

## **TERRORISM: An Attack on Social, Political & Economic Security**

**Dr. Alka Kulshrestha**

*HOD, Deptt. of B.Ed.,*

*I.N.P.G. Mahila College, Meerut.*

Email: *dr.alkakulshrestha@gmail.com*

**Dr. Kuljyotsna**

*I.N.P.G. Mahila College, Meerut.*

Email: *kuljyotsna@gmail.com*

### **Abstract**

*Social structure and order, governance of society and politics are dependent on good communication, and good communication requires agreement on definitions of terminology. Terrorism can dramatically influence the world, as shown by the far-reaching and prolonged effects of the attacks in New York on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2001. The definition of terrorism will affect communication and response to this issue and so have consequences for society and politics. However, a suitable universal definition remains elusive because different bodies, organisations and government agencies have different definitions to suit their own particular role, purpose or bias. A universal definition will define terrorism irrespective of the aims of the group. As stated by Louise Richardson "The legitimacy or otherwise of the goals being sought (by a group) should be irrelevant to whether a group is (defined as) a terrorist group" and "so a terrorist is not a freedom fighter and a terrorist is not a guerrilla. A terrorist is a terrorist, no matter whether or not you like the goal s/he is trying to achieve, no matter whether or not you like the government s/he is trying to change".*

Reference to this paper  
should be made as  
follows:

**Received: 23.02.2019**

**Approved: 10.03.2019**

**Dr. Alka Kulshrestha**

*TERRORISM: An  
Attack on Social,  
Political &  
Economic Security*

*RJPSS 2019, Vol. XLIV,  
No. 1, pp. 60 -66*

*Article No.8*

**Online available at:**

[https://anubooks.com/  
?page\\_id=5262](https://anubooks.com/?page_id=5262)

## **Introduction**

Terrorism is international. The command and control of terrorist groups, the recruitment, training, active operations and the target audience can all be located in different countries and so counter-terrorist measures will not be effective unless all nations cooperate in agreeing to the characteristics of terrorist groups and their activities. Agreement on a common definition would be a step towards universal cooperation in the prevention of terrorism. The UN unsuccessfully attempted to get universal agreement after the 1972 Munich Olympic massacre. Some nations, particularly in Africa, Asia and the Middle East, were unwilling to label groups as terrorists if they sympathised with their aims, because of the perjorative aspects of the label. The West has also sympathised with groups which have committed terrorist activities. The Reagan administration supported the Nicaraguan Contras and there was Western support for the African National Congress in South Africa in the mid-1980s when their actions were terrorist.

Nonetheless, the UN has struggled to provide a definition that is accepted by all nations. In 2001 it adopted the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings even though they were unable to define the word “terrorist”. The Convention only covered one very small aspect of terrorism. The UN produced an interim draft definition in 2001. It down-plays political justification and lists acts of violence as terrorism if they are “resulting or likely to result in major economic loss, when the purpose of the conduct, by its nature or context, is to intimidate a population, or to compel a Government or an international organisation to do or abstain from doing any act.” In 2007 they were shifting to a consensus academic definition. On 1 December 2010 the Head of the UN Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate said that “the fact that there was not a universal definition of terrorism presented a challenge”. Badey, as quoted by White agreed that “nations are hampered by an inability to define and criminalise terrorism” and this remains a problem in achieving trans-national counter-terrorism.

For the last thirty years, the threat of terrorism has been multiplied manifold. The terrorist acts have become more dangerous with the advancement of technology. Only the little part of the world remained untouched and unharmed by the contemporary beckon of terrorism. Terrorism involves violence against public, with a political or religious desire. Terrorists use acts of violence for frightening the group of peoples or pressuring the Government to do or not do something. Many Countries give aid and dangerous weapons to the terrorist groups in order to weaken the other country.

Terrorism is now an international phenomenon. Now the world is facing so many groups of terrorists. The main reason of emergence of terrorism has been exploitation of weaker and poor section of the society by the rich and powerful. Their peaceful attempt to non-violent protest was unsuccessful to give any result. Hence, they opted to use violence to yield the results. Such acts of violence are also called terrorist activities. There are many other reasons for terrorism like religion, language or to set up a new pattern of government.<sup>3</sup> Terrorism is not new and this term is being used for the centuries but it can be relatively hard to define. Terrorism has been defined, variously, as a tactic and strategy, a crime and a holy duty, as a justified reaction to oppression and exploitation of weaker section of society. As an uneven form of conflict, to suppress the terrorism, States use coercive powers including military action. In some cases, terrorism has been used as a means to carry on a conflict without showing to opposite the nature of the threat. They mistakenly take terrorism as normal criminal activity. Because of these characteristics, terrorism has become increasingly common among those pursuing extreme goals throughout the world. But despite its popularity, terrorism can be a nebulous concept.

Terrorism in India, according to the Home Ministry, poses a significant threat to the people of India. The regions with long term terrorist activities have been Jammu and Kashmir, east-central and south-central India (Naxalism) etc. Media reports have alleged and implicated terrorism in India to be sponsored by Pakistan, particularly through its Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI). The US accused Pakistan of enabling and ignoring anti-India terrorist cells working on its soil; however, Pakistan has denied its involvement.

Pakistan has long been accused by its neighbours India and Afghanistan, and western nations like the United States and the United Kingdom of its involvement in terrorist activities in the region and beyond. Pakistan's tribal region along its border with Afghanistan has been claimed to be a "haven for terrorists" by western media and the United States Defence Secretary. According to an analysis published by the SabanCenter for Middle East Policy at Brookings Institution in 2008, Pakistan was, "with the possible exception of Iran, perhaps the world's most active sponsor of terrorist groups... aiding groups that pose a direct threat to the United States." Daniel Byman, an author, also wrote that, "Pakistan is probably 2008's most active sponsor of terrorism".

Author Gordon Thomas states that whilst aiding in the capture of Al Qaeda members, Pakistan "still sponsored terrorist groups in the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir, funding, training and arming them in their war of attrition against India". Journalist Stephen Schwartz notes that several terrorist and

criminal groups are “backed by senior officers in the Pakistani army, the country’s ISI intelligence establishment and other armed bodies of the state”. According to Ted Galen Carpenter, a senior fellow for defence and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, “Without the active support of the government in Islamabad, it is doubtful whether the Taliban could ever have come to power in Afghanistan. Pakistani authorities helped fund the militia and equip it with military hardware during the mid-1990s when the Taliban was merely one of several competing factions in Afghanistan’s civil war. Only when the United States exerted enormous diplomatic pressure after the Sept. 11 attacks did Islamabad begin to sever its political and financial ties with the Taliban. Even now it is not certain that key members of Pakistan’s intelligence service have repudiated their Taliban clients.

Afghanistan is not the only place where Pakistani leaders have flirted with terrorist clients. Pakistan has also assisted rebel forces in Kashmir even though those groups have committed terrorist acts against civilians. And it should be noted that a disproportionate number of the extremist madrasas schools funded by the Saudis operate in Pakistan.” Pakistan’s former ambassador to the U.S., Husain Haqqani has said Pakistan sponsors terrorism.

According to author Daniel Byman, “Pakistan is probably today’s most active sponsor of terrorism.” Writing in an article published by The Australian he stated, “following the terror massacres in Mumbai, Pakistan may now be the single biggest state sponsor of terrorism, beyond even Iran, yet it has never been listed by the US State Department as a state sponsor of terrorism”.

Former Pakistani president Pervez Musharraf has conceded that his forces trained militant groups to fight India in Indian-administered Kashmir. He confessed that the government turned a blind eye because it wanted to force India to enter into negotiations, as well as raise the issue internationally. He also said Pakistani spies in the Inter-Services Intelligence directorate (ISI) cultivated the Taliban after 2001 because Karzai’s government was dominated by non-Pashtuns, who are the country’s largest ethnic group, and by officials who were thought to favour India.

India has been consistent in alleging that Pakistan was involved in training and arming underground militant groups to fight Indian forces in Kashmir. The government of Pakistan has been accused of aiding terrorist organisations operating on their soil who have attacked India. Pakistan denies all allegations, stating that these acts are committed by non-state actors.

India alleged that the 2008 Mumbai attacks originated in Pakistan, and that the attackers were in touch with a Pakistani colonel and other handlers in Pakistan.

The testimony of David Headley, who was implicated for his role in the Mumbai attacks, points to significant ISI involvement in the activities of the Let, including the Mumbai attacks. This led to a UN ban on one such organisation, the Jama'at-ud-Da'wah, which the Pakistani government is yet to enforce.

On 5 April 2006, the Indian police arrested six Islamic militants, including a cleric who helped plan bomb blasts in Varanasi. The cleric is believed to be a commander of a banned South Asian Islamic militant group, Harkat-ul-Jihad al-Islami, and is linked to the ISI. Pakistan denied involvement in militant activities in Kashmir, though President Asif Ali Zardari admitted in July 2010 that militants had been “deliberately created and nurtured” by past governments “as a policy to achieve some short-term tactical objectives” stating that they were “heroes” until 9/11.

In October 2010, former Pakistan President and former head of the Pakistan Army, Pervez Musharraf revealed that Pakistani armed forces trained militant groups to fight Indian forces in Kashmir. Many Kashmiri militant groups designated as terrorist organisations by the US still maintain their headquarters in Pakistan-administered Kashmir. This is cited by the Indian government as further proof that Pakistan supports terrorism. Many of the terrorist organisations are banned by the UN, but continue to operate under different names. Even the normally reticent United Nations (UN) has also publicly increased pressure on Pakistan on its inability to control its Afghanistan border and not restricting the activities of Taliban leaders who have been declared by the UN as terrorists. Both the federal and state governments in India continue to accuse Pakistan of helping several banned terrorist organisations, including the Indian organisations unhappy with their own Government, like the ULFA in Assam.

Pakistan is said to be a haven for major terrorist groups like Al-Qaeda, Lashkar-e-Omar, Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT), Jaish-e-Mohammed (JeM) and Sipah-e-Sahaba, Jaish ul-Adl.

In 2012, the US accused Pakistan of enabling and ignoring anti-India terrorist cells working on its soil; however, Pakistan has denied its involvement. In July 2016, Government of India released data on a string of terror strikes in India since 2005 that claimed 707 lives and left over 3,200 injured. In mid-September 2018 Police in India have announced they have arrested a terrorist from the Hizbul Mujahideen group in the city of Kanpur, who wanted to attack on Ganesh Chaturthi. The 2016 Uri attack was an attack by four heavily armed Pakistani terrorists on 18 September 2016, near the town of Uri in the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir. It was reported as “the deadliest attack on security forces in Kashmir in two decades”. The Pakistani terrorist group Jaish-e-Mohammed was involved in the

planning and execution of the attack. At the time of the attack, the Kashmir Valley region was experiencing a period of unrest. On September 29, eleven days after the attack, the Indian Army conducted retaliatory surgical strikes on launchpads used by Pakistanis in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir. Indian Director General of Military Operations (DGMO) Lt Gen Ranbir Singh said that it had made a pre-emptive strike against “terrorist teams” who were preparing to “carry out infiltration and conduct terrorist strikes inside Jammu and Kashmir and in various metros in other states”. [39] The Economist reported that small teams of Indian commandos crossed the Line of Control and struck Pakistani safe houses, killing dozens of terrorists.

In a very recent incident on 14 February 2019, a convoy of vehicles carrying security personnel on the Jammu Srinagar National Highway was attacked by a vehicle-borne suicide bomber at the Pulwama district, Jammu and Kashmir. The attack resulted in the deaths of 40 Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF) personnel and the attacker. The responsibility for the attack was claimed by the Pakistan-based Islamist militant group Jaish-e-Mohammed. A Jaish-e-Mohammed member named Adil Ahmad Dar, a Kashmiri local, was identified as the attacker. However, the government has taken several iconic decisions against Pakistan to deal with this tragedy but still the losses are unrecoverable.

Terrorist attacks leave deterrent effects on society, political instability for the government and loss to the economy, in shape of loss of national and international business. Terrorism is very dangerous as it not only kills the human life but also the infrastructure, industry, ultimately damages its overall growth.

### **Conclusion**

There is a clear urgency to address radicalisation and recruitment to violent extremism in prisons and effectively reintegrate terrorism offenders. Yet the lack of understanding of the extent of the problem has led many governments to implement hasty solutions based on untested assumptions and anecdotal evidence. Much can already be done in terms of improvements to basic infrastructure, services and staff training to build on international good practices of fostering a prison environment that is less conducive to radicalisation and recruitment to violent extremism. However, to truly optimise risk reduction interventions and reintegration programs for VEOs, serious investments are needed to enhance our understanding of both the causes of and solutions to the problem at hand. This includes carefully considering how underlying principles and interventions proven to prevent different types of reoffending are also applicable to VEOs. It is important to recognise that each VEO presents different

risks, needs and engagement challenges that require bespoke approaches for policies and programs to have a long-term meaningful impact.

### References

1. Alex P Schmid and Albert Jongman, *Political Terrorism. A New Guide to Actors, Authors, Concepts, Data Bases, Theories, and Literature*, 5 (North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1988), Pg **43, 48**
2. Crenshaw, Martha, *Terrorism in Context*, 77 (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007), Pg **12**
3. Dr.Surat Singh and Hemraj Singh, *Law relating to Prevention of Terrorism*,25 (Universal Law Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2003), Pg **24, 25, 38**
4. Enders & Sandler (2011), *The political economy of terrorism*, 2nd Edition, Cambridge University Press, ISBN 9781107004566, Pg **12, 18, 19**
5. International Terrorism: Threats and Responses: Hearings Before the Committee on the Judiciary By United States Congress House Committee on the Judiciary, ISBN 0-16-052230-7, 1996, pp. 482.
6. Michael Sailo (2006), *Administration of Justice in Mizoram*, ISBN 978-8183240598, Chapter 2, Pg **22, 28**
7. Sharma (2013), *Growing overlap between terrorism and organized crime in India: A case study*, Security Journal, 26(1),Pg **60-79**
8. Stepan, Alfred; Linz, Juan J; Yadav, Yogendra (20 January 2011). *Crafting State-Nations: India and Other Multinational Democracies*. JHU Press, . ISBN 978-0-8018-9723-8., Pg **105**
9. Uri attack: BSF jawan succumbs to injuries, death toll rises to 19". The Indian Express. 25 September 2016.
10. Warren Kozak, Remembering the Terror in Mumbai The Wall Street Journal (26 November 2011)