



TECHNIUM
SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL

Vol. 16, 2021

**A new decade
for social changes**

www.techniumscience.com

ISSN 2668-7798



9 772668 779000

Education as a target of Special war

Bakir Alispahić

Faculty of Criminalistics, Criminology and Security Studies, University of Sarajevo,
Bosnia and Herzegovina

balispahic@fkn.unsa.ba

Abstract. War is no longer a conflict between two armies in the battlefield, or a guerrilla fighting in the jungles – war has become much closer, both physically and metaphysically. The 21st century wars are conducted to win hearts and minds, and full control of population. Special war, as a war of the fifth generation, incorporates all parts of social life in order to inflict a significant damage upon the target state. The battlefield is no longer hundreds of thousands kilometres away, it is in our immediate proximity – on the social media networks, the places we visit, the books we read or the schools we go to. Subversive measures of indoctrination and propaganda that have penetrated all pores of the society, are currently directed towards the education system as an important element of successful and adequate functioning of the state and its society. This paper discusses education as a target of Special war. The author also analyses the ways in which the education can be misused for the realization of some 'higher goals'.

Keywords. Special war, education, security, subversion

Introduction

Over the course of human history, the security and safety have always been the priorities of the tribes, clans and still are the priorities of a state as an organic creation. The security in primitive communities has always been orientated towards survival i.e. the protection against predators (animal or human), search for food, as well as procreation. The evolution and development of human and his thought resulted in creation of a State as the product of culture, resources surplus and lastly – the fear. System of modern states came about in 1648 by the Peace of Westphalia, when it became necessary to establish balance of forces and power, and to essentially eliminate the possibility for a power or alliance to dominate over other alliances or lonely cities – states.

Domination of one state or alliance over other has been traditionally embodied in the military power or force, which is entirely expected as only the military power was the guarantor of larger resources, as well as further development. Resources are the main driver of development of a state and its population, thus enabling its domination and hegemony over other states and societies on both the regional and global levels. By acquiring surplus of resources, the state and its society in turn gain enough time and space to pursue other very important activity such as the science, which is not possible to achieve in the times of poverty and hunger. Looking at the history of mankind, the agricultural societies had achieved full domination over the societies of the hunters – collectors, and the main reason for it was the food which became more available through the agriculture compare to hunting and collecting edible

wild foods far away from home. Contrary to any agricultural society, the 'society' of hunters-collectors did not occupy a certain specific territory in terms of its residence as it was bound to constant movement that meant a great loss of time and resources required for studying the science. The security that agriculture had provided for the man enabled him to invest surplus time into thinking and dealing with other important things such as the science which was subsequently used for domination and supremacy. Although the man has dominated the nature, he has never fully realized domination over other individuals of his own kind – Homo sapiens, and so in such natural, anarchic system, he had to care for his own safety as well as for the safety of other homines sapientes and hominids. Anarchy and chaos are natural phenomena which emerge as products of diversities and heterogeneity in natural and unsterile surroundings, so the man as a thinking creature tried to sterilize and to uniform many aspects of life such as human nature and biosphere. Although the man tried to tame and restrain the human nature, that was not possible, therefore, as the ultimate and multiplied result of all that we have states in an anarchic international system which are led by the principle *bellum omnium contra omnes*.

'The war of all against all' goes beyond the domain of kinetic activity, and it has evolved in direction of the use of subversive methods which are much more perilous than an overt kinetic war. Until the end of the Cold War, security of a state was measured on the basis of military threat level and a threat of kinetic attack, however, such thinking became obsolete once the active subversive measures were applied which were not primary and of exclusive kinetic and visible nature. Traditional security had had only one domain and that was to protect that state from military threat, however, in the modern age that is considered rather outdated and vulnerable strategic thinking. Special war as a doctrine and strategic activity emerges as a new, evolved and improved method of security threat and the enemy destruction. Its hidden danger has been recognized by many critics of traditional, military understanding of security who have expanded the domain of security studies in favour of four more sectors – political, social, ecological and economic.

The expansion of security studies has allowed for a better understanding of the threats and reference objects, but it has also opened up a space for identification of new fields for attacks and endangerment. The modern, post-industrial and digital western society becomes increasingly endangered by non-violent active subversive measures, which are the part of Special (Hybrid) wars. Some of the key and important targets for modern subversion of any society are education and science. The education as an integral part of the western identity has become susceptible to subversions and indoctrination by the East (primarily by Russia and China as an antithesis to liberal imperialistic, western way of life).

The conflict between communism and liberalism has never ceased, and the desire for world dominance of one or the other system will never end. The unity of the world under cover of totalitarian communism or quasi democratic liberalism presents obverse and reverse of a coin. Each of the systems use certain subversive methods and techniques of the other, but also of their own society as a whole. Modern subversion and fight for supremacy starts with a man and his indoctrination, and not at the level of kinetic fight of uniforms and flags led by means of physical weaponry. Spread of ideology, whether it is aggressive communism and totalitarianism, or capitalistic liberal system, begins through schooling and education which serves as the basis for indoctrination of the youth who are as a vulnerable category susceptible for successful manipulation.

Traditional vs. modern security concept

Human nature has always strived towards security and well-being, therefore, the security as a higher goal can be viewed as the main driver of the development of human

civilization. An absence of the endangerment factor, whether it is to do with the lack of food, weather conditions or predators – other people or animals, positively and significantly contributes to the evolution and development of the mankind and taking a stride towards unknown vastness of the cosmos. In the very beginning of the human existence and development, man's life was a reference object, the only and basic protected element besides which all others were insignificant and less important. The importance of a man as a thinking and rational being was so great that everything was done to protect him from both natural and human influences. Looking at the historical human development, a state as a necessary element was created with the purpose to protect the humans from other people, tribes, states or nature. European, western security system had its beginnings around the Westphalian peace in 1648 and the formation of modern states which pursued colonizing and economic adventures. A state became a powerful organism which, with the help from its monarch or ruler, strived to expand its own living space, which often caused conflicts with other states or organized groups of people (tribes) on the far continents of America and Africa.

The countries on the European continent were not safe one from the other, and the situation was always very risky for the empire, state and the ruler. Various internal crises, riots, revolutions and wars became an everyday phenomenon. Whether it was a bloodshed such as the massacre of St Bartholomew's Day, a revolution as was the one from 1789 or the wars such were Napoleon's or even the First World War, they certainly formed thinking about a state as a reference object and a military threat (violent – kinetic) as the only one. The war doctrines at the time were founded on the use of military for resolution of all kinds of 'disputes'. Back then there were not any 'advanced' methods of subversive activity and indoctrination, and the man as a being was not perceived as an attack target but rather as cannon fodder and expendable. An individual was not in the focus of protection as it was the state, and the only threat identified and possible in that case was the military threat. Traditional security studies approach both the threats and responses as the preconditions for security analysis: there are threats which are military by their nature, and the responses are also military (Mutimer, 2015).

According to Hobbes (1651:106), the states – Commonwealths were created for people '... to defend themselves from the invasion of strangers and mutual harm, for securing own industry and fruit of the earth they can use to feed themselves and live a satisfactory life...' The state or common good, as Hobbes calls it, is orientated towards protection of living and non-living things, whether it is attacked by someone else or as the matter of mutual harm, existing as a higher and sacred goal which gathers individuals in one whole. A person as a lonely individual is not significantly important from some global and overall perspective, however, the groups of thousands and millions of individuals constitute an organism which, through the institutions, forms and regulates the life. Threats to life of an individual are many and, on the one hand, are simple, but the question is what about the threats to 'life' of the state. Could the state be endangered, harmed or could it, in the case of previous presumptions, die?

The states have specific borders that are not territorial, which can be seen from the way they define the threats, for example, in an ideological field (Buzan, 1983). Defining threats from the angle of a state and state system is not compatible with defining threats from the angle of the man as a rational creature that is, contrary to the state, a part of the material world. For a state, the man is not more than a subordinate element and object that serves for protection of state interests and borders. Ideology of a state as a unitary and holistic concept allows for determining of primary ideas which, actually, endangers security and the way it should be defined in the accord with the threat. The said defining determines the reference object, which is the state as an end in itself.

Traditional security studies treat their reference object just like that – as an object (Mutimer, 2015). To them, the state is nothing other than heartless, cold and abstract object created through the efforts of our ancestors, whose vanishing secondarily or tertiaryly endangers other subsystems. Such narrow way of thinking and conceptualizing destroys man as an individual that is a mixture of abstract and material, existing outside of the threats directed towards a state as an abstract phenomenon. The attitude about unimportance of an individual as an element of the state, is very rudimentary, dehumanising and neglects the entirety of a system. The system that was created by hundreds of thousands or millions of individuals, can fall apart and vanish if the influence on the individual is so strong as to be multiplied across all social layers.

Most traditionalists insist on military conflict as the key to security, and are prepared to relay their state centrism (Buzan, Weaver Ole & de Wilde, 1998). Physical threat to a state that comes in the form of the enemy military and enemy state as a system, is a threat if declared and when such idea is formed in the minds of others. Specific elements of the state, the institutions and individual participants, by means of connecting phonetics (marking and labelling) and semantics (sign or term), dictate what the security threat to a state implies, and what the concept of security and security studies actually is. According to the traditionalists, it is always the military threat, and not something else. Stephen Walt makes perhaps the most severe statement about traditionalist stance, arguing that the security studies are concerned with the phenomenon of war, and that they can be defined as 'studying threat, use and control of military power'

(Buzan, 1998). The military threat expressed through the form of war becomes the main symbol and sign of endangerment, which, when presented to the masses, forms a specific picture in their minds. The mass of people becomes conditioned to equate the point – disappearance of the state, with the sign – military threat (war) as the main and only concept of (in)security. Philosophy of traditionalism is based on the question – who or what needs to be protected. The traditionalists have a rather simple answer to this question: by protecting the state by means of military power, everything else is protected: the people, institutions, biosphere, capital, resources, etc. The state is transformed into an absolute and categorical form without which there is nothing else, particularly the people, and so it is the imperative to protect the state in order to protect the people and everything else. The key question becomes the survival of people who do not have their own state (for example, the Palestinians, the Kurds etc.)? Does it mean that the nations without state are not endangered, as the imperative of endangerment is actually the endangerment of a state as an abstract creature and element? Narrow mindedness of the traditional security system that is directed towards two vectors – the military threat as a form of endangerment, and a state as the reference object, in modern times can present an enormous danger which will ultimately end the existence of the state or/and an individual. The modernists and expansionists appear in the security studies as torchbearers who strip the cover of darkness and ignorance over a stagnant and archaic concept of state and national security. A modern, expanded understanding and concept of security begins with the Copenhagen and Welsh schools. The modernists, the security expansionists, have come to recognize sectors other than the military, and reference objects other than the state – the man. The traditional, narrow-minded perception of state as an object that is protected, and military threat as the only relative one, leaves enough room for other aggressive strategies and doctrines of endangerment of the system. In his book *People, States and Fear*, Buzan introduced four more security sectors in addition to the military one. According to Buzan (1983), there are five security sectors: the military, political, economic, ecological and social. These sectors represent a considerable expansion of the angle through which we observe the threats to the state and the human.

Following the break-up of the former Soviet Union and the end of bipolar system, a series of problem emerged from the anarchy of international relations. It is that anarchy, reflected in non-existence of a genuine and strong hegemon, on the one hand has forced other, militarily weaker countries to undertake a series of other active measures aimed at endangering their adversary.

After Buzan and other modernists had realized the danger of narrow minded traditionalism and the focus in the relation military threat – the state, the field of security studies was re-examined followed by a conference held in 1994 at the University of York in Toronto '*Strategies in conflict: Critical approaches to the security studies*'. This event was a turning point in favour of a more comprehensive understanding of the security aspect and navigating the focus towards other elements and subjects, and not only to the state.

In their work '*Critical security studies: Concepts and cases*' Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams re-examined the security concept, as well as the reference object by raising the question: what is it that is being protected. The traditional answer to this question would be – the security of the states (Mutimer, 2015), however, their ideas were far more revolutionary and wider than those of the traditionalists. Critical observation of the security begins with a thought about other people and communities, and their needs, and the key question raised is whether the security of the state is more important than the security of humankind, or some other subject e.g. corporation or market.

Modern debates about the nature of security often float in the sea of endless presumptions and deeper theoretical questions about whom and what the term security relates to (Krause & Williams, 1997). The security itself becomes arguable, as well as the reference object and the manner of its protection, and the general understanding of disciplinary security concept. According to Krause and Williams, the critical security studies should re-examine the reference object of security, ponder over security as something larger than the military security itself, and alter the way of studying security (Mutimer, 2015), considering that the objectivity presupposed by the traditional approaches is unsustainable. Their critique of neorealism and state centrism provided the security theorists with an insight into a wider field of security studies and strategies.

According to Buzan (1983), security is a relative concept which is easier to apply to things and objects than to people. As said before, the abstract forms and notions such as a state are not and cannot be endangered in the same way the human can be. The state does not feel hunger, cold, polluted air or thirst, and the state does not worry about the problems of survival and living in the same way the people do. Individual security cannot be defined in an easy and simple manner as the lay people and the uninformed may think. The factors such as life, health, status, wealth and freedom – are far more complex, often contradictory and exhausted by the difference between objective and subjective assessment (Buzan, 1983). Many of them cannot be replaced if they are lost (life, extremities, status), and causal – consequence relations, considering the threats, are rarely clear (Buzan, 1983).

The concept of threat represents another stumbling block in the security studies. According to Buzan, not all threats are same, as they do not carry the same weight. Looking back at the history, certain maladies such as measles, jaundice or influenza presented enormous threats to the human survival, however, today, thanks to modern medicine they are not so any longer. At the same time, certain modern factors (sudden industrialization and environmental pollution) were not the threat to life and health in the past, but today they certainly are. Additionally, the poverty becomes a fluid category, meaning that some parts of the world can 'come out' from the poverty thanks to, for example, certain natural discoveries bringing about the industrial or technological changes.

Individual security stems from social surroundings and the threats that emerge in it. Social threats tend to emerge in a variety of forms, but they are four obvious basic types: physical threats (pain, injury, death), economic threats (property expropriation and destruction, deprived access to work or resources), the legal threats (prison, deprived normal citizen freedoms) and threats to social status (degradation, public humiliation) (Buzan, 1983).

The question arises how to solve the issue of threats to human life and the existence, avoiding at the same time a total anarchy and system breakdown. Balance between the security and freedom often becomes a burning issue of a society. The problem of excessive security that a state provides for an individual, is not realized without certain restrictive and oppressive measures which, again, may endanger an individual and turn the state system into totalitarian. On the other hand, an 'excess' of freedom creates anarchy and lawlessness which may bring a society down to the level of primitive communities, and the rule of force and the strongest. Relation between the order and chaos in a society must be well balanced, without dominance by any of the elements. The state can often be, and is, the main threat to freedoms of people, which is directly reflected on the entire security of its people, but also of the state per se.

Buzan's division of sectors into military, political, economic, ecological and social, serves to better understand what the actual threats are for an individual. Each of the mentioned sectors has its field of endangerment and threat which has to be critically observed, also from the geographic and economic points of view. The western states do not experience the same threats as the countries of Africa or Asia; those sectoral threats depend on the state itself. Forms of economic threats to the citizens of the wealthy West differ from the threats that the citizens of Asia and Africa encounter. For the Europeans, the economic endangerment could mean an inability to go to a summer holiday for the third or fourth time in the season, or to buy a brand new luxury car, while the economic threat for citizens of an African country may mean an inability to buy food or have an access to potable water.

Without sectoral division of the security, a state and its institutions as well as other participants could not understand what individual, human security actually means. It is clear that the state is not hungry, cannot feel cold, it does not suffer the consequences of a low social status or polluted environment, poor quality food or undrinkable water. The state is also not concerned about the ability to pay back a loan or survive a late salary payment. The state is a specific system and organism which has to be observed differently than the human's, so it is not advisable to equate these two subjects.

Also, the Copenhagen school is 'responsible' for coining the term 'securitization'. The securitization is perhaps the most important conceptual trend that has emerged from within the security studies as a response to the epistemological challenge cited by Krause and Williams (Mutimer, 2015). Originally designed by Ole Wæver, the securitization concept has offered a new view to the increasingly tiring debate between those who claimed that the threats are objective (i.e. what actually presents a threat to the international security), and those who claimed that security is subjective i.e. the experience of threat (van Munster, 2012). In an attempt to avoid or bypass this debate, the Copenhagen school instead suggests to observe the security as an act of speaking in which the central question is not whether threats are real or not, but the ways in which certain issues (troops movement, migrations or degradation of environment) can be socially constructed as a threat (van Munster, 2012). The threat itself becomes a social construct, something that is created by people with a certain purpose in mind, primarily political, and expressed vocally, which additionally determines the threat as dangerous or fatal for a society or humankind. Therefore, a certain phenomenon becomes a security issue because certain protagonists have so decided, and the phenomenon becomes labelled as 'dangerous', 'alarming', or 'fatal', clearly pointing towards urgency and attention it

requires. Securitization, however, is not created simply when one protagonist declares an existential threat, but at the moment when certain audience accepts that speaking act that is focusing on the event or the subject as a threat.

The securitization politicizes certain issues, regardless of whether they are harmful or useful for an ordinary person. Increasing interference of the state and corporations in the domain of individual security should not be ignored, where the said subjects actually determine which issues are security issues and what it is that requires attention. The modern age corporatism is becoming a more powerful figure at the international level, expanding beyond the state borders and global institutions to the point where the governments are no longer able to sanction it. The real power of corporations was revealed during the pandemic of COVID-19; it was realized that the global corporations such as Amazon, Facebook, Google and Twitter can play very important role in defining the notion of security and security issues that relate to people. Those corporations have immense financial power and hence can influence certain governments to undertake or refrain from undertaking a certain action.

While certain people have billions on their bank accounts, the ordinary person is struggling to make ends meet. The issue of economic security as one of the security sectors is the matter of survival of humankind as well as of an individual.

Without evolutionary development of the security studies and the concept of security per se, the human survival is rather debatable and is not sustainable in the context of traditionalism which is too state centric. Such way of thinking leaves room to other participants and subjects to act subversively towards states and nations that hold on to traditionalism and state centrism. The economic or social/cultural war is by far more dangerous and fatal than the conventional and overt conflict. What the West refers to as the 'Gerasimov doctrine', which is merely a strategic plan related to the 'Primakov doctrine', represents a powerful weapon for subversive activities aimed towards non-military weakening of a target state. In his book *The Value of Science Is in the Foresight: New Challenges Demand Rethinking the Forms and Methods of Carrying out Combat Operations*, Gerasimov advocates continued strategic operations that as the main weapon use subversive methods. Gerasimov (2013) argues that, with regard to proportions of the destruction and victims, catastrophic social, economic and political consequences, the new kinds of conflicts are comparable to the consequences of any real war. This new kind of conflict is aimed at other modern and contemporary sectors such as cyberspace and education.

Development of human civilization, the new technology achievements, as well as global events such as, for instance, pandemics, have altered the society and the way of thinking of people and states. Development and progress that increasingly accelerate the life, also change the very structure of every person's life. Technology achievements such as smart telephones (and other devices), the internet and social media, have changed everyday life to a large extent. That change was positive in the beginning, providing opportunities for a wide range of activities which make everyday life easier (communication, instant knowledge and information, entertainment etc.), but they have, at the same time, created great many problems in the form of security issues such as reduced privacy or easier indoctrination and enemy propaganda.

At present, it is impossible to understand security as a concept related only to the state and military, when the technology has made it possible for non-state actors to emerge as the attackers with or without the use of kinetic force. The corporations, activists, non-governmental organizations, terrorist groups, political parties, quasi scientists and others, can endanger a state in a number of ways that are much more detrimental than any military intervention.

Non-violent active measures that deeply undermine the state and society, as well as the problems created by inadequate social and state structures, execute a direct attack on the man

as a being, preventing his any further prosperity. The security should be perceived as a fluid system, and not a rigid and inflexible field ruled by only one constant. The security concept of developed countries such as Germany or the United States is not the same as in the countries of Africa or the Middle East. While the West fears the communism, slow internet connection and viruses, the existential (in)security of people in Africa or in the Middle East commonly relates to the lack of potable water, medicines and hygiene supplies and food, as well as the presence of terrorism.

The security field should constantly expand and be observed much deeper and beyond the first impression. Technology and development of industrial society have opened up a modern Pandora's Box, full of new threats and dangers, both for the people and countries. Those threats and risks do not recognize state borders or some other barriers, and have their place in the arsenals of all those with sufficient financial means and expert personnel who can handle them. Contrary to the traditionalists as well as the Copenhagen trio, the members of the Welsh school have had entirely different understanding of the security concept. The Welsh school and its founder Ken Booth, attempted to link the Critical security studies with the post Marxist critical

theory. Booth has been very decided and clear as to two very important points. The first point is in that not all who consider themselves working within the framework of the critical international theory and the Critical security studies in particular, want to accept such notion of critical theory as their point of departure (Mutimer, 2015).

The Welsh school is basically trying to expand the social theory by studying and analysing the factors that stand as a hurdle to human emancipation. However, Booth and Wyn Jones are best-known thinkers of this school and their academic works have efficiently contribute to the field of critical security studies and promotion of security concept.

Booth himself is a big devotee of post Marxist theories, particularly of the Frankfurt school and its concepts, as well as of the works of Jürgen Habermas. Booth's theory is founded on the thesis of the Frankfurt school which holds that the entire knowledge is a social process i.e. the knowledge does not exist on its own and by itself, as it is produced by certain subjects and protagonists. As the knowledge is also a social construct, it also means that it is politicised and has a certain role in its existence. It becomes a product of certain elites (social, political, military etc.) for the sake of their benefit and purpose.

Just as the knowledge can be shaped and formed for specific purposes according to the statements by the Frankfurt school, Booth (2007) argues that security is what we make of it. If the entire knowledge is meant for someone and for some purpose, regressive theories are for the one that is currently in power with the purpose of maintaining dominance (Mutimer, 2015). Therefore, security is becoming a political concept and a construct. Politicised security passes from social 'ownership' to being owned by political subjects and becomes a political activity. Political activity intervenes into social relations, not into natural or material; it is related to the possible, unexpected, it modifies the context in which it enrolls instead of filling it with new subjects (Virno, 2015).

National security, education and Special war

National security as a basic form of state protection, through a series of measures such as the politics, diplomacy, economy and military, represents the main target of Special war. Contrary to the conventional methods of war which employ violent means and men as their main weaponry, new methods are in their essence strategically very different from the conventional ones. The age of raging wars and war campaigns lasting several years spread across several countries or continents is over, and the new war doctrine is characterized by

invisible, silent and slow moves that can be detected and recognized only during some big changes or events. According to Muslimović (2011), Special war is the way and means of fighting for unjust and aggressive goals; it is conceived and organized by the highest state institutions, and the objects of application are various elements of the society, state institutions and political factors. Prior to an official war declaration, it is necessary to implement preparations for the war, from subversive activities in the enemy state, terrorist attacks by third participants, to the creation of own justification for declaring the war (Muhić, 2020). The said actions will soften the target which becomes susceptible to influence and occupation, whether it is violent or invisible – without foreign uniforms and flags.

In its essence Special war represents a doctrine of leading a total and general war with non-violent means, on all social fronts, attacking the citizen directly, not physically but in an abstract manner – mentally, spiritually, out-of-body, affecting his way of thinking and behaviour. The person becomes a prisoner of his own mind that is programmed by the enemy.

The main attacking elements of Special war are subversive methods of propaganda, indoctrination, various forms of diversion, social maladies, assassinations and political murders, as well as ‘quiet and justified’ riots and revolutions. That is realized by means of spinning of reality and fabrication of a new reality implemented through synthesis of controlled media and their narrative, as well as strong agitation by infiltrated elements.

The age of global conflicts and world wars is replaced by the localised wars and insurgencies which serve as experimental fields for testing new methods such as instigating riots and revolutions, population control, or employing the propaganda - media machinery. The modern digital age of 21st century has offered to the states and intelligence services powerful weaponry of rapid dissemination of information. The Cold War would have surely ended differently had there been at the time the internet and social media in the form they exist today, and new aggravations of disputes in the world can be seen as a sequel of the Cold War on steroids. Nuclear threat has not been entirely removed, it is, however, replaced with other more dangerous means and concealed types of attacks. With the expansion of the protection sector from the military to the political, economic, ecological and social as well, all seriousness of the threat of new strategies and doctrines such as Special or Hybrid war has been understood; using non-military and non-violent methods, the Special war attacks also the sectors other than the military. One of the very important targets of the attacks is education.

Education as a relatively new sector that exists and which should be incorporated in the security domain together with the previously mentioned sectors, is susceptible to attacks and is rather vulnerable. Its vulnerability is directly reflected on people, with particularly negative implications on the state that can at a certain critical moment – break up.

The Special war as *novum* and *terra incognita* in the international relations should be viewed in the same way as the conventional, kinetic war. Neglecting the activities that are not violent and directly military per se, undermines the state security to a large extent and threatens to destroy it. Again, the world is turning to the traditional concept and understanding of security in which the only identified and realistically understood threat is the military one, while all the others are rejected. In addition, it is a common understanding that only the state is the reference object to be protected, which also represent a significant omission.

The methods of attack in a Special war are directed at men, indirectly aiming the state, and consequently the defence activities undertaken have to be primarily directed at a person and his/her life. The very purpose of Special war is to ‘get to’ the state as an abstract entity through the man and influence on the entire society, and to influence further functioning of the state system and apparatus with the help from people, those deceived and cheated. When there is a

sufficient number of infiltrated enemies, traitors or useful idiots in the government, that state is unable to adequately defend itself, and thus will always be endangered by its adversaries.

An aggressor state that employs Special war as the means and method of realization of its goals, undertakes a series of measures for infiltration and indoctrination of the attacked society, with the goal to create an inert, indolent and infantile mass that will not understand the events, and hence will not undertake anything to stop them. This is possible to achieve through adequate propaganda and corruption in the government upper levels. Money as the main driver of everything, has become stronger than patriotic sentiment and love for one's country and people, and in the modern age it serves well to bypass any 'obstacle', whether it is love, loyalty, patriotism or something else. The money has become the chief corruptor of everything lofty and 'sacred', and as an instrument of Special war, it enables a faster and simpler occupation of the target country and its systems. Given the fact that in the 21st century everything can be bought, the new loyalty and patriotism are also for sale, although those 'mercenaries' and traitors will be eventually accepted in the new system, as well as that of the aggressor.

When it comes to national security, the protection against kinetic attacks comes first, whether it is an invasion or an aggression by another state, or it has to do with terrorist activities. On the other hand, a series of sectors and social and political spheres which are equally threatened with non-violent measures – become forgotten. Due to the rapid technological and technical development of human civilization, the education and schooling have become more accessible, cheaper and larger, however, it does not necessarily mean that the quality of what is taught is at a satisfactory level anywhere in the world.

Education and schooling is a new target of attacks in Special war, which is why the education has to be recognized as a new security sector in addition to Buzan's five sectors – the military, ecological, economic, social and political, but also in the accord with the post Marxist assertions that knowledge is a social and political product, always for someone and with some purpose. Neglecting the problem relating to the education, blended in the propaganda – indoctrinating study materials, as well as in the useful idiots, traitors and foreign agitators, will create within new young generations moral and intellectual freaks that (un)conscientiously hate and destroy their own country.

The traditional concept of security that gives priority to the military issues only, has become too anchored and nested in the minds of state officials, politicians and strategists. The protection of state and society observed through the prism of the use of military for defence and attack, in the modern age becomes increasingly archaic and inefficient. Insurgencies and low intensity conflicts are possible in certain underdeveloped third world countries of Asia and Africa, however, such military operations cannot be applied to developed countries of Europe, the United States or China. What cannot be achieved by mass invasion and tank divisions, can be achieved by winning hearts and minds, starting at the preschool level education, through the elementary and high school, concluding with a complete indoctrination at the university level. The function of the modern educational system is two-fold, to produce and transfer knowledge as one, and political function which essentially implies a sort of assimilation and indoctrination with the purpose of ensuring cultural and political homogeneity of the society (Gellner, 1998), which is actually more important than the first one. More is achieved through the assimilation and indoctrination than any other type of fire or cold weapons, or the system of coercion. More territory and resources are achieved by quiet and invisible methods implemented throughout decades than any big war.

The education should be observed through the etymology of the term, and that is a process of gaining education by attending schools (Jezikoslovac, 2020). The knowledge acquired in school represents an important factor but not sufficient to form a person to be a

useful and functional individual in a society. Currently there are many well educated people in the world but not as many with the knowledge, so the education is more important than schooling. The education itself represents a tool for understanding and the use of knowledge gained in school. According to Pastuović (2012), education is an organized acquisition of knowledge and psychomotor skills, as well as the development of those skills which help the studying process. From the aspect of hyper productive and consumerist society, the schooling is much more important than education, and the skills gained by mere school attendance in most cases are not applicable in real life. One goes to school because it is obligatory, the things learnt in school are more or less important, so the school system itself is politicised and indoctrinated, which brings us back to the post Marxist theories about knowledge for someone and someone else's purpose. The schools should be the institutions for upbringing and education, however, in the modern digital age, they do not perform the upbringing function; rather they serve as day-care centres for children and minors while their parents are at work. The upbringing could be defined as an act of conscious influence on a young person with the aim to instil into him or her certain habits and characteristics that are appropriate for the society he or she belongs to (Halilović-Kibrić, 2018). At present, the education role is being taken over by the social media which, through a system of informal social reaction, direct young brains as to what is acceptable and what is not acceptable, indoctrinating them through the global trends founded on consumerism. Because of their naivety and inability to comprehend a deeper meaning of some events or things, as well as weak parental control (but also their own ignorance of the situational circumstances), the indoctrinating content finds its way to them, thus creating new generations of indolent and inert persons, or aggressive haters of everything different and everything like themselves. The schooling system of the elementary and secondary schools is programmed to introduce the students to the basics of certain sciences, without deeper understanding of what is being learnt. The knowledge gained in such educational institutions is repetitive and of short span, short of opportunity for a real life application and longer retention in brain engrams. Although the elementary school should also perform the function of upbringing, it is becoming less so. The influence of social media and trends continues to grow in the liberal societies which allow almost everything, and where everything is viewed through the prism of fabricated and exponentially augmented economic and social inequity. Privileged status of certain minority groups and inequity often ensure preferential treatment and privileges in the schooling system, i.e. the privileged are spared some obligations and tasks. Contemporary schooling is a disorganised system of repetitive contents which has lost its primary role of upbringing and directing the youth to the science. Commercialization of the universities and consequently the growth of the private university sector presents a danger to the society and knowledge in many ways. The risk that stems from an uncontrolled and unregulated system of tertiary education is reflected in the way of acquiring a diploma as a measuring unit of success and importance of an individual in the society, but also of the quality of education. The mere commercialization of universities does not bring the quality of education up to an enviable and adequate level. The money has emerged as the key driver of the tertiary educational institution. The money as a catalyst of almost everything in the modern, post-industrial society, is the main culprit for increasing the reach and efficiency of Special wars. Subversive politics and strategy of the Special war ignores traditional security aspects such as military and defence/offensive measures, instead, it redirects its focus on the society and those most vulnerable – the youth. The easiest way to undermine a society is through an attack on the naïve and innocent who do not understand the real meaning of what is going on, and are unable to recognize the attack vectors. The institutions of tertiary education presently serve as the factories producing useful idiots, and their number increases every year. The problem is not related to hyper production of

educated personnel but the level and quality of their education. The accessibility of tertiary education for a wide mass of people without discrimination on the basis of some parameters is deemed noble and desirable, as the education should not be the privilege of the wealthy. On the other hand, relatively easy access to education, as well as a hypertrophy of the student mass and making concessions for certain social categories (ethnic minorities, LGBT+ population and others) in the sense of further advancement without merit, blocks and inhibits an effective production of educated personnel as the vehicle of further development of the society and human civilization as a whole. The modern society has the mentality of victim, it is crippled in terms of advancement and progress, constantly attempting to create an artificial equality between the successful and unsuccessful, which creates a climate of mediocrity and a lack of competition, unless it is about 'who is going to be a bigger victim'.

Special war as a means of destruction does not employ conventional weaponry but ideology and social weaknesses for dissolution of the state. Divisions and differences within multicultural states become more apparent due to the special war, making the differences become the weakness. The indoctrination itself and divisions emerge in the educational institutions at all levels, where the upbringing and training of children, the youth and adolescents begins by identifying and targeting the differences between students. The reason to attack the educational system through the special war is in its efficacy in creating ideological soldiers and useful idiots for war and peace. The role of education is two-fold, creating peace and creating war. That said, the education can be employed to incite war and conflict by promoting ethnic divisions, cultural repression and manipulating historical facts in the textbooks (Halilović-Kibrić, 2020).

Some examples of misuse of education

As a risk and vulnerable category, the young people become the main target for foreign personnel with malicious intentions. The lessons learnt (and applied) from the Cold War are in the use again. The conflict between liberal West and communist/socialist East had set the basis for indoctrination and subversions as the means of non-kinetic fight. Indoctrination performed by means of print media, TV and radio had achieved much more in terms of the fall of the Soviet Union than any direct military attack would have done. Now when neo imperialistic tendencies emerge again, the role of indoctrination of the youth through the educational and schooling system, with the help of the internet, becomes a growing danger. The modern developed countries are not as much endangered by the enemy military operations and threats, as they are threatened by not so 'risky' things such as schooling and education which can produce significant troubles in the form of social unrest and revolutions which could destroy the system from within, allowing the enemy to get hold of the state resources. As Clausewitz (1832) used to say, 'war is a mere continuation of politics by other means', however, wars can be conducted in the ways that do not include military means. Mao Zedong described war as politics that implies bloodshed, while the politics is a war without bloodshed. As for the modern times, we could say that war has evolved into a war without bloodshed, which however has not decreased its dangerousness. The dangers brought by the evolution of war into the fourth generation of Special wars, have essentially changed the entire metaphysics of conflicts on the state and global levels. Central to the war phenomenon of fourth generation is not military evolution but the political, social and moral revolution: the legitimacy crisis of state (Lind & Thiele, 2015). As Lind and Thiele further argue, the citizens pass their primary loyalty from the state to other entities: the tribes, ethnic groups, religions, gangs, ideologies and 'causes'.

Universities as educational centres are convenient for 'absorption' of foreign narratives and ideologies, and as such become more radical in the implementation of the said ideas. The

young who constitute a significant structure at the universities are rather naïve in terms of accepting foreign (antagonistic) ideas. Susceptibility and tendency to imitate others is characteristics of the youth (Alispahić, 2019), which creates the opportunity for production of radical ideological soldiers of a foreign system, which find many flaws in their own system while glorifying the foreign. Emergence of idolatry, inferiority complex, uncertainty about one's own value, and readiness to serve the better and more successful ones, are not uncommon phenomenon (Alispahić, 2019). Idolatry as well as a lack of loyalty gradually creates useful idiots that adopt radical and extreme ideas of a certain ideology.

Radicalism and extremism of the young people indoctrinated in educational institutions have for its goal to present them to a wider mass of people in the region or globally as 'revolutionaries'. The young usually find their role models in the persons 'from the other side', i.e. ideological enemies of their country. One example is glorifying Joseph Stalin, Pol Pot or Mao Ce in some developed countries of the West. The villains and criminals are presented as revolutionaries and all their actions are celebrated as part of their fight against imperialism, colonialism and alike. Neglecting or even celebrating their crimes by useful idiots and other indoctrinated persons enables an efficient division of society, but also an ideological convergence of the indoctrinated group and the state which acts aggressively and antagonistically towards the official government. As Sun Tzu said, the best victory is the one that does not require a battle, and so the state conducting Special war does not run the battles; instead, the useful idiots and those disloyal to the state and society do it for them.

Victories and defeats in Special war are a category that is not entirely clear, as neither the victory nor the defeat are visible until the end of the war, failure of the aggressor or the attacked state. It is not necessary to accept all the revolutions and riots in an attacked country as something positive, which brings a total shift and adoption of enemy ideology. It is possible sometimes for a state or its bodies, as well as majority of its population, to recognize hostile activity by foreign intelligence factor, and to confront it adequately and successfully.

As war continues to evolve, so does its metaphysics changes. Special war as its overall and omnipotent form, incorporates a series of activities, technologies, social changes and trends and other, in order to fabricate and create a new 'reality' enabling the antagonistic and aggressive elements to prosper.

Educating security personnel abroad

Education and schooling is not only reserved for the children and adolescents but also for the professional personnel members who are meant to govern the state and its security sector. According to Ganija (2017), these personnel members can be defined as the persons who work at the state and other bodies and institutions, possessing legally prescribed rights, duties and obligations within the framework of execution of their tasks i.e. during the length of their service. The personnel as a spine of every organization give shape to the organization, making it either successful or unsuccessful, depending on their knowledge, possibilities, will and ideology, but also the politics they turn to. Professional education and training of the persons tasked with crucial and important jobs from within the national security domain, cannot be left to chance, without plan and structure. The purpose of such education meant to form the personnel, is to systematically produce capable people loyal to the state and nation, who will not bend under pressure, persuasion and 'rewards' offered by the enemy and traitors.

The personnel politics deals with finding, education and training of quality personnel members. It is a complex and hierarchically organized system of whose success depends the entire national security. The personnel politics is a legal, rational, aimed and purposeful professional process of finding, recruiting, assessing and hiring of personnel and their

placement to the jobs and tasks which best suit their characteristics and abilities, as well as their affinities (Alispahić & Alispahić, 2019). Faulty personnel politics that inadequately assesses, educates, trains and ideologically forms their personnel, has sentenced the agency and state to death. The 'death' is reflected in decadence and atrophy of the agency which becomes incapable of executing tasks and which leaks information to the enemy. The problem of information leaks is a result of inadequate personnel politics which have made mistakes at selecting specific personnel, as well as their assessment. We have heard of many affairs involving double agents who worked officially for one agency, yet they were providing an enemy service or agency with crucial information from 'home'. Whether it is about double agents from the former KGB or FBI in the Cold War, or contemporary foreign or domestic intelligence officers, if the personnel policy fails its primary task, the rest of its work and existence is doomed to fail.

For a better understanding of what ill personnel politics and selection may mean, we can look at the example of some operative recruited by an enemy intelligence service, who becomes their trump card in Special war. This operative, indoctrinated with the enemy ideology, his own greed, blackmailed, attracted to money or other material things, conscientiously reveals classified information (about his or other agents, acquires strictly confidential documents, plans and lists, reports about the situation and relations in his agency etc.) or spread disinformation he receives from his true owners – the enemy intelligence agency.

Indoctrination by the enemy intelligence and security military personnel was a delicate problem for all agencies in the past (before and during the Cold War). Personnel politics at the time was of great importance, particularly from the point of view of the enemy agency attempting to penetrate into another agency or service. In that regard, the personnel politics had for its aim to find a compatible, obedient and loyal 'traitor' who would take the role of double agent, seemingly loyal to his mother agency, while feeding his new employer with classified information.

Today it is no longer required to recruit foreign operatives through the systems of blackmail, pressure or financial or other rewards. Much better and more efficient approach is the approach of 'mutual cooperation and education'. The Special war methods are neither 'hard' nor kinetic, rather, they are soft and invisible, bordering on benefaction, benevolent intentions and a desire for everyone to achieve what they wish, however, the real situation is entirely different. The purpose of Special war is to implement the goals and tasks inconspicuously, in a seemingly good spirit and light, however, the 'goodness' is merely a cover and diversion meant to conceal the real goal, which is to destroy the enemy.

Indoctrination of personnel can be seen through the previously mentioned subversion measures:

- demoralisation, destabilisation, crisis and normalisation. Manipulated future personnel members are likely to become:
 - Demoralised, through presentation of their homeland as rotten, incapable, without the future;
 - Destabilised, through changing their ideological attitudes and tendencies;
 - Confused, due to an identity crisis whereas the target members are no longer able to tell the truth from a lie, with a possibility for a blackmail;
 - Becoming accustomed to their new status of an informer, agent or some other euphemism for traitor.

The power of Special war is not reflected in its destructive power, but in its ability to build, unify, create links, schemes, relations and plans with the suitable, recruited and indoctrinated personnel members of its own, as well as of the enemy system. On the basis of such destructive unification, sufficient space is opened to take over the state bodies and

institutions (of the other country) which marks the beginning of the manipulation phase and governing the other, enemy country. There is no alliances in Special war as this war itself is a 'war of all against all', there are no friends or allies, only common interests which can at any moment turn into stumbling blocks. That is why it is necessary to always have the upper hand over adversaries but also the allies i.e. the enemy that has not become that as yet.

Recruitment of enemy personnel members, as well as their indoctrination through education and training, seminars and alike, constitutes a very efficient manner of action by intelligence and security apparatus of the aggressor state which conducts a Special war. This is why specific forms of education can be very dangerous for a state and its citizens, particularly the training programs designed for the members of state intelligence and security system. Human weakness is used to the maximum advantage, and betraying one's country, people and even one's own ideals has become a 'normal' act that can always be justified one way or another. Using another's intelligence and security personnel for own purposes, particularly in the form of an overt betrayal – a double game, as well as invisible indoctrination and subversion of the mind with the aim of creating internal divisions and foes in the target country or its intelligence service.

Control of education in the sense 'who educates' and 'where' is the imperative in respect of protection of the state and society against malicious tendencies by aggressive state which actively pursue measures of Special war.

Science as a Special war weapon

The science is increasingly becoming a relative category which, at the same time, does and does not have an objective and realistic foothold in the physical world. It is also increasingly becoming a victim of political agendas as well as of Special war. The facts are fabricated and manipulated so that certain attitudes (one's own or the enemy's) are either confirmed or refuted, and to justify certain situations which represent 'preparing the ground' for future actions of certain state bodies and institutions.

Schooling and education in their essence serve to contribute to the science and its development, to raise it to a higher level and enable human prosperity in all realms. At the same time, the science is overburdened with social problems and agendas of certain politics and ideologies. Subjectivity and overload that the scientists suffer, as well as the risk of bribery, is likely to transform the science into a propaganda instrument. As it has become rather easy to control media, limiting and diverting information flow, it is as easy and simple to control the science and scientists as to what and when they will say. At the same time, it is still socially unacceptable to doubt the scientists as they are in the modern age considered infallible.

Conclusion remarks

New generation of warfare that falls under the category of Special war, has altered the term *war* in its very essence. War is no longer a conflict between two armies in a battlefield or a guerrilla fighting in remote jungles – war has gotten much closer, both physically and metaphysically. The 21st century wars are conducted to win hearts and minds, and achieve a total population control. Winning hearts and minds is not carried out by means of force, fear or coercion, but quite the opposite, through making preferences and giving privileges. Additionally, winning hearts and minds implies establishing strong foundations to secure future winning population masses and their minds. Modern war conducted in the field of abstract and intangible, as its instrument uses subversion, instead of direct military infantry or aviation attacks. Maliciousness of Special war has identified education as a new target, suitable for subversion of society through indoctrination of the youth. In this modern world, indoctrination

begins in the schools and education institutions which are unable to protect themselves from the propaganda and agitation by aggressive intelligence personnel, whereas a political agenda of a certain (non)state figure becomes an integral part of life of the young people. (Re)shaping hearts and minds is the imperative for realization of goals of the aggressive state which conducts Special war. By such shaping, the society of the target country is socially programmed and culturally conditioned to accept certain attacking/aggressive narratives as their own and affirmative. Mass programming and conditioning is possible through schooling system and media and internet propaganda and information control.

Indoctrination by enemy ideology and spread of foreign propaganda through education and science has largely eased subversion of a state and its people, and snatching its resources. Traditional concept of security linked solely to military threat as the only threat, is archaic and obsolete, and such uniformed way of thinking represents a danger to the state and its society. An expanded understanding of security encompassing the military, political, economic, ecological and social sectors, should be further expanded to include educational sector so that the reference object – a state, is joined by the man as a new reference object. In addition, the science should receive more attention as its manipulation enables penetration into strategic depth of national security.

The 21st century is the age of significant changes on both the micro and macro levels. Endangerment of men is continuously increasing and, contrary to a State, a man does not have sufficient and adequate means to defend himself from other state or non-state figures. Attack on a man as a functional unit and cell which constitute a complex system, and through its ‘spoiling’ and ‘infecting’, the tumour of anti-state and anti-social activities is growing at the speed of light and spreading throughout the entire organism – the state. Prevention of such anti-state and anti-social action is reflected in the protection and preservation of schooling, education and science, which is the imperative for the functionality and survival of the state and society. Special war as a war of the new fifth generation, incorporates all parts of social life to inflict a significant damage to the target state. The battlefield is no longer hundreds of thousands kilometres away – it is situated in our immediate vicinity: on the social media we befriend, the places we visit, the books we read and the schools we attend. Subversive measures of indoctrination and propaganda that have entered all pores of society, are presently directed at the education and schooling system as a vitally important element for successful functioning of the state and its society. Successful infiltration of foreign aggressive intelligence personnel into the schooling and education system is a reliable signal that ‘tumour’ has started to spread.

References

- [1] Alispahić, B. (2019). Metodika rada obavještajno-sigurnosnih službi. Fakultet za kriminalistiku, kriminologiju i sigurnosne studije Univerziteta u Sarajevu.
- [2] Alispahić, B., i Alispahić, S. (2019). Kadrovska politika sigurnosnih agencija. Fakultet za kriminalistiku, kriminologiju i sigurnosne studije Univerziteta u Sarajevu.
- [3] Booth, K. (2007). *Theory of World Security*. Cambridge University Press.
- [4] Buzan, B. (1983). *People, States and Fear: National Security Problem in International Relations*. Wheatsheaf Books.
- [5] Buzan, B., & Waever Ole i de Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: A new framework for analysis*. Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc.
- [6] Clausewitz, C. v. (1832). *O ratu*. Princeton University Press.
- [7] Crause, K., & Williams, M. C. (1997). *Critical Security Studies: Concepts And Strategies*. UCL Press.

- [8] Engdahl, W. F. (2005). Sjeme uništenja: geopolitika genetski modificirane hrane i globalno carstvo. *Detecta*.
- [9] Floyd, R., & Croft, S. (2011). *European Non-Traditional Security Theory: From Theory to Practice*. *Geopolitics, History, and International Relations*, str. 152-179.
- [10] Ganija, V. (2017). *Edukacija kadrova u sigurnosnim službama Bosne i Hercegovine*.
- [11] Gellner, E. (1998). *Nacije i nacionalizam*. *Politička kultura*, 49-63.
- [12] Gerasimov, V. (27. 02 2013). *The Value of Science Is in the Foresight: New Challenges Demand Rethinking the Forms and Methods of Carrying out Combat Operations*. *Military-Industrial Kurier*. <https://jmc.msu.edu/50th/download/21-conflict.pdf>
- [13] Halilović-Kibrić, N. (2018). *The Influence of Segregated Education on Security and Stability in Post-Conflict Bosnia and Herzegovina*. *Security Dialogues* 9 (1) (str. 7-25). [http://periodica.fzf.ukim.edu.mk/sd/SD%2009.1%20\(2018\)/SD%2009.1.03%20Halil%20ovic-Kibric,%20N.%20%20The%20Influence%20of%20Segregated%20Education%20on%20Security%20and%20Stability%20in.pdf](http://periodica.fzf.ukim.edu.mk/sd/SD%2009.1%20(2018)/SD%2009.1.03%20Halil%20ovic-Kibric,%20N.%20%20The%20Influence%20of%20Segregated%20Education%20on%20Security%20and%20Stability%20in.pdf)
- [14] Halilović-Kibrić, N. (2020). *Security Aspects of Fostering the Dominance of Politics Over Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina*. *Kriminalističke Teme*, 20(5), 57-76. <https://doi.org/10.51235/kt.2020.20.5.57>
- [15] Hobbes, T. (1651). *Leviathan*. London: Green Dragon in St. Pauls Church-yard.
- [16] Jezikoslovac. (2020). *Školovanje, značenje i definicija*. <https://jezikoslovac.com/word/cx1k>
- [17] Lazović, M. (2003). *Obaveštajci i špijuni*. *Paideia*.
- [18] Lind, W. S., i Thiele, G. A. (2015). *4th Generation Warfare Handbook*. Castalia House.
- [19] Muhić, E. (2020). *Obavještajno - sigurnosna služba i odnos sa specijalnim ratom*. Fakultet za kriminalistiku, kriminologiju i sigurnosne studije Univerziteta u Sarajevu
- [20] Muslimović, F. (2011). *Specijalni rat*. Udruženje za zaštitu tekovina borbe za Bosnu i Hercegovinu.
- [21] Mutimer, D. (2015). *Kritičke sigurnosne studije: Povijest razlika*. u Collins, A. *Savremene sigurnosne studije*. Oxford University Press.
- [22] Pastuović, N. (2012). *Obrazovanje i razvoj - Kako obrazovanje razvija ljude i mijenja*. Institut za društvena istraživanja.
- [23] Van Munster, R. (2012). *Securitization*. *International Relations*. DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780199743292-0091
- [24] Virno, P. (2015). *Zamisli revoluciju*. Quodlibet.