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It is a known fact that day-by-day terrorism world over is taking worst forms from limited to total and indiscriminate warfare. Terrorist activities often arise in reaction to an injustice – real or imagined or ideological indoctrination or fundamentalist-oriented education in traditional religious schools or ignorance about beliefs or due to economic unemployment. This is an important issue that needs serious attention. This paper deals with the networks, roots and eradication of terrorism. Using review of literature and secondary information available in books, journals, reports, internet and other sources, this paper analyses the issues related with terrorism and concludes that a multi-prong strategy is required for the eradication of terrorism with a long-term perspective.
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Introduction

When the cold war ended coinciding with the removal of the Berlin Wall (between East and West Germany) in early 1990's and the disintegration of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) in 1989, various think tank academics, policymakers, development analysts, governmental agencies as well as non-government Organisations (NGOs) became optimistic to harvest, sooner or later, the crops of peace as conflicts will be the things of the past. They were hoping against the hope that the whole world had already suffered very much the losses of humans, non-humans and properties due to the two world wars. The unhealthy competition between the First and the Second Worlds (US & Eastern Europe respectively) precipitated the arms race in different parts of the world – thus it siphoned off a substantial chunk of the world economy. But, simultaneously, US became the only super power to affect the world affairs single-handedly (as USSR no more existed) – resulting into a unipolar world. That is, the ‘balance of power’, that restrained both superpowers, has ceased to exist. The US has attacked Iraq and Afghanistan to bring democratic governance and peace – reminding us of the old adage of ‘white man’s burden’ to civilise the uncivilised people in the undeveloped/developing countries.

But nowadays the happenings are different. With the emerging process of globalisation, the terrorists are operating beyond borders.

---
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For instance, LeT (Lashkar-e-Taiba) has presence in 21 countries, for perpetual ‘jihad against the infidels’. Different forms of conflict, new and old, are affecting the world simultaneously – of these three types are prominent (Toscano 2009):

(a) Danger of conventional (territorial) war between the neighbouring countries;
(b) Pre-modern conflicts (ethnic, tribal) e.g. in Africa, especially Somalia, Sudan (where State has collapsed);
(c) Post-modern threat of non-territorial, network-operating terrorism.

However, two more forms of bilateral or multilateral conflicts have also emerged:
(i) Amplification of water disputes, especially about international rivers/oceans;
(ii) Claims and counter-claims on new spaces like Antarctica.

Various major terrorist activities (more than 100) have occurred since the last leg of the twentieth century in different parts of the world. A glimpse may be seen in Table 1 below:-

**Table-1. Major Terrorist Attacks in the World (1983-2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place/Country</th>
<th>Killings/Victims</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Beirut (Libya)</td>
<td>241 (US Marines)</td>
<td>By suicide bombers of Hezbollah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Abadan (Iran)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Burning of a cinema hall by opponents of Shah of Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Bomb in French UTA plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>Sikh terrorists exploded Kanishka (Air India) aircraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Lockerbie (Scotland, UK)</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Commissioned by Col. Gadafi of Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Mumbai (India)</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>13 blasts targeting financial and commercial establishments by Dawood Ibrahim &amp; ISI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Oklahoma City (US)</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Hacking of Alfred P. Murrah building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3 villages in Elizane (Algeria)</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>Al Qaeda led by Osama bin Laden who was killed in Abbottabad (Pakistan) on 2nd May, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>World Trade Centre, New York</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>Hostage-taking in a Moscow (Dubrevka) theatre for 2 1/2 days. JemmahIslamiah (of Al Quida) attackers were convicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Moscow (Russia)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Al Qaida attacked Atocha Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Beslan School, North Ossetia (Russia)</td>
<td>Hostage-taking in a school for 3 days by Ingush and Chechan Islamist terrorists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>London (UK)</td>
<td>Tube rail attack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Mumbai (India)</td>
<td>7 blasts in 7 locations in suburban trains by Jihadis (Indian+Pakistani)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Karachi (Pakistan)</td>
<td>Bomb attack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Mumbai (India)</td>
<td>Attack by Pakistani terrorists (designed by ISI) at Taj hotel, Trident, Nariman house, CST Railway station, Leopold Caffe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Peshawar (Pakistan)</td>
<td>Car Bombing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Mohmand (Pakistan)</td>
<td>Suicide Bomb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Peshawar (Pakistan)</td>
<td>Taliban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Baga (Nigeria)</td>
<td>150-2000 Boko Haram militants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Garissa University (Kenya)</td>
<td>Al-Shabaab killed them mostly students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Ankara (Turkey)</td>
<td>Islamic State (IS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Paris (France)</td>
<td>Bombing by Islamic Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Mogadishu (Somalia, Africa)</td>
<td>Bombing by Islamic Organisation (+ 275 injured)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared from various sources by the Author.

Not only this, the situation worsened due to the global economic recession and melt down in 2008 that affected both the developed and the developing world’s though with varying degree and magnitude.

These are some important issues world over serious attention. In this backdrop this paper attempts to elucidate the networks, roots and eradication of terrorism. The paper is based on review of literature and related information available in various sources. The paper is divided into four sections including introduction, second section deals with terrorism and insurgency. Third section discusses the root causes of terrorism. The fourth section deals with the ways of eradicating terrorism.

**Terrorism and Insurgency**

While the term ‘terrorism’ has been in vogue among different strata of society in different parts of the world, especially since 1980’s yet it is difficult to precisely define it. The term terrorism originated from the Latin word ‘terrere’, meaning ‘to frighten’. A broad-based
definition of terrorism was given by Bruce Hoffman (1998), of US Rand Corporation as: “Terrorism is the deliberate creation and exploitation of fear through violence, or the fear of violence, in the pursuit of political change specifically designed to have far-reaching psychological effects beyond the immediate victims”. Similarly Donald J. Hanle (1989) defined terrorism as: “Terror is an intense paralysing fear, or the dread of it. Terrorism is a deliberate attempt to create terror through a symbolic act involving the use or threat of abnormal lethal force for influencing a target group or individual”. Further, US Dept of Defence defined terrorism as “the unlawful use of or threatened use of force or violence against individuals or property to coerce and intimidate governments or societies, often to achieve political, religious or ideological objectives” (Laqueur, 1999). However, there is no universally agreed definition of terrorism, except that its essence is violence or threat of violence. Nietzsche had rightly said once that only things, which have no history, can be defined. But terrorism has a long history indeed. It is, therefore, more appropriate to differentiate between insurgency and terrorism and professional crime and terrorism in a following way:

(a) Sudden and unexpected acts of violence by terrorists to create mass fear and panic among the people more than the physical losses; the more horrifying the act, the greater the psychological impact at a hotel or railway station or market place etc. e.g. planting a bomb; on the other hand, insurgents aim at substantial and physical losses.

(b) Terrorists target civilians more often than government offices and machinery; on the other hand, insurgent groups target government offices and security forces more often than civilians, through networks.

(c) Terror groups operate beyond national boundaries, while the insurgent groups operate locally and territorially (say, in north-east India).

(d) Insurgent groups have specific local demands, while the terrorists have general and vague grievances of discrimination or deprivation, ‘real’ or ‘perceived’, ‘immediate’ or ‘far distant’(even in other country).

(e) Terrorist groups are less concerned with ends (gains), rather more concerned with means (violence); insurgent groups use violent means but have political ends.

(f) Terrorists as well as insurgents have no respect for laws and morality in a democratic nation.

(g) Terrorists are now-a-days better organised at international level, more professional, well-equipped, and
well-funded on large scale; insurgents operate as guerrillas and for funds often impose levy on government officials, contractors, suppliers, traders, etc.

(h) Terrorists want to sensationalise even small incidents through media attraction. Through spectacular violence terrorists show their existence to their supporters and adversaries. To quote Diego Gambetta, the criminal “wants his crime to be seen as an accident, while the terrorist wants even an accident to seem designed”.

(i) While wars involve violence between states and are regulated by codes of behaviour, including avoiding of violence against non-combatants, origin and working of terrorist groups are often unknown, usually “shadowy” outfits, not caring for legitimacy.

There is a ‘moral economy’ of violence, that is, a moral framework within which violence is situated. There are five understandings of violence by terrorists and secessionists (Bajpai, 2002):

(i) Violence as an historical inevitability – violence bound with assertion;
(ii) Violence as self-defence – to confront government attack to minimise losses;
(iii) Violence as intrinsic to politics – seeing violence as a levelling of playing field with government;
(iv) Violence as emancipation – (or empowerment) as weapon of the weak;
(v) Violence as political bargaining – when negotiations are over, to use violence as a means of communicating seriousness and power – a part of grammar of politics.

Undoubtedly violence is associated with terrorism but all sorts of violence are not terrorism though all terrorist acts necessarily involve violence. According to one estimate, in India, in 2007 there were 905 terror attacks causing 1093 deaths and in 2008 there were 744 terror attacks causing 1113 deaths (Sharma, 2009).

During 2016, as per the US State Deptt, there were 11072 terror attacks worldwide and India had 927 such attacks in 2016, and in India it was 16% more than that in 2015 (798 attacks). In 2015, in India, 289 persons died in 5 such attacks while in 2016 terror attacks killed 337 persons in India. The number of persons injured in such attacks in 2015 was 500 against 636 in 2016. More than half of terror attacks in India (59%) in 2016 took place in four states. Jammu
& Kashmir (19%), Chhattisgarh (18%), Manipur (12%), Jharkhand (10%). J&K experienced 93% increase in terror attacks in 2016 against 2015. Three most deadly terror organisations are: Islamic State (IS), Taliban (Asia) and Boko Haram (Africa). In 2016 three largest terror targets were Iraq, Afghanistan and India. Pakistan was fourth with 734 attacks (1010 in 2015) but it differed from these three countries because it harboured and raised terrorist groups. “According to the US State Deptt in 2016 there were 334 terror groups/organisations in the whole world against 288 groups/organisations in 2015. Further the number of terror attacks worldwide in 2016 reduced by 9% (11072) against 12121 in 2015. Similarly total deaths due to such terror attacks worldwide also reduced by 13% in 2016 (25621 deaths) as against 2015 (29424 deaths) due to fewer attacks and deaths in Afghanistan, Syria, Nigeria, Pakistan and Yemen” (The Times of India, 2017). Needless to say that 55% of all terror attacks took place in Iraq, Afghanistan, India, Pakistan and the Philippines out of 104 affected countries, while 75% of all deaths due to terror attacks occurred in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Nigeria and Pakistan (Chauhan, 2017).

Often, in some quarters, there is a vitiated thinking that an act of terror may be good of bad. In Pakistan, Afghanistan and some Middle East countries often a distinction is made between a good and a bad ‘Taliban’ (religious leaders desirous of running a nation as per Islamic laws – Sharia). But it is a fictitious distinction because all Talibans are anti-democracy, anti-human rights, anti-universal values, anti-ethics, anti-laws and anti-women. Simply a difference in terms of degree or anti-human goal does not entitle a terrorist or Taliban as ‘good’. Actually such distinction is propagated by a stream of religious fundamentalists and terrorists. For instance, the main perpetrator of the bombing of Twin Towers of World Trade Centre (US) on 11th September, 2001, Osama-bin-Laden had remarked afterwards: “There are two types of terror - good and bad. What we are practising is a good terror” (Sunday Telegraph, November 11, 2001). Similarly at the 1998 convention of Organisation of Islamic Conference, Article two provided: “People’s struggle, including armed struggle against foreign occupation, aggression, colonialism, and hegemony, aimed at liberation and self-determination in accordance with principles of international law shall not be considered a terrorist crime” (Toscano, 2009, pp. 71-72). But such exemption cannot be accepted because often many terrorist groups indulge in acts of terrorism in the name of freedom struggle, say, in J&K at the instance of cross-border terrorists. Actually Pakistani Taliban and Afghan Taliban belong to the broad Taliban movement. Secondly, there is no difference between Al Qaeda and Taliban. Those fighting in foreign
countries are called Al Qaeda while those fighting in Afghanistan and Pakistan are called Taliban, admits Maulawi Oman, a spokesperson for the Pakistani Taliban (Rohde, 2010). In short, it may be safely stated that any unlawful violence for creating mass fear and hysteria by an individual, group or organisation, committed in a nation with a democratically elected government, is an act of terror. During 1998-2009 about 53% of deaths and injuries from terrorist attacks were caused by religious groups, 37% by the so-called ultra nationalist groups and 10% by communist, leftist, anti-globalisation and radical environmental groups (Gupta, 2009).

Now another question arises: What is the profile of a terrorist? What sort of mind has he? How does he differ from people in general in a society? Though there are several geographical, political, religious and ideological differences among several terrorists groups, yet following features make up a terrorist’s profile close to reality (Laqueur, 1999; Stern, 2010; Sarah Kershaw, 2010):

(a) The fundamental belief of most of the terrorists is to provoke the system, the state and a collectivity of the people and, on the other hand, they also desire to ‘reawaken’ and rekindle the fighting spirit of their community, sympathisers and supporters.

(b) Often the choice of victims is arbitrary-most X, Y, Z of a society and only sometimes a specific target group; and often they target civilians than police/military; e.g., on 26th November, 2008 terrorists attacked on Taj Palace hotel where nine Israeli Jews, and 25 American, Australian, Canadian and European Christians were killed and the rest 155 Indians were killed at Taj Palace, Oberoi/Trident, CST railways station, Nariman House and Leopold Caffe.

(c) Usually terrorists do not achieve their final goals but sometimes they succeed by limiting and redefining their goals; 90% of terrorist organisations disappear within a few years of their birth but it is also a fact that terrorism often wins a political-psychological war, rather than a military war.

(d) Most of the terrorists—‘front activists’- are young persons, though aged persons may be engaged in planning, strategy-making and training because ‘terrorism requires strength, stamina, and speed, physical qualities of youth’. In Saudi Arabia most of the detainees were men in their twenties from lower or middle class families and 24% had criminal records (Stern, 2010).
Often the terrorists grew up in fatherless families or hated their fathers, or were children of divorced parents; but some terrorists were brought up in harmonious families.

Often the terrorists suffer from anti-destructiveness, believe in superstitions and have trains of authoritarian personality;

Often terrorists are less educated and less articulate; but as exceptions Osama-bin-Laden was trained as a civil engineer, Aymen al Jawahiri was trained as a Physician, and Mohammed Atta (9/11 hijacker) was an architect.

In many terrorist groups women have played an important role – 30% of LTTE cadre in Sri Lanka have been women; on the other hand, Islamic and Irish terrorists have not engaged women because, in their view, bomb planting and throwing are man’s jobs; in fact, Algerian and Talibani terrorists have been anti-women and hence have imposed strict code for them including full Purdah from head to toe, no-schooling, no cinema viewing etc.

On global scale usually minorities are predominantly represented among terrorists; e.g. among Palestinian terrorists, Christians were included, and the Protestants were represented among Irish (Catholic) terrorists.

Often the terrorists view that they have right to attack but the State and society have no right to defend themselves; they pose themselves as martyrs, prisoners of war but cannot be tried in a court of law as only they know the truth.

There is a ‘generational transmission’ (to use Jerrold M. Post's terms) of extremist beliefs which begins early in life; a strong sense of victimisation and alienation; the belief that moral violations by the enemy justify violence in pursuit of a ‘higher moral condition’; the belief that the terrorists’ ethnic, religious or nationalist group is special and in danger of extinction, and that they lack the political power to effect change without violence;

What drives one to terrorism there are three types (according to Ervin Staub):

(i) Idealists' identify with the suffering of some group;
(ii) ‘Respondents’ react to the experience of their own group;
(iii) ‘Lost souls’ are adrift, isolated and perhaps ostracised and find a purpose with a radical group.
Root Causes of Terrorism:

The root causes of terrorism are multiple. The first and the foremost cause is community bashing – a strong feeling of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ is perceived and sustained for quite long time. It is indoctrinated by fundamentalists that one community is being deprived and discriminated against because of its religious faith and one instance of conflict is stretched too far to link with religion. For instance, the Palestine-Israel conflict was perceived as a conflict of Muslims versus Jews. Similarly Hindu-Muslim conflicts in Ayodhya (1993) and Gujarat (2002) are often portrayed in an eccentric and one-dimensional way as assaults on Islam and Islamic brotherhood without realising the fact that perpetrators of such violent incidents have been punished or are under trial in courts of law without fear or favour. Even the Supreme Court of India has been proactive to ensure that fair justice is done in such matters of national importance. Special Investigation Team interrogated even the Chief Minister of Gujarat and some influential accused persons like Ministers (Maya Kodnani and Babu Bajrangi) who were tried in Mumbai Court and were awarded stern punishment in terms of imprisonment. The founder of Al Qaeda and international Islamic Front (IIF), Osama-bin-Laden, declared in 1998 to wage a global ‘jihad’ (religious war on non-Muslims) against the common enemies of Islam – Crusaders (Christians) and the Jews. Later in 2006 he included Hindus as the third common enemy of Islam. Thus the ‘global Jihad’ is directed against the Christians, Jews and Hindus. It is also partly true that some days before 26 November 2008 terrorist attacks in Mumbai, about two dozen Indian Muzahideens were arrested by Mumbai Police and their Pakistani links tried to take revenge in the name of Muslim brotherhood. Undoubtedly the fanatics brainwash some Indian Muslim youth for a so-called great Islamic cause. Though Samuel Huntington’s thesis of ‘clash of civilisations’ is not correct due to its narrowness, yet it is a fact that on the whole some Islamic fundamentalists are mostly involved in terrorist violence on global scale. For Al Qaeda, US is the ‘great Satan’ and Israel is a ‘little Satan’. Jihadi terrorism of fundamentalist Islam is actually “a diverse phenomenon and both Shia and Sunni groups have been and are waging Jihad” (Mathur, 2009, p. 27). Muslim brotherhood has transcended the Shia-Sunni divide as illustrated by the Al Qaeda (Sunni) – Hezbollah (Shia) relationship in order to establish a global Islamic Caliphate. Both share resources and capabilities. Interestingly the terrorists name their organisations after God or other religious symbols. For instance, Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT) means ‘army of the pure’, Hezbollah (Lebanon) means ‘Party of God’, Hamas (Palestine) means ‘Islamic Resistance Movement’, Ikwan-ul-
Musalmeen (Egypt) means 'Muslim brotherhood', etc. In the terrorist attack in Mumbai at 8 locations (Taj hotel, Mazagon Dock port colony, Oberoi/Trident hotel, Colaba market, Cama hospital, Nehru road, NB road, Free Press road) on 26 November, 2008 in total 189 persons were killed out of whom 9 were Israelis and 25 were Christians and citizens of US, UK, France, Italy, Germany, Canada and Australia - this shows resentment against NATO forces operating in Afghanistan as well as Israel's policy against Hamas. In addition, *Jihadi* terrorism has transcended Jammu and Kashmir region and LeT has emerged as an international *Jihadi* and terrorist organisation working in close cooperation with JeM and Al Qaeda through its surrogates in Pakistan with an aim to escalate tension between India and Pakistan, and they have succeeded in stalling the peace process between India and Pakistan. Further Pakistan (the hub of Islamic fundamentalism) keeps its terrorist groups on borders in suspended animation when pressure from international community increases. Tarak Fatah (2017) rightly distinguishes between “State of Islam” (like Turkey and Indonesia) and Islamic State (like Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Iran) as the latter practises the rule of 'Sharia' while the former moves on the path of modernisation. Further a new terrorist organisation ISIS (Islamic State of Iran and Syria) has emerged in a big way and huge networks worldwide.

Needless to quote here Husain Haqqani, “Pakistan needs to roll back terrorism to secure its own future”. Moreover, though not fully agreeing with the hypothesis of Samuel Huntington (‘Clash of Civilisations’), since he has reduced the term civilisations to religions, Shairi Mathur (2009, p. 29) rightly observes, “*Jihadi* terrorism seems to derive energy from friction along the fault line between the Muslim world and the West”. Al Qaeda, LeT, JeM, Harkat-Ul-Mujahidin, Jamat-ud-Dawa, Jamat-ul-Furqan, Al Qanoon, Khuddam-ul-Islam and other *Jihadi* groups perceive the close ties between US and India (especially since the civil energy agreement 123) as the extension of the West in Asia. Thus India is the victim of the connivance of cross-border terrorism and *Jihadi* terrorism (Islamic State) simultaneously. For example, the problem of terrorism and separatism declined in 2012-14 but revived in terms of stone-pelting by the young generation also at the behest of Pakistan, its army formations and ISI through terror-funding. National Investigation Agency (NIA) identified 48 habitual stone-pelters in mid-2017 in Pulwama, Anantnag, Badgam, Kulgam, Tral, Awantipora, Shopian and Baramulla. About 50 J&K youth joined Hizbul Mujahideen and 50% of 220 active terrorists in Kashmir are Pakistanis. In 2016 about 370 terrorists tried to cross the border from Pakistan and 119 succeeded. However, during 2015-17 India’s security forces have
succeeded in killing many terrorists in Jammu & Kashmir like Abu Qasim, Safullah, Burhan Wani, Aqib Maulvi, Sabzar Bhat, Junaid Mattoo, Bashir Lashkari and Abu Dujana (commander of Lashkar-e-Taiba in J&K). Abu Dujana had developed a bad reputation due to his illicit and forced relations with many Kashmiri women, as Muneer Khan, Inspector General of Police (J&K) told (The Times of India, 2017). He hailed from POK (Pak Occupied Kashmir). Main objectives of Pakistan-based jihadi groups, targeting India are as follows (Karim, 2009):

(a) Spreading lawlessness in large areas to bring crucial economic and political activities to a standstill;
(b) Creating civil disturbances and administrative chaos;
(c) Disrupting trade and industry by attacking India's financial institutions, banks, and stock exchanges;
(d) Existing separatists and armed micro political groups in escalating internal conflicts;
(e) Engineering incidents to widen communal and ethnic divide;
(f) Undermining national security for subversion of India’s administrative echelons and penetration of sensitive organisations.

Needless to add that domestic and international terrorism support each other – in case of sponsored terrorism in India well-trained commandoes are assisted by some indigenous mercenaries who are well-acquainted with routes, locations, communication gaps, lack of vigilance and striking points. In 2003 there were 2500-3000 militants in Jammu & Kashmir, many of them foreign jihadis. The period from 1996-2003 was that of low-intensity proxy war in J&K. Period from 2003 to 2006 was a high intensity period of terrorism in J&K. Since 2006 to 2015 there was a decline in terrorist activities in J&K but increased during 2016-17, especially in the form of stone-pelting on security and civil officials. Thus there is a life cycle of birth, growth, decline and revival of terrorist activities in a society.

Second major root cause of terrorism in India is to destabilise its prosperous economy and strengthening of democracy here. That is why Pakistan-trained terrorists attacked on India’s Parliament (Sansad Bhawan) in December 2001. The Parliament symbolises people's ultimate power, secularism, sovereignty and integrity of the Indian nation. It is interesting to note that in Pakistan (and other neighbouring countries) democracy has been a casualty and jihadi groups desire to have Islamic regime as per backward looking Sharia. Cross border terrorists’ strategy is to cripple India's financial capital (Mumbai), create fear among tourists and foreign investors, and undermine India's global image of regional power. That is why
terrorist suicide attack (26 November 2008) in Mumbai chose five star hotels to attract international attention and Al Qaeda has international networks and can damage any nation.

Third cause of terrorism is the alleged social, economic and political deprivation and misery, as liberal scholars point out: “People who harbour a sense of grievance will turn to violence to dramatise their misery or to change the conditions that are responsible for it” (Bajpai, 2002, p. 24). Long long ago Aristotle had observed: “Poverty is the parent of revolution and crime” James C. Davies (1962), Ivo Feierabend and Rosalind Feierabend (1977, 1977), as well as Ted R. Gurr (1970) in ‘relative deprivation theory’ argued that when expectation outstrips achievement – regardless of the absolute level of economic consumption or the provision of political rights – frustration is generated. Economic inequalities (both within and among nations), conflict between business interests of transnational corporations and indigenous business houses as well as governments, unequal exchange between nation-states (often intensified by World Trade Organisation, liberalisation, privatisation and globalisation), legal and illegal migration on a large scale, and communal/racial divide have some kind of association with terrorist violence. The unipolar world has ‘Whitehouse effect’ as a political-economic corollary of the ‘greenhouse effect’. And the cumulated collective frustration results into collective anger and violence. However, as Deepak K Gupta (2009) rightly points out, most of the terrorists world over hail from the middle and the upper middle class families, not from the poor families. Actually the liberals must explain why only some persons of all those, having grievances against State for deprivation, choose to take up arms but others either limit themselves to constitutional and legal modes of redressal of their grievances or turn to moral economy of kinship support – as ‘social capital’ is generated through civil society organisations, not the state. Further macro-level studies, linking aggregate measures of poverty and deprivation, have found mixed results. According to a study (Krueger & Maleckova, 2003; Abadie, 2006), there is no direct correlation between low GDP and terrorism. Nonetheless, the poor people in countries with high level of unemployment are more vulnerable to recruitment of the 25000 insurgents and terrorist suspects detained in Iraq as of 2007, nearly all were previously underemployed and 78% were unemployed (Stern, 2010).

Regarding international terrorism there is little evidence that the poorest countries export attackers, particularly to the west; on the other hand, while many poor countries experience widespread violence and civil wars, many others do not experience as such. However, some scholars have found that there exists ‘fraternal
deprivation’; for instance, among the Palestinians or Maghreb Arabs in Europe – there poverty among a specific ethno-linguistic or religious group is often linked with terrorist act. To be precise, more than economic deprivation, feeling of humiliation and injustice gives birth to acts of political violence (Sarraj, 2002). But cross-national analysis often shows weak correlation between various sorts of deprivation and terrorist activities. To quote Dipak K. Gupta (2009, p. 27), again “Social, economic, and political inequalities do provide necessary conditions for violent uprising, but they are not sufficient causes. In other words, acts of rebellion do not take place simply because there is widespread frustration. For that they need additional factors”. Thus socio-economic and political deprivation may only create conducive condition for the emergence of terrorism.

Fourth cause of terrorism, as conservatives say, is the emerging stresses and strains of nation-building. That is to say, new systems of laws and institutions frighten some people more but the state has to enforce new modern laws and institutions. Hence resistance turns to violence. For instance, in Pakistan and Afghanistan governments desire, at least formally, to open and run modern schools for children but Talibans (Islamic fundamentalists) and other primordialist groups stick to traditional Madarsas based on ‘pure’ Islamic laws and beliefs. They do not want any education to girls. That is why Talibans have not only broken Buddha’s idol of heritage in Bamian but also smashed various school buildings. Obviously such Madarsas inculcate unscientific myths and distorted histories through religious preachings in the young minds. Even a young Pakistani girl MalalaYousafzai was shot with several rounds by Islamic terrorists as she stood for modern education of Muslim girls but somehow she could survive. Later she was awarded Nobel Prize for Peace along with Kailash Satyarthi (a crusader for child rights). Those nation-states, which are unable to cope with various kinds of stresses and strains, ultimately are destined to become ‘failed states’. Though the stresses and strains may play a significant role in creating conditions for the emergence of terrorism yet conservatives of this view must explain why some ethno-religious groups ‘naturally’ choose to rebel but others do not do so in the course of nation-building.

Fifth cause of terrorism is direct or indirect encouragement, promotion and support by some nation-States (State actors) and their coercive apparatuses like army, intelligence agencies and para military forces to settle scores with other nation-States as is proved time and again in the case of attacks on India the hands of Pakistan based terrorists supported by Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) and Pak army/Rangers. Ajmal Kasab, who was captured red handed with arms and ammunitions in Mumbai attack (26 November, 2008),
was a Pakistani national whom at first Pakistan government did not accept and later when different evidences were given, Pakistan requested Interpol for red corner notice to Ajmal Kasab though his trial was over and he was sentenced to death after spending crores of rupees on his security. Further, Pakistan government cleared the purchase of a bullet proof land cruiser for Jamat-ud-Dawa supremo Hafiz Mohammed Sayeed who is an ideologue of LeT and delivers hate speeches against US, Israel and India. It is estimated by Indian army that there are fifty major terrorist camps in Pakistan-occupied-Kashmir (PoK) involved in terrorist activities against India. Actually the Pakistani state and its coercive institutions try to divert the attention of the masses from the internal socio-economic and political problems like high unemployment rate, high poverty ratio, high malnutrition, high illiteracy, political instability, prevalence of corruption, ethnic conflicts and so on. Hence they fan hatred and enmity against India by raising the complicated issue of Jammu and Kashmir on the ground of religion and distorted history. Further the unemployed youth are provided arms and ammunitions, training, salaries, insurance and other benefits in order to be groomed in terrorist activities as has been revealed by some arrested Pak-trained terrorists including Ajmal Kasab.

Sixth cause of terrorism, as realists point out, is the competition between nation-states. Since there is no world government and the United Nations has not been able to enforce its decision on many nation-states, it is imperative that “the only means of settling the disputes and differences is through the threat or actual use of violence...terrorism is one of the strategies available to states in their competition for power. Terrorism can weaken rival states by throwing their domestic life into chaos and weakening the sinews of their government. Convulsed from within, they cannot compete with their external rivals” (Bajpai, 2002, p. 26). This explanation is partly true but the moot question arises as to why some nation-states use terrorism in an international ‘balance of power’ game but other nation-states do not do so. However, there is no denying the fact that external influences on terrorism is historically correct and a terrorist group cannot operate and sustain for long purely on the basis of domestic means and resources. It needs huge funds for a long period for the following purposes:

(i) Directly indulging in smuggling and other illegal economic activities like trade in drugs, narcotics, arms and ammunition or taking funds from foreign sources or sympathetic diaspora for propagating their parochial ideals;
Purchase of vehicles, equipment, arms and ammunition directly;

Periodic payments to youth deployed for terror acts;

Regular payments needed for intelligence gathering about state and its apparatuses, mass gathering, routes etc;

Regular payments for hideouts, safe buildings etc;

For maintenance of infrastructures like godowns for arms etc.

As per US RAND Corporation, the percentage of money coming from charitable donation is higher for the highly ideological groups, such as Al Qaeda or Hamas or IRA. However, the anomic groups like the leftist FARC in Colombia, Sendero Luminoso in Peru, and Abu Sayyaf in the Philippines are engaged in kidnapping and extortion. To some extent, choice of fund-raising reflects the cultural tradition of the groups. However, though drugs are forbidden in Islam, Al Qaeda and Talibans are engaged in drug trafficking (poppies) in Afghanistan. This may be seen in Table 2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissident Groups</th>
<th>Method of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Ideological :</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Al Qaeda (Original)</td>
<td>Osama Bin Laden’s investments &amp; business partnership; charities from all parts of Arab/Muslim World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Hamas</td>
<td>Iran (state-sponsored), Islamic charities, remittances from Arab expatriates, commercial enterprises (sewing and weaving centres and cattle farms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Palestine Islamic Jihad</td>
<td>Iran provides $2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Hizbollah</td>
<td>Iran and Syria, Worldwide fund-raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Professional :</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. ITA</td>
<td>Kidnapping, Extortion, robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. IRA</td>
<td>Extortion (from Northern Irish Catholics), bank robberies, donations from Catholic-Irish descendents outside or Ireland (mainly from US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Anomic :</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Abu Sayyaf</td>
<td>Largely self-financed through ransom and extortion; suspected to receive support from Islamic extremists in Middle East and South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. FARC</td>
<td>Cocaine trafficking &amp; production, extortion, kidnapping, hijacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sundero Luminose</td>
<td>Cocaine trafficking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Saudi Arabia has been lavishly funding Islamic fundamentalists in the name of charity; e.g. it funds International Islamic Relief Organisation (which has been blacklisted by UN for
backing terrorism) that works in 32 countries for relief to the victims
of natural disasters and to carry out humanitarian, health and
educational projects. According to Macedonia officials, Saudi Arabia
is pouring hundreds of millions of pounds into Islamic groups in the
Balkans to destabilise the latter through spreading of hatred for the
west and recruiting fighters for jihad in Afghanistan. Fundamentalists like Al Qaeda have financed the construction of
scores of mosques and community centres as well as paying followers
up to 225 pounds a month to grow beards and persuade their wives
to wear the ‘niqab’ (burka) – a custom unknown in liberal Islamic
tradition of the Balkans (Macedonia) as Macedonia government
resources revealed (Pancevski, 2010). Due to pressure from USA Al
Qaeda has gone underground and donations from Persian gulf
operate through cash couriers and informal money transfer shops
‘hawalas’. Further it has also turned to organised crimes like
kidnapping and drug trafficking – shipment of cocaine from Latin
America to Europe also. Ayman al Zawahiri is engaged in
telemarketing too (soliciting donations through cell phone
recordings). In June 2009 Al Qaeda’s Abu al Yazid, engaged in
Afghanistan operations, wrote on a website controlled by Al Qaeda:
“If a holy fighter does not have the money to get weapons, food, drink
and the materials for jihad, he cannot fight jihad” (Vardi, 2010, p.
65). Al Qaeda leaders plea for more: “It is not just about funding
the attacks – they must pay the operations and families of suicide
bombers, bribe public officials, travel, purchase travel documents
and provide training,” observed Stuart A Leavey, Under Secretary
for terrorism and financial intelligence at US Treasury (Vardi, 2010,
p. 66). Further $3.4 billion Afghan heroin trade is a critical source
for Talibans who tax poppy farmers and collect transit and protection
fees related to the drug trade. Al Qaeda has networks with Dawood
Ibrahim who operates a 5000 member criminal syndicate engaged
in narcotics, contract killings, etc., in Pakistan, United Arab Emirates
and India. In addition, Revival of Islamic Heritage Society (Kuwait)
also funds Al Qaeda networks. Couriers carry $100,000 per trip
between Afghanistan and the gulf, funds coming from legitimate
commerce and heroin trafficking. In 2006 a Pakistani financier for
Lashkar-e-Taiba handed David Headley of Chicago $25000 to conduct
video surveillance in India in preparation for Mumbai attack on 26th
November, 2008. James Fearon studied 28 civil wars since 1945
and concluded that, on average, civil wars lasted 39 years long when
insurgent groups were financed by contraband like heroin or cocaine.
For example FARC, a leftist terror group in Colombia kept itself
going on for about 50 years with the help of profits from cocaine and
kidnapping activities.
Finally, a threat to cultural – religious identity may also cause the emergence of terrorism. For instance, Sikhs in Punjab apprehended that Sikhism and Punjabi language in Gurmukhi script would not flourish as Sikhs were not shown as a minority community in Indian Constitution. This apprehension acted as ‘cultural amplifiers’ (to use John E. Mack’s words). Hence through Anandpur Sahib Resolution in 1973 (by Akalis) the idea of Khalistan got credence. The resolution demanded Chandigarh and other Sikh populated Punjabi speaking areas to be merged with Punjab and more autonomy to Punjab state. In 1978 a revised Anandpur Sahib resolution demanded Union government’s restriction to defence, foreign affairs, communication, currency and railways; Sikhs to be listed as a minority in Indian Constitution, and more financial powers to be given to the State of Punjab. Meanwhile Jarnail Singh Bhindranwala became a powerful extremist leader who was killed in June 1984 in Operation Blue Star but in reaction Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the then Prime Minister of India, was killed by her Sikh security guards. Later Rajiv Gandhi (Prime Minister of India) & H.S. Longowal (President of Shriomani Akali Dal) reached a ‘Memorandum of Settlement’ in July 1985 allowing transfer of Chandigarh to Punjab, redrawing of some territorial boundaries between Haryana and Punjab, referring Centre-State differences on autonomy to Sarkaria Commission, adjudication of river water disputes between Punjab and Haryana, and promotion of Punjabi language. But different militant Sikh groups did not accept this Rajiv – Longowal pact and Longowal was killed – as they demanded independence, not merely more autonomy. Actually Punjab is situated on the western border with Pakistan, hence ISI provided Sikh militants/terrorists the haven, money, training and arms and ammunitions as it did in Jammu and Kashmir.

Thus terrorist activities often arise in reaction to an injustice, real or imagined, or ideological indoctrination, or market conditions (taking one’s market share), or socio-religious networks, or fundamentalist-oriented education in traditional religious schools, or individual misguided preferences & prejudices (pure faith or hatred towards others), or ignorance about beliefs or an economic employment.

Eradicating Terrorism

Controlling terrorism is a tough task and eradicating it is the toughest one. However, there are two exceptions: Malaysia eradicated leftist insurgency in 1960's with iron hand and India did it with Sikh terrorism in the mid 1990’s. There are again three views on eradication of terrorism from conservatives, liberals and realists.
Conservatives think that any kind of appeasement of concession would result into disintegration of a nation-state. Therefore State should tackle it basically as a law and order problem and stamp out the violence. Hence State should collect actionable intelligence, segregate the terrorists from others, delink the terrorists from getting people’s support (inside the nation-State), reduce police response time to reach the place of occurrence, boldly face and encounter the terrorists as criminals, make speedy trial of the terrorists to have deterrent effects on the other. ‘Gill Doctrine’, as a model for 21st century counter-terrorism, succeeded in defeating religious terrorism in Punjab without making any political compromises nor addressing ‘root causes’ (Sahni, 2006). During 1981-1993 a total of 21,469 persons (including 8009 terrorists) were killed in various conflicts in Punjab. They substantially relied on foreign patronage, especially from Canada, US, UK and (West) Germany. Many so-called Khalistani terrorists were engaged in self-enrichment. K.P.S. Gill was posted in Punjab as Director General of Police. He had experience of fighting terrorists / insurgents in J&K and Assam. He was a Jat Sikh and was fighting the Jat Sikh terrorists in Punjab – he died in mid-2017 a natural death. Ten postulates of Gill doctrine are as follows (Mahadevan, 2009):

i) Terrorism is ‘the’ major challenge to the security of individual nation-States, so counter-terrorism cannot be denigrated as a mere law and order issue.

ii) Extensive foreign sponsorship of terrorism by rogue States has enhanced the striking power of terrorist groups, hence instead of use of minimal force, proportional force to the threat be used;

iii) Need to insulate the local population from suffering disproportionate collateral damage, so to avoid use of area weapons and airpower.

iv) To neutralise the sustaining dynamic of terrorism is more important than addressing the root causes (though mis-governance may play a role in fostering militancy).

v) Though security forces cannot act as substitute for the administrative wing, yet one cannot develop areas one does not physically control.

vi) ‘Societal Stockholm Syndrome’—even in instances where popular support for militancy appears high, it may not be so in reality. Gill calls the so-called ‘popular support’ as dubious and merely a survival tactic adopted by local population living under the shadow of gun.

vii) First objective of counter-terrorism is to break the collective mental paralysis that terrorist violence imposes
on local population, hence the police should engage terrorists operationally and *physically isolate* them from the terrorised people.

viii) Religious elements in Khalistan movement meant that it was closer to an identity-driven struggle, not ideology-driven. It is easier to eradicate ideologically-driven struggle through intellectual persuasion, hence Gill appealed directly to the terrorists’ natural instinct for survival – *either die for their idea of God or live for themselves*. Many Khalistan is responded by surrendering and those who did not respond were engaged in gun battles;

ix) All terrorist movements need to constantly replace cadres lost to security forces’ action; hence counter-terrorism should be conceived of as a war attrition. Government should develop an operational capability for attrition levels which are intolerable for the terrorists.

x) Counter-terrorism should make every reasonable effort to avoid violations of human rights to be politically sustainable in democratic nation-state; for this security forces should develop excellent intelligence and investigative capabilities in order to ensure that *only the guilty suffer* – targeting repression of terrorists and their active supporters based on good local intelligence.

Gill Doctrine thus hinged upon three crucial variables to achieve three possible attritional counter-terrorism; and in 1992 there was a convergence of three factors-offensive police, supplementary manpower and political mandate (Table 3).

**Table 3. Crucial Variables, Possibles and Converging Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crucial Variables</th>
<th>Possible (Pre-1992)</th>
<th>Converging factors (1992)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Local Intelligence</td>
<td>1. Surgically neutralise as many terrorists as possible.</td>
<td>1. Intelligence-led police offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of political Resolve</td>
<td>2. As quickly as possible</td>
<td>2. Supplementary manpower to assist policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A capacity for synchronised operations</td>
<td>3. For as long as possible</td>
<td>4. Political mandate to eradicate terrorism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Mahadevan (2009)

Liberal scholars are of the view, on the other hand, that the best way to eradicate terrorism is to launch an integrated programme of social, economic, and political engineering. That is to say, State has to accommodate the aggrieved groups in multi-dimensional ways
like providing productive employment opportunities, rehabilitation of surrendered terrorists, enhancement of political representation and empowerment at different layers of government, better and professional training of misguided youth, better health and medical facilities and so on. If a community feels aggrieved because of belonging to a religion, race, community, linguistic group or nationality, it needs to be addressed on priority through meaningful action. Further, Islamic tradition of dialogue (ijtihad) needs to be revived in order to defeat the monopolistic and one-dimensional interpretation of sacred texts by religious leaders. Often Osama-bin-Laden quoted a ‘fatwa’ (religious order) by 14th century Islamic scholar Ibn Taymiyya that divided the world into ‘house of Islam’ and ‘house of unbelief’. But in March 2010 new Mardin (Turkey) conference of Islamic scholars from India, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Kuwait, Iran, Morocco, Indonesia, Bosnia, Mauritania, Yemen) three major decisions by consensus were taken (The Times of India, 2010):

a. Anyone who seeks support from Ibn’s fatwa for killing Muslims or non-Muslims has erred in his interpretation.

b. Great Muslim empires of the past are not a model for a globalised world.

c. Modern civil States, that guard religious rights, necessitate declaring the entire world a place of tolerance and peaceful co-existence.

It has been experienced in different countries that socio-economic developmental programmes may eradicate domestic terrorism to a large extent. According to findings of US RAND Corporation, “developmental assistance could weaken local support and curb a number of terrorist activities, besides discouraging new recruits to join terrorist networks” (Karim, 2009, p. 12). Further it is prudent not to play with emotions of the masses (like operation Bluestar in Punjab by Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the then P.M.). A temptation for quick solution to an emotional and sensitive issue needs to be avoided, rather a well-thought out strategy be planned. Often the terrorists and extremists happily desire to polarise a society on religious, racial, linguistic or other primordial grounds. Hence a government should avoid the danger of over-reaction. Wherever possible, political accommodation should be tried if terrorists have broad-based support in the society at large. Saudi Arabia claimed to have de-radicalised 400 militants during 2004-2009 through rehabilitation programmes and integrated them into mainstream society more successfully than ordinary criminals. It was found that for some terrorists jihad is just a ‘job’. Saudi Arabia rehabilitation
programme (prison-based, transitional services, post-release services) reintegration of participants into their families and communities by encouraging family visits and getting the community involved in their follow-ups after they are released – recognising the ‘group dynamics’ that is key to both radicalisation and de-radicalisation. Further Saudi Arabia government also runs a terrorism prevention programme that monitors religious leaders, school teachers and websites. It also supports a NGO, called ‘Sakinah’ (tranquillity) Campaign, that helps internet users, who have visited extremist sites, interact with legitimate Islamic scholars online, with a view to steering them away from radicalism (Stern 2010). However, its credentials are not beyond doubt as it funds many religious groups in different countries on a grand scale with wider and extreme ramifications.

The realists, by and large, agree with the conservatives’ strategy for eradication of terrorism but also add that India’s neighbours supporting terrorism should be stopped in this regard. But simply diplomacy will not succeed here, rather well-planned coercive actions like offensively checking infiltration on borders and blocking external aid can compel them to stop interfering in India’s domestic affairs. It is not out of context to mention here that a small country like Israel has been successfully offensive in controlling terrorism from several Arab countries – sometimes using air-striking force much more than necessary. Similarly after 9/11 incident (11 September, 2001), US has so much tightened the security at its land borders, sea routes, airports, satellite establishment and institutions of strategic importance that no major terrorist incident has taken place there afterwards. Hence India should opt for offensive strategies (both preventive and curative) from bridging the legal gaps to police investigation to fast track trial to execution of punishment without delay. However, it is notable that ‘one-size-fits-all’ strategy like ‘global war on terror’ should not be targeted against Islam (as US President has announced restriction on visas for some Islamic countries). Hence specific sensitive and appropriate proactive strategy without bias and malice is called for. As proved in police investigation, in Pune blast the LeT and Indian Mujahidin (IM) had connived, hence Union government rightly froze 12 bank accounts of Mohsin Ismail Chowdhury (at Ratnakar Bank in Pune) in March 2010 under section 51A of Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act. He is linked with ISI-operated Karachi Project (wherein ex-army men of Pakistan are working). Government of India has amended Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act (expanded the definition of terrorist act, provision against fund raising widened, detention of accused extendable up to 180 days on report of public prosecutor,
recruitment and training for terrorist activities made punishable), established National Investigation Agency (NIA) which is doing intensive investigation and fool proof process. For effective action we have to realistically assess the following option (Karim, 2009):

1. Our military option and its long term aims & consequences;
2. Our political option and ability to muster international support for strong, coercive policies against Pakistan;
3. Our ability to dismantle terrorist organisations/camps across borders in a short time-frame.
4. Our requirement of specialised weapons, organisation and personnel for destruction of the Pakistan-based terrorist infrastructure.

Undoubtedly we should realistically assess and investigate as to how the Pak-trained terrorists could easily come and enter various establishments like Taj Palace with a huge load of arms and ammunitions. No doubt they could not have been successful without support of indigenous groups/individuals – they need to be detected and booked under the laws of the land. Unfortunately India’s major cities like Mumbai, Ahmedabad, Delhi, Kolkata, Bangalore, Hyderabad, Lucknow, Agra, Jaipur, Goa, Chennai, Patna, Ajmer, Guwahati, etc., have suffered terrorist attacks in the past but we have unfortunately, not learned much lesson so far. It is better to keep the army in the secondary role, and the police and Para-military forces in the forefront of tackling terrorism in a professional way. And there is no short cut method to success. The police should nip the terrorists in the bud effectively. Though Mumbai Police Commissioner is vested with all legal powers, including the Magistrate’s power (under Criminal Procedure Code 1973 and Police Act) for maintaining law and order, yet he did not proactively and professionally act upon the terrorist acts on 26 November 2008. Rather there were disjointed efforts by several police officers and these created a chaotic situation. Ram Pradhan Committee, constituted by Maharashtra government, reported that the then Police Commissioner of Mumbai, Hasan Gafoor, failed to adequately exercise ‘commands and controls’ during crucial hours but later he pointed out in an interview that Additional Commissioner of Police (Anti-Terrorism squad) Parambir Singh, Additional Commissioner of Police (South region) K. Venkatesham, Additional Commissioner of Police (Crime) Deven Bharti, and Joint Commissioner of Police (law and order) and K.L. Prasad either dithered on rushing to the sites or chose to be away from action – ‘they chose to ignore the need of the hour’. Though Rakesh Maria, the then Joint Commissioner (crime) was made in charge of the control room by the then Police
Commissioner, another Joint Commissioner (law and order) K.L. Prasad too stationed in the control room did not go to the trouble spot. Second, Marine Commandos were stationed just a few kilometers away from the terror spots, but they took three hours to reach there after the request was made by the Deputy Commissioner of police. Further they refused to chase the terrorists on the ground that they were specialists in offshore operations only! Actually earlier they had been used in land operations too. Third, on 20 November (2008) National Security Guards (NSGs) were withdrawn from ongoing operations on the orders of DGP and Home Minister and instead it was ordered to involve Mumbai police, though NSG has been doing appreciable job and masses have more faith in them. Even the Chief of Anti-Terrorist Squad (ATS) Hemant Karkare was wearing bullet-proof jacket in full public view with a media hype in an unprofessional manner (and it was observed keenly by the supporters of terrorists inside Taj hotel and there was a fool-proof communication between terrorists and their supporters). And the police control room did not reach on the spot in time with the reinforcement though Hemant Karkare and his team had given SOS to it. Further most of the police force in India are equipped with outdated, .303 rifles while terrorists are well-equipped with modern fire arms like Carbine, SLR, light machine gun (LMG), AK 47 rifles, and so on. Therefore, the advanced modernisation of the police force is the need of the hour. US have been successfully using UAVs (Unmanned Air Vehicles) like Drone to control terrorists. But unfortunately in many States of India (law and order is a State subject in Indian Constitution) the professionalism of police force is giving way to politicisation of police force – misusing it for the party in power, on the one hand, and allowing flourishing of nepotism and corruption, on the other. Hence police reforms like separation of investigation, and law and order wings, confidence-building measures among the lower police functionaries, GPS (Geographical Positioning System) in police vehicles, continuous professional in-service training, budging the gap between the higher and the lower police forces, elimination of political interference in day-to-day functioning, increasing police-population ratio (at present 1:694 in India against 1:336 in US and 1:294 in UK), creating a separate security cadre for VIP duties, filling of vacancy in different ranks (which is often not due to the paucity of fund but for caste and bribe considerations) etc. As an experienced former Police Commissioner of Delhi Ved Marwah (2009, p. 86) rightly remarks, “Recruitments are held up till demands for money are met. There are also demands for recruitment on caste and other considerations. If someone joins the police by payment of bribery or using political links, that person can hardly be expected to perform duties in an impartial manner”. In 2006 the Supreme
Court of India, based on National Police Commission's recommendations, gave the following directions:

a. Insulating the police from undue political interference and giving it functional autonomy.
b. Making it accountable.
c. Separating investigation from law and order duties.
d. Transparency in the selection of police chiefs and giving minimum tenure of two years.
e. Central government to constitute a National Security Commission to upgrade effectiveness of police forces and improve their working conditions.

Finally, we have to persuade and convince the international community that a terrorist act is a terrorist act and it should not be differentiated and measured with different yardsticks whether it occurs in the developed countries or in the developing countries. Unfortunately the developed countries have not shown the required seriousness and urgency for support on several terrorist attacks in different parts of India. Also unfortunately US have been giving both developmental aid and military aid to Pakistan for fighting with the ‘hard Talibans’ and for rehabilitation of the ‘soft Talibans’ but, as ex-Pakistan President Parvez Musharraf admitted in a press conference in US, Pakistan has been using most of its aid for military modernisation to fight against India. Thus, Musharraf played a ‘double game’. India has lodged its strong protest with US time and again and now the new regime of Donald Trump (US President) the noose is tightening against aid to Pakistan.

One important trend in recent years is the increasing role of the State, which was getting diluted and weakened due to the process of globalisation, because of three major factors: first, due to economic recession and failure of most of the private financial institutions and banks, the new economic responsibility is again thrust upon the State to bail out these institutions. India did not face the consequences of melt down in US due to its better regulation of financial institutions. Second, due to the increasing terrorist and other violent activities like naxalism, insurgency and so on, the security and coercive role of the State has been re-emphasised. Third, due to the increase ageing population, public health care is to be increased in both the developed and the developing countries and due to the increase in unemployment more government spending on this aspect is required, hence the need of growing the State power for providing ‘social safety nets’ i.e. neither State can be reduced to a non-entity nor it should be allowed to become a ‘leviathan’ (as Thomas
Hobbes had recommended in his ‘social contract’ theory). It is actually required that the State should play a proactive role to protect its citizens in different ways ranging from providing social safety nets to security to protect the global commons. Due to fluid borders of nation-States, the problem of terrorism gets compounded, hence strict vigilance and security on the borders of nation-States is very much required. Since terrorism is often a crucial intertwining of law, politics, business, economic crime etc., so State is to be re-invented and rejuvenated for the protection of humans, non-human creatures, and property. There has never been a ‘just terrorism’ like a ‘just war’. Actually day-by-day terrorism is taking worse forms from limited to total and indiscriminate warfare. Hence it requires a multi-prong strategy for its elimination with a long-term perspective.

**Conclusion**

This article has attempted to provide some understanding of the problem of terrorism, its genesis, manifestation and operation as well as the need of its eradication. The following are the measures that should be adopted to eradicate this problem:

State and its apparatuses (both coercive – police & army – and ideological - press, social media, culture, etc) have to be more proactive and well-planned since the terrorists are well organised on a global scale. Tit for tat is necessary for violence by committed militants both inside and across the borders. Local police should lead the anti-terrorist operations, helped by army formations, as they have better information.

At world scale our diplomacy should be more effective to convince one and all that there is nothing like good terrorist and bad terrorist – terrorism as such is bad, hence needs to be eradicated fully. Similarly developed countries must also realise that terrorist activities in developing countries should be taken as seriously as the same in developed countries.

Domestic politics of India should not remain fragmented because national sovereignty & integrity is most important for all individuals, groups, parties and communities. Both ruling & opposition parties (including regional ones) should speak in one collective and cohesive voice so that a clear message is sent to the terrorists within India and their outside networks (both state and non-state actors).
Funding of all terrorist organisations should be checked and uprooted in all possible ways so that they may not be able to get arms and ammunitions as well as other logistics to operate against India in any way. This requires national and international qualitative intelligence gathering and coordination as well as effective action on all actionable intelligence.

We may conclude in the words of Toscano (2009, p. 109): “All instances of successful defeat of terrorist groups, even rather of powerful ones, show a combination of repression of the terrorist operatives, on the one hand, and of the socio-economic and political initiatives, on the other. On terrorism we should neither be ferocious hawks nor timid doves, but rather wise owls”. Let us act in this manner at the earliest.
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