



## RESEARCH PAPER

### The Dynamics of Counter Terrorism Strategy in 21<sup>st</sup> Century: An Academic and Conceptual Framework Analysis

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Muhammad Iqbal Roy\* <sup>2</sup>Brig (R) Muhammad Amin SI(M)

<sup>3</sup>Muhammad Waqas Nawab

1. HOD, Department of Political Science, Govt. Murray College, Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Ex-Vice Chancellor, BUET Khuzda, Baluchistan, Pakistan
3. Lecturer, Department of International Relations, University of Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan

PAPER INFO	ABSTRACT
<p><b>Received:</b> July 23, 2020</p> <p><b>Accepted:</b> August 25, 2020</p> <p><b>Online:</b> September 30, 2020</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> Bull Dogma, Counter Terrorism, Maneuver Paradigms, Proxy War</p> <p><b>*Corresponding Author:</b> dr.roypolsc97@gmail.com</p>	<p>The qualitative and analytical study includes how States and International Organizations have applied certain strategies to contain the evil of terrorism in different parts of the world? The strategy of single or collated States against the global terrorism is known counter-terrorism. It remains operational through a coherent combination to combat terrorist activities around the World. It is an organized practice of the states to prevent the possible threats at national and international level with the application of certain preventive measures. The Counter Terrorism strategy contains Early Warning Intelligence, pre-emptive strike, a tight security system, an effective detention, disruption of financing, retaliation, coherent intelligence system, diplomatic measures and formation of special Counter Terrorism Units. These distinctive techniques of counter terrorism used by the global institutions and states i-e Australia, Britain, Canada Germany, India, Pakistan &amp; the United States aimed to contain the objectives &amp; to curb the sanctuaries of the dissidents.</p>

## Introduction

Counter terrorism refers the strategy of an individual state or of a group of the states against the network, agenda, activities and sanctuaries of the terrorists in different areas of the world. The counter terrorism policy has been revised as the result of dreadful terrorist attacks of 9/11. It has been derived from combination, co-operation and co-ordination to cure different kinds of terrorist activities. The Counter terrorism Strategy includes both formal and informal efforts for the development of a worldwide network of sharing information and operations against the targeted, located and identified sanctuaries of the perpetrators. Counterterrorism is also an organized exercise of the states and institutions to avoid the probable threats at local, national and international level by using certain peaceful and coercive tactics led by the Terrorism Early Warning Intelligence System. The countries striving for peace and fighting against terrorism consume their potential sources, i.e. the police, security agencies and military forces and embroil more social support through media awareness campaigns to eliminate the gigantic evil of terrorism. The modern nation states and international organizations have picked up certain possible approaches, methods and retaliatory response to pullout the roots of

ongoing phenomenon of global terrorism which has become a critical and complex debauchery in the contemporary global environment. The peace loving non state actors like United Nations and regional organizations along with the states fighting against global terrorism have occasions applied the provisions of the tight security system, better prevention and effective detention, disruption of financing, repression, retaliation, punishing the foreign supporters of dissidents, formation of pre-emptive schemes of strikes, Special Counter Terrorism Units, institutional reforms, diplomatic co-operation and the sharing of information with different intelligence agencies are the major tactics of the counterterrorism strategies of states in contemporary international relations.

### **The Definitional and Theoretical Aspect**

The concept of counter terrorism seems difficult to define like that of terrorism, since it is very complex. Paul Wilkinson is of the view there is not a globally agreed counter terrorism strategy because every incident of terrorism has its own attributes (Wilkinson, 2006). Kelman describes counter terrorism “a set of measures that states apply in response to acts of terrorism”. The Oxford English Dictionary defines counter terrorism as, “political or military actions or measures intended to combat, prevent, or deter terrorism, sometimes (in early use) with the implication that the methods utilized resemble those of the terrorists” (Kelman, 2012). 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. According to another perspective, counter terrorism 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 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 state or collective states to combat different acts of terrorism though formal or informal efforts by using military police and other law enforcement agencies known as counter terrorism (Ahmed, 2006). 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. The authoritarian and democratic societies use the same mechanism of counter terrorism. Strategies of counter terrorism that work to defeat domestic extremists and foreign attackers in a democracy may work equally well in an authoritarian system with a government determined to repress local democratic dissidents or ethnic religious minority suppressed. Sederberge (2003) has presented three approaches of countering terrorism adopted by different states at different times to deal the terrorist groups:

### **Narratives of Counter Terrorism**

The Crime Approach treats terrorism as a crime and concentrates on the role of police and judicial system to deal with the violent terrorist. The Disease method deals with terrorism as a disease and emphasizes on the treatment of the root causes of terrorism. Similarly WarTactic method emphasis on the framing crisis of terrorism as one of the war, which means the curtailment of civil liberties and an opportunity for the enemy (Baker, 2003). The descriptive narration of above mentioned methods of counter terrorism strategy can be explained in the following chronicle order.

### **The Disease Proactive Method**

The modern social scientists have discovered the disease preemptive method as a significant tool to contain and combat terrorist activities in different parts of the world. The experts of international politics consider that terrorism can be avoided through the psychological temptation of perpetrators who are involved to wage different activities of terrorism. This tactic 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 (Katzenstein, 2003). 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). 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 (Kilcullen, 2005).

### **The Crime Anticipatory Method**

The advanced countries like the United States, Britain, Canada, Australia, Germany and France have paid a deep concentration on the formulation and application of the crime anticipatory approach to deal with the hidden and obvious activities of the terrorists. He exponents of terrorism as a crime method believe that the terror crime can be control through the enforcement of certain reforms in the police department and judicial

infrastructure of the States. The weaker, incapable and corrupt crime control institutions create more opportunity to increase the terror activities. 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 (Landman, 2006). 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 (Muller, 2008). A decision to use law enforcement versus military action needs to be dealt with through a case by case basis (Dwigans & Schmitt, 2011). 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. The states like Pakistan, Turkey, India, Malaysia, and Iran have deeply started to concentrate to the application of crime approach as key factor of their counter terrorism strategy.

### **The War Pre-emptive Method**

The gigantic threat of global terrorism has brought the human security at the stake of risk, danger and uncertainty particularly by the begging of 21<sup>st</sup> century. The States have reviewed the policy perspective of homeland security both in peaceful reforms and coercive retaliation method. The punitive response through Military operations has been used by the states as a decisive counter terrorism strategy in the contemporary global politics. 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 global WOT 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). 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, 2008). 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). States rely on intelligence information, tactics of retaliations, and assassination of the enemy and preemptive strike methods, as tools of countering terrorism. The war preemptive approach of counter terrorism has been used in Pakistan, Afghanistan, India and Middle East to combat and crush the terrorist activities in the post 9/11 environment.

## **Attributes of Counter Terrorism Strategy**

Following are the significant features of the counter terrorism policy and practice adopted by the States to maintain law & order, peace and stability and to protect their homeland security.

### **The Corporeal Protective Measures**

The promulgation of physical protective measures becomes another significant policy perspective adopted by the States like Australia, Britain, Canada, Germany, India, Israel Pakistan and the United States in the post 9/11 environment 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 States civil, military and intelligence authorities to discourage and avert terrorist attacks in different parts of the world.

### **Non Lenience Policy**

The State administration believes in not making any kind of concession to the terrorists inside and outside of its territorial jurisdiction. Therefore, the government adopts zero tolerance agenda against all suspects and terrorists from its soil and to crush malicious network and objectives of terrorist organizations. A fundamental belief of this policy is that no country will yield to terrorist threats and attempts to intimidate or extort concessions to the terrorists (Graham, 2003). The major objective of no concession policy is to put all potential terrorists on notice that using terrorism is futile and non-beneficial, thereby discouraging similar acts in future. The zero tolerance policy against the terrorists has been brought to bear in incidents of aircraft hijacking, the seizure of embassies, hostage taking and bomb threats for ransom or to extract concessions. The policy of zero tolerance and no concessions doesn't mean refusal of negotiations with terrorists. The States officials are supposed to adopt an established dialogue posture in order to gain the release of hostages and dissuade the terrorists from the commencement of their brutal terrorist acts.

### **Revealing and Discouragement**

The modern nation state counter terrorism strategy 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 the advanced counter terrorism program. The peace loving States and institutions deploy Different civil and military agencies for law enforcement and to deter the terrorist activities (Stevenson, 2004).

### **Commandment of Rule**

The rule of law has been considered as the paramount principle of peaceful counter terrorism policy throughout the world. The rule of law should be applied and strengthened as a principle tool while fighting against any kind of terrorism. The Countries

have advanced their 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 Modern nation State anti-terrorism campaign. In searching for the best way to combat terrorism, the countries are dependent on law enforcement even relied on law enforcement. The fundamental principle of State 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. It is agreed by the governments of different states 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).

### **The Potent and Bulling Dogma**

The use of cohesive diplomacy becomes an important feature of the counter terrorism strategy of the sates in the contemporary international environment. The powerful states normally use the tactic of the imposition of economic sanctions against the states and groups which are involved in sponsoring terrorism. The Practice of Law enforcement and the executive orders as a wide variety of sanctions against the states sponsoring terrorism becomes a policy principle of counter terrorism. The States identify, condemn and apply 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 legislatures of several States have occasionally passed several acts to condemn, curtail and freeze program and funding of terrorist groups engaged in the projection of certain terrorist incidents and attacks in different parts of the world. For example The American Congress imposed different military and economic sanctions against the states like Afghanistan, North Korea, Libya, Iran, Iraq, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Pakistan being the terror sponsoring States. The refusal and monetary restrictions of the reservoirs, sanctuaries and weapons to the terrorists groups appears another component of counter terrorism policy of the States (Ochmanek, 2003).

### **The Ambassadorial Maneuvers**

The Diplomatic tactics are considered effective and fruitful to diminish and discourage all kind of terrorist activities throughout the world. Normally the States encourage international cooperation and coordination to control and combat all forms of terrorism. The States administrations usually facilitate 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 Peace keeping global institutions and Countries are spouse to persuade 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. The international community has organized a worldwide coalition and NATO alliance

against the evil of terrorism. The policy of cooperation with willing and capable states is encouraged in the contemporary international politics.

### **The Internal Co-operation Policy**

The domestic integration, compatibility, solidarity and unity give a positive and strong image as a nation to contest and conquer all the anti-state elements, decedents and the terrorists. The State administration of different countries has formulated a comprehensive and coherent team work between civil and military establishment to combat different terrorist activities. It also includes the measures like the homeland security through improved border control, intelligence and other security measures like diminishing poverty and conditions that terrorists can exploit. The legitimization of terrorism as a tool of statecraft and an instrument of non-state actors is included in the contours of the Common 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 provides a huge support to crush the aims and objectives of the terrorists (Rosenau, 2008).

### **The Early Warning and Threat Assessment System**

The early warning threat assessment system has become an integral principle of modern counterterrorism agenda of all the states used by the civil and military intelligence and information gathering agencies in the post 9/11 environment. Usually the Central governments take responsibility for the assessment of the threat of internal and external terrorism. According to the director of central intelligence agency and the director of federal bureau of intelligence both the CIA and FBI are directly responsible to perceive and assess the threat of domestic terrorism being the leading intelligence organizations of the country. These agencies work in a close collaboration and through a clandestine intelligence in order to discover, disrupt and penetrate the terrorist groups within the territorial domain of the United States (Wilcox, 2003). The international community relies on its intelligence system for both tactical and strategic warnings of terrorist attacks. Therefore, through application of early warning intelligence system, the global counter terrorism policy has resulted in the apprehension of a growing number of international terrorists. Numerous States have revived their threat assessment system to take greater account of the mobility of trans-national terrorists and their practice of seeking out vulnerable targets in the areas where these terrorists have not previously attacked. The threat assessment system of the States also makes watch and ward of different environmental factors. The analysts in the threat assessment and warning system of these States focus on different categories of the terrorists, i.e. state sponsored terrorism, terrorist organizations, transnational networks of terrorism, religious fanaticism and the cyber terrorists who make plan to attack over the communication and digital infrastructure, Public Places, officials diplomats, police training centers, check posts and military personals of these States.

### **Acquiescence of International Law**

The activities and wave of terrorism has been curtail and managed through the application a compliance of international law along with a great combination and working

relationship with states and non-states actors during 2001-2020. The States have expanded their anti-terrorism campaign from domestic to international arena. The Allied countries engaged in global coalition against terrorism have 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 States have reviewed and expended their bilateral extradition treaties in order to strengthen anti-terrorism cooperation through international law. The several UN member States have upgraded and reformed the extradition laws to contain crimes and control the of transnational terrorist groups. Furthermore the mutual legal assistant treaties have been revised by the peace loving countries as an instrument to increase the level of cooperation in the investigation and prosecution of the criminals involved in domestic and global terrorism. The complex interdependence theory has greatly strengthened the norm of cooperation among the States and increased the commitment for the compliance of international law against the proceeding of the terrorist networks and their associate groups in the global environment (Rosenau, 2005).

### **Challenges & Implications of Counter Terrorism Strategy**

Since the occurrence of horrible terrorists attacks on the soil of the united states in September, 2001 certain non-state actors like the UN Security Council, NATO, European Union & several States have adopted monotonous measures to pull out the network of different extremist and fanatic organizations to pullout their hideouts for the persistent peaceful environment in the World Politics but the results have not been abstracted as fruitful as it was determined in different Parts of the World. Although a great success has been acquired in the context of countering terrorism during 2001-2020 as the result of the application multiple counter Terrorism strategies both in diplomatic and coercive policy perspectives. The United States, Pakistan India, United Kingdom, Germany, France, Canada and Australia have spent billions of Dollars and cost millions of human lives but yet tings have to be learnt for the future course of action in respect the sheer elimination of Terrorist activities from the world politics. The non-State actors, Peace keeping organizations and States striving for countering Terrorism face the following Challenges & implications in terms of their ongoing Counter terrorism Policies.

### **Unproductive Policy Agenda**

Military and nonmilitary options reflect country's ineffectiveness for a counter terrorism strategy. Some countries lack the proper counter terrorism legislation in their respective legal proceeding record through the legislatives bodies. (Kennedy, 2004) which

proved insignificant for the elimination of terrorist activities from the territorial jurisdiction of the concerned States.

### **Slow and Steady Judicial System**

The judicial system of different States creates problems to precede speedy trials of the suspected terrorists and could not obtain any reasonable success to halt the activities of the banned militant groups which had started functioning by the substitute names. The example of Jama'at-ud-Dawa (JuD, former LeT) can be cited in the case of Pakistan which has established madrassas, schools, health centers, and hospitals and hence depicted itself as a welfare organization.

### **The interest Preferences Policy**

There are some important overlapping shortcomings that lead to the countries toward ineffectiveness of their counter terrorism policy in the context of combating and elimination of all kind of terrorist activities. The anti-terrorism strategy linked with its geostrategic and regional environment, especially dealing with the national interests and policy preferences of the States do adopt the pro-strategic interest postures. For example Pakistan's policy interest in the case of India is connected with the Kashmir issue as Islamabad considers the Kashmir dispute as an 'unfinished agenda' of the partition plan of United India. Therefore, Pakistan preferred to stick with constant approach about the Kashmir conflict and adopted both the war and dialogue policy to keep India engaged in a low intensity conflict by using the jihadi organizations through proxy wars. Although civil and military authorities gave tough time to crush the terrorists and their networks heavily "through the tactics of arrests, targeted assassinations and aggravated intergroup massacres" (Tellis, 2008). Pakistan's strategy of 'bad Taliban' and 'good Taliban' raises a question mark on its commitment and credibility to eliminate all kinds of terrorist network and organizations from its territorial jurisdiction. Therefore 'Pakistan friendly' jihadi and militant organizations are actively operating in Kashmir held by India and have been graded as the 'strategic assets' in the military circles of Pakistan. These strategic assets also use training camps and resources under the ideological inspiration of the state.

### **The Civil-Military Discontent**

The uncertain, dubious and cockeyed civil military links in the politics of different States i-e Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka have emasculated the worth and efforts of the country to combat domestic, regional and home grown terrorism. There has been an incessant race for dominance and control over one another between civil and military leadership. Consequently the Military wins the Powers race and led to define the countries security and defense policies. Whenever the civil elites try to play their independent role in the context of national security decision making process, the military has pushed it back vehemently. The Kerry Lugar Bill 2009, Memo gate scandal 2012 and establishing the institution of NACTA 2013 can be seen as glaring examples of civil military disharmony in the politics of Pakistan. Thus the civil- military discord has made the counter terrorism strategy quite a tough task due to different perspectives on the formulation of counter terrorism policies in various developing countries of the World. The civilian political

faction in different countries prefers the formulation of counter terrorism strategy accorded to their law and order situation. This is a huge issue in the civilian domain and it could be handled through the application of sound administration and governance measures. Contrary to the civilian political leadership, the military considers the formulation of counter terrorism strategy on the basis of national security issues which is overwhelmingly the Targeted and specific agenda centric that can be entertained through proxy war. The military establishment preferred to provide support to the 'strategic assets'. The civil- military conflict remained alive on the conduct of different security operations and on the issue of negotiations with the dissident groups. (Daily Times, 2013, September 10).

### **The Question of Ownership of War on Terror**

The Counter terrorism Strategies face huge challenge of the ownership of the War on Terror in different countries particularly like Pakistan in the case of its role as a front line State being non NATO ally of the US led global coalition against War on Terror. Pakistan's counter terrorism efforts lacked of the development of national consensus about the term 'war on terror' whether it was Pakistan's war or of the United States. Therefore Pakistan army designated War on Terror its own war and called to acquire support from the People to Combat and win the contest against the Terrorists. This can be noted from General Kyani's (former military chief) speech of 14<sup>th</sup> August 2012. On the other hand some popular political parties, such as the mandatory PMLN, Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf (PTI), Jama'at-e-Islami (JI) and Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam (JUI) candidly described WOT as an American war rather of Pakistan. Therefore, military's effort to fight the internal threat of terrorism questions its determination and commitment in the absence of support from the masses and political leadership.

### **The Vague and Biased Investigation Infrastructure**

There is a lack of rational value free constant and reliable investigation and evaluation infrastructure of the incidents of terrorism in the case of the articulation of counter Terrorism Strategies of different Countries where the biased, irrational and inappropriate implementation of the Counter terrorism Strategies have generated serious questions of performance and target achievement. The multiplicity of players in the arena of counter terrorism policy has been straggling struggling both in the practical and ideological differences in the decision making circles &the limited role of civil administration in the formulation of national security policies, the ineffective performance of national crisis management cell and other agencies yet don't produced an impressive and accurate result in respect of countering terrorism.

### **The Multi-Faceted Policy Perspective**

Another important drawback of counter Terrorism Strategy becomes the multi – faceted agenda to fight against the terrorists. If a Country follows unbalanced and having unequal powers among a variety of players and actors, along with trust deficit. It cannot acquire the determine and targeted objectives with the application and promulgation of multi layered counter terrorism policy based on the principle of polarization.

### **The Lesson yet to be learnt**

A wide gap yet exists to articulate and manifest a rational approach of the policy formulation through the socio-political circles of the State mechanism with a legal and political legitimacy of the state in the contemporary world politics. The countries i-e Pakistan, India, Israel still need to learn from the practice and policy of the developed countries i-e the United states & great Britain dealing with their respective terrorist incidents of 9/11 201 & 7/7 2005. The developing Nations yet have to learn the lesson from Australia, Canada , Germany and Norway to improve the performance of their local and national law enforcement agencies and institutions. The weaker domestic surveillance and sweeping system along with the backward indigenous scientific research environment raised the finger on the credibility & potential of counter terrorism policy of the struggling States fighting against the terrorism in international environment that how to completely uproot potential terrorist organizations particularly Pakistan has to learn a lot about how to use the available sources that would enable the country to improve its law & order situations and skills of training required for fighting the terrorists being the important partner of the global coalition against the gigantic threat of terrorism .

### **The Weaker legislation & promulgation Policy**

The counter terrorism strategy of the State is compromised through the weaker law enforcement sector. The poor legal and judicial infrastructure composed of the police, law enforcement agencies & the information cells with the incredible and stumbling infrastructure, equipment, search skill, training capability and fighting potential raise the finger of question mark in the context of the framing of an agreed global counter terrorism policy

### **The Trust Deficit Problem**

The element of distrust, hater, ideological and geographical conflicts along with the environment of incompatibility with international community generates vacuum in the perception, formulation and promulgation of global counter terrorism strategy. The policy incapability of Pakistan's counter terrorism strategy during 2001-2020 has remained questionable due to the presence of an element of distrust, hater and anti-American sentiments. there is a dire need to improve the working relationship of fighting against the evil of global terrorism. It is also essential to acknowledge the feelings and sacrifices of the people, institutions and forces fighting the war on terror by those countries who are frequently blamed to be involve in the formulation and application of conspiracy theory merely to secure one's own designed interests rather than to maintain everlasting global peace and stability

### **Conclusion**

Since the occurrence of the awful terrorist attacks on the soil of the United states in September 2001 followed by a devastating series of terrorist activities almost in the entire world during 2001-2020 has jolted the global peace and brought the humanity and State security at the stake of the risk of survival and destruction both in cost and life. Thus the emerging geo-strategic, social, economic and political dynamics of the world politics in the post 9/11 environment guided different international institutions and states to revisit regional and global security paradigms .Consequently the strategy of single or more states

to combat different acts of terrorism through formal or informal efforts has been articulated in the form of counter terrorism policy. It is an organized or informal exercise of the states to contain and crush probable threats at national and international level. States and counter terrorism agencies or institutions apply different tactics i.e. tight security system, freezing financing system, rapid prosecution, formation of pre-emptive strike policy, making of special counter terrorism task force and institutional reforms. The transnational nature of ongoing terrorism has guided the states to adopt new strategies, doctrines and policies to develop regional and worldwide security while dealing with the global menace of terrorism. The United Kingdom adopted strict measures to prevent terrorist activities through political, economic, social and military check and deterrence. Australia, Germany and Canada also extended a great cooperation to root out international terrorism through legislative, economic and security reforms following the legislative proceedings. The United States reformulated its foreign policy preferences in the wake of horrible terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. Consequently, The United States and its allied countries launched anti-terrorism policy and efforts in the name of WOT under the umbrella of global coalition. The States have initiated certain anti-terror bills and converted into law. The homeland security department, anti-terrorism strategy, rule of law, zero tolerance policy, detection and deterrence, diplomatic treaties, coercive policy, physical protective measures, domestic cooperation, assessment warming and compliance with international law while working with international community are the major ingenuities transmitted by different states. Yet more things have to be learnt by international community to acquire the determined targets in respect of countering terrorism. Furthermore, the culture of intolerance, aggression, ignorance and deprivation needs to be eliminated through peaceful means like uplift of school education, establishing universities and improvement in the living standards of the people. The States can cultivate more strong relations by trust building measures, respect to the reciprocal sovereign status and exchange of core information regarding contest and crush terrorism. The entire international community will have to stay engaged with each other, cooperate where cooperation is possible and hold dialogue to reduce differences in the context of the application of global terrorism policy. There is no need in picking up unnecessary conflicts with any regional and global actor for the sake of tenacious peace and prosperity in the world politics.

**References:**

- Ahmed, I. (2006). *Understanding terrorism in South Asia: Beyond statist discourses*. New Delhi: Manohar Publishers.
- Baker, (2003). *The Politics of Diplomacy; Revolution, War and peace, 1989-1982*. New York; G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Cronin, A. K. (2010). The evolution of counterterrorism: will tactics trump strategy? *International Affairs*, 86(4), 837-856.
- De Castro, R. C. (2004). Addressing international terrorism in Southeast Asia: A matter of strategic or functional approach? *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 193-217.
- Dwigans, D. L., & Schmitt, M. N. (2011). International Law and Counterterrorism. In eds. Harmon C., Pratt N., Gorka S. *toward a Grand Strategy against Terrorism*.
- Graham B. (October 23, 2003). Rumsfeld questions antiterrorism efforts. *Washington Post*.
- International Institute for Strategic Studies. (2004). US military doctrine and counterinsurgency in strategic survey, 2003/4. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jehl, D. (April 15, 2004). Blerk prognosis by CIA nominee. *New York Times*.
- Katzenstein, P. J. (2003). Same war: Different views: Germany, Japan, and counterterrorism. *International Organization*, 731-760.
- Kennedy, C. H. (2004). The creation and development of Pakistan's anti-terrorism regime, 1997-2002. *Religious radicalism and security in South Asia*, 387-411.
- Kilcullen, D. J. (2005). Countering global insurgency. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 28(4), 597-617.
- Landman, T. (2006). Holding the line: Human rights defenders in the age of terror. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 8(2), 123-147.
- Müller-Wille, B. (2008). The Effect of International Terrorism on EU Intelligence Co-operation. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 46(1), 49-73.
- Ochmanek, D. (2003). Military operations against terrorist group abroad: Implications for United States air-force, (MR-1738-AF) Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Rosenau W. (2005). Waging the war of \_\_\_ in David G. Kamien (eds.) *The McGraw Hill Homeland Security*. New York, NY: Macgraw Hill.
- 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.

- Sageman, M. (2008). A strategy for fighting international Islamist terrorists. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 618(1), 223-231
- Stevenson, J. (2004). Counter terrorism: Containment and beyond. Adelphi Paper 367. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Tatyana, K. (2012). Definition and Dimensions of Counterterrorism. In Frank Shanty (Eds.), *Counterterrorism: From the Cold War to the War on Terror*, Volume one, Combating Modern Terrorism (1968-2011). California: Praeger.
- Tellis, A. J. (2008). Pakistan's record on terrorism: Conflicted goals, compromised performance. *Washington Quarterly*, 31(2), 7-32.
- Wilcox, Jr., Phillip C. (2003). United States. In Yonah Alexander (Ed.), *Combating Terrorism: Strategies of Ten Countries*. (pp. 25-29). New Delhi: Manas Publications.
- Wilkinson, Paul. (2006). *Terrorism versus Democracy: the Liberal State Response*. New York, NY: Routledge.