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Introduction

The simultaneous and coordinated aerial attacks on New York and Washington on 11 September 2001 reawakened the world about the problems of terrorism. The magnitude of the destruction and the near universal condemnation and disapproval were followed by a realisation of the need for an effective international arrangement or mechanism to fight terrorism. As terrorism transcended national borders and became a global phenomenon, states especially the great powers, recognised the importance of strengthening and enforcing various international treaties, conventions and agreements concerning terrorism. In other words, a consensus began emerging on the need for invigorated international regime on terrorism.

Terrorism has bedevilled humanity for nearly two millennia and has become widespread since end of the World War II. Despite its longevity and destructive nature, terrorism evokes different response from different states. States such as Israel and the US, view the fight against terrorism as a paramount national responsibility. Highly sensitive to the question of sovereignty, they have been reluctant to cede authority to any supranational body and often use all national means including force. Other states, particularly the smaller ones with less counter-terrorist capability, insist on a more legalist, multilateral approach.
The principal purpose of this study is to arrive at an understanding of international regime on terrorism. This work will seek to analyse and describe the evolving *regime* especially after the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001. While the emphasis is on the contemporary regime, the study will seek to establish the context through an exploration of the history of terrorism and the main international debates concerning terrorism.

**Regime**

It is critical, however, establish a conceptual understanding of Regimes. Regime is a highly contested concept. According to the widely accepted definition of Stephen Krasner, regimes may be seen as “… principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures around which actors’ expectations converge in a given issue-area.... Principles are beliefs of facts, causation and rectitude. Norms are standards of behaviour defined in terms of rights and obligations. Rules are specific prescription or proscription for actions. Decision-making procedures are prevailing practices for making and implementing collective choice ...”\(^2\)

According to John Gerald Ruggie, regimes “embody principles about fact, causation, and rectitude as well as political rights and obligations that are regarded as legitimate.” In so doing, they “represent a concrete manifestation of the internationalisation of political authority.”\(^3\)

---

1 Unless mentioned otherwise, the expression *regime* in italics refers to international regime on terrorism.


For Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye regimes are “sets of governing arrangements” that comprise “networks or rules, norms and procedures that regularise behaviour and control its effects.”\(^4\) Oran Young defines regimes as “sets of rules, decision-making procedures and/or programmes that give rise to social practices, assign roles to the participants in these practices, and govern their interactions.”\(^5\) By its very nature, a regime limits, “the discretion of their constituent units to decide and act on issues that fall within the regime’s domain.”\(^6\) While not establishing any “binding and enforceable legal mechanisms”, regimes “are much more important in providing established negotiating frameworks (reducing transaction costs) in helping to coordinate actor expectations (improving the quality and quantity of information available to states).”\(^7\) In short, revolving around rules, norms and procedures, regimes are more than “temporary arrangements that change with every shift in power or interests.”\(^8\)

There are three general approaches to the study and evaluation of international regimes. **Realists**, who consider the state as a unitary actor pursuing its own national interests in an anarchic international system, regard regimes as related to interests as contingent and transient and susceptible to changes consequent to changes in power and interests of the states involved. According to this view, regimes are a misleading concept that obscures economic and power relations.\(^9\) **Liberals** concentrate on the shared values of states as the basis for regimes and view them as a pervasive characteristic of the

---

\(^4\) Keohane and Nye quoted in Krasner, n.2, p.2  
\(^6\) John Gerald Ruggie, n.3, p.196  
\(^8\) Krasner, n.2, p.2
international system.\textsuperscript{10} And modified \textit{structural realists} combine the basics of realism and liberal institutionalists and see regimes as co-operative efforts between states wishing to avoid sub-optimal outcomes arising out of the pursuit of individual self-interest in isolation.\textsuperscript{11}

A security regime can be defined as "those principles, rules and norms that permit nations to be restrained in their behaviour in the belief that others will reciprocate."\textsuperscript{12} Robert Jervis identifies four characteristics that differentiate a security regime from a regime in non-security areas.\textsuperscript{13} They are:

- Security issues are more competitive in nature than non-security regimes;
- Unlike non-security regimes, states may resort/threaten to use military means either to retain the status quo or to change it to their advantage;
- The stakes are higher and unforgiving in the security regime;
- Uncertainties of detecting what others are doing and measuring one's own security are greater in the security regime;

As a result, success of a security regime depends upon its ability to fulfil a number of preconditions.

- The Great powers must be interested in establishing a more regulated environment than where all states behave individualistically. The success of the non-proliferation regime as manifested by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation

\textsuperscript{9} Ibid., p.1
\textsuperscript{10} Young, n.S, p.5
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid p.5
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., pp.174-8
Treaty (NPT), for example, was primarily due to the arrangement working in favour of the five nuclear powers and their determination to maintain and perpetuate their nuclear monopoly and exclusivity.

- The states must believe that others also share the same interest in mutual security and co-operation. The Chinese posture vis-à-vis NPT highlight this demand. While it was outside the system, China was a prime advocate and practitioner of proliferation but upon joining the Treaty in 1990 it quickly modified its position and emerged as the prime advocate of non-proliferation.

- Even if all major actors were to agree for the status-quo, security regimes cannot be formed when one or more actors believe that expansionism will enhance security. Since World War II a number of regional security arrangements failed largely because of the non-participation of key regional players. In some cases, countries seeking to establish a regime excluded potential rivals or adversaries and in others, conflict of interests precluded the participation of important players. The failure of South East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO) and Central Treaty Organisation (CENTO), despite being floated by the US, to gain importance was largely due to the refusal of other regional players to go along with the American doctrine of containment. The success of North-Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) on the other hand, was largely due to the willingness of major West European countries to share the American perspective and even the maverick French were unable to restrain the growth of NATO.
• War and individualistic pursuit of security run against the security regimes because if states believe that war is good in itself, they will not form a regime to prevent it. Preventable wars are often predicated on the willingness of states to pursue war as more profitable option than peaceful resolution of conflict. The June war of 1967 and the Operation Desert Storm in 1991 fall into this category when Israel and the US respectively thought war was a better option. Conversely, to be successful the regime formation should be more attractive than the war option.

In the absence of some/all these essential conditions, regime formation on security would be incomplete and futile.

**Evolving Regime on Terrorism**

The evolution of the regime on terrorism was made arguably possible when a large number of states within the international system, led by the great powers, seemed to have reached a common understanding that terrorism needed to be countered. As indicated earlier, in the modified structural realist view, states co-operate to secure *pareto optimal* outcome and avoid sub-optimal outcomes, which would accrue from individual efforts in addressing terrorism. The process of defining these unacceptable behaviour or acts of terrorism is leading to the formulation of a legal framework, which bestows certain obligations upon the member states. To be effective the signatories have to codify these obligations into the domestic laws and treaties governing crime prevention, trial and extradition of terrorists.

On the eve of the 11 September, 2001 attacks, a loose *regime* was in place. Though lacking stringent adherence and reward-punishment induced compliance
mechanism, states were forced to act due to the pre-eminent and destructive nature of terrorism. The efficacy and efficiency of such a regime would eventually depend not only upon its ability to define the norms of behaviour but also its willingness to enforce that behaviour upon the member-states.

The events of 11 September 2001 added a sense of urgency, magnitude and global reach to regime evolution. Besides leading to number of human casualties in a single co-ordinated act, they attacks targeted the economic as well as the military power of the US and its global reach. By shaking the sense of domestic personal safety, the attacks generated strong domestic pressures, which seemed to have compelled the US Administration to place war against terrorism on its prime domestic as well as foreign policy agenda. Compliance with American demands on terrorism has arguably become the touchstone to measure not only the friendliness of a state towards Washington but also its peaceful intentions as well. The spate of UN resolutions and various multilateral declarations against terrorism and financing of terrorism that followed the 11 September 2001 attacks are a direct result of the intense American involvement, pressure and inducement. Thus, as discussed earlier the American response to the 11 September attacks has intensified regime formation. Like other regimes, the regime on terrorism suffers from a number of structural problems, operational deficiencies and lack of enforcement mechanisms.

Principles

While, there is no universally acceptable definition of terrorism there seems to be a growing international convergence on the need for an agreed framework. Since the early 1930s, terrorism has been a feature of international relations and yet, this
phenomenon has defied a definitive definition. Despite numerous definitions, controversies and arguments, terrorism is viewed, as being more than just “the threat or use of violence for political ends.” Such a narrow definition would invariably include the state because it often resorts to such measures to compel its adversaries to comply with its political demands. The involvement of non-state players and the deliberate attempt to terrorise the non-combatant civilian population distinguish terrorism from other forms of social violence. When essential elements of a terrorist activity, namely perpetrator, victim/target and location, involve more than one country, it becomes international/transitional. Non-state actors, armed forces or agents of the state may perpetuate such activities.

There is an on-going debate on the principles of the regime on terrorism, which centres around the lack of consensus on definition of terrorism. Various conventions have only defined terrorism tautologically: as “acts of terror” (for example, hijacking or terrorist bombings). Many states use ‘terrorism’ or ‘state terrorism’ to describe any act of coercion committed against them by a foreign state or agency. Other states insist that a legal definition of terrorism should distinguish terrorists from ‘freedom fighters’ struggling for a legitimate cause. Acts of terror are not to be judged by the use of violence but by their political content.

Consequently, this argument has been often used to refuse extradition where states claimed that the accused terrorists were acting out of ‘political’ motives. Attempts to strengthen the norms against terrorism by defining legal obligations towards acts of terror have often floundered on this contentious point. The type of co-operation needed to
effectively combat international terrorism is based on the principle that terrorism must not be allowed and must be punished fully under the law to deter further incidents.

Countries such as Israel, which view themselves as a prime victim of a sustained terror campaign, have been in the forefront of the international debate on terrorism. Israel's adversaries have repeatedly argued that suicide attacks such as a car bomb in a crowded market place should not be regarded as terrorism because they are a legitimate means in the Palestinian national liberation struggle. At the same time, it is difficult to ignore that terrorism is more about "what one does" rather than about "what one does it for." It is more about 'actions' and less about 'justness of the cause.'

Other targeted states have also argued that irrespective of political, philosophical, ideological, racial and religious or other objectives, acts of terror could not be justified. Countries like India have often argued that attempts to suppress international terrorism on a selective geographical basis would have little hope of lasting success. Efforts by the rich industrialised countries to limit the battle to their own territories and the Middle East were no substitute for a comprehensive international approach.

A strong regime on terrorism is difficult to evolve, unless all participants agree on the meaning of what is to be contained. Despite efforts by the UN, a globally accepted definition of terrorism, as indicated earlier, is elusive. Only in 1979 did the United Nations General Assembly adopt a resolution condemning terrorism per se when it declared that "all acts of terrorism that endangered human lives or fundamental freedoms where unequivocally condemned."
Norms

Support for the regime on terrorism comes from states that see themselves as having suffered extensively from terrorism. Correspondingly, states, which have experienced few instances of terrorism, such as Switzerland, Austria and Luxembourg, even hesitate to formulate national legislation concerning terrorism. Moreover, domestic terrorism tends to evoke strong national responses while nations tend to respond weakly to terrorism overseas especially when it does not affect their specific interests. In the words of Rohan Gunaratna, “most governments permit foreign terrorist groups—especially those that do not pose an immediate threat to their national interests—to operate on their soil.”14 Even in the domestic arena reactions of the states vary when terrorism emanates from separatist/nationalist aspirations.15 Domestic political calculations on occasions compel a state to respond differently to different terrorist groups; contrasting Israeli responses to terrorism by Palestinian elements and Jewish settlers underscore this dichotomy.

Ideological issues have dominated the internal debate on the norms governing the regime on terrorism. For instance, during the Cold War period the Soviet Union was reluctant to condemn hijacking and even sought to justify such acts on ideological grounds. This position changed following the hijacking of a Soviet domestic airliner in October 1970. At the same time, despite their opposition to terrorism, hijackings and attack against diplomats during the Cold War years, the Soviet Union was believed to have sponsored terrorist groups especially in the Middle East. In 1989, Mikhail

Gorbachev articulated a counter terrorism policy, which eventually paved the way for cooperation between Moscow and Washington.

While any effort concerning international terrorism has to be transnational, at the operational level, such a strategy reinforces the primacy of the nation state. The first international effort to address terrorism was the G-8 (G-7 plus Russia) summit meeting in Halifax in July 1995 and since then the issue has figured prominently in the G-7 and EU deliberations.

Following a series of suicide bombings in Israel in March 1996, thirty world leaders including a dozen from the Arab World met at Sharm el-Sheikh (Egypt) for first summit against terrorism. Projected as a Conference of Peacemakers, it sought to bolster the faltering Middle East peace process and to promote regional security. Despite partisan political calculations, the participants “emphasize[d] their strong condemnation of all terrorist actions, in all their infamous forms ...” The statement reasserted their determination to resist these actions with the utmost firmness, and on terrorism, states that the conferees decided:

—To encourage coordinated efforts to halt terrorist acts on the bilateral, regional and international levels in order to guarantee that the perpetrators of such acts are brought to justice and also to back the efforts made by all parties to prevent the exploitation of their territories for the purpose of conducting terrorist acts.

—To prevent terrorist organizations from recruiting new members or obtaining weapons and financing.

—To make the utmost effort to determine the financing sources of these groups and to cooperate in halting the flow of such funds.
—To provide training, equipment and other forms of support to the parties that adopt measures against the groups that use violence and terrorism to threaten peace, security and stability.

—To form an open working team representing all the participants in the summit to prepare recommendations on the best methods of implementing the clauses of this statement through existing efforts and to submit a report to the conferees within a period of 30 days. 16

Such declarations have only symbolic value unless they are transformed into concrete steps. Furthermore, despite agreements on the need to fight terrorism, the even G-7 members are unable to establish the necessary national legal framework because of their chronic disagreements over the nature and extent of terrorism and how best to combat it.

**Rules**

The debate concerning rules of the regime revolves around the usefulness and general effectiveness of an international regime in actively combating terrorism. Critics have pointed out to the ambiguities of the evolving regime itself. They say that even if conventions were to be fully implemented (an unlikely proposition) the 'limited and piecemeal' nature of the solutions in these conventions make them ineffective in fighting terrorism. Without a stronger, better-defined prohibition on terrorism, they argued, these international legal instruments will be largely ineffective.

The main problem with the regime is that it lacks teeth. It is apparent that these norms have been useful and most states seem to believe that these international standards

---

16 *Programme for the Promotion of Nuclear Non-Proliferation, (PPNN) Newsbrief, (Southampton), no.33, 1/1996, p.16.*
are effective in preventing and punishing terrorism. And the 11 September 2001 attacks have only accentuated the need and intensified the regime formation efforts.

**Decision-making**

The legal framework of various bilateral and multilateral arrangements has made it difficult for individuals committing terrorist acts to find safe havens. Growing reluctance of terrorist groups to claim responsibility for successful attacks is an indication of the diminishing ‘acceptability’ of terrorism.\(^{17}\) It has hampered the ability of groups or states in justifying terrorist acts on political grounds. The internal differences within the Islamic world over suicide bombing, for example, is a clear indication that nations are finding it increasingly difficult to rationalise and justify the use of terrorism for political ends.

At the same time, given the complexities, a comprehensive international legal system is difficult to evolve. It was in the UN that most of the debates over the shape and content of counter-terrorism conventions has taken place and institutional legal mechanisms developed. Most of the debates concerning terrorism following the 11 September 2001 attacks revolve around the UN and its effectiveness. Despite unilateral undercurrents, the US has been looking to the UN as its prime arena for its international coalition against terrorism.

Terrorism evokes unilateral and multilateral responses. Some states, such as Israel and the US, view the fight against terrorism as a paramount national responsibility and

---

\(^{17}\) No groups claimed responsibility for some of the recent terrorist attacks against Israel largely due the willingness of the latter to enforce massive retaliatory measures. Punitive measures against family members of suicide bombers, for example, has reduced erstwhile practice of sending pre-recorded video footage of such ‘martyrs.’
category normally involves non-governmental agencies and bodies which seek to modify an existing international order in favour of the weaker nations. Since weak states lack the international influence to modify the existing set of rules, the task is left to NGOs, often sponsored by stronger states.

Though generally emanating from or rooted in developing societies, terrorism is primarily a threat to developed industrialised world or advanced developing countries. Hence, any regime to address terrorism cannot be seen as an instrument of social change but rather an outcome of great power interests. Instead of acting unilaterally or through limited co-operation with allies, the desire of great powers to formulate a regime underscores the need for broader international co-operation.

Due to political, logistical, technical or economic reasons, great powers are compelled to seek new allies and forge an international consensus on a given issue. Given the transnational nature of terrorism, exclusive arrangement as manifested in various technology control regimes, would be insufficient. While there are barriers to technology, modern terrorism has transcended national boundaries. Hence, there is the need for wider coalition against terrorism. At the same time, any regime based on great power interest-promotion would have to consider the following:

---

\[22\] Despite its disapproval of the military coup that overthrew a democratic government, Pakistan became the linchpin of American counter-terrorism campaign against Taliban-controlled Afghanistan.
• The regime should be able expand through inclusion of various other players who share the same concern and aspire for similar if not identical results. Any exclusive arrangement would undermine the very purpose of regime formation.

• Though motivated by great power interest, the regime should be able to bestow benefits to all member-states. While great power predominance might be acceptable, any hegemonic regime would be resented by others. Even if their individual ability to undermine great power interests were limited, their cooperation would be limited and this turn would weaken the regime.

• As a complement to rewards mechanism, the regime should be able and willing to punish states that threaten or violate the basic core. No regime can survive if the member-states undermine the rationale upon which the regime is formed. If necessary, the regime should even contemplate expelling recalcitrant.

• Over years, a successful regime should gather a life of its own and become less susceptible to great power manipulations. While this would be welcomed by a number of states, great powers tend to view an independent regime with suspicion and might seek to supplant with alternatives.

Literature Review

Conceptual Studies

*International Regimes* edited by Stephen D. Krasner explores evolution of the regime theory in international systems. The causal factors and causes, which necessitate regime formation, relationship among various components of the regimes and their consequences, are the focus of this volume. Writing on the security regime, a chapter by
Robert Jervis, differentiates security from other non-security regimes. Robert O. Keohane’s edited work *Neo-realism and its Critics*, focuses on the inescapability of studying theory in international politics and examines whether political realism and neo-realism constitute valuable ways to enhance our understanding of international affairs. *The Logic of Anarchy*, by Barry Buzan, Charles Jones and Richard Little is a systematic critic of Kenneth Waltz’s neo-realism, which has dominated the theory of international relations since late 1970s. It attempts to re-build structural realism and to extend its logical framework outward to link up with other areas of international relations theory. *Neo-realism and Neo-liberalism* edited by David A Baldwin identifies six focal points, which dominate the on-going debate on this theory of international politics. They are nature and consequences of anarchy, international cooperation, relative vs. absolute gains, priority of state goals, intensions vs. capability and institutions and regimes.

The essays in *The study of Global Interdependence: Essays on the Transnationalisation of World Affairs* by James N. Rosenau focus on the changes in world affairs and on approaches of studying and comprehending the change. They deal with the emergence of greater complexity in the affairs of state and examine the concept of interdependence pervading the present international system. The scope of interdependence is so broad that it is often used to analyse the circumstances and conditions that shape and limit the course of human events. The concept of transnational relations suggests dynamic processes initiated and sustained by people. Hence the juxtaposition of the title and subtitle stresses a concern with those aspects of mounting interdependence that extend beyond changing physical realities into the realms of individual experience, collective endeavour and by group interaction.
Beyond Sovereignty Issues for a Global Agenda, Maryann K. Cusimano looks at the trans-sovereign problems, which shape the international relations agenda of the post-Cold war world and challenge the inviolability of state borders leading to unilateral responses. Environmental threats, refugee flows, terrorism and nuclear smuggling are some of these phenomena, which defy traditional understanding of sovereignty. Trans-sovereign problems are 'problems which transcend state boundaries in ways over which states have little control and which cannot be solved by individual state actions alone'. Non-state actors such as non-governmental organisations, intergovernmental organisation, multinational corporations and international crimes syndicates are important players in both creating and addressing trans-sovereign issues.

David B Bobrow' s International Relations New approaches, explores the search for and adoption of new concepts and techniques for international relations analysis which have been part of the general process of change in the social sciences. Among the signs of that change are increased interdisciplinary intellectual co-operation and increased acceptance of scientific methods. Three sets of factors have shaped changes in international relations analysis, namely, intellectual objections to what is being done, concerns with current international problems, and opportunities created by new technology and research funds. None of these variables by themselves would have yielded the changes, which have occurred in analysing international relations.

In Terrorism, Walter Laqueur discusses the doctrine of systematic terrorism, the sociology of terrorist groups, the current interpretations of terrorism, its common patterns, motives and aims and lastly the efficacy of terrorism. The Anatomy of Terrorism by David E. Long deals with the component elements of terrorism such as, the definition
of terrorism; the motivations behind terrorist acts; the typology of groups engaged in terrorism; the sources of support; and the way in which the governments organise to combat terrorism. To understand terrorist behaviour, Long tries to analyse the social psychology of the terrorist groups as well as to the social, political, economic and operational environment within which particular terrorist groups operate.

Bruce Hoffman's *Inside Terrorism* focuses on the salient and important trends in terrorism both past and present as to explain why terrorist do what they do and sheds light on the likely future patterns and potential ties. Edited by Walter Reich, *Origins of Terrorism, Psychologies Ideologies Theologies States of Mind*, focuses on the psychology of terrorism. It develops two approaches namely, the analysis of strategy and as well as analysis of psychology to account for most instances and forms of terrorist behaviour. In *Terrorism Threat and Response* Eric Morris and Allan Hoe discuss threats of a modern terrorist and their impact on the society at large. Relatively small groups possess an ability to destroy and to cause trouble and strife to a larger population.

**Empirical Studies**

In his *Terrorism in the 1980's*, Edgar O'Balance had chosen five terrorist organisations to examine the prevailing spectrum of terrorism. International terrorism reached its new heights 1970s and began to decline in early 1980s, only to rise again from mid-1980s. He studies their aims, motivations, and tactics and how various security forces have responded to counter the threats they pose. Annamarie Oliverio in *The State of Terror* focuses not only on the acts of terrorism by terrorists but on their portrayal and manipulation by others and particularly on the media's construction of terrorism. By comparing the Italian and American state and media presentation of the Achille Laura
and TWA cases, Oliverio explains how terrorism is presented differently in accordance with differing state interests. According to the author, 'terrorism is a construct that is best understood as a relative rhetoric of the state, intrinsic to state craft.'

The notion that the age of terrorism is fading is contended in the book *The Age of Terrorism and the International Political System* by Adrian Guelke, partly because of the changing meanings and applications of the term terrorism and partly because of the changes of the policy by governments in their handling of clandestine violence by small groups. The book begins with an analysis of the concept of terrorism and finally explores the relationship between the age of terrorism and the nature of the international political system. *International terrorism -National regional and Global Perspectives*, edited by Yonah Alexander revolves around the manifestations of terrorism. Modern terror is contradistinction to its older precedents has introduced a new breed of warfare in terms of technology, victimisation and threat response. The theme of *The Terrorism Industry* by Herman O'Sullivan is that the designation of terrorist is a highly political choice and that visibility, attention, indignation and counter-terrorist actions in the west follow political and self-serving agenda.

In *The Age of Terrorism* Walter Laqueur emphases on issues, which are of key importance, namely the doctrine of systematic terrorism, sociology of terrorist group, current interpretation, common patterns, motives, aims and efficacy of terrorism. In the years to come, he warns of the danger of escalation, the possibility that terrorism may trigger off a full-scale war. The question of potential technological response and the role governments must play in thwarting both domestic and transnational terrorism are discussed in *Terrorism Threat, Reality, Response* by Robert H. Kupperman and Darrel M.
Trent. It surveys the technology and organisation of the terrorists and ways and means to counter them. It also delves into important technological and management issues that must be addressed if terrorism is to be kept within tolerable boundaries.

**Research Questions**

1. What are the principal debates on international terrorism?
2. What are the emerging norms and principles of the evolving regime?
3. Does the absence of a universal definition of terrorism undermine the regime?
4. In what ways have the end of Cold War and the attacks of 11 September 2001 had a bearing on the evolution of a regime on international terrorism?
5. What is the present state of the international regime on terrorism?

**Hypothesis**

International terrorism has been at least from the end of World War-II a prominent feature of international relations and thus an evolution of a regime on international terrorism was inevitable. Conflicting interests amongst states precluded an international consensus on the definition of terrorism. Coupled with the difficulties in determining the identity of the perpetrators, the presence of non-state actors has made the evolution of a regime that much more complex. Moreover, the ongoing technological revolution has broadened the scope intensity and lethality of terrorism. Under these circumstances the Western powers especially the US who were the prime victims of terrorism, have played a pre-eminent role in the evolution of a regime on Terrorism. This hypothesis, therefore, would reinforce the modified structural realist approach to regimes.
The continuing problem of terrorism and the absence of an international mechanism for military action have generated new interests in a number of countries towards finding a middle ground. When an effective mechanism is in place, unilateral counter-terrorist actions might become politically costlier when compared to a multilateral response. In the meantime, more states are seeing an advantage in building a multilateral consensus around their own counter-terrorism polices and through multilateral forums, enforcement actions can be broadened, amplified and strengthened.

**Methodology and Sources**

The proposed study is both theoretical and analytical in nature. This interface between regime theory and the issue area of terrorism is based on primary sources on terrorism as well as secondary literature. Bilateral, multilateral and international agreements and documents available in the World Wide Web have been used. The publication of agencies such as United Nations, European Union, and NAM and other regional agencies have also been consulted.

**Summary of Chapters**

The thesis has been organised into five subsequent chapters. The second chapter on *The History of International Terrorism* deals with the origin, birth and history of terrorism and its evolution in five distinct phases. Beginning with the origin of the word terror and terrorism, the history of terrorism from first known instances until the mid 20th century is traced. It also tracks the transcendence of terrorism across national boundaries followed by an examination of terrorism in the immediate post World War years. Also
the changes, which have taken place in international terrorism following the end of the Cold War, are examined here.

The third chapter on Debates on International Terrorism studies various debates that have spanned the discourse on terrorism and the concurrent definitional problem that has afflicted the study of terrorism. Given the manifold dimension of international terrorism, varying perceptions of this issue has led to a large range of deliberations and discussions. An attempt has been made to understand the salient trends and important characteristics of terrorism. The various debates surrounding terrorism and other forms of political violence have also been examined. Finally sums the characteristic of terrorism have been summed up here.

The fourth chapter on The Evolving Regime on Terrorism evaluates the regime on terrorism, beginning with attempts undertaken in early 1930s towards the evolution of a regime and provides a broad overview of existing international conventions that constitute the regime. It also critically evaluates the limitations and shortcomings of the existing regime and finally appraises the contributions made by India towards the international regime.

The penultimate chapter on The regime after 11 September, 2001 focuses on the events of 11 September, 2001, which dramatically transformed the regime beyond recognition. The US, the prime target of the attacks, organised, assembled and led a concerted international effort to circumvent erstwhile lethargy and indifference and to evolve a broad global consensus on terrorism. Effectively using the organs of the United Nations, it managed to modify, upgrade and strengthen various treaties and arrangements that were already in place. Capitalising on the international outrage, it even altered some
of the basic parameters governing international terrorism. This chapter deals with various post-11 September, 2001 international efforts towards strengthening the international regime and the emerging challenges that face the regime.

The main arguments of the thesis are summarised and concluded in the sixth chapter.