

The "War" on "Terrorism"

Sunil Beta Baskar

2005-07-24

Abstract

The word 'Terrorism' has taken to the headlines of all major daily media covers worldwide. With cowardly attacks everywhere, it is time that humanity understood this deep-rooted element that needs to be rooted out. This essay is to hopefully take the reader to think in the right direction. The motivation behind this essay has been a series of discourses and conversations with friends and family, over e-mail on related topics.

1 War

1.1 Quote from "Arthashastra"

To begin with, I'd like to quote a translated passage from "Arthashastra" authored by Chanakya (a.k.a Kautilya), no later than 150 BCE. This book's title (like Sun Tzu's "Art of War") is best translated as Chanakya's "Science of Governance".

The would-be conqueror shall judge the relative strengths and weaknesses of the following aspects [of waging a war], as applicable to him and to his enemy, before starting on a military expedition:

- power;
- the place [of operations];
- the season for marching [toward the battle ground];
- when to mobilise different types of forces;
- the possibility of revolts and rebellions in the rear;
- the likely losses and expenses and gains and
- the likely dangers.

If [on balance, after giving due weight to the different factors], the conqueror is superior, the campaign shall be undertaken, otherwise not.

Shloka {9.1.1}

The above translation is from a brilliant piece of work by L.N.Rangarajan [ISBN 0-14-044603-6], former Indian Ambassador to Greece, Sudan, Tunisia, Norway and Iceland. The book goes on to explain each of the issues in particular. It even goes further to describe "Open War", "Secret War" and "Undeclared War" and means to address them. In this sense, it is a definite predecessor to modern military academic text.

1.2 Defining 'War'

War:

(noun) A state of open, armed, often prolonged conflict carried on between nations, states, or parties.

There are other meanings to 'war', as in - the period of warfare, the method of warfare, etc. But strictly we will adhere to the above definition of "war" derived from the American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (accessed via reference.dictionary.com)

1.3 Evolution of Modern Warfare

In the modern world, the above issues are covered by a theory that spans a more broad domain inclusive of economic theory, sports & games, evolution, etc. (much more than just war). We refer to this theory (quite frequently) as "Game Theory."

Game Theory is in itself too vast and is beyond the scope of this essay. You could pay a visit to [Ground Zero Sum](#) and follow further links on Game Theory and its relevance to warfare, particularly in the context of terrorism.

'War' in conventional terms requires proper identification of the 'enemy' or 'adversary'. In following wars in the 20th century including "World War I", "World War II" (Allies vs Axis), "India vs Pakistan" (twice), "North Vietnam vs South Vietnam", "North Korea vs South Korea", a clear demarcation was possible. Not all these wars were played as Zero Sum Games, some were waged in order to restore a peaceful order and enforce restraint on aggression in the future.

Within the same century another type of warfare sprung in, popularised under the name, "Cold War", a term frequented by a US Political advisor "Bernard Baruch." This was a war of restraint rather than aggression. In the same period, the US learnt that accumulation of military resources could be used to restrain a possible enemy against using similar or less powerful military resources. Undoubtedly it led to an arms race between the players (namely USA and USSR.) It also led to the re-use of "military power" as a negotiating tool (as evident in the Cuban crisis and later in the US employing their battle fleet to restrain any military action in the east stopping China vs. India, China vs. Taiwan to name a few.)

Such interference in the affairs of other nations (not uncommon in the annals of history when one nation's power towered over the rest), led to the a negative referral of the United States under an image it had conceived for itself: "Uncle Sam."

To make my point clear, in the height of the Roman Empire, Egyptian King Ptolemy Antiopter, wrote off Egypt in a will to Rome due to weak economic situation and the lack of a capable heir. After his death, Julius Caesar, as Consul of Rome, interfered, installed Cleopatra as the monarch after assisting

in the defeat and murder of other claimants (Ptolemy the Younger and Arsinoe) to the throne. All elements of warfare including siege engines were employed during this operation.

During the height of modern colonialism (through the age of renaissance), many European nations interfered in the affairs of several other nations (who were weaker economically, politically and in military strength, and later became known as the 'Third World') to acquire and use resources to their advantage. This race of colonialism predominantly affected a majority of Asian and African countries, resulted in the formation of many of today's nations where both the Industrial Revolutions and the effects of the Renaissance had not yet been felt. Colonialism became a vehicle for renaissance to reach those nations and bring equilibrium to international affairs. Interestingly, the Science-Fiction series "Star Trek" refers to a "Prime Directive" on exploration which addresses "non-interference" in the affairs of places and people being explored (which is derived from the diametric opposite happening in world history).

In all above cited cases of interference, some form of warfare were employed in addition to "divide and conquer" strategies. At the end of World War II, colonialism was no longer accepted. A lot of work was done by all nations involved to prevent future "interference" under the name of colonialism or for any such purpose (of acquiring propriety on resources of a target nation or league.) Further, an agenda of peace (to be read as "restraint") was established for development in the future. Globalisation promoted global competition, which in some way would allow all countries to compete without using a tool such as 'war'. As competition is deeply-rooted on game theory and satiates a major human necessity, the push on globalisation increased. Globalisation (though slow as a process) began to break borders, open technology and knowledge into the whole world.

The "Cold War" (of militarisation for restraint) was also 'won' by the promoters of "freedom" (essentially "free" competition.) The USSR (a communist and partially fascist regime) fell to the call for such freedom. It had restrained the diversities within itself which led to a fracture. Interestingly "The People's Republic of China" (PRC) has also restrained diversities within itself, but recently tried to introduce "free" competition into society to avoid such fracture. In this path, their size and resources have allowed them to become the next major superpower in the world.

However, despite the advancement of political strategy and a new trend of globalism, until now, most successful warfare has been with the employment of force against a clearly identified enemy. In every case where the enemy could employ camouflage and effectively become invisible to the attacking force, the attacking forces have been at a disadvantage (and in more than one case faced severe casualties.) This was clear in the Vietnam War and later when India offered a Peace Keeping Force to Sri Lanka to curb terrorism caused by Militant groups in North Sri Lanka (called the LTTE.)

1.4 The Price paid for mistakes

The Price for Mistakes in not following the edicts quoted at the very beginning of this essay are tremendous. The expenditure of warfare skyrockets and bleeds into a death-toll. The would-be-conqueror is defeated and also faces the prospect of being attacked. When Rameses II of Egypt took a military campaign against the Turks, mistakes (in following the rules of planning a campaign) were made. That resulted in the fracture and enormous loss of the attacking force. Rameses II was only grateful to have returned back to Egypt with what little was left of his troops. This was a result of ill planning (and above all *execution* of what had been planned) despite the fact that Rameses II was himself a great General, Architect and Administrator.

When Adolf Hitler invaded USSR, he had made a mistake committed several times by earlier generals. He had chosen the wrong season to attack, further he had not studied the intricacies of desert warfare [the desert in this context is icy] (slow advancement by acquiring and holding supplies in camps.) He had adopted a Blitzkrieg (which was successful with bordering nations). Two mistakes added on to a third, supplying much needed food (to stand the Russian winter) to Mussolini's troops who were badly organised. These mistakes cost him his dream, of a unified Eurasian "Third Reich". The allies won and gathered evidence on his "war crimes", so today, we view Adolf Hitler in his negative, (largely) pagan and monstrous image. It avoided a possibly alternate historical timeline like the one shown in the movie Fatherland.

When US troops invaded Vietnam for what was an accepted cause by the world, they faced the problem of being unable to identify the enemy. Besides, the enemy was split in factions including guerilla units. The terrain which included a rain-forest was something most of the units were unfamiliar with. The result was a heavy loss of life on the part of those who had gone to restore peace (and enforce restraint.) The troops had to be called back after a national apology (on the death toll of US soldiers and marines rising, fighting for a cause that was not its own.) This operation was a bitter reminder that getting involved to cool down a possible civil war in a region over which a nation has no stake, for the sake of global stability is a most dangerous undertaking with the least likelihood of success.

When "Operation Desert Storm" was under sway, it gained success after masterful manouvres of the military. The aggressor was put down, the neighbours who had sought for help¹ were saved. However, due to the nature of the global peace agreements and conventions of the new world era, the leader was allowed to return to his country, partially demilitarised (with a grudge against the defenders of peace.) Here the defenders of peace acted in a "righteous" manner (although uncalled for.) Had the enemy (or at least their fundamentalist leader) been vanquished then, a new war on terror against the same aggressor (for reasons whatsoever) could have been entirely avoided. "Operation Sword" (which is happening today) would not have been necessary (and the loss of civilian life in Iraq which despite media recognition, goes

¹whenever neighbours have sought for help, interference in alien political affairs has had success.

unnoticed).

2 Terrorism

The book "Arthashastra" classifies war as "Open Warfare", "Secret Warfare" and "Undeclared Warfare". Terrorism which we face today, can be termed "Secret and Undeclared Warfare." ("Arthashastra", Shloka {7.6.17})

2.1 Defining Terrorism

The definition of terrorism in the modern context is disputable. Here are a few aspects of terrorism, that help define it.

- The *act* is **violent**
- The *motive* is **hidden** under *political, religious or sectarian claims*
- The *target* is **civilian**
- The *objective* is to **intimidate**
- The *intimidation* is **directed at government or society**
- The *perpetrator* is **non-governmental**
- The act is unlawful

To add more perspective to this definition, Adolf Hitler's Blitzkrieg was a "terrorising" attack, but a clear act of war by an identifiable aggressor. The perpetrator was "governmental" and hence his attack falls out of the above definition of "terrorism." However, due to the violation of treaties signed prior, his acts of 'war' were illegal (and far from righteous.)

2.2 Guerilla Warfare

When one of the parties engaged in a situation of war is weak, that party resorts to a subversive technique of warfare termed 'Guerilla Warfare'. It is sometimes also referred to as **Partisan** and originates from Spanish: 'Guerra' meaning war. Guerilla warfare is usually employed almost exclusively in situations of Asymmetric Warfare. It encompasses the usage of "terror" techniques, but largely employs unorthodox forms of warfare. It is used commonly in rebel uprising and rebel insurgence against an installed government usually motivated by political, sectarian (and in some cases humanitarian) purposes. Due to lack of proper governmental structure and support of a civilian base, such parties get funded by illegal means and hence also participate in what we label today as "terrorist activity."

The earliest account of Guerilla Warfare, to my memory dates back to the 17th century (which is scribed in detail.) During this period, most part of the Indian subcontinent was under the Islamic "Mughal Empire" under Emperor "Aurangzeb", which controlled the whole of India through a network of

oligarchies that covered almost the entire subcontinent. A Self-made Hindu Chieftan, who by his own efforts later was coronated Hindu Emperor of India "Shivaji Bhonsle", employed "surprise", "deception" and "ambush" as principal elements of warfare against a vastly overpowering Mughal (a.k.a Moghul) Empire. His use of unorthodox elements of warfare however do not mentioned documented loss of civilian life and therefore cannot be established as acts of terrorism. The techniques he employed in warfare (largely asymmetric) gave rise to modern methods classified under "Guerilla Warfare."

Due to the asymmetry in the size and resources of the forces, the smaller force usually disguises itself as civilians. Essentially, this results in a widespread "spy-ring" or "intelligence-network" which when called upon, bears arms for a "cause." Such method of urban camoflaug is not new and is known to have existed even prior to the Roman empire in the time of "Alexander, the Great". The employment of the Trojan horse in the epic battle against Troy is in itself an example of a Guerilla technique. In this case, though the army laying siege was strong and well numbered, yet it had no way of penetrating the impregnable fortress of Troy. There is no doubt that the rules of open warfare were broken by this purely tactical manouvre attributed to Ulysses.

Partisan warfare was also common during the World War II. The French, Dutch and Polish reistance, to name a few provided a route for Allied espionage agents during "Secret Service" missions (dominated by the SAS) against the Axis powers. Much of the resources (clothing, local support, military arsenal) was supplied to insurgent agents by Partisan and Rebel groups. It definitely played a significant role in undermining the Axis and giving Allied forces key advantages. It is notable that these guerilla groups operated through worldwide "intelligence networks."

2.2.1 Dictatorships and Military Regimes

Much of Guerilla warfare in the modern context takes place in countries where the system of governance is under dispute usually by a sizeable majority. This is almost always the case with dictatorial and military regimes. The problem with most parties employing Guerilla warfare is the lack of a condition of equilibrium (or an endpoint to the addressed imbalance.) Hollywood films (of quite some time back) like Viva Zapata illustrate this fact. They seem to get locked into a phase of continual regime reversal (also addressed in original comic style by Herg in his "Tintin" series.) Some dictators outsurvive others, but most of their tenures are marked by guerilla attacks, assassination attempts (or assassinations) and a turbulent, unstable society with a bleak law and order situation. The recent breakdown of Indonesian economy (owing to both natural and political factors) to the extent that they have been unable to afford oil in the global market is an example of such results. Idi Amin, Gen. Augusto Pinochet, Col. Muammar Al Gadaffi, Fidel Castro, President Suharto (Indonesia) are some of the names that dominate this genre.

2.2.2 Ethnic or Sectarian Disparity

In other cases, it seems to be sparked by disparate ethnic groups (sometimes an ethnic minority against a majority), but in most cases it is the weaker party who resorts to guerilla warfare. The PLO (in Israel) fighting for a separate Palestinian state, the LTTE (in Sri Lanka) fighting for a separate 'Tamil' state, the ULFA and the Bodo (in India) fighting for an Assamese state, the Naxals of Andhra (in India) for a different political regime, Islamic Fundamentalists (in India) fighting for "Independent" Kashmir are all examples of such conflict. They too employ means inclusive of terrorist attacks.

2.2.3 The Common Denominator

For those who have seen movies like Collateral Damage, one would notice the level of organisation of Guerilla groups. They depend on Hierarchical organisation with military-like chains of command. The lack of an endpoint or final goal creates persistence of disorder under different leaders. As the ruling government (or more powerful entity) is against such organisation, the Guerilla or Partisan or Resistance groups operate underground through an elaborate intelligence network. This intelligence network communicates using discrete methods, employing elaborate codes and at higher levels cryptography. With the help of "insiders", the network provides information that is used to advantage by the Guerilla groups to organise a subversive attack. This underground intelligence network is usually the backbone of any Guerilla movement. As the entire Guerilla group is not governmentally recognised and deemed illegal, they are funded through the "blackmarket" which exists in most countries and is outside the monitor (and legal net) of government officials. This forces them to pursue illegal trade including narcotic drugs, weaponry and in modern days pirated media (software, movies, music, etc.). Many Guerilla groups seek shelter in the name of ethnicity (as in the case of LTTE, PLO), Sympathy (for prior Human Rights violations against them) and/or religion due to a strong lack of security in any ideals whatsoever. Adding to this, in some such regimes (notably countries including Colombia, Cuba, Libya) people get so used to such regimes that their entire life is spun around it. Under such circumstances breaking divisive governance (into a ruling and a guerilla faction) is almost impossible. In almost parallel lines, the Nazi party used fascist influence against the communist party of Germany and later used ethnic hatred [against Jews] to organise their faction.

2.2.4 Anti-Guerilla Warfare

During repeated Guerilla incursions by trained mercenaries in the Jammu and Kashmir area, near the Line of actual Control (LoC), the Indian army resorted to using complete radio jamming of most radio frequencies and rotated its own communication frequencies for communication to break their communication backbone. The results when jamming was first employed were very effective and curbed incursion until sufficient holes were found in the jamming technique.

2.3 The Modern Context of Terrorism

In the modern world, communication has taken a global turn with the advent of international modes of communication spanning the Internet, Mobile and Satellite Telephony and technological tools to preserve anonymity (originally for privacy reasons.) This very communication that has given an upswing to Global trade and Business organisation, has given new life to the backbone of "Terrorist" operatives.

There is no doubt that terrorist operatives in the modern age, operate under the following premises:

- They are a minority.
- They have been unjustly made victim to some sort of oppression (political, economical, religious, ethnic or humanitarian).
- They are INCAPABLE of addressing their minority status and their oppression within any legal or just means.
- Their voices for appeal are being suppressed or ignored by the majority of the "new globally united" and "free" world.

In order to make their voices heard, they resort to violence against civilians (under an absolutely broken and negative impression that victimising others would make them listen to their cause.) "Terrorist" attacks in the modern attacks as defined earlier in this section are against civilians and use violence under unexpected circumstances. A secondary motive for terrorist attacks that appeals to their twisted psyche is "revenge." This is hardly acceptable when their violence is unleashed against civilians who had absolutely no involvement in whatever victimised them or their ancestors.

There is an interesting Indian film in Malayalam named "Truth", about an investigation on the assassination of a Chief Minister of a state. At the end of the movie it turns out that the murder of the Chief Minister was "Collateral Damage" and the target was a High Ranking Police Officer in charge of his security. A great number of civilians (in this fictional piece) also are injured and killed. This is an illustration of the fact that the ratio of collateral damage to enemy target damage is largely imbalanced in a terrorist attack. This can go to the extent that there are no intended enemy targets neutralised and the only casualties are civilian.

I must make a point here, that this is in exact opposition to modern military training approach of "surgical" military teams trained to handle situations by neutralising only enemy targets and harming no one else. There are many new books on the new Urban warfare techniques, and realtime-action-strategy games like Counter-Strike and Rainbow Six which show the complexity and allow gamers to experiment with tactical operations. Tom Clancy, in his series of books on anti-terrorism addresses the creation of a global antiterrorist unit capable of surgically fighting terrorist attacks and insurgency.

Today, "modern 'international' terrorists" are powered by global communication networks that allow for seamless transfer of funds, intelligence information and organisational commands. They target people of certain "developed" nations which they believe are the cause for their (negative?) state of affairs. Research over the years has proved that many operatives are psychologically "programmed" using suggestive techniques, coercion, hypnotism and procedures that might resemble re-education (a brainwashing tool used by communist regimes). Once altered in this manner, many of the operatives are no longer susceptible to logical, humanitarian or moral thinking. In many cases this renders hardcore operatives useless under interrogation even if they were detected and captured.

"Terrorists" of the 21st Century have taken undue advantage of the global open policy of the world and managed to lodge themselves in nations waiting for a strike. Due to the sophisticated psychological convincing they have undergone, they are no longer capable of making a decision considering a moral or rational perspective.

The worst part is they have shielded themselves under the name of "Islam" and call themselves 'warriors of the holy war' or Jihad. The true meaning of the word '*Jihad*' is to "exert utmost effort or to struggle". However, perverted by the terrorists themselves, it has brought disgrace to their own religion in meaning "terrorist warfare" and a further corruption of the one who "exerts utmost effort" *mujahid* to mean militant fighter. This owes to the possible fact that Islam, which quite similar to Christianity was once a unified religion but later underwent divisions. Hence Islam is open to varied interpretation and the "militant" interpretation is accommodated by a sizeable number.

3 The War against Terrorism

As the world is moving towards complete globalisation (of markets; of society; for a world without borders), terrorism (in any form) threatens to slow down (or bring to an abrupt halt) this process of global unification. It is imperative to halt and reverse the ill of terrorist activity. Many would start to ask the question, "Can we in simple terms wage a war against terrorism? Will it be worth it?"

3.1 Yesterday and Today

3.1.1 Rome and Piracy on the High Seas

Owing to my reading on Roman History pertaining to the time of Julius Caesar, here's another account of war against "terrorist activity." In the days when the Roman "Republic" was at its Zenith, the seas of the mediterranean were under the mercy of pirates who looted and pillaged at will. Rome, although a military super-power, never resorted to wielding an established Navy. In all campaigns involving transportation or warfare on the seas, they hired ships from "client" nations and fought naval battles much the same way as they would fight on land. Hence, Rome was decidedly not for patrolling the high seas (it wasn't what they were good at, nor in their interests.) It so

happened that, Julius Caesar, then a member of the Roman senate was captured for Ransom by a pirate. The ransom was paid by the nearest Roman province and he was rescued. After some events that transpired, Caesar convinced the Roman senate to empower General Pompeii with money from its treasury to fight the pirate menace. (Rome never fought wars that did not acquire territory or increase the wealth of its treasury.) After a long argument, the Senate was finally convinced and Rome empowered Pompeii to end the Piracy menace in the high seas. He dealt with it in his own unorthodox style (he was no Naval admiral). But that put an end to piracy and rendered the seas safe for the public. Rome, the "Republic", a superpower in that time had intervened and on the call of its senate fought piracy expending resources and gaining just "greater good." The benefits to Rome were at best indirect.

3.1.2 Aum Shinrikyo

A much more recent incident in 27-Jun-1994, involving the Aum Shinrikyo cult took place in Matsumoto in Japan. They attempted to use a nerve gas, "Sarin" to gain undue advantage by disposing off judges in a legal settlement. Thanks to a wind that blew the cloud away, the incident injured 200 people who required overnight hospitalisation. The cult went undetected over this incident despite investigation.

On 20-Mar-1995, 15 points in the Tokyo subway stations were chosen for a multi-point terrorist attack. There were 12 casualties, with at least 3800 affected. More than 400 were hospitalised on that day. This was the first time when a covert and surprise attack sprung in with the use of chemical agents. The cult had also attempted laboratory tests with other toxins including Anthrax, Botulin and even a strain of the Ebola virus. The motive for the second attack remains *unknown* to the present day. But, murder particularly 'mass murder' was on their agenda. The cult had also allegedly murdered members (of the Sakomoto family) who wanted to revoke membership. The leader of the cult, Asahara denied any involvement in the terrorising event and remains silent.

Aum Shinrikyo has had several overseas branches: a Sri Lanka branch, small branches in New York City, United States and Bonn, Germany. The group also had several centers in Moscow, Russia. The cult remains under surveillance (originally for a period of 3 years after the attack, later extended to 6 years since Jan-2000). They are still considered to be a threat. What their attack points out is the scale of threat posed by any organisation. The organisation in concern, here, a religious cult, was able to amass funds in tens of millions of dollars and siphon them for a purpose to which they offered no explanation.

3.1.3 Taliban

The Taliban, largely a militant group employing guerilla warfare, engaged in a civil war within Afghanistan and removed "Rabbani", the legal head of state from office. He fled to the North East and controlled a small territory. Some countries started recognising the "Taliban" as official rulers of Afghanistan

under "Mullah Omar." It is notable that since they were 'Sunni' Muslims, the 'Shia' refused to recognise their sovereignty. However several states including Pakistan and Saudi Arabia recognised their sovereignty and supported them in both logistics and in funds in controlling the state. Afghanistan, under Taliban rule, for a large part derived its economy from being on the "drug route" and also as cultivators of Opium plants. Television and Media were banned, fundamentalist, anti-humanitarian forms of law were imposed including gender bias, capital punishment, all of which was for the most part, draconian. To add to this they offered sanctuary to the much sought *Osama Bin Laden* who was implicated in the gruesome incidents of 11-Sep-2001, a day that will live on in infamy. They also employed Engineers from Pakistan [alleged by locals] for the destruction of ancient Buddhist idols dating back to 80 ACE.

The USA declared a formal war on the Taliban regime (and continued to recognise Rabbani as the legal head of state). They successfully defeated the Taliban regime (who were clearly less powerful in military strength.) Beyond that, the USA and UN assisting states reinstated proper governance, a democratic regime, re-created educational institutions and restored 'order' to the country. This was perhaps one of the most successful anti-terrorism operations at a very large scale. But one must clearly note that this was against a less powerful foe over a country that had little or no industrialisation since the Taliban regime. Further, the Taliban did not possess armored vehicles, but had an outdated cavalry and their only heavy artillery was mobile rocket silos.

There are many issues regarding the casualties of this war, human rights of the POWs captured and delivered to the Northern Alliance by the invading US forces. But these issues are under dispute. Massive humanitarian aid was offered to the Taliban through the UNFP (United Nations Food Program) and Pakistani help (who wanted to relinquish their image as "Taliban supporters.") The United States did not succeed in capturing *Osama Bin Laden*. However, the operation did reduce the supply of narcotic products available in the International Blackmarket for the period of the attack and sometime thereafter. Many residents are reported to have resumed cultivation of narcotic crops due to poverty and lingering famine.

3.1.4 Iraq

After a successful "Operation Desert Storm", Iraq was demilitarised and was forced to engage in a continuous process of reducing weapons and military strength. A Trade embargo was also imposed on them to restrain their economy and prevent them from resorting to militarisation. In late 2002, several UN weapons inspectors reported that there were several unaccounted warheads and missiles that were not covered in the report (12,000 page) submitted to them. This led to growing suspicion of the possibility of re-militarisation. Further, the US intelligence agencies claimed to have received convincing intelligence on the presence of Weapons of Mass Destruction. They also alleged (with no supportive evidence) that a critical "Al Qaeda" cell operated from within Baghdad.

Before the authenticity of these claims could be verified and studied by the international community, the US took it upon itself to act quickly before the evidence disappeared. This was a high-risk decision, resulting in the invasion of Iraq in 2003. The Iraqis seemingly offered little resistance to the initial invading forces (who were almost in for a victory march, reminding one of 'Arnheim' of WW2 infamy.) Saddam Hussein was also hunted down, captured alive and brought to the US for trial under an international war-crime tribunal. However, no evidence of Weapons of Mass Destruction nor Al Qaeda operatives could be unearthed through the entire operation.

In the aftermath of the operation, a new interim government was setup to pave way for a democratic government in Iraq. However, terrorist attacks in "Baghdad" are part of daily news with civilians and Peace-keeping forces suffering casualties repeatedly. Furthermore, the situation of the lack of law and order seems to persist and the exit strategy originally sought for, has yet to be completed. The new conflict to restore urban peace is codenamed "Operation Sword" and the media does not indicate hope in its progress.

4 Beheading the new Hydra

Terrorism, enabled with the open doors of the global world and its communication networks, is now gaining on like the mythological *Lernaean Hydra*. Cut off one head, and two pop up. The recent bombings in Madrid, London and Egypt (apart from continual attacks in Baghdad) point out that we are ill-prepared to deal with "terrorism" (as it re-incarnates) at the moment. Investigating and convicting individuals concerned with a particular incident series is like cutting off one head, but something tends to follow up as happened in a panicky London recently.

Essentially addressing the issue at a case-by-case or state-by-state level is no longer feasible as most terrorist groups seemed to have linked together (thanks to the very globalisation they are against.) One part of curbing terrorism is elite anti-terrorist forces, with capabilities in multiple disciplines of warfare pertaining to terrorist attacks. Much of this has been seriously addressed and elite anti-terrorist forces are being trained by many countries around the world.

The second part is to understand the ideals exhibited by the terrorists are in most likelihood non-existent, immoral or irrational (or all of the above.) This can be clearly derived from the Aum Shinrikyo attacks of the past (where the attacks were in line with their ideology of destroying the living world to return and create it in the "right plan.") What is common in all attacks is that civilians unconcerned are harmed with no form of warning (Secret and Undeclared war). In the past, while addressing terrorism, the possibility of "peace-talks" were always present. In cases of ethnic conflict, repeated cease-fires, led to re-arming of the terrorist/guerilla groups resulting in the impossibility of peace. The world no longer believes in a *diplomatic* solution to any form of terrorism.

4.1 Defeating the Hydra

There are several different versions on Heracles actual heroism of defeating the Hydra (to the extent that the number of labors is being debated between 10 and 12), one under question being this. But as legend has it, Heracles exposed all the heads of the Hydra to sunlight and cut them off (one after the other, swiftly), and held up to Apollo, it could not regrow its heads, and thereby was vanquished.

In similar fashion, a worldwide attack on all operatives of the "underground" or "terrorist" or "partisan" groups must be launched. Further, this attack has to be "terrorist" in nature and based on strong intelligence information. (Terrorism can be fought with the very same tools of Terrorism - fear, surprise and deceit.) Leaders and pivots involved in organisation need to be slain without remorse (not brought to justice). This will rid us of the present threat, so that the socio-political issues that resulted in their formation can be addressed subsequently.

Such methods were adopted successfully in India. I can quote two instances. During heavy militant insurgence in the North Eastern states, Indira Gandhi, then Prime Minister of India, invited militant leaders to peace talks and had them shot. (deceit and surprise) Without the leaders the cells were rendered dysfunctional within which time a temporary political solution was imposed. In a second instance, a major naxal threat in Tamilnadu, in the districts of Dharmapuri bordering Salem, were curbed by a police officer who had all suspected militant leaders shot in fabricated encounter deaths. (deceit, fear and surprise in one package.) While these may be listed as gross violations of human rights, the highways which the Naxals frequented to rob and plunder public were rendered safe for use. The political situations and issues were subsequently addressed. I am sure such attempts have succeeded in the past in several contexts, but today we have to co-ordinate and attack terrorists all over the world together. This can be done only with the collaboration of the common man. I have several friends (in India and elsewhere) who have been very cautious in checking the background of any stranger or newfound friend they met and informed authorities concerned through due contacts if they smelt anything suspicious. Such measures have to be undertaken worldwide until there is confirmation that the major ringleaders have been positively neutralised [KILLED].

Further, the Islamic countries who blend Social and Political Law with Religious edicts, must accept that terrorism is an act of violence against the innocent and outside any religious moral teachings. The word "Jihad" decidedly does not (and never did) mean "Holy War", it only means forceful action to achieve one's solidarity. A Mujahid is one who righteous to his religion enforces and follows his teachings with all his willpower (not one who drives a vehicle laden with Bombs into a wall, Bin Laden better watch out.) Such misinterpretation of religious teachings must be curbed once the primary threat is neutralised. There are many anti-terrorist experts (I can name one, "Tom Clancy"), who are well-versed with dealing with this menace. It is about time they took the helm of affairs.

The Pope no longer issues Papal Bulls (like Fatwahs imposed by disparate Shia, Sunni leaders). Society has advanced far enough to accept radical issues and even issues that may question the very fundamentals of religion. The United States has been exemplary by allowing books like "The Last Temptation of Christ" (not sans hue and cry) to be published showing a true "free" culture which the new global border-less world must learn to emulate.

4.2 Uncle Sam

The United States appeased Saddam Hussein in their efforts to curb Iranian supremacy and fundamentalism. The President of the United states undeniably had a business relationship with today's most sought after "Osama Bin Laden." It is time they accept their past mistakes of ill-chosen allies and tread carefully to bring peace to a growing global world with falling borders. Acknowledging past mistakes is a move of solidarity and not one that shows weakness. The present government of the United States, to say the very least is very weak and possibly even misguided in its attempts to restore peace. One cannot go ahead and accept, "the people got what they deserved." A country that has the ability to lead other nations must have a leader capable of leading itself in the first place, which sadly does not appear to be the case. The reason for the resignation of form US Secretary of State "Collin Powell" has gone unmentioned, although it seemed to be a show of inner strength in accepting a mistake that was done. Trust in the US needs to be built, this is going to be harder and harder if they handle their foreign affairs continually in the same way. Else, the US has to allow Britain or another nation to take prime stance and lead the world in the war against terrorism. Taking a step back for the right reasons, may produce the best results. Sadly, I am no political advisor the USA, and this message might hardly sway them from their overwhelming requisite for self-importance.

5 Conclusion

Although the above section provides a neat conclusion for this essay, I have included a formal conclusion to avoid ending it in a (somewhat) prejudiced tone. The world is melding into a global union, melting down borders in the process and attempting to promote free and accepted co-existence of differing dogmas and diverse people. The fore-runner so far in such "free" thought has been the USA in recent years (Britain held this prior.) Terrorism is a global enemy with no defined purpose or cause² solely to exercise harm on those incapable of defending themselves. It needs to be addressed in what would be the first massive international cooperation (not "Deep Impact"). Let us all unite to thwart out the very schism that might threaten the future of humanity.

²whatever is shown as a cause is a mere excuse to perpetrate violence.