realize this objective, not only the economic and political power but also the appropriate infrastructures must be available. Since terrorists are not well versed in these issues, they try to realize their goals only by means of terrorism. But this strategy can never last. The achievement of terrorist goals can never provide a solution for the real political and economic problems.

By making a terrorist attack, a suicide bomber wants to go to paradise and in doing this, he accepts the consequence that this action will not change the desperate situation of his fellow humans; on the contrary, they will more likely be exposed to additional retaliatory measures. This is what we experience in Palestine almost every day. According to our legal concepts, a terrorist suicide attack is therefore to be considered as murder out of base motives. The

suicide bomber is the only one who benefits from this action since he alone will be rewarded by the prospect of going to paradise at the expense of other humans.

Due to their negative moral attitude and their readiness to use brutal force, it is rather unlikely that terrorists will ever be able to organize and rule a democratic society and a democratic state whose primary concern is the welfare of its citizens. Terrorists will always be authoritarian rulers and will therefore always try to abuse the welfare of the people for their own purposes.

Depending on their objectives, terrorists can also be considered as freedom fighters. To distinguish terrorists from freedom fighters, the criterion of good and bad goals cannot be applied, however. An action qualifies as terrorism when barbaric methods and procedures are used, regardless whether they serve a good or a bad cause and whether they are used by the inferior or the superior party.

Again and again, pacifists have demanded non-military sanctions such as economic sanctions in order to establish peace in crisis areas and areas of war. From the ethical point of view, however, it must be taken into account that such sanctions will have a disastrous and often even fatal impact on the population as well. It is not the military forces and the ruling powers that are hit by the sanctions but only the weakest individuals of the population, that is those who were to be protected in the first place. In other words, economic sanctions can have the same effect as massive bombings against populated areas. The only difference is that bombings "strike people dead" whereas sanctions "slowly strangle" them. In both cases, however, it is the civilian population which is the target of the action.

Against this background, it is difficult to understand why civil sanctions are still considered as more humane than the precise employment of weapon systems against military facilities which causes far less unintended destruction of assets and losses among the civilian population.

2.6 Weaknesses

There are 46 Islamic states. None of these states is a democracy. They all are more or less authoritarian and despotic. None of these countries accepts the human rights. Islamism does not distinguish between the private family and the public state. It does not know independent, responsible human beings but only autonomous collectives. All citizens must subordinate themselves to the mullahs who have declared themselves to be the owners and guardians of the absolute truth.

It is an illusion to believe that Islamic states can be turned into western-type democracies. Islamic states will never allow more democracy since this would secularise society and, as a consequence, curtail the power of the ruling religious leaders. That is why the Islamic states are also trying to prevent modernization efforts because this would automatically encourage the establishment of democratic structures. On the other hand, this attitude will also lead to isolation and backwardness compared with the western world. By adopting this approach, the Islamic states will throw away their chance of overcoming poverty and powerlessness by means of economic growth.

A major weakness of Islam is the dogmatic character of the Koran which was developed 1400 years ago in a totally different era. The message of the Koran is backward-looking and apposed to progress because it does not allow the believers to discuss the modernization or

adaptation of the Koran. Since the whole life is governed by the Koran, creativity and progress have no chance to develop. Creativity and progress are not compatible with the prohibition of independent thought and dogmatic ways of thinking. The strictly enforced Islam will therefore lead to social and economic deadlocks which will sooner or later give rise to undesirable developments and to the overthrow of the ruling classes. The most striking example in this connection is the Soviet Union with its dogmatic communism and the most recent example are the Taliban in Afghanistan with their dogmatic Islamism.

Another important weakness of Islamism is the oppression of women. As a result, a great part of the intelligent human resources are wasted. Since the power is exclusively in the hands of the mullahs, another great part of the intelligent male potential of the population cannot be used. All in all, this leads to a very small elite of leaders with an almost exclusively theological background, who are absolutely unable to understand and solve the complex economic and political problems of their usually underdeveloped states.

To what extent this omnipresent influence of the mullahs also affects the military, can be seen in the terrorist groups and combat troops. If the members of these groups believe that they will directly go to paradise when they are killed in action, they will become careless, will take unnecessary risks and will not be particularly interested in the actual military success. In addition, it must be taken into account that the majority of leaders avoid to be personally involved in the attacks and operations since their primary concern is their survival and increase in personal power.

3. Conclusions
Political, military and ethical conclusions

3.1 Political conclusions

The terrorist attack of September 11 was not directed against the USA by accident. For the Islamic world, the United States represents a self-righteous world policeman consistently pursuing the intention of establishing the western world order against the interests of other states and religions.

Once again it has become painfully clear that western governments are not inclined to take proactive measures against threats on the basis of "learning by doing" but rather "learning by suffering." Western politicians still lack the recognition that the early implementation of risk precautions is better than subsequent risk management. Risk precautions include two dimensions: Firstly, efforts must be made to minimize risks through proactive measures and secondly, if this does not succeed, the capabilities must be available to control risks which have taken place.

International terrorism is a new threat which is not directed against geographical borders of states or alliances but against western religions, cultures, values and world views as well as the resulting political objectives and interests. That is why not the geographical borders of the western world but the global objectives and interests of the western world will have to be defended. This is a decisive qualitative change in the security and defence policies, a change which until now has neither been understood properly nor implemented consistently.

The future threats will have new qualitative and global dimensions, which cannot be countered by an independent national security and defence policy any more. National security

against international terrorism can only be ensured at the international level in cooperation with allies. This, however, can only be successful if all allies make a contribution in accordance with their economic and technological capabilities. At present, however, the political leaders still consider an alliance as a community in which on the one hand they have a say and on the other hand they can hide behind the strength of the other partners.

Today, only the USA has a global ability for actions to limit the global risks of the international terrorism. Paradoxically, this is what the USA is being criticized for. But Europe also has the economic potential to ensure a global capacity of action. What is missing here is a common political will as a result of national selfishness. Consequently, Europe unnecessarily puts at risk its security interests.

It is a shame that Europe is unable to make an effective military and political contribution to the fight against the international terrorism side by side with the USA. Therefore Europe can only watch idly how the United States is making decisions and translates them into military operations which will also have a severe impact on the future of Europe. The current example is the impending US attack on Iraq. It is wrong to believe that the USA must show consideration for the weak Europeans and must not make any decisions without taking into account Europe.

Europe cannot compensate its lacking potentials of power and determination by criticizing the behaviour of the United States. If Europe wants to influence the global decisions of the USA it must develop into an important and thus indispensable partner of the USA. In this connection, it will not suffice to just have the same capabilities as the United States. Europe must develop complementary and new military capabilities which are not sufficiently available or not available at all in the USA.

Security is the prerequisite for freedom and peace and therefore one of the most fundamental and most vital aims of state policy. This security must not be neglected in favour of other, less important aims for reasons of electioneering manoeuvres or other opportunistic reasons. The development of situation of last years has shown that the European security policy has continued to lose global influence because of selfish national interests, lacking European security awareness and opportunist behaviour to the USA.

An other decisive deficit of the western security policy is the over and over again lacking planning for peace stabilizing measures after the military mission of the forces has been completed. For the solution of humanitarian, political, social, religious and economic problems not only the appropriate civil means and forces must be available but also must really come into action. The employment of military forces will not make sense unless this requirement can be met. However, not all politicians are obviously familiar with this simple conclusion. Otherwise it can hardly be explained why a successful military operation is often followed by political helplessness and why the expensive and dangerous mission of military forces drag on for years without finding political solutions.

Politicians must accept that not all of the problems of the world can be solved by the available military and civil forces. They must accept that there is also the alternative to live with these insoluble problems. It would be ethically irresponsible, however, if the required means and forces for bringing about improvements were available but were not used for egoistic and opportunistic reasons.

In spite of the U.S. war on terror, the Islamic states have not reached a turning point of their religious and political goals. They fight against western influences and particularly against more democracy. From the Islamic perspective this would question the unity of religion and politics. For them, Islam is the only true and authoritative world religion and therefore politics have to follow Islam and must not be separated from it. Even the members of the ruling religious elite of Islam do not want more democracy since the accompanying secularisation would deprive them of power. Thus, from the perspective of many Islamic states, the western influence represents a vital threat, which even justifies terrorism. Therefore the striving of the western world to democratise the Islamic states is a totally wrong approach.

In many European states there is no security adviser directly supporting the head of state. This means that the head of state is exclusively dependent on the one-sided advice of his departments and has no access to an independent, interdepartmental expertise. As a result, this crucial security area will be left to the dispute about responsibility between the different departments, usually for the only reason that independent departments are traditionally considered to be an integral part of democracy. In view of the current security situation, this is an avoidable mistake which does not take into account the primary goal of the constitution, that is the security of the population. This should be clear to the responsible politicians.

Today, the internal security of a state cannot be separated from its external security any more. To counter the risks of international terrorism, the government has to use all assets available. These assets comprise the whole of its military and police capabilities, to include the capabilities of territorial defence and disaster control. In the future, the security of a state must not only be the task of the entire nation but also an European a task. The internal and external security must be seen as a whole and must be interlocked. For this purpose, a European security council provided with operational capabilities and responsibilities must be established.

3.2 Military conclusions

The progress achieved in the war on terror until now has shown that the United States and their allies are not helpless in their fight against terrorism. Against the Taliban a military success was achieved, the dimensions of which were initially not expected. Countries which previously supported terror organizations now fear preventive US strikes and try to cooperate with the US against terrorism or at least desist from openly supporting terrorism.

But as a matter of principle, terrorism cannot be defeated in a war of destruction. While a war of destruction can knock out the combat elements, it cannot affect the ideas in the minds of the terrorist leaders. Terrorism accepts defeats but always makes sure that the masterminds and their ideas for the continuation of the struggle will survive. Therefore, the terrorist chain of command will always succeed in slipping away in time and saving themselves. This was also the case in Afghanistan. The USA have not succeeded to destroy the Al Qaida in Afghanistan totally.

But also the terrorist leaders have recognized that in case of extended terror attacks they run the danger of paralysis and self-destruction if the survival of the underlying ideas is called into question as a result of the expulsion, arrest or destruction of their chain of command. It is characteristic that since the defeat of the Taliban and the beginning of the hunt for Bin Laden no similarly spectacular terrorist attacks have occurred.

Any meaningful war must by necessity pursue the objective of achieving a lasting peace. This also applies to the fight against terrorism and requires to hold open opportunities for an acceptable compromise to initiate a future reconciliation. When force is used it must therefore always be kept in mind that the consequences of that violence must not block the road to compromise and reconciliation. This implies a qualitative and quantitative limitation of the force used which should ideally only target the operating terrorist, their leaders, supporters and fellow travellers and spare as far as possible the civilian population not involved.

This day the western states, to include NATO, do not have the capabilities to engage international terrorism with military and civilian means which have pinpoint accuracy and a high degree of selectivity and discrimination. The currently existing conventional superiority of the armed forces is inadequate to fight terrorism, because terrorism does not fight conventionally but asymmetrically. Even the United States is today only partly capable of fighting an asymmetric war at the military level and totally unable to face the ethical dimensions of such a war.

For the fight against the international terrorism new technologies are needed for precision weapons which have pinpoint accuracy, minimize collateral damage and render combatants incapable of combat instead of killing them. For the use of such weapons appropriate new tactics, techniques and strategies will have to be developed. The European, but even the American armed forces, are far away from such a development.

In cooperation with their allies, today's armed forces are optimised for defeating an enemy that uses similar, symmetrical military procedures and principles as they do. What terrorism relies on is the exact opposite. Terrorism does neither know front lines nor the international law of war nor human rights. Terrorists attack unexpectedly by using asymmetrical qualities and extremely brutal force. In doing this, they rely on their extreme brutality which traumatizes their enemies and prevents them from responding rapidly and effectively.

State-of-the-art, privately available technologies are of greater advantage to the terrorists than to the national defence organizations. For the terrorists, money is totally irrelevant whereas government organizations depend on the availability of appropriate funds and on overcoming the bureaucratic obstacles in good time to match the modern equipment of terrorist forces. As a rule, the democratic states will only make available the required funds if the political pressure is strong enough and usually this is only the case when it is too late already. The defence against terrorism requires not only the transitional availability of limited budget funds but the continuous development and further development of the required specific capabilities, as well as continuously available additional funds.

From the previous conflicts we have learned that it is imperative to employ special ground forces to fight terrorism. Only on the ground can the resistance of other land forces and other resistance organizations be definitely crushed. In addition, this is the only way of defeating once and for all the remaining terrorist and criminal organizations after a military confrontation.

If, for military reasons, ground troops cannot be deployed, it will neither be possible to deploy police forces and humanitarian relief organizations for establishing a durable peace. The conflict will thus continue at a lower level. There are enough examples to illustrate this which I will not mention here. Only he who can move safely on the ground will also be able to pursue humanitarian, political, social, religious and economic objectives effectively.

However, the employment of land forces has its limitations if the enemy fights covertly. In this case, large-scale land operations will not make sense since they would only lead to a protracted war of attrition which is impossible to win on foreign soil even for great powers. If the enemy fights covertly, a success can only be achieved by commando forces which are superior in terms of time, space and technology due to their high degree of specialization and optimisation.

General-purpose forces will not suffice to defeat terrorism, irregular forces, partisans and organized crime. Military forces must be specialized to perform both infantry and police tasks. An example for this type of forces is the "Multinational Specialized Unit" (MSU) which has been very successful for many years in all KFOR operations against non-military forces and organized crime.

The decisive advantage of these civil-military detachments is that they are capable of rapidly switching between two tasks and/or roles such as, for instance, the role of infantrymen who have combatant status and are equipped with heavy infantry weapons and the role of antiterrorism policemen who are authorized to arrest and to conduct investigations in support of police operations which are relevant to future legal proceedings.

The civil-military detachments are either composed of specialized military personnel or specialized policemen. Although the outcome will not be the same due to their different careers, it will at least be similar. Therefore, it is futile to lead endless discussions about the question whether the responsibility should lie with the Ministry of the Interior or with the Ministry of Defence. However, what is of vital importance for the success of an operation is the uniform operational command and control. In the first phase of an antiterrorism campaign, this must be ensured by the armed forces and later on it is to be ensured by the civil authorities. What must be prevented by all means is that terrorism takes advantage of the dispute about responsibility and the resulting unsuitable compromises.

4. Strategy against terrorism
Objectives of the strategy and considerations about the strategies to fight terrorism as well as about ethical restrictions.

4.1 Objectives of a strategy against terrorism

The terrorist attacks of September 11 have caused a dangerous radicalisation and an increase in fundamentalism not only of the Islamic masses but also of the Islamic elite. For the first time after the crusades, the Islamic world has felt that the much-hated US and western world can be seriously threatened by terrorist means. There is the risk that terrorism will win new adherents and supporters as a result of exaggerated western antiterrorism measures which are directed against the Arab states as a whole. The fight against terrorism must not end in a totally oppressed Islamic world but must lead to an Islamic world which, through tolerance and the willingness to compromise, has developed into a peaceful and cooperative partner of the West.

In the past, it was possible to achieve a total victory and to dictate the terms of peace to the defeated country. Today, total victories are not possible any more due to the lethality of modern weapons. Present-day and future wars cause so much destruction, losses and suffering that democratic states can politically justify them only for a limited period of time. That is why in the end, there will always be a compromise and not a clear victory. This leads to the

conclusion that the use of force must always be limited so as not to cause additional problems which are even more difficult to solve.

The use of force can only be an appropriate means in the first phase of an operation and it will only be useful if there is a feasible plan for solving the problems which caused the use of force. If this is not the case for compelling reasons the use of force will be counterproductive and should therefore be avoided.

Terrorism is not only a problem of using physical force but also a psychological problem. The defence against terrorism must therefore not only be limited to the use of force but must be comprehensive. This requires the integrated effort of different organizations and specialists such as secret service specialists, military and police security experts, psychologists, economic experts and politicians.

The fight against terrorism must pursue comprehensive objectives and must have a long-term horizon. Reconciliation is the most important requirement for a permanent and stable peace. But reconciliation, in turn, requires justice, tolerance, trust and the creation of a solid economic basis for the population. But these requirements cannot be fulfilled within a short time. The suffering caused by war and particularly by terrorism and the related countermeasures have aroused so much hatred and distrust that a very long time, at least one generation, is needed to heal the inflicted wounds. That is why all rapid solutions for such conflicts are just illusory and, as a matter of principle, unsuitable. Nevertheless, politicians still pursue the illusion of rapid solutions and repeatedly experience failure – as if they are unable to learn their lesson.

As part of the fight against terrorism there is a requirement for antiterrorism forces which are directly employed against identified terrorist forces as well as indirectly against potential terrorist action as part of preventive measures. The tasking of antiterrorism forces must place individual terrorists and their terrorist organizations into a situation where they will always have to fight against the entire spectrum of governmental defence organizations. Whose effectiveness can be maximized if all defence organizations operate simultaneously by coordinating and optimising their efforts. Although this approach should, in fact, be self-evident it is being implemented very hesitantly.

The problem is of a bureaucratic nature. The conflict of responsibility between many relevant departments and agencies must be solved first before they can be coordinated and controlled by a central authority. Although the resistance of particular departments is very strong in a democracy, this problem can be overcome if one takes the defence against terrorism seriously.

The President of the United States has succeeded in handling the problem but only after the terrorist attacks of September 11. The Europeans should have learned from this disaster but at present there is every indication that they will not. We have to counter the tendency to talk away the threat or to try and avert it by good behaviour instead of building up really effective security forces for the protection of the citizens which is a requirement, by the way, raised by most European constitutions.

Another anti-terrorist approach is to target its ethical and moral depravity. A terrorist must be seen as what he is, that is a criminal. It must be perceived to be highly immoral and dishonourable to be on the same level as the terrorists or to support them. After all, terrorists are no freedom fighters! In this connection, the world religions, in particular, are called upon not only to reject terrorism from the religious point of view but to condemn it directly.

It is wrong to consider terrorism only as a special kind of warfare. Terrorism deliberately relies on criminal methods far outside the international law of war, The Hague Convention and human rights. That is why terrorism must be seen as a particularly brutal crime and the persons committing these crimes must be tracked down just like criminals. Accordingly, we must not only speak of the defence against terrorism but of the fight against terrorism. All other expressions would play down the character and objective of terrorism.

4.2 Strategy for the fight against terrorism

It must be assumed that the world will continue to solve its problems by the use of force. However, the future weapons will be different from those used in the past. Conventional weapons technology has developed a lethality which has led to a self-deterrence similar to that of nuclear weapons. Due to the damage and losses to be expected, conventional warfare is no longer an appropriate means to achieve political objectives by force. In the future, it is to be expected that violent confrontations will be waged by means and methods that are superior to conventional warfare in one way or another. The September 11 was only the beginning.

The intentions and objectives of the terrorists and their leaders are difficult to change because they do not provide targets that can be directly engaged. What can be changed, however, if the required military superiority exists, are the intentions and objectives of those states that harbour, train and logistically support the terrorists. As a result, the US President has threatened war on the so-called "rogue states" respectively "criminal states".

Due to the imminent danger that Iraq produces weapons of mass destruction, a war against this state has become very likely. But it is very doubtful, whether there is a connection with the international Terrorism. If the war happens, the USA will try to wage a war similar to that in Afghanistan. It is to be expected, however, that the so-called "rogue states," to include Iraq, have learned from the military defeat of the Taliban and will not only use conventional weapons and means but also terrorist methods. It is doubtful whether the US forces and their allies will be able to sustain a terrorist war militarily and psychologically, which will not only be conducted in Iraq but all over the world and which will also strive to cause losses among the populations of the western states.

The armed forces are undoubtedly able to fight large-scale terrorist actions, to provide security and protection for the population and to pave the path for durable solutions. But the armed forces are unsuitable for bringing about durable solutions by military means. Operations by military forces can only be seen as a transitional phase and must be immediately followed by phases of stabilization and consolidation which require the employment of civilian forces and means. However, it must be ensured that these assets are actually available prior to the deployment of military forces.

Operations against terrorism must not be limited to bringing an ongoing terrorist war to a conclusion. Their objective must be to prevent future terrorist wars as well. That is why the defence forces and assets must primarily have a deterrent effect which is to be underpinned by preventive measures. For the masterminds and the terrorist operatives the risk of failure must always be high, if possible too high. Terrorism will lose its supporters and thus its power if it turns out to be an unsuccessful strategy. For the defence against Islamic terrorism, in particular, it is of vital importance to highlight its lack of success.

The deterrence must include the entire spectrum of military and civilian measures of reconnaissance, combat, damage minimization and pursuit to force the terrorists to operate in a difficult and high-risk environment. For this purpose, the same principle can be applied as in the fight against conventional military forces, that is seizing the initiative from the terrorists by changing the situation so rapidly that they are unable to respond appropriately. Antiterrorism forces must therefore have an extremely high responsiveness, flexibility and a wide range of engagement capabilities. These capabilities are only insufficiently developed in the current military forces and civilian defence forces, however.

Prevention is a decisive component in the fight against terrorism to ensure an effective and thus credible deterrence. While deterrence on the whole is ethically acceptable, prevention will provoke ethical conflicts since preventive measures must be taken against people who have not yet been proved guilty or who, for the time being, have not done anything wrong yet. A deterrence which includes a preventive component will thus always have to operate in ethical border areas. This fact has be considered as inevitable if the fight against terrorism shall be effective.

4.3 Strategy against the causes of terrorism

The causes of terrorism must be fought with intellectual and psychological weapons and not with military weapons. Similar to the conclusion of Clausewitz we might say this is not the "continuation of politics by other means" but the "continuation of war by other means." A strategy against the causes of terrorism must at the same time be a strategy against the psychology of terrorism. We must find out what is on the terrorists' mind and how we can influence it.

 It is legitimate if populations and minorities in distress use force as a last resort in order to defend themselves against oppression, persecution, injustice or a desperate economic situation. But in the process, there is always the risk that the use of force degenerates into terrorism. This will happen if the despair has reached a certain level and there seems to be no other means and ways to put an end to a desperate situation.

The escalation into terrorism occurs if the ethical instincts of the superior side are poorly developed or if its actions are driven by feelings of revenge and retaliation. Terrorism can be prevented if desperate potentials are prevented from developing. The objective of such a policy is not to buy the enemy's good behaviour, but to prevent the escalation into terrorism which will cause a much lower effort than to fight a war against the terrorism as the USA intend to do.

If this is so, the question arises why this approach is not adopted more often? It probably lies in the nature of man. Aggression, feelings of revenge and retaliation and the exercise of superior power are stronger than ethical and religious principles. It is probably primarily a matter of culture and education whether these strong feelings or intellectual principles will prevail. In this connection, it must be taken into account that in the evolution of man aggressiveness and the ability of using force have been major requirements for survival and they cannot easily be changed by education.

The reasons for a conflict must be seen in connection with the situation on the ground, to include the specific cultural and moral conditions. In doing so, the same moral and ethical standards must be used as those applied in the crisis area and/or by the populations involved. To judge a situation only by one's own, national standards or by the standards of international

organizations will not lead to a lasting solution of crises and conflicts since the parties to a conflict will either not understand or accept these standards.

The Islamic world cannot match the West in terms of technology, economic and military power, and will hardly be able to catch up in the future due to its religiously dominated leadership. However, the Islamic world has more to offer than the West in the areas of religion, culture and values. This is not due to the western values as such but to their minor significance for the western lifestyle.

Large parts of the western world, especially the USA, have degenerated into fun-seeking, consumer-oriented societies which increasingly neglect their cultural achievements and values underpinning and supporting their states. This cannot be an example for the Islamic states. It is understandable that they refuse to accept western influences in principle and especially this negative western development. On the other hand the western world, and Europe in particular, have highly-developed cultures which find general recognition also in other cultures. It is not enough, however, only to talk about the value of the western culture, but we must convincingly live by it. This implies that consumerism will cease to be the measure of all things but that in future also the proven, traditional values will once again take effect.

The western world have to recognize that they now and especially in future will only represent a small proportion of the world population and therefore will lose influence in the social and religious fields. It is foreseeable that some time also the armed forces of the western world will lose their superiority. It can therefore be assumed that it will no longer be possible to uphold the current global world order based on western values and functioning in line with western economic interests against the interests of the other peoples.

In the future, interests can only be met on the basis of a mutually fair balance of interests. From this follows that in the future a close and fair cooperation will also be required with the Arabic and Islamic states. A cooperation which will automatically also remove some essential causes of terrorism. It is therefore not only reasonable and useful, but mandatory, to start a fair cooperation with the Islamic states as soon as possible, instead of waging an antiterrorism wars, which cannot be won. The western world should not wait for the USA, but should self-confidently seize the initiative in order to show the United States an alternative way into the future which is not based on economically and military superiority but on a fair partnership.

4.4 Ethical aspects and their limitations

Terrorism is a particular type of using force which is morally reprehensible and which must be rejected outright in view of its barbaric methods and procedures. That is exactly why the fight against terrorism must not cause cruelties similar to those the terrorism makes use of. To apply the principle of the Old Testament "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth" would be counterproductive here. Such a behaviour will only arouse new hatred which will grow permanently stronger and will thus self-increasing the willingness to use force.

As a result of the cruelties of terrorism, there is, however, a permanent risk that even those parties which have fought fair so far, will be induced to use barbaric methods and procedures as well. The reasons for this are of an emotional nature such as revenge and retaliation on the one hand and of a rational nature in order to prevent friendly losses on the other. A war characterized by retaliatory and pre-emptive strikes is exactly what is currently happening

between Israel and radical Palestinians and it will obviously neither lead to an cease-fire nor to peace.

The concrete example I am referring to is the attack of an Israeli combat aircraft equipped with a 1000 kg bomb against a building in a densely populated quarter in the town of Gaza . The objective of this attack was the terrorist leader of the Hamas Movement, Salach Schehade. In this attack, the death of 15 Palestinians was accepted, another 150 were partly seriously injured. The radical Palestinians responded to this by a new series of terrorist attacks against Israel which resulted in similar losses.

The problem of terrorism cannot be solved by the killing or capturing of terrorists since it will be impossible to hunt down all terrorists and all of their masterminds. All you will at best achieve is to keep the number of terrorist operatives small but you cannot eliminate them once and for all and thus create peaceful conditions. A military victory over terrorism in the traditional sense cannot be achieved. Terrorism cannot be defeated by military means alone, it must also be defeated in the minds. And this objective cannot be reached by armed forces or police forces alone.

On the whole, we can state that although a particular nation can make it clear to the terrorists that a victory by terrorist means cannot be achieved, the nation itself must also be aware that its assets and procedures will not suffice to eliminate terrorism once and for all. Besides, these assets will probably include countermeasures which are just as cruel and inhumane as the terrorist actions themselves. From this follows that in the long run terrorism will not be successful but on the other hand the suffering, losses and damage among the friendly population and in one's own country will reach an unacceptable level. We have to get used to the idea that in the end a compromise is inevitable - as unpleasant as this idea might be.

Assuming that this is the case, the question arises why so much injustice and so much cruelties must happen when, after all, a compromise will have to be reached anyway? The answer is simple and shocking: A certain threshold of pain must be reached first before the hostile parties will show the required willingness to compromise and reach a peace agreement. The situation usually escalates since both parties will be convinced to the very end that they can win a clear victory. This conviction will even be confirmed by the support provided by other countries. From the ethical point of view, the support by other countries will have a war-protracting effect and will increase the suffering, destruction and losses.

The exercise of power and the use of force can be morally just as wrong as the decision to abstain from the use of force. Anyone who has the ability to take action in order to counter a foreseeable danger and does not act will automatically be responsible for this inaction. With regard to the states which have the appropriate means to counter violence and terrorism this implies that they have the obligation and responsibility to use these means even for the welfare of other people. Consequently, the strengthening of international law, for instance, will not reduce but increase the number of interventions. The threat of the US President to launch a pre-emptive attack against the so-called "rogue states" must also be seen from this aspect.

An absolute renunciation of force is no real alternative since it deliberately disregards the chance to prevent injustice just for fear of ethical conflicts. The defence and protection against terrorism must also be seen as a social responsibility and religious obligation. The capability to fight terrorism must not be sacrificed for an abstract principle – as noble as this principle may be from the ethical perspective. It is these ethical scruples which the terrorists consider as

a weakness and exploit uncompromisingly. To ensure an effective protection of a state, its government must even be willing to wage the fight against terrorism in a legal and ethical border areas.

When is prevention which accepts death and injury of people unavoidable and ethically justified? The answer depends primarily on the objectives pursued and on the consequences which any refusal to pursue these objectives would have. Only absolutely vital objectives justify injury or death of people – provided that there are no other ways and means to achieve the same objective. Not only friendly but also enemy damage and losses must be in a rationally, morally and ethically justified proportion to the envisioned objectives.

From the ethical point of view, the use of force always creates a conflict situation since damage is inflicted on some people in order to avert damage from other people. A conflict situation occurs when one ethical requirement can only be met if another ethical requirement is violated. The question is whether the ethical requirements can be weighed against each other in order to find a solution? The answer is "no" since these ethical requirements are different but equally binding and cannot be compared which precludes any rational optimisation.

There is no single absolutely correct strategy without any disadvantages to fight terrorism. But there is the possibility to minimize as far as possible the extent of the force used and thus the infringement on ethical and moral principles. That is a question of the appropriate military equipment which that way obtains an ethical dimension.

The armed forces must have a military equipment on their disposal that allows them to accomplish military tasks with superiority on the one hand and to avoid or at least to limit unintentional damages on the other. Above all that requires precision weapons and also weapons with non-lethal effects. The politicians have to realize that military equipment has an ethical dimension which may not depend on budgetary means. Deriving from the ethical dimension there is not only the political but also the ethical duty to make the appropriate equipment for the armed forces available as soon as the technological feasibility is given.

5. <u>Final Conclusions</u>

I would like to close my lecture with 5 final conclusions:

1. **The international terrorism is a global problem which can be fought only worldwide.**
   National solo attempts of separate states, as for example of the USA, but also international alliances, as for example the NATO, are on their own not in the position to switch off worldwide operating terrorism-networks successfully. Necessary is a world-wide, all civilian and military forces and means comprising co-operation of states as many as possible.

2. **Every success of the terrorism must be refused with all military and civilian means and forces.**
   For terrorist there may be no chance to escape after terrorist attacks unidentified. In close international co-operation superior civilian and military abilities and procedures must be developed to detect, pursue, hunt down and to eliminate international terrorist organisations world-wide. The efficiency must be so high that the terrorism turns out as definitely unsuccessful and this way deters itself.

3. Terrorism must be outlawed world-wide.
Terrorism is an ethical, moral and religious evil. States which tolerate terrorist organizations on their territories and / or support them, must be forced consistently by the UN with international sanctions and if necessary with military interventions to give up the terrorism. It is decisive that it remains not only by a threat, but that sanctions and military interventions are also executed consistently without compromises. If this can not be guaranteed politically and militarily, there should also be no threat.

4. The fight against the terrorism may limit itself not only to reactive measures, but must also enclose preventive measures.
Only with prevention terrorist attacks can already be prevented before the execution. Prerequisite is a comprehensive and extensive reconnaissance in close international co-operation and the determination, to really act in case of danger. Particularly the peoples of the states concerned by the terrorism must be convinced that prevention is ethically justified and that the terrorism can only be defeated, if the population contributes actively to the reconnaissance and the repulse of the terrorism.

5. The removal of the causes for the terrorism is as important as the defence of the terrorist attacks itself .
Only if the causes have been stated unambiguously and have been analysed, they can also be diminished gradually and durably. It depends on showing all practicable ways and on developing first of all also the readiness, on recognizing existing injustice and problems and on wanting to regulate them in a different way than by force.