

COUNTERING TERRORISM AND POLICY PLANNING - AT INTERNATIONAL PLANE

AGRIMA CHOUDHARY¹

Abstract

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and the ensuing terrorist bombings in Riyadh, Casablanca, Istanbul, Madrid, London, Mumbai and elsewhere have deepened concerns about the terrorist threat and renewed cries to better understand the roots or causes of terrorism. This essay focuses on current counterterrorism doctrines. It argues the current methods and techniques used by the global organizations in Countering Global Terrorism. The structure mainly debates around a military or war model, need to be updated in the light of the present state of terrorism. The paper compares and contrasts the strengths, weaknesses, and prospective counterweighing effects of modern counterterrorism strategies, arguing that in order for the United States to be successful in its battle against Al Qaeda's brand of global terrorism, it must take its struggle from the open battlefields of counterinsurgency into the shadowy world of counterterrorism. The work emphasizes on the involvement of each and every citizen in countering terrorism, because ultimately it is our problem.

Introduction

What is a Global Terrorism? Or what is a Domestic Terrorism? Is there a difference between domestic terrorism and global terrorism? Does the 9/11 attack not have any impact on the global market? Or does Americans were not concerned about the 26/11 Mumbai attacks? Does the terrorist outbreak is the concern only for the businessman whose building was targeted, the persons who got paralyzed, or the family of the victim who died? Does the concern not include the parents whose child is studying in the city where the bomb blasted or the newly wedded couple spending there holidays there?

The blazes of two outbursts, severed limbs, three dead, including one child, thousands of innocent people attacked by killers who transformed a cheerful day in the most horrible way possible. That is

¹ 2nd Year ,Institute of Law, Nirma University

what happened in Boston, and the bad news is that, it will happen again, sooner or later, in a different place and at a different time, because this is the world in which we live at present.

Why this is all happening? Do the police constables or military officers not performing their duty well? Is there is a lack of security? Or there are the loopholes in the government policies?

I feel that every terrorist attack is a global terrorist attack. It is an incident not against the particular nation but against the humanity at large. This is what we call the Era of Revolution. But, revolution at present should take place for what, global terrorism or human rights? One and the same thing, isn't it?

Terrorism

Terrorism. The word incursions fear into the hearts of numerous, and to many others it is misunderstood. The word terrorism has no specific internationally accepted definition. Terrorists are ideologically ruthless and use violence against the civilians to create panic and fear amongst them.

Terrorism originates from the Latin word *terrero*, which means fear. Largely, terrorism can be categorized into three forms: political, quasi political and religious. Alteration in policies, mainly in reference to skin color, creed or profession is what provokes the political terrorists. Quasi political terrorism is the use of terrorist maneuvers for the specific/personal gain. It is done not for the particular group or section of people but for the individual needs. And, religious terrorism focuses on mushrooming ones belief at the cost of others. Terrorists falsify and use the persons of different religions in order to satisfy their own religious views. All in all, terrorism is painful and unjust. There is nothing named as good or fair terrorism. Terrorism of each and every type is against the society or say, human rights, to be precise.

Human Rights

"Human rights" is a fairly new concept, and it is the one that has been receiving a great deal of attention at this juncture in the early years of the twenty-first century. However, views differ wildly about what constitute human rights. Most recent world citizens believe that each individual should have at least the most basic rights. Now, the question rises that what covers the basic rights. My impression of the the basic rights is the fundamental rights conferred to each and every Indian citizen by the Constitution of India, and the Article 21 of the same would I say is the utmost basic right, i.e., the right to life and liberty.

World as a Victim

Many terrorists consider their mission successful when hundreds of helpless, innocent women and children lie in the lane covered with blood. Terrorist attacks have occurred factually hundreds of times in United States. Exact numbers are not clear because of the blurred line between domestic terrorism and political ferocity. According to the Department of Justice, there have been 50 terror attacks on the inland soil of the States. According to the FBI's worldwide NCTC data trend, in the year 2011 only there have been above 11,500 acts of terror around the whole world. These global attacks were sited in 72 countries, and resulted in approximately 50,000 fatalities. Out of this 50,000, 13,200 capitulated to massive trauma.² The methods are diverse, the offenders are pertinacious and the doings of terror are utterly inexcusable.

What happened in Boston is a part of everyday life in Baghdad and Kabul, a continuous threat in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem and a nagging fear in Lahore, Islamabad and Moscow. Major acts of violence have become traumatic happenings in Egypt, Norway, Algeria, in the Russian Republic of North Ossetia, in Beslan and in Balinese and Tunisian villages. Terrorists have carved themselves into the history of big, cities full of pride like Madrid, Mumbai and Marrakesh, London, New York, Jakarta and Istanbul.

In India, Al Tipura Tiger force blows up innocent citizens about once in a year in an effort to bout the government's Pakistani foreign policy. In order to increase votes and backing, the Maoist Party of India and Communist Party of the Philippines train guerillas to terrify individuals. Likewise, Hamas the Islamic group operating in Palestine, the Pilipino Liberation Tigers of Tamil and political Anarchists have rioted in various places around Europe, including Italy, the U.K., Greece and France. These maniacs are profuse and wide ranging.

Is the Netherlands in the instant day, after the murders committed by Islamist fanatics, and after the vociferous debates over immigration and the Muslim minority, still the same nation it was 10 or 20 years back? After the massive attacks of madman Anders Breivik, can Norway still hold on to its erudite democracy without finding the middle ground? Has Great Britain, which in all possibility has

²"FBI — Reports and Publications." *FBI — Homepage*. Web. 14 Dec. 2011. <<http://www.fbi.gov/statsservices/publications>>.

more surveillance cameras in public areas than any other country, actually been able to sustain its way of life in the decades since IRA terrorism and the more recent doings of Muslim fanatics?

Pike, a British man, was seriously injured and later got paralyzed when he jumped out of a window of the Taj Mahal Palace Hotel after it was raged by some of the 10 Lashkar-e-Taiba rebels who carried out the attacks in Mumbai on November 26, 2008. The outbursts killed 166 people and left hundreds injured. The Briton, who went through several surgeries, has claimed that the hotel failed to protect its boarders in spite of being warned about the probable attacks. He sued the owners of Taj Mahal Palace Hotel in a British court of law because regardless of the outcome, he wants to know whether the hotel could have done more to ensure his, as well as other guests safety in the building.

September 11, 2001 is a day that will live in ignominy. On that critical day, various Al Qaeda operatives of Saudi and Pakistani birth hijacked three planes. One plane was hovered into the World Trade Centre (WTC). In this first sway, about 1402 people were slayed. As fire scorched the building, the main backing beam began to heat and stoop. A little over an hour later, a second plane swayed the tower sending lethal shrapnel onto the streets and effectively destroying the buildings structural backing. As we all know, the towers fell down. Later that day, passengers aboard another hijacked plane in an astounding display of jingoistic sacrifice. These attacks killed precisely 2,918 people, 343 firefighters and paramedics, and 23 NYPD officers. This attack was the greatest loss of life on American soil since the Pearl Harbor incidence. With this attack, terrorism felt very real to the Americans and the need to end the same was also sensed.

According to the FBI NCTC data compilation, terrorism is down 12 percent, globally. This has been accredited to slight economic attainment in some countries, yet inexplicable because the number of young males in places of conflict increased by 70,000. In spite of this clear success by the counter terrorism organizations, attacks continue to be predominant in Southeast Asia. Contrary to widely held belief, Asia is the terrorism capital of the realm; with the FBI estimating that "75 percent of the world's terrorist attacks and deaths took place in South Asia and the near East."³

In the year 2011, these attacks add up to 8,690 and resulted in 9,960 demises. Due to rural conditions and lack of medical care, NTC government report on 2011 terror does not include a figure considering the number of people injured by these attacks. With terrorism obviously being exceedingly predominant and by the same token dangerous, you may wonder what is being done to stop it, and what we can do to sort it out.

³Supra 1

Combating International Terrorism

"Our war on terror begins with Al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped, and defeated."⁴ President George W. Bush, addressing the United States Congress on September 20, 2001, highlighted the long-drawn-out and on-going nature of combating international terrorism on a global scale in the aftershock of the terrorist attacks on Washington and New York on September 11, 2001, (henceforth 9/11). The ensuing military campaign, which began with the violent overthrow of the Taliban in Afghanistan, brought the Central Asian states, (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan) to the forefront of U.S. global strategy.⁵ On September 24, 2001, Turkmenistan offered transport and overflight rights for humanitarian relief in support of U.S. antiterrorism efforts in Afghanistan; there soon followed offers from Kazakhstan of airfields, bases and overflight rights, and subsequent proposals from Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.⁶ The Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev offered basing rights to U.S. forces; the fact that no bases were created in the early stages of the campaign was not caused by lack of trying on the part of the Kazakh government.⁷ The Kazakhs did allow more than 800 overflights during 2002 in support of operations in Afghanistan, as well as transshipment of supplies through its territory, and have generally proven supportive in the war on terrorism and the conduct of U.S. policy.⁸ Kazakhstan sent a small team of representatives to the U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM); the three officers arrived in June 2002 and serve there in a liaison capacity.⁹ Other Central Asian states, notably

⁴George W. Bush, "Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People," United States Capitol, Washington, DC, September 20, 2001.

⁵Robert G. Kaiser, "U.S. Plants Footprint in Shaky Central Asia," Washington Post, August 27, 2002.

⁶Jim Nichol, "Central Asia's New States: Political Developments and Implications for U.S. Interests," Congressional Research Service (CRS), Foreign Affairs, Defense and Trade Division, January 6, 2003.

⁷Col. Robert C. McMullin, "Caspian Sea Regional Security in the 21st Century," USAWC, Strategy Research Project, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, April 2003, p. 16; Lyle J. Goldstein, "Making the Most of Central Asian Partnerships," Joint Forces Quarterly, Summer 2002, pp. 82-90.

⁸Patterns of Global Terrorism 2002, Released by the Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism, U.S. State Department, April 30, 2003.

⁹They also report to the Kazakh mission at NATO HQ, Brussels, acting as a useful facilitator in the deployment of 25 Kazakh military specialists to Iraq in support of the international peacekeeping operation. Uzbekistan was the first Central Asian state to send a small team of representatives to CENTCOM, sending four officers in December 2001;

Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Uzbekistan, were more forthcoming in their support and evidenced crucial in providing bases for the projection of United States power into Afghanistan. Kyrgyzstan granted founding for combat and combat support units at Manas airport for United States, Canadian, Italian, French, Norwegian, and South Korean forces. Tajikistan allowed the use of its international airport at Dushanbe for refueling and basing for United States, British, and French militaries. Uzbekistan offered basing for U.S. forces at Karshi- Khanabad and opened a land corridor for humanitarian aid to reach Afghanistan through Termez.¹⁰ Thus, the Central Asian states emerged as key allies in the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT), and the foundations established in the region proved critical to United States forces securing the rapid downfall of the Taliban in Afghanistan, doing away with a long-standing threat to the region. Their continued partnership will be a significant piece of the strategy for preventing the resurgence of terrorism.¹¹

A significant focus of the GWOT is on emerging terrorist threats to United States interests overseas, as well as in quest of denying international terrorists the opportunity to launch global operations. During his national address on September 20, 2001, U.S. President George W. Bush linked Al Qaeda and the Taliban directly to the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan.¹² Indeed, the nature of such links, long doubted by regional intelligence services, points to a potentially explosive connection of militant Islamic groups, criminal groups and drug traffickers. The Central Asian states will need ongoing support in assessing, analyzing, identifying, and countering this historical and growing threat.

What is clear, however, is that the criminal gangs, narcotics barons, and religious ideologues endemic in Central Asia, notably in the Ferghana valley, will continue to foment terrorism for the foreseeable future.¹³

Central Asia is the vital theatre in the war on terrorism. It is a region of friable new states, all facing a wide range of defies. Ungoverned regions- the cauldron of terrorism- are so common. The U.S.

Kyrgyzstan followed by sending five officers in May 2002; and Tajikistan shortly afterwards assigned four liaison officers to CENTCOM.

¹⁰Jim Nichol, "Central Asia's New States"; "International Contributions to the War Against Terrorism," U.S. Department of Defense Fact Sheet, June 7, 2002.

¹¹Statement of General Tommy R. Franks, Former Commander U.S. Central Command, Before the Senate Armed Services Committee, July 9, 2003, p. 15.

¹²George W. Bush, "Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People," United States Capitol, Washington, DC.

¹³Fiona Hill, "Central Asia: Terrorism, Religious Extremism, and Regional Stability," House Committee on International Relations, Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia, July 23, 2003; AlisherKhamidov, "Countering the Call: The U.S., Hizb-ut-Tahrir, and Religious Extremism in Central Asia," Muskie Fellow in International Peace Studies, University of Notre Dame, U.S. Policy Towards the Islamic World, Analysis Paper #4, The Brookings Institution, July 2003

State Department notes that, the United States has learned a harsh lesson after they disengaged from Afghanistan in the early 1990s. They contemplate that they must not allow countries to become breeding grounds for radicalism and terrorism. To prevent these damaging forces from taking root in Central Asia, United States have intensified their efforts to help the countries of Central Asia become stable, affluent, and fully unified members of the world community and the global economy. Now, the question is how to undertake this intricate endeavor. This could suggestively be done by refining the anti-terrorist capabilities of the Central Asian militaries. This might include increased and attentive military training by way of a special emphasis on Special Forces units. The training ought to take place within a provincial train and equip program to escalate effectiveness and efficiency.

The Strategic Studies Institute has offered Army and Department of Defense leaders with various ideas and suggestions for augmenting the antiterrorist capabilities of America's partners in Central Asia.

Politically, they suggest that the United States military and security arrangement programs in the Central Asian region must accompany Washington's broader diplomatic efforts to promote social, economic, democratic and political reform programs; and these have to be a part of a long-term drive toward promoting better stability and avoiding the peril of failing states slithering further into trouble. The United States must reassure its allies in the region, for the most part those assisting in the GWOT, that they will not be desolated at the far along day of the week, giving a more long-term assurance to support the development of their new independent states, assisting them move towards democracy, firming them up economically, and warranting the avoidance of a security vacuum in the region. They as well need to be reassured that the security situation in Afghanistan will settle down, and that terrorism training encampments will not again thrive there and aid as a training ground for a lot of the terrorist groups that impend to infest the region. In pursuing its security reinforcement and assistance programs in the region, the United States should, straight or through NATO (which has specific mechanisms to that result), call attention to the common nature of the threat to each of the regional performers and seek to encourage deeper and more widespread sharing of intelligence within the Central Asia. In addition, developing the antiterrorist capabilities of these states still more should be conditional upon closer regional cooperation and security amalgamation; fragile and isolated states must avoid chasing "islands of security", rather they must join together in a fresh and new essence of security cooperation to encourage long-term stability in Central Asia. Policymakers must work just as strenuously to foster social and political progress within

the area to deprive radical groups of possible local popular support, based upon human rights abuses, social justice, and poverty. Security policymakers must also pay attention in the same way to merging threats within Central Asia, such as the Islamic Party of Liberation (Hizb-ut-Tahrir), operating with its partners in the region on checking their full emergence, besides focusing on reducing or countering more insistent or immediate threats.

Military plays an essential role in countering the global terrorism. Hence, military training is of utmost importance for achieving the purpose. The forthcoming Central Asian military assistance programs need to lay emphasis on two threat parameters: counterterrorism and peacekeeping operations. There cannot be a direct and easy approach to the development of these programs, as the effort must be aware of the dramatic differences in the abilities and needs of each of the state's security and military forces. These two missions also require specialized skills, training, and equipment sets that are not commonly standard in a conventional force. United States Special Operation Forces (SOF) should train and go along with their Central Asian counterparts on military exercises and operations, and efforts should be made to train their leaders in a different way; in particular, leading them to carefully examine the uses of SOF in the present warfare. United State training should include all the SOF type units from the several security agencies in charge for securing the country's border and counterterrorist operations. The objective is to train these agencies together to promote better operational integration. Additional training should be organized for the long term, with help creating special warfare centers, mountain warfare leaders, mountain warfare infantry centers, common operational skills and an interagency communication structure to facilitate faster integration between the military and other security agencies. Future trainer within each state then will have the required skills and education to carry out effective training without foreign assistance. Clearly, not all of these states can meet the expense of development of the above mentioned centers; a possible solution would be regional centers encouraging closer cooperation among the states. Moreover, effective training is only one of the many building blocks needed in developing the antiterrorist capabilities of these militaries. In spite of their best efforts and most financial resources being channeled towards the SOF in each state, they lack basic kit and advanced weaponry.

The identified operative weaknesses from the military campaigns against the Inertial Measurement Units incursions in both 1999 and 2000 can be abridged as follows:

- Failure at the planning and implementation stages to properly manage the deployment and operational activities of the armed forces between the several power ministries.

- Lack of well-trained, mobile, combat-ready soldiers capable of effectually conducting operations in mountainous terrain.
- Want of basic protective kit, poor equipment and communication systems in the field for soldiers deployed to carry out war.
- Inferior quality military intelligence resultant of the lack of operational and tactical intelligence and scouting assets.
- Poor targeting information, which proscribed finding, fixing, targeting, and then effectively involving enemy forces. The process remains too slow and unwieldy to provide timely targeting data to either air or ground assets.
- Support from air assets was irregular, inaccurate, and infertile, degrading the morale of ground forces.
- SOF did not play the principal role in operations, being used instead as light infantry.
- Limited multinational military cooperation rendering incompetent any efforts to pursue fleeing rebels, or contain the conflict.
- Failure to attain a synergy of the armed forces deployed in the Batken region or get full spectrum dominance over the enemy.

Suggestions

United States political decision makers and military planners are faced with increasing challenges developing the antiterrorist abilities of the Central Asian militaries. The United States should devise a systematic and synchronized train and equip program in Central Asia. A Central Asia train and equip program would have need of flexibility both at the planning and implementation phases, allowing for adaptation to the specific needs of each participating state as well as the productive participation from the regional militaries themselves. The scope and budget of such a program suggests the need to develop a global approach, building on the NATO Secretary General's efforts to improve the alliance's relations with the states in Central Asia. A NATO based supportive structure should be formed to reinforce the program, making use of the experience of member states and partners in Partnership for Peace (PfP). Accordingly, the burden of the assistance program would be shared. There should be political link between investing in such a program and encouraging the Central Asian militaries to collaborate more closely; this could be especially beneficial in developing a longer-term regional approach to security.

Simultaneously, U.S. policy must encourage the formation of elite units within the region, resourceful of meeting the future and evolving security requirements of the 21st century. As the difference between war and peace has blurred as a consequence of the post 9/11 security situation, a Central Asian train and equip program should nurture enhanced levels of interagency cooperation. Assessing the cost of such programs should be considered against the cost of a continued open-ended risk of having to set up United States forces in support of regional partners: these states seek out to fight terrorism themselves, and not to depend on United States power projection in a crisis.

Counterterrorism within any modern state implicates the use of police based operations leading to investigation and condemnation through the criminal courts. Currently the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) is developing regional counterterrorist legislation.¹⁴ A police conducted investigative approach, depending upon the timely assembly and use of intelligence, is a vital preventive measure and part of a process of skillfully dealing with terrorist incidents in a way that does not stimulate further support for the terrorists' cause among the local population. Nevertheless, the police forces in Central Asia, which are integrally corrupt and lacking professional experience in dealing with the intelligence assembly process and the construction of databases, to a great extent need reform. A reformed police structure could increase the efficiency in dealing with real incidents and bring to justice those responsible for using political violence. It would also have the distinctive advantage of avoiding arrests and incarceration on a large scale which often increases public support or empathy for the terrorist cause.

"Counterterrorist operation" has had impacts beyond the region, generating empathy among Islamic extremists, human rights campaigners, and others all through the world. A police and intelligence led policy, with the military only involved when necessary, is a vital element of counter terrorism for a modern state. The Central Asian states can be supported in this by more contacts and link with western counterterrorist specialists and national police and intelligence services. The understanding of the British Special Branch police in countering Irish Republican terrorism for more than 30 years, and the Antiterrorist Branch's forensic and exploratory skills can be shared with the Central Asian states. Equally, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in the United States can share their

¹⁴"Review of the Implementation of OSCE Commitments to Prevent and Combat Terrorism," OSCE, June 10, 2003.

experience.¹⁵ The post 9/11-security environment demands better intelligence cooperation, not just among agencies but among nations.

Institutions' Aid

International institutions are salient in the 'Global War on Terror'. Nonetheless, there remains variation in the institutionalization of counter-terrorism, across policy areas and over time. By and large, institutions pursue tasks of counter-terrorism once they are backed by power. Institutions work as 'swords' as strong states seek to influence others. Weak states, as well, are subtle to the distributional consequences of cooperation and use institutions as 'shields' to resist the powerful. These claims are reflected in patterns of mutual aid within the UN, and in terrorist backing and maritime security. Looking forward, multifaceted counter-terrorism may remain contingent upon state power.

The '*Global Counterterrorism Forum*' is a major initiative to build an international architecture for dealing with 21st-century terrorism. It is an association of nations including emerging economies such as India, Russia, China and 11 Muslim countries along with the European Union, Japan, New Zealand, and Australia. It was launched by United States Secretary of State Hillary Clinton on 22 September 2011. It intended to offer a unique platform for senior counterterrorism policymakers and experts from all over the world to work together to identify urgent needs, plan solutions and mobilize resources for addressing crucial counterterrorism challenges.

In a first, the forum was destined to create a venue where partners can come together and identify pressing needs in counter-terrorism around the world, plan solutions and assemble the resources to implement those solutions. The forum is meant to move past some of the discussions that have paralyzed multilateral institutions in the earlier times from dealing with counterterrorism, precisely the endless debate over who is a terrorist.

The initiative was made on the failure of earlier such initiatives like the G-8 Counter-terrorism Action Group, which was intended to be a capacity-building organization, but failed.

The group will have a coordinating committee of Foreign Ministry officials in addition to five working groups. Two functional groups would focus on rule of law, criminal justice and countering violent extremism. Three groups would be attentive on the regions of Sahel, Southeast Asia and

¹⁵FEMA existed as an independent agency until March 2003 when it became part of the Department of Homeland Security.

the Horn of Africa. The working groups will be co-chaired by members of the GCTF but will be exposed to other countries.

The changing aspects of conflict de-escalation by social movements or party-political opposition groups have attracted cross-disciplinary interest among social scientists, but there still remain a number of knowledge gaps to be filled. On the one hand, there is already wide-ranging research on the shifts from unarmed expressions of collective grievances to the taking on of violent strategies by oppressed constituencies or 'minorities at risk', as well as on the changeover from armed insurgency to negotiations, reintegration, demobilization and conventional politics. However, there is scarce learning on the phenomenon of armed groups shifting their conflict-waging approaches from violent to nonviolent means, especially in circumstances which cannot be resolved by force but are also 'unripe' for established de-escalation methods through negotiation and political integration. There is a need to fill this conceptual and empirical gap, by examining the nature and the drivers of transitions from armed strategies to nonviolent means of contentious collective action on the part of non-state conflict performers. The focuses should particularly be on the internal and relational/environmental factors which reinforce their decision making process, from a change of leadership and a rational re-evaluation of the goals and means of rebellion, to the search for new local or international partners and the cross-border emulation or diffusion of new ranges of action.

Conclusion

Terrorism is not something we are conceding liberty to fight because the threat is especially terrible compared to other dangers of the modern world. All kinds of things kill us in far greater numbers. Rather, alike airplane crashes and shark attacks, acts of terror are frightening than most causes of death. The apparent contradictions in what manner we treat different threats suggest that we are not exchanging civil liberties for security, but a sense of security. We are not empowering the national-security state so that we are safer, but so we feel safer. How many people feared dying in their vehicles more than dying in a terrorist attack?

Certainly not me! I illogically find terrorism far scarier than the sober inept and reckless drunks who surround my vehicle every time I take a carefree trip. The thought that the government could keep me safe from terrorism is emotionally very appealing.

Intellectually, I know two things:

1. America has well-preserved liberty and privacy in the face of threats far better than terrorism has so far posed (based on the total number of people actually killed in terrorist attacks), and we have been better off for it.
2. Giving up liberty and privacy to keep myself safe from terrorism does not even guarantee that I'll be safer! It is probable that the surveillance state will prove offensive and ineffective. Or that giving the state so much liberty to exercise extreme power in secret will itself threaten my safety.

I understand, as well as any person, that terrorism is scary. But now it's time to stop responding to it with our guts, and to start responding with our brains, not just when we are deciding to vacation in Washington or New York, but also when we are making policy together as free citizens. And if we truly hope to weaken terrorism, we should show the equal amount of sympathy and concern for the stories of victims around the world as for those in India. Only then can we create a global movement against terror.

We ought to admit to ourselves that there is no fully acceptable answer to the question of how governments and free societies should react to the danger from the fragmented micro-terrorism of these days. We seem to have resolved the technical side of the issue, more or less. Robust security apparatuses have been created around the world since the tremor of 9/11. The success in the effort to fight terror is undeniable, and the proficient work of police constables, intelligence agents and soldiers has helped baffle countless attacks.

In the perilous times in which we live, terrorism is always a dreadful possibility, and when it strikes, we should not pretend to be more shocked than we really are. The more regular our response to terror, the weaker it turns out to be. The more we give emphasis to the civil strength of our contemporary, democratic societies, the more senseless all attacks will become. After all security can only be pursued and enhanced through cooperation, not competition.