

The Global Counter Terrorism Strategies

Dr. Muhammad Iqbal Roy

Head,

Department of Political Science,

Govt. Murray College, Sialkot

Correspondence: rov.profpolscience1997@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Counter terrorism is an important strategy, technique and policy opted by different states to deal with all types of terrorist activities. It is a method for the solution of the existing complex issue of terrorism or an effective tool in dealing with all the possible threats of terrorist groups. There is not any single counter terrorist technique, i.e. applicable as the solution to the challenges created by the violent and dissident organizations through the entire world. One scheme of counter terrorism, which works in one place or time, could fail in another place or time. Therefore, terrorism is far too complex for one solution to be effective in dealing with all possible threats. There are certain obvious possible responses to combat the threat of terrorism like the provision of a tight and better security system, disrupting and freezing the finances, repression and retaliation, punishment for the supporters of the terrorists, diplomatic and cooperative measures to curb and control terrorism being applied by the states and non-state actors since 9/11 to the current global environment. The countries like Britain, Canada, Germany, Pakistan, United States and the European Union adopted coercive measures of countering terrorism with strict military operations and non-military tactics. The Global counter-terrorism strategies included certain approaches i.e. the war, crime, and disease approach of combating domestic and international terrorism. The study reveals the ratio of success and failure of counter-terrorism strategies applied by the states and non-states actors due to certain discrepancies of theory and practice in the present global politics. The authoritarian and democratic societies use the same mechanism of counter terrorism that work to defuse and defeat the domestic extremists and foreign activists of involved terrorist organizations.

Keywords: *Counter-Terrorism Strategies, War, Crime & Disease Approaches, Global War on Terrorism, Zero Tolerance Policy, Paradigm of Understanding.*

Theoretical Framework

Counter terrorism is a strategy of the single and the collated states against the global terror. It is a policy of recent international politics, which has been derived from the combination, co-operation, and co-ordination to cure different kinds of terrorist activities. Counter-terrorism includes both formal and informal efforts for the development of a worldwide network of sharing information and operations against the targeted, located, and identified hideouts of the dissidents. It is an organized exercise of the states to prevent different probable threats at local, national and international level by using the Terrorism Early Warning Intelligence. The states use their potential sources, i.e. police, security agencies; military forces and involve more support from the society through media awareness campaign to pull out the roots of terrorism. The continual phenomenon of terrorism has become more complex and critical and not quite easy to deal with few options. There are certain obvious and possible responses to combat the threats of terrorism adopted by the states in the contemporary regional and international environment. The provision of tight security system, better prevention and effective detention, disruption of financing, repression, retaliation, punishing the foreign supporters of terrorists, formation of pre-emptive strike action, establishment of Special Counter

Terrorism Units, institutional reforms, worldwide diplomatic co-operation and the sharing of information by different intelligence agencies are the major tactics of the counter-terrorism strategies of the states in contemporary international relations. An organized and formulated exercise of a single or collective states to combat different acts of terrorism through formal or informal efforts by using military police and other law enforcement agencies known as counter terrorism (Ahmed, 2006, pp. 17-18).

Sederberge (2003) has presented three approaches of countering terrorism adopted by different states at different times to deal the terrorist groups:

Counterterrorism Approaches: Mechanisms for State Capability

The War Approach

According to the war approach the conflict can be viewed as one of war. The United States used the conflict as a war approach after the incident of 9/11 with the declaration of global war on terrorism. The US GWOT however, has not been fully effective and successful. The US attack against the Taliban regime in Afghanistan by October 2001 was clearly in keeping with the war approach. The Muslim community in different countries like Malaysia, Iran, Afghanistan, and Pakistan has perceived this American effort as a battle against Muslims and an American policy to create control and hegemony over the Muslim world. Framing a crisis involving terrorism as one of war also means that the maintenance of civil liberties could be perceived as providing opportunity for the enemy (Baker, 2003, p. 563). Consequently, the war strategy of counter terrorism can create greater stress on civil liberties and traumatic disorder in the society. The war tactic may also inspire potential terrorists to join violent groups because it can enhance the status of terrorists in the eyes of potential recruits (Sageman, 2011, p. 135). Another problem standing with the 'war counter terrorism technique' is that victory is likely to be implicitly defined as the absence of any attacks by global jihadists. Even small attacks of the terrorists become their victories (Cronin, 2010, pp. 855-56). States rely on intelligence information, tactics of retaliations, and assassination of the enemy and preemptive strike methods, as tools of countering terrorism.

Terrorism as Crime Approach

This approach treats terrorism as a crime and concentrates on the role of police and judicial system to deal with the violent terrorist activities. The British authorities applied the crime approach after the London transit bombings in July 2005. According to this very approach terrorism must be treated as a severe crime. This strategy suggests that through judicial proceedings the designs of terrorists can be limited and the frequency of their actions reduced. The destructiveness, aims, planning and mindset of the terrorists can be influenced through the use of law enforcement and judicial system. A decision to use law enforcement versus military action needs to be dealt with through a case by case basis. Like the war approach of counter terrorism, it has been suggested that in some cases terrorism as crime approach and law enforcement techniques cannot become the real source for the solution of terrorism problems. The United States and many other countries dealt with terrorism as a crime through the use of intelligence services, diplomacy, retaliation and repression especially pre 9/11 environment (Sederberge, 2003).

Terrorism as a Disease Approach

This approach deals with terrorism as a disease and emphasizes on the treatment of the root causes of terrorism. The disease version of counter terrorism also deals with the symptoms, motives, mindset, and articulated objectives behind the incidents and activities of dissidents. The countries suffering from domestic violence and terrorist activities are more likely to continue to rely on police techniques and reforms. The disease approach pays most attention to reforms and concessions to change the mindset of terrorists because the military response or war technique is not likely to be a successful counter terrorism strategy (De Castro, 2004, p. 198). It is necessary to defeat not only the extremists, terrorists and militants through the application of war and crime strategies, but also their supporters are needed to be provided with the benefits of peace, prosperity, modernization, globalization, and disadvantages of violent actions through a disease therapy of fighting terrorism (Kessler, 2007, pp. 20-27)

Table 1

Approaches of Countering Terrorism after 9/11

The War Approach	The Crime Approach	The Disease Approach
This approach involved framing a crisis involving terrorism as one of war, which meant the curtailment of civil liberties and an opportunity for the enemy (Baker, 2003, p. 563)	This approach treated terrorism as a crime and concentrating on the role of police and judicial system to deal with the violent terrorist.	This approach deals with terrorism as a disease and emphasizes on the treatment of the root causes of terrorism

Source: (Sederberge, 2003)

The European Union Counter Terrorism Policy

Joint Cooperative Arrangements

The member states of the European Union have experienced a large variety of terrorist acts. There has been left wing, right wing, separatist, religious, social, local, and international incidents of terrorism in Europe. The evil of terrorism has been solidly entrenched in the history of Europe, but Madrid bombing in March 2004 and London transit bombing in July 2005 gave a real wake up call to the European Union. Counter terrorism has long been confined within national borders; there was a temporary and adhoc cooperation in cross borders dossiers. Terrorism, Radicalism, Extremism etc. Violence International (TREVI) was established in 1976 as the first organized platform for EU counter terrorism cooperation. A working group was composed of police and interior officials of ten European community member states, which dealt with the issue of terrorism, asylum, and immigration. The TREVI working groups were reorganized in 1992 and assigned to deal with justice and home affairs. Another new organization was founded, the law enforcement agency, Europol, which answered the calls of a number of European police chiefs for the creation of the Europol, equivalent of the

United States Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The prime function of Europol was to facilitate the exchange and coordination of criminal intelligence, especially in the context of international crimes. The European Union adopted a broad program for cooperation in the realm of police and justice matters including terrorism in 1999. The 9/11 incidents in the United States proved to be a watershed for counter terrorism in Europe. The terrorist attacks of 2004 in Spain and London bombing of 2005 caused a great number of casualties. (Clutterbuck, 2006, pp.33-47)

Consequently, different European statesmen and leadership argued strongly in favor of greater cooperation in fighting against terrorism. The existence of al-Qaeda and similar styled European terrorist groups, i.e. IRA Ireland, ETA Spain, Red Brigades Italy, Baader Meinhoff Gang, and Germany were pointed out and decided to be hunted through mutual cooperation. The European Union decided to take on a greater role in helping the member states to monitor and prevent cross border terrorism. A flurry of decisions, initiatives, and mechanisms aimed at enhancing the capabilities of EU states in fighting terrorism. The dynamics behind EU counter terrorism can be compared to successive shock waves propelled by major attacks of the terrorist on the soil of Spain, England, and Germany. The sense of urgency also faded away with the passage of time and gradually winded down the intensity of the matter. But the 9/11 attacks brought the European Union into uncharted territory boosting cooperation and furthering political integration. The European Union did a reasonable legislative work regarding counter terrorism. The arrest warrant of terrorist offenses was decided, intra-European counter terrorism cooperation and a common concept of terrorist offenses was adopted by the EU member states. The intra-EU judicial and police cooperation by its inclusion into member states' legal systems was introduced. The European Union wide coordinating body among magistrates to enhance the effectiveness of the competent judicial authorities of the member states while dealing with the investigation and prosecution of the serious cross border and organized crime was established as Eurojust (Coolsaet, 2010, pp. 857-60). The European Union security officials extended cooperation to provide training for Iraqi security forces for the maintenance of peace in the Balkans, Afghanistan, and parts of Africa. European Union member states also were concerned about failing states like Sudan and Congo to control problems of terrorism and organized crime. However, the radical Islamist terrorist groups remain a serious threat to the European Union. The Italian authorities arrested Mohammed Daki, a Moroccan in Milan, who was trying to induct terrorists to fight American forces in Iraq. Daki was suspected to have links with Hamburg cell that carried out the September 11th attacks in the United States.

The twenty five EU member states decided to seal their national borders in the aftermath of major terrorist attacks in Europe. There are certain things EU can do, and is doing, to help member states counter terrorism strategy. But a few questions arise regarding the ability and credibility of EU to tackle terrorism. The EU cannot arrest or prosecute terrorists like America, as an individual state. The EU is not a national government and cannot use spies or satellites to track the terrorists. National intelligence agencies and local police carry out most counter terrorism work such as infiltrating cells and arresting suspects. Further, in cross border investigations, different governments conduct their actions through bilateral cooperation. The European Union also requires action from every member state

The Global Counter Terrorism Strategies

not only by the law enforcement authorities, but from all government departments like finance, education, health and statistics departments, etc. consequently gun terrorism, targeted firing incident, vehicle crushing terrorism and train terrorism fashionably continued in different European countries like Russia, France, Germany, Spain, Holland and England which lost hundreds of innocent lives. The Christ Church's Mosques Massacre with 50 lives in March 2019 is a terrible example of terrorism in Europe. On the other hand, national governments in Europe find it difficult to coordinate their own agencies and ministries involved in international counter terrorism strategies. There is an enigma in the EU policy of counter terrorism. Still, member states agree in principle that cooperation at the EU level is advantageous because of the threat of cross border terrorism, but on the other hand, they are slow to give powers to the EU regarding investigation, prosecution, resources, and spies and funding. These powers would need to be truly effective. Despite having problems of combating terrorism; the EU is working hard to coordinate national and international policies of counter terrorism.

The British Counter Terrorism Strategy the Traditional Dynamics of Retaliation

The United Kingdom counter terrorism practice and legislation has evolved in response to the perceived threat of terrorism since 1974. The British decision making authorities did a great work in the context of prevailing terrorist threats and acts and how the government needed to combat and deal with different types of terrorist activities. The British parliament enacted Emergency Powers Act 1920 in response of the principle perceived threat of the Irish Republicans. The Prevention of Violence Act 1939 was brought in response to an Irish Republican Army (IRA) campaign of violence under the S-Plan. The Prevention of Terrorism Act was drafted to supplement the Emergency Powers Act in the wake of the Birmingham bombing in 1974. The temporary provisions of the Prevention of Terrorism Act were renewed annually during 1974 to 1990. The British parliament passed the Terrorism Act on July 10, 2000. This act addressed the omission of non-Irish domestic terrorism from the earlier legislation and made most of its provisions permanent. The Terrorism Act of 2000 represents permanent nationwide legislation; the definition of terrorism was applied to domestic and international terrorism. The police will retain the powers that they have under the current legislation to stop and search terrorism and take action to combat terrorism. The police authorities will have powers to tackle terrorist financing. A judge will consider police application for extensions of detention under the terrorist power of arrest (Donohue, 2008, pp. 17-19).

The Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act (ATCSA) was formally introduced in British parliament on November 19, 2001 receiving royal assent and went into force on December 13, 2001. According to new perceptions and measures the nature of terrorism had shifted from domestic or separatist violence to multifaceted versions. The unbound threat of terrorism is motivated by cultural and religious epitomes. The law lords in British parliament ruled that part 4 of ATCSA was incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights, but under the terms of the Human Rights Act of 1998 it remained in force. The Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005 was conscripted to answer the law lords ruling, the Terrorism Act 2006 creates new offences related to terrorism amending the existing PTA. The Terrorism Act of 2006 was enacted in the aftermath of the tragedy of 7/7 in

2005. The home secretary stands responsible for all security and counter terrorism operations in the United Kingdom. The Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) negotiates international treaties and deals with terrorism. The British home secretary also takes responsibility to provide passage of legislation and implementation of counter terrorist laws. The terrorism protection unit (TPU) and crime directorate work under the supervision and responsibility of home department which deals with Irish terrorism, contingency planning, domestic and international terrorism. The cabinet office briefing room (COBR) is established and that acts as a center of the crisis management center. The COBR consists of concerned ministers, senior officials and linked government liaison officer (GLO), a senior home office, a civil servant who reaches at the scene of the incident with a team including security service officer and a press officer (Taylor, 2003, pp. 190-91).

The British authorities decided to join the war with NATO forces on October 7th, 2001 in the wake of September 11 terrorist attacks. The London administration took serious measures against any kind of terrorist planning, project, or activities on its own soil. The London metropolitan police evacuated important places like 10 Downing Street, airports and civil aviation authority banned all air traffic over Central London. The British government initiated a coherent and comprehensive review of its preparedness and contingency plans against the terrorists. The British intelligence community developed a joint terrorism analysis center and directed further resources for nonproliferation and international terrorism. Furthermore, the British government launched certain initiatives to curb and control terrorism through other international forums, i.e. United Nations, European Union, and NATO (Donohue, 2008, pp. 17). The British authorities adopted measures for countering terrorism, being an important and active participant of global coalition i.e. policy actions grounded in law, training and exercise of military forces, intelligence and surveillance of the doubtful individuals, organizations and aliens, consequence and crisis management, public and parliamentary debates, legislative reviews and public awareness through the enhancement of quality of antiterrorist forces, institutions and mechanism.

The German Counter Terrorism Policy

The German parliament held a special session in the wake of 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks on WTC twin towers and the Pentagon. The Bundestag Chancellor Gerhard Schröder called the attacks on New York City and Washington, D.C. as the “declaration of war against the civilized community of states, a declaration of war against the free world.” The Chancellor responded quickly to assure the US President George W. Bush of Germany’s unrestricted solidarity with the United States against the terrorists. The German government demanded more efficient measures in order to obstruct breeding grounds for worldwide terrorism (Mauer, 2008, p. 59). The Berlin administration introduced wide ranging counter terrorism legislations at home, within weeks after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. The German government also joined in the international collaboration and extended support to all international institutions fighting against terrorism. Germany proposed different initiatives at the UN forum. The EU and NATO shared a contingent of Special Operation Forces (SOF) to uproot the Taliban regime in Afghanistan as an active contributor of global alliance in WOT. The German intelligence services have been aware since the 1990s of al-Qaeda’s

The Global Counter Terrorism Strategies

terrorist activities and clandestine character. The German authorities even viewed al-Qaeda's largely horizontal, multinational, and heterogeneous network and transnational dispersal of personnel with various cells working in different parts of the world (Steven, 2004, pp. 9-13). The German intelligence was mainly concerned with the rise of right wing extremism and its challenge to domestic security till the end of 1990s but after the September 11 terrorist attacks, Germany expanded its concern to international terrorism particularly Islamist foreign groups, with varying intensity becoming a threat for Germany's domestic security.

The 11 September 2001 attacks showed investigators that an Islamic network with fairly solid structures existed within the Federal Republic of Germany. The German intelligence services and government launched anti-terrorist campaign using different devices, tactics, preventing future attacks. Many suspects were arrested and several numbers of Muslim terror suspects were filed in the court for investigations and judicial purposes. The German government deployed special investigators to trace the Muslim terror suspects and many of the cases have already been concluded by the German courts. The Berlin administration contributed a lion's share of counter terrorism against transnational threats through new legislation. The German parliament proposed the enforcement of law against domestic and international terrorism declaring it as a criminal act. The air force security was tightened. The most important measures were the evolution of the privileged status of religious groups and associations, changes in the penal code and the government's decision to provide additional DM3 billion available for counter terrorism measures in the federal budget of Germany for 2002. The German government introduced security package II: preventive protection against depersonalized and trans regional threat. The security package II includes the competency of security organizations and intelligence services. The role of federal criminal police office has been strengthened with regards to fighting terrorism in Germany.

The Central Index of foreigners has been remodeled to become the basis for granting or declining visas to the foreigners. The police access to data collection has been improved and the religious affiliation of the foreigners, immigrants and all applicants are being strictly noted. The German parliament passed the Aviation Security Act in June 2004 and it was enforced in the country to avoid the violation of aviation laws. Germany's contribution to international counter terrorism became a fundamental shift due to Germany's role as an important partner in the war against terror. The German security policies have always been embedded in a multinational framework accorded to the UN, EU and NATO's efforts and operations against the terrorist organizations. The German government perceived the EU as a single entity that required a counter terrorism policy of its own in a globalized world. The EU plan of action on combating terrorism with almost 200 counter terrorism measures was essentially the result of summit meetings and as such it came to symbolize a month of transformation initiated by German Chancellor Schroder (Boer, 2003, p. 189). The German counter terrorism policy reflects the European Union approach and the Berlin administration put efforts to accelerate the legislative process in order to adopt measures and activities that exist already on the EU agenda. The German focus is therefore on legislation and coordination of the heterogeneous policies of the member states. Germany emphasized on the improvement of counter terrorism capabilities at the European

Union level, especially within the realm of Europol and Euro just. It also extended the military cooperation with NATO forces and bilateral understanding with the United States to curb and combat all forms of international terrorism.

The Canadian Counter Terrorism Approach

The government of Canada adopted a multifaceted response to the security landscape in the wake of 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States. The events of 9/11 generated unprecedented attention for security measures in Canada. The Canadian government showed a deep sympathy for its southern neighbor in all perspectives to adjust and compensate the passengers of 200 flights that had been diverted to Canada immediately after the terrorist attacks. The Canadian government took various steps to prevent terrorism through crafting legislation, budgetary reforms, policy related, and other counter terrorism responses. The Canadian situation was evident as the government sought to respond to several potentially conflicting objectives like assuring the Canadian nation that the government was acting to keep Canada one of the safest countries in the world, extension of Canada's dynamic and concrete international support, collaboration, and assurance of Canadian cooperation in combating terrorism. The Canadian government reshaped its foreign policy in the context of Canada's assessment of direct threats to its security, together with a variety of social, demographic, and geographic factors.

The Canadian security and intelligence services (CSIS) director Ward Elcock expressed "our proximity and close ties to the United States, the openness of our society for the movement of both people and money, and our multi-ethnic population makes our country one in which terrorist may seek to find a heaven" (Purdy, 2008, p. 115). Whereas Jim Judd, another CSIS director told a parliamentary committee in 2005 that "historically most terrorist organizations elsewhere in the world have operated or sought to operate in Canada on fundraising, propaganda, recruitment and other activities-and this certainly continues to be true today" (Jud, 2005). The Canadian government clearly formulated its counter terrorism strategy adjusting within the new era of globalization, global conflict, and terror.

The Canadian parliament reviewed Canada's Anti-terrorism Act immediately after 9/11 attacks and got royal assent in December 2001 included the definition of terrorist entities, facilitating activities to the terrorists, funding for terrorism as a crime and law enforcement for national security along with investigative tools to identify the terrorists and their network. The government also advanced its annual budget in 2001 in the context of new funds into Canada's security funds and agencies like air security CA\$2.2 billion, intelligence and frontline investigations, marine security and national security agencies CA\$1.6 billion, emergency preparedness and military counter terrorism capacity CA\$1.6 billion, screening of entrants to Canada CA\$1 billion and border security CA\$1.2 billion (Gotliab, 2003). The Canadian parliament enacted a new Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA) in June 2002. The statute was treated as part of Canada's anti-terrorism plan dealing with the persons who posed security threats and who were denied of access to refugee, asylum, and immigration. The Canadian administration coordinated its immediate post 9/11 policy to be called the anti-terrorism plan including, prevention of terrorists from getting entry into Canada,

The Global Counter Terrorism Strategies

protection of Canadian citizens from terrorist attacks, legislation on the issues of identification, prosecution, conviction and punishment of the terrorists, security of US-Canadian border with the option of legal trade and to coordinate with the international community to capture and bring terrorists to justice (Whitaker, 2003, p. 45). The Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada (PSEPC) was a most significant structural change by the Canadian government in 2003. This portfolio includes six agencies and three review bodies with a total of 52,000 employees recruited for the scrutiny and hunting of the terrorists costing of CA\$5 billion.

The PSEPC included creation of cabinet committee on security, emergencies and public health, appointment of a minister of state for civil preparedness, increase in military reserves, proposal of a national security standing committee and nomination of a new security advisor to the prime minister of Canada. The Canadian government issued a comprehensive statement of the national security policy under the title of “securing an open society” in April 2004. The Canada’s new security environment included the formation of an integrated threat assessment center, making of the national security advisor council; arrangements of a cross-cultural round table on security, the government operation center an around-the-clock, initiation of security measures and creation of a public health agency.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada, and the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency have been reformed to protect the soil of Canada from the influence of terrorist organizations. The Canadian federal government also increased its assistance and cooperation to the states seeking help to fight terrorism; it also extended its legal support for the resolution of regional and international disputes that could be exploited by the terrorist organizations. Canada cultivated diplomatic relations with the moderated political sections in the societies which have been threatened by the religious extremists. The state of Canada also cooperated with more than 50 multilateral organizations actively working for the cause of the counter terrorism agenda. The federal government of Canada has signed and ratified all international conventions on global forums to address the specific terrorist acts. The Ottawa administration expects strong relationship and coordination with the United States to continue joint counter terrorism nexus. The Canadian authorities are well in a position to adopt agency-to-agency cooperation along with the implementation of anti-terrorism measures set out in the action plans associated with safe and smart border agenda, the security and prosperity partnership and a growing number of joint US-Canadian operations against the scourge of terrorism.

The United States Counter Terrorism Strategy in a Standalone Perspective

The terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 on the world trade center and the pentagon created a wide space of opportunity for the formulation of a unified counter terrorism strategy and measures. The United States and many other countries started a serious work against the tactics of violence and terror by various non-state actors and extremist organization that created a transatlantic threat perception and dangers in a peaceful world. The US President George Bush used the term war to describe the American counter terrorism campaign through wide and large military efforts to pursue the network of al-Qaeda and other

terrorist organizations after the incident of 9/11. The Bush administration incorporated the term GWOT in the context of hortatory and inspiration to arouse the American public and to highlight the US government's commitment to defeat a formidable and cruel enemy.

A negative use of the GWOT term deflected the charges that the United States and its allies are waging war against Islam—a favorite trope of Osama bin Laden and his fellow jihadists (Keppel, 2002, p. 220). Some of the American critics have charged that the GWOT is not a war on terrorism or Islam nor is it a “global war on things that annoy us.” Rather, it is a campaign against al-Qaeda that is something of a contested concept having been described as a “franchise”, a “multinational network”, a “global insurgency”, a “clearing house” and a “secret international brotherhood” (Raufer, 2003, p. 393).

The director of the CIA George Tenet famously “declared war” on al-Qaeda and told to the senate select committee on intelligence in February 2001 that Osama bin Laden and his global network of assistants and associates remained the most serious and immediate threat to the United States. The FBI declared counter terrorism as a “Tier One” priority and added Osama bin Laden to its “Ten Most Wanted List.” The American agencies across the government were spending an estimated US\$7 billion annually to contest terrorism at home and abroad by the end of 2000 (King, & David, 2000). Counter terrorism policy remained a top priority during the Clinton administration as the president frequently spoke against the case of biological, chemical and nuclear terrorism. The practice of apprehending terrorists and bringing them to court for trial also became a major policy perspective of the Washington administration to combat Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaeda network, as a center for producing international terrorism and guerrilla warfare. The United States assumed and declared Afghanistan under the Taliban regime as world's first terrorist-sponsored state. The US counter terrorism officials were convinced that a major attack probably abroad was imminent by the summer of 2001. The US administration adopted a new strategic plan against fighting Bin Laden's terrorist circle, al-Qaeda (Keppel, 2002, p. 220).

Salient Features of the US Counter Terrorism Policy

Rule of Law and Preservation of Zero Tolerance Policy in State Domain

The US state department has described terrorism as premeditated and politically motivated violence against the non-combatant targets. Terrorism is a crime that should be prosecuted. The rule of law should be applied and strengthened as a principle tool while fighting against any kind of terrorism. The United States has advanced its anti-terrorism policy and approach through the application of domestic laws, maximum support to international conventions and treaties that curtail different forms of terrorism. Therefore, the administration of the rule of law to curb terrorist activities stands a prime policy of the US anti-terrorism campaign. In searching for the best way to combat terrorism, the United States even relied on law and law enforcement. The fundamental principle of American policy towards counter terrorism is that no political cause or grievance can justify the killing of innocent civilians and that any such act must be considered a crime. The United States forced the other governments to deal with such acts with iron hands and suggested to bring them to court for legal penalty and punishment through the application of law and law enforcement (Jehl, 2004). A fundamental belief of this

The Global Counter Terrorism Strategies

policy is that the United States will not yield to terrorist threats and attempts to intimidate or extort concessions to the terrorists (Graham, 2003).

Detection and Deterrence of Terrorist Elements

The United States counter terrorism policy includes intelligence sharing and features of cooperation among intelligence agencies and law enforcement entities throughout the world. Detection of terrorist organizations, creation of the situation of deterrence and prevention of planning and projects of terrorists to stop their apprehensions stands on the top priority of US counter terrorism program. Different civil and military agencies have been deployed for law enforcement and to deter the dissidents (IISS, 2004, pp. 38-48).

Diplomatic Engagements

The United States has encouraged international cooperation and coordination to control and combat all forms of terrorism. The US government provided facilities and assistance of training, practice, and operation in apprehending and bringing the terrorist suspects to justice and preventing them to find safe haven in different parts of the world. International cooperation has required intensive diplomacy, bilateral and multilateral close, and coordinated relationships among law enforcement, intelligence agencies, and foreign ministries of the states. The United States extended support to all peace loving countries pursuing the terrorist organizations through the application of military and diplomatic tactics, because the globalization of terrorism has reached the last generation and a worldwide consensus has been developed to combat terrorism with a maximum force and full strength of action (Wilcox, 2003, pp. 25-29).

The Coercive Methodology

Imposition of economic sanctions against the states and groups that sponsor terrorism is another important feature of the US counter terrorism policy. Laws and executive orders imposed a wide variety of sanctions against the states sponsoring terrorism. The United States identifies, condemns, and applies different prohibitions like the economic trade embargo and military assistance, restrictions on organizations, networks, and countries that promote criminal and pro terrorism environment as an instrument of counter terrorism strategy. The United States congress has occasionally passed several acts to condemn, curtail, and freeze program and funding of such aforesaid platforms involved in the projection of certain terrorist incidents and attacks in different corners of the world. The US Congress imposed different military and economic sanctions against the states like Afghanistan, North Korea, Libya, Iran, Iraq, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Pakistan being the sponsoring centers of different kinds of terrorist activities. Denying terrorists access to monetary sanctuary and reservoirs of weapons, including material that can be used to proliferate terrorism is an important component of the US anti-terrorism approach (Ochmanek, 2003, p. 33).

The Physical Protective Measures

The United States has adopted multiple physical protective measures to secure buildings, aircraft, airports, railway stations, government offices and other vulnerable country wide installations. The use of detective devices, searching mirror, metal detecting device, walk through gates, close circuit TV cameras and

other important secret electronic devices have been installed by the American civil, military and intelligence authorities to discourage and avert terrorist attacks.

The legitimization of terrorism as a tool of statecraft and an instrument of non-state actors is included in the contours of the US counter terrorism policy. A close coordination and effective network among the civil and military agencies share responsibility through domestic cooperation in the context of working relationship against terrorism.

The director of central intelligence within the US government is responsible for assessing the threat of international terrorism whereas the FBI director is responsible to assess the threat of domestic terrorism (Rosenau, William, 2008, p. 139).

Compliance of International Law

The United States has expanded its anti-terrorism campaign from domestic to international arena. America and its allies have also enlarged the reach of international law against terrorism in a wide scale series of treaties and conventions. These international treaties have made obligation of the signatories to enact domestic laws for defining and marginalizing of terrorist acts. The Tokyo Convention of 1963 dealt offenses and certain other acts committed on board aircraft, the Hague Convention of 1970 for the unlawful seizure of aircraft, Montreal Convention 1971 for the suspension of unlawful acts against the safety of civil aviation, the Convention on the Prevention of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons 1973, Convention against the Taking of Hostage 1979, Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts 1988 against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, the 1991 Convention for the Marking of Plastic Explosives for the Purposes of Detection, the Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombing 1998 and Convention for the Suppression of Financing of Terrorism 1999 are the major landmarks of anti-terrorism efforts through the enforcement and compliance of international law. The United States has expanded its bilateral extradition treaties with other states in order to strengthen anti-terrorism cooperation through international law and mutual legal assistance treaties with other states (Rosenau, 2008, pp. 1141-42).

Pakistan's Counter Terrorism Strategy in an Individual Paradigm of Understanding

Pakistan has been facing a persistent wave of anti-state terrorism acts since the incident of 9/11 in the United States. Pakistan has lost more than 40,000 lives of its civilian and military persons along with economic loss amounted to almost \$70 billion. Pakistan faces the menace of terrorism perpetrated by non-state home grown actors and sectarian violence of militant, jihadi and extremist organizations. The Islamabad administration has actively been involved in fighting against the scourge of terrorism since the launching of Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) in October 2001 as a frontline state of GWOT. Pakistan has to pay a heavy cost of being an active and frontline state in the war against terror. The endurance of war has contributed in the socio-economic instability and political unrest in Pakistan, especially in the tribal areas and few districts in Provincially Administered Tribal Areas (PATA). The law enforcing agencies have been facing a serious difficulty in the administration of the rule of law in the tribal belt of northern Pakistan i.e.

The Global Counter Terrorism Strategies

Waziristan agencies bordering to Afghanistan due to the presence of radical, religiously motivated, politically committed international terrorists. These transnational terrorists have been integrated by certain non-state organizations through global networks of terrorist cells located in different regions of the world. The national and international intelligence agencies have reported that different terrorist organizations have developed their sanctuaries in the northern areas of Pakistan beside the Durand Line (Lander, Mark & Nicholas Kulish, 2007; Nichloas, 2007, p. 34). The terrorist organizations like al-Qaeda, Taliban and other associates like Sipah-e-Sihaba Pakistan (SSP), Jaish-e-Mohammed (JeM), Harkatul-Mujahedeen, Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT), Hizb-ul-Mujahedeen and Tehrik-Nifaz-Shariat-i-Muhammadi (TNSM) have exploited the prevailed lawless environment across Pak-Afghanistan border areas and undermined the writ of the state. Pakistan has been reported as an epicenter of numerous militant and extremist groups involved in ongoing lethal and frightening terrorist activities. These terrorist groups have close operational links with each other and operated for decades in association of Afghan Taliban and al-Qaeda (Siddiq, 2009, p. 64). Pakistan has adopted military and non-military methods as prime determinants of its counter terrorism policy to handle the hazards of terrorism. Pakistan launched various security operations against the militants in its northern areas. Pakistan also adopted the policy of intelligence information based 'search and capture' actions in its densely populated cities like Islamabad, Karachi, Lahore, Peshawar and Rawalpindi capturing various leaders of terrorist organizations, i.e. al-Qaeda and the Taliban. The Islamabad administration also emphasized on non-military options i.e. negotiations and legislative aspects. The government of Pakistan has signed different peace agreements with the extremists and militants. On the other hand, different governments in Pakistan have chosen legislative aspects and passed different anti-terrorism laws since 9/11 whereas various presidential acts and ordinances remained an additional and effective counter terrorism policy perspective. The government of Pakistan occasionally took strict actions against the terrorist network. President Musharraf, President Zardari and Prime Minister Imran Khan banned the working of different militant groups in Pakistan to combat the aims and the agenda of the dissidents. On the whole Pakistan's counter terrorism strategy remained ineffective as compared to the developed countries due to lack of speedy trials against the terrorists, an element of civil military discontent, conflict of the ownership of US led war on terror, lack of reliable investigation and evaluation of infrastructure, weaker law enforcement sector, element of distressed and multifaceted approach.

Conclusion

The global counter terrorism strategy calculus has been affected both directly and indirectly impinged by the scourge of terrorism under the variable and varied socio-political environment. The perception, understanding, evaluation and response towards the terrorist activities has jeopardized the formation of a unanimous global counter terrorism strategy and the diversity of opinion weakened efforts of countering terrorism and strengthened the breeding of terrorism in the beginning of post 9/11 era. The phenomenon of terrorism has existed in a way or many throughout the human history. The horrible and devastating events of Twin Towers on September 2001, of World Trade Centre surfaced as the key issue in the contemporary world politics. The 9/11 carnage has changed the nature and

dimension of security politics in the modern international relations. The protection of homeland soil and its inhabitants emerged as the leading determinant of the foreign policy of a state. New security parameters have been introduced but no single universally agreed definition of terrorism was developed. However, the threat of terrorism has been declared as the threat and use of violence against the civilian people to acquire certain settled targets through the violent victimization and brutal destruction of the non-combatants and innocent targets. The United States introduced the global coalition strategy to root out the menace of terrorism under the joint defense of war on terror. Pakistan and many other peace-loving states joined in the US-led WOT and began to initiate their counterterrorism strategies against the activists of al Qaeda and Taliban across the Pak-Afghan borders. The counterterrorism strategy of the states depends on the perceived threat and its sources forced by the affected Nations. Some countries face terrorist activities, attacks, and destruction from within the society initiated by the home-grown dissidents' rebels and the terrorist groups. A state adopts the specific set of counterterrorism strategy, but if terrorism occurs from external means and sources, the counterterrorism policy and measures can be of different nature and intensity. But in both ways, the states require all legal, political, economic, and social measures for the punitive actions against the terrorists and their facilitators in letter and spirit to get control over the gigantic issue of global terrorism. It is essential to know clearly that what is terrorism, who is doing it, how much governments and major policy makers are known to this inhuman scourge of terrorism or what is the level of negligence on the part of the concerned governing authorities, stakeholders in the context of terrorist activities, especially countries like Pakistan. There is dire need to bring maximum social, political, economic and legislature reforms to root out the evil of terrorism. A coherent and comprehensive anti-terrorism policy is required to cope with the problem. Pakistan must learn from the counterterrorism policy both in theoretical and practical approach of the states like Australia, Britain, Canada, Germany, and the United States for acquiring definite and determined results. The multifaceted counterterrorism policy is required to be given up along with the discontent civil military leadership while chalking out counterterrorism strategy. A full pledge co-operative regional and global approach needed to be opted by all the states fighting against the terrorism all around in the world to avoid the incidents like Pulwama and the Christchurch. Thus the global counterterrorism strategy still requires to construct a compact and strong infrastructure of deterrence, exigency, early warning intelligence system, rule of law, diplomatic tactics, zero tolerance policy, physical protective measures, border infiltration sealing agenda, permanent anti-terrorism legislation and to change the fundamental and extremist mindset from its socio-political circles for the lasting peace and success in the war on terror.

The Global Counter Terrorism Strategies

References

- [1] Ahmed, I. (2006). *Understanding terrorism in South Asia: Beyond statist discourses*. New Delhi: Manohar Publishers.
- [2] Baker, (2003). *The Politics of Diplomacy; Revolution, War and peace, 1989-1982*. New York; G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- [3] Boer, D. M. (2003). The EU counter terrorism wave: Window of opportunity or profound policy transformation? In Marianne van Leeuwen (Eds.), *Confronting terrorism: European experiences, threat perceptions, and policies* (p. 189). The Hague: Kluwer.
- [4] Clutterbuck, L. (2006). Developing a Counter Terrorism Network: Back to the Future. In P. Katona, M. Intriligator, & J. Sullivan (Eds.), *Countering Terrorism and WMD: Creating a global counter-terrorism network* (pp. 33-47). London: Routledge.
- [5] Coolsaet, R. (2010). EU counter terrorism strategy: Value added or chimera. *International Affairs*. 86(4), 857-60.
- [6] Cronin, (2010), pp. 855-856.
- [7] Donohue, L. K. (2008). Britain's counter terrorism policy. In Doron Zimmerman Andreas Wenger (Ed.). *How states fight terrorism: Policy dynamics in the West*. (pp. 17 – 58). New Delhi: Viva Books.
- [8] Gotliab A. (March 5, 2003). A grand bargain with the US, *National Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalpost.com/index.html>
- [9] International Institute for Strategic Studies. (2004). *US military doctrine and counterinsurgency in strategic survey*, (2003/4). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [10] Jehl, D. (April 15, 2004). Blerk prognosis by CIA nominee. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/>
- [11] Keppel, G. (2002). *Jihad: The trial of political Islam*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [12] Kessler, G. (2007). Terroism and War. In J. Hocking, & C. Lewis (Eds.), *Counter-Terrorism And The Post-Democratic State* (pp. 20-27). Massachusetts: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- [13] King, N. & Cloud, D. (2000). On high alert: Casting a global net, US security forces survive terrorist test. *Wall Street Journal*, A1.
- [14] Lander, Mark and Nicholas Kulish. (2007). Turkish Connection Shakes German. *International Herald Tribune*, September 8-9.

- [15] Mauer, V. (2008). Germany's counter terrorism policy. In Doron Zimmerman & Andreas Wenger (Eds.), *How states fight terrorism: Policy dynamics in the West* (pp. 59-78). New Delhi: Viva Books Private Limited.
- [16] Ochmanek D. (2003). *Military operations against terrorist group abroad: Implications for United States air-force*, (MR-1738-AF) Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- [17] Purdy, M. (2008). Canada's counter terrorism policy. In Doron Zimmermann & Andreas Wenger (Eds.), *How states fight terrorism: Policy dynamics in the West*. (pp. 105-132). New Delhi: Viva Books Private Limited.
- [18] Raufer, X. (2003). Al-Qaeda: A different diagnosis. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, 26(6), 391–398.
- [19] Rosenau, W. (2008). US Counter Terrorism Policy. In Doron Zimmermann and Andreas Wenger(Eds.), *How states fight terrorism: Policy dynamics in the West*. (pp. 133-156). New Delhi: Viva Books Private Limited.
- [20] Sageman, (2011). *Understanding terror networks*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- [21] Siddiq, Ayesha. (2009). Jihadism in Pakistan: the Expanding Frontier. *Journal of International Affairs*, 63, 57-71.
- [22] Stevenson, J. (2004). *Counter terrorism: Containment and beyond*. Adelphi Paper 367. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [23] Taylor, T. (2003). United Kingdom. In Yonah Alexander (Ed.), *Combating terrorism: Strategies of ten countries* (pp. 187-233). New Delhi: Manas Publications.
- [24] Whitaker, R. (2003). More or less than meets the eye? The new national security agenda. In G. Bruce Doerm (Ed.) *How Ottawa spends 2003-2004: Regime change and policy shift*. (pp. 44-58). Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- [25] Wilcox Jr., Phillip C. (2003). United States. In Yonah Alexander (Ed.), *Combating Terrorism: Strategies of Ten Countries*. (pp. 25-29). New Delhi: Manas Publications.