CENJOWS

BREAKING DOWN INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM: INDIA'S FIRM STAND AND THE CHALLENGES

MS HARSHITA PANDEY

BREAKING DOWN INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM: INDIA'S FIRM STAND AND THE CHALLENGES

Ms Harshita Pandey is a Research Assistant at CENJOWS

Abstract

One of the most formidable challenges disrupting the international peace and threatening security is the issue of international terrorism. The increasing technological and information revolution has further changed the character of international terrorism, making it more challenging for countries to adapt and respond. This article aims to understand international terrorism, its character, the roles of actors, the causes and responses of countries to counter terrorism, and to engage with the issue of state-sponsored terrorism. The article adopts an explanatory approach to understand the causes and factors of international terrorism. The article concludes by asserting India's approach of no tolerance towards terrorism, reiterating it as the gravest offence against humanity, and calls for stronger political will to get rid of double standards for combating terrorism.

Introduction

The catastrophic events of 9/11 proved Samuel P. Huntington's prophecy true.[1] The realisation that terrorism is a threat to the peace and security of the nations soon dawned on the West. Prior to the events of September 11, 2001, only the second and third world countries had to deal with acts of terror. Terrorism is now a global threat and endangers humanity. International terrorism is a complex and multifaceted concept, encompassing multiple perspectives. In a globalised world, terrorism has also witnessed varied forms. This chapter attempts to formulate a conceptual understanding of international terrorism, its history, and the causes of terrorism. The chapter outlines the role of non-state actors in perpetrating terrorism and attempts to understand the phenomenon of state terrorism and state-sponsored terrorism. Ultimately, the chapter addresses the measures taken to counter terrorism. However, before conceptualising what we understand of international terrorism, it is imperative to briefly trace the history of terrorism.

History of Terrorism

Terrorism is by no means a new occurrence in our society. Its root can be traced back to the French Revolution and the Reign of Terror of 1793-94, which oversaw the killings of people considered to be the rivals of the revolutionary times. The genesis of the term 'terrorist' is located in the French Revolution. If one traces the history of terrorism, one finds that anarchist terrorism was a dominant theme in Western societies in the late eighteenth century. Anarchist terrorism is encapsulated as performing actions to gain a political agenda and acquire publicity. Andrew Heywood defines it as "propaganda by the deed that uses violence to increase political consciousness among masses to rebel and revolt, by ambushing oppressive and exploitative representations in society."[2] The assassination of leaders like William McKinley, president of the USA, Tsar Alexander II of the Russian Empire, and President Carnot of France is attributed to anarchist actors. Further, the 1894 attack in Paris at the Café Terminus was aimed at the bourgeois society. In the 1960s and 1970s, anarchist terrorism was evident in the emergence of groups like the Italian Red Brigades, the Army Brigade in the U.K., the Baader-Meinhof group in Western Germany, and the Red Army in Japan.

It was not until the end of the Second World War that terrorism underwent nationalist overtones. In the 1940s and 1950s, the countries from Asia, the Middle East, and Africa underwent the democratization wave, and nationalist terrorist groups fought for freedom against colonial power and oppressive regimes. Liberation struggles like the Palestine Liberation Organisation are a case in point. The Western countries were not devoid of the nationalist upsurge, as the origin of the Irish Republican Army in the U.K. and the Basque Separatist organisation in Spain are just a few examples of nationalist terrorism in the West. However, the events of 9/11 underscore a new form of terrorism that threatens the entire humankind, its peace, and security. Before understanding what changes led to such an act, we must understand the meaning of terrorism. The following section provides a more detailed discussion.

Defining Terrorism: A Challenge for the World

Terrorism is essentially a contested concept. It is challenging to develop a definition of terrorism that acquires consensus from all stakeholders. What constitutes terrorism is difficult to pinpoint. Terrorism is, however, different from other popular warfare involving violence, as terrorism is aimed at achieving and triggering political change. Similarly, James D. Kiras (2014) defines *terrorism* as "the use of violence by sub-state groups to inspire fear, by attacking civilians and symbolic targets, for purposes such as drawing widespread attention to a grievance, provoking a severe response, or wearing down their opponents' moral resolve to effect political change."[3]

At the core of terrorism lies violence aimed at achieving political ends by instilling fear in people's minds. Terrorism involves acts that create a sudden threat, raising uncertainties in people's minds and creating complex situations where the threat to peace and security is always at risk. Terror acts can target innocent people and persons at the helm of governmental affairs. The aim is to gain public attention towards their aim. However, defining terrorism is a challenging task. Terrorism can be understood based on the nature of the act itself, whether it aims to instil fear or create horrors in people's minds. We can also understand terrorism based on the victims or the targets of the terrorist activities. The third category of definition of terrorism is based on the perpetrators or actors who perform terrorist acts. Both state actors and non-state actors can perpetrate terrorism. Many non-state bodies perform terror activities against the state or international bodies, also understood as 'terrorism from

below.' States can also perpetuate fear and perform violence targeted at some people or ethnic groups. It is also known as 'terrorism from above' or state-sponsored terrorism.

Terrorism can also be distinguished from other violent acts involving political motives. Crenshaw[4] (1983) highlights the distinction of terrorism from warfare of the conventional nature as terrorism is the weapons in the hands of the weak who cannot survive in a conventional or traditional armed conflict.[5] Terrorism involves tactics found in guerilla warfare as both terrorism and guerilla warfare are asymmetrical. Asymmetrical warfare involves conflicts between groups or countries with significant differences in military strategies, power, and abilities. However, there is also a significant difference between terrorism and guerrilla warfare. Guerrillas control territory and use it for training or operate it as base camps. They also enjoy the support of the people they dominate.

On the other hand, terrorists lack such support. Guerrillas also outnumber terrorists as the latter is generally a group of only a few individuals. In contrast, guerilla warfare involves many people who agree with the dominance of their heads and support them in their warfare. Guerrillas operate as military bands and attack defended targets. At the same time, terrorists attack civilians and do not generally enjoy the support of many people. The intention behind the terrorist attack is to gain publicity and the attention of the masses towards their cause. Terrorists depend on violent acts that are highly noticeable to instil shock and fear while also underlining the helplessness and incapability of the government authorities to control such acts. Terrorists also do not engage in activism as they lack the support of the people. According to Yamamoto, a terrorist attack is performed by a non-state actor that aims to threaten people through a physical act of violence aimed at civilians, military personnel who are in a non-combatant position, and property. The attack attempts to seek a response from third parties: the government, people, groups, or organisations. Also, a terrorist attack has a political element to it as the attack is performed by keeping a political goal in mind, and the objective is to achieve that goal. Yamamoto (2015) defines *terrorism* as "the use and threat of violence by non-state actors against non-combatants and property to elicit responses from third parties to advance political goals."[6]

Jennifer S. Holmes[7] (2009) highlights that the research and progress in terrorism are slow as the four unresolved issues at the core of the topic act as a hurdle. The four issues involve contestation over the nature of the concept of terrorism.[8] These are the issues of division or classification of the acts of terror, the challenge of different perspectives associated with the terrorist activities, and lastly, the issue of quantification.

Terrorism can also be distinguished as domestic terrorism and international terrorism. Gregory D. Miller (2019) highlights that scholars like Joseph Young and Michael Findley advocate two types of terrorism: domestic and international terrorism.[9] The two separate categories are drawn based on different processes and factors culminating in a terrorist act. Domestic terrorism considers the factors and reasons that originate within the state. In contrast, international terrorism results from the variables and factors whose emergence lies both in the originating state (where the source of the terrorism lies) and the target state. Miller asserts that a popular methodology adopted to differentiate between domestic and international terrorism is dependent on three variables. The first variable is associated with the nationality of the perpetrator. The second variable is the victim's nationality, and lastly, the third variable calls for where the act took place or the location of the attack.

Domestic terrorism is a phenomenon that takes place when all three variables are similar. An example of domestic terrorism includes the case of the bombings in Oklahoma City in 1995. The criminal terrorists were citizens of the U.S. The act was against the people of the U.S. on U.S. soil. The 9/11 attacks are a case of international terrorism, as the victims were citizens of the USA and the location of the act was also the USA. However, the perpetrators were not citizens of the USA and originated from different countries. The difference of terrorism between the two simple categories of terrorism, domestic and international terrorism, can be problematised. Gregory Miller (2019) highlights that the dichotomy of terrorism is an exercise of oversimplification. Terrorism is a complex issue, and a motivational factor behind terrorist attacks is also an important variable that needs to be considered while comprehending terrorism. While taking all the above-stated three variables as standard, the role of motivation can problematize the distinction between domestic and international. As Miller argues, the nature of motivation can be global. The case of the attack in London in 2005 is a case in point to substantiate the role of motivation. All three variables were standard.

The perpetrators of the attacks were British citizens; the act was directed to harm the people of Britain, and the attack location was London. However, the motivation behind the attack was similar to the lines of the 9/11 attacks.

Any attempt to deal with terrorism primarily requires how we understand terrorism. Therefore, defining terrorism is the most fundamental task. However, it has been challenging to achieve consensus on the definition of terrorism. The challenge lies in the different approaches and perspectives to view an act of terror. What might be terrorism can be viewed as a freedom struggle or a political struggle for the rest. However, agreeing on common grounds on a definition of terrorism helps advance counter-terrorism operations and widespread consensus and support of other stakeholders. Additionally, understanding the motivation behind terrorist activities shall also help understand the concept of terrorism in a better way.

Causes of Terrorism

Martha Crenshaw suggests that the primary factor acting as a cause of terrorism is the presence of specific grievances among a group of people, like an ethnic minority that has suffered at the hands of the dominance of the majority. Crenshaw defines *terrorism* as the extreme form of social movement that aims to either achieve a separate state or demand equality.[10] In the modern era, separating tendencies of certain groups that turn towards terrorist acts, and in the era of decolonisation, the nationalist movements also relied on terrorism. A feeling of an unjust system and a deep sense of discrimination give rise to anger and the frustrating mindset of the terrorists. The state is held responsible for perpetuating such suffering and deprivation.

Merely the presence of grievances against the state and the majority of people does not lead to terrorism. The other cause that aggravates terrorist activity or acts as the reason behind terrorism is the people's lack of participation in influencing political activity. A feeling of dissatisfaction and discrimination dominates people's minds who are devoid of the opportunity to represent their political demands. Richardson (2006) highlights that the causes of terrorism are placed at the individual, national and international levels. The emergence of terrorism "requires a lethal cocktail of three ingredients: a disaffected individual, an enabling group, and a legitimising ideology."

The role of context is also essential to understanding the cause of terrorism targeted against the elites. Terrorism is a culmination of dissatisfaction among the elites or a minority, acting on behalf of the wider population, who may or may not approve of the means adopted by the terrorists. Crenshaw highlights that the most fertile ground for terrorism is when passiveness among the people and elite dissatisfaction occur in concurrence. Terrorism may also symbolise a stable society that resists change or progress and aims to preserve its societal structure.

There are also situational factors that act as precipitating triggers or causes of terrorist activities. The government's use of excessive force against the dissenters and protesters, among others, can give rise to acts of terrorism. Naroda Volya, a terrorist organisation, emerged in 1879 due to the tsarist regime's oppressive measures to quell populist struggles. Another example is the repressive measures adopted by the French government against the anarchists at the time of the French Revolution. The strong connotation of the triggers indicates that it is imperative to understand the perception and interpretation of the context by the terrorists.

The causes of terrorism are multiple and diverse. It is not merely one factor that leads to terrorist activities. Instead, it is the culmination of multiple factors that causes terrorism. The reasons behind a terrorist act can also be encapsulated into psychological, strategic, and ideological factors. Out of the causes mentioned above of terrorism, some act as direct factors while others act as indirect factors that lead to terrorism. Terrorism is the culmination or fallout of causes that act as preconditions or precipitants of terrorism. The causes that broadly belong to the category of the precondition are those factors that provide the field for terrorist activities in a span of an extended time. The other category is the causes that act as precipitants of terrorism, meaning those events or factors that immediately trigger terrorist acts. These broad categories of causes are mentioned below:

- **Structural** causes are those factors that affect people's lives, for example, the disparities in demography, deprivation of basic needs, the rise of a sense of individualism, the structure of class conditions, and deprivation from society or cooperative association with society, among others. In the long run, these factors may or may not contribute to the origin of terrorism. The failure to

redress grievances through politics leads actors to find solace in violent means to gain attention towards their demands and grievances.

- **Facilitating** causes are those causes that act as facilitators or boost the occurrence of terrorist acts. Examples of such causes are the growth of technology, ease of transport, weapons distribution and access to information from the modern news media houses, and weakness in law and order situations. The acceleration of globalisation in the modern-day also triggers the outbreak of terrorism, especially after the 9/11 attacks. The propounders of the ecology theory of terrorist activities indicate that the conditions that affect terrorism have aggravated due to modern developments. Technological development, internet access, and other modern-day phenomena make it easy for terrorists to affect terror activities. Ines Von Behr et al. highlight that the internet plays a crucial role in contributing to terrorism.[11] Ogun (2012) highlights that the terrorists use the internet for propaganda activities, recruitment, and dissemination of ideology, and thus the internet becomes a tool for psychological warfare. Therefore, proactive strategies preventing misuse of the internet while balancing civilians' concerns are the key.[12]

- **Motivational** causes of terrorism are the genuine grievances, deprivation, and traumatic events that people face in their lives that act as the motive behind terrorism. The role of propagating ideology and rhetoric is crucial here, as they act as motivations that affect terrorist and extremist activities.

- **Triggering** causes are those reasons that act as precipitants or activate terrorism. Sudden political events or policies that call for revenge or widespread dissatisfaction, political upheavals, disruption of law and order, and formulation of a peace deal over a contested political issue can trigger terrorist outrage.

- **Psychological** causes are also imperative to understand and comprehend the issue of terrorism in a better way. Terrorists may act or adopt barbarous measures purely for personal reasons, like acquiring political power or seeking revenge. The psychological perspective of terrorism highlights that terrorists perform acts of terror to gain publicity and the attention of the masses towards themselves and the cause they are serving.

- **Ideological** causes highlight that terrorism is a means to achieve ideological ends. *Ideology* is the principle of a belief system that shapes a group's aims, objectives, and way of life. Ideology also incorporates political philosophies and religion. Terrorism in the modern period, especially after the 9/11 attacks in the USA, contains a religious element and is based on religious extremism. This kind of terrorism is also called the new terrorism, where the goal is not merely achieving political change. Instead, it declares total war against other religions or disbelievers. Performing terrorist activity is seen as performing a sacred duty. The secular motivations or secular ideologies are replaced with religious goals and objectives in the New terrorism. Examples of groups based on ideology include the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), the Irish Republican Army, Baader Meinhof of Germany, and Al Qaeda.

Crenshaw highlights that terrorism is a tool in the hands of a group belonging to distinctive ideological groups to challenge the state's security.[13] It attempts to challenge the government's authority, delegitimise its basis, demoralise the state actors, gain popularity and support for their cause and inspire others to follow their lead. Terrorism is, therefore, a deliberate choice, and groups that practice terrorism find it reasonable as terrorism helps them achieve political goals that give effect to immediate outcomes.

Non-state Actors

A non-state actor means any private individual or group, or a secret agent who is not an official person acting for the government. M. Merrick Yamamoto highlights the role of a non-state actor in a terrorist attack.[14] By non-state, one refers to those individuals and groups who are non-governmental, as their act is based on themselves as they act as private individuals in their capacity and not on the part of the government as official actors. Non-state actors are distinct from the official state actors: the military personnel and government leaders. Groups conduct most terrorist attacks. A group may use terrorism as the only means to achieve its goal.

In contrast, other groups may prefer obtaining support and gaining legitimacy by offering health, welfare, or education and conducting terrorist attacks. Al Qaeda used terrorism as the primary tool available to achieve political goals and propaganda. Another group called Hamas or the Islamic Resistance Movement used to carry out

political activities, perform social services, and use guerrilla warfare tactics targeted against government or military personnel and acts of terror against ordinary people. An example of a terrorist act carried out by an individual is the 1996 bombings of the Olympics in Atlanta, Georgia, performed by Eric Rudolph. Audrey Kurth Cronin highlights that terrorist organisations, following their historical significance, can be divided into four distinct categories. These four groups are left-wing terrorists, right-wing terrorists belonging to the right-wing, separatists or ethnic-nationalists, and religious or sacred terrorism. After colonialism, ethnic-nationalist struggles became popular as they demanded a different state based on their ethnicity. The right-wing terror was widespread with the rise of fascist powers. At the time of communist movements and struggles, the left-wing extremists aimed to acquire political power. In the aftermath of the post 9/11 terror attacks, the sacred or terrorism with religious overtones has become the dominant trend.

Similarly, Phil Williams, in the study on *Violent Non-state actors and National and International Security*, highlights the categories of terrorism developed by David Rapoport.[15] Rapoport underlines the modern waves of terrorism into four waves: anarchist terrorism, anti-colonial terrorism, leftwing, and terrorism with a religious element. Louise Richardson highlights that the terrorist groups either try to achieve temporal or transformational goals. The temporal goals are political objectives that can be achieved without ousting the government. Examples of temporal goals include secessionist movements by the Chechens, Sikhs, and Basques. In contrast, the achievement of transformational goals attempts to annihilate the state. An example of transformational goals is the rise of communism, which aimed to completely overthrow capitalism in Eastern Europe and establish a caliphate in the Middle East.

State terrorism

States can also engage in terrorism through various means by employing different strategies. A state can support a group of proxy actors to carry out terrorist activities or directly sponsor a terrorist organisation, also understood as state-sponsored terrorism. A state can also carry out terror against its people in some instances. State terrorism refers to the terrorism carried out by the state directed toward another state or its people. Andrew Heywood (2011) defines *state terrorism* as terrorism carried out by bodies or actors of the government, like the military, police, or intelligence

agencies.[16] Joshua Wright (2019) defines *state terrorism* as the use or threat of violence, fear, or acts of intimidation by a state or its proxies targeted towards a larger audience.[17] It is one of the most dangerous kinds of terrorism as it can exist in various forms like intelligence, policies, military action, or even civil form. Jack P. Gibbs (1989) defines *state terrorism* as a situation when the government agent, state employee, or official engages in terrorist activities at the suggestion or supervision of a subordinate or superior government authority.[18] However, the state does not acknowledge or concur to accept its role in a terrorist attack. Those engaged in carrying out the act of state terrorism focus on concealing their identity and acting in a secretive manner. When a state performs terrorist activities or is linked to such an act, the most formidable challenge and threat are to the state's legitimacy. A state under no conditions wants to be associated with such an act, and therefore to meet its strategic goals, a state relies on the non-state actors and supports them covertly to perform terrorism. It is known as state-sponsored terrorism.

A state relies on non-state actors to perform acts of terrorism. Terrorists act as covert actors to achieve the agenda of the state. An example of state terrorism is the case of the 1988 Pan Am 103 bombing. In 1988, on December 21, a bomb was planted on Pan Am flight 103. It was at Lockerbie that the flight crashed. The passengers and the crew members on board lost their lives, and a few civilians also became victims. The incident is also known as the Lockerbie bombing. The act was performed by two Libyan nationals who were members of the Libyan Intelligence Services. In this case, the Libyan government acknowledged the responsibility for the attacks. Scholars have emphasized and stressed the idea of terrorism carried out by non-state actors, or what may be called 'terrorism from below.' However, 'terrorism from above' or state terrorism (or state-sponsored terrorism) has received little attention.

State-sponsored terrorism perpetuates terrorism on other states or states by providing financial help, required weapons, logistics, training, and safe locations and territory to the terrorist outfits to achieve political and strategic goals. David B. Carter (2012) attempts to understand whether the state's support of terrorism is a curse or a blessing for the terrorist groups.[19] Carter argues that it is not always the case that sponsorship of terrorism by the state acts as an advantage to the terrorist groups. The state perpetrating terrorism through providing safe havens, resources, weapons, and funds to the terrorist outfits can, for its own strategic advantage hand incentive,

provide the whereabouts of the terrorist outfits to the target state looking forward to operating counter-terrorist operations. The Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF) case is an example of state-sponsored terrorism. The JKLF received abundant resources and support from the neighbouring state of Pakistan to fight against the Indian state in Kashmir in the 1990s. However, in the late 1990s, the JKLF leadership made severe accusations against the Pakistani establishment that it had shared necessary intelligence regarding the group's whereabouts with the Indian state. The Indian military eliminated the terrorist outfit in the late 1990s.

State terrorism includes cases where the government itself perpetuates terror and violence against its citizens to accrue political advantages, like curbing resistance or sacking opposition. It is difficult to believe that the state can be an actor carrying out terrorism. As Michael Stohl (2006) highlights, the state is seen as a neutral actor in Western political thought and aims to resolve conflicts. Stohl highlights the understanding of the state in terms of Weber's definition of the state, where the state is recognised as an entity having a monopoly on legitimate violence.[20] A state with legitimacy can still use violence to achieve political goals against other states or citizens. Also, an illegitimate regime may turn to violent means to gain legitimacy in a coercive manner. An example of state terrorism is the terror towards people during the era of Stalin in the Soviet Union.

Countering Terrorism

Terrorism is a formidable challenge to humanity, peace, and security. In addition, unlike other forms of political violence, terrorism has an aspect of suddenness and covertness associated with it, making it challenging to operate counter-terrorism measures. Andrew Heywood suggests three main strategies to counter and combat terrorism: the first step is strengthening the state's security. The second strategy is to combat terrorism by military oppression, and the third crucial strategy is to counter terrorism through political deals.[21]

Strengthening the security of the state is one of the most formidable measures to counter terrorist activities in the age of a borderless world, a phenomenon of globalisation. States that have been at the receiving end of nationalist terrorism have often tightened their security to deal with the challenge. Countries like the USA, the UK, India, and Israel, among others, have focused on enforcing the policy of detention

and anti-terrorist legislation. The anti-terrorism laws are stringent and allow the detainment of people alleged of the state's involvement in terrorist activities. States like the USA have also adopted Extra-legal or quasi-legal measures like extraordinary rendition under the Bush regime to counter terrorists. This measure allows the state to interrogate suspected people in detention camps using extra-legal methods and even torture. An example of extraordinary rendition is the detention camps established at Guantanamo Bay, located in Cuba.

However, dealing with terrorism by embracing harsh security measures has a crucial disadvantage for countries with a liberal democratic order. The first significant challenge is that the adoption of stringent anti-terrorism laws leads to a trade-off between liberty and security. The anti-terrorist laws and extrajudicial measures to deal with terrorism give the executive arm of the state powers that can harm the fragile checks and balances system in a democracy. The very essence of individual liberty, human rights, and freedom, in general, is in jeopardy.

The second option at the disposal of the states is to resort to military oppression to combat terrorism. This approach involves two definite strategies. The first is to stop the state-sponsored safe havens of the terrorists and attack the supporters of the terrorist organisations. An example of this was the USA's attack on the regime of Saddam Hussein and diminishing the power of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. The second approach aims at directly targeting the terrorist organisations, their base camps, and outfits, as evident in the USA's war on terror aimed at eliminating the terrorist camps and their leaders in Afghanistan, Sudan, Kenya, and Tanzania. The USA also attacked Osama bin Laden in 2001. Russia also eliminated separatists and their terror in its military exercise in Chechnya. Sri Lanka successfully ousted the terror of separatists by bringing the armed conflict to an end in 2009.

The challenge with using military oppression as a tactic to tackle terrorism is that it has its repercussions. The use of force and the tit-for-tat strategy make the situation more challenging more often than not. In many cases, it triggers the motivation of the terrorists and strengthens their resolve to spread terrorism. Also, there are no winners when it comes to the war. Military oppression is the least successful counter-terrorist measure, as the drawbacks are incredibly challenging.

The third strategy is to adopt the route of political deals, diplomacy, and negotiation to deal with international terrorism.[22] Having open dialogue and discussion on contested issues can also help resolve the issue of terrorism. Terrorism, as we have understood in most cases, aims at political change, and therefore, engaging in political issues is the key to resolving conflict. An example of it was the achievement of the Belfast agreement signed in 1998 after thorough discussions with the Irish Republican Army of Northern Ireland and Britain. However, political negotiations and deals serve little interest in the case of the new terrorism as their objective is not merely political; instead, such terrorist outfits aim to establish a theocratic regime. Therefore, dealing with the Taliban in Afghanistan is a formidable challenge, and an apparent breakthrough is difficult to achieve. Also, negotiating a political deal with terrorist outfits is seen as a policy of appeasement. Many countries avoid participating in such dialogues until violence is perpetuated through other means by terrorist organisations. Kathryn L. Gardner (2007) has highlighted the role of the FATF (Financial Action Task Force) in dealing with terrorism. FATF focuses on countering terrorism by crippling the financial support to the terrorist organisations with an anti-money laundering policy that aims to distort the enabling environment that gives rise to terrorism and its operations.

India's approach to eliminating International Terrorism

India has been a victim of international terrorism, which has posed a challenge to its integrity, peace and security. It firmly calls international terrorism the gravest offence against humankind.[23] Terrorism encompasses bigotry, violence, intolerance, and fear in the minds of civilians and devastates peace, lives and endangers the social fabric.

India raises concerns over the elusive effort on the Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism and the lack of international stakeholders to agree on a definite characterisation of terrorism. India asserts and reiterates the OP3 of UNSC Resolution 1566 (2004), which provides an acceptable definition of terrorism.

India calls for dismantling the entire ecosystem that harbours terrorism, glorifies such acts, condemns those who operationalise terror hubs, and also highlights the need to impose sanctions and disrupt the financing networks that promote terrorist activities. The 2022 Delhi Declaration was launched on Countering the Use of New and Emerging Technologies for Terrorist Purposes. India's consistent efforts and role in

the global fight against terrorism include its contributions to the UN Office of Counter Terrorism, the UN, the Financial Action Task Force, and the Global Counterterrorism Forum.

Conclusion

International terrorism is a global challenge in the contemporary world. Terrorism, as we have understood, is difficult to conceptualise, and in reality, it is a complex challenge that threatens entire humankind, global peace, and the security of the nation-states. Terrorism also puts pressure on the liberal democratic order of the states. In the modern era of globalisation, terrorism is taking new forms. In any sense, the age of information revolution in a globalised world has created conditions that extend the reach and impact of terrorism. Therefore, the transnational character of international terrorism requires the coming together of states, crucial non-state actors, and international bodies to counter-terrorism.

DISCLAIMER

The paper is the author's individual scholastic articulation and does not necessarily reflect the views of CENJOWS, the Defence forces or the Government of India. The author certifies that the article is original in content, unpublished, and it has not been submitted for publication/ web upload elsewhere and that the facts and figures quoted are duly referenced, as needed and are believed to be correct.

ENDNOTES

[1] Samuel P. Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?," Foreign Affairs 72, no. 3 (Summer 1993):
22–49.

[2] Andrew Heywood, *Global Politics*, (U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

[3] James D. Kiras, "Terrorism and Globalization," in *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, 7th ed., ed. John Baylis, Steve Smith, and Patricia Owens (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 225.

[4] Martha Crenshaw, "The Causes of Terrorism," *Comparative Politics* 13, no. 4 (July 1981): 385–86

[5] Martha Crenshaw, "The Causes of Terrorism," *Comparative Politics* 13, no. 4 (July 1981): 385–86

[6] M. Merrick Yamamoto, "Terrorism Against Democracy: Responding to the Challenges of Non-State Actors" (Working Paper, Center for International and security Studies at Maryland), 2015. URL:https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/189454/Terrorism%20Against%20Democracy%20-%20012115.pdf

[7] Jennifer S. Holmes, "Terrorism" in *The SAGE Handbook of Comparative Politics*, (London: SAGE Publications,2009).

[8] Jennifer S. Holmes, "Terrorism" in *The SAGE Handbook of Comparative Politics*, (London: SAGE Publications,2009).

[9] Gregory D. Miller. "Blurred Lines: The New 'Domestic' Terrorism." Perspectives on Terrorism 13, no. 3 (2019): 63–75. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26681909.

[10] Martha Crenshaw, "The Causes of Terrorism," *Comparative Politics* 13, no. 4 (July 1981): 385–86

[11] U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Criminal Justice Reference Service, "The Radicalisation in the Digital Era: The Use of the Internet in 15 Cases of Terrorism and Extremism," NCJ 244529, 2013, https://www.ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/radicalisation-digital-era-use-internet-15-cases-terrorism-and-0.

[12] Mehmet Nesip Ogun, "Terrorist Use of Internet: Possible Suggestions to Prevent the Usage for Terrorist Purposes," Journal of Applied Security Research 7, no. 2 (2012): 203–17, https://doi.org/10.1080/19361610.2012.656252

[13] Martha Crenshaw, "The Causes of Terrorism," *Comparative Politics* 13, no. 4 (July 1981): 385–86

[14] M. Merrick Yamamoto, "Terrorism Against Democracy: Responding to the Challenges of Non-State Actors" (Working Paper, Center for International and security Studies at Maryland), 2015. URL:https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/189454/Terrorism%20Against%20Democracy%20-%20012115.pdf

[15] Phil Williams, "Violent Non-State Actors and National and International Security" (Zürich: International Relations and Security Network, ETH), 2008b. https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/93880/vnsas.pdf

[16] Andrew Heywood, *Global Politics*, (U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

[17] Joshua Wright, "State Terrorism: are academics deliberately ignoring it?", *Journal of Global Faultlines* 6 no. 2, (2019): 204-214. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.13169/jglobfaul.6.2.0204.

[18] Jack P. Gibbs. 1989. Terrorism and Counterterrorism: A Social and Legal Analysis. New York: Greenwood Press

[19] David B. Carter, "A Blessing or a Curse? State Support for Terrorist Groups," International Organization 66, no. 1 (2012): 129–30

[20] Michael Stohl, "The State as Terrorist: Insights and Implications," Journal of Conflict Resolution 50, no. 2 (2006): 210–11

[21] Andrew Heywood, *Global Politics*, (U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

[22] Gardner, Kathryn L. "Fighting Terrorism the FATF Way." *Global Governance* 13, no. 3 (2007): 325–45. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27800665.

[23] UNGA Sixth Committee, (2025), "Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism" India Statement.URL:https://www.un.org/en/ga/sixth/80/pdfs/statements/int_terrorism/02mtg_india.pdf