INDO-U.S. COUNTER-TERRORISM COOPERATION

Sanjay Kumar, Associate Professor, M.Phil. (JNU)

PG Department of Political Science
A N College, Patna

Abstract

South Asia, considered a "strategic backwater" by U.S. policymakers for almost ten years following the conclusion of the Cold War, has resurfaced as a significant area of U.S. Foreign Policy apprehensions in recent years. It was only reasonable that the utmost significant authority in South Asia should arise as a 'crucial actor' and 'natural partner' for U.S. Government. India's worldwide figure and economic growth are both on the rise, and decision-makers in the U.S. are re-evaluating the necessity of boosting their level of involvement with the country. India and Pakistan rose to prominence in the US-led World-wide War on Terrorism following September 11 strikes on the American homeland (GWOT). During their administration, the ties between India and the U.S. saw a significant shift in pace. Although increasing defense collaboration is believed to have "driven" the India–U.S. association to its present level, it has not resulted in more vital anti-terrorism coordination. The perception of a lack of collaboration can be traced to divergent perspectives on crucial security concerns. This article examines whether the improvement in Indo-American ties and claims of increased collaboration has resulted in a similar degree of anti-terrorism cooperation between the two nations. This article also discusses some persistent features of the connection, sources of change, upcoming possibilities, and restrictions. It will also explain how and why U.S. policymakers consider India a long-term companion beset by intimidation and associated variability.

Keywords: Indo-US, Terrorism, Cooperation, 9/11 attacks, and International Terrorism

Introduction

The global political system transformed, and U.S. supremacy was established after the Cold War's conclusion. After the cold war's conclusion, changes in the trading system, political economy, and investment patterns led to the development of new international connections in the decades. The U.S. became the world's preeminent power and fashioned the new international order according to its liberal beliefs and security needs. In the book, "The End of History and the Last Man," Francis Fukuyama described the human history. "We are seeing not just the end of the cold war or the passage of a particular period of history, but also the end of history as a whole, which is the culmination of mankind's ideological progress and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government" (Ashok, 2002).

However, the 9/11 terrorist attacks by Osama bin Laden radically altered the global political structure. To sustain regional stability, the U.S. took a unilateral approach to international politics and changed its focus. South Asia, a "strategic backwater" for U.S. policymakers, emerged as a significant region of U.S. foreign policy interest. U.S. authorities reconsidered the necessity for more engagement with India in light of India's rising importance on the international stage after the cold war. Thus, the commencement of Indo-US anti-terrorism collaboration at the start of the new millennium was founded in India's rising global and economic significance.

Terrorism has been a persistent threat to the global community. Terrorism is an ancient portent that has gained new strategies and a higher level of superiority. It is a problem that is getting prevalent and frequently predominates in our lives. It influences the formulation of foreign policy by nations and the conduct of commerce by enterprises. This phenomenon influences every element of existence.Consequently, terrorism is a political, legal, and military challenge in the current day. Consequently, India and the U.S. must cooperate more closely. It brought with it grave difficulties like ethnic disputes, the spread of weaponry, environmental issues, population increase, drug trafficking, and terrorism. It receives a disproportionate focus within the national security framework compared to other current concerns.

© **Associationof Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)**

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories.

Page | 74

Terrorism is an age-old issue, but the ever-evolving methods and approaches deployed today to make it an even more frightening concern. Since the conclusion of the Cold War, new

tendencies have emerged in a range of international conflicts and tensions, accompanied by substantial changes in their expressions. The connection between ideology and terrorism has always been murky.Most nation-states were founded on the idea of self-determination at the start of the twentieth century. Terrorist activities produce crises, incite indignation, erode community relationships, and erode trust in our democratic institutions, as stated by terrorism expert Brian Jenkins in a recent article. The World Trade Center explosion resulted in six fatalities. A yearly occurrence of such an event, however, would be untenable for our civilization (Sheehan, 2000).

New Facets of Global Terrorism

Terrorists now act globally, no longer focusing on a specific section or nation. The expanded risk to provincial and worldwide safety presented by insurgents — due to their increased ideological, technological, and financial connection with foreign rebel organizations — is gradually gaining the international community's attention. The saturated arms market has become a magnet for transnational terrorist organizations such as the LTTE, PKK, and Hamas. The increased likelihood that terrorists may employ nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons of mass devastation is another component of terrorism undergoing significant change. While executing a WMD assault, terrorists must take into account four factors:

- The choice to acquire and use WMD;

- The procurement of knowledge, production equipment, and raw materials;

- The fabrication of the weapon and its testing; and

- The planning and execution of an attack.

Consequently, governments must evaluate the danger posed by chemical weapons and biological poisons. Getting the technology and materials required for producing these weapons is simple, but their repercussions on the civilian population are devastating. The intricacy of producing and utilizing nuclear weapons makes their use in terrorist outbreaks improbable; nonetheless, it would be far simpler to cause lethal radioactive contamination by placing radioactive material in highly populated regions.Three or four attempts were made by

the same Aum Shinrikyo cult to employ biological weapons in Japan. There have been between 12 and 13 incidences of bioterrorism as of today.

Mr. William Cohen, the U.S. Secretary of Defense, has signaled a willingness to enhance funding for developing and upgrading systems for detecting and eliminating radioactive and biochemical contamination. Carpenter stated that terrorism "possesses all of the characteristics of a long-term security issue" and thus treated with the utmost gravity. Many years ago, it was believed that terrorists did not need weapons of mass destruction and that mass murder was not their goal. John Deutch, one among the authorities in global relationships, remarked, "Terrorists want a large audience, not a large death toll." In the modern era of terrorism, however, there is a greater reliance on explosives that primarily target the civilian population.

Causes of Rising International Terrorism

There are a few more pledges made by people involved in the violence and holding particular belief systems that justify terrorist conduct.Listed below are recognized variables that motivate individuals to engage in various forms of terrorism (Rajeswari, 2000).

Increase in Fundamentalist-Terrorism

The growth of this sort of terrorism has been significantly influenced by economic hardship and social discontent. Most Mujahideen recruits were young, highly educated individuals who could not find work in stagnating financial prudence of the Middle East and Africa.

Extreme religiosity

The consequence of the emergence of fundamentalist terrorism serves as one reason for their destructive force and resolves to fight a "holy" war grounded on religious ideals. The consecrated war fought by fundamentalist organizations has ripped several nations apart and resulted in the murder or ongoing captivity of many Western hostages.

There are still just a few groups that firmly adhere to this ideology. The Japanese Red Army is one organization that has advocated anarchist ideals. These groups tend to be tiny and short-lived, perhaps because their aims are vague, and it is hard for them to recruit new members. Specific terrorist organizations in Western Europe continue to adhere to the philosophy of nihilism, the most extreme version of anarchism that seeks the annihilation of all social structures and forms.

Separatism

In order to have a more significant impact on their need for separation, psychological terror is induced. In Spain, they used explosives and engine guns to coerce the administration into granting their demands for independence. Sri Lanka has also been experiencing the same situation.

Nationalism

It is challenging to distinguish between a nationalist undertaking and a separatist program as a cause of violence. Nationalism-motivated groups "want for their segment of society, which is typically but not always a minority, control of the system of government and the distribution of resources within that nation-state" (Daniel, 1998).

Terrorist countermeasures

The growth of so-called counterterror terrorists is arguably the most dangerous phenomenon after the end of the 20th century. Several nations in Central and South America have succumbed to the allure of anti-terror strategies to combat violence (Kelly et al., 1981).

Consequently, ultimate objective and target of all types of terrorists are to threaten people they view as oppressors, opponents, and hurdles to achieving their objectives. Their methods include hijacking, extortion, and merciless murder by gunfire and explosives. Typically, terrorist groups are tiny in order to work effectively against governments. Terrorism is a significant threat that requires a national, bilateral, and international strategy that is successful and consistent.

© **Associationof Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)**

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories.

Page | 77

9/11 and Indo-US Relations

The calamitous incident of September 11, 2001, often known as "Black Tuesday," has become an important date in the history of the modern world. In this horrific attack, terrorists attacked all U.S. strength and domination symbols. The World Trade Center symbolized U.S. economic might, the Pentagon's military capabilities, and the White House, where the target was missed, represented U.S. supremacy as the single superpower in the post-cold war framework of global power. Symbolizing the grandeur of American capitalism, the twin buildings in New York City were reduced to rubble. Michael Cox has called these attacks the most heinous terrorist strike in history and the first significant land attack on the U.S. since the British burned the White House in 1832. Following the September 11 attacks, India provided U.S. with significant support for its anti-terrorism efforts in Afghanistan. Thus, India and the U.S. have begun collaborating in the armed and administrative realms. Both have implemented many anti-terrorism programs and participated in various cooperative military drills.

Additionally, company-level cooperative counterinsurgency training for army units is one example of increased military connections. In 2008, both nations planned a minimum of five combined military drills. International Military Education and Training (IMET) aid supplied by the U.S. to India has tripled since 2000.

Obstacles to Enhanced Cooperation against Terrorism

However, the setting of a blossoming relationship does not imply a problem-free or trouble-free connection between the two nations. Complicated topics vary from perceptual variations to divergent danger assessments to how to best wage the Global War on Terror (GWOT).

Perceptual differences

The heightened security collaboration between the two nations has prompted U.S. experts to assume a more robust level of anti-terrorism coordination. While military collaboration between 2001 and 2003 eclipsed other aspects of Indo-American ties, the growth in defense cooperation did not always stem from a shared understanding of security. Similarly, while mutual military relations are expanding, the effectiveness of joint exercises will remain limited without a more considerable emphasis on preparation for future mutual actions that benefit the welfares of both nations.

© **Associationof Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)**

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories.

Page | 78

Different Perceptions of Danger

While America's principal danger assessments focus on the nexus of terrorism and WMD, Indian policymakers do not share the same sense of urgency. The emergence of China and its ramifications for the international authority structure are an unmentioned U.S. worry. Numerous commentators have suggested that increasing US-India security connections can counterbalance China's expanding influence in Asia, despite New Delhi's denials and insistence on retaining its strategic independence (Hate et al., 2007).

India and Global Anti-Terrorism

Many Indians in the deliberate and policymaking communal find it repugnant for ideological and substantive reasons to be intimately associated with "war on terrorism." India's averseness to paint all Islamist organizations with the same broad brush originates from its fear that doing so would radicalize its substantial Muslim population and offer a base of support for Al Qaeda and its affiliates. Paradoxically, collaboration is hampered by the U.S.' division between Islamists (Al Qaeda and its affiliates) and non-Islamists, those unswervingly threatening U.S. benefits and others. Thus, the communally agreed upon 'benefit measures' between these nations continue to be a loose fit (D'Souza, 2008).

U.S.-India Strategic Dialogue regarding the fight against terrorism

On June 9, 2012, Representative Joe Crowley stated in the House of Representatives: "Strengthening our connection with the democratic nation of India is, in my opinion, one of the most significant moves the U.S. has taken in recent years. With this partnership, one of our most critical decisions has been collaborating and coordinating on homeland security problems. In this sense, Crowley and Congressman Ed Royce have introduced an amendment to the 2013 Homeland Security Appropriations Act.

On June 13, 2012, Shri S.M. Krishna, India's Minister of External Affairs, and Hillary Rodham Clinton, U.S. Secretary of State, met in Washington, DC, for the Third Annual U.S.-India Planned Dialogue. The leaders replicated the extraordinary growth and extension of the mutual partnership since the initial strategic Dialogue in 2010. They pledged to widen and excavate the U.S.-India world-wide deliberate relationship and laid forth a future vision based on achieving shared prosperity, peace, and stability. The U.S. and India share an apparition for harmony, security, and affluence in Asia, the Indian Ocean area, and the Pacific region. They are dedicated to working with others in the region toward developing an open, balanced, and inclusive architecture.

© Associationof Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories.

Page | 79

Indian and U.S. responses

The broad terrorist actions in the Middle East, Africa, and South Asia push U.S. and India to see violence as a danger to all egalitarianisms on a global scale. The U.S. and India are anxious about Pakistan's ties with the Taliban and Kashmir-based extremist organizations. Michael Sheehan, US State Department Coordinator for Terrorism, has claimed that U.S. keeps a close eye on Pakistan and would endure to conduct a "serious and ongoing evaluation" of the nation (Rajeswari, 2000). Regarding Pakistan's participation in funding terrorism, as outlined in the State Department's annual report, Pakistan's Minister of Information, Javed Jabbar, condemned the findings as "inaccurate and deceptive." Sheehan stated that Pakistan was not listed on the list of terrorist organizations because Pakistan's reaction to the issue of terrorism was inconsistent. Sheehan stated, about the conclusions of the Blue Ribbon Commission on Terrorism of the U.S. Congress, that Pakistan's record of cooperation in the fight against terrorism remained uneven. He continued, "Despite considerable and tangible cooperation in some areas, including arrest and extraditions, Pakistan has allowed terrorists to live and move freely within its borders" (Rajeswari, 2000). Regarding this subject, the U.S. might take two distinct approaches.

In his analysis of the growth of militancy in Pakistan, Sheehan argues that the country's political and economic problems, as well as the resulting damage to its institutions, have created a ripe environment for terrorists (Rajagopalan, 2000). The educational system's collapse has compelled the impoverished to seek instruction at Pakistani religious institutions (madrasas), which serve as a training ground for militancy. At least a portion of these institutions instills anti-American and anti-Indian sentiments and religious fanaticism (Rajeswari, 2000). Since the conclusion of the Cold War, the U.S. has had a long past of goodwill with Pakistan; thus, it should be much simpler for the U.S. to draw Pakistan into a cooperative framework on counterterrorism.

In this regard, India and U.S. must cooperate on the terrorist issue. First, India and U.S. have an elongated history of democracy as the fundamental party-political norm, and violence has no place in this context. In addition, both nations share a secular outlook that condemns radicalism in any form. Therefore, they share similar political beliefs and a disdain for all forms of terrorism.

© Associationof Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories.

Page | 80

Consequently, any approach developed to combat terrorism must target the matter at its root, i.e., their intricate connections with other organizations throughout the globe to fulfill their demands for fund-raising, weapon acquisition, training camp upkeep, etc. According to Sheehan, there must be a plan for "draining the swamp" with the following fundamental principles:

• We exert pressure on state sponsors by detaching from the world.

• We criminalize terrorism via the designation of Foreign Terrorist Organizations (FTOs).

• Through public remarks that distinguish between actor and action, we depoliticize the message of terrorism.

• Working with our G-8 and E.U. allies, we establish an international consensus for zero tolerance.

• We upkeep the development of an global legal framework that will enable governments and the United Nations, the European Union, the Organization of American States, and other organizations to combat terrorism with vigor lawfully.

• We employ a bilateral approach to apprehend, impede, and deport terrorists.

• Lastly, through our worldwide training program, administered by the state, law enforcement,

and intelligence organizations, we enhance the capabilities of nations that require it to combat terrorism (Sheeham, 2000).

As a result of the "draining the swamp" tactic, the terrorists' mobility is constrained, and they may be readily discovered. This must be an integral part of the Indo-American anti-terrorist strategy.

© Associationof Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories.

Page | 81

The international community provides organizations with acceptable methods of speech, but violence and terrorism are not legal means of expression. Terrorists' political or religious beliefs are insufficient justification for their brutal actions. They should be considered straightforward crimes perpetrated by these organizations, and appropriate action should be taken against them. Terrorism in the twenty-first century employs a range of strategies, including information collection, heightened safety measures, and the use of power. Obtaining global support for multilateral treaties in the fight against terrorism is thus a crucial objective for India and the U.S. How to combat terrorism is the primary concern of most countries.

However, the administration and security services have adopted a more sophisticated response to terrorist strikes during the past several decades. As one of India's former prime ministers, I.K. Gujarat, stated, contemporary terrorists "have access to not just finances but also the most advanced technology" (Rajeswari, 2000). So, the government must upgrade its expertise to keep ahead of the terrorists. The problem is that when terrorists deploy suicide bombers (Hamas, Hizbollah, LTTE) and nerve gas, as they did in the Tokyo subway in the 1990s, the world community must do a great deal to combat terrorism. In combating terrorism, the U.S. and India must take the following into account:

• To closely evaluate significant occurrences and create detailed, action-oriented reports for the affected communities.

• To construct a sophisticated statement system as part of a more considerable modernization effort that provides access to the most advanced technologies.

• Improved administration of local relationships, their support networks, and sources of finance

• To create original methods of security and secrecy maintenance.

• Specialists are required in impacted regions.

• To cultivate the ability to foresee security needs. (Rajagopalan, 2001)

Interagency teams from the two nations agreed on various procedures to strengthen their collaboration in the fight against international terrorism. The Indian government accepted the

U.S. offer of Anti-terrorist Assistance programs. In their efforts to combat terrorism, India and the U.S. should place a premium on intelligence collection and the exchange of essential information. India and the U.S. are interested in enhancing a framework to combat international terrorism. This shared objective in combating terrorism should serve as the appropriate foundation for India and U.S. to strengthen their partnership.

Conclusion

U.S. should avoid public misinterpretations The Indians believed that the federal administration was incompetent. The Indians believed it was improper for the U.S. to approach the state administration directly on an intelligence topic. Intensification of formal diplomatic and non-governmental discussions on topic of enhancing anti-terrorism assistance. The level and frequency of meetings of the U.S.-India Counter-terrorism Joint Working Group (CTJWG) must be increased. At these sessions, there should be a free exchange of views on how to confront the intellectual basis of terrorism. The experience of India in confronting emerging terrorist threats, including domestic and foreign actors, should be the main focus of these debates. Private-sector firms and think tanks dealing with counterterrorism should also be included in CTJWG discussions to generate innovative ideas about the most recent counterterrorism technology and exploration.

Evaluate the cooperation of cyber safety, energy security, and nuclear-powered non-proliferation initiatives to bolster the security of both nations against emerging terrorist threats. With the approval of the U.S.-India civil nuclear pact, U.S. and Indian authorities must reconsider the potential for increasing collaborative nuclear terrorism risk reduction measures, including enhancing export restrictions and security at India's civilian nuclear plants. A pistol spell on the Indian Institute of Science in Bangalore on December 28, 2005, led to an inquiry that identified the Kaigan nuclear power facility in India as a potential target for terrorists seeking to strike critical infrastructure. Take a broad picture of the difficulties in the area and prioritize expansive diplomatic operations in the region. This could involve the appointment of a prominent regional envoy who can play a productive role in simultaneously easing Afghan-Pakistani and Indo-Pakistani tensions by encouraging the countries to move advancing with confidence-building measures, such as the opening of a road between Kashmir managed by India and Pakistan.

Strengthen U.S.-Indian collaboration in fostering democracy and religious tolerance to disrupt recruitment and support for terrorists inspired by Islamist ideology, notably in Afghanistan. As a functional multi-religious and multi-ethnic democracy, India is a tremendous model for Afghan leaders attempting to establish democratic institutions in their nation. Expand maritime security collaboration efforts. Maritime coordination is one area in which U.S.-Indian counterterrorism collaboration might be expanded. Given the increase in piracy occurrences over the past several months, there is rising worry that terrorists, maybe operating in conjunction with pirates, could hijack supertankers and detonate them near key ports or maritime chokepoints. India and the U.S. have already increased their maritime assistance in Southeast Asia.

Thus, to minimize provincial and worldwide radical risks to U.S. and Indian interests, the U.S. should increase intelligence sharing through existing U.S. intelligence-liaison protocols. There is potential for the U.S. and India to expand their collaboration against terrorist threats for mutual benefit. Since 90% of counterterrorism involves intelligence, U.S. and India should work to eliminate impediments to intelligence cooperation.

References

Byman, Daniel. "The logic of ethnic terrorism." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 21.2 (1998): 149-169.

D'Souza, Shanthie Mariet. "Indo-US counter-terrorism cooperation: Rhetoric versus substance." *Strategic Analysis* 32.6 (2008): 1067-1084.

Hate, Vibhuti N., and Teresita C. Schaffer. "US-India Defense Relations: Strategic Perspectives." *CSIS South Asia Monitor* 105 (2007): 4.

Kapur, Ashok. "The aftermath of 11 September: Changing geo-political equations and Indo-US relations." *India and the United States in a Changing World. New Delhi: Sage Publications* (2002).

Kelly, Micheal J., and Thomas H. Mitchell. "Transnational terrorism and the western elite press." *Political Communication* 1.3 (1981): 269-296.

Rajagopalan, Rajesh. "Pakistan's nuclear export initiative." (2000): 1177-1181.

Rajeswari, P. R. "Terrorism—an area of cooperation in indo-US relations." *Strategic Analysis* 24.6 (2000): 1091-1107.

Sheehan, Michael A. "Post-millennium terrorism review." *Vital Speeches of the Day* 66.10 (2000): 298.