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The purpose of this thesis has been to explore and analyze policy guidelines to deal with the menace of international terrorism in India. The challenges that such a situation creates for Indian diplomacy are identified here. The hypothesis was: International terrorism as a challenge to Indian diplomacy. This is sought to be worked upon by highlighting the various challenges that emanate from state sponsorship of terrorism against India. The different responses that India has come up with diplomatically and their nature coupled with the guidelines that these provide for the future conduct of Indian diplomacy form the backbone of the thesis. How this problem of terrorism has sometimes sabotaged and sometimes toppled the very basis of bilateral relations is studied in the context of India's relations with different countries. At the same time, in an era of changed global political equations, new alignments and understanding between nations have come into being and this has laid the basis for fresh cooperation among states that may have pursued different ideologies and entertained different views before.

Terrorism in all its manifestations involves brutal violence generally against unarmed civilians who are in no way responsible for the policies or perceived grievances against which coercive terrorist violence is being used. Acts of lethal violence against innocent people tend to shock and stun a society and its leaders into submission. Whenever there is a massacre of children or of the innocent, unsuspecting passengers of an airliner, the victims just serve as tools of terrorism to convey a horrifying message to the leaders and the people of the targeted country.

International or transnational terrorism generally involves acts in which the nationality of the victims is different from that of the perpetrators. In most cases international terrorism requires bases outside. Without such base facilities, international
groups can neither plan nor execute strikes with precision. A premeditated plan to perpetrate acts involving terror, massive destruction of life and property to destabilize a country and damage the credibility of the system or the government is generally sponsored from outside. Like other forms of terrorism, international terror aims to horrify and shock by attacking innocent noncombatants. The abundance of ‘soft targets’ that a modern industrialised society offers the terrorists only enhances the former’s vulnerability and the latter’s lethality.

Growing interterrorist linkages have worsened the terrorist phenomenon. The joining of hands of terrorist groups of varying ideological hues has made the government’s counterterrorist task much tougher than before. In India, the growing linkages between the various terrorist groups in Kashmir, the LTTE and the NorthEastern insurgent outfits has exacerbated the terrorist menace. The close nexus that these groups harbour with hawala traders and narcoterrorists was evident many a times in acts of terrorism that have rocked India.

Statesponsorship of terrorism has made terrorism an instrument of foreign policy of many nations. Essentially, international terrorism then becomes the continuation of war by other means. The eighties saw the emergence of what came to be known as LIC – low intensity conflict. This kind of a conflict encompasses a kind of politico-military struggle to achieve political, economic and psychological objectives. Like the state sponsorship of terrorism, LIC aims to attain strategic and political objectives by acts in violation of the law.

Even though most instances of international terrorism are well-documented there is a reluctance on the part of many nations to proceed with international counterterrorism
cooperation The main reason preventing such action against terrorism is the lack of a universally accepted definition of the concept. The growing elasticity of the term has made it so malleable that just about any derogatory conduct can be classified as 'terroristic'. Inspite of this lacuna, some common formulations have come into being to define what precisely constitutes terrorism. Generally, all such formulations converge on the basic premise that terrorism involves the threat or use of violence for political purposes and in the process, seeks to influence the attitude and behaviour of a target group other than the immediate victims.

The oft-repeated cliché that one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter has also been an important reason for the absence of a coherent international definition of the concept. In the context of the struggle for liberation from alien domination which most of the Third World countries faced on their way to attaining their independence, this distance between 'terrorist' and 'freedom fighter' became so narrow that practically all international forums, particularly the United Nations, ended up becoming hotbeds of controversy regarding the constituents of terrorism. For example, the Palestinian Liberation Organisation (PLO) and the South West Africa Peoples' Organisation (SWAPO) were branded by some nations as terrorist outfits, while simultaneously being granted the ranks of legitimate international entities by most of the Third World countries. Thus when the UN General Assembly held a spate of sessions in 1973, 1977 and 1979 all efforts aimed at arriving at a common definition were drowned in the din of inter-actor polarization. The UN Resolution 2625 was generally accepted as a basis for defining terrorism by subsequent resolutions like the one emanating from the SAARC Regional Convention on Suppression of Terrorism.
The technological revolution of the modern world has, in the meantime, worsened the ground situation by being an ally in the growth of 'New Terrorism'. Technology has never been such a double edged sword as now, and in the hands of terrorists, it has only become an unmanageable advancement. With the fear of possible instances of nuclear, chemical and biological terrorism, the terrorist armour has only been strengthened. Added to this is the media corroboration in providing "newsy" terrorist incident an instant global audience and thus creating a wider psychologically affected population.

The word terrorism became a term of daily usage in India on an unprecedented scale after the Punjab situation brimmed over the top and assumed grave terroristic proportions. The mix of volatile state politics that was complicated by politicians with vested interests and the assertion of independent ethnic identity produced a fertile ground for notions of secessionism to flourish. The religious cloak that various terroristic outfits chose to disguise their real motives in succeeded to quite an extent in influencing the popular psyche. The Central government's politicking only made the situation go from bad to worse and as the state plunged into darkness, Pakistan stepped into escalate the lawlessness and governmental collapse by supplying the terrorists with arms, ammunition and sanctuaries. Many terrorist groups also set up bases in countries like the United Kingdom and Canada and this later on posed a major diplomatic challenge to India. As strong police and paramilitary action brought down the level of violence and as the electoral process was initiated again after years of President's rule, Pakistan chose to turn its focus on to the Kashmir valley.

The Kashmir issue has been a longstanding point of dispute between India and Pakistan, and its claim to contention begins from the day the Indian subcontinent was
divided into two nations. After the Partition, the Maharaja of Kashmir decided to join India and signed the Instrument of Accession to legalise his stand. This fact has always been questioned by the Pakistani side who refused to accept the legality this act. Till date, the Pakistani side has harped on a having a plebiscite in Kashmir as per the United Nations resolutions which India considers invalid as they have been superseded by history and the 1972 Simla Agreement alike. After fighting three wars with India – in 1948, 1965 and 1971, Pakistan decided to go in for a change of modus operandi and planned to launch a low-cost proxy war in the Valley. This aimed at escalating the terrorist situation already present to a higher degree of viciousness by using the card of Islamic commonality on the one hand and engineering events to invite harsh government measures on the other. The latter was followed by highlighting the abuse of human rights by the Indian state and its security personnel in every international forum. The aim was to put India in the dock by doing a good job of this disinformation strategy. Till date this is a grave diplomatic challenge for India. Even though the Geneva session of the UNHRC in 1994 and the visits to Jammu and Kashmir by various international groups in the same year largely absolved Indian of any such allegations, the issue of human rights abuse has always retained the potential to make India vulnerable in the face of such criticism.

In the North-East, the basic problem of alienation, backwardness and political bunglings led to the creation of insurgency in almost all the states. With the strategic importance of the region to India and the bases that various terrorist groups have secured in the neighbouring countries, the situation has entered a fragile phase. Inspite of the many accords entered into by the Central government, the ground situation continues to be grim especially in Assam where the ULFA has sabotaged the state government’s
machinery and credibility with every terrorist episode that it undertakes. In Nagaland, the insistence of the militants to engage in talks with the Central government only on their terms and at a venue abroad are conditions that have put the government in a dilemma as it is not willing to talk in any framework that does not follow the constitutional law of the land.

In neighbouring Sri Lanka, the ethnic strife of July 1983 and related subsequent developments brought India to act in tandem with the Sri Lankan government to deal with the situation. The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam became India's Frankenstein's monsters when they claimed the life of its former Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi, the man behind the Indo-Sri Lanka Accord of 1987 and the subsequent despatch of the Indian Peacekeeping Force to Sri Lanka which was sent to accomplish the unenviable task of making order out of chaos. The lessons that such entanglement and experience taught India are the the ones that it can forget only at its peril.

The Bombay blasts of 1993 could boast of well-documented Pakistani connivance but not of any cooperation coming India's way from the Pakistani side despite its assurance to the contrary. With these blasts, Pakistan managed to unnerve the nerve centre of India's business and economy. To stop such episodes from repeating themselves, India has to strengthen its diplomatic moves worldwide and gain more international co-operation in its fight against international terrorism.

Diplomatically, most problems arise from the vagueness spawned by compromises by nations. The lack of consensual definition on the concept of terrorism only aggravates matters. The biggest threats that international terrorism poses to a country's diplomacy comes from the target country's desire to seek foreign policy
objectives that terrorism tends to hinder. As all established rules of international law and diplomacy are violated by resort to terrorism, the problem of managing the menace while sticking to the established norms of international conduct challenge diplomacy everywhere. The main obstacle to India comes from its limited international clout on the one hand and its related inability to go in for an American-like counterterrorist strategy of bombing Libyan cities in April 1986. Such a conduct may jeopardize the chances of ever reaching a peaceful settlement of international disputes. Indian diplomacy has thus faced multiple challenges especially in the wake of Pakistan-sponsored terrorism on its soil and the engineering of events like the Hazratbal crisis of 1993 and the Charar-e-Sharif crisis of 1994. India-bashing in the US Congress by groups inimical to India have further complicated Indo-US relations from time to time. The Indian embroilment in SriLankan affairs and its subsequent disgraceful ending affected Indo-SriLankan ties adversely. Thus diplomatically India has faced many challenges over the last decade and the search for solutions is still on.

India has entered into some bilateral and multilateral agreements designed to counter terrorism. The Indo-British Extradition Treaty is the best example of the former while the SAARC Regional Convention on Suppression of Terrorism exemplifies the latter. The diluting of the ‘political offence exception’ in Indo-British Treaty is a novel way of eliciting international cooperation on the matter. At the multilateral level the SAARC convention is considered a historical step because of the very fact that contending parties came together to draft it. On proper implementation, it can go a long way in controlling the terrorist menace in the region.
The Geneva diplomacy of 1994 that won India the favour of Pakistan's traditional allies, Iran and the OIC has important lessons and opportunities for Indian diplomacy. In the post Cold War era, new political alignments have broken traditional ties and this fact alone provides a vast opportunity for any diplomacy to utilize in making its position heard by different nations.

The freshest and perhaps the biggest challenge that has come India's way is the fallout of the Pokharan-II nuclear blasts of May 1998. Though Pakistan took no time in firing the equalizer, the situation took a turn for the worse for India as immediate international reactions ensued. The Western fear that Kashmir would become the focus of a nuclear war in South Asia that the international community took no time in putting Kashmir on the agenda. The Permanent Five of the UN Security Council described Kashmir as the "root cause of tensions" in the region in their 4 June 1998 Joint Communiqué. The G-8 Summit also endorsed this view and this rejected the semantic core of Indian diplomacy of Kashmir being an internal matter.

To confront all these challenges, Indian diplomacy needs to evolve a strong and coherent approach on all issues. On the issue of international terrorism, adhocism has to be shown the door and a consistent policy formulated. A rethinking of metaphors, concepts and tools of foreign policy is the need of the day and would go a long way in settling longstanding contentious issues.