

## **Waking Up to New Variants of Terrors - 26/11 Attack**

### **What is the issue?**

\n\n

\n

- It is ten years since the 26/11 Mumbai terror attack carried out by Pakistan in 2008.

\n

- It is imperative that a relook at the Indian security establishment is taken, given the emergence of new variants of terror.

\n

\n\n

### **What are the recent instances of terror?**

\n\n

\n

- India and Mumbai city are no strangers to terror.

\n

- In 1993, over 250 people were killed in Mumbai in a series of coordinated bomb explosions.

\n

- It was attributed to Dawood Ibrahim, reportedly as retaliation for the demolition of the Babri Masjid.

\n

- In July 2006, bomb explosions in a number of suburban trains in Mumbai killed over 200 people and injured several more.

\n

- The most audacious terror attack till the 26/11 Mumbai terror incident was the attack on the Indian Parliament in 2001.

\n

- It was carried out by the Pakistan-based terror outfits, Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT) and Jaish-e-Mohammed (JeM).

\n

\n\n

### **What is the 21st Century scenario?**

\n\n

- \n
- Most of the 21st century terror attacks reflect a paradigmatic change in the tactics of asymmetric warfare, and the practice of violence.
- \n
- Terror attacks are being carried out across the world by al-Qaeda and its affiliates, the Islamic State, al-Shabaab, and similar terror outfits.
- \n
- They are certainly very different from those witnessed in the previous century.
- \n
- The 26/11 Mumbai terror attack is one of this kind and was an unprecedented exercise in violence.
- \n

\n\n

### **What is the case with 26/11?**

\n\n

- \n
- It involved not merely a well-trained terrorist group, but also backed by the resources of a state, viz. Pakistan.
- \n
- It was a case of 'war by other means', in which the authorities in Pakistan, the Inter-Services Intelligence Directorate, the Pakistani armed forces, were involved.
- \n
- Seldom has any terrorist group used such highly sophisticated, state-of-the-art communications, including Voice over Internet Protocol.
- \n
- Planning for the attack involved the use of a third country address.
- \n
- Handlers in Pakistan were given unfettered freedom to provide instructions to the terrorists during the entire four-day siege.
- \n
- The choice of the sea route aimed at deception and avoiding detection was again dictated by official agencies.
- \n
- The training regimen dictated by the Pakistani Special Forces involved
- \n

\n\n

- \n
- i. psychological indoctrination by highlighting atrocities on Muslims in India and other parts of the globe

- \n
- ii. basic and advanced combat training
- \n
- iii. commando training, training in weapons and explosives, swimming and sailing
- \n

\n\n

- \n
- A more unusual feature of the Mumbai attacks was the involvement of two U.S./Canadian nationals of Pakistani origin.
- \n
- They are David Headley (who at the time was a LeT operative) and Tahawwur Hussain Rana.
- \n
- The Mumbai terror attack went on for nearly four days, from the evening of November 26 to the morning of November 29.
- \n
- Seldom has a terrorist incident lasted this length of time, since the Munich Olympics massacre in 1972.
- \n
- From an Indian standpoint, it was perhaps for the first time that an operation of this nature involved
- \n

\n\n

- \n
- i. Rapid Action Force personnel
- \n
- ii. Marine Commandos (MARCOS)
- \n
- iii. the National Security Guard (NSG)
- \n
- iv. the Mumbai Police
- \n

\n\n

- \n
- As is now known, the Mumbai terror attack was not based on a sudden impulse.
- \n
- Several years of planning and preparation had preceded the attack, even as the Pakistani President, Pervez Musharraf, was talking peace with then Indian Prime Minister, Manmohan Singh.
- \n

\n\n

## **What were the shortfalls?**

\n\n

- \n• The Indian security establishment had failed to anticipate an attack of this nature and was not adequately prepared to deal with the situation.  
\n
- Secrecy was the very essence of this operation as plans were limited to a mere handful of persons.  
\n
- In the LeT hierarchy, apart from Hafiz Sayeed, only a few like Zakiur Rehman Lakhvi (chief military commander), Sajid Mir and Zarar Shah (communications chief) were privy to the operational plans.  
\n
- U.S. intelligence is said to have penetrated Zarar Shah's computer and possibly had far more details of the operation than were actually shared with Indian intelligence.  
\n

\n\n

## **What are the subsequent measures?**

\n\n

- \n• In the wake of the terror attack, several steps were initiated to streamline the security set-up.  
\n
- Coastal security was given high priority, and it is with the Navy/Coast Guard/marine police.  
\n
- A specialised agency to deal with terrorist offences, the National Investigation Agency, was set up and has been functioning from 2009.  
\n
- The National Intelligence Grid (NATGRID) has been constituted to create an appropriate database of security related information.  
\n
- Four new operational hubs for the NSG (National Security Guard) have been created to ensure rapid response to terror attacks.  
\n
- The Multi Agency Centre, which functions under the Intelligence Bureau, was further strengthened and its activities expanded.  
\n

- The Navy constituted a Joint Operations Centre to keep vigil over India's extended coastline.

\n

\n\n

## **What lies ahead?**

\n\n

\n

- Newer methodologies, newer daringly-executed concepts, and deeply laid plans of terrorist groups are a ground reality.
- \n
- So terrorism continues to be a major threat with modern refinements and terrorism mutating into a global franchise.
- \n
- One new variant is the concept of 'enabled terror' or 'remote controlled terror', viz. violence conceived and guided by a controller thousands of miles away.
- \n
- Internet-enabled terrorism and resort to remote plotting is thus the new threat.
- \n
- There are no ready-made answers to this; vigilance is important, but being ahead of these new age terror is even more vital.
- \n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu**

\n

