

International Journal Research Publication Analysis

Page: 01-14

FROM SURGICAL STRIKES TO LEGAL STRICTURES: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY OF INDIA'S STRINGENT ANTI-TERRORISM POLICY UNDER THE NARENDRA MODI GOVERNMENT

***Aditya Verma**

Research Scholar, Department of Political Science & International Relations Dr Ram
Manohar Lohia Awadh University, India.

Article Received: 11 June 2026

***Corresponding Author: Aditya Verma**

Article Revised: 01 July 2026

Research Scholar, Department of Political Science & International Relations Dr Ram

Published on: 21 July 2026

Manohar Lohia Awadh University, India.

DOI: <https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijrpa.2892>

ABSTRACT

Terrorism, as a global challenge, has become a central theme of security policies in national and international relations of the 21st century. It not only defines the boundaries of nations but also deeply affects their strategic, political and social systems. This paper aims to provide a holistic analysis of the counter-terrorism strategies adopted by the Narendra Modi government after 2014, covering decisive actions such as surgical strikes, air strikes, NIA amendments, reinterpretation of UAPA (Unlawful Activities Prevention Act) and abrogation of Article 370 from Jammu and Kashmir. It uses both primary and secondary data to fill an important void in the existing research literature, where political, social and legal analysis of counter-terrorism policies has often been done separately. Our research integrates all these perspectives to provide a holistic perspective.

The innovation of this research lies in the fact that it reviews not only the strategic consequences of counter-terrorism actions but also their social impact, human rights situation, impact on minority communities and international diplomatic responses. This research contributes to the understanding of society as to how counter-terrorism policies are not limited to security alone but also have far-reaching effects on social polarisation, national integration, civil liberties and perception of minorities.

KEYWORDS: Terrorism, Government, Nation-State, Security, Religion, Nationalism.

INTRODUCTION

Terrorism has become such a serious challenge in the structure of the modern nation-state that it not only affects internal security but also obstructs the path of global peace and development. The terrorist attacks in America on 11 September 2001 not only changed the direction of global politics but also redefined the priorities of international security strategies, and gave rise to a common wave against terrorism across the world. The history of terrorism in India is as old as the development of national security policy against it has been complex and dynamic. Terrorism is a global problem that has engulfed many countries of the world. India, being a multicultural and multi-religious country, has been grappling with the challenge of terrorism for years. Terrorism is a complex and multi-faceted subject which is not easy to define as it has different meanings in different contexts. Terrorism generally means the use of violence or force to accomplish a political, religious or social objective.(Hoffman, 2017) There are many forms and types of terrorism, mainly including domestic terrorism, international terrorism, religious terrorism, political terrorism, and state-sponsored terrorism.(Crenshaw, 1981) Different countries have understood the definition and forms of terrorism differently. In the United States, terrorism is viewed from a national security perspective, in which it is considered a serious crime that should be controlled by stringent laws.(Sheehan, 2007) In European countries, it is viewed in terms of human rights and justice, where the protection of civil rights is a priority.(Richardson, 2006) In India, terrorism is seen as a security challenge, especially in divided regions such as Jammu and Kashmir, where it has profound social and political impact.(Subrahmanyam, 2014) After the year 2014, a significant change has been seen in India's strategy towards terrorism, with strong military action not only against terrorists but also against states, organizations and ideologies that directly or indirectly support terrorism.(Tellis, 2016; Rajagopalan, 2020) The current government's counter-terrorism measures include the enforcement of stringent laws, intensification of military operations, and promotion of international cooperation. After attacks like the 2016 Parliament attack, Pathankot attack, and Pulwama, there was a special focus on empowering security agencies and effectively eliminating terrorists. Apart from this, ending special privileges in the Kashmir Valley and imposing strict security measures were also part of this strategy.(Kumar, 2018) Along with this, the Indian government has also strengthened anti-terrorism laws. Amendments made in the 'UAPA' (Unlawful Activities Prevention Act) have legalized the process of identifying terrorists as individuals and seizing their assets. This policy provides more efficiency to the security agencies, but at the same time raises questions about civil rights and transparency of the legal process.(Bhushan, 2021;

Amnesty International, 2020) The Modi government's strategy against terrorism can be seen as based on three major pillars—diplomatic pressure, military counteraction, and strengthening the internal security structure. In particular, actions such as the 'surgical strike' (2016) and the 'air strike' (2019) reflected a proactive and preventive change in India's strategic policy.(Tellis, 2020) Along with this, India also played an active role in garnering diplomatic support against terrorism on international forums. On forums such as the United Nations, Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and BRICS, India has tried to expose the sponsors of terrorism, especially in the context of Pakistan.(Bajpai, 2021) The anti-terrorism policies of the current government have also been deeply influenced by "nationalism". In the name of protecting the unity and sovereignty of the nation, stringent laws gained social legitimacy. This nationalism was often used to stir public sentiments, which gave popular support to the anti-terrorism campaign. As an example of this, the public reactions after the 'Pulwama attack' can be seen, when a widespread atmosphere of war-oriented nationalism was created.(Varshney, (2020)

India's Counter Terrorism Policy: A Historical Perspective

The initial contours of India's counter-terrorism policy became clear after independence, when the country gave priority to combating anti-national elements and separatist activities.(Bajpai, 2002) After independence, India adopted several strategies to combat terrorism to ensure its internal security as a sovereign nation.(Gupta, 2010) After 1947, the then government in the country implemented stringent security measures in view of armed conflict in the Kashmir region and threats from across the border.(Bhardwaj, 1990) These early decades were a period of formation of the Indian security apparatus, in which internal security and intelligence departments were organized to ensure the integration of the country.(Kapur, 2005) India identified terrorism as an internal security threat in the 1950s.(Wilkinson, 2006) In the 1950s and 60s, India faced insurgency and separatist activities in areas such as Punjab, Assam and Nagaland, which led to a more focused and consolidated counter-terrorism policy. India often used military and police forces against these movements. Under the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act, 1958 (AFSPA), this law gives the army special powers such as arrests and searches without warrants to combat terrorism and insurgency in areas such as Assam, Manipur, Nagaland. This made it clear that combating terrorism could not be limited to law enforcement agencies alone but also required strategic and diplomatic measures.(Chakravarti, 2007 & Sarkar 2010) In the 1970s and 1980s, militancy and separatist movements in states such as Punjab and Assam led to the

need to further strengthen India's counter-terrorism framework. During this period, stringent legal provisions were implemented under the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act (TADA) 1985, but due to complaints of misuse of this law and human rights violations, it was abolished in 1995.(Nair, 2004) The nature of terrorism is changed in the 1990s, especially after the 1993 Mumbai blasts and the 1999 Kargil War, when the government focused on domestic terrorism as well as the role of cross-border terrorism.(Kumar, 2010) During this period India promoted international cooperation against terrorism, especially with the United States, Russia and European countries for intelligence sharing and partnership in counter-terrorism efforts.(Narang, 2014) India further hardened its counter-terrorism strategy after the 9/11 attacks on the United States in 2001. After the 2001 Parliament attack, the Indian government introduced stringent anti-terrorism laws such as the Prevention of Terrorism Act (POTA), which was aimed at punishing terrorists, although the law was also accused of human rights violations.(Singh, 2010) POTA was intended to punish terrorists quickly and effectively, but it was also misused and repealed in 2004.(Rao, 2006) The Akshardham Temple attack of 2002 is also particularly notable. In this attack on the Akshardham Temple located in Gandhinagar, Gujarat on 24 September 2002, terrorists not only carried out explosions in the temple complex but also opened fire, killing 33 people and injuring many. The attack was a malicious attempt to disrupt religious and communal harmony, which the then government took very seriously.(Human Rights Watch, 2003) In addition, the government gave security agencies more powers to prevent and investigate terrorist incidents.(Chowdhury, 2012) Meanwhile, several bomb blasts in Dadar and elsewhere in Mumbai in 2006 also demonstrated the magnitude of terrorism. On 11 July 2006, 187 people were injured and more than 10 were killed in the bomb blasts in Mumbai's Dadar area.(Samar, 2007) The government gave security agencies more powers to prevent bombings and stepped up efforts to improve intelligence after these incidents. The 2008 Mumbai attacks had a profound impact on India's counterterrorism policies. The attack not only raised questions about the accountability of security agencies but also highlighted the need for coordination on counter-terrorism at the national and international levels.(Verma, 2010) India subsequently established the National Investigation Agency (NIA), aimed at centralizing the investigation and prosecution of complex terrorism cases.(Kapoor, 2012) The NIA established better coordination among states to improve counter-terrorism cases, thereby improving efficiency in law enforcement.(Singh & Sharma, 2013) Studies of these terrorist attacks and the responses of governments of the time show that terrorism is a complex problem that requires multi-faceted strategies to address it, and all governments tried to adopt

those strategies legally within their country. These security policies prioritized the importance of comprehensive reform, institutional capacity building, and international cooperation. India learned from this period that coordinated and sustained efforts at the legal, institutional, and diplomatic levels are necessary in the fight against terrorism.(Hoffman, 2009)

From Surgical Strikes to Legal Restrictions: Narendra Modi Government's Counter Terrorism Policy

India has been facing cross-border terrorism for decades in the form of attacks in Jammu and Kashmir, Punjab and urban centres by Pakistan-backed groups. India's counter-terrorism policy has seen a marked shift since Narendra Modi became Prime Minister in 2014. Unlike previous governments, the Modi government has adopted an aggressive and retaliatory approach, which has been clearly reflected not only in retaliation to terrorist incidents but also in legal and diplomatic steps towards eliminating the structural roots of terrorism. This shift is not just strategic but also ideological—with national security being viewed not just as a military policy but as the primary legal and political responsibility of the state.(Cohen, 2019) It has not only strengthened defensive measures but also adopted offensive strategies.(Ghosh, 2019) The Modi government's counter-terrorism policy has been characterised by a holistic strategy coordinating diplomacy, military action and internal security laws.(Pant & Joshi, 2021) Two main pillars have emerged in the current government's strategy—first, military retaliatory actions such as surgical strikes and airstrikes; second, legal and diplomatic crackdown on organisations and networks supporting terrorism.(Tellis, 2019) After the killing of 18 Indian soldiers in the Uri terror incident in 2016, the Indian Army attacked terrorist launchpads across the Line of Control in what was called a “surgical strike”. The first major move by the current government was the ‘surgical strike’ carried out by the Indian Army in Pakistan Occupied Kashmir (POK) in 2016. This was the first time India officially acknowledged that it was sending its troops across the border to destroy terror launch pads. This action established the doctrine of “Proactive Deterrence” in India's counter-terrorism policy. This event also signaled to the international community that India no longer had a reactive, but a decisive strategic approach.(Ladwig III, 2015) This strategy has become more robust in the second term of the Modi government. The airstrike carried out by the Indian Air Force on Jaish-e-Mohammed's bases in Balakot after the Pulwama terror attack in 2019 is considered the culmination of this policy. This was the first time that India has taken military action in the interior of Pakistan, not across the Line of Control but by crossing the international border. This is not just a military response, but the

beginning of a new era in India's counter-terrorism policy.(Pant & Joshi, 2019) The present government has also adopted a 'Zero Tolerance Policy' against terrorism in Kashmir. After the removal of Article 370 in 2019, the central government has further intensified anti-terror operations along with development in the valley. Security forces were given extensive powers, as a result of which many major terrorist leaders have been killed or captured. Among them, Burhan Wani, Riyaz Naiku and Naveed Jatt are prominent.(Pande, 2020) Apart from this, through operations like 'Operation All Out', intensive action has been taken against local and foreign terrorists in Jammu and Kashmir. By establishing coordination between the Indian Army, CRPF and Jammu and Kashmir Police, anti-terrorism operations have been made more intense and effective.(Chari, 2020) While the UAPA amendment on the one hand gave more powers to the investigating agencies, on the other hand there was also criticism by civil liberties and human rights organizations that this law could become a means of misusing power. Nevertheless, the government has presented it as an indispensable weapon to deal with terrorism.(Amnesty International, 2020) But the surgical strike of the year 2025 (Operation Sindoor) has given it a more mature and comprehensive dimension strategically. The aggressive defense policy that the Narendra Modi government has laid the foundation of after 2014 has appeared to mature at all three levels - technical, military, and diplomatic - in 2025. This strike was not a limited military action, but a multi-pronged campaign that included coordination of cyber surveillance, international communications, and domestic law enforcement. After this strike of 2025, India also implemented a special anti-terrorism law 'Terror Finance Prevention and Digital Surveillance Act - 2025', which prescribes measures to prevent the help received by terrorism through digital transactions and cryptocurrency. Under this act, strict monitoring of social media accounts, blockchain wallets and foreign funding channels related to terrorism has been given legal validity.(Mehta, 2025) The current government has emphasized on the production of indigenous technology and equipment to combat terrorism under the 'Make in India' policy in the defense sector. Indigenization has been given priority in drones, night vision equipment, AI-based surveillance and border fencing. This policy not only enhances self-reliance, but also strengthens long-term strategic capabilities.(Pant & Joshi, 2020) Along with this, India has increased counter-terrorism cooperation with Israel, France and Russia, which includes intelligence sharing, joint exercises and technical exchanges. In particular, "unmanned aerial vehicles" (UAVs), "Spike" missiles and cyber surveillance technology have been acquired from Israel, which has strengthened anti-terrorism capabilities.(Levitt, 2022) Information technology has also been used extensively in the anti-terrorism policy of the Narendra Modi government. The 'National

Intelligence Grid (NATGRID)' has been revived, which has created an integrated network by connecting data from various security agencies to prevent the activities of potential terrorists. This system works similar to the US's 'PRISM' and the UK's 'Temora' system.(Lal, 2019) Along with this, India has increased the use of technological surveillance systems such as drones, satellite imaging and smart fencing in its border areas. These steps have been taken under the 'Comprehensive Integrated Border Management System' (CIBMS) to prevent cross-border infiltration.(Singh, 2021) Another important initiative is to give the NIA (National Investigation Agency) extensive powers in interstate and international matters. In 2019, the NIA was also given the right to investigate abroad, so that it can investigate anti-India terrorist attacks abroad. This power is similar to the functioning of organizations like the FBI (USA) and Mossad (Israel).(Joshi, 2020) The current Modi government has not limited the fight against terrorism to internal security alone, but has linked it to the broader discourse of “nationalism” and “national security”. Prime Minister Modi and Home Minister Amit Shah have made it clear from several platforms that “the elimination of terrorism is essential for the unity and integrity of the nation”, and forces supporting it will be severely punished.(Menon, 2018) Apart from legal restrictions, the Modi government has also formulated policies against hate speech and radicalism to stabilize the country’s socio-political environment. For this, special security forces have been created in various states and awareness campaigns have been conducted through media and educational institutions. In this context, Sumitra Dev writes that "Amid the growing threat of terrorism in India, the policy of social unity and inclusive development has become an essential part of the anti-terrorism strategy.(Dev, 2021) Apart from military and legal measures, the Modi government has also given importance to development schemes at the local level, understanding the social and economic causes of terrorism. Efforts were made to promote employment, education and infrastructure in sensitive areas like Kashmir and Northeast India, so that youth are not attracted to terrorism. This policy is part of a comprehensive fight against terrorism, which involves not only the use of military force but also socio-economic reconstruction. The current Narendra Modi government's counter-terrorism policy represents a mixed approach, combining military power, legal strictness, technological innovation, and international diplomacy. This policy remains a subject of criticism as well as its effectiveness, especially when it is examined relative to democratic values and civil liberties.(Wilkinson & Chhibber, 2022)

International impact of India's counter-terrorism policy

The current Narendra Modi government has treated terrorism not just as an internal security concern but as a global challenge that requires extensive international cooperation. This approach has shaped India's counter-terrorism policy and security coalition building, especially against neighbouring countries, which has significantly changed India's role on the global stage. India has played an active role in international engagements such as the United Nations, Interpol, and other multinational forums regarding cross-border terrorism with Pakistan. The Modi government adopted a policy of "zero tolerance" against terrorism, giving a clear message of India's strength against terrorism. Under this policy, India has also kept a close watch on the financial networks of terrorist groups and has established intensive cooperation with the US, European countries and the East to disrupt terrorist funding disasters globally.(Choudhary & Singh, 2019)

The surgical strike (2016), Balakot air strike (2019) and Operation Sindoor (2025) against terrorists by the current government have established India's military capability and resolve globally. These actions have demonstrated the firmness of India's national security policy along with cracking down on Pakistan-based terrorist attacks. These claims have not only affected the regional power balance but also global security, as many Indian activists have encouraged terrorists to increase cooperation with India for atrocity networks.(Hoffman, 2017) The Modi government has played a key role in the detente against the international community. Due to its strong stand against Pakistan's principles, India has not only strengthened national security but also bolstered a moral and political claim on the issue of global turmoil. For this, the Modi government has constantly tried to build and implement consensus against it in various international forums including the United Nations. For example, India has strengthened the counter-terrorism partnership with the US, Russia, France, Israel and many countries in the Middle East, which promotes cooperation and intelligence-sharing. This strategy has led to India's international image emerging as a prestigious and globalized one, which stands for regional and global stability.(Jones, 2021) The current Narendra Modi government's fierce anti-communism stance has affected India's imports with neighboring countries like China and Pakistan. India's tough policy against the Republicans against Pakistan has increased tensions between the two countries, but it gives India an opportunity to protect its policy.(Patel, 2021 & Zhang, 2023) At the same time, border disputes and security concerns with China are also deeply linked to the Modi government's anti-invasion strategy. Both of these have changed the geopolitical aspects of South Asia due to India's strong and clear stand with the largest neighboring

countries.(Chandra, 2020; Lee & Roy, 2022) India has promoted influential initiatives in collaboration with forums like the United Nations, Interpol, Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) for anti-invasion measures. India has attempted to strengthen international legal and security banks to eliminate criminal funding, restaurant stalking and jihadi networks.(Kumar and Banerjee, 2022; Ahmed, 2020) In this context, India's role has also included regional security cooperation, especially with the group of Afghanistan, Nepal and Bangladesh. India's prestigious hegemony with the US has enhanced cooperation on power and security cooperation in the Indo-Pacific region, especially through the QUAD (Quadrilateral Security Dialogue). Similarly, India has also promoted counter-terrorism technology and intelligence cooperation with countries like Israel, France, Russia, thereby strengthening its global security capabilities.(Sharma and Dasgupta, 2023; Cohen, 2017) A profound impact of the Modi government's anti-extremism committees on the global level is also that India has been placed at the forefront of the United Nations Security Council regarding the extremist threat.(Bajpai & Gokhale, 2020) Additionally, India has also focused on Romanian RIST students in aggressive counterinsurgency operations, recruiting them to join global corporate firms and selling them internationally.(Singh, 2019)

CONCLUSION

This research paper analyses India's new approach to terrorism and presents a comprehensive discourse that can be useful at all three levels of education, policy-making and social consciousness and can serve as a guide for security policy makers, legislators and civil servants to better understand the impact and limitations of counter-terrorism strategies. The direction and intensity of change in India's counter-terrorism policy should be analysed not only from the administrative perspective but also at the strategic and ideological level. Under Narendra Modi's regime, terrorism has been defined not only as a law and order problem but as an "anti-national war". This ideological background became the basis of policies, which are visible in "surgical strikes", "air strikes", "UPA amendments", "extension of NIA powers" and "abrogation of Kashmiri Article 370". Unconventional weapons like information warfare and social media monitoring were also used unprecedentedly during this period. The Indian government has strengthened various 'digital surveillance' tools such as NATGRID and Cyber Crime Prevention Against Women and Children (CCPWC), which have helped prevent the spread of radicalism through digital means. The study also shows that counter-terrorism strategies not only include military operations, but also measures such as data surveillance, cyber intelligence gathering and monitoring of foreign funding to directly hit the

sources of terror. Along with this, cooperation with international bodies like FATF (Financial Action Task Force) has been successful in putting pressure on countries like Pakistan, due to which India's policy has also received global support. However, some critical aspects of these policies have also come to the fore - such as the potential impact on civil liberties, allegations of suppression of opposition political parties or ideologies and the possibility of misuse of laws like UAPA. Despite this, seen in the broader perspective of national security, the current counter-terrorism policy has created confidence in the public about security and established India's global image as a strong nation. The aim of this paper is not only to evaluate the success of tough measures against terrorism but also to highlight the need to strike a balance between democratic values and national security. Thus, this paper provides a platform for discussion for civil society and human rights activists.

REFERENCE

1. Ahmed, N. (2020). United Nations and Counter-Terrorism: India's Strategic Engagement. *International Relations*, 14(3), 300-315.
2. Amnesty International (2020). Human Rights in India: Report.
3. Ashley, Tellis. (2019). Balakot, Deterrence, and Risk: How This India-Pakistan Crisis Will Shape the Next. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
4. Bajpai, K. (2021). *India's Diplomacy in the Age of Modi*. Oxford University Press.
5. Bajpai, K. (2020). *India's Security and Counterterrorism*. Oxford University Press.
6. Bajpai, K., & Gokhale, N. (2020). India's UN Diplomacy on Terrorism.. *Journal of International Relations*, 44(1), 77-92.
7. Bajpai, Kanti. (2002). *India's Approach to Terrorism: Strategy and Structure*. India Review.
8. Bhardwaj, R. (1990). *Security Challenges in Post-Independence India*. Delhi University Press.
9. Bhushan, A. (2021). UAPA and Fundamental Rights. *Economic & Political Weekly*.
10. Chakrabarti, P. (2007). Internal Security and Counterterrorism in India. *Security Studies Quarterly*, 12(4), 43-67.
11. Chandra, M. (2020). Geopolitics of South Asia: India's Strategic Posture. *Asian Political Review*, 7(2), 190-208.
12. Chari, P.R. (2020). *India's Kashmir Strategy under Modi*. Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies.

13. Chaudhary, R., & Singh, P. (2019). Cross-Border Terrorism and India's Diplomatic Engagement. *International Journal of Political Science*, 8(1), 34-52.
14. Chopra, R. (2021). Human Rights and Counterterrorism in India", Human Rights Watch Reports.
15. Chowdhury, P. (2012). Counterterrorism and Intelligence in South Asia. *South Asian Affairs*, 23(3), 78-95.
16. Cohen, S. (2017). India's Military Cooperation with Israel and France. *Journal of Defense Studies*, 11(2), 120-135.
17. Crenshaw, Martha. (1981). The Causes of Terrorism," *Comparative Politics*. Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 379-399.1
18. De. (2021). Contemporary Indian Politics.
19. Ghosh, S. (2019). Modi's Security Doctrine: A Paradigm Shift. (*Indian Defence Review*).
20. Green, D. (2018). Global Counterterrorism Networks. *Journal of Strategic Studies*.
21. Gupta, A. (2010). Counterterrorism in India: Historical Perspectives. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
22. Hoffman, B. (2009). *Inside Terrorism*. Columbia University Press.
23. Hoffman, B. (2017). India's Surgical Strikes and Regional Security. *Journal of Strategic Studies*.
24. Hoffman, Bruce. (2017). *Inside Terrorism*, Columbia University Press. p. 23.
25. India: Gujarat – Human Rights Concerns. (2003). Human Rights Watch.
26. Jones, S.(2019). India's Counterterrorism Diplomacy. *International Affairs Journal*.
27. Joshi, M. (2019). Balakot Air Strikes and India's Counterterrorism Policy. *Indian Defence Review*.
28. Joshi, S. (2020). NIA and the New Mandate. *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 55, Issue 42.
29. Kapoor, D. (2012). Role of NIA in India's Counterterrorism Framework. *Journal of Indian Law and Society*, 3, 45-61.
30. Kapur, A. (2005). India's Intelligence Framework: Historical Evolution. *Journal of South Asian Studies*, 12(3), 45-62.
31. Kumar, A. (2010). Evolving Terrorism Threats in South Asia. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 33(4), 519-538.
32. Kumar, A. (2023). *India and the UN Counterterrorism Policy*. Routledge.

33. Kumar, R. (2018). *Counterterrorism Strategies in India: The Modi Era*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
34. Kumar, S & Banerjee, P. (2022). Multilateral Cooperation in Combating Terrorism: India's Role. *Global Policy Journal*, 13(2), 201-218.
35. Kumar, S. (2017). India's Counterterrorism Strategy Under Modi Government. *Journal of Asian Security and International Affairs*, 4(3), 245-267.
36. Ladwig III, Walter C. (2015). Indian Military Modernization and Conventional Deterrence in South Asia. *Journal of Strategic Studies*.
37. Lal, R. (2019). Digital Surveillance and Indian Counter-Terrorism. *Journal of Intelligence Studies*.
38. Lee, S. (2022). Security vs Rights: The Indian Dilemma. *Asian Journal of International Law*.
39. Levitt, M. (2022). Counter-Terrorism Technologies and Indo-Israel Partnership. *Middle East Quarterly*.
40. Li, X., & Roy, D. (2022). Border Conflicts and Security Policies in South Asia. *Journal of International Security*, 33(4), 402-419.
41. Mehta, P. (2004). POTA and Its Impact on the Indian Legal System. *Indian Journal of Political Science*, 65(1), 93-101.
42. Menon, R. (2018). The Politics of Nationalism and Counter-Terrorism. *Contemporary South Asia*, Vol. 26, No. 3.
43. Nair, S. (2004). Human Rights and Counter-Terrorism in India: The Case of TADA. *International Journal of Human Rights*, 8(2).
44. Narang, V. (2014). *India and Global Counterterrorism*. Routledge.
45. Pande, Aparna. (2020). *Making India Great: The Promise of a Reluctant Global Power*. HarperCollins India.
46. Pant, H. V. & Joshi, A. (2021). India's Counterterrorism Approach under Modi. ORF Occasional Paper.
47. Pant, H. V., & Joshi, Y. (2020). Indigenisation and India's Defence Sector. ORF Occasional Paper, Observer Research Foundation.
48. Pant, Harsh V., and Joshi, Ritika. (2019). Balakot Air Strikes and India's Cross-Domain Deterrence. ORF Issue Brief No. 298.
49. Patel, D. (2021). India-Pakistan Relations and Terrorism. *South Asian Conflict Studies*, 28(1), 55-70.

50. Patel, R. (2021). India's Strategic Partnerships and Counterterrorism. *International Affairs Journal*.
51. Rajagopalan, R. (2020). *India's National Security: A Reader*. Oxford University Press.
52. Rao, S. (2006). Challenges in Counterterrorism Legislation." *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, 3(2), 203-217.
53. Richardson, Louise. (2006). *What Terrorists Want*, Penguin Books. p. 58.
54. Roberts, K. (2021). Strategic Partnerships in Asia: India and the West. *International Security Studies*, 45(1), 78-95.
55. Sarkar, S. (2010). Counterterrorism Policy in India. *Indian Journal of Political Science*, 71(2), 279-296.
56. Sharma, R. & Dasgupta, S. (2023). India's Defense Diplomacy in the 21st Century. *Defense Studies*, 23(3), 250-270.
57. Sharma, R.K. (2021). India's Global Security Posture. *South Asian Studies*.
58. Sheehan, Michael A. (2007). *Terrorism and Counter-terrorism*, Polity Press. p. 15.
59. Singh, A. (2021). Smart Borders and National Security. *IDS Occasional Paper Series*.
60. Singh, R. & Sharma, A. (2013). Coordination among Security Agencies in India. *International Journal of Security Studies*, 7(1), 78-92.
61. Singh, R. (2006). Terrorism and Law Enforcement in India. *Journal of South Asian Studies*, 29(3), 345-367.
62. Singh, R. (2010). Legal Responses to Terrorism in India. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 8(2), 45-67.
63. Singh, R. (2019). Balancing Security and Human Rights in India's Counterterrorism. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 41(3), 656-675.
64. Smith, J. (2023). Leadership in Global Counterterrorism. *International Security Review*.
65. Subrahmanyam, K. (2014). *India's Security Challenges*, Manohar Publishers. p. 112.
66. Surgical Strikes: Army Hits Terror Launch Pads Across LoC. *Indian Express* (Sept 30, 2016).
67. Tellis, A. J. (2020). *Balancing Without Containment*.
68. Tellis, A. J. (2016). *India's Emerging Security Strategy*. Carnegie Endowment.
69. Varshney, A. (2020). *Nationalism and Terror: Political Exploitation of Security Threats in South Asia*. Cambridge University Press.
70. Verma, R. (2010). Mumbai Attacks and India's National Security Paradigm. *Strategic Analysis*, 34(6), 847-860.

71. Vijay, Samar. (2007). Bomb Blasts in Mumbai: Security Challenges and Policy Responses. South Asian Journal, 2007.
72. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/097168580700500202>
73. Wilkinson, S. (2006). Votes and Violence: Electoral Competition and Ethnic Riots in India. Cambridge University Press.
74. Zhang, L. (2023). India's Counter-Terrorism Policy and Sino-Indian Relations. Journal of Asian Geopolitics, 9(1), 14-29.