U.S.-INDIA COUNTERTERRORISM COOPERATION:
DEEPENING THE PARTNERSHIP

THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM, NON-PROLIFERATION AND
TRADE

SEPTEMBER 14, 2011

STATEMENT OF FRANK J. CILLUFFO
DIRECTOR, HOMELAND SECURITY POLICY INSTITUTE
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Chairman Royce, Ranking Member Sherman, and distinguished Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today. US-India counterterrorism cooperation in the face of a shared threat has not been all that it could be, to the detriment of both nations. Your leadership in this area is to be commended, as it should help bolster the security posture of America and India alike. Terrorism is a transnational threat, which to some extent must be tackled through transnational solutions. This hearing is, therefore, an important step in the right direction.

India and the United States share similar histories in regard to homeland security events and counterterrorism practices. Two tragic and catastrophic events, the September 11 attacks in the United States and the "26-11" Mumbai attacks in India, illuminated previously unseen homeland security issues and refocused each nation's strategic consciousness. As in the United States, an evolving terror threat has fueled calls for reform in the internal security architecture of India.

It is vital that the United States work with the Indian government to strengthen the efficacy of their internal security architecture and to develop common best practices and intelligence sharing protocols among US and Indian law enforcement, intelligence, and security services. In short, US and Indian officials should commit themselves to forging the practitioner-to-practitioner relationships necessary to counter the terror threat to India, to the United States, and around the globe.

I do not make these recommendations lightly and I recognize the challenges such pose at the operational and strategic level — especially in regard to Pakistan. Yet, I am equally cognizant of the fact that India is a key democratic ally in an unstable region dominated by extremism. This extremism presents itself in multiple forms. Not only jihadists and Islamist separatists operating in Jammu and Kashmir, but also Maoists in the Naxalite region in the east, the re-emergence of the Sikh terrorist organization Babbar Khalsa and to a lesser extent the Tamil Tigers (Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, LTTE) all threaten Indian internal security. Furthermore, the threats India faces from extremist networks within the country and beyond, affect not only Indian public safety, but directly threaten US national security interests — jihadi extremism posing the greatest threat.

Yes, enhanced cooperation with India will complicate US cooperation with Pakistan. The truth is, however, that American-Pakistani cooperation is erratic, and varies based on the political climate and bureaucratic interests in Islamabad, with attitudes and actions varying between and across agencies. The cooperative relationships that do exist at the practitioner level with our Pakistani partners will survive, even if the political rhetoric becomes more strained — self-interest will ensure such. In the wake of bin Laden's death, when U.S.-Pakistani relations seemed to be at a low point, there were still some reasons for optimism. Consider the recent arrest of Younis al-Mauritani, described as al-Qaeda's foreign minster, at a compound in the Pakistani suburbs of Quetta. The arrest was made as a result of high-level ISI-CIA cooperation, and was one of the most high-profile al

Qaeda arrests made by Pakistani security forces.[1] However, despite some recent promising developments, the US cannot allow its national security to be held hostage by nearly two decades of unfulfilled expectations in Pakistan. It is vital that the United States now work to deepen America's cooperative relationships with India's internal security architecture to counter the terror threat that permeates and extends beyond the region.

THE THREAT PICTURE: A SNAPSHOT

The United States and India face common challenges as they work to defend against a host of threats, both regional and global. The threat environment the United States and India face today is one that is different from yesterday and one that will change tomorrow. It has metastasized and morphed and comes in various forms, ranging from al Qaeda senior leadership (AQSL), which despite the recent deaths among their leadership ranks, should still be seen as a danger to US interests, to al Qaeda's affiliates who continue to grow in reach and numbers — namely al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) operating out of Yemen; al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) operating out of North Africa and spreading throughout the Sahel, as well as training other militant groups like Boko Haram; and al-Shabaab in Somalia, al Qaeda's East African wing.

Regionally, we have seen the conflation of jihadi organizations in Pakistan. United States' and Indian national interests and shared counterterrorism vision should be based on this common threat. These organizations increasingly ascribe and subscribe to al Qaeda's goals, vision and objectives. This witches' brew of organizations, from the Haqqani Network (HQN) to Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT), from Tehrik-e Taliban Pakistan (TTP) to Harakat ul-Jihad-I-Islami (HuJI), from Jaish-e-Mohammad (JEM) and the Islamic Jihad Union (IJU) to the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU), is coming together and cooperating on a tactical and sometimes strategic basis, linked by an affinity for militant Islamist ideology. While countless terrorist groups target Indian soil, and US interests in Afghanistan and the broader Southeast Asian region, several groups have found refuge in Pakistan as they continue to expand their network and pose a greater danger to the United States and India. Pakistan has significant, historical links to HQN and LeT, and both organizations pose serious security implications for US interests.

Lashkar-e-Taiba, or "Army of the pure," was created in the early 1990s as a militant wing of the Pakistani-based Islamic fundamentalist organization Markaz Dawual-Irshad. This group was founded in the Kunar province of Afghanistan, in order to fight alongside the Taliban against the Soviet Union, and is now based in Muridke near Lahore in Pakistan.[2] Its formation was supposedly aided by instruction and funding from Pakistan's intelligence agency, the Directorate for Inter-Services Intelligence, which gave this

---

[1] "Al Mauritani's Arrest," DAWN.com September 7, 2011
[2] U.S. State Department, "Country Reports on Terrorism, Chapter 8 -- Foreign Terrorist Organizations." Last modified April 28, 2006. http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/crt/2005/65275.htm

support in exchange for the LeT promising to target Hindus in Jammu and Kashmir, and train Muslim extremists on Indian soil. Like several other key Islamist militant groups, the LeT follows a strict fundamentalist interpretation of Islam, or the Wahhabi theological tradition. Although the group was formed to help fight alongside the Taliban, its primary goal was to drive out the Indian forces in the Kashmir region and establish an Islamic caliphate instead of Hindi rule, challenging India's sovereignty over Kashmir and seeking to unite all Muslim areas surrounding Pakistan.[3] Over time, the breadth and reach of the group's goals have evolved. It is becoming more clear that in recent years LeT has begun to expand its sights globally, extending beyond Kashmir and India to include Western targets such as Washington, Tel Aviv, as well as New Delhi. Now instead of solely waging war to impose Islam over all of India, the group has adopted the ideology of other militant Islamist groups that have a more holistic anti-western approach, seeking to implement Islam worldwide and unite the Muslims of the world. LeT has proclaimed that it has chosen the "path of jihad" in order to liberate all Muslims from non-Muslim rule, especially under democratic systems.[4] LeT is responsible for the "26-11" Mumbai attacks which targeted Westerners and the renowned international Taj Hotel in India's largest city.

While LeT is perhaps the most widely known terrorist threat to India in the region, other entities operating out of Pakistan demonstrate similar capabilities. One such organization is the Haqqani Network. This organization is currently led by Sirajuddin Haqqani, the son of Jalaluddin Haqqani, but originated in the 1970's and has formed significant ties with Osama bin Laden and the Taliban in the years since its inception. Today, the Haqqani Network is operationally based in North Waziristan, the remote border region between Pakistan and Afghanistan. They receive protection and support from facets of Pakistan's intelligence agency, the ISI, which continues to drag its feet on taking action against the Haqqanis because they see the network as a useful proxy to expand their influence and establish footholds in Afghanistan.[5] Because the Haqqani network is seen by parts of Pakistan's government as a valuable ally, the government has refused to take action in the tribal regions of Waziristan which creates safe havens, not only for the Haqqanis but for al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations, with which the Haqqanis are intimately involved. The Haqqani Network poses a significant threat to United States (which strangely, and inadvisably, has not been designated a foreign terrorist organization) and Indian interests in the region, as it is believed that the organization is a powerful insurgent force in Afghanistan, one that targets coalition forces as well as Indian investments and interests in the country. The network has long served as an enabler,

---

[3] Bajoria, Jayshree, "Lashkar-e-Taiba (Army of the Pure)" Updated: January 14, 2010.
http://www.cfr.org/pakistan/lashkar-e-taiba-army-pure-aka-lashkar-e-tayyiba-lashkar-e-toiba-lashkar--taiba/p17882
[4] "Lashkar-e-Toiba 'Army of the Pure'"
http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/india/states/jandk/terrorist_outfits/lashkar_e_toiba.htm
[5] Jeffrey Dressler, "The Haqqani Network: From Pakistan to Afghanistan," Afghanistan Report 6 (2010), Institute for the Study of War.

predominantly for al Qaeda, but with the overarching goal of expanding global militancy.[6] It is believed that the Haqqanis carried out the Kabul hotel bombing in June. Counterinsurgency operations over the past year have seen success against the Haqqanis but a sustained counterterrorism effort is needed to prevent regeneration.

A third terrorist organization exercising significant influence in the region is Harakat ul-Jihad-I-Islami (HuJI). While HuJI's founding purpose was to counter Soviet forces in Afghanistan in the 1980's, their goals have shifted to targeting Indian military forces and interests in Kashmir. A key player in HuJI's growth has been Ilyas Kashmiri, head of al Qaeda operations in Pakistan. While his whereabouts are currently unknown, targeted strike missions by US drones likely killed him earlier this year. Similar surgical attacks in the region resulted in the death of al Qaeda's second in command last month, Atiyah Abd al-Rahman.[7] The deaths of these crucial figures, "bridge builders" both among regional terrorist groups and within the ranks of the organizations themselves, proves the value in continued drone campaigns.

HuJI, the militant group Kashmiri led, played an important role in the conflation and cooperation of extremist organizations in the region. Kashmiri spent years in the Pakistani Army's Special Forces and fighting in Afghanistan against the Soviets. He was able to translate that experience into effective leadership of HuJI's forces in Kashmir. In a long string of high-profile terror attacks on targets in India, he displayed the full range of his training and planning abilities. This blend of expertise, together with a pragmatic action-oriented mindset, made him a unique commodity in the jihadi world. Few, if any, other leaders had comparable organizational skills, or were as well positioned to spur global jihad. To that end, he developed strong personal connections with myriad Islamist terrorist groups, including Lashkar-e-Taiba, the Haqqani network, Tehrik-i-Taliban Pakistan, Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan, and, most importantly, the senior leadership of al-Qaeda. Each group valued his ability to convert the grand aspirations of its leaders into practicable plans of attack. Unsurprisingly, Kashmiri and HuJI both appeared on the "most wanted" lists drafted by the United States, Pakistan, and India. Among other things, Kashmiri served as al Qaeda's principal in interaction with radicals in the West, and acted as a coordinator between David Headley and Tahawwur Hussain Rana of Chicago, and Lashkar-e-Taiba, in their work together on the Mumbai attacks of 2008. Leveraging the strengths of each group to complement the others, Kashmiri was able to build bridges between organizations that would otherwise have competed for resources, recruits, and publicity.

Instead of resting on our laurels, now is the time to double down and pull out all the stops, by striking hard—again and again—while al Qaeda is back on its heels. Careful

---

[6] Don Rassler and Vahid Brown, "The Haqqani Nexus and the Evolution of al Qa'ida," Harmony Program (2011), The Combating Terrorism Center at West Point.
[7] Greg Miller and Julie Tate, "Al Qaeda's No. 2 Leader is Killed in Pakistan, U.S. Officials Say," The Washington Post, August 27, 2011.

use of drones, underpinned by intelligence, will help consolidate recent counterterror gains. With luck, there will soon be more opportunities such as this to highlight and profile valuable al Qaeda leaders lost. A decapitation strategy may not be sufficient to ensure strategic victory, but there is a reason the term "high value target" exists and we should make it our business to eliminate as many of them as possible as quickly as possible.

COUNTERTERRORISM RESPONSE IN BRIEF

Even from this brief snapshot, three specific conclusions can be drawn. First, that the national security risks originating from this region threaten both the United States and India. Second, that the danger does not arise from the actions of a nation-state that can be deterred through the traditional tools of statecraft — but from the intentions, actions, and aspirations of an expanding nexus of terrorist organizations, criminal gangs, and rogue nation and sub-national state entities. Third, the antecedent social, political and economic conditions that gave rise to this threat domain have a long history and are not immediately solvable — in short, the elimination of the root causes of these threats are beyond the capabilities of any one country (including the United States).

What are the implications of such conclusions? Again, there are three. First, the United States must partner with other nation-states that have not only the capability but the political will to address these issues — both within their borders and beyond. Second, that to meet these threats, the United States and others must not only develop innovative strategies — ones that not only blend intelligence, paramilitary force, conventional force, and policing — but also establish national and international networks that interconnect the efforts of those organizations that will carry out such strategies. Third, to avoid exhaustion on the part of their organizations and citizenry and in recognition of the budgetary constraints we now face, the United States and allied countries must make the difficult decisions necessary to target effort only to those operations where what is achieved is worth what is expended. The reality is this: for reasons tied to both tactics and treasury, the United States needs to lighten its footprint (including in Afghanistan) and increase its flexibility, acumen, and lethality.

 Before the United States can take actions to assume a lighter footprint (especially in Afghanistan), it is paramount that we hold Pakistan accountable to take action against the extremist forces festering under their watch. The litmus test here is whether Pakistan will sever its historic ties to its proxies, namely LeT in India and the Haqqani Network in Afghanistan. While we acknowledge the fact that there are some factions in Pakistan that will never cut these ties, we must also realize that some in Pakistan recognize the threat these groups pose. Those individuals are motivated to cooperate with the US, and we should continue to do all we reasonably can to encourage and support their efforts. This is not only in the best interests of the United States and India, but also of Pakistan. These terrorist organizations pose a significant threat to United States national security as these

groups whose targets were once simply regional, are now buying into the broader, global jihadi goals and objectives.

AREAS OF COOPERATION

India's threat landscape has evolved in much the same way as the United States' terrorism picture. As evidenced by the attacks in Mumbai this summer, the new threat domain is very different from that exemplified by the large-scale, heavily orchestrated Mumbai attacks of 2008.   The latter have not disappeared, but rather, added to their ranks is a new domain that is increasingly defined by low threshold, small group or lone-wolf style attacks on perceived soft targets.[8] To meet and counter a constantly changing threat picture, a flexible counterterrorism system must be created. A system of systems that develops long standing practitioner-to-practitioner relationships among US-Indian police, security, intelligence and perhaps military institutions is needed. Key to the construction of such, is the development of a counterterrorism strategy that ensures -a nation's security is as much a journey as it is an ideal end-state. While it is important that we know where we want to go, it is equally as important to ensure that rigid structures are not locked into place but rather a resilient, adaptive architecture is implemented which can change as the terrorist threat continues to evolve.

One area that has experienced success in adapting to the changing landscape is paramilitary campaigns. This evolution in the operational environment demands that the authorities under Title 10 (legal basis for the military services and the department of defense) and Title 50 (procedures for covert actions) be equally synchronized and coordinated.[9] It is vital for the synchronization of military and intelligence assets to occur because Somalia, Yemen, Waziristan, and the Sahel are all under- or ungoverned spaces. To address these issues we cannot implement what has become the US' dominant counterinsurgency (COIN) model — we must assume allied forces will not have the forces required to maintain positive control over the terrain or population. As is the case with traditional and current COIN practices, campaigns must leverage intelligence to the greatest extent possible in the targeting of military and police force. Given the realities on the ground, however, intelligence assets must be used to support strike missions that go beyond the narrow parameters of conventional COIN. Be it through the use of drones, special forces, conventional forces, or even the police, constant pressure must be applied against terror organizations. In short, covering fire must be maintained in order to deny them the operational space and time necessary to plan, train, and carry out terrorist operations.[10]

---

[8] Arun Kumar, "India Severely Impacted by Terrorism: US Report," *News One*, August 19, 2011.
[9] Frank J. Cilluffo and Clinton Watts, "Yemen & Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula: Exploiting a Window of Counterterrorism Opportunity," Issue Brief June 24, 2011, Homeland Security Policy Institute (HSPI).
[10] Frank J. Cilluffo, "After bin Laden the Threat Remains: Drones, CIA, and SOF the Only Game in Town," HSPI Commentary 22 (2011).

Broader cooperation on counterterrorism issues, exemplified in several recent initiatives, demonstrates the strength and shared vision of US-India relations. In July 2010, the India-US Counterterrorism Cooperation Initiative was signed. Built upon the 2000 India-US Joint Working Group on Counterterrorism, the 2001 revival of the India-US Defense Policy Group, the 2004 Next Step in Strategic Partnership, and the 2005 India-US Defense Framework Agreement, this new initiative establishes an ongoing exchange between the two nations. The initiative calls for expansive sharing of best practices in areas of mutual interest including terrorist financing, forensic sciences, mass-transit security, investigation procedures, and cyber security, all with the goal of strengthening joint capabilities to combat terrorism. In November 2010, President Obama and Indian Prime Minister Singh announced the US-India Homeland Security Dialogue. The first dialogue took place in May between Indian Home Minister P. Chidambaram and U.S. Department of Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano, who discussed ways India and the US could increase communication and shared practices to eliminate terrorist safe havens and infrastructure in the region. Our two nations will work to foster capacity building and increased engagement between our intelligence agencies. Progress in these areas will be assessed every six months.

CHALLENGES FOR COOPERATION

While we have made great strides in expanding our relationship with India in the counterterrorism space, obstacles to increased cooperation remain. These hurdles must be addressed and overcome if we hope to jointly counter the threats in the region. Despite the anti-terrorism initiatives mentioned above, as well as a whole host of other mechanisms for cooperation, a trust deficit encompasses the US/India relationship.[11] The US relationship with Pakistan as well as Indian perceptions of the US withholding intelligence on Islamic militants in Jammu and Kashmir continues to be a source of distrust, one that prevents deeper cooperation between our two nations.

More specifically, one aspect of the Indian security structure that deters cooperation is endemic corruption found in every level of India's law enforcement apparatus. Corruption prevents front-line police officers from fulfilling their duty effectively as they often concede to bribes and regional politics, rather than focusing on community policing and accurate crime reporting.

Another obstacle to greater intelligence sharing between the US and India is a notion that pervades the US intelligence community regarding the Soviet KGB's close relationship with the Indian intelligence structure, the Research & Analysis Wing (R&AW), India's External Intelligence Agency. Vestiges of the Cold War represent a reality that rightfully leave many in the US counterterrorism community hesitant to engage in deeper

---

[11] Lisa Curtis, "After Mumbai: Time to Strengthen U.S.-India Counterterrorism Cooperation," Backgrounder No. 2217 (2008), The Heritage Foundation.

involvement until further assurances are made that the information can be appropriately protected.

THE PATH AHEAD

In addition to current initiatives and ongoing dialogues, and notwithstanding identified challenges for cooperation, there are multiple, unexplored avenues that could be pursued:

- Counterterrorism Intelligence Sharing
- Law Enforcement to Law Enforcement Cooperation
- Institutionalizing Lessons Learned Re: Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures
- Cooperation on Countering Violent Islamist Extremism
- Cooperation on Counter-radicalization Efforts
- Critical Infrastructure Protection

Allow me to drill deeper into these bullets. Working together on shared interests will help to bridge the trust gap that exists between our two countries. Countering violent Islamist extremism, homegrown counter-radicalization, and critical infrastructure protection all represent areas of mutual interest with India. Within the region as a whole, and in Afghanistan specifically, both United States coalition forces and Indian interests are threatened by the same regional terrorist organizations. US-Indian intelligence sharing and cooperation is important if we hope to prevent future attacks from the Taliban and al Qaeda in Afghanistan.[12]

While Afghanistan is a logical place to start, it is in the United States' best interests to minimize the evolving, global terrorist threat originating in the region by breaking down the walls between our intelligence agencies and working toward increased intelligence sharing. This is a vital next step, as intelligence remains the lifeblood of any counterterrorism campaign. One way to foster a fuller and more frank dialogue between the United States and India is to routinize discussions between and among the occupants of mid-level positions in our respective security and intelligence services. While high level security talks are important, the breakdown of barriers will only occur if regular exchanges between mid-level security services officials are encouraged. A similar approach with other key US allies has proven successful; it is time India is incorporated more deeply into this framework.

In order to determine what our joint counterterrorism path ahead looks like, it is important to observe and absorb lessons learned from our respective countries, and employ best practices across the board (with necessary tweaks or alterations, as local practices or context might require). Doing this will prevent both countries from having to "reinvent the wheel" when it comes to counterterrorism strategy, and will demonstrate where gaps in knowledge or loopholes in security still exist. By sharing and adopting

---

[12] Lisa Curtis, "After Mumbai."

knowledge gained from individual experience, we will build trust between our two countries and ensure that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.

A key component in expanding this knowledge base is through open and regular dialogue not only in bilateral relations at the federal level, but between US and Indian law enforcement entities. Initiatives of this kind are already being implemented in the form police exchanges, leading to new understandings about tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTP) that have since been shared nationwide in this country. Members of the Los Angeles and Las Vegas Police Departments have been first-hand participants in these interactions. LAPD and LVPD sent a team of experts to Mumbai to meet with local law enforcement officials to learn about the city's response to the "26-11" Mumbai attacks, and returned with heightened understanding of counterterrorism tactics, techniques and procedures that are changing the US law enforcement landscape. They observed where loopholes existed within the Indian terrorism response model and upon returning to the United States, worked to ensure those gaps were closed in regards to our own counter-terrorism strategies. Several key lessons included the need for all urban centers to have a clear, unified chain of command for response, so that in the event of a terrorist attack or natural disaster, counter-efforts are best organized and resources are employed most effectively. Operational training must be conducted to plan for and resist continuous, entrenched attacks. Furthermore, the police forces in Mumbai were poorly equipped with limited weaponry, inferior tactics, and inadequate knowledge of the Taj Hotel's layout. India needs to modernize and professionalize its law enforcement architecture, aggressively address the rampant corruption, and enhance standardized information sharing processes vertically and horizontally throughout the local, state and federal levels of government. The national police in India rely on an entrenched, three-tiered law enforcement system, one that does not empower the first responder. This lack of a first-preventer mentality must be addressed, simply because in spite of this reality, the current mindset is that public security will come from the police and no private sector participation is necessary. This notion should be addressed immediately, as the private sector, like the hotel industry in Mumbai, can and should play a key role in homeland security initiatives. In short, the current threat climate demands leadership on the part of both government, which should have its own house in order to set a good example, and the private sector, which is uniquely situated to help inform and render public sector efforts more effective. Public-private partnerships act as a force multiplier against our adversaries, in an era where non-state actors have unprecedented power to affect outcomes and resilience depends upon the joint efforts of all sectors as well as individual citizens.

Another important "lesson learned" originated from the manner in which the terrorist attacks in Mumbai were conducted. The highly successful, multi-team assault on the Taj Hotel was a style of attack that could potentially be implemented in the United States. Thus the LAPD team, after extensive study with Indian law enforcement in Mumbai, developed tactics, techniques and procedures that have since been nationalized in the US.

Training in Multi-Assault, Counter Terrorism Action Capabilities or MACTAC will enable law enforcement teams to immediately locate and neutralize violent assaults and terrorist actions like those executed in Mumbai. The growing relationship between our countries' law enforcement agencies is mutually beneficial as lessons are learned and new counterterrorism strategies and tactics are adopted.

Future US efforts should be aimed at helping Indian law enforcement move away from rigid, more traditional event-focused models of policing. Major metropolitan law enforcement agencies in the United States are working to implement intelligence-led community policing strategies. The importance of, and motivations behind, such strategies were captured by a recent Counterterrorism Intelligence Research Survey conducted by the Homeland Security Policy Institute.[13] HSPI's data regarding the perceptions of police intelligence commanders in the US demonstrates that intelligence-led community policing is a product of the belief that the counterterrorism mission is a shared responsibility between local and national officials, that increased information sharing is warranted given perceptions of the threat, and that for local law enforcement — information from citizens and ongoing investigations is every bit as important as information from national partners. Given the dynamics of India's population and expected population growth — India has one of the lowest police-to-population ratios in the world at 142 police officers for every 100,000 people, whereas in the United States the ratio is 315 police per 100,000 people — it is logical to assume that India's megacities will become high value soft targets where terrorists can threaten millions of innocent lives.[14] A hybrid of intelligence-led policing with community-led policing is the best solution for both nations to counter the evolving terror threat.

Other areas that hold promise and potential for US-India partnership include cooperation on Countering Violent Islamist Extremism and on furthering counter-radicalization, especially as pertains to homegrown terrorism and Internet radicalization. Although effective initiatives in both areas require action on the part of entities and individuals outside the realm of government, it is also true that governments at all levels have a role to play in these initiatives, including by spurring and coordinating efforts.

Likewise, governments have a crucial--but not exclusive--role to play in critical infrastructure protection. Public-private partnerships are key to these endeavors, and in this regard, the United States has much to share and much to learn. Cooperation on these issues could help advance a culture of shared responsibility for internal security, as well as help secure the tough neighborhood in which India is situated, which in turn could be beneficial for US national security.

---

[13] Cilluffo, Frank J., Joseph R. Clark, and Michael P. Downing. 2011. "Counterterrorism Intelligence: Law Enforcement Perspectives." Research Brief, Vol. 1, No. 1. Washington, DC; Homeland Security Policy Institute.

[14] Dasgupta, Sunil. "Why Mumbai Needs A Mayor." *Foreign Affairs.* August 1, 2011.

I wish to thank the Committee and its staff for the opportunity to testify before you today, and I would now be pleased to try to answer any questions that you may have.