prepmate®

Internal Security Preview

INTERNAL SECURITY

GS Mains Paper III

For Civil Services Exams

Table of Contents

Chapter 2 Role of External state and non-state actors in creating internal security challenges

Role of non-state Actors

Before understanding the role of non-state actors, let us first understand what do we mean by 'Non-State actors'.

A non-state actor (NSA) is an organization and/or individuals that is not affiliated with, directed by, or funded by any government. The interests, structure, and influence of NSAs vary widely. The examples of NSAs include labor unions, non-governmental organizations, banks, corporations, media organizations, business magnates, people's liberation movements, religious groups and aid agencies.

Let us understand the challenges to internal security posed by Non-state actors:

1. **Fundamentalism:** The Encyclopedia Britannica describes fundamentalists as "varied theologically conservative communities which emphasize total and even literal inspiration from the Holy Scriptures and their absolute authority in matters of faith and works."

The term eventually came to be used for all religious movements that seek to return to "fundamentals" and to any movement seeking political power for the purpose of governing according to religious values.

The ideology and practice of fundamentalists is called fundamentalism. Generally, the following five ideological characteristics linked to fundamentalists and fundamentalism:

Utopian ideal

Presently, some religious movements with political implications are described as fundamentalist movements. Fundamentalists in various traditions teach that there was a perfect moment, and they endeavor to recover that moment. This often involves reacting to that which is seen as a threat to realizing the ideal, even if the ideal never actually existed.

Difference with religious orthodoxy

It should be emphasized that there is a very thin line between fundamentalism and religious orthodoxy. Both obstruct change and contribute to social stagnation. The fundamentalists go a step further by being radical and in some cases spreading terrorism and violence as part of their zeal to spread their religion.

Perspective of non-fundamentalists

From the perspective of a non-fundamentalist, fundamentalisms are often scandalous. They appear to stand in the way of individual self-determination, to violate basic human rights, and to impede material advancement, progress, and prosperity. But this is precisely the point of fundamentalisms: they and their gods are not to be judged according to human standards. In their view, one cannot evaluate social behavior along strictly humanistic lines; behavior is good if it conforms to God's will.

Fundamentalists in India

In contemporary political discourse in India, a "fundamentalist" is a person who resorts to selective retrieval, picking out from his religious tradition certain elements of high symbolic significance with a view to mobilizing his co-religionists for action. The goals of such action are usually a mixture of religious objectives and the politico-economic interests of one's own community.

In the near contemporary religious history of India, the popular fundamentalist movements have been Jamaati-Islami, Hindu Nationalism, and Sikh Fundamentalism. Let us understand these fundamentalist movements.

Mawlana Mawdudi and the Rise of Jamaat-i-Islami

Mawlana Mawdudi was born in 1903 to a very religious family in Aurangabad, in Central India. His father, an austere and devout Muslim, educated his children at home in order to protect them from the social customs of the West that were invading Indian society. He was 16 when Gandhi started his nationalist movement for home rule. He cooperated with the Hindus for independence for some time, but eventually separated himself from the cause. He devoted his time to studying the Koran and to developing his ideas on an Islamic society apart from India. His writings indicated how to stem the flood of Western influences, claiming the superiority of Islam over non-Islamic ideas.

In the mid-1930s, when the Muslim League of India started to propagate its idea that the Muslims of India constitute a separate and distinct nation, Mawdudi was enraged. He feared that Muslims would stray from Islam toward nationalism. Nationalism, in his view, was a Western idea that rested on non-Islamic concepts. In 1941, he created his own fundamentalist group, the Jamaati-Islami (the Islamic association). In his view, the best way to transform society was to create a small group of dedicated followers in order to capture political leadership. He gave the examples of the Fascists in Italy and the Nazis in Germany.

His intention was to restructure the whole of Indian society on an Islamic pattern. After partition of the subcontinent in 1947, Mawdudi went over to Pakistan like scores of other Indian Muslims. There he sent preachers to the villages of the new state. Very

soon the number of his supporters swelled and the Jamaati-Islami (JI) emerged as a genuine political party which continued to develop and strengthen. But JI's attacks on the military dictatorship of General Ayub Khan, who took power in Pakistan in 1958, prompted its dissolution and the imprisonment of its leaders, including Mawdudi.

On his release in 1962, Mawdudi resumed his activities. Despite the fact that his association had lost its political clout, his ideas gained wide publicity in fundamentalist circles both in Pakistan and in the Muslim world at large. His concept of an Islamic state was used in 1978 by General Zia-Ul-Haq to justify his coup against the elected government of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. The General declared that he was a soldier of Islam dedicated to creating an Islamic state in Pakistan based on Mawdudi's ideas. Although the founder of JI was not there to give his opinion (Mawdudi had died in 1972), his supporters denounced Zia's usurpation. Despite the fact that the JI lost its importance as a fundamentalist group in Pakistan, the writings of Mawdudi, especially his concepts of an Islamic state, had started to penetrate every corner of the Muslim world.

Jamaat-i-Islami
The Jamaat views Islam as a comprehensive way of life that covers the entire spectrum of human activity (individual, social, economic, or political). For the JI, Islam means the total commitment and subordination of all aspects of human life to the will of God.

Though the overall ideology of Jamaat is uniform, it has adopted different approach in different political contexts. When the Jamaati-Islami became formally organized into two separate entities at the time of partition, the Pakistan Jamaat launched a campaign for the establishment of an Islamic state as the most important means for creating the order envisaged by Islam.

According to the Jamaat of India, there is nothing wrong with the formulation of secularism that states, "Secularism as a state policy implies that there should be no discrimination or partiality on the basis of religious belief." In fact, the Jamaat has categorically affirmed that in the present circumstances it wants the secular form of government to continue. The Jamaat seems to believe that "the state must remain secular, but the Muslims should be saved from secularism."

The Jamaat of Kashmir follows a different path altogether. Though it lacks the political clout to influence the people or polity of the troubled state, it raises its voice for separation from India and covertly supports and coordinates militant activities in the Kashmir Valley

Islamic Fundamentalism

Several forms of fundamentalism promote revivalist movements of various religions, but internationally, Islamic fundamentalism is the most pronounced and widespread. The entire Muslim world turned fundamentalist around the 12th century, when the ultraconservative interpretations of the Koran triumphed. Since that time, whenever Islamic ways of life have "softened," ultra-fundamentalists have reacted against the laxity of leaders who failed to implement the Shariah, the revealed laws of the religion of Islam.

The rise of fundamentalist forces in other countries certainly helped revivalists in India gain popular sanction in the 1980s. Islamic fundamentalism in Pakistan and the Middle East made a definite impression on Indian Muslim leaders, and this in turn further strengthened the morale of religious revivalists.

Modern Islamic organizations have been the driving force behind the dynamic spread of the Islamic resurgence. The Iranian revolution of 1978-79 focused attention on Islamic fundamentalism and with it the spread and vitality of political Islam in other parts of the Muslim world.

Mawlana Mawdudi noted, "Be it in the sphere of economics or politics, or civics or legal rights and duties, those who accept the principles of Islam are not divided by any distinction or nationality of class or country."

Islam divides the human family into two factions: the believers and the infidels. It divides human history into two periods: the age of ignorance (jahilya) and the age of enlightenment. And it divides the inhabited earth into two camps: the land of the believers (Dar-ul-Islam) and the lands of the infidels (Dar-ul-Harb). Further, it postulates a permanent war between these divisions. The believers are called upon to wage an unceasing war (Jihad) on the infidels until the latter are converted or killed off. The age of enlightenment should strive in the same way, until everything belonging to the age of ignorance is remolded or replaced. And the Dar-ul-Islam should continue to send faithful followers of Islam to the Dar-ul-Harb until it is converted into Dar-ul-Islam. This is the behavior pattern of Islamic fundamentalists. They cannot but look upon their non-Muslim neighbors as subjects to be converted by all means.

Muslim fundamentalism in India shares some of the abiding concerns of Islamic fundamentalism elsewhere in the world but also has some distinct local aspects. Besides the economic and social problems which Muslims share with non-Muslims in India, there are issues that specifically affect Muslims as a group. Muslims are convinced that there is a pattern of discrimination against them. They believe that they are considerably

worse off than many other Muslim communities in non-Muslim countries and that their situation is deteriorating as a result of Hindu activism.

Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS)

ISIS is an example of extreme religious fundamentalism. The roots of ISIS can be traced back to the late Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, a person from Jordon. In 2004, a year after the US-led invasion of Iraq, Zarqawi pledged allegiance to Osama Bin Laden and formed al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI), which became a major insurgency group.

After Zarqawi's death in 2006, AQI created an umbrella organization, Islamic State in Iraq (ISI). ISI was steadily weakened by the US troop surge and the creation of Sahwa (Awakening) councils by Sunni Arab tribesmen who rejected its brutality.

Baghdadi, a former US detainee, became its leader in 2010 and began rebuilding ISI's capabilities. By 2013, it was once again carrying out numerous attacks in Iraq. It had also joined the rebellion against President Bashar al-Assad in Syria, setting up the al-Nusra Front in Syria.

In April 2013, Baghdadi announced the merger of his forces in Iraq and Syria and the creation of 'Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant' (ISIS). The undefined region around Syria is historically referred to as Levant; it includes Syria, Lebanon, Israel and Palestine, and Jordan. The leaders of al-Nusra and al-Qaeda rejected the move, but fighters loyal to Baghdadi split from al-Nusra.

At the end of December 2013, ISIS shifted its focus back to Iraq and exploited a political standoff between the Shia-led government and the minority Sunni Arab community. In June 2014, after consolidating its hold over dozens of cities and towns, ISIS declared the creation of a caliphate and changed its name to 'Islamic State (IS)'.

Aim of ISIS

In June 2014, the group formally declared the establishment of a 'caliphate'—a state governed in accordance with Islamic law, or Sharia, by God's deputy on Earth, or caliph. It demanded that Muslims across the world swear allegiance to its leader—Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi—and migrate to territory under its control. IS has also told other jihadist groups worldwide that they must accept its supreme authority.

Difference between ISIS and Al Qaeda

Al-Qaeda is another religious fundamentalist organisation. However, Al Qaeda follows a very different approach to waging jihad (a holy war) than that adopted by the Islamic State. Following are the major differences between the two:

1. **Aim:** Al Qaeda, led by Bin Laden until his death in 2011, was never overly concerned with the immediate formation of an Islamic caliphate. ISIS, on the other hand, declared establishment of an Islamic Caliphate in 2014.

2. **Target enemy:** Al Qaeda's primary enemy has always been the United States. On the other hand, ISIS' targets are much closer to home such as Bashar Assad's government in Syria and democratic government in Iraq that impede the creation of a 'pure' radically sectarian Islamic state.

3. **Approach:** Al Qaeda focussed on terrorist attacks, whereas ISIS focusses on territorial conquest.

4. **Use of social media:** ISIS' mastery of social media and online propaganda has given it the ability to recruit tens of thousands of young jihadists in a way that al Qaeda was never able to do with its written statements and proselytizing (convert or attempt to convert someone from one religion, belief or opinion to another).

ISIS and India
India has remained largely insulated from this trend. The number of Indians to have joined the ranks of the IS is very small. According to the December 2015 report by the private intelligence company, Soufan Group, the number of Indians who have joined the IS was 23, compared to 760 from the United Kingdom and 150 from the United States.

Why is India insulated from ISIS?
Though IS has carried out major terrorist attacks in India's neighbourhood—in Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Pakistan, it has failed in India.

Given the secular nature of Indian Islam, it is extremely difficult for groups such as the IS to become popular amongst Muslims, as it did in parts of Iraq and Syria. But lone-wolf attacks by IS sympathizers could pose security risks.

What should India do?
1. To prevent the group from gaining a foothold on its territory, India needs high-level intelligence and counter-terror operations to continue.

2. Equally important is better coordination between the state and Muslim religious leaders in countering radicalization and having in place specific de-radicalization programmes, as Western governments do.

What are lone wolf attacks?

A lone wolf or a lone-wolf terrorist is someone who prepares and commits violent acts alone, outside of any command structure and without material assistance from any group. However, he or she may be influenced or motivated by the ideology and beliefs of an external group and may act in support of such a group.

Loss of traditional strongholds by ISIS

In year 2017, the Islamic State lost Raqqa, important city in Syria. Earlier, ISIS lost Mosul, Iraq's second largest city. The IS, which once controlled territories as large as the UK, is now concentrated in some pockets in Iraq and Syria. It is believed that with these losses, self-proclaimed 'Caliphate' is now practically over.

On 26 October 2019, US Joint Special Operations Command conducted a raid to capture al-Baghdadi. US officials stated that Baghdadi died by self-detonating a suicide vest to avoid arrest. The death of Baghdadi has significantly weakened the ISIS.

Strategy used to capture territories from ISIS

In both Iraq and Syria, different actors battled the IS. In Iraq, government troops were joined by Kurdish Peshmerga and Shia militias in ground battles, whereas the US provided air cover.

In Syria, the Syrian Democratic forces (a multi-ethnic group alliance) along with US aircraft cover, and Syrian government forces aided by the Russian Air Force opened multiple fronts against the IS. Under pressure from all sides, the group finally crumbled. However, still ISIS sympathizers are there in multiple nations of the world and the possibility of lone wolf attacks cannot be completely ruled out.

Hindu Nationalism

The decennial census introduced by the British made the different communities aware of their own numerical strength, and showed the Hindus as losing ground in terms of population. Without drastic action, it appeared, the decline could be irreversible. Christianity, Islam, and Sikhism were all proselytizing religions, with active mechanisms for conversion; Hinduism was not. As things stood, the traffic in conversion was flowing only one way, and those lost to Hinduism were gone forever.

Hindu Nationalists strongly feel that three elements are most essential for the progress of the Hindu Jati (in this sense, community, although usually the term connotes caste): that its members share a common language, that religion is held in common by them, and that members are in unity and share a common origin. "Hindi, Hindu, Hindustan," thus became a slogan coined to awaken Nationalist feelings.

The evolution and resurgence of Hindu Nationalism at the state level is not very old. Although the Hindus were the majority community ruled by minority rulers since the 12th century A.D., there was no major uprising in any part of the subcontinent against any of the foreign rulers. Despite forceful conversions to Islam and other deprivations imposed on the Hindus during the reign of Mughals in general and Aurangazeb in particular, the only forces that rose or stood up against these harsh treatments were a handful like Shivaji, the Maratha warlord, and the Sikhs. Even the 1857 uprising against the British was more a military rebellion than one that was either a national or religious movement against the rulers.

Later, with the growth of the Indian National Congress (nurtured by the British themselves), aspirations for self-rule and independence were channeled along a nonviolent path. It was only after the Muslim League came into the political arena and advocated a separate homeland for the Muslims that the Hindus were awakened and rose up against this idea.

The events that led to partition of the subcontinent as a consequence of independence, the Hindu-Muslim riots and trans-border movement that followed, and the assassination of Gandhi by a Hindu fundamentalist were the catalysts that really molded Hindu Nationalism into concrete shape.

Although Hindu Nationalist organizations were active in some parts of India since independence, their growth and rising popularity has been closely linked to the rise and increased activities of Islamic fundamentalists and vice versa. While occasional Hindu-Muslim riots did occur at a few places at irregular intervals, these were a result of localized frictions and often perpetrated by narrow-minded individuals out to gain some petty dividends.

What gave direction and purpose to this movement was a chain of events linked to the liberation of Bangladesh. The first among these was the influx of Muslim refugees from this newly formed state beginning in 1971. This led to changes in the demography of some eastern states of the nation, especially in the state of Assam. The majority community suddenly became the minority, and this changed status made them feel threatened.

The next event that fueled the Hindu Nationalist movement is not linked to Islam directly but is worth mentioning. This was the traumatic experience of the Hindus during the brief period of the Sikh extremist movement in Punjab. Although the Sikh Fundamentalist Movement led to tragic events in the 1980s and 1990s, its impact has

largely been contained, as its contours of influence were limited to the state of Punjab alone. However, it was mostly Hindus who bore the brunt of Sikh militancy in the state.

The ethnic cleansing of Hindus in Kashmir also evoked strong Hindu nationalist sentiments. Coinciding with the events in Kashmir, there has been the proliferation of Madrassas in not just Kashmir, but many parts of North India. The pretext to open these institutions was the plea that Urdu, the language of the Muslims, was not being taught in normal schools. But instead of knowledge to enlarge the mind with logic and analytical reasoning, what is being imparted to the pupils is religious indoctrination and narrow fundamentalist philosophy. Along with the mushrooming of Madrassas, there has been a discernible demographic change. The Muslim population that had stood at less than 10 percent at the time of independence has enlarged to over 14 percent and is continuing to grow.

Today there is a new Hindu identity under construction in many parts of India, especially in the northern and central states. It is a process which is undoubtedly propelled by the fact that this identity is also the basis of the political growth of some contemporary parties.

Insurgency
Insurgency is an organized armed resistance against the state or constituted authority with the aim of overthrowing the regime. And those people who are engaged in insurgency activities are known as 'insurgents'.

Insurgency, therefore, involves at least one non-state actor or movement that fights against an established authority to achieve political change.

The Indian Army's Doctrine for Sub Conventional Operations defines insurgency "an organized armed struggle by a section of the local population against the state, usually with foreign support. Its goal may be seizure of power and replacement of the existing regime or even liberation of a defined area".

The goal of an insurgency is to challenge the existing authority with an attempt to bring political change for the control of its territories or a part of it. But the terrorist groups do not attempt to bring political change. Instead, they used violence even against the civilian targets to instill fear and alter public perception on the effectiveness or legitimacy of the government.

A concept related of insurgency is counter-insurgency. It means those measures which are taken by the state to counter the insurgency. It may be defined as a comprehensive

civilian and military efforts designed to simultaneously defeat and contain insurgency and address its root cause. However, there is no single set of technique for counter-insurgency. It requires a wide range of military, civilian, political, economic, or social actions of various kinds executed by the government in order to undermine an insurgency and also resolve its root causes. The mere use of force may help to contain or suppress a rebellion for certain period, but it cannot resolve the problem and bring a lasting solution. Therefore, in most countries, including India, counter-insurgency operations are usually executed in a combination of civilian and military means backed by appropriate political, economic, and social measures and also perception management aimed at winning 'hearts and minds' of the people.

Genesis of Insurgency in India

There are various factors that lead to the genesis of insurgency. Some are real and some are imagined or constructed (history, ideology, politics, ethnicity, religion, language, or combination of different factors). Consciousness about the identity based on these factors has been variously conceptualized as ethnonationalism, nationalism, etc. The insurgencies have leaders, cadres or popular support, ideologies and specific goals. They have wide range of goals: some insurgencies call for separate state, others for regional autonomy while some others demand for secession or complete independence. Insurgency is in fact a collective mobilization.

Insurgencies are often accompanied with violence involving state machineries and insurgents. Occurrence and levels of insurgency have not been a permanent feature. Drawing from India's experience, Paul Staniland (2017) has identified three types of insurgency in India as:
(i) tribal and ethno-nationalist separatist insurgency as in the Northeast or Punjab (ii) religious minority separatist as in Jammu and Kashmir
(iii) ideological or Maoist insurgency in central and eastern India.

But what is common among insurgencies is the popular dissatisfaction against the established regime and their common desire to bring political change, usually for the right to self-determination.

Jammu and Kashmir insurgency

Insurgency in Jammu and Kashmir, which had existed as a state till August 5, 2019 when it was divided into two Union territories of Jammu and Kashmir, and Ladakh, emerged in the late 1980s. This was preceded by a period of political uncertainty. In 1974, Sheikh Abdullah reached an agreement with Indira Gandhi, known as 'Kashmir Accord'. Under this Accord Sheikh Abdullah was released from jail. After the release he became the Chief Minister again. But, upon his release, he was asked by the centre to drop the

demand for self-determination. Dropping of self-determination demand created resentment in Jammu and Kashmir.

A few years after the Accord, the central government dismissed the Faruq Abdullah government that was formed after the death of Sheikh Abdullah. The Kashmir Accord and dismissal of Faruq Abdullah government were viewed as acts of intervention by the Centre in the state politics and "subversion of democracy".

The resentment intensified following the controversial election of 1987 in Jammu and Kashmir. After this election, Kashmir valley witnessed a dramatic rise in armed-rebellion against the Indian state. By the 1990s, two types of insurgency groups emerged in Kashmir. One was the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF) which launched a guerrilla revolt against India with the aim to 'liberate' Kashmir from India.

The other was the Pakistan-sponsored groups like the Hizbul Mujahideen (HM) based on pan-Islamism. There were multiple reasons for the rise of insurgency in J&K. Younger generation of educated Kashmiris like Yasin Malik, Shabbir Shah and Javed Mir participated in Vidhan Sabha election in 1987. But because of manipulation and rigging in the election, they lost their faith in electoral process and resorted to rebellion as channels for expressing their discontents. Around that time, the use of religion for politics in Kashmir became more intense, transforming the 'political struggle' of Kashmir into a religious struggle exclusively for Kashmiri Muslims.

In 1993, around twenty-six pro-separatist parties united to form the All Parties Hurriyat Conference (Hurriyat). There were two factions divided on ideological lines within the Hurriyat: one faction following the 'hardline', advocating for merger with Pakistan; another faction, the 'moderate' faction, urging for an 'independent' Kashmir. And after the Kargil War of 1999, insurgency in Kashmir became dominated by pro-Pakistan local groups and cross-border proxy groups.

Pakistan sought to control the Kashmir militancy by supporting Islamic groups which are inclined towards Pakistan and systematically undermining pro-independence groups like the JKLF. During the 1990s, a large number of suicide bombings or fidayeen attacks were carried out by Pakistan-sponsored groups like Lashkar-e-Taiba, Harkat-ul-Mujahideen, Jaish-e-Mohammad, etc. as a part of Pakistan's proxy-war against the Indian state. Insurgency related violence continues until 2003, when a ceasefire agreement between India and Pakistan reduced the intensity of violence.

Though violence may have been contained, the rebellion itself was far from over. Tensions once again escalated in 2008 in the Kashmir valley but with a completely new

form, in which Kashmiri youths came out in mass protests on the streets. Unlike the previous generation who took up arms, this new generation has used 'stone pelting' as a new form of agitations which were largely spontaneous. But, by and large, the new form of mass protests is less violent as compare to the high-intensity violence of the 1980s and 1990s. This is, however, not to suggest that insurgency has disappeared from Kashmir, rather it continues to remain one of the most complex problem in India today.

Insurgency in the Northeast

Out of the eight states in northeast India - Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Tripura, and Sikkim, three have witnessed insurgency of higher scale and more enduring than in other states. These three states are Nagaland, Mizoram and Manipur. The details about the insurgency in these three states is discussed after a while. Let us first discuss the insurgencies in the remaining states of North-east.

Tripura

In Tripura, the tribal majority state of Tripura was reduced into a Bengali dominated state due to the massive population influx after the Bangladesh War of 1971. It led to the formation of Tripura National Volunteers Insurgency (TNV) in collaboration with Mizo National Front (MNF) in 1978. After a decade of violence, TNV surrendered with an agreement in 1988. However, peace could not prevail for long as a new insurgent group called National Liberation Front of Tripura (NLFT) emerged in 1989. Later, another group called All Tripura Tribal Front (ATTF) emerged. Both groups continued their rebellious operations because of their common agenda to drive out Bengali immigrants.

Meghalaya

Insurgency in other states started later: In Assam and Meghalaya insurgencies started in the late 1980s and the 1990s respectively. In Meghalaya insurgency developed with the emergence of the Hynniewtrep-Achik Liberation Council (HALC), 1992. HALC aimed to protect the interest of indigenous peoples of Meghalaya against the rise of the outsiders. Later, it was renamed and converted into Hynniwtrep National Liberation Council (HNLC). Besides this, another insurgent group known as the Achik National Volunteer Council (ANVC) emerged in the state.

Assam

In Assam, the United Liberation Front of Assam (ULFA), which was formed on 7 April, 1979, aimed to achieve a sovereign state out of Assam. ULFA demanded complete independence from India. Its cadres engaged in violence in India and then fled to Bangladesh. With assistance of Bangladesh, leaders of ULFA have been captured. The movement is no longer active.

Bodo movement sought to achieve an autonomous state of Bodoland within the Indian Union. National Democratic Front of Bodoland (NDFB) was formed in 1986. Bodos (tribal people) began revolts against dominant Assamese. They formed 'All Bodo Students Union' on lines of AASU. ABSU demanded separate state for Bodos and engaged in violent clashes with non-Bodos.

The problem of Bodos was handled by signing an agreement with them. Bodos were granted an autonomous council in those districts where they were in majority.

Naga Insurgency

In northeast India, the Naga insurgency is the oldest. Indeed, some consider it to be "the mother of all insurgencies" in India. It can be traced to political mobilization of Nagas during the second decade of the twentieth century. In 1918, the Nagas formed the Naga Club. In 1929, the Naga Club placed the demand for 'sovereignty' before the Simon Commission in 1929. In 1946, the Naga Club was developed into a political organization called the Naga National Council (NNC) under the leadership of Angami Zapu Phizo, with the aim of forming an independent Nagaland.

In February 1947, NNC submitted a memorandum to the British administration, in which a demand was put up for an interim government. As a result, an agreement known as Nine-Point Agreement or as Naga-Akbar Hydari Accord which was signed in June 1947 between NNC and Akbar Hydari, the Governor of Assam, on behalf of the British administration. The Accord "recognized" the right of Nagas to develop themselves according to their freely expressed wishes guided by the Naga customary laws. It also entrusted special responsibility to the Governor of Assam, as the Agent of the Union Government, to ensure the observance of the agreement for a period of ten years. And after the expiry of this period, the NNC would be asked whether they wanted the agreement to be extended or a new agreement would be reached regarding the future of Naga people.

A few months after the Naga-Akbar Hydari agreement was signed, NNC under Phizo declared independence of Nagaland on August 14, 1947. It was one day before India attained Independence. Following attainment of Independence on August 15, 1947, the Naga-inhabited territory as a part of larger state of Assam came under the Republic of India. But NNC did not accept inclusion of Naga inhabited territory as a part of Indian Union. This led Phizo to launch an armed struggle against the Indian government for an independent Naga state. The Government of India responded by creating a state of Nagaland in 1963. In 1964, an agreement was signed between Government of India and NNC following a peace mission; as a result, the operation (insurgency) was suspended.

Again, an agreement, known as the 'Shillong Accord', was made in 1975 between the NNC and the Union government. However, the accord failed to bring permanent peace in Nagaland. A faction of NNC cadres like Issac Chisi Swu, Thuingaleng Muivah and SS Khaplang refused to accept the Shillong agreement terming it as 'sell-out'. They formed the National Socialist Council of Nagaland (NSCN) in 1980 to continue their movement However, in 1988, NSCN too was split into two factions: One, NSCN-IM led by Thaingaleng Muivah, Isak Chisi Swu; and another NSCN-K led by S.S Khaplang.

Since then, the two rival factions have continued separate struggles for Naga independence. However, these groups entered ceasefire agreements with the Government of India, the NSCN-IM in 1997 and NSCN-K in 2001. Following these agreements, NSCN-IM dropped the demand of sovereign state and raised a new demand for 'Greater Nagaland' or 'Nagalim'. 'Greater Nagaland' or 'Nagalim' implies unification of all contiguous Naga-inhabited areas in different states beyond Nagaland, i.e. Arunachal Pradesh, Assam and Manipur along with some parts of Myanmar into a single administrative unit. This demand evoked opposition in other states than Nagaland resulting inter-ethnic and inter-state conflict and violence in the region. Again, on 3 August 2015 Union Government and different Naga groups reached an agreement—the Naga Framework Agreement'—with the purpose of addressing the issues raised by the latter.

Manipur

Manipur has the highest number of insurgent groups representing various ethnic communities. Insurgency in Manipur began with signing of Instrument of Accession or 'Merger Agreement' by Maharaja of Manipur with the Union of India in September 1949 in Shillong. In Manipur, it was generally alleged that the Maharaja was forced to sign the agreement. This led to mass protest against joining of Indian dominion by Maharaja.

Hijam Irabot, a communist leader led an armed struggle for creation of Independent (Sovereign) state of Manipur. However, he was outlawed and he escaped to Burma in 1950 where he died the following year. Though Irabot's movement failed to achieve the goal, it sowed the seeds of Manipuri nationalism. Later, in 1964, secessionist insurgent group called the United National Liberation Front (UNLF) was formed under the leadership of Arambam Samarendra for the "restoration of Manipur's sovereignty". In 1968 Revolutionary Government of Manipur (RGM) was formed to act like parallel government. Later, following the socialist ideology, many other secessionist organizations came into existence in the state. For example, People's Revolutionary Party of Kangleipak (PREPAK), People's Liberation Army (PLA) and Kangleipak Communist Party (KCP) were formed in 1977, 1978 and 1980 respectively.

Many insurgent groups representing different tribes also emerged in 1990s demanding for some form of autonomy or separate homelands. In the 2010s, underground outfits representing the tribes such as Kuki, Zomi, Hmar, etc. are under Suspension of Operation (SoO) Agreements with the Governments of India. The SoO pact was signed on August 22, 2008, with the primary objective of initiating political dialogue. To counter, the insurgency in Manipur, Armed Forces Special Powers Act of 1958 has been in operation since September 1980.

Mizo Insurgency

Mizo insurgency started in 1960 with the formation of an organization called the Mizo National Famine Front (MNFF) which was formed under the leadership of Laldenga to provide relief to the remote Mizo villages during the Mautam famine (a Mizo word for 'bamboo flowering') in the Mizo Hills in 1959-60. The poor handling of the famine by the Assam and Union governments caused great frustration among the Mizos.

Mizo and Lusai hills were then part of Assam till 1972 when Mizoram became a separate state. The Mizos felt that Union government and the Assam governments did not take sufficient steps to help during the famine. The miseries caused due to the famine added to their complaints of step-motherly treatment at the hands of the Assam Government's decision to make Assamese language as an official language of the state. It left Mizos worried about the future of their identity and their culture.

Under these circumstances, the Mizo organizations (MNFF) argued that their issues cannot be addressed by the Indian state. They believed that their grievances could be resolved if they had their sovereign state. Soon after the famine ended, in October 1961 Laldenga turned MNFF into a political party by dropping the word 'Famine'. Thus, Mizo National Front (MNF) came into existence, and in 1966 it launched a major uprising for establishing a sovereign state for the Mizos. The demand for secession resulted in the outbreak of violent clash between the MNF and Indian security forces. An agreement of 1976 reached in Kolkata between the MNF and the Government of India and subsequent negotiations reduced the intensity of violence. Finally, after two decades of turmoil, a political settlement was reached through Mizoram Accord of 1986 signed between the MNF and Government of India.

In February 1987, Mizoram became twenty-third state of the Indian Union with Laldenga as the first Chief Minister of the state of Mizoram. Since then Mizoram has been the most peaceful state in the region. So far, the Mizo Accord remains the most successful political settlement in the history of independent India. The Mizo Accord is often referred to as 'the only insurgency in the world which ended with a stroke of pen'.

Insurgency in Punjab

Punjab witnessed insurgency which began in the late 1970s and reached its peak in the first half of the 1980s. This insurgency is also known as Khalistan movement for the establishment of an independent Sikh state called 'Khalistan'. The Khalistan state was to be set up to implement Anandpur Sahib resolution, a resolution which was passed at Anandpur Saheb in 1971. It was violent movement in which thousands of people were killed.

The Khalistan movement was led by Bhindranwale. To escape arrest, in 1983, Bhindranwale along with his followers occupied and fortified the Sikh shrine Akal Takht inside the Golden Temple Complex from which he led the insurgency campaign. To counter escalating violence, June 6, 1984, Indira Gandhi government at the centre ordered a military action, known as 'Operation Blue Star' into the Golden temple in order to flush out militants from the Golden Temple complex. During the operation, around 200-250 Khalistanis/militants including Bhindranwale were killed.

The 'Operation Blue Star' caused resentment among Sikhs against Indira Gandhi-led government. This resulted in assassination of Indira Gandhi in 1984 by two of her Sikh bodyguards. After a few years of 'Operation Blue Star', the insurgency came to virtual halt, especially by 'Operation Black Thunder' in 1991, an operation which was carried out K.P.S Gill, chief of Punjab police.

Various reasons have been given in academic literature for the rise of insurgency in Punjab: political, social-cultural and economic. While citing political reasons, some experts claim that the movement in Punjab was like other self-determination movements. Punjab insurgency happened because of centralization and intervention in the state politics by the central government, and lack of accommodation of self-determination by the central leadership. One stream of argument about the political reason underlines that the Khalistan movement emerged from the competition between the Congress and Akali Dal to dominate political space in Punjab.

Those who argue that Social and cultural, and economic reasons led to the rise of Punjab insurgency emphasize that green revolution and changing customs caused economic crisis and erosion in Punjabi culture. These factors created anxiety among people. Supporters of Khalistan movement understood that establishment of Independent Khalistan state would help to address the social, cultural and economic crisis in Punjab.

Maoist Insurgency

In some parts of the country such as Jharkhand, certain areas of Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and Odisha, some sections of the society are involved in insurgency which is inspired by Maoist ideology professed by China's communist leader Mao Zedong. Such insurgency is known as Maoist or Naxalite.

The aim of the Maoist insurgent is to end class-based division and replace the Indian state with the state whose policies and character are guided by Maoist political ideology. Their strategy involves armed rebellion by well-organized groups against the state institutions including police and the propertied classes who they consider their class enemies.

The term 'Naxal' is derived from a village called Naxalbari in Darjeeling district of West Bengal where the movement was originally emerged in 1967. It originated as a small peasant rebellion by members of the Santhal tribe against the exploitation and oppression by local landlords. This movement which started as a local incident soon developed into a series of events.

The Naxalite movement was led by Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) founded in 1969 headed by Charu Majumdar. Within a few years of its beginning, the 'Naxal' movement spread to other states such as Bihar and Andhra Pradesh. However, Charu Majumdar was arrested 1972 and jailed like several other Naxalite leaders.

Following the release of several Naxal leaders in 1977, the Naxal movement was fragmented into four major groups on ideological ground: Maoist Communist Centre (MCC), People's War Group (PWG), the Party Unity (PU), and CPI-ML (Liberation). The MCC, PWG and the PU rejected the idea of parliamentary democracy and merged to form the unified CPI-Maoist in 2004.The CPI-Maoist launched an armed rebellion against the state forces after which the movement became more intensified. In 2009, the Government of India launched counter-insurgency operation called "Operation Green Hunt" to counter the Maoist insurgency.

Strategy to control insurgency

In order to understand the strategy and tactics used by insurgents, let us first understand their methodology of working. Insurgents work through the following methods:

1. Insurgents harp and even magnify the insecurity among local population so that population seeks support of insurgents.
2. Insurgents establish credibility among local population by helping them.

3. Insurgents undertake violent attacks on government authority and project it as relief to the common people.

As means of violent attacks, insurgency movements engage in guerrilla warfare i.e. undertake violent acts against state and after undertaking the act merge with common population. They do not engage in face to face war with the security forces.

Infact, insurgency involve 4 main players – Insurgent force, State which the target of insurgency, Local Population who has support for insurgency and the international community. The international community may assist the insurgency by providing weapons, moral support and so on.

The counter insurgency actions should be comprehensive to address the above strategies used by insurgents and the players involved:
a) Gaining support of local population.
b) Disrupt insurgency forces control over the local population by discrediting insurgent forces.
c) Direct action against the insurgent forces.
d) Disrupt opponents' relations with international community.
e) Established relationship with international community.

Terrorism
There are several opinions regarding the origin of terrorism. According to one theory, the term terrorism comes from the French word terrorisme, which is based on the Latin verb terrererin (to cause to urinate out of fear), and which refers to a kind of violence or the threat of imminent violence.

Terrorism can be defined in multiple ways. Terrorists are non-state actors whop employ unconventional and orthodox techniques of violence in order to attain certain political objectives.

Terrorism can also be defined as an organized violence against the State or individuals with some political and personal objectives. Again, it can be said that terrorism is the unlawful use or threat of violence against a person or property to further political or social objectives. It is sometimes used as a means to intimidate or coerce a government, individuals or groups to modify their behavior or policies.

The Encyclopedia Britannica describes terrorism as the systematic use of terror or unpredictable violence against governments, public or individuals, to attain a political or

personal objective It can be broadly defined as violent behaviour designed to generate fear in the community or a substantial segment of it for political or personal purpose.

The essential characteristic of terrorism is that it involves 'creation of terror' among the population by violence or threat of imminent violence. Terrorism does not involve support of local population. Rather, terrorism creates sense of fear among the affected population, thereby, demoralises society as well as state. It is expected by terrorist groups that inability of the state to curtail terrorism will force the state to agree on demands of terrorist.

Nature of terrorism in India

In the previous section, we have learnt about the home- grown insurgency movements. Insurgency is often assumed as identical with terrorism, although there are differences between them. The insurgent tends to use similar kind of violent activities as terrorist do. However, unlike terrorism, insurgency movements generally involve or require material or moral support from some section of the population in order to justify their existence and also to erode the legitimacy of the government. In this regard, insurgent groups normally carry out information and psychological warfare for propaganda and mass political mobilization. Terrorist groups, on the other hand, do not enjoy popular support.

Considering the above differences between insurgency and terrorism, we can clearly conclude that most of the terrorism emanating in India is in nature of cross border terrorism. What is cross border terrorism? Terrorism that originates within one country and operates only there is different from terrorism that has its roots in one country and it operates with the support of the country of its origin, but it uses violence to create terror in another country. This second type of terrorism is described as cross-border terrorism as its activists are sponsored and trained by a country other than its victims.

The terrorism that India has been subjected to since 1980s has its origin, training and full support across the Indian borders in Pakistan or Pak-occupied Kashmir. There are large numbers of training camps across our borders where young men are taken after being misguided, and there they are motivated, trained, financed and equipped with armaments to indulge in violent activities in India. Thousands of innocent people have been killed in India as a result of this cross-border terrorism. Similarly, the terrorist acts against Israel are perpetrated from across its borders. Thus, while Boko Haram militancy in Nigeria is from within the country, terrorism against India is certainly of a cross-border nature.

International Terrorism

There is only a technical difference between cross-border terrorism and international terrorism. While in the former, terrorists are trained in one country to operate in just one other country, the international terrorism has its victims in several countries. Al Qaeda, for example, is not limited to its victims in any one country or region. Its "enemies" are found worldwide, though its main targets may be a few countries. The Al Qaeda seeks the predominance of Islamist principles and all those who come in its way must be targeted. Thus, the United States and the United Kingdom today are the general victims of international terrorism. India, Russia, Sri Lanka, Nepal and many other countries are also victims of terrorism. The difference between cross-border terrorism and international terrorism is rather indistinct. All terrorism involving two or more countries may be, broadly speaking, termed as international terrorism.

Liberals, Conservatives and Realists on Terrorism

There are two main streams of thinking on the causes and remedies for terrorism-Liberal and Conservative. To these may be added the third, the Realist approach. We shall very briefly refer to the three views:

- Liberals feel that terrorism is a response to economic, social and political deprivation as well as bad government. People who have a sense of grievance will turn to violence to dramatise their misery or to change the conditions that are responsible for it. Governments may often dispossess people of their basic rights and may be corrupt and inefficient. Such governments often become targets of terrorist attacks.

- Conservatives, on the other hand, attribute terrorism to the natural stresses and strains of nation-building. New systems of laws and institutions backed by a government often frighten some people. Classes, castes, religious and linguistic groups-all may find difficult to adjust under a new government, and new laws. The state tries to enforce its laws. Various groups may resent these attempts. The state may use force to check violence by resistant groups. A cycle of violence and counter-violence may then begin.

- Realists see terrorism as arising out of competition between nation-states. States normally settle their disputes through the threat, or actual use of force. Realists consider terrorism as a consequence of competition among nation-states for increasing their powers. Realists, being total believers of power, attribute terrorism to the struggle for power.

In view of their different perspectives of terrorism, liberals, conservatives and the realists naturally have different responses to the curse. For liberals, the way out of terrorism is to improve the lot of the people, including those who might be seeking secession, and to

provide better governance. Liberals, thus, feel that timely and imaginative social, economic, political and administrative engineering can redress the grievances of the people, and check terrorism.

The Conservatives, on the other hand, do not think that the remedy offered by liberals can be a solution. They feel that good governance is, in any case, the responsibility of every state. Conservatives argue that a responsible government must use violence to end terrorist violence. For conservatives, force is a reality, and it should not be used as a last resort. The state should use violence (force) as quickly and as firmly as possible. Pre-emptive violence will end terrorism and save innocent lives.

The prescription suggested by the Realists is closer to the views of the conservatives. The realists say that in the nation-state system that operates in the contemporary world, there is only one way of defending a state, and that is the use of force against the rivals, whether groups of terrorists or a state that threatens. The governments are fully justified in using force to stop the terrorists from harming one's interests. Realists argue that no amount of economic development and good governance will prevent a rival state (as Pakistan, in case of India) from instigating and sustaining violence. Only the threat or actual use of counter-violence can effectively defeat terrorism.

Methods of Terrorists
Violence is the principal means of all terrorist groups. The terrorists use various methods to cause panic and fear among people. Some of these methods include hostage taking, hijacking, political assassination, kidnapping, and explosions.

The terrorist methods have gradually evolved from primitive means to the most modern sophisticated weapons and even killer gases. They used, and sometimes they still use, the simple weapons like country-made pistols or crude bombs. In the past the terrorists merely tried to seek publicity, and people were generally not killed, they were only frightened. Bombs were sometimes thrown only to attract attention, with the clear aim of not killing the innocent people.

Moreover, depending on the goal and resources at the disposal of a terrorist group, it may select either soft targets or hard targets. In some cases, indiscriminate firing is resorted to, in crowded places, like markets or places of worship. For example, during the Khalistan agitation, killing of individual opponents was a common feature. At times indiscriminate firing on groups of people, by modern weapons like AK 47 etc. resulted in murders of large number of innocent people.

Use of bombs has now become an important weapon of terrorism. For example, Serial

bomb blasts, and the use of dreaded RDX in Bombay in 1993 killed hundreds of innocent people, and many times more wounded, almost simultaneously at different places in Bombay. The excuse was the destruction of disputed site at Ayodhya. But, whatever the provocation may be, serial bombing was indeed an inhuman act of terror.

The assassination of Rajiv Gandhi in 1991 is an example of individual killing. Explosion of bombs kept in the cars, or auto rickshaws, or even the bicycles has become a common method of killing of large number of innocent people in crowded places. This is common in India, besides other countries.

Hijacking of aircrafts to make demands that cannot be easily met cause mental torture of the hostages. Sometimes individual passengers are killed, as was one in the case of Indian Airlines flight from Kathmandu that was hijacked in 1999. One passenger was killed, and the others kept hostages for nearly a week by the hijackers who were Pakistanis. The plane remained parked at Kandahar in Afghanistan till India agreed to release three dreaded Pakistan-sponsored terrorists from Indian jails. The hijackers as well as released militants later freely moved about in Pakistan. Much earlier an Indian plane was hijacked, taken to Lahore, where it was blown off after the passengers were disembarked. Hijacking of aircrafts in different parts of the world is a very inhuman terrorist activity.

Lastly, the use of hijacked aircrafts to kill thousands of people on ground and destroy property worth billions of dollars became a new technique when World Trade Centre in New York, and part of Pentagon building in Washington DC were attacked by the American planes hijacked allegedly by Al Qaeda terrorists. This incident of 11 September 2001 was most gruesome.

Later, a number of people were killed in a car bomb explosion outside Jammu and Kashmir Secretariat in October 2001. A daring attempt was made to attack the Indian Parliament in session on 13 December 2001. The attempt was foiled as five Pakistani terrorists were gunned down in a battle outside India's Parliament, in which over half a dozen brave Indian security persons lost their lives.

Landmine blasts is another device followed by militants and terrorists not only in Jammu and Kashmir, but also elsewhere. Earlier, in 2002 itself, a number of terrorists entered the Akshardham Temple in Gandhinagar in Gujarat and fired indiscriminately killing and injuring large number of devotees, though later the security forces overpowered them and they were also killed. In Jammu and Kashmir, it has happened several times that the terrorists enter a mosque and take shelter there, till security forces are able to kill them or arrest them. Their aim is to engage the police in cross fire so that the

mosque may be damaged and they can call it communal act of Indian security forces.

Suicide Squads

Highly motivated terrorists have adopted a unique method of eliminating their target by killing themselves in the attack. In 1991, during the election campaign for Lok Sabha, the former prime minister Rajiv Gandhi was assassinated by a woman terrorist of LTTE. She had allegedly tied powerful explosives round her waist, and as she proceeded to garland Rajiv Gandhi, she exploded herself killing both herself and Rajiv Gandhi. This technique of suicide killing had been repeated several times since then, both in India and abroad.

The self-proclaimed jehadis have formed suicide squads, and they destroy themselves while eliminating the target. The Islamist suicide militants, or jehadis, describe themselves as 'fidayeen'.

One of the worst examples of suicide attacks was the Pulwama attack in Jammu and Kashmir in which 40 Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF) personnel were martyred. The Pulwama attack took place on February 14, 2019, when a Jaish-e-Mohammed suicide bomber rammed a vehicle carrying over 100 kg of explosives into their bus in Pulwama district.

Various Groups and Their Objectives

In this topic, we will discuss the terrorist groups which threaten the internal security of India:

Khalistan militancy: During the decade of 1980, India suffered foreign sponsored and financed terrorism in the name of creation of Khalistan, or the Sikh homeland. This was the game plan of anti-India forces mainly in Pakistan and some individuals in Canada who wanted to destabilise India. Fortunately, the foreign designs did not succeed, though the militancy took a heavy toll.

Cross border terrorism: Pakistan has never reconciled itself to the accession of the state of Jammu and Kashmir to India. Having failed in its attempts through wars to get Kashmir, Pakistan has been training, financing and sponsoring several terrorists to terrorise the people of India in general and of Kashmir in particular. Since 1989, cross-border terrorism has continued unabated. Several thousand innocent lives have been lost, children orphaned, women widowed and property damaged in Kashmir by terrorist outfits like Jaish-e-Mohammad, Lashkar-e-Taiba and many others who keep on changing their names. There are hundreds of training camps in Pakistan to train, misguide and motivate youth to carry on killings of innocent people.

Al Qaeda: Al Qaeda is considered the most powerful terrorist organisation of the world. Not many people had heard of it till 11 September 2001 attack on World Trade Centre in New York. 11 September 2001 act of Al Qaeda was led by Saudi dissident Osama-bin-Laden who was operating from Afghanistan in collusion with the then fundamentalist rulers of that country called the Talibans. Once the United States decided to liquidate Osama and his Al Qaeda, the power situation changed, as Pakistan, the creator of Taliban, decided to join the US led coalition against Al Qaeda and entire international terrorism. However, Pakistan did not desist from promotions of terrorism against India.

Abdullah Azzam founded Al Qaeda in 1987 in order to create societies founded on strictest Islamist principles. Osama bin Laden was a trusted colleague of Azzam, but Osama allegedly got his mentor Azzam killed so that he could become the supreme leader of Al Qaeda. On May 2, 2011, Osama bin Laden, the founder and first leader of the Islamist militant group al-Qaeda, was shot and killed at his compound in the Pakistani city of Abbottabad, by in a CIA-led operation. The operation was code-named Operation Neptune Spear.

Today Al Qaeda appears to have become a symbol of terrorism and jihad. However, it is believed that terrorism that is killing of non-combatant, innocents is forbidden in the Holy Koran, unless they fall in the category of conspirators. The religious scholar most quoted by Osama, Ibn Taymiyyah says: "As for those who cannot offer resistance or cannot fight, such as women, children, monks, old people, the blind, handicapped and their like they shall not be killed". However, we find that this basic tenet is often forgotten.

Al Qaeda members are highly motivated to kill anybody or die themselves for the sake of Islam. Al Qaeda founding document had laid down rules. The first of these says, its volunteers must jump into the fire of the toughest tests and into the waves of fierce trials. Full loyalty and devotion is expected of them, and Jihadis are expected to know of the existence of anti-Islam machinations all over the world.

Although Afghanistan was Al Qaeda's principal military training base, it also trained recruits in Sudan, Yemen, Chechnya, Tajikistan, Somalia and even Philippines. Al Qaeda has a vast network. Al Qaeda pursues its objectives through a network of cells, associate terrorist and guerrilla groups and other affiliated organisations. While Al Qaeda cells mostly operate in the West, its associate groups are more numerous in the South or developing world.

The 11 September 2001 attack in New York was an eye opener to all. Subsequent attacks on Indian Parliament and in 2002 in Bali in Indonesia are all directly or indirectly linked with the terrorist network. The United States-led coalition tried to finish Al Qaeda network, but it failed to do so.

State-Sponsored Terrorism

There is a perception that terrorist activities are carried out by oppressed or disempowered groups of people to seek justice. In the process they resort to violence. However, in certain cases the state becomes involved directly or indirectly in supporting or even promoting terrorism.

Making a comparison between non-state actor terrorists and the state-terrorism, Kanti Bajpai wrote: "Both seek to frighten. Both can be bloody. Both may seek to shock and disrupt. Both may be defensive in nature, seeking to protect society against the oppression of the other. Both try to undermine the legitimacy of the other. Neither tolerates rivals-the state will not permit the instruments of violence in the hands of terrorists; the terrorist organisation will not permit other terrorist groups to flourish." There can be similarities as well as differences.

Achin Vanaik has pointed out two key differences between terrorism and state terrorism. Firstly, terrorist organisations usually take, even if they do not positively affirm, responsibility for their violence, for example, Lashkar-e-Taiba took responsibility for terrorist attack on Raghunath Temple in Jammu (2002). States, on the other hand, are reluctant to acknowledge the use of violence to frighten and intimidate.

Secondly, terrorist groups seek publicity for the outrage; but the state does not. In fact the two differences are related to each other, and Bajpai feels that even these differences are not inherent; "in the right circumstances, (even) the state might well admit to and advertise its use of violence." Thus, conceptually speaking, terrorism and state terrorism are not very different in nature, though in form, they indeed are.

In contemporary period many states have been active in terrorist activities against other countries. Proxy war has been going on against India for a long time. The nature of militancy against India since 1980s has been praised by Pakistan as "freedom struggle", but the whole world now knows that it is a war against Indian people in the form of militancy and terrorism in which several thousand innocent people of all communities have been killed. Our neighbouring country even described the occupation of Kargil heights in 1999 by its own fully armed means the freedom struggle by the people of the state, which nobody believed.

Related terminology

So far, we have already discussed fundamentalism, insurgency and terrorism. There are various other terms which are often used as synonym of terrorism. However, these terms have slightly different meanings.

Extremism

Extremism is considered as pursuance of an ideology or indulgence in behaviour in politics or religion far outside the accepted standards. Thus, extremist groups are determined in accordance with commonly accepted standards or norms of society. For instance, in a very religious society, a non-religious person would be regarded as extremist.

Similarly, in liberal societies, individuals or groups which advocate replacement of democracy with authoritarian government are labelled as extremists.

Extremism is considered as opposite to centrists or moderates. Therefore, extremists may lie on both sides of political spectrum. Thus, in Indian context, far left groups such as naxalites and far right groups such as Muslim, Hindu and Sikh fundamentalists can be regarded as extremists. In India, there are popular right-wing extremists organized on basis of caste as well. One such organisation is Ranveer sena in Bihar. It is an organisation of people belonging to so called high caste. In the past, it has engaged in atrocities against dalits.

Radicals

The term radical can be understood from two perspectives: Literal meaning perspective and mainstream meaning perspective. Let us first understand the literal meaning. The term 'radical' comes from the Latin word of radix (root) and radicalization literally means the process of 'going back to the roots'. It refers to roots – of plants, or words, or numbers. By extension from botanical, etymological, and mathematical usages, early modern thinkers described radical when they went to foundations, fundamentals, first principles, or what was essential. Indeed, according to a strict interpretation of radicalization, a person strictly following a traditional recipe for cooking without adding new ingredients could be considered a 'food radical'.

The mainstream definition of radicals, such as the one given in the Oxford dictionary, sees it as "people who advocate thorough or complete political or social reform."1 The term 'radical' is often linked to the Enlightenment and the French and American revolutions of that period. The term became widespread in 19th century only, when it often referred to a political agenda advocating thorough social and political reform.

If we combine both the perspectives, radicals often mean people who advocate complete social or political reforms to go back to roots or fundamentals. In this sense, fundamentalism and radicalism mean the same thing. However, fundamentalism is often used in context of religion. However, radicalism may be used in any other context as well.

Radicalization as process

There is another meaning of radicalization. In order to understand this meaning, let us compare this term with extremism. First and foremost, most research on terrorism and political violence point to a major aspect of radicalization being a process while extremism is theorized as a psychological and ideological state. One distinction between the two terms thus pertains to their reference to dynamic or static phenomena. Also, a second emphasis regards causal associations between the two terms. Extremism refers to the extent of one's beliefs regarding political and ideological matters (including religiosity), while radicalization is related to the mechanisms that produce, or are caused by extreme beliefs.

One ended

Radicalism is the opinions and behavior of people who favour extreme changes. The radicalists tend to change quickly such as revolution to achieve their ideas or opinions. On the other hand, extremism is a belief or behavior involving uncritical zeal or obsessive enthusiasm. The extremist displays very strict standards and little tolerance for contrary ideas or opinions.

The extremists can be both on the radical side or on the conservative side. For instance, there can Extremist who is also Radical and there can be Extremist who is also Conservative. Thus, Radicals can be only on side of drastic change but not on side of conservatism.

Militancy

Militancy is a condition which experiences the use of violence, being combative or predisposed to fight. Militants can include any individual or group which takes to violence. This need not only include terrorists and insurgents, but also armed religious groups which take to violence to further their beliefs. Since resort to violence is a common factor here, often the term militancy and terrorism tend to be used interchangeably.

However, since terrorism has greater acceptability as a term to describe extreme use of violence, both internationally and in India, it has largely replaced the term militancy. While it is difficult to ascribe a relative scale, a militant approach could however also

imply a more moderate use of violence or expression of combative attributes, whereas terrorism clearly implies an extreme form of violence.

Role of External State Actors in creating internal security challenges
The external actors especially the neighbouring countries create many internal security challenges. Let us understand these challenges:

1. Pakistan
The internal security challenges created by Pakistan can be broadly classified into two categories:

a. Related to Kashmir
- Development of sense of alienation and anti-Indian sentiment among the Kashmiris.
- Radicalization of Muslims in Kashmir.
- Demographic change in Kashmir so that Hindus migrate from Muslim dominated areas.

b. Related to overall India
- State sponsored terrorism such as jehadi terrorism to weaken government of India and to internationalize the Kashmir issue, and to create problems of security in India.
- Drug trafficking in India.
- Support to insurgencies in India especially Punjab Khalistan movement.
- Fake currency to weaken Indian economy.
- Smuggling of goods across borders.

2. China
The internal security challenges created by China are as follows:
- Naxalites in India draw ideological inspiration from China. Moreover, it is alleged that on account of ideological similarity, China supports morally as well as materially the Naxalite movement in India.

- It is also alleged that China has provided assistance to various north-east insurgent groups.

- China is a major exporter of Telecommunication equipment to India. China can also access and possibly control communication networks of India and engage in hacking of information.

- India has border disputes with China particularly Aksai Chin region of Ladakh and Tawang area in Arunachal Pradesh. China has incurred huge costs for infrastructure

development on its side of border in recent years, which would enable China to mobilise its troops at very fast pace on the border in case of war.

- India is a low riparian state of China. It is alleged that China is diverting flow of rivers such as Brahmaputra flowing into India.

3. Bangladesh

The internal security challenges created by Bangladesh are as follows:

- Influx of illegal immigrants into India – It is estimated that nearly 15 to 18 million Bangladeshi immigrants are presently residing in India. Majority of these immigrants have spread to Assam and other north eastern states. Around 3-5 million has spread to rest of north India.

Often there is conflict between Bangladeshi immigrants and local population for employment opportunities and control over economic resources. Moreover, this community is considered vulnerable to enter into criminal activities and terrorism.

- Radical sections in Bangladesh - A political party in Bangladesh namely Jamat-e-Islami is engaged in promoting Islamic terrorism in India. This political party has coalition with Bangladesh Nationalist Party, which is the largest opposition party in Bangladesh.

- Influx of Refugees – The Chakmas and Hajongs were originally the residents of Chittagong Hill Tracts (now in Bangladesh). They had to leave their land after it was submerged due to Kaptai dam project in the 1960s. Chakmas are Buddhists and Hajongs are Hindus by faith. Both these communities also faced religious persecution in East Pakistan (now Bangladesh). According to official documents, these refugees have increased from about 5,000 in 1964–69 to 1,00,000. Out of those who reached India, most of them were Chakmas and only 2,000 were Hajong. The Indian government moved a majority of the refugees to present-day Arunachal Pradesh.

- India shares the longest border with the Bangladesh. There is also large amount of smuggling across the border.

4. Myanmar

There is a problem of influx of refugees from Myanmar. The Rohingya people or Rohingya are predominantly followers of Islam who reside in Rakhine State of Myanmar, previously known as Arakan. In 1989, the name of Arakan State was changed to "Rakhine" by the military junta (Military government of Myanmar).

Myanmar is a Buddhist-majority country. Many buddhists consider Rohingya (muslim

majority community) as illegal immigrants from Bangladesh, though they have been living in Rakhine for generations. They have faced systematic persecution at the hands of Myanmar's military since the country's independence in the late 1940s.

They have also been denied citizenship under the 1982 Myanmar nationality law. They are also subject to restrictions on their movement, denied access to state education and civil service jobs. The legal conditions faced by the Rohingya in Myanmar have been compared to apartheid.

Rohingya have been subjected to recurrent military crackdowns in Myanmar in years 1978, 1991–1992, 2012, 2015, and 2016–18. These military crackdowns have led to large-scale migration of Rohingya into neighbouring Bangladesh and India. The military crackdown in 2016–18 have led to displacement of around 800,000 Rohingya from Myanmar. Before the military crackdown in 2016–18, an estimated 1.4 million Rohingya lived in Myanmar.

5. Sri Lanka
There are two main internal security issues:
1. Issue of Tamils: Tamils in Sri Lanka face multiple discriminations. The regions inhabited by Tamils are less developed as compared to other regions, their language has been recognized as official language only recently and Sri Lanka has unitary structure; thus, the Tamils lack powers of self-determination.

Tamils in India share strong ethnic ties with Tamils in Sri Lanka. Thus, maltreatment of Tamils in Sri Lanka inspires movement of Tamils in India.

2. Fishermen issue: Indian fishermen repeatedly drift towards Sri Lankan waters while fishing. Sri Lankan navy capture their boats and fishing equipment, arrest fishermen and sometimes even kill them.

6. Nepal
The internal security issues created on account of Nepal are as follows:
1. Smuggling of goods: There is heavy smuggling of goods from Nepal to India. Many such goods from Tibet come via Nepal to India.

2. Maoists issue: The Maoists play a dominant role in the Politics of Nepal. It is alleged that the Maoists in Nepal support (atleast morally) the naxalite movement in India.

Overall challenges by external States
Apart from the above challenges which arise from our neighbouring nations, there are

other challenges which can arise to the internal security of India from other nations of the world:

1. Access to communication networks and hacking of information.
2. Transfer of black money from India to safe havens.
3. South-Asian nations suffer from common problems of drug-trafficking, fake currency, and smuggling.

Why South Asia is vulnerable to drug trafficking?
There are three major drugs producing regions:
1. **Parts of Mexico and Colombia**

2. **Golden Crescent:** It is one of Asia's two principal areas of illicit opium production. This crescent-shaped area consists of parts of three nations namely Afghanistan, Iran and Pakistan.

3. **Golden Triangle:** It is the other region in Asia known for illicit drug production. This triangle- shaped area comprises parts of Myanmar, Thailand, Laos and Vietnam.

As India is sandwiched between two major drug producing regions of the world, Golden Crescent and Golden Triangle, India is more vulnerable to the problem of drug trafficking.