World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology
International Journal of Electronics and Communication Engineering
Vol:8, No:3, 2014

Analyzing and Determining the Ideal Response Force for Combatting Terrorist Groups

Erhan Turgut, Salih Ergün, Abdülkadir Öz

Open Science Index, Electronics and Communication Engineering Vol:8, No:3, 2014 publications.waset.org/9997673/pdf

***Abstract*—**Terror is a modern war strategy which uses violence as a means of communication in order to achieve political objectives. In today's security environment narrowing the propaganda field of terrorist organization is the primary goal for the security forces. In this sense, providing and maintaining public support is the most necessary ability for security units. Rather than enemy and threat-oriented approach, homeland security oriented approach is essential to ensure public support. In this study, terror assumed as a homeland security issue and assigning the law enforcement forces with military status is analyzed.

***Keywords*—**Terrorism, Counter-terrorism, Military Status Law-enforcement.

I. Introduction

TERROR is a modern war strategy which uses violence as means of communication tool and mostly determines innocent people as a target in order to achieve political objectives. The ideological and intellectual effort for justifying the use of terror as a means of communication is called as terrorism [1]. The main target of the terrorist organizations, which accepted terrorism as a mindset, is to create field of propaganda by applying violence so as to providing public support.

It is possible to date terrorism in ancient times but it is with the modern age that terrorism is used as a way or strategy. As we look through the evolution of terrorism we can classify as follows: at first stage it is the terrorist events among labor class in 19th century, at second stage it is the freedom movements in 20th century that use terrorism as a mean and terror events driven by ideological stimuli during cold war. At third stage, it is the terror events taking place globally after the September 11th terror attack [2]. Although it was at local places and caused effects at limited area before, nowadays terror is global threat that affects whole world. As terror events happened in the world between 2001-2012 are analyzed took place at 116 different UN member countries. When analyzed especially the year 2012, in 75 different countries 7.294 terror event occurred. In these events 11.450 people died, 21.218 injured and 813 kidnapped [3].

In this paper terror is considered not only as a global threat but also as a homeland security problem. Counter-terrorism as a homeland problem is complicated subject that must be analyzed through the two fundamental terms of counter-terrorism and counter-terrorist. In order to succeed in counter-terror, both counter-terrorist that needs military precautions and counter-terrorism that aims to narrow the propaganda area of terror groups of which aim is to affect the citizens must be operated in coordination and harmony.

E. Turgut, S. Ergün, and A. Öz are with Turkish War College, İstanbul, Turkey (e-mail: eturgut@harpak.edu.tr, salihergun06@gmail.com, fenersfan@gmail.com)

II. Basic Models in Counter-terrorism

Some models are developed to identify the countries threat definitions for the counter-terrorism, aims at the counter actions, legal frame of counter actions and the units that will be used in counter actions. Ronald D. Crelinsten and Alex P. Schmid have classified the basic models used in counter terror as "Reconciliatory" and "Suppressive". In Suppressive Model they divided into two groups "Criminal Justice Model" and "War Model" [4].

A. Reconciliatory Model in Counter-Terrorism

Reconciliatory Model claims that rather than fighting against terrorists, focusing on reforms and optimizations about eliminating problems of terrorists, and working out accordingly, facilitate achieving results [5]. However, both limitless demands of terrorists and disapprobation of people about meeting the requests of terrorists impede governments to prefer this policy. Besides, it is assessed that saving lives of some people or meeting their demands jeopardize more people's security and freedom [6].

B. Suppressive Model in Counter-Terrorism

This model adopts the strategy of neutralizing the armed units of terror organizations. "War Model'' and "Criminal Justice Model" are commonly accepted types of suppressive model.

1. War Model

In War Model, it is accepted that military forces are primary instrument and laws of war are valid. The indirect acceptance of political roles of terrorist organizations, especially in the international level, and legalization of their actions are some drawbacks of implementing laws of war. Excessive use of violence against terrorist organizations helps them to make propaganda and gather more supporters [7]. Moreover, terrorists earn right to self-defense and reprisal. Mostly due to all these drawbacks, the liberal democracies refrain from applying War Model [8].

2. Criminal Justice Model

This is the most preferred model in fighting against terrorism in democratic countries. In the Criminal Justice Model, counter-terrorism is carried out by law-enforcement agencies within the framework of criminal codes. Overtaking or

Open Science Index, Electronics and Communication Engineering Vol:8, No:3, 2014 publications.waset.org/9997673/pdf

neutralizing terrorists, and arresting or punishing them are executed in accordance with the principles of supremacy and rule of law [9]. It is possible that terrorists can be considered as simple criminals rather than political offenders or rebels. Although this model has been criticized for its inability to put sufficient pressure on terrorists in the short term, it ensures success in the long run.

Criminal Justice Model does not completely exclude implementing military power. Military power can be implemented especially against terrorists outside the country. It can also be used against terrorist inside the country as a last resort if law enforcement forces are insufficient to suppress them. Even in that case, it is aimed that military forces do their duties within the framework of constitution, under the control of civilian authority and in the boundaries of law. This model is the best option for democratic societies.

Although War Model achieve desired results in the short term with its heavy pressuring means on terrorist groups, it may cause losing the public support in favor of terrorist groups in the long term. On the other hand, Criminal Justice Model maintains public support and legitimacies of security forces in the medium and long terms through its dependence on the necessities of rule of law.

III. Ensuring Legitimacy in Combating Terrorism and Importance of Public Support

The objective of counter-terrorism is strengthening the legitimacy on the public. Both state and terrorist groups fight to maintain legitimacy in the eyes of the public. This race determines the ultimate winner of the fight. Strengthening the legitimacy is a common goal to be followed by all departments of the state at all levels. Every movements made by states, should be evaluated in terms of creating the desired political impact on the people. [10]. State authority by its nature, is at superior condition at first having this legitimacy against terrorist groups. But the strategies followed during the fight, could cause a side changing in favor of the terrorist groups and may engender the hazard of terrorist groups' activities seeing as legitimate activities. In terms of terrorist groups this gaining legitimacy is meant at the same time gaining the public support. Thus, terrorist groups who are lack of public support and mostly marginal initially would have eliminate these weaknesses.

Public support is vital important for terrorist groups in terms of providing logistical support, reliable communication lines, safe shelters, intelligence. And also public support is important for terrorist groups in terms of supplying of man power, weapon and ammunition makes them alive and developed. Fighting against terrorism, the aim should be not only neutralize the terrorists, but also deprive of sources that terrorist groups needs for the existence and operate. This is barely possible with the support of the public in favor of security forces.

The strategy which the countries will apply when faced with the threat of terrorism is determines the alteration of direction at public support. Even though countries using armed forces as the main combating units, by depending on war law, have accomplished successful operations, due to the civilian casualties, they may lost public support and cause it to switch to the terrorist organization side. According to researches, %84 of casualties who died during the armed clashes since 1945 were civilian casualties while struggling with terrorist groups [11]. So that it is very crucial for not weakening the legitimacy of the government and losing the public support.

IV. The Disadvantages of Use of Army Against Terrorists

Especially, after the industry revolution security services were subjected to a fundamental change. After this period security separated two parts; interior security and defense. Interior security is applied under the supervision and control of civil authority; defense is applied for military authorities which have been configured so as to ensure the effectiveness of deterrence. The basic difference between interior security and defense is about the focusing point. While the law enforcement forces perform their duties public-service oriented, the military forces are structured enemy and threat-focused and operates in accordance with these purposes [12]. According to those told above, forces equipped and trained differently cannot achieve success if they are assigned for each other's tasks. Consequently this situation expressed by Frank Ledwinge "Armies prepared for Third World War, astonished by the terrorist groups which are incomparable on force, after the cold war" [13].

The permanent use of military in combating terrorism may cause the notion that terrorists are "external enemy" and an equal force against army. Combating terrorism by means of war and categorizing them as external enemy may bring them legitimacy that is vital for terrorist organizations. In this case international community may begin to use terms; "War", "Cease-fire" and "Determination of Boundaries" which are unfavorable to the states.

On the other hand, long-lasting and corrosive counter-terrorism operations gives substantial damage on internal functioning, hierarchical structuring, sense of duty and discipline of armies which are structured and trained for conventional battles. The low intensity conflict during the combatting against terrorism leads to the misperception about battles. In counter-terrorism operations army units have low casualty rates. However, in a conventional war, casualty rates much more higher than counter-terrorism operations. This may cause on soldiers who get accustomed to low casualty rates get into shock and become non-combatant. Besides, clashes also took place in the counter-terrorism operations, often takes the form of low intensity conflict. For this reason soldiers are living the conflicts in which used mostly light weapons and rarely heavy weapons and explosives. Conventional conflicts for which land, aviation and navy forces elements demonstrate the maximum effect with all its abilities create of shock effect on soldiers who detect battles like a low intensity conflict, of course.

Open Science Index, Electronics and Communication Engineering Vol:8, No:3, 2014 publications.waset.org/9997673/pdf

V. Law Enforcement-Based Counter-Terrorism in the Axis of Criminal Justice Model

Providing requirements of law of democratic state, not losing public support and legitimacy for Counter-Terrorism are possible by conducting successful Criminal Justice Model. But, it should not be forgotten that terrorism is a great threat for the unity of the country and her citizens. We can criticize Crime Justice Model on that the police forces will be insufficient in combatting those terrorist organization that have complex structure like cell-based organizations and that use highly professional military tactics and heavy weapons as well as military explosives. These criticisms have indicated the security gap of Criminal Justice Model. This model requires obligatory that units must have some qualities like military units in fighting terrorism must operate within the legal parameters like the police forces.

In this context; while some countries prefer to fight against terrorism by assigning special forces consisted of police, some other countries try to solve the problem assigning the military units more within the borders more in spite of disadvantages. The countries which have law enforcement with military status have an important advantage to overcome this vulnerability.

Law-enforcement forces with military status mostly connected to both interior minister and defense minister. Missions of law-enforcement forces with military status consist of judicial, military and administrative duties. Compared to civil law enforcement forces they are more disciplined, centralized and hierarchically structured. In addition to their law enforcement characteristics they also carry some abilities of military like; light and certain amount of heavy weapons, armored vehicles, helicopters and unmanned aircrafts. Many of the country's law-enforcement forces with military status have special operations and commando units. All these features make these forces ideal elements in the fight against terrorism. And security gap of Criminal Justice Model can be filled by assigning these forces.

V. Conclusion

Law-enforcement forces with military status have many features by its nature that make them best option to combat against terrorism. Today, ensuring success in combat against terrorism needs adhered approach to human rights, individual freedoms and democratic principles. Therefore fighting terrorism inside country must be carried out by law-enforcement forces with military status like Criminal Justice Model proposes too.

Doron Zimmerman says “When surgery is required, a sword is not the right instrument with which to perform the operation.” This parable is a good example that explains how to approach the problem of terrorism [14]. It’s inevitable to experience problems when charging armies that organized and trained to win the battle, instead of law-enforcement forces that structured to provide serenity of society. Terrorism is a problem to be solved by applying minimum impact instead of maximum impact.

References

[1] Bal, İhsan, “Alaca Karanlıkta Terörle Mücadele ve Komplo Teorileri”, Usak Yayınları, pp. 20, 2006.
[2] Ibit:30
[3] COEDAT (Center of Excellence, Defense against Terrorism), “Annual Terrorism Report”, pp.12, 2012.
[4] Crelinsten, R.D. and A.P. Schmid. “Western Responses to Terrorism: A Twenty-Five Year Balance Sheet, Western Response to Terrorism”, Frank Class, pp.309, 1993.
[5] Ibit:310
[6] Bell, J. Bowyer, “A Time of Terror: How Democratic Societies Respond to Revolutionary Violence”, Basic Books, pp.173, 1978.
[7] Kegley, Charles W. “The Control of International Terrorism”, St. Martin’s Press, pp.172-173, 1990.
[8] Chalk, Peter, “West European Terrorism and Counterterrorism”, Macmillan Press, pp. 97, 1996.
[9] Pedahzor, A. and M. Ranstorp, “A Tertiary Model for Countering Terrorism in Liberal Democracies: The Case of Israel”, Frank Cass Vol. 13, pp.5 2001.
[10] Galula, David, “Ayaklanmaları Bastırma Hareketleri: Teori ve Tatbikatı”, Genel Kurmay Başkanlığı Basımevi, pp.5,1965.
[11] Wilkinson, Paul, “Terrorism Versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response”, Second Edition, Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, pp.9, 2006.
[12] Usak, “PKK Terör Örgütüyle Etkin Mücadelede Analiz, Risk, Fırsat ve Öneriler” konulu rapor, USAK Yayınları, pp.26, 2008.
[13] Ledwidge, Frank, “Losing Small Wars: British Military Failure in Iraq and Afghanistan”, Yale University Press, pp. 142,2012.
[14] Zimmerman, Doron, “Between Minimum Force and Maximum Violence: Combating Political Violence Movements with Third-Force Option”, The Quarterly Journal, Volume 4, Issue 1, p.43-60, pp. 43, 2005.

Erhan Turgut was born in Kars/TURKEY in 1981. He received the B.S. degree in System Engineering from Turkish Military Academy in 2004. He served in Turkish Army in different counter-terrorism units as a gendarmarie officer between 2004 and 2012. He is currently studying at Turkish Army War College. He is interested in terrorism, counter-terrorism, political violence and intelligence.

Salih Ergün received the B.S. degree in System Engineering from Turkish Military Academy in 2004. He served in Turkish Army in different counter-terrorism and special operations units as a gendarmarie officer between 2004 and 2012. He is currently studying at Turkish Army War College. He is interested in terrorism, counter-terrorism.

Abdülkadir Öz received the B.S. degree in System Engineering from Turkish Military Academy in 2004. He served in Turkish Army in different units as a gendarmarie officer between 2004 and 2012. He is currently studying at Turkish Army War College. He is interested in terrorism, counter-terrorism, crime prevention strategies.