Chapter First

Introduction

The terrorism means all kinds of violent acts, under taken by a person, group or a state with an aim to create fear\terror for a religious, political or ideological goal. This is aimed towards government and civilians equally. It can be broadly classified into political terrorism for political purposes (this could be domestic or cross border and for ideology or control of state) and non political terrorism. Terrorism that is not aimed at political purposes but which exhibits “conscious” design to create and maintain a high degree of fear for coercive purposes, but the end is individual or collective gain rather than the achievement of a political objective. Terrorism is an ideology practised by terrorist groups and activists in order to achieve their political aims and objectives. Often it is a by product of religious fundamentalism, or dogmatism of one kind or other. Deliberate use of violence characterises it. While defining terrorism OED states, a recent history of the car bombing described this weapon-the terrorist tactic par excellence–as the “poor man’s air force”. This is not to romanticise the impact of terrorism. The same writer described the car bombing as “an inherently fascist weapon guaranteed to leave its perpetrators awash in the bloody of innocents”.

Common definition of terrorism refer to those violent acts which are intended to create fear and perpetrated for a religious, political or ideological goal, deliberately target or disregard the safety of civilian’s and are committed by non government agencies. Terrorism has a negative impact on the development of any nation, particularly a nation like India. Terrorism is commonly understood to refer to acts of violence that target civilian’s in the pursuit of political or ideological aims. In legal terms, although the international community has yet to adopt a comprehensive definition of terrorism, existing
declarations, resolutions and universal ‘sectoral’ treaties relating to specific aspects of it define certain acts and core elements. In 1994, the General Assembly’s declaration in measures to eliminate international terrorism, set out in its resolution 49/60, stated that terrorism includes ‘criminal acts intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in a general public, a group of persons or particular persons for political purposes’ and that such acts “are in circumstances unjustifiable, whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological racial, ethnic, religious or other nature that they may be invoked to justify”.

Modern terrorism has become an increasingly visible and disturbing feature of the contemporary international scene. On every single day, acts of terrorism take place around the world for variety of motives, whether the terrorist style themselves as separatist, anarchist, dissidents, and nationalists. Marxist revolutions or religions true believers; what makes them as terrorist is that they direct violence against persons and property with the goal of terrorizing the wider audience. An expert in radical Islamic activity, Jason Burke states that there are multiple ways of defining terrorism and all are subjective. Burke goes ahead to state that most define terrorism as “the use are threat of serious violence” to advance some kind of ‘cause’ some state clearly the kinds of group (sub-national, non-state) or cause (political, ideological, religions) to which they refer others merely rely on the instinct of most people when confronted with innocent civilians being killed or maimed by men armed with explosive, fire arms or other weapon. So terrorism was initially used dictatorship against its own citizens. Officials definition, have mainly emanated from those European countries that have endured terrorist campaigns. The British describes terrorism as the use of threat, for the purpose of advancing a political, religious or ideological cause of action which involves serious challenge against a person or property. In the federal republic of Germany,
terrorism has been defined as ‘enduring concludes struggle for political goals, which are intended to be achieved by means of assaults on the life and property of their persons, especially by means of severe crimes. The defection of Europeans interior ministers notes that, “terrorism is-the use, or the threatened use by cohesive group of persons of violence short of warfare to affect political aims”.

Accounts of terrorism mainly fall into two categories; those that understand the phenomena as a form of warfare, and those that do not. Robbert Taber describes terrorism as “urban guerrilliasm” a form of warfare that is more humane than most other types of warfare. In his words, terrorism conventionally viewed with pious horror as political murder is for more human beings more selective, than most other types of warfare. It is the systematic use of murder and destruction, and the threat of murder and destruction in order to terrorize individuals, groups, communities or governments into conceding to the terrorist political demands. Terrorism appears to be the preferred tactic of small and weak organizations in their quest to compensate for what they lack in numbers.

Terrorism is an activity or a ‘weapon-system’, as Brain Jenkins has termed it that has been used by an enormous variety of non-state groups, regimes, and governments. Historically the use of terror by regimes has been infinitely more lethal than that of non-state groups because, by definition, regimes\governments-are likely to have control of far greater supplies of weapons and manpower to implement their policies of terror in the course of internal repression of foreign conquest. However in an operative democracy, the major threat of terror is posed non-state movements or groups seeking to destroy or undermine democratic governments and to impose own agenda by coercive intimidation. Terrorism as an expression of violent dissent provides a dramatic method of highlighting a ‘cause’. It seeks to demoralise, terrorise and renders helpless the target group \ state; it seeks to achieve its cause through
coercion with total disregard of the consequences of innocent human beings as the motto is that the end justifies the means. Terrorism is also a convenient label, which a colonial power may choose to give a liberation movement for acts of violence directed against the power. When terrorism is institutionalised in the coercive exercise of the power of a state aimed at gagging even democratic dissent, it becomes state terrorism. At first it was identified with the state action but latter it was applied to individual or group violence. It covers varied form of violence, ranging from discriminate bombing to hijacking, kidnapping, taking of hostage assassination and severe destruction of property. Terrorism is uniquely offensive form of political violence, generally in response to the political importance of the ruler or some political malaise. Literally, terrorism like other ‘ism’ is a system or the method or theory behind strongly believing in use of terror towards the achievement of certain objectives. Terror in the ordinarily parlance means intense, overpowering fear and use of terrorising method for governing or resisting a government. Terrorism has been assuming grave dimensions, endangering or taking innocent lives or otherwise, jeopardizing human rights and fundamental freedoms. The internationalisation of the problem of terrorism has been associated with the extension of the terrorist’s means and methods of actions. Terrorism is an intense paralyzing fear, or the dread of it. Terrorism is a deliberate attempt to create terror through a symbolic act of involving the use of threat of abnormal lethal force for the purpose of influencing a target group or individuals. The term lethal force is used in lieu of lethal violence due to the pejorative nature of the latter term. In conventional parlance violence connotes the illegitimate use of force, as in criminal violence. But even when coupled with a more ‘neutral’ term such as political violence it still conjures images of force used against a legitimate, established authority. As observed by Hannah Arendt, violence can be justifiable, but it never will be legitimate. Consequently, this employs the more neutral term force to avoid to the greatest possible degree any normative
concepts. Terrorism as we seek to establish here, is an instrument of war.
terrorism may be used in a manner considered by those adhering to the
ideological school as being “good or evil”. Certainly the same western
democratic nations that today decay the use of terrorism as evil, barbarous, or
criminal would have warmly applauded the terrorist attack on Adolf Hitler and
the Nazi regimes in July 1994. And to use a more contemporary example, were
Kaddhafi to meet the same fate as Anwar Sadat, few in the western democratic
world would be likely to condemn such an act. Clearly, then arguments of the
legitimacy of the use of force in a terroristic manner are superfluous to
understanding the unity of that force. Terrorism is called terrorism because it
violates the normative values of the target entity regarding the employment of
lethal force. According to Alexander Schmid, extranormalness is what sets
terrorism apart from all other forms of force employment. It is this factor of
abnormality that separates terrorist force from other types of force employment.
This is course invites of question of what is to be considered abnormal. Clearly
abnormality is at best a transitive phenomenon. As Schmid notes, when tanks
and poison gas were first used in combat, they were considered abnormal and
caused panic and terror among those who initially faced them. Perhaps the most
widely accepted definition criterion used to define abnormality force in war is
the killing of non-combatants- particularly civilians. Even this is not always
considered abnormal, however. Indeed killing civilians was considered common
place unit it was too for during the thirty years war. The sack of Magdeburg in
May 1961 was so complete the bloody that historian. H. W. Koch calls it the
Hiroshima of the thirty years war. Nearly all of Christendom was repelled at the
horror of the wanton pillaging, slaughter, and destruction. The reaction to this
and the terrible cost of the war in general resulted in the peace of Westphalia.
Which among other things, placed limitations on warfare and protected non-
combatants from its scourges? Terrorism affects the social structure as well as
the individual; it upsets frame work of the precepts and images which members
of society depend on a trust. Since one no longer knows that sort of behaviour to expect from other members of society, the system is disoriented. The formerly coherent community dissolves into a mass of anomic individuals, each concerned with personal survival.

Crayton (1983), for instance, defined terrorism as an effort to get or keep power or control through intimidation, by generating a fear of destruction in those terrorized. He argued that terrorist usually operate in units, disguise themselves under the banner of a cause, and believe that they cannot achieve their objects through legal means in crayon’s opinion., terrorist groups emerge due to problems that emanate from deprivation, which include minority status, prejudice, disenfranchisement and poverty as well as exploitation, because terrorist lack access to an equitable responsive social or political system. They obtain publicity through the mass media in order to make their point. Freedman (1983) defined terrorism as the use of violence to create harms indirectly by victimizing a neutral or innocent third party. A Minister is assassinated his successor taking warning. A police man is killed ten others trembled...” terrorists, is short, use publicity of their willingness to engage in violence to influence their enemies. For Thornton (1964-74) terrorism is the use of terror as a “symbolic act” the goal is to gain influence over political behaviour through the use or threat of violence.

For the layman, terrorism can be defined as the illegal use of political violence. But when the term first came to be the force during the French revolution, it had a positive connotation and was used as “an instrument of governance” to “consolidate the new government’s power of by intimidating counter revolutionaries...” however, with the advent of democracy and liberalism in Europe in 19th century, the term started gaining a revolutionary and anti-state connotation. The exact reverse of the earlier Robespierrean context, in the late 19th and early 20th century, terrorism meant “propaganda by deed” to
attract public attention to the then existing anarchist terrorist groups and their causes. Except during the inter-war period, when state terrorism dominated, the revolutionary connotation of terrorism continued even after world war second. It meant violence used by anti-colonialist and indigenous nationalist groups, especially with the sponsorship of some sovereign states. During the cold war, some American scholars, went to the extent of describing terrorism” as a calculated means to destabilise the west as part of a vast global conspiracy by the “USSR”. Terrorism was also associated with “proxy war” employed by smaller states to take on more powerful ones without risking formal retaliation. The two super powers also resorted to this tactic during the cold war. This war when the well known phrase of ‘one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter, came to be force, bringing in the problem of moral judgement while defining the term terrorism. This problem continues even today, not as a moral dilemma, but more as a usage for convenience by the states that sponsor terrorist groups to “Bleedy their enemies”. Use of terrorist as “surrogate warriors” by some states to take on their powerful adversaries has become a kind of asymmetric warfare strategy mainly to escape identification retaliation and sanction. In its evolution the term terrorism thus from a “positive” origin has reached the other end of the spectrum to bear a ‘pejorative’ and subjective connotation. New terrorism is seen as a threat to all states to all people’s which can strike any time, everywhere. Yet, the world has not fully grappled with the enormity of the challenge, nor been able to arrive at a consensus on ways to deal with this new form of threat. The amorphous nature of the present day organisational structure of terrorist groups is deliberate; to not only thwart easy identification, but also to facilitate the escape of the terrorists. The new terrorism is more lethal, claiming more casualties than-ever-before. Religion and revenge factors constitute the major ingredients of motivation to the new cohort of terrorists. They are high-tech, professional and leave fear footprints. The present day terror groups are difficult to penetrate. Terrorism has been a
ubiquitous phenomenon, though its objectives, forms and processes varied over time and space. The spatial and temporal variations in terrorism have been of concern to those affected by it, in whatever ways. Therefore, although the genesis of terrorism gets manifestation in a particular section of society, yet it suddenly acquires nation and international dimensions and becomes a complex problem within no time. Today it has spread to such an extent that the faith of common men in the law and order system is shaken. They live a life of insecurity. At the same time terrorism is also a purposeful activity not only for those who initiate or openly elite. Terrorism is not a fresh phenomenon of sudden, alarming and recent innovation. It has existed throughout the recorded history of mankind, and most societies have, at different times, witnessed an upsurge of terrorist violence. In recent times terrorism has however become an issue of considerable concern, a confusingly complex matter attracting widespread national and international attention. During the last two decades terrorism has reached such stunning proportions that many nations feel baffled and groping. The use of terrorist violence has increased significantly, especially, since the end of the Second World War, becoming a permanent phenomenon after sixties. The number of reported incidents oscillates from year to year, but the overall projector is clearly upward, and increase is not merely a reflection of better reporting; it is genuine. Terrorism has also increased in its severity, brutality and ferocity. The number of fatalities and other casualities resulting from terrorism has also climbed up considerably. The terrorist toll has, now gone beyond numbers, beyond rhetoric and beyond expressions of sorrow. The national and international awareness of the terrorist threat has grown and matured. The amount of writing now being produced on terrorist and terrorism is abundant. The phenomenon of terrorism has demanded increasingly scrutiny over the past two decades. Terrorism has become a central and controversial issue of world-wide attention – a subject of analysis and debate not only by members of the military and law-enforcement communities, but also by
government officials and academic alike. Terrorism’s current influence on the mechanics of civilisation has been sufficient to earn egregious labelling as ‘the greatest evil of our age, a more serious threat to our culture and survival than the possibility of nuclear war, or even the rapid depletion of the planets natural resources.

Terrorism is not a phenomenon unique to the modern era. Viewed from a historical perspective, example of terrorist behaviour are abundant.

The Jacobin reign of terror in France during the revolutionary period of the 1790s is frequently cited in reference to the origin of terrorism as a political concept. Similarly, the Anarchist Narodnya Volya’s determined use of violence in their efforts to topple the Russian Tsars through the latter half of the nineteenth century is given credence as an antecedent of modern terrorism. Also worthy of mention are the activities of the Croatian-Serbian terrorist group, the ‘black hand’ who were responsible for the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand at Sarajevo in 1914 an act which triggered the First World War. But of terrorism of today is not simply a product of history, although past and present events continue to play a dominant role. Rather, the very nature of modern of civilisation has largely prompted recrudescence of terrorism as a political tool. Dramatic strides in technological innovation, sharply defined international power blocs, and the striving for influence in developing nations, as well as religious, ethnic and cultural discord, have all made contributions to the current growth of terrorism. Terrorism, as opposed to other forms of violence, is the systematically applied threat or use of illegitimate force with the designed intent of achieving a goal by means of such a method of coercion. It is violence used as a policy; it is fear or terror engendered on an organised basis. Eckstein and Aron, among other authorities, agree that terrorism is inherently indiscriminate in the strategy of its use, terrorism has many applications, including purely
criminal purposes; it is politically motivated terrorism however which is of major concern in the modern context.

Terrorism is a form of war away and outside the purview of guerrilla war, revolutionary war, insurrection or conventional war aims at total destruction of men and materials and a goal of guerrilla and revolutionary war is to cause physical damage, terrorism seek psychological results. A terrorist himself cannot achieve any political objective and must rely on his audience to respond in the manner he desires. A psychological reaction in the audience, through the use of violence affecting the audience’s political behaviour is the terrorist’s immediate objective. Terrorism however, identifies itself with guerrilla action in one way that it does not follow the principle of war. It includes act of violence or campaign of violence waged outside the accepted rules and procedures of international diplomacy of war. It is unconventional, unorthodox and fought by irregulars. Terrorism consists of acts which by themselves may be criminal by nature involving violence or threat of violence but which has the additional feature of being executed by a organised group which the deliberate intention of creating a climate of extreme fear with a view of disrupting established order, causing panic and chaos among the people and stamping out opposition. Victims in a terrorist situation are mostly innocent, chosen for their softness, publicity value and their suitability as bargaining levers. Terrorism consists of certain attacks of violent nature which have clear national and international consequences. It is a kind of warfare-warfare without terrority; it has an origin and has a concept. ‘War’ literally means ‘a state of conflict’ a contest between parties carried on by arms; any long continued struggle often against or between impersonal forces; open hostility. Traditionally terrorism was described as “a covert use of violence directed against a government and was a practised in conjunction with revolutionary war on guerrilla war in support of nationalist and international movements and as a means of agitation by a particular section
of the society”. Terrorism was considered to be the use of murderous violence to achieve political ends. In broader terms, however, is a spectacular act of violence directed against an individual or group of individuals or against property, destruction of which will impair the morale of the people, or any act of intimidation carried out by members of an organised group with a view to drawing attention of the public and the government like, to their cause or grievances. The aim is to defame or discredit the established order and create chaos and confusion in the administrative machinery and instil fear in the minds of the general public. Terrorism can therefore be termed as brutal-crimes committed or actions taken, to create a climate of ‘terror’ or fear in the general public and to undermine the functions of the established system with the ultimate aim of guiding public opinion and public action to a designed result. The natural of concomitant of terrorism is extreme violence is conjoined by destruction of life, property of human values of threat to perform such acts against selected targets, by highly motivated persons for the cause considered by them just but may not be existential, with the support of the community and the community out of fear or under duress reacts in a fashion desired by the terrorists. Terrorism is a very projective term. Both democracies and autocracies use the term in political discourse to delegitimize their political enemies while terrorist groups usually avoid the terms to describe their activities. According to Bruce Hoffman, Lehi, one of the Jewish terrorist groups active in Palestine during the 1940s, believed to be the last group actually to describe its publicity as terrorists. Terrorism is a positive term has not disappeared entirely in the writing of radical ideologies, however. Example, the famous Brazilian revolutionary Carols Marighella Lauded ‘terrorism as a tactic the revolutionary should never abandon in his seminal treatise mini-manual of the urban guerrilla. Terrorism has long been a controversial term in academic for very good reasons. While there is much good research on individual terrorist groups, their campaigns and conflict areas in which they operate. The study of terrorism as a
generic phenomenon has suffered from serious problems. Charles Tilley, e.g., has warned social scientists against reifying the term ‘terror’, ‘terrorism’ and ‘terrorist’, since they do not identify casually coherent and distinct social phenomenon. Terrorism databases do, exist but they have been criticised for not being entirely scientifically coded. Furthermore none of them are comprehensive, at least not when it comes a domestic terrorism. In the social movement and political violence literature, terrorist incidents are usually not coded separately, but instead they are melded in with other forms of collective political violence. Terrorism is obviously just one of many forms of non-governmental collective political violence, and the term is perhaps more aptly defined by delimiting it from other related terms. It must be seen as part of a broader violence continuum where some acts are more ‘terroristic’ (i.e, share more of its definitional characteristics) than others. It is common to distinguish terrorism from guerrilla warfare and armed insurgencies by the former’s deliberate targeting of non-combatants, and by the fact that terrorist groups are commonly, but not always, small conspiratorial groups with no capacity or ambition to physically defeat the enemy or control terrority terrorism is often associated with political violence by non-state actors in societies at peace.

History reveals that terrorism is not a recent phenomenon. It is older than the ancient civilisation of Greece and Rome. Early examples include pharaoh of Egypt, Neb-U- Chad-Nez’zar of Balyon, Herod of Roman Empire, known for their terrorist activities. Generally, it was a weapon of a strong rather than the weak, which was called the state terrorism. Chenghiz khan, Taimur, the Huns, the Marathas, the Mughals, the Nazis, and Stalin also struck terror in to the hearts of their opponents. Unlike ancient and medieval period terrorism is considered as the strategy of the strong as well as weak. Many modern states including democracies indulged in terrorist activities directly and indirectly violating and denying human rights. The concept of terrorism being the weapon
of the weak perhaps first demonstrated by the jewis in Palestine at the end of the Second World War. The Irgun Zuai Leumi attacked target such as public utilities, government installations and public servants in an attempt to speed up the withdrawl of the British from Palestine and formation of the state of Israel. Since, then it has been the weapon of both the Jewish state as well as different Palestinian groups in which the latter indulged plane hijacking during 1970s and early 1980s and now both are intermittently bombing and firing each other. Terrorism starts with a man or a group or a state fired by religious or political or social objective, which cannot be achieved through negotiations, conventional means of persuasions or the democratic process. Some of the non state groups even intend to remove the existing government by democratic method using force. The purpose of terrorism varies from group to group and time to time. Therefore it is very difficult to narrow down their objectives. However the first possible purpose of terrorism is to obtain world wide publicity or notoriety. The second objective is to ensure the support and co-operation of the people by selective killing of the opponents. The third objective may to break the will of the government by selective attack on government buildings and installations, officials, families and security forces and even political leaders so that to paralyzze the govt. machinery. Merciless killing of innocent people explicitly highlights the inability of a government to maintain law and order. Subsequently the terrorist groups try to fill the vacuum and impose their writ. They can even run parallel government organisations and judicial system according their coded law. The fourth purpose may be to create an ethnic divides for force migration by selective attacks against one community. In a mighty country like India terrorism has had its faint beginnings only in the 20th century, as we seen it today. International terrorism had its openings in India in the assassination of two prime ministers of india-Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi. Historically speaking the Sungan Couped Tat of overthrowing the mauryas staged by pushya Mitra Sunga appears to be the first act of terrorism in
ancient India. Murder diplomacy was the order of medieval Indian history as well. To study the history of terrorism is to study the history of human civilization. From the murder of Julius Caesar in 44 B.C. to the atrocious airplane attacks of September 11, 2001, terrorists have been the cause of many of the monumental events of human experience. Terrorism has been a part of history of virtually every country in the world, and its causes have varied widely over time and place. The terrorist attack on Julius Caesar has remained a potent symbol spanning the centuries. Political leaders have everywhere been the targets of terrorists. When, in 1865, John Wilkes Booth jumped onto the stage at the ford that after shouting “Sic Sempertyrannis” (“thus always to tyrants”), the despot he felt justified in killing was Abraham Lincoln, president of the United States.

The Jewish Zealots of the first century, also known as the Sicarii, constituted one of the earliest large-scale terrorist organisations. Their goal was to prevent roman rule over Judea (now Israel). They died for their efforts in a mass suicide at Masada in 20 A.D. but not before they had incited an insurrection of the populace against the Roman occupation of Judea. Another religiously inspired terrorist group, whose best-known member was guy Fawkes, was much less successful. Many people have heard of guy Fawkes- in Great Britain, there is a holiday named for him-but more people don’t known that he was caught red-handed in 1605 trying to blow up London palace of Westminster.

Rapport disputes the myth that terrorism has increased a technology has advanced. Terrorists have always had weapons, transportation, and communication-no matter how rudimental. From the sword of the Zealots - Sicarii to the dagger of assassins to the Silk scarf noose of the thugs, terrorist have used whatever technology was available, Rapport thus concludes that “the
critical variable cannot be technology; rather, the societies to them are decisive factors”.

Terrorism is often considered an old form of violence with more modern characteristics. It involves the purposeful of deliberate inducement of fear, through the use of threats or violence as methods of effecting change by dissatisfied entities. Although terrorism is often regarded as a method limited to small groups such as the Italian Red Brigades, the Japanese red army, Hamas, or Islamic Jihad, it has nonetheless been the preferred method of many despotic regimes, especially during the cold war era in Argentina. It entails inducing strong fear, uncertainty, outrage, and ultimately inflicting violence on the target population. In other words terrorism is used to both state and non state actors to pursue political and social- economic goals. Terrorism as a concept serves no useful analytic purpose because it has become a catch-all label for virtually all types of civil strife; insurgency, urban and rural guerrilla warfare, coups de’etat, or riots. Second terrorism serves no use as a tool for analyzing violence because it is underlined by contending political objectives. What to some is viewed as terrorism is merely a struggle for national self-determination to others. Terrorism, as a result, becomes a vehicle for verbal attacks against enemies, for judging rivals, or to score propaganda points against the opposing side. Virtually all definitions of terrorism emphasis the deliberate choice involved in acts of violence. But, although environmental circumstances may exist that are conducive to the formation of terrorist groups and the perpetration of terrorist acts, only a few people affected by negative political and socio-economic circumstances practice terrorism. In analyzing the causes of a phenomenon, social scientists often make a distinction between long-term causes and immediate causes, or preconditions and precipitating factors. The former are conditions that lay the foundation for, while the latter are spacefic events that speed up or immediately precede the occurrence of the phenomenon. With
regard to terrorism, some analysis identify modernization manifested in sophisticated network of transport and communication that give the terrorists case of mobility and publicity as a precondition of terrorism. Another precondition of terrorism is urbanisation due to the complex and crowded nature of cities, which provides a variety of targets, ease of mobility, enhanced, communication, and a source of new recruits among transients and transitional who have migrated from rural areas to the cities, or those who are simply unemployed and generally dissatisfied with the status quo. Cities provide the attentive public, as well, for effective communication of the terrorist’s goals. The over population and impersonality of city life also enhance secrecy and anonymity. A society with a historical legacy of violence may become a breeding ground for terrorism. The society may already be one in which violence has been used for centuries to the point where it becomes ingrained in the national consciousness, or is a part of the socio-political and historical habits and traditions. In Ireland, for example, incidents of political violence extend as far back as the eighteenth century. There have been so many terrorists’ incidents in Ireland that any new occurrence does not seem to surprise many people. The political culture of Ireland, in other, words, includes a subculture of terrorist activities. Terrorism in one society may have “contagion effect” on another society because of imitation and interdependence of factors. Acts of terrorism are communicated to the world in a matter of minutes. Ideologies are transnationalized from one region to another. Maoism, for example, was adopted by the shining path of Peru and by the national union for the total independence of Angola (UNTA) in the 1970s. Various other liberation movements in developing countries, especially during the cold war, were influenced in varying degrees by soviet or Chinese communalism, or by the Cuban revolution. The word “terrorism” was first popularised during the French revolution. In contrast to its contemporary usage, at the time terrorism had a decidedly positive connotation. The system or regime De La Terreur of 1793-94- from which the
English word came-was adopted as a means to establish order during the transient anarchical period of turmoil and upheaval that followed the uprisings of 1789, and indeed many other revolutions. Hence, unlike terrorism as it is commonly understood today, to mean a revolutionary or antigovernment activity undertaken by non state or sub national entities, the regime de la terreur was an instrument of governance wielded by the recently established revolutionary state. It was designed to consolidate the new government’s power by intimidating counter revolutionaries, subversives, and all other dissidents whom the new regime regarded as “enemies of the people”. The committee of General Secretary and the revolutionary tribunal (“people’s court” in the modern vernacular) were thus accorded wide powers of arrest and judgement, publicly putting to death by guillotine those convicted of treasonous (i.e., reactionary) crimes. In this manner, a powerful lesson was conveyed to any and all who might oppose the revolution or grow nostalgic for the ancient regime. Ironically, perhaps terrorism in its original context was also closely associated with the ideals of virtue and democracy. The Revolutionary leader Maximilien Robespierre firmly believed that virtue was the mainspring of a popular government at peace, but that during the time of revolution virtue must be allied with terror in order for democracy to triumph. He appealed famously to virtue, “without which terror is evil, terror, without which virtue is helpless” and proclaimed; “terror is nothing but justice, prompt, severe and inflexible; it is therefore an emanation of virtue.” Despite this divergence from its subsequent meaning, the French Revolution’s “terrorism” still shared at least two characteristics with its modern-day variant. First, the regime de la terreur was neither random nor indiscriminate, as terrorism is often portrayed today, but was organised, deliberate, and systematic. Second its goal and its very justification-like that of contemporary terrorism was the creation of a “new and better society” in place of a fundamentally corrupt and undemocratic political system. Indeed, Robespierre’s vague and utopian exegeses of the revolution’s
central goals are remarkably similar in tone and content to the equally turgid, millenarian manifestos issued by many contemporary revolutions – primarily left-wing, Marxist-oriented-terrorist organizations. For example, in 1794 Robespierre declared, in language eerily presaging the communiqués issued by groups such as Germany’s red army faction and Italy’s red brigades nearly two centuries latter. Like many other revolutions, the French revolution eventually began a consume itself. On 8 thermidor, year two of the new calendar adopted by the revolutionaries (July 26, 1794), Robespierre announced to the national convention that he had in his possession a new list of traitors. Fearing that their own names might be on that list, extremists joined forces with moderates to repudiate both Robespierre and his regime de la terreur. Robespierre and his closet followers themselves met the same fate that had befallen some forty thousand others; execution by guillotine. The terror was at the end; thereafter “terrorism ‘became a term associated with the abuse of office and power-with overt “criminal” implications. Without a year of Robespierre’s demise, the word has been popularised in English by Edmund burke, who in his famous polemic against the French revolution, described the “thousands of those hell hounds called terrorists...let loose on the people”.

Terrorism in India cannot be wished away. It has already caused tremendous havoc to life and property. Normal life is so badly disrupted that some people have even started migrating out of the affected areas. Terrorism is unlike to vanish from the political scene in the foreseeable future. It will continue to be used extensively to bring about changes in our political structure by alienated groups inside the country, and by external powers to further their own expansionist designs and on ideological grounds. Conventional wars have become too expensive and in any case, the changes of achieving objectives through wars have diminished, because of various reasons, the most important being nuclear warfare and the possible international reaction. Moreover a proxy
war waged through terrorism had the advantage of giving the sponsoring country the option of denying its role, if international reaction becomes too hot for it to bear. It is an attractive low cost option which has greater chances of success. It does not suffer from the risks of a conventional war, as it is waged in the victim country’s territory. According to security experts, the option of as proxy war through terrorism increasingly replaces the option of waging a conventional war. A terrorist act is able to achieve this kind of impact because of its surprise and shock tactics; surprise because the victim has little or no chance to take defensive measures or to react, and shock because the target often is totally innocent. The target is at times selected at random to create the maximum shock effect. The apparent cruelty of the acts added to the elements of shock and fear. Terrorism has three important elements which distinguish it from other forms of violence; the creation of terror, the seemingly random use of violence and the targeting of innocent or the non-combatant’s. Terrorism is a type of violence where the motivation for the commission of a violent act is not so much to cause physical damage as to cause the psychological effect of creating terror, not only for the intended victim and his family but for the entire community. Whether an act should be deemed an act of terror or not-for example, a case of hijacking of an Aeroplane - depends on whether the objective of the hijacker is personal escape or to create terror among the people. Terrorism is aimed at not just the victim but at all the people who are seeing the act being committed, reading about it in the television, or hearing about it from other people. Terrorism has been compared to a theatre by some commentators, who say that the audience of the terrorist act comprises the whole society. Terrorists are clever enough to calculate the reaction of such an environment on the masses. The deepest anxiety amongst ordinarily people arises when they fear a collapse of law and order; when they fear that they and their loved ones are vulnerable to the armed intruder; when they can protect neither their life nor their property. Terrorism works towards a collapse of the social order and
terrorists exploit this situation by trying to protect them as a better alternative. Terrorism in India is essentially the creation of politics. For its substance this link with politics is vital. Without this link it becomes a type of criminality which can have no place in a civilized society. The underlying justification for terrorism is that it is within the power of some committed people’s will to build a society of their choice. They believed that they can not only redesign the human society, but also drastically change human nature itself. It justifies the overthrow of an unjust regime by any means whatsoever. For terrorists any means justifies the end, that is, to liberate aggrieved people from the oppressive regime.

Terrorism elevates politics to the status of a quasi-religious movement, which aims to inspire people to throw away the yoke of an oppressive government. Pursuit of power based on religious ideology leads to politics where people’s interests become secondary and increasingly irrelevant. Disenchanted with the political leaders, frustrated and angry with the existing conditions and suffering under the misrule of the self-seeking politicians and in sensitive bureaucrats, people are attractive to the rhetoric of the militant. He gives hope and place to the poor and exploited sections of the society. Following the demise of the cold war, in particular, increasingly interest is being focussed on issues related to democracy, human rights and terrorism in their individual capacity and in combination. Various studies, researches and reports mention that the growing menace of terrorism compounded by internal dynamics and external linkage, poses a formidable challenge to values, Norma and institutions of democracy at national and transnational levels. What are these values? What exactly is democracy? How and why terrorism grows and poses a challenge to democracy and so called other values? Answers to all these questions remain disputed. For example, the same kind of terrorist act in one case is taken as a crime and in another case as a form of political opposition and
struggle for human rights. Such an approach is based on ideological criteria and vestiges of the cold war concepts. Accordingly in the western media the criticism of terrorism, until the collapse of the soviet government focussed mostly on communist terrorism. Contemporary attention has shifted to a selective, odd collection of people engaged in acts of violence in different parts of the third world.

In general the criteria for defining the term terrorism has remained subjective and based mainly on political considerations. The fact, however, remains that terrorism is promoted by a wide range of motives depending on the point in time and the prevailing political ideology. It, therefore, takes different forms, is usually equated either political subversion, employed at times by governments and is used as an instrument of syndicated crime. As with any complex social problem there have been attempts to simplify critical issues in terrorism. The analysis of terrorism as a form of political violence is a problem because of lack of consensus about definition of the phenomenon itself and objective criteria free of any ideology. Walter liqueur an eminent authority on the subject is of the view that there is no definition of terrorism that could cover all its various manifestations in history. He includes under the heading of terrorism highly heterogeneous phenomena as peasant revolts, revolts in general, civil wars, wars for national liberation and resistance movements against foreign invaders. Despite differences in approach most scholars and observers tend to agree that present day terrorism is a negative political phenomenon with grave consequences for the individual, society, political regimes, international community and the human race as a whole.

Terrorism, of course, is not a recent phenomenon. It has been present throughout history. It originated in the conspiracies within the royal courts for capturing power. But developments in the modern age have changed the entirely concept. Systematic terrorism in its modern form received great impetus in the
late 18th and 19th century’s either the propagation of secular ideologies and nationalism in the wake of French revolution. The pro imperial nationalism that led to the Meiji restoration in Japan in 1868 was accompanied by frequent terrorist attacks on toqugawa shogunate. In the southern United States, the Ku Klux Klan was set up after the defeat of the confederacy in the American civil war to terrorize former slaves and representatives of the reconstruction administration imposed by the federal government. Adherents of anarchism across Europe and elsewhere carried out terrorists attacks on high officials, or even ordinary citizens in the latter 19th century. A glaring example of state sponsored nationalist terrorism was the assassination of Frances Ferdinand in Sarajevo in 1914, precipitating world war first. However in the 1960s international terrorism exhibiting destructive activity across national borders came into its own.

The last decade of the twentieth century has been that the old paradigm of predominantly state terrorism has been joined by a new religiously motivated terrorism that neither relies on the support of sovereign states nor is constrained by the limits on violence that state sources have observed themselves or placed on their proxies.

Admittedly, terrorism in our day is undergoing all kinds of mutations. New adversaries, new motivations and new rationales which have emerged in recent years can couple with today’s increased opportunities and capabilities to launch terrorism on a trajectory towards higher levels of lethality mass destruction and mass killing. Certain recent trends in terrorist activities highlight not only the increased potential deadlines of terrorism, but also the increased role the non-state actors may play in future as perpetrators. These developments are primarily related spread of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, as well as the proliferation of small arms. They further concern the growth of a variety of terrorist groups and organisations with diversified
motivations, funding mechanism and strategies, and the great dispersion of power existing now at the transnational level. International community, at least for the time being, seems to be out of step with the growing phenomenon. The nature of terrorism is as form of warfare, and its unique place in the nature of political violence. This term has been used by governments, the media and even by academics, to denote phenomenon that have very little in common. Thus for some terrorism means violent acts of groups against states, for others- states oppression of its own citizens, and for still others- warlike acts of states against other states.

Terrorism is equally applicable to nuclear war, conventional war and guerrilla war, the term loses any useful meaning. It simply becomes a synonym for violent intimidation in a political context and is thus reduced to an unflattering term, describing an ugly aspect of violent conflicts of all sizes and shapes conducting throughout human history by all kinds of regimes.

1.1 Review of Literature

- Dr. Stephen Younger, in his book, “Concepts of Terrorism”, (Jan.2003), has given in short and middle term, we must endeavour to prevent acts of terrorism, in part by preventing violent conflicts that give rise to terrorism. Failing that, we must ‘manage’ the conflicts that give to terrorism. If not actually stop them altogether. In addition to enhancing airport and aircraft security and making appropriate use of military and law enforcement resources and actions. In the short to middle term should include improved coordination between security and intelligence gathering organisations within as well as between states and international organisation plus increased numbers and competencies of conflict.

- Dr. Hans Koechler, in his book “The war on Terrorism”, its impact on sovereignty of states, human rights and civil society (2007), have stressed apart from these short-term political psychological effects, one of the
undeclared, but nonetheless for-reaching goals of the war on terror may to make United States, hegemonial rule virtually immune from criticism whichever country opposes the war is portrayed as belonging to-or sympathizing with-an “axis of evil is enemy of the just world order” represented by the United States as self appointed guardian of human rights and democracy. The global describes strategy describes above its legal and political implications have also a serious on civil society in general.

- P.C. Dogra, in his book, “Threat to Security”, is to analyze that the North-East region of India has been a chronic victim of festering insurgencies. India’s security forces are confronting this challenge to internal security for a long time without much success. There are obvious internal roots of these insurgencies as well as the powerful external dimension that keep the fires burning in this sensitive region. Several scholar studies have been published to understand the complexity of the challenge and help evolve effective policy guidelines. In this presentation the focus will be only on the external dimension which needs a constant review and re-assessment in respect of the changing dynamics of India’s relations with the immediate neighbours that share borders with the turbulent North-East region. One of the tremendous ethnic diversity of the region. There are about 200 tribes living in the region with most having a rich cultural tradition, and alloyed with a strong historical perception. The numerical strength of these tribes is not a major factor as none of the tribes is larger than two million in number. These smaller groups are struggling for their own identity in terms of their cultural heritage which is causing a lot of problems both between the tribal groups as also between as one of them and the larger Indian national identity.

- Earl Conteh-Morgan, “Collective Political Violence”, an introduction to the theories and cases of violent conflicts, (2004), terrorism is often
considered an old form of violence with more modern characteristics. It involves the purposeful or deliberate inducement of fear, through the use of threats or violence as methods of affecting change by dissatisfied entities. Although terrorism is often regarded as a method limited to small groups such as the Italian red brigades, the Japanese red army, Hamas, or Islamic Jihad, it has nonetheless been the preferred methods of many despotic regimes, especially during the cold war era. Just as there are many competing explanations of what causes other forms of collective political violence such as, revolution, genocides, or ethno political violence.

- Dipankar Sengupta and Sudhir Kumar Singh, “Terrorism in South Asia”, (2004), terrorism has become one of the most important cause evoking serious and real threat to the security of countries, their inhabitants, property, democratic system and natural development of human society and civilization. Potential and realised threats are of subjective origin and character they are threats produced by wilful acts of individuals, groups, political and other organisations or governments. Terror and terrorism began to emerge after Napoleon’s defeat and Waterloo and the renewal or royalist regime in France under new circumstances and arrangements of Europe, based on agreements on the congress of Vienne 1814-1815. The original and new forms of terrorism were applied especially in revolutions in the nineteenth and early twentieth century’s. In colonial and civil wars of that time, and during the after world war first in a situation created by the Versailles peace treaty and some other international pacts.

- General Afsir Karim, “Counter Terrorism the Pakistan Factor”, (1991), acts of terrorism is sponsored and launched by one country to another using violence and lethal force with a view to achieving long term political or strategic objectives is a facet of modern warfare. The aim of
that country which sponsored and abets terrorism and insurgency can range from destabilisation and weakening of a government or a central authority to the breakup of the existing social and political order, in the targeted country.

The state which sponsored terrorism or insurgency is actually waging in unconventional war in which terrorists or insurgents are generally used as convenient tools, till a particular stage. In such a case the sponsoring states and terrorists could have divergent aims and objectives. This, however, is not likely to become apparent to the terrorists or insurgents till it is too late. The country sponsoring terrorism or insurgency provides financial help, often through voluntary organisations or emigrants, weapons, training, safe sanctuaries and other facilities for launching operations. The terrorists or insurgents thus have a symbolic relationship with the sponsors. This relationship is however unequal because it is the sponsor who decides the course of operations through it may not directly control the employment and actual operations of the terrorists once they are inside the targeted country or areas.

- Dhruv C. Katoch and Shakti Sinha, “Terrorism Today Aspects, Challenges and Responses”, (2016), Cross Border Terrorism has been a byword in the lexicon of Indias security for over twenty-five years. It cane into prominence during the Punjab-based militancy and terrorism in the eighties, with the sponsorship that the Pakistan extended to such terror activities. However, it matured as Pakistan’s withdrew its hands from Punjab and extended to the Jammu and Kashmir where a more serious situation in 1989-90. With regard to India’s problem with Cross Border Terrorism, the armed forces, central armed forces and intelligence agencies have done a marvellous job in securing India. The fact that there have been no major terrorist strikes since 26/11 and that the number of terrorists in Jammu and Kashmir is dwindling, are measures of the
success of the Indian state. The situation demands that we fight smart in the present-day environment and not use the methods of yesteryears. The dynamics of conflict management indicate that the situation has travelled through the usual process of conflict initiation to conflict progression stabilisation, and is now moving toward conflict resolution before it gets to conflict termination. Each stage has its own characteristics and needs to be dealt in its own unique way. Obviously, there are no fixed dates are specifies to bracket these stages and they merge into each other and sometimes it is difficult to discern the exact stage at which the conflict is. However, it is good to examine one or two instances which exemplify the movement process.

Sharda Jain, “Politics of Terrorism in India”, (1995), the Punjab of 1980s has experienced one of the most lethal terrorist violence in the world which has left not only thousands of innocent people killed, injured and uprooted but has also left its scars on the five hundred years old harmonious relationship that existed between the two prominent sections of Punjab society, the Hindus and the Sikhs. This, however does not mean that a common Hindu are Sikh were prone to kill each other, or harboured a feeling of perpetual hatred against each other. The tragic course of events nevertheless certainly marked a watershed in the Hindu-Sikh relations putting the common man in both the communities in a dilemma. The predicament of the two was that, while on the one hand they are so closely related socially and economically that is almost it is impossible for them to completely sever the ties, the political mess, on the other hand, into which they were pushed by their ambitious political leaders, and sow the seeds of communal polarisation, albeit temporarily. A miniscule group of highly brainwashed religious fundamentalist Sikhs, mostly indulging in criminal activities for personal gains, did cast a vicious suspicion over the glorious past of their Sikhs.
Bruce Hoffman, “Inside Terrorism”, (2006), the India have been facing up to the challenge of terrorism through various strategies. There are, no doubt, success stories in this endeavour of fighting terrorism, but the challenge remains as serious and daunting as ever. It seems that the nature of this challenge has also been undergoing rapid transformations as a result of the evolving domestic, regional and international contexts. However, the persistence of the challenge of terrorism also undermines the fact that the strategies pursued to cope with the challenge have not been adequate, appropriate, or effective. As terrorism has come to occupy a critical place in the global as well as south Asia’s regional politics, and as much of peace, stability and progress in a given country as well as the region as a whole depends upon curbing terrorism, it is necessary to explore the possibilities of how best to deal with it.

1.2 Objectives of the Research Work

The present work has been undertaken keeping in view of the following objectives.

- To find out the cause of terrorism in India.
- To analyze the consequences of terrorism on different spheres of life.
- Highlight the forces behind terrorism.
- General awareness in order to tackle the problem of terrorism.

1.3 Research Methodology

Research methodology is a systematic investigation into study of materials and sources in order to establish facts and reach new conclusions. It involves specific techniques that are used in research process to collect, assemble and evaluate the data. In the present work methodology aiming in
observation, collection and formation of data for exploring facts will be used. The comparative and historical methods will be used so that the study will be multidimensional in character and approach. It will be using both primarily and secondary sources for the said work. The primary sources in the form of speeches, letters, interviews, statements, personal diaries will be followed to give better formation for constructing the framework of the study. The secondary sources consisting of books, reports, journals, newspapers, articles etc. will be taken into consideration for the purpose of research. To make the work helpful for the further researchers the views of responsible personal and official records will be taken into consideration.

1.4 Hypothesis

1. Poverty and unemployment are the cause of terrorism.

2. Terrorism cause of national disintegration and political instability.

3. Terrorism leads to economic disruption.