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Introduction

Terrorism today poses the gravest threat to mankind. From an occasional footnote until the mid-1990s, in less than a decade, terrorism became a ‘hydra-headed monster’ seriously affecting the lives of the common man in almost every corner of the world. Specially after the 11 September 2001 terror strikes in the US, terrorism has occupied the centre stage of all world news and academic and policy debates. There has been a vigorous debate about almost every aspect of terrorism—the meaning and definition of terrorism, the terrorist strategy, profile and background of terrorists, the causes, consequences and morality.

However, democracy as a cure for terrorism has come under serious discussion very recently. Some Western scholars have argued that the lack of democracy in the Arabian Peninsula has contributed to the rise of Al-Qaeda and religious extremism in the Muslim world. They have, therefore, emphasized democracy overseas (specially in the Middle East) as the best policy option to combat terrorism in the Muslim world. Some of them even contended that ‘regime change’ and ‘imposed democratization’ should be adopted as a policy in the Middle East and they supported the Bush Administration’s Afghanistan and Iraq interventions in this light.

On the other hand, some others suggest that there is no strong relationship between democracy and an absence of or a reduction in terrorism. They even argue that dictatorships in the Muslim world are a helpful factor in controlling the surge of terrorism because of the factor of ‘unity of command’ which would be missing in a democratic dispensation. They also contest that the political leadership in the Muslim world is corrupt, inefficient and weak, therefore, democratic governments would not be able to make the tough decisions which a hereditary monarch or a military dictator can easily make. Terrorism, according to them, has nothing to do
with democracy: rather, it stems from factors much more specific than regime type.

Both India and Pakistan started their journeys on the democratic path right after partition of the subcontinent in 1947. But India has enjoyed uninterrupted parliamentary democracy since Independence, while in Pakistan, democracy has been derailed four times in the last 62 years because of the military interventions. In India, even during Indira Gandhi’s 19-month-long emergency rule in 1977, as Urmila Phadnis argues, the ‘Congress system’ operated, preventing one-man dictatorship, a practice that was otherwise very common in the new post-colonial democratic systems of the Third World. On the other hand, in Pakistan, military dictators like Ayub Khan, Zia-ul Haq and Pervez Musharraf enjoyed almost decade-long personalized autocratic rules. This varied democratic experience of the two South Asian neighbours with a shared historical background makes it very interesting to study the impact of their contrasting democratic conduct on their ability to face the challenge of terrorism.

Thus, using India and Pakistan as test cases, this study examines whether India’s secular democratic experience since its independence in 1947 has contributed for less or more terrorism at home and abroad. Similarly, we explore whether military rule in Pakistan has been a part of the solution for combating terrorism, or it has been a part of the problem in dealing with the monster of terrorism. Furthermore, focusing on FATA, Balochistan and Swat, we shall explore how democracy can work as a conflict-resolution model for terrorism in Pakistan. This study also proposes some policy-relevant suggestions for both India and Pakistan which could be useful for other countries as well to democratically confront the challenge of terrorism.

This study has four main objectives. The first is to study if there is an empirical relationship between ‘democracy and terrorism’. The second is to examine whether democracy can be a factor in fighting terrorism. The third is to find out a possible democratic response to terrorism which can work as a conflict-resolution model for terrorism. The fourth is to suggest policy-relevant options from
India–Pakistan experiences that could be useful for others facing similar challenges.

Here, it would be necessary to clarify the definitions and usage of the terms ‘democracy’, ‘terrorism’, ‘conflict resolution’ and ‘war on terror’. We use these terms in this study as they are normally used and understood in the academic world. Neither is it mandated nor do we want to indulge in the academic controversies around the definitions and usage of the above terms. Nonetheless, regarding democracy, we would like to make it clear that we take ‘democracy’ both in its electoral (balloting) and substantive form. In a broader understanding of democracy, we include what Amartya Sen terms ‘democracy as public reason’, or in other words, ‘government by discussion’ and ‘participatory governance’. Similarly, for ‘terrorism’, we are taking terrorism in its all forms, viz., non-state terrorism, state-sponsored terrorism, ethno-national terrorism, ideological terrorism, religious extremism, and international terrorism.

We acknowledge the fact that given the communication barriers that exist between India and Pakistan, a joint study impinging on this mutually hostile security domain was a gigantic task and a kind of challenge for both of us. Specially with so many things happening in 2008 and 2009 when this study was conducted in both India and Pakistan, it was extremely hard to keep our study updated and relevant with time. We have tried our best to meet this challenge and make this study interesting reading and an integral whole.

This study includes an introduction and separate chapters on the theoretical discourse, policy discourse, and case studies of India and Pakistan followed by a brief conclusion. In Ch. II on the theoretical discourse, we study the interrelationship between democracy, terrorism and conflict resolution by exploring the three sets of relationships, viz., conflict resolution–terrorism, democracy–conflict resolution, and terrorism–democracy, and try to establish a link between them. Then, on the basis of these three sets of relationships, we develop a model for democracy working as a conflict-resolution model for terrorism.

In Ch. III on the policy discourse, we examine whether democracy and democratization are the right strategies to deal with
the scourge of terrorism. The linear relationship between democracy and terrorism is discussed both in the policy-making and academic circles. The Bush Administration’s argument for democracy promotion in the Middle East as a means of fighting international terrorism and the use of force to achieve it in Afghanistan and Iraq and the intense international debate that followed it are especially discussed in this chapter.

In Ch. IV on our case study on India has been divided into four parts. The first part describes the nature of Indian democracy, the second part analyses the gravity of the terrorist threat faced by India, in the third part we focus on the nature of Indian public discourse on democracy and terrorism, and in the final part we examine democracy as a counterterrorism measure for India. Within this broad framework, we specifically investigate whether India’s secular democratic experience since its independence in 1947 has actually contributed to less or more terrorism at home and abroad, and to what extent the deepening and strengthening of India’s democracy can solve its present and future terrorism problem.

In Ch. V on our case study of Pakistan, we have focused on terrorism in FATA (including Swat) and Balochistan only because these two regions are the most violent and volatile regions and most of the terrorist acts happening in other parts of Pakistan have some link, specially with FATA, and sometimes even with Balochistan. In the first instance, we study whether military rule in Pakistan has been a helpful factor in combating terrorism in FATA and Balochistan, or has been a part of the problem. Then we apply our ‘Democracy as a Conflict-Resolution Model for Terrorism’ developed in the chapter on the theoretical discourse on Balochistan, FATA and Swat, and see whether democracy can really work as a conflict-resolution model for terrorism in FATA and Balochistan or not.
I

**Conflict Resolution, Terrorism and Democracy: The Theoretical Discourse**

Saeed Ahmed Rid

THEORETICAL DISCOURSE

The title ‘Democracy as a Conflict-Resolution Model for Terrorism: A Case Study of India and Pakistan’ suggests a triangular relationship between democracy, terrorism, and conflict resolution, therefore, we need to establish three sets of interrelationships here namely, conflict resolution–terrorism, democracy–conflict resolution, and terrorism–democracy. When we look at the theoretical and policy discourses on these three otherwise very popular terms ‘conflict resolution’, ‘terrorism’ and ‘democracy’, we find very little scholarly research on the above-mentioned three sets of relationships. The discourse on conflict resolution–terrorism and democracy–conflict-resolution relationships is especially scarce. On the other hand, some scholarly research was carried recently out on the terrorism–democracy relationship which has its primary focus on the US thrust for democratization in the Middle East.

The above three sets of relationships are discussed in this section in the light of the theoretical discourse available on them, and an attempt is made to establish a link between them. In the end, on the basis of these three sets of relationships, we try to establish how democracy can work as a conflict-resolution model for terrorism. Before dwelling on the three sets of relationships mentioned above, let us first try to understand the nature of terrorism as a conflict, and find out why it is so difficult to handle.
CONFLICT RESOLUTION–TERRORISM INTERRELATIONSHIP

When 9/11 took place, the conflict-resolution community (CRC) in the US and all over the world was finding it hard to immediately provide a non-violent response for 9/11 when ‘a cry for revenge’ was resonating from all corners in the US. American conflict-resolution experts Charles Hauss and Matthew Hersey later described this situation in these words, ‘September 11th showed just how empty the conflict-resolution “tool kit” is for addressing terrorism.’¹ However, after 9/11, quite a few thinkers from the conflict-resolution community have written about addressing terrorism from the conflict-resolution perspective. Here, we will focus on Lederach’s article, ‘Quo Vadis: Reframing Terror from the Perspective of Conflict Resolution’ published just after 9/11, and Oliver Ramsbotham, Tom Woodhouse and Hugh Miall’s book Contemporary Conflict Resolution, published in 2005.

Underscoring the complexity and depth of the challenge posed by terrorism, shortly after 9/11, the famous conflict-resolution expert John Paul Lederach who is known for his pioneering work on conflict transformation admitted, ‘we are dealing with a phenomenon that does not fit common, traditional understandings, particularly as prescribed in politics and international relations as usual’.² Therefore, in this unusual situation, Lederach calls for uniting what he calls the ‘two voices’ often described as representing contradictory and incompatible points of view, and argues that neither of the ‘two voices’ on their own can provide answers. These two voices are basically the two broad lines of thinking on terrorism in which the whole world community is divided today. The first line of thinking, which Lederach calls the first voice, believes in a military solution of the problem and calls for the blatant use of force and warfare against the leadership and personnel involved in the violence. On the other hand, the second voice suggests the strategy of non-violence and calls for addressing the root causes. This second voice, which is commonly held by the conflict-resolution community, describes terrorist threat as a ‘social milieu’, not as a personified entity. Therefore, they call for changing the
environment that creates terror by working at a ‘systemic prevention level’. Lederach argues that the integration of both voices is necessary to frame a formidable response because he feels they speak about one aspect of the reality and leave the other one untouched. The first voice emphasizes the issue of individual accountability while leaving the root causes unchallenged, whereas the second voice focuses on transforming the ‘social milieu’ which produces this violence while giving little attention to the accountability of the manipulative leaders. Connecting this to our democratic peace thesis, the democratization of the troubled areas would help in transforming the ‘social milieu’, and, as suggested by Lederach, democratic peace should take place simultaneously along with the necessary administrative measures.

In another development, the rise of terrorism has washed out the borderlines along local, regional and international conflicts. The fault lines that have emerged along those boundaries have created uncertainties about where and how this form of conflict should be addressed, and that ‘if interests cut across states and communities, where does appropriate jurisdiction lie?’ 2 This is why Oliver Ramsbotham, Tom Woodhouse and Hugh Miall in their book Contemporary Conflict Resolution, published in 2005, termed terrorism a ‘transnational conflict’ and suggested the ‘Cosmopolitan Conflict Resolution’ approach for addressing the menace of terrorism. They say they use the term ‘cosmopolitan conflict resolution’ to indicate, ‘an approach that is not situated within any particular state, society or established site of power, but rather one which promotes constructive means of handling conflict at local through to global levels in the interests of humanity’. They pronounce the well-being of human-beings a matter of concern for all, the same as the well-being of its citizenry being the responsibility of a state. Therefore, they argue that the state-based international society has a potential to evolve into a world community. They pin their hopes on the rise of cosmopolitanism, which will compete with terrorism with the help of ‘global civil society’ and ‘ethical universalism’.

Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Miall have also given a policy framework for addressing terrorism. They give four dimensions to
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this policy framework, namely, prevention, persuasion, denial, and coordination. Prevention calls for addressing the root causes like global inequalities, injustices, poverty and conflicts like Palestine, Kashmir and Chechnya. Persuasion reduces motivation and recruitment by persuading governments and potential supporters to choose political accommodation rather than violence and repression. Denial requires cutting off supplies for terrorists and breaking the back of terrorist networks. The authors of ‘Contemporary Conflict Resolution’ admit that conflict resolution has very little to offer in this dimension, but emphasize that the denial strategy must be integrated with the prevention and persuasion strategies. In the last dimension, coordination, they stress the need for making this whole effort a real international enterprise not dominated by a single superpower. The authors acknowledge the fact that democracy is widely prescribed as ‘the best long-term preventive antidote to terrorism’, but they also point out the 10 challenges to democratic peace posed by terrorism.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION–DEMOCRACY
INTERRELATIONSHIP

At the end of the Cold War, liberal democracy attained a decisive victory against authoritarian governments. Consequently, a sharp increase in the number of democratic governments was observed from 1988 to 1994. Researchers in the conflict-resolution community argue that this positive trend of increasing democratization was an important factor behind decline of armed conflicts within states, and a visible increase in the negotiated settlements in the post-Cold War era. In the 1990s, several conflict-ridden societies turned to democracy as a way of exiting intractable conflicts. From El Salvador (1994) to East Timor (2002), democratic elections and referendums paved the way for peace in regions which were formerly trapped in violent conflicts.

However, the first incidence of this kind goes back as far as 1978, when UNTAG was mandated under Security Council Resolution (SCR) 435, ‘to ensure the early independence of Namibia
through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. Nonetheless, real peace was only restored in Namibia after December 1988 when the Namibia Accord was signed between SWAPO and the French. Later, the same formula was used in several instances by the UN for the withdrawal of former colonial masters and their replacement by a new, independent, democratic states. In some other instances, various ethnic, religious and racial identity–based conflicts were settled using the same method of transitional democratic elections and referendums under UN supervision. Angola, Bosnia, Croatia, East Timor, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Northern Ireland, Sierra Leone, South Africa, and Zimbabwe, are some of those examples.

Apart from this, democracy is also associated with ‘post-conflict peace-building’ to avoid the reversal of old conflicts and creating a self-sustaining peace. Despite its shortcomings and failures, democracy is considered the best available tool to manage widespread social conflicts in deeply-divided societies over the long term. What makes democracy superior to any variant of authoritarian rule in terms of peace-building are its institutional mechanisms and fundamental rules of the game which provide a safe arena for competing interests. Democracy provides an environment where minorities and weaker sections of the society can express themselves without fear of retaliation. Ben Reilly points out that, ‘the best example of this is the electoral process itself, where parties and individuals may win or lose, but where the losers may win next time and the winners know that their victory is only temporary’.

The evidence shows that the performance of democracy in deeply-divided societies has produced mixed results. South Africa, Madagascar, Namibia and Northern Ireland are some of the success stories. On the other hand, in Cambodia, Ethiopia, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe, democracy has failed to manage conflicts and create sustainable peace. Nevertheless, most conflict-resolution experts do not question the utility of democracy in dealing with deep-rooted conflicts: rather, they question the implementation of undiluted Western models of democracy in post-conflict societies.
model of democracy (which features winner-take-all, and the
losers of elections must wait as the loyal opposition for five years
or so to get a chance to replace the government of the day) is not
ideal for post-conflict peace-building in divided societies. Rather,
they suggest ‘power-sharing democracy’, which, with its inclusive
procedures and accommodating institutions, has a better chance of
delivering a lasting peace. ¹⁰ Timothy D. Sisk points out that there
is no single ideal set of institutions or practices which can work
in all cases. ¹¹ Therefore, an appropriately-crafted set of democratic
institutions according to the specific requirements of a particular
conflict would be crucial for promoting sustainable peace.

This shows that over the period of the last two decades, democracy has
emerged as one of the most important tools against intractable identity-
based conflicts in deeply-divided societies, which implies that democracy
can be useful against the menace of terrorism as well. As a matter of fact,
terrorism is very closely associated with identity, specially in the context
of this research with religious identity. Nelson Mandela’s struggle against
apartheid and the Irish Republican Army’s (IRA) movement against British
colonialism also displayed clear traits of terrorism at some point in history.
If democracy can resolve those centuries-old complex conflicts, this gives
hope that democracy might be successful against terrorism as well.

DEMOCRACY–TERRORISM INTERRELATIONSHIP

The discourse on ‘democracy’ and ‘peace’ dates back to 1795,
when Immanuel Kant, in his seminal work _Perpetual Peace_,
prophesied, ‘if all nations were republics, it would end war’. Consequently, he described democracy as one of the necessary
conditions for perpetual peace. From this emerged the theory of
‘democratic peace’, which has been a source of great debate in
academic circles, specially since the 1980s, when a clear surge in
democratization was also observed throughout the world. ¹² But it
was former US President George W. Bush who, after 9/11, directly
connected ‘democratic peace’ with terrorism and viewed promotion
of democracy as an instrument of his foreign policy for combating
terrorism. The Bush Administration, specially during its second
term, viewed promotion of democracy in the Arab world as a cure for Al-Qaeda–led terrorism emanating from the Middle East.

In the discourse of the ‘democratic peace’ theory, most research is regarding ‘dyadic peace’, that democracies (democratic states) do not fight one another. Accordingly, after three decades of extensive research on the theoretical and empirical side of ‘dyadic peace’, it has now emerged almost like an empirical law in international relations. Even so, as far as this research is concerned, we are least concerned about ‘dyadic peace’, because in this research we study terrorism as an internal conflict committed by non-state actors, or at least a conflict not involving nation states as two contending parties.

We are more concerned about ‘monadic peace’, which contends that democracies are more peaceful in general, or that democracies have less internal systemic violence. The monadic peace argument contends that intrastate conflict and civil wars are less likely in democracies as compared to the other regime types because democratic practices are more inclusive and flexible. The argument goes that democracy can integrate the disgruntled sections of society by accommodating their legitimate concerns through power-sharing mechanisms. Thus, democracy helps in reducing the desperation and helplessness which are the breeding grounds for civil wars, intrastate conflicts as well as terrorism.

In contrast to dyadic peace, until recently, monadic peace has remained the least explored area in academic circles. However, in the twenty-first century, and specially after 9/11, monadic peace has come under serious debate because intrastate conflicts and non-state actors have emerged as the most critical threats to world peace. But so far, contrary to dyadic peace, in the case of monadic peace, there is no agreement in academic circles about whether ‘democracies are more peaceful in general than other regime types’. However, comparatively more support is found for the hypothesis that newly-established democracies or transitional democracies are much more vulnerable to civil wars and minor intrastate conflicts than durable democracies. Nonetheless, the same studies also confirm that non-consolidated democracies are less likely to be involved in such
conflicts as compared to non-democratic states. MacMillian, Russett and Starr and Huth and Allee support the monadic peace hypotheses whereas Pickering, Bennett and Stam and Buhaug contradict the monadic peace contentions and present empirical evidence against it. However, several others like Benoit, Russett and Oneal and Branislav, Alexandrova and Gartzke raise objections on the research designs and statistical methods used in the studies which discard monadic peace hypothesis. We will not go further in this theoretical debate because the scope of our research does not allow us to go in depth of this hotly-contested academic debate. However, for the purpose of this research, it would be important to note that despite obvious objections and criticism, the proposition of monadic peace is strongly supported by the published research results so far.

On the other hand, not a single empirical study is available so far which directly tests the causal relationship between democracy and terrorism. Nonetheless, after President Bush’s prescription regarding democracy promotion in the Middle East, monadic peace’s hypothesis regarding domestic (intrastate) peace has come under fierce attack from scholars of the realist school of thought. Connecting ‘monadic peace’ with Bush’s ‘democracy promotion’ policy in the Middle East, from Fareed Zakaria to F. Gregory Gause III and Michael Freeman, all so-called realists have come hard on ‘democracy as a cure for terrorism’.

Gause, in his famous article, ‘Can Democracy Stop Terrorism?’ published in Foreign Affairs in September 2005 matches Freedom House’s classification of states as ‘free’, ‘partly free’ and ‘not free’, with the State Department’s annual ‘Patterns of Global Terrorism’ report, and claims that, as there was no significant difference in the number of major terrorist incidents happening in ‘partially free’ and ‘not free’ countries between the years under study from 2000 to 2003, it proves that there was no relationship between ‘the incidence of terrorism in a given country and the degree of freedom enjoyed by its citizens’. Gause further argues that democracy promotion in the Middle East does not satisfy immediate US strategic interests, as democratic elections in the
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Middle East would ‘lead to Islamist domination of Arab politics’, Hamas’s victory in Palestinian elections being one indicator.\textsuperscript{29} One wonders, that when Guase is so critical of the US policy of ‘democracy promotion’ in the Middle East and claims that there is no causal relationship between democracy and terrorism, then why, at the same time, he calls upon US policy makers to focus their energies on encouraging the development of secular, nationalist, and liberal political organizations in the Arab world. This shows that Gause is somehow convinced about the utility of democracy against terrorism, but his actual opposition is because of his strong conviction that democracy would not serve immediate US interests in the region. Even Fareed Zakaria, who is otherwise very critical of democracy in the Third World, agrees at the end of his book, \textit{The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad} that, despite all its flaws, ‘democracy represents “last best hope” for the people around the world’.\textsuperscript{30} The arguments for and against Bush’s policy of ‘democracy promotion’ is discussed in detail in our second chapter on policy discourse.

Here, we would like to question equating the Bush doctrine of ‘democracy promotion’ with the democratic peace hypothesis on the face of it. First of all, the term ‘democracy promotion’ needs to be defined precisely and accurately. Does it include the military occupation of a nation state, as the US did in the case of Iraq and Afghanistan in the name of democracy promotion? In fact, none of the proponents of democratic peace has ever called for or approved such an intervention. Nor would they approve promoting democracy by forcing the Middle Eastern governments to introduce democratic elections when there is no political opposition and internal demand for democracy. Therefore, the Bush doctrine of ‘democracy promotion’ must not be allowed to unnecessarily overshadow the worth of the monadic peace argument, which otherwise has great value for combating the menace of terrorism. Further, as far as South Asia is concerned, it was not a part of the Bush Administration’s democracy promotion policy. Rather than supporting democracy in South Asia to combat terrorism, the Bush Administration relied heavily on Pakistan’s military dictator Gen
Pervez Musharraf and left no stone unturned to save his rule against the democratic opposition in Pakistan.

DEMOCRACY AS A CONFLICT-RESOLUTION MODEL FOR TERRORISM

In this section, we shall look at the above discourse in aggregate and try to figure out how democracy can work as a conflict-resolution model for terrorism. From the above discussion, we understand that terrorism is a very complex conflict and requires a response far wider than what the realist security paradigm provides for. Our study of terrorism as an asymmetric conflict shows that the direct military strategy suggested by the realists does not pay off against terrorists, because civilian deaths resulting from the military operations enhance the sympathy for terrorists among the local population and the affected area becomes a breeding ground for terrorism. Therefore, the basic problem in dealing with terrorism is how to isolate terrorists from the local population, or, as conflict-resolution experts Fisher and Ury would say, ‘separate the people from the problem’. This is why Lederach suggests that integration of the ‘two voices’ is necessary to frame a formidable response against terrorism.

In the section regarding ‘terrorism as a conflict’, we also pointed out that a viable indirect strategy has to be found which can deny terrorists or guerrillas the all-important physical sanctuary and social support. Actually, isolating terrorists and denying them physical sanctuary are two sides of the same coin, because the basic motivation behind isolating terrorists is to deny them the direct control of a physical sanctuary and a popular support base.

This is where democracy and conflict-resolution techniques could be very helpful. At local level, the campaigns attached with so-called global terrorism have some strictly local motivations and local conflicts which could be addressed locally by addressing some of the genuine local grievances. International terrorists like those of Al-Qaeda cannot succeed unless they have some local support base. Therefore, isolating Al-Qaeda and the Taliban locally would
break the back of their movements, and then they can be dealt with militarily. To isolate terrorists locally, negotiations, mediation, agreements and peace accords should be used to make peace with ‘moderate’ local actors. For the term ‘moderates’, we take here the definition used by Neumann and Smith in *The Strategy of Terrorism: How it Works and Why it Fails* (2008). According to their definition, ‘moderates represent all those political activists who—whilst perceiving a degree of association with, or sympathy for, the terrorists and their cause—have chosen not to resort to violence but hope to bring about political change through non-violent means’.\(^{32}\) Uniting the moderates against terrorists in those problem areas or so-called safe havens helps in isolating the terrorists and winning the much-needed goodwill and confidence of the local population.

Democracy provides the enabling environment for this conflict-resolution strategy to work successfully. Democratic elections, local self-government institutions, and activities of the mainstream political parties would help in bringing the people of those troubled regions in the mainstream. Further, democracy, with its power-sharing mechanisms, inclusive procedures and accommodating institutions has a better chance of delivering a lasting peace in conflict-ridden regions. However, an appropriately-crafted set of democratic institutions according to the specific requirements of those regions would be crucial for promoting sustainable peace.

The four-point policy framework for addressing terrorism given by Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Miall in *Contemporary Conflict Resolution* helps to integrate what Lederach calls the ‘two voices’ and construct a grand strategy for dealing with the terrorist threat. The first two dimensions of this four-point policy framework, ‘prevention’ and ‘persuasion’, represent the conflict-resolution community voice, whereas the third, ‘denial’, represents the military-solution part. According to this grand strategy, the ‘prevention’ dimension addresses the root causes like inequalities, injustices, poverty, and lack of democratic opportunity, whereas the ‘persuasion’ dimension integrates all ‘moderates’ in the mainstream by persuading the local insurgent groups and their supporters to adopt the path of political accommodation. Thus, the job of the ‘prevention’ and ‘persuasion’
methods would be to isolate the terrorists and deny them physical sanctuaries or safe havens with the help of the strategy discussed in detail in earlier paragraphs. Here comes the role of the ‘denial’ dimension, which works through military strategy and tries to break up terrorist networks and arrest their activists, and cut off the financial and military supplies used for acts of terrorism. Finally, the ‘coordination’ dimension holds the key in the overall success of this strategy, because without the support and goodwill of the international community and a coordinated effort on the part of important regional and global actors, the terrorist threat in South Asia cannot be eliminated.

We would see later how far this grand strategy can be used in FATA and Swat to bring sustainable peace in those troubled Pakistani regions and isolate the Al-Qaeda and Taliban elements active there. The comparative study of the peace agreements negotiated by Musharraf’s military regime in South and North Waziristan agencies in 2004 and 2006 with the local Taliban, and the peace accord signed in Swat by the current democratic government in 2009 would give us an idea whether democracy can make a difference or not. However, before doing that, it is necessary to turn our attention to the ongoing global debate both at the policy-making and academic levels whether democracy and democratization can be a cure for combating terrorism or not.
Is democracy an effective policy implement to deal with the challenges of terrorism? This chapter examines the linear relationship between democracy and terrorism both in the policy-making and academic circles. It is important to discuss this relationship, because the findings have significant implications for our respective case studies on India and Pakistan in Chs. 3 and 4.

Democracy is generally considered as a morally and ethically just political system that best embodies human desires for freedom and equality. Therefore, spreading democracy to other countries was seen as largely legitimate and had been a long-running theme of many countries and organizations including the US, EU, UN and a plethora of international and national non-governmental organizations (NGOs) over the past decades. However, the events of 11 September 2001 had radically changed America’s thinking on democracy and triggered a fundamental re-evaluation of Bush Administration’s national security policy that elevated democracy promotion as the centre of his foreign policy agenda.

On 11 September 2001, the US was attacked on its own soil by 18 radical Islamist militants belonging to Al-Qaeda in the single most destructive terrorist act in history. The Bush Administration responded to this unprecedented event with dramatic and sweeping new policies, including the most important, ‘democracy promotion initiative’ in the Middle East. The president was convinced that to prevent another 9/11, the scourge of terrorism had to be cut-off at its roots, and the root cause of terrorism, as he saw it, was the reactionary/authoritarian regimes in the Middle East. Thus, an audacious and ambitious strategy was formulated by the Bush Administration, what Gaddis described as ‘a grand
strategy of transformation’, a plan for ‘transforming the entire Muslim Middle East, for bringing it, once for all, into the modern world’.  

The Bush Administration’s National Security Strategy (documents of 2002 and 2006) and many of his speeches on foreign policy were permeated with statements that the root cause of terrorism and Islamic radicalism was the region’s lack of democracy, and that promoting democracy was, therefore, one route to eradicating the terrorist threat. As President Bush mentioned in his State of the Union address:

we seek to end tyranny in our world. Dictatorships shelter terrorists and feed resentment and radicalism and seek weapons of mass destruction. Democracies replace resentment with hope, respect the rights of their citizens and their neighbors and join in the fight against terror. Every step toward freedom in the world makes our country safer—so we will act boldly in freedom’s cause.  

Similarly, the US National Security Strategy of 2002 declared that ‘America will encourage the advancement of democracy and economic progress…because these are the best foundations for domestic stability and international order’. The doctrine optimistically predicted that once democratic institutions exist in Iraq, democracy will spread to neighbouring countries that will, in turn, adopt peaceful policies.

No other system of government [declared President Bush] has done more to protect minorities, to secure the rights of labor, to raise the status of women or to channel human energy to the pursuit of peace…When it comes to the desire for liberty and justice, there is no clash of civilizations…People everywhere are capable of freedom and worthy of freedom.  

In his second inaugural address on 20 January 2005, President Bush used the word ‘freedom’ 25 times, ‘liberty’ 12 times, and ‘democracy’ or ‘democratic’ 3 times. In this speech, he argued that promoting the freedom of other countries was now an urgent requirement of our nation’s security and the calling of our time. So it is the policy of the US to seek and support the growth
of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world.\textsuperscript{38}

In yet another speech at the National Defence University in March 2005, Bush argued that ‘when a dictatorship controls the political life of a country, responsible opposition cannot develop and dissent is driven underground and towards the extreme’.\textsuperscript{39} He argued that:

\begin{quote}
if (people) are permitted to choose their own destiny and advance by their own energy and by their participation as free men and women, then the extremists will be marginalized and the flow of violent radicalism to the rest of the world will slowly and eventually end.\textsuperscript{40}
\end{quote}

Thus, President Bush saw the Middle East as the epicentre of an international terrorist upsurge because of its ‘democratic deficit’. It was argued that, with the exception of Israel, none of the countries in the region demonstrated enough respect for political rights and civil liberties. That existing institutions like parliaments were controlled in a manner that reflected the will of small, powerful elite who dominated the country, rather than accurately expressing public sentiment. Secular opposition parties lacked dynamism and broad-based political support in the region, civil society was weak, and independent media were largely absent due to the severe legal restrictions and coercive methods that the region’s regimes used to stifle political expression. These placed the moderate opposition at a disadvantage and encouraged political extremism.

The closed nature of Middle Eastern societies contributes both to the declining legitimacy of the regimes and the proliferation of inaccurate information manipulated for the regimes’ own benefit. With populations discouraged by their lack of political and economic opportunities, and hungry for a cause with which to identify and for someone to blame as well, as the media that were not free, the Middle East is specially fertile ground for terrorism and terrorist activity.

The Bush Administration argued that the consolidation of democratic regimes in the greater Middle East would, in the long
term, increase the legitimacy of the governments, and thereby reduce the appeal of anti-systemic movements such as the Al-Qaeda. In the shorter term, democratic governments throughout the region would increase internal stability within states, because democracies have longer life-spans than autocracies. If democratic regimes ruled all countries in the region, conflict between the states would be less likely, consequently, the demand for weapons, including WMDs, would decrease. Finally, a more secure, stable and democratic region would not only reduce the need for a US military presence, but also make it more secure by preventing renewed terrorist attacks against America.

The Bush Administration had, however, made no secret of its intention to use military force as the primary means to bring democracy in the Middle East. The invasion of Iraq (and Afghanistan to a lesser degree) had been justified in part by the need to transform the regime into a democracy.

The Bush Administration’s argument for democracy promotion in the Middle East and the use of force to achieve it in Afghanistan and Iraq, however, provoked an intense international debate among intellectuals, scholars, journalists and policy makers across continents whether democracy and democratization were the right strategies to deal with the scourge of terrorism. There are scholars on the one hand, who strongly consider democracy as a panacea to provide security and civil liberties to citizens and avoid political extremism and terrorism provoked by unaddressed grievances. On the other hand, there are those who vociferously argue that democracy has very little or no impact on terrorism. Let us take on this critical debate one after another.

DEMOCRACY CAN REDUCE TERRORISM

Lack of democracy is widely perceived as a contributing factor for terrorism. When a state is ruled by an authoritarian regime, citizens might be frustrated by their inability to participate fairly in the political process. The conventional wisdom is that when citizens have no way to peacefully voice their dissent and achieve political
change, they will resort to violence to do so. With the spread of democracy, it is assumed that new, peaceful avenues of dissent will be opened up and obviate resort to violence.

Francis Fukuyama and Michael McFaul, for instance, argue that:

democracy provides the best institutional form for holding rulers accountable for their people. If leaders must compete for popular support to obtain and retain power, they will be more responsive to the preferences of the people than rulers who do not govern on the basis of popular support. The institutions of democracy also prevent abusive rule, constrain bad rule and provide a mechanism for removing the corrupt or ineffective rule. Furthermore, democracy provides the setting for political competition, which in turn drives better governance. In contrast, the absence of political competitions in autocracies produces complacency and corruption and has no mechanism for producing new leaders.\textsuperscript{41}

They, therefore, suggest that the US has a moral interest in promoting democracy and a strategic interest to be on the side of moral policies. But they caution that democracy promotion should be placed in a broader context of promoting economic development, reducing poverty and furthering good governance.

According to Jennifer Windsor, the director of the Washington-based Freedom House, ‘though the absence of democracy does not directly explain the cause of terrorism, yet lack of democracy has played a role in creating the conditions conducive to the recent emergence of Islamic extremist movements’. She thinks that the current political situation in the Middle East is primarily driven by internal realities, but it also is a reflection of past US policy choice not to support democratic reforms within the region.\textsuperscript{42}

Fareed Zakaria, the editor of \textit{Newsweek}, argues that, ‘although democracy is not really an antidote to terrorism, but it can certainly make an impact’. To him, ‘political leaders take a different approach to the militants than the military dictator, one that involves more diplomacy and less force’. Citing the case of Pakistan, he argues that:
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if the two political parties (PPP and ML[N]) which together won almost two-thirds of the vote adopt a forthright anti-terror strategy, it will be seen as a Pakistani strategy, not one being directed by the Army or the Americans. Until now, the battles against militants have been seen as America’s obsession. What democracy could do is make Pakistanis understand that this is their war.43

In another piece, he wrote, ‘the forces of moderation thrive in an atmosphere of success. Two Muslim societies in which there is little extremism are Turkey and Malaysia. Both are open politically and thriving economically.44

The New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman advocates that while Muslims from around the world joined international terrorism under the banner of Al-Qaeda, Indian Muslims have been the sole exception. He suggests that, perhaps, democracy and the rule of law made Muslims feel that their legitimate grievances could be addressed within the bounds of the state structure in India.45

Thus, the underlying logic of the assertion that democracy will reduce terrorism is the belief that, being able to participate openly in competitive politics and have their voices heard in the public square, potential terrorists and terrorist sympathizers will not feel the need to resort to violence to achieve their goals. Even if they lose in one round, the confidence that they will be able to win in the future will inhibit the temptation to use extra-democratic means. So, the habits of democracy will ameliorate extremism.46

Democratic institutions and procedures, it is argued, by enabling the peaceful reconciliation of grievances and providing channels for participation in policy making can help to address those underlying conditions that have fuelled the recent rise of Islamic extremism. The source of much of the current wave of terrorist activity (the Middle East) is not coincidentally also overwhelmingly undemocratic (in the region stretching from Afghanistan to Algeria, there is only one democratic country, Israel, and a few partially democratic countries such as Turkey, Jordan and Kuwait), and most regimes in the region lack the legitimacy and capacity to respond to the social and economic challenges that face them. They lack legally-available
forums for people to organize and debate. Closed political systems make the mosques the main outlet through which social frustration and anger are being expressed. Most of these religious outlets have been hijacked by extremist elements.

A stable democracy manages conflict effectively by being open to political feedback about what is not working in the country, and responding with remedial measures. It is a trial and error system. Possible remedial measures include changes in policies, or if these are not sufficient, changes in leadership, or if these are not sufficient, even changes in the constitutional rules of the game. When a democracy is working well, the majority of a nation's residents are either sufficiently satisfied with the status quo, or at least reasonably confident about the mechanisms that exist to make things better.

Democratic movements and leaders by nature build support by operating openly and by using traditional instruments of peaceful protests, such as criticism through the media, public meetings and mass organizations. A democracy with opposition parties, periodic elections and critical media has much better prospects to prevent or overcome disasters like famines, simply because democratic mechanisms offer the space for public outcry and empower the public to criticize and demand immediate action from the government.

Democracies are also better (i.e. less violently) able to resolve nationalist disputes over perceived occupations because they have mechanisms such as plebiscites and referendums through which minority populations might achieve some level of confederation, autonomy, or even independence.

It is also argued that decisions in a democratic polity are arrived at through consensus and compromise. Democracy requires a consensus that conflicts among people and groups should be resolved without resort to force. The observation that democracies substitute the counting of heads for the breaking of heads captures the point well. The procedural rules of liberal democracy arguably guarantee that governments function in a transparent way, governed by law, and remain accountable to the people they serve.

Finally, democracies permit dissidents to express their policy preferences and seek redress. Democratic rules enable non-
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violent resolution of political conflicts. Different social groups can participate in the democratic political process to further their interests through peaceful means such as voting and formal political parties. As democracy lowers the costs of achieving political goals through legal means, groups should find costly illegal terrorist activities less attractive.

DEMOCRACY CAN’T DEFEAT TERRORISM

The linear relationship between democracy and terrorism has, however, been challenged by many on both theoretical and empirical grounds. Eubank and Weinberg, who have looked extensively into the connection between terrorism and democracy, have examined whether democratic or authoritarian regimes host more terrorist groups. They find that one is more likely to find terrorist groups in democratic societies than in authoritarian ones. For them, political and civil liberties are positively associated with political terrorism. They conclude that, ‘the likelihood of terrorist groups occurring in democracies is three and a half times greater than their occurrence in non-democracies’.47

Examining incidents from 1975 to 1997, Quan Li has found that although terrorist attacks are less frequent when democratic political participation is high, the kind of checks that liberal democracy typically places on executive power seem to encourage terrorist actions. She further argues that political constraints on democratic governments have a positive effect on terrorist incidents. The democratic government does not enjoy unlimited authority, but is held accountable by the legislature and the electorate. Democratic leaders who abuse power get thrown out of office. The political constraints prevent the democratic government from encroaching on civil liberties, weakening its ability to retaliate by using force against terrorist groups.48

According to Vox Day, democracy cannot end terrorism, because terrorism is ideally suited for influencing democratic results. Defining terrorism as violence by and for the people, he argues that it is expressly designed to speak through the mass media in order to
influence the masses. As every successful politician knows, fear is an excellent means of manipulating the minds of the voting populace, so terrorism has a utility in democratic societies that it does not have in autocracies.49

C. S. Sood argues that:

democracy gives permission to all sorts of organizations, institutions and structures. It also permits them to pursue and propagate their ideology. It is this weakness of the system the terrorists exploit. They take advantage of the democratic freedom for advancing themselves. Terrorism makes an effective use of the democratic machine to attack democracy, more so because democracy permits people to sympathize with them and even to voice their sympathies in public.50

Some others argue that while long and stable democracies do harbour less violence, this is not true in cases of democratizing states, which lack reliable political institutions such as effective rule of law, organized parties competing in fair elections, professional news media, etc. Eyerman, for instance, finds that established democracies are less likely to experience terrorism than non-democracies, but new democracies are more likely to experience terrorist incidents than other types of states.51

Similarly, Mansfield and Snyder advocate that democratizing countries or those immediately after democratization, which are not stable, are more likely or prone to lead wars, and, thus, use violence.52 In her highly-praised post-September study of religious militants, Jessica Stern argues that, ‘democratization is not necessarily the best way to fight Islamic extremism because the transition to democracy has been found to be an especially vulnerable period for states across the board’.53

Douglas A. Borer and Michael Freeman argue that democracy is not an effective way of reducing the threat of terrorism. They mention that democratization is unlikely to be an effective method because: (1) it will not undermine the root causes of terrorism; (2) it will create more targets for terrorists; (3) it will weaken the response of the states; and (4) it might produce fewer willing allies for fighting terrorism.54
Disagreeing that democratization would reduce Islamic fundamentalism’s opposition to democracy, Olivier Roy argues that while some Islamic reformers would accept democracy as a legitimate political system and would be willing to work within that system, the jihadis do not accept the legitimacy of democracy because it gives sovereignty to the people rather than to God. Moreover, for them, anything other than shariah—whether democracy or godless authoritarianism—is equally unjust, and, therefore, illegitimate.\textsuperscript{55}

Moreover, Osama bin Laden’s and other’s opposition to democracy is not on religious but on political grounds: they would not win in democratic elections. On the contrary, it could be expected that they would do anything to counter their defeat, including indulgence in terrorist activities. Moreover, terrorists rarely represent political agendas that could mobilize electoral majorities. Terrorist organizations are also not mass-based organizations: they are small and secretive. They are not organized or based on democratic principles. They revolve around strong leaders and a cluster of committed followers. They, therefore, would reject the very principles of majority rule and minority rights on which liberal democracy is based. Furthermore, terrorists do not want democracy. What they want is the establishment of a medieval Muslim Caliphate.\textsuperscript{56}

Gregory Gause and Bernard Lewis oppose democratization as a panacea for terrorism because the results of free elections would be favourable to the Islamist radical parties. To them, the democratization effort in the Middle East has brought to power groups such as Hamas in the Palestinian territories, Hezbollah in Lebanon and the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, all of which are illiberal and hostile to the US. They also fear that democratically elected regimes (e.g. Hamas, Hezbollah) might actually support and sponsor terrorism. Islamic extremist parties may come to power and change the foreign policies of their countries and then fund, support and use terrorists as proxies for their political battles with other countries, including the US.\textsuperscript{57}

Dietrich Jung argues that it is flawed—if not dangerous—to perceive policies of democracy promotion as the right means of
fighting terrorism. He contends that a democratic system cannot completely prevent societal actors from pursuing their aims by violent means. Citing the case of Western liberal democracies, he mentions that:

in the 1970’s and 1980’s, a number of European states were confronted with terrorist organizations whose members had been recruited from the post-World War II generations. These political extremists did not suffer under authoritarian regimes and social deprivation but in fact enjoyed the liberal rights and social security of the democratic welfare state. [He warns that] in the current poisoned atmosphere between the West and the Arab world, the combination of coercive policies with an inflated discourse on democracy and human rights might even enhance the propensity among younger generations in the Middle East to pursue their political goals by violent means.58

After discussing the debate on whether democracy and democratization are the right strategies to deal with the scourge of terrorism, let us now examine Bush’s democracy promotion initiative in the Middle East as a means of fighting international terrorism. Several recent events clearly prove that this policy of democracy promotion does not stand up to scrutiny for several reasons. First of all, Bush’s grand strategy of democratization has neither brought democracy nor ended terrorism in Iraq and Afghanistan. The difficult process of developing democratic institutions in Afghanistan has so far failed to produce stable government or a growing economy, a situation that has created an opening for the Taliban’s resurgence. Similarly, in Iraq, neither democratic government nor an effective state has taken root. In fact, the Iraq war has increased terrorism seven times worldwide.59 Additionally, some of the heavy-handed American tactics used in the ‘war on terrorism’—such as Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib and the allegations of torture at both facilities and use of undemocratic practices such as holding suspects without trial or charges, denial of access to legal counsel, etc. have not only eroded public backing for the Western-led democracy promotion initiative, but helped fuel anti-American sentiments in many Muslim countries, helping militant groups muster support.
Second, there was a huge gap between US rhetoric about democracy promotion in the Middle East and the reality of democratic values in its dealings with the Arab world. For instance, the Bush Administration’s mandatory prescription of democracy in Afghanistan, Iraq and Iran, rejection of democratic outcomes in the Palestinian authority and rich rewards for unreformed authoritarian leaders in Pakistan and Saudi Arabia made it difficult to convert a sceptic to the democratic cause.

Third, the American reading of the sources of Arab radicalism was too simplistic. The deep sources of terrorism are much more complex than just the Middle East’s democratic deficit. One can argue, in fact, that the modernization and globalization processes produce terrorism. As we later argue in this study that there is not just a single cause of terrorism, similarly there is also not any one-size-fits-all type of solution to terrorism.

The legitimacy of democratization depends very much on the means, processes and institutional arrangements used to achieve it. In general, democratization is seen as acceptable, specially if it happens organically within a country or through the exercise of soft power. However, when it is attempted through military means, a strategy of democratization may lose its legitimacy. Democratization by force may be illegitimate because it violates the norm of state sovereignty. In short, the ends can be justified, but only if the means are proper.

Experience shows that democratization has always been primarily an indigenous process, often generated and sustained by courageous men and women who push for political change within their societies. Democracy imposed from outside rarely succeeds, as has been clearly demonstrated in Iraq and Afghanistan recently.

Similarly, a close look at the global debate on democracy and terrorism reveals interesting propositions. For instance, although many scholars argue that societies under transformation from authoritarianism to democratic rule show a higher propensity for violence and terrorism, yet most of them agree that democracy with constitutional guarantees of rights, the rule of law, electoral processes and representative government can reduce the level of
terrorist violence in the long run. Likewise, while many are not sceptical about the ability of the democratic political system to deal with the challenge of terrorism in future, democracy promotion through coercive means is considered as a questionable tool for containing terrorist violence.

However, there is a major shortcoming inasmuch democracy is commonly understood both in the policy-making and academic circles. Democracy is often reduced to its most visible lowest common denominator—elections. But there are two conceptions of democracy. The pragmatic view or ‘formal democracy’ is indeed simply summed as government by, for, and of the people, for which periodic elections are a proxy. However, the moral view or ‘substantive democracy’ is ‘more than majority rule disciplined by checks and balances and is based on justice, inclusion and equity’,61 ‘democracies don’t just serve majority interests, they accord individuals intrinsic respect’.62 Thus, the values of democracy and rule of law must be instilled before proceeding to elections. Without the checks and balances and practice of accountability, elections can be held to ransom and governance institutions can be too easily hijacked.

Our research findings on both India and Pakistan clearly confirm this. While the absence of democracy in Pakistan over a significant period of time has greatly increased terrorist violence in that country, the presence of democracy in India has not stopped terrorism either. We, therefore, argue that democracy, both in its formal and substantive forms, can be the real antidote to terrorism in both the countries in the long run.
India is considered the world’s largest democracy, not out of any love or affection. The country completed the 15th General Election in May 2009, which is described as the ‘largest democratic and election management’ in the world, spread over a month, involving 714 million eligible voters, 4.7 million polling staff and 2.1 million security personnel. What is more important than this is that Indian democracy is hailed as a ‘miraculous phenomenon’, specially in the context of the political experience of other developing countries that are still struggling to institutionalize and stabilize democratic institutions. As the Nation, a Pakistani newspaper wrote on the eve of India’s 15th General Elections in 2009 that, ‘in spite of many weaknesses in the Indian political method, the answer to what makes India politically stable and economically advanced lies in its uninterrupted political process, one that is virtually unique in the neighbourhood’.

Yet, it is ironic that liberal democratic India has been the stage of immense terrorist violence. The promise of liberal democracy, after all, is that extreme, violent action, whether by governments or other members of the society, will be avoided. Starting from its independence in 1947, India has experienced terrorism of various hues: religious, ethnic, ideological, cross-border, etc. Why did terrorism occur in India?

There are many causes. Colonial history, geo-politics in the South Asian region (Soviet and American intervention in Afghanistan), strategic objectives of the neighbouring countries, and the increasing influence of radical international Islamic thought are some of the major causes of terrorism in India. This chapter, however, examines whether people can get alienated even under a democratic political system and thus become vulnerable to radical ideologies and terrorism. In other words, it investigates whether
India’s secular democratic experience since its independence in 1947 has actually contributed to less or more terrorism at home and abroad. Second, to what extent the deepening and strengthening of India’s democracy can solve its present and future terrorism problems. But before discussing these questions, it is worthwhile to focus first on the nature of India’s democracy, and then on the gravity of the terrorist threat faced by India.

**NATURE OF INDIAN DEMOCRACY**

Since its independence in 1947, India has been a federal democratic republic. Except for a brief period of 19 months when a national emergency was declared and fundamental rights were suspended, India has been governed by democratically-elected governments. Even during this brief emergency rule in India, as Urmila Phadnis has forcefully argued, the ‘Congress system’ prevailed, thereby preventing a serious breakdown of the democratic process. Unlike many other post-colonial states, both within and outside the South Asian region, where military regimes and single-party dictatorships seem to be the order of the day, India stands out as a remarkable story of success of democracy. Here, democracy not only survived and prevailed, it has, in fact, been strengthened. While many Western democracies today are facing a decline in the participation of the people in the electoral process, in India, more and more people are participating in the democratic exercise. This has allowed millions of Indians to feel empowered and in control of their own destinies and their faith in the constitutional system of government has become very strong.

What stands at the heart of India’s democracy? Indian democracy is based on a liberal political structure and a composite and tolerant political culture. Kanti Bajpai has identified four key elements of the Indian political structure: liberal constitutionalism, civic nationalism, devolution of power in a layered federalism, and group rights.66

*Constitutionalism* is the promise that the state will deal with individuals and groups according to the established principles and
practices rather than arbitrarily. A liberal constitution consists of principles that limit the authority of the governments through necessary checks and balances, and protect individuals and groups from the ‘tyranny of the majority’. The Indian constitution has all these elements.

Civic nationalism is the form of nationalism in which the state derives political legitimacy from the active participation of its citizenry, from the degree to which it represents the ‘general will’. It is based on the notion that citizenship is based not on ethnic, but rather on political attributes such as the willingness to abide by the rules of a common political order. Seen in this sense, being Indian is not a matter of ethnic belonging; rather, it is based on belonging to a particular political community by virtue of birth, and later by virtue of one’s own reason.

The third component of India’s political structure is the devolution of power in a three-tiered federal system. Federalism involves division of power and authority between the central and state governments so that power is not concentrated in the hands of one body or set of institutions. To the liberal mind, this form of institutional arrangement is desirable, as it distributes power and provides more avenues for participation and access to authority. Indian federalism divides jurisdictions and powers between the central and the state governments in a very detailed manner. Besides, in order to satisfy the local aspirations, the Panchayati Acts of 1992 and 1993 were passed by the Indian Parliament making local governance institutions the third-tier of India’s federal system.

The fourth is the conferral of group rights that Indians enjoy as members of a community. The most important rights are the rights of religious communities, language communities, and caste and tribal communities. Religious groups in India enjoy various group rights which are covered both within and beyond the ambit of the Fundamental Rights. They can run their own educational institutions and raise money for religious institutions free of tax. More importantly, Christians and Muslims in particular have the right to their own personal laws, a provision unparalleled in any other constitution of the world. The language groups in India also
enjoy various group rights. Some of their most important rights include having a state of one’s own, and being educated in one’s own language. The reorganization of states in India has been done, in part, on linguistic basis. Group rights of a different sort have been extended to caste and tribal groups, including provisions that prevent discrimination and those that provide for affirmative action. The most important affirmative action is the provision for reservation of seats in education, employment, and political representation.

Indian democracy is not only based on a liberal political structure, but also rests on a composite and tolerant political culture. The Indian political culture consists of three elements, all of which are interrelated. They include: a valuation of tolerance, an aversion to violence, and a conception of the ‘political’. First, Indian political culture is based on a belief in tolerance. This is not to say that Indians are always tolerant. What it means is that Indians value what they regard as tolerance in public life, and believe it is a political good. A second feature of India’s political culture is the aversion to violence in politics. This does not mean that Indians are strictly non-violent. Rather, Indians dislike the use of violence in politics and condemn extremism and violence whenever they do occur. Finally, Indians have a ‘thick’ conception of the political. They view politics not as mere policy making, but a process about debate and dialogue. In addition, culturally different and politically conscious groups in India share a common space as fellow citizens. There is an absence of a hegemonic culture, and, subsequently a hegemonic identity. This is in direct contrast to many of its neighbours, where a moral superiority is established over the cultural values of the minorities.

GRAVITY OF THE TERRORIST THREAT

Terrorism, insurgency and subversive activities existed in India even during Nehru’s time. But they reached the dangerous level only in the last two decades. According to a report by the New Delhi–based South Asia Terrorism Portal, at least 231 of the country’s 608 districts are currently afflicted, at differing intensities, by various
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insurgent and terrorist movements. In addition, wide areas of the country appear to have ‘fallen off the map’ of good governance, and are acutely susceptible to violent political mobilization, lawlessness and organized criminal activity. A detail analysis of major terrorist activities in India is discussed as under.

THE NORTH-EAST

The north-eastern region including Assam is a region that consists of seven states with 10 per cent of India’s land mass. Linked to India by a narrow 70-km stretch between Bangladesh and Bhutan, sharing an uninterrupted border of over 3,700 km with China, Burma, Bangladesh and Bhutan, and composed of ethnic groups which also reside in the neighbouring countries, the whole area has been in a state of turmoil since the early years of Independence.

The Nagas were the first to initiate an armed insurgency against the country. They declared independence a day before India got its independence. Led by A. Z. Phizo, the Naga Nationalist Council (NNC) started a violent and organized insurgency in Nagaland. The Army moved into the state to crush the insurgency, but without much success. The peace process as attempted in 1964, 1975 and 1986 also did not yield much result, but the intensity of the conflict only became more bitter. The enforced or negotiated peace has also led to the fragmentation of the insurgent groups, such as the NSCN into the NSCN–Isaac Muivah and NSCN–Khaplang, resulting in factional rivalry and a tendency to outdo each other through ‘competitive militancy’.

The Manipuri communists under the leadership of Hijam Irabot took up the militant armed struggle from 1949 onwards against the government forces for the ‘sovereignty’ of Manipur and socialist ideology. In 1953, the Manipur Nationalist Union (MNU) led by Y. Shaiza and S. Indramani proclaimed in a public meeting in Imphal that Manipur should be an independent buffer state. In 1963, the Meitei community under the leadership of W. Tomba initiated an armed struggle against the state forces for the independence of Manipur.
Today, the various insurgent groups which are active in the state include: the United National Liberation Front (UNLF), the Revolutionary People’s Front (RPF), the People’s Liberation Army (PLA), the People’s Revolutionary Party of Kangleipak (PREPAK), the All-Manipur Students Union (AMSU), etc. These separatist outfits claim to be the ‘watchdog of the people’ and carry out many of violent operations, such as forced bandhs, public curfews, road blockades and extortion. Two outfits, the UNLF and PLA, are virtually running a parallel government in the state. One outfit, the RPF, has decided to issue the so-called ‘non-immigrant residential permits’ to all non-Manipuris.

The insurgency that began in Manipur and Nagaland soon engulfed Mizoram. The Mizo National Front (MNF) was formed in 1959 by Laldenga with independence as its goal. Laldenga cherished a separate nation constituted of the Mizos, as different from the plainsmen and having a political right to self-determination. The MNF formed the Mizo National Army to fight the Indian forces. After the failure of Operation Jericho in which the MNA guerrillas overran Aizawl, Laldenga escaped to Pakistan in 1971. The Mizoram Accord of 1986 led him to surrender arms and join the national mainstream. He became the first chief minister of Mizoram in 1987.

The origin of insurgency in Tripura lies in the massive influx of Chakmas from Bangladesh. This has altered the demographic character of the state, resulting in land alienation and economic exploitation. A strong tribal identity against all this has led to militancy in Tripura. The Tripura National Volunteers (TNV) established in 1978 is the first extremist group to fight for an independent tribal state of Tripura. Other prominent outfits operating in the state include: The All-Tripura Tiger Force (ATTF), the National Liberation Front of Tripura (NLFT), etc. These outlawed extremist outfits resort to kidnapping and murder of non-tribals, including secular tribals, as part of the ‘ethnic cleansing’ (Operation Rokhlai) in the tribal-dominated areas.

The situation in Assam is no better. The violent insurgent activities of ULFA and the ‘ethnic cleansing’ of Santhals by the Bodos have brought the state to the brink of a precipice. Established
in April 1979, the United Liberation Front of Assam was an offshoot of the Assam agitation over the large-scale influx of the Bengalis who came from West Bengal and neighbouring Bangladesh. The steady reduction of Assamese into a minority in their own state, and the perception that they had failed to obtain their fair share of benefits from the oil, tea and timber resources of their own state eventually led to the demand for an independent Assam. ULFA has virtually established a parallel government in the state and set up a highly effective system of ‘levying taxes’.

To curb violence in the state, the Government of India launched a series of military operations, such as Operation Bajrang (November 1990), Operation Blueprint (June 1991), Operation Cloudburst (September 1991), Operation Rhino (1991), Operation All Clear (2003), etc. The devastating military blows inflicted by these military operations have brought ULFA to the negotiating table, but it also resulted in a split in the organization: the surrendered ULFA (or SULFA), and the ULFA. Now the hardcore militants of ULFA spearhead violent activities in the state, from kidnapping and extortion to blowing up oil installations, railway tracks, bridges, etc.

If the ULFA aims to ‘liberate Assam’ from India, several Bodo militant outfits, such as the National Democratic Front of Bodoland (NDFB), the Dima Halam Daoga (DHD), and the Bodo Liberation Tigers (BLT) want a separate state of Bodoland being carved out of Assam. These outlawed organizations are not only antagonistic to one another, but seek to change the ethnic composition of the areas under the Bodoland Autonomous Council (BAC) by ‘cleansing’ the non-Bodo settlers such as the Hindus, the Muslim immigrants from Bangladesh, and Santhals. Unfriendly countries have exploited the ongoing turmoil in the North-East to their advantage. Their involvement has made the problems much more difficult to resolve.

MILITANCY IN KASHMIR

Since August 1989, terrorism began to manifest in Kashmir in the form of kidnapping and killing of people. The Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF), which initially raised the banner
of revolt, kidnapped Rubaiya Sayeed, the daughter of the then home minister, Mufti Mohammad Sayeed, in December 1989. It is widely believed that the release of five hardcore JKLF militants by the V.P. Singh Government in exchange for Ms Sayeed gave a fillip to militancy in the Valley.

Besides the JKLF, other militant organizations active in the early phase of militancy in Kashmir included the Hizb-ul-Mujahideen, the Muslim Janbaz Force, All Jehad, and Ikhwan-ul-Mulimmen. While some of these outfits were secular in character and stood for the independence of Kashmir, the others were oriented towards the establishment of an Islamic society, thus working for the merger of Kashmir with Pakistan.75

It is worthwhile to mention here that terrorism in Kashmir cannot be understood without focusing on the role of Pakistan in the military campaign in the state. Although the separatist insurgencies in Kashmir could claim their origins in domestic political failures, many Indians believe that Pakistan’s injection of Afghan mercenaries had extended the insurgency in Kashmir beyond its natural life.76

Husain Haqqani, a reputed Pakistani scholar and presently a diplomat, in his book *Pakistan: Between Mosque and Military*, writes that, ‘the rise of Islamic militants in Pakistan is not the inadvertent outcome of some governments’. It is ‘rooted in history and is a consistent policy of the Pakistani state’. The author writes that,

Pakistan was created as an Islamic state with a population that shared little geographically, ethnically and linguistically. The country’s rulers have maintained power using religion as an ideology. And then the region’s geopolitics—the tensions with India and the battle against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan—helped create deep links between the Pakistani military and the Islamic militant groups. The Pakistani military has lost the wars it has fought via traditional means. But running the guerrilla operations—against the Soviets, Indians and the Afghans—proved an extremely cost effective way to keep its neighbours off balance’.77

For India, the Pakistani strategic objective has been ‘to bleed with a thousand cuts’ so as to weaken and destabilize it over a
period of time that, ultimately, India succumbs to defeat, division and disintegration.

Initially, Pakistan’s role was limited to political, diplomatic and military support to the local Kashmiri militants. In the mid-1990s, militancy in the state was hijacked by foreign mercenaries controlled and guided by Pakistan. After the tit-for-tat nuclear tests of 1998, Pakistan’s confidence that it could raise the conflict threshold with India without risk of the latter’s military retaliation increased with the direct involvement of its Army to change the status quo in Kashmir, resulting in the Kargil war of 1999. While the Kargil debacle caused political turmoil in Pakistan, replacing the civilian Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif by the military dictator Gen Pervez Musharraf, India experienced substantial rise in violence and killings in Jammu and Kashmir (J&K) by the Pakistan-based terrorist organizations, which Nayyar and Mian call ‘the proxy army’.

From 2000 onwards, groups that were previously limited to the Kashmir theatre expanded their operations into the Indian hinterland. Notable attacks included the 2000 attack on the Red Fort, the 2001 attack on the Indian Parliament, the 2006 Mumbai [earlier Bombay] subway attack, the 2008 Mumbai assault, and numerous other attacks in India. In addition, in 2000 fidayeen (high-risk commando) operations were introduced in Kashmir, and since then used throughout India, the last being in November 2008 in Mumbai. Of these, the Parliament attack of 2002 and the Mumbai attack of 2008 have triggered an intense military confrontation between the two nuclear rivals as India has accused Pakistan of complicity in these attacks. Islamabad, on the other hand, has maintained that these attacks are the handiwork of the non-state actors that the state does not control. New Delhi is, however, not convinced, and, instead, argues that the so-called non-state actors are actually extensions of state actors like the powerful army/intelligence apparatus, albeit with some degree of plausible deniability.

Most of the recent terror attacks against India have been carried out either by Jaish-e-Mohammad (the Army of Mohammad) or by
Lashkar-e-Toiba (LeT, the Army of the Pure), both based in Pakistan. These two fundamentalist organizations see India–Pakistan conflict over Kashmir as a religious struggle, and claim that participation in this so-called jihad is duty-binding on all Muslims who would go straight to heaven after fighting against India. Actually, Kashmir, for these rogue elements, is a ‘gateway’ to convert India into what they style as Dar-ul Islam, the Abode of Islam. This has led many Indians to refuse to accept that the Kashmir issue is the real cause of jihadi terrorism and its solution would actually end violence in that strife-torn state.

As was demonstrated during the Mumbai attack of 2008, these terror groups are resorting to spectacular acts of mass murder in India’s urban centres with the goal of intimidating and terrorizing the Indian public. In addition, these groups are increasingly targeting national assets, the Gateway of India, Taj Mahal Hotel, Red Fort, national Parliament, etc. and have established links with other fundamentalist and terrorist organizations in different parts of India with similar motives. LeT and JeM are also ideologically and operationally intertwined with Al-Qaeda, which is driven by a pan-Islamic agenda of transforming the present world order. The Al-Qaeda has also made it very clear that India is a target. ‘To fight against Americans, Russians and Indians’ and to ensure that ‘Islam will spread over the entire world’. All these outfits now see India as part of the ‘Crusaders–Zionists–Hindu axis (the US and the West–Israel–India) that, they believe, have joined hands to destroy Islam.

Also, for the foreseeable future, India is likely to remain a target of these Pakistan-based terror outfits. This is due, among other things, to India’s inability (and indeed that of the international community) to compel Pakistan to dismantle the vast terrorist infrastructure comprehensively, to Pakistan’s incapacities to do so even if it had the will, to terrorists’ objective to derail the Pakistani Government policies of pursuing rapprochement with India and fighting extremists in FATA and to the expanding participation of Indians in terrorist violence with varying degrees of assistance from Pakistan and Bangladesh.
THE NAXALITE PROBLEM

The Naxalite problem has assumed threatening proportions in recent times and constitutes what Prime Minister Dr Manmohan Singh has rightly described as the ‘single biggest internal security challenge’ confronting the country. While the number of Maoist-affected states in the country is currently pegged at 14, the movement has demonstrated the intent and potential to spread across the length and breadth of the country. The Maoist threat has now overtaken all other insurgencies in the country, at least from the perspective of geographical spread, with various levels of Maoist mobilization and violence currently afflicting at least 165 districts in 14 states. Moreover, over the past few years while fatalities in various other insurgencies have tended to decline consistently, fatalities related to the Maoist conflict have continuously increased. In 2006, for instance, 638 people (210 civilians and 214 police personnel) died in Maoist violence. In 2007, the death toll was similar in pattern: 650 fatalities, 240 of civilians and 218 of police personnel.

The Naxalite Movement, also known as left-wing extremism, originated in 1968 and accepted the ‘Naxalbari path’ of revolution. Greatly influenced by Charu Mazumdar’s theory of ‘class struggle’ and ‘class violence’, the Naxalites operate in the forest and tribal areas of the affected states, because they offer ideal conditions to carry out guerrilla warfare. They use tactics such as ‘to kill one and frighten thousands’, and as L. K. Advani, the former home minister observed, ‘indulge in terrorist acts such as the annihilation of the so-called “class enemy”, the cult of the bomb and of the AK-47s, mass killings, destructive attacks on public installations, summary trials conducted by the so-called prajadalams and the brutal punishment meted out by them’. The People’s War Group (PWG), the Maoist Communist Centre (MCC), the Party Unity, Communist Party of India (M-L) Liberation are some of the most dreaded Naxalite outfits.

Of these, the PWG is the most dominant and deep-rooted extremist outfit. According to recent reports, the group has linked with other militant groups and the protagonists of separatist
movements operating in J&K, Nagaland, Assam and Manipur. Reports also suggest that the PWG has established contact with like-minded groups outside the country as well, particularly with the revolutionary groups of Nepal. The PWG believes in ‘capturing power through the barrel of the gun’, and is mainly active in Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar and Jharkhand, and partially active in Orissa, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu.

Recent reports suggest that the Maoists have articulated a new strategy to target urban centres in their ‘Urban Perspective Document’, drawing up guidelines for ‘working in towns and cities’, and for the revival of a mobilization effort targeting students and the urban unemployed. Two principal ‘industrial belts’ have been identified as targets for urban mobilization: Bhilai–Ranchi–Dhanbad–Kolkata [earlier Calcutta] and Mumbai–Pune–Surat–Amdavad [earlier Ahmedabad]. Former Union Home Minister Shivraj Patil told the Lok Sabha (Lower House of Parliament) on 5 December 2006 that the Maoists were planning to target important installations in major cities of India. Patil said, ‘Like forests provide safe hideouts to Naxalites in tribal areas, the cities also provide them cover. Taking advantage of this, they plan to target major installations in cities.’

JIHADI VERSUS SAFFRON TERRORISM

In recent years, there has been a new and more disturbing phase in the terrorist activity in India, what may be termed ‘retaliatory terrorist strikes’ by the home-grown fundamentalist groups. Two such terror groups have recently come to the limelight: the Indian Mujahideen (IM), and Abhinav Bharat.

IM is a jihadi terrorist group in India that has claimed responsibility for several recent terror attacks in various urban centres in India during the 2006–8 period. Important places targeted include: Varanasi (March 2006), Hyderabad (2007), Lucknow (November 2007), Jaipur (May 2008), Bangalore (July 2008), Amdavad and Surat (July 2008), New Delhi (September 2008), etc. The fanatics described these attacks as ‘Islamic raids’. In its emails to
the media prior to the attacks, the IM claimed that the Babri Masjid demolition in 1992, the Mumbai riots of 1993, communal violence in Gujarat in 2002 and various other atrocities against the Muslim community in India were reasons for its jihad. The group wanted to ‘stop the heartbeat of India’, spread Islam in the country, wage jihad against the infidels (non-Muslims, i.e. Hindus) and establish God’s government according to Koranic principles.

Indian intelligence officials believe that IM is a splinter group which broke away after the Student Islamic Movement of India (SIMI) was banned and is linked to the Pakistani LeT and Bangladesh-based Harkat-ul-Jihad-e-Islami for their logistical and technical help.\(^\text{90}\) It has spread its tentacles far and wide, establishing hideouts and sleeper cells in several congested Muslim localities in India’s cities and towns. SIMI, they believe, took new titles because its top leadership has been detained and would be available for interrogation. The change of name is also believed to signal a change in tactics, as SIMI-affiliated militants attempted to garner more support from India’s Muslims rather than be seen as a group consisting of foreigners. Press reports suggest that IM was fed and watered by transnational financial networks: networks linked both to diasporic Islamists living in West Asia and Pakistan-based organizations like LeT.\(^\text{91}\) Although the IM wants to make the common man believe that the Indian Muslim is not being treated well, hence there was a need to conduct such attacks, their real motive is to cause communal disharmony and recruit potential terrorists.\(^\text{92}\)

Abhinav Bharat (this is different from the organization by the same name, which is registered as a public charitable trust), the organization from which the terror cell emerged, was founded in mid-2006. Named after a group set up by the Hindu ideologue V. D. Savarkar in May 1904 to wage war against imperial Britain, AB’s leading figures believed that terror was needed to counter jihadi terror. It carried out the Malegaon (Maharashtra) and the Modasa (Gujarat) terrorist attacks in September 2006 and Samjhauta Express attack near Panipat (Haryana) in February 2007. The fanatics wanted to settle scores with the Muslims who apparently continue to perpetrate
atrocities upon Hindus by creating an armed India and burying Hindu tolerance through aggressive ethno-religious nationalism.

According to the charge sheet filled by the Maharashtra Anti-Terrorism Squad in the Maharashtra Control of Organised Crime court, AB was to be a front organization with the intention of propagating a Hindu *Rashtra* with its own constitution and aims and objectives. It had put together an ambitious plan that called for a Taliban-like government, which would ensure that India was rid of anyone opposed to the idea of Hindu *Rashtra*. In order to accomplish its goals, it would start by fighting terror with terror. It would raise funds through business such as retail stores and impart arms and ammunition training to those who were interested in the plan. The organization had also planned to approach Israel for help. It had even decided to adopt a national flag, which was to be saffron in colour with a gold border.

The emergence of this more sophisticated home-grown terror cells carries grave repercussions not only for national security, but also for domestic politics, Hindu-Muslim relations and diplomacy with Pakistan. Perhaps more important, it touches on India’s idea of itself as the world’s largest secular democracy, capable of including a multitude of peoples and faiths.

THE INDIAN PUBLIC DISCOURSE ON TERRORISM

Over the last few years, public discourse on democracy and terrorism in India has become sharply divided. Two basic points of view have been vying for supremacy as India has grappled with militancy in Punjab, Kashmir, the North-East and in other important parts of the country. According to the first viewpoint, during the last six decades Indian democracy has operated in a manner that has contributed to terrorism. The other view contends that democracy in India has actually reduced terrorism at home and abroad. The contest between these two different positions has in some ways sharpened after the attacks on the World Trade Center in New York, the US war against terrorism, and the events closer to home.
DEMOCRACY HAS CONTRIBUTED TO TERRORISM IN INDIA

Asghar Ali Engineer, a well-known Islamic scholar and head of the Mumbai-based Centre for the Study of Society and Secularism, argues that as the process of democracy deepened in India, the feeling of insecurity among classes of people has increased. For instance, Dalits today are much more empowered than they were in the 1960s. Now the upper castes feel threatened. So they keep challenging the reservation policy. Similarly, sections of middle-class Hindus are much more prejudiced against Muslims as the community has progressed a lot in the past few decades. Muslims now demand better education rather than change in personal laws or promotion of Urdu, which they used to do in the 1970s. He holds the Sangh Parivar singularly responsible for making Hindus believe that they are being besieged by Muslims. This has been terribly damaging to the community.95

According to Maya Chadha, democracy unleashes assertive groups, particularly the segmented democracy of India. She further argues that different ethnic and religious groups as well as social classes often act like individual nationalities that mobilize support for causes, and if demands are not met, movements turn to extremism.96

S. D. Muni argues that while India presents the picture of ‘unity and diversity’, the possibility of conflict between the ‘unity’ and the ‘diversity’ could not be ruled out. He advocates that India’s developmental dynamics, federalism and democracy have caused the dual process of integration and alienation of ethnic and national groups and identities. He concludes that these varying patterns of conflict formation and containment (including resolution) are likely to persist in the future.97

To Stephen Cohen, much political violence, even in the name of separatism, stems from the failure of democratic politics to accommodate separatist or violent groups soon enough. At the height of the Khalistan Movement, for example, most Sikhs in India were not as interested in a separate state as they were in obtaining justice. This is also true of the separatist movement in Kashmir. It
had Kashmiri rather than Islamic roots and would not have burst into armed opposition in 1989 had Kashmir been treated more fairly in the preceding years. He, however, concludes that India’s physical vastness and the inability of the separatist movements to work together have made it possible for the country to transform these revolutionary movements into evolutionary ones.  

Similarly, Neera Chandhoke argues that, although the circumstances in which the formerly princely states merged into India is a major cause for violence and separatism in the country, these could still have been neutralized in the period that followed, if democracy and federalism had been given a chance to work. To her, the reasons for the violations of the democratic/federal principles are complex, but basically, after 1967 when the Congress lost power in half of the states and in the aftermath of the 1969 split in the Congress party, then Prime Minister Indira Gandhi adopted a series of strategies which transformed the nature of federalism in the country. Being more than aware that effective power depended on control of the states, Ms Gandhi proceeded to dissolve the boundaries between the domain of state politics and central politics. The central government wilfully selected and dismissed Congress and non-Congress governments in state after state, imposed President’s Rule arbitrarily, and, in general, treated states as feudal fiefdoms. States consequently lost whatever autonomy they had been granted under the federal system. This not only led to popular dissatisfaction, it also delegitimized state leaders who were seen as incapable of safeguarding regional autonomy.  

Echoing Chandhoke, Jaswant Singh contends that most internal security problems in the subcontinent are directly traceable to bad policies by the governments (whether those of Pakistan, in the case of East Pakistan; or those of India, in the case of the North-East, Punjab, and Kashmir) that ignored the legitimate demands of ordinary citizens. While foreign governments may have meddled in India, disturbances in those cases were also caused by flawed Indian domestic policies.  

K. Subrahmanyam blames the type of political culture prevalent in the country that makes India so vulnerable to terrorism and so
difficult to unify in countering it. For instance, terrorist attacks, instead of bringing our political parties together in a united effort to fight terrorism, have led to mutual recrimination. This is the situation in a country that has been engaged in fighting terrorism for well over a quarter of a century. He suggests that there is a great need to overcome the mindsets that accept terrorism of certain categories as part of politics. There is also a need to cleanse our electoral process and parliament, encourage the political parties to get into a meaningful dialogue among them, otherwise he warns that this would give a great deal of comfort and encouragement to the transnational and intra-national terrorist organizations that target this country.101

Citing the case of Punjab, Sharda Jain advocates that terrorism is a product of bad politics and not necessarily a result of socio-economic injustice. It is, accordingly, a political problem and needs political solution.102

Ujjwal Kumar Singh contends that the anti-terror laws such as the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities Act and POTA have led to the construction of suspect communities and alienation of entire groups of people from the national mainstream.103

There are some who consider that democratic India’s ‘soft’ response to terrorism has invited horrific crimes by secessionist forces within and outside the country. U. S. Bajpai remarks that:

when our image weakened as a result of the 1962 military setback, it emboldened Ayub Khan to test whether one Pakistani was not equal to ten Indians. Our weak image was responsible for the Chinese decision to arm the rebellious north-east tribal groups such as the Nagas and Mizos and to extend support to a Maoist revolutionary group in West Bengal, the Naxalites. Finally our weak image tempted Yahya Khan to force 10 million refugees into our territory.104

According to K. P. S. Gill, who is credited with having wiped out terrorism from Punjab, the nature of terrorism demands quick, indeed immediate and decisive application of appropriate force. It requires the creation of institutional structures and protocols of response, not only for counterterrorist action but for relief and containment of
the impacts of the terrorist acts. Above all, it demands a measure of clarity and an understanding that the use of weak and ineffective force compounds and escalates violence and that continuous emphasis on political and negotiated solution actively privileges violence and terror at the cost of the interests of the law-abiding citizen and of the nation. He further suggests that our capacities to survive, to grow and to secure our position among the promised ‘great powers’ of the world will depend on our capacities to root governance in reality and reason, not in the political illusions that manifestly dominate most contemporary perspectives. Constitutionalism, rule of law and the imperatives of governance have too long been neglected in India or have been reduced to slogans and rituals. Unless this trajectory is reversed, our failure will compound themselves to destroy the tremendous gains of independence and of the economic revival of the past two decades.\textsuperscript{105}

According to Subhas Kapila, if Pakistan-based terrorist organizations like the LeT and the JeM feel emboldened to attack highly-sensitive targets in India with impunity, it is because Indian governments of all hues have not imposed any political or military deterrence on Pakistan-based terrorism directed at India as a strategic weapon used by the Pakistan Army and its rogue terrorist organizations. India’s soft stances also stand reinforced by the Indian media’s noted political columnists and the Indian government’s favourite media foreign-policy experts who have been singing the same soft tune. India’s judiciary too has placed over-reliance on extending judicial processes to terrorists and by giving precedence to human rights to terrorists who, in their killings, have shown scant regard for the victim’s human rights. He suggests that India cannot keep on relying endlessly on condemnations from the UN, the US, Russia and others to defeat the threat against it. India itself has to impose political and military deterrence on the perpetrators of terrorism against it.\textsuperscript{106}

Similarly, Brahma Chellaney argues that,

India’s own soft response to terrorism has emboldened terrorists and their sponsors over the years. The terrorists see India as a soft target
because it imposes no costs on them and their sponsors. Although the problem of terrorism in India has worsened since the 1980s, successive Indian governments have done little to combat it through a prudent strategy backed by firm resolve.

There are some others who argue that terrorism thrives on hate created by communalism and denial of equity and justice. Praful Bidwai, for instance, deplores the ‘grave blunder’ the Indian state has committed in regarding Muslims as ‘permanent victims’ and treating them with kid gloves. He mentions that the Indian leaders and the media largely chose to ignore the indigenous origins of many recent episodes of terrorist violence, rooted in the communalization of the society and politics, the growing demonization of Muslims, their butchery in Gujarat and the state’s abject failure to bring the culprits of communal violence to book. The true effects of the Gujarat pogrom and its terrible aftermath—through the ghettoization and impoverishment of Muslims, the continued detention of hundreds of youth under draconian laws and the community’s total political exclusion—have all alienated a large number of Indian Muslims, the erosion of their faith in Indian democracy and the ability of the political system to deliver justice. All this, he thinks, is creating a climate in which terrorism is likely to prevail.

Sitaram Yechury argues that during the last two decades, since the run-up to the demolition of the Babri Masjid, the systematic whipping up of communal polarization and the consequent electoral dividends appear to buttress the tendency to take recourse to this disastrous route as the main pathway to capture the reins of political power. Elections are no longer appearing to be the arena of choice between alternative political and ideological directions and policies. Increasingly, elections are being reduced as the theatre to garner support through sharpened communal polarization. Such sharpening of communal polarization for political gains only feeds terrorist response from other side. While the attempt to whip up communal polarization to derive political benefit at the cost of the country and the blood of its people must be defeated, efforts
to combat terrorism and strengthen internal security must be conducted with utmost impartiality.\textsuperscript{109}

According to Girish Karnad:

the growing violence is a failure of our political institutions and of civil society. It is a consequence of our failure to uphold the principles of the rule of law, mutual understanding and civil dialogue. The worst contributors to this scenario are the politicians who dream of electoral victory at the cost of social catastrophe. The powerful ideal of unity in diversity, which has held the country together for six decades, has been seriously imperilled by the use of religious and ethnic prejudice as a political weapon. Intolerance of those different from us and the abandoning of reasoned discussion to deal with differences, spells the end of India for which the freedom struggle was waged.\textsuperscript{110}

DEMOCRACY HAS CONTRIBUTED TO LESS TERRORISM IN INDIA AND ABROAD

There are many others who do not subscribe to this viewpoint. In a well-researched report, D. Banerjee and Suba Chandran mention that there have been no credible reports about the participation of Indian Muslims in any major terrorist activities outside India as part of international terrorist activities waged by Al-Qaeda or its affiliates. There is no record of any Indians in Guantanamo Bay or from the recent arrests in the UK of militants for their involvement in terrorist activities. Similarly, the Australian government, despite its best efforts, could not establish the involvement of an Indian doctor for plotting terror against the UK. Even more surprisingly, until today, not many Muslims from the Indian mainland have taken part in the violence in Kashmir—whether in the name of ‘militancy’ led by the Hizbul Mujahideen or ‘jihad’ led by the Lashkar-e-Toiba even though they share a common faith with Kashmiri Muslims and Pakistanis, and unlike the latter, they have no Line of Control to cross, no mountain to pass. Thus, they argue that Indian democracy, with its powerful secular traditions, a rule of law under an independent judiciary, and the nature and growth of Islam in India have all contributed moderating influences over radical tendencies in Islam that have manifested itself around the world with such virulence.
They further clarify that India has almost categorically been the victim, and not the perpetrator. Whether in J&K or as in recent years, in other parts of India, the ideological indoctrination, motivation, training, explosives, sophisticated weaponry, and in most cases the terrorists themselves have come from abroad. This is what distinguishes India from all other countries.\textsuperscript{111}

Prime Minister Manmohan Singh similarly argues that, ‘not one of India’s 150 million Muslim citizens had joined Al-Qaeda or the Taliban because India is a functioning secular democracy, where all sections of society can participate equally in national life’.\textsuperscript{112}

Amalendu Mishra is of the view that:

although the Indian state is engaged in more than one uprising at any given time, as yet, it has not yielded to the process of territorial mutation. A multi-national state with all the inherent tensions, India had a ten percent increase in its territory after independence.\textsuperscript{113}

Ajay Gondane, while focusing on the jihadi terrorism and the role of Indian Muslims in it, observes that the Indian Muslims have kept away from jihadist movements because of democratic inclusiveness, enforceable constitutional rights and privileges, open channels of social and geographical mobility, eclectic socialization, communication, employment of their impulses by authority positions, and a secular framework decrying religious bigotry. Sensitivity in handling Muslim aspirations facilitated their integration and encouraged their participation in national efforts towards consolidation of democracy, in tandem with other religious groups.\textsuperscript{114}

According to Rollie Lal, Muslims in India have largely not identified with the global fundamentalist Islamic movement. Whereas in South-East Asia, Jemaah Islamiah intends to unite Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore and parts of the Philippines into a single Caliphate, a similar trend has not arisen in India. Indian Muslims maintain allegiance to the Indian state to the extent that most Indian Muslims outside Kashmir support the Indian stand on Kashmir.\textsuperscript{115}

These two discourses, although representing contradictory and
often incompatible points of view, yet reflect the contemporary perspectives on democracy and terrorism in India. Moreover, they contain some elements of truth. For instance, those who consider that the way Indian democracy has functioned over the years has actually contributed to terrorism are right that short-sighted political policies by successive governments have resulted in the growth of terrorism. For instance, it is well-known fact that in both Punjab and J&K, the party in power at the centre, notably the Congress Party, not only interfered in state politics, it repeatedly attempted to destabilize state governments. This was in complete violation of the basic principle of federalism of state autonomy. And this, in turn, was to generate tremendous discontent in the two states. Second, democracy was simply not given a chance to work, particularly in Kashmir Valley, because the political parties in power both at the centre and the state sought to monopolize power. It only gave legitimacy to a secessionist–terrorist upsurge in the state that Pakistan instigated and supported.

On the other hand, when democracy was allowed to function, it had a cooling effect on terrorist violence in the country. For instance, the creation of Mizoram as a separate state within the federal structure of India helped enormously in transferring dissent that was otherwise challenging the territorial integrity of the nation state. Similarly, there is no doubt that use of force (an ‘eye-for-an-eye or bullet-for-a-bullet’ policy) played a major role in curbing terrorism in Punjab. But it is also true that normalcy returned to the strife-torn state only after a democratically-elected state government assumed power in mid-1990. Kashmir is another example. If the absence of democratic institutions to respond to the civic requirements and political aspirations of its citizens contributed to Kashmiri alienation from Indian democracy, then the unprecedented voter turnout in both the 2002 and 2008 Assembly elections in the state (remarkable by any standard, even with the Srinagar area where the militants hold most sway, registered higher numbers than before despite the poll boycott call given by the separatists) restored people's faith in democracy and revitalized institutions of governance in Kashmir. In a way, they also marginalized the secessionist leaders
who counted on Pakistan-supported terror brigades to enforce their political agenda on the people of Kashmir. This is partly because, since the 2002 state elections, there are no complaints about central intervention in the total exercise or local manipulation—or even of coercion by the security forces. There is a greater credibility of the electoral process on the one hand, and greater stakes in local power politics on the other. Intense competition between the two regional parties (the NC and the PDP) meanwhile has led to popular involvement in elections. This is certainly a major reason for the decline of violence in J&K in recent months.

However, there are many problems with this discourse. First, it speaks about one aspect of the reality and leaves the other untouched. For instance, it is unfair to say that India has not achieved any success in combating terrorism. Second, it does not refer to the many myths, falsehoods and confusion that have been created and nurtured in the name of terrorism in India. Finally, it does not go to the root of the problem.

Similarly, those who think that democracy has proved an antidote to terrorism in India are correct to a certain extent. If India did not have the democratic structure and political culture as described above, there would have been much greater instability and violence. As things stand, over one billion-plus people live together with some measure of coexistence. This is quite an achievement, one that was made possible by its political structure and culture.

But there are many problems with this ‘no-Indian-Muslim Al-Qaeda’ approach. First, it does not explain the role of India’s political process and governance institutions that have positive effects on terrorist incidents in the country. Second, it ignores the indigenous origins of many recent episodes of terrorist violence, both jihadi and saffron terrorism. Third, it subtly accepts that extremism is a product of external factors and India is only a victim.

Now the main question is: why, despite a long history in counterterrorism, democratic India has not been able to stop terrorist violence. In fact, terrorist attacks against the country have increased and not decreased in recent years. The simple answer is that the problem of terrorism in India has been subject to opportunistic and
subjective interpretation by the successive governments, political parties, community leaders, intellectuals and the press alike resulting in many myths, confusions and falsehoods on the one hand, and lack of adequate and sufficient governmental and institutional response to combat terrorism on the other. Therefore, there is need for greater public clarity on the issue of terrorism, the underlying causes that sustain it, and the way it should be dealt with.

First, there is a great division in political circles as who is causing terrorism in India. People are still made to believe that most terrorist attacks are a product of Pakistan’s Army/ISI, and India is only a victim of Pakistan’s age-old machinations. True, terrorist groups inimical to India still continue to get support from the neighbouring countries, especially Pakistan and Bangladesh. But it would be shortsighted to blame the external factor alone. By blaming everything on foreign countries, the government misleads the people into believing that the problem they face is entirely the creation of a ubiquitous ‘foreign hand’. External factors can have a role, and indeed take advantage of things only when the internal conflict mechanism (it is not important that they are present, it is also important how the people who heed these, actually operate them) remains weak or non-existent. The sooner the government and opposition come to term with this, the easier it will be to fight the menace of terrorism.

Second, even if there has been a late realization of the problem of home-grown terrorism, there is no unanimity as who is responsible for it. For the so-called secular politicians, a Muslim can do no wrong, and any crime that implicates any Muslim has to be due to the bias on the part of the security services. Thus, they oppose any ban on SIMI. Then there are religious fundamentalists who claim that no Hindu can be a terrorist. They would also not like the non-Hindus to be treated as equal citizens of India, and, in fact, want the elimination of all non-Hindu citizens. Thus, they do not want a ban on the Bajrang Dal. This line of thinking is actually based on the fear that any straight talk of terrorism will affect the entire community. This is actually perverted thinking that actually condemns the entire community.
Clearly related to this is the myth that links terror with a particular religion for allegedly recommending or legitimizing violence against innocent civilians. This discourse assumes that, ‘all terrorists are Muslims, although all Muslims are not terrorists’. It is reminiscent of the mid-1980s when every Sikh was viewed with suspicion after Indira Gandhi’s assassination. The recent arrests of Pragnya Singh and others in connection with the Malegaon and Modasa blasts and with links to right-wing Hindu extremist organizations should serve as an eye-opener to all those who believe in this type of reasoning. Giving a religious character to terrorism or demonizing one particular religion has dangerous consequences. It makes the entire community a scapegoat for the acts of a few terrorists, which is wrong because it undermines the strength of the nation’s democracy and creates conditions for intolerance to proliferate. Worst of all, it reinforces, divides and creates the frustration and alienation that terror networks feed on. It should be remembered that terrorists have no religion. No religion and no religious community can and should be blamed for the criminal acts of some individuals belonging to that community. The culprits should be booked under the law whether they are Hindus or Muslims.

Similarly, it is equally worrying to see that many vocal Muslim commentators have chosen to be in denial mode: denying the fact that the culprits behind the bomb blasts in various cities are Muslims; denying that SIMI may be engaged in anti-national activities; denying even the existence of an organization called the IM and insinuating, instead that it is a phantom created by the security forces to give Muslims a bad name. This line of thinking echoes the earlier ones: jihad worldwide is a creation of America’s propaganda machine; 9/11 was an inside job because thousands of Jews stayed away from work that day; etc. It may be noted that genuine doubts motivated by a spirit of enquiry are apposite in a free and open society for ascertaining the truth. Doubting every fact and event, however, on mere suspicion, without a tinge of contrary evidence betrays irrationality. Contrary to the vehement denial by government and community leaders, it is true that a section of India’s
youth belonging to both the Hindu and Muslim communities is on the path of self- or other destruction, and the state has to deal with them in an appropriate manner.

Like the communalization of the issue of terrorism, there has also been a communalization of the fight against terrorism in India, which is equally dangerous. The country cannot fight terror because its political leadership does not know what is under attack and what needs defending. Like the blind men and the elephant, each side of the political spectrum takes one part and ignores the rest.

This becomes clearly evident when we look at the approach of the main political parties towards each other on the question of fighting terrorism. The Bharatiya Janata Party, for instance, has accused the Congress-led UPA government of being blinded by vote-bank politics over fighting terror, to the extent that it cannot differentiate between national interests and national perils. The repeal of POTA, delay in hanging of Parliament attack case convict Afzal Guru, handling of the ban on SIMI, soft-pedalling of the issue of Bangladesh nationals, etc. are cited by the party to make its point. The Shiv Sena, a BJP alliance partner, has similarly accused the Congress for saving terrorists from the gallows and showering Muslims with concessions. It has also criticized the Samajwadi Party leaders for ‘rushing to defend Muslim terrorists’. The Congress, on the contrary, has alleged that the BJP’s politics are based purely on creating hatred among people of different faiths and communities because it is controlled by the fundamentalist and communal forces which are responsible for terrorist activities against the minorities.

Similarly, when the ATS investigators held the Hindutva groups responsible for the Malegaon blasts, the BJP described it as ‘Hindu-bashing by pseudo-secularists’. The Shiv Sena went one step further, claiming that Hindus were being ‘framed for acts of terror by Islamic conspirators’. The VHP leader Praveen Tagodia claimed that, ‘no Hindu can be a terrorist’. He warned that there would be a political backlash if any government persisted with this assertion. Shiv Sena leader Bal Thackeray backed Pragnya Singh and asked the legal community to defend her and other accused. Thackeray believed that, since the government had done almost
nothing to combat Islamic terrorism, there was a need for Hindu suicide bomb squads.

Like the government and the opposition parties, there are also differences between the central and the state governments on how to fight terrorism. The central government has always maintained that law and order is a state subject and it is primarily the duty of the state governments to ensure that peace and the rule of law prevails in their respective territorial jurisdictions. The states, on the contrary, have complained that due to partisan considerations, the central government has not given them adequate financial and military support at the right time in their fight against terrorism and insurgency. This divergence in perception has resulted in treating the problem of insurgency and terrorism merely as ordinary law-and-order problems by the respective states, which is actually not so. Each state initially responded to the problem in its own fashion and with the resources available at its disposal. It may be mentioned that because policing is under the control of individual states, state police forces vary in size, competence, and capabilities. In most cases, the state police are stretched to capacity and they, therefore, cannot match the resources and knowhow of terrorist organizations, specially the ones that operate with the help of a global network. Similarly, the state governments sometimes do not have basic intelligence-gathering capabilities, let alone the ability to contain such activities. All this led the situation to grow worse quite fast. When the problem became serious, the central government finally intervened, not through a pro-active national policy, but through a series of knee-jerk reactions.

It is true that as long as there are political parties, there will be competition, and in a democracy, political points will indeed be scored. But consensus on vital issues is a must in a democratic and federal set-up. India being a federal, democratic and secular country cannot fight terrorism effectively if there is no bipartisan political support or unanimity between the centre and the states on most vital issues affecting national security. What is happening is a national problem, and has to be dealt with the larger framework of national security.
If the political parties are a divided house on how to fight terror, the community response in this respect is not better either. A section of Hindus feel that even though they constitute an overwhelming majority in the country, their interests have been continuously ignored. The ruling classes of India, they assert, have put the interests of religious minorities before those of the majority in order to win elections. They also feel that jihad terrorism is the biggest problem they face as they go out for their day-to-day life. They are enraged at the inability of the political leaders to win the fight against terrorism, and believe it is because of the ‘Muslim vote’ that the terrorists are not dealt with more harshly. They also believe that the aim of jihad is to destroy what India has achieved economically and to divide the country once more in the name of Islam.¹²⁵

A part of the Muslim community, on the contrary, feels that local jihadi terrorism is only a reaction to the injustice of the Indian state. If the state were even-handed, there would have been no problem of terrorism. A few of them have even accused the Indian polity of being ‘unfair’ to Muslims, rendering only ‘token gestures’, instead of addressing the real issues. They blame the politicians of promoting a stereotypical image of the Muslim community and not allowing the moderate, liberal voices to be heard. Shabana Azmi, a well-known Bollywood actress and social activist, recently remarked: ‘whenever it is a Muslim question, you will get the dariwallas and only all the Maulvis to speak’.¹²⁶

Equally worrying is the tendency to project any police action against a suspected member of the community as action against the community as a whole. That the security forces must be diligent, fair and unbiased in discharging their duty is undeniable. Those who violate this code must be chastized and punished. But to complain that the entire community is targeted when the security forces do their normal duty of intelligence gathering and investigation is to handicap the Indian state, whose first responsibility is to protect all citizens irrespective of their caste, colour or religious background. During the Batla House and the Malegaon blast cases, leaders of both communities came to the defence of those arrested from among
their communities while demanding strict action on terror outfits of the other community. The portrayal of anti-terror initiatives as conspiracies is the latest method adopted by these demagogues. Such conspiracy theories are dangerous, as they hurt the morale of the police and fuel insecurity among the people.

If SIMI or IM are suspected in the terror attacks and are viewed as terrorist organizations, nobody should have any objection—including the Muslims. Similarly, it will be wrong of Muslims to believe that the Sangh Parivar represents all Hindus. There are many Hindus dead against its exclusionary politics. As was evident after the Gujarat riots, there are a lot of secular and human-friendly people in this country who always oppose crime and injustice.

Finally, the rise of local terrorism is based on a narrative deliberately woven around the sufferings of a section of India’s population, especially the Muslims. This narrative of victimization (portrayal of the community at the receiving end in assorted episodes from Babri Masjid to Gujarat) has unfortunately found easy acceptance in two unexpected quarters: those who use violence to achieve their objectives, and those who condemn it. This deserves to be exposed in favour of clear thinking.

Terrorist groups always try to create an impression that they are nothing but voices of the oppressed. But this narrative of oppression seems to become simply a pretext. It has its own self-fulfilling logic, so that everything that happens is simply more grist for the victimhood mill. Every political party, every state organ, every media intervention is portrayed as one vast conspiracy to reduce Muslims to victimhood, as if there is no space left to address legitimate grievances. As Hasan Kamal wrote, ‘these elements treat their sentimental hysteria as “pain of the community” and an effort at removing grief of Muslims and they perform irresponsible acts in a fit of frenzy’.127

Moreover, terrorists claim that they are acting to address the grievances of their community. If this a battle on behalf of Muslims, what sort of a battle is this? For, if nothing else, these acts make life more and not less difficult for Indian Muslims. It is as if the terrorist is obsessed more with the cult of violence than genuine
care for Muslims whom he uses as a pretext. ‘Irrational behaviour’, Camus once wrote, ‘transforms men into matter.’ This is exactly what terrorists want to do: convert citizens, including their fellow co-religionists, into fodder for their own designs.

In fact, in the name of revenge, they are causing much more harm to Muslims. In the past, terrorist activity by Muslims in India has provoked a violent reaction by Hindu fundamentalists, leading to more violence and spiralling unrest. No great intelligence is needed to see that the jihadists are working against the interests of India’s 160 million Muslims. ‘Islamist terrorism,’ as the cleric Mehmood Madani pointed out, ‘threatens to snuff out the hard-won gains of a new generation of Muslims who have defied the odds to emerge as successful entrepreneurs and professionals.’

Terrorists would always use a cause to hide their evil. And what is the cause? That: Muslims in India are a persecuted lot; that they will never get justice in ‘secular’ India; that secularism itself is against the very tenets of Islam; and that Muslims can lead a truly Islamic way of life only in an Islamic state. This hate campaign is carried out to create hatred for the Indian state and for the glorification of terrorist activities and to pit the Hindu majority against the Muslim minority, to result in a communal clash between the two communities. The victim syndrome will then provide them adequate recruits for their heinous acts. Notice how the recent terror targets have been religiously-sensitive places (Varanasi), or timed to coincide with religious occasions (Delhi blasts during Diwali).

It needs clarification that murder does not have a religion, even when it claims a religious excuse. As the late Edward Said wrote, after the 9/11 attacks in the US, ‘No cause, no God, no abstract idea can justify the mass slaughter of the innocents, most particularly when a small group of people are in charge of such actions and feel themselves to represent the cause without having a real mandate to do so.’

Armed struggles have not and will not succeed. For gaining one’s rights, one does not have to kill innocent people. Mahatma Gandhi, Nelson Mandela and Martin Luther King would have no relevance if violence was effective. The Sri Lankan case amply
demonstrates that AK-47s cannot defeat a state, and when people and communities with genuine political grievances take up arms, it only provides the state with an easy way out, of enforcing a military solution.

It is, therefore, imperative and extremely urgent to take strict notice of, and stridently oppose the radical self-styled jihadis, who are distorting Islamic teachings for their narrow objectives and spreading death and destruction in the name of Islam. Jihad, which is clearly defined in the Koran and Hadith (the sayings of the Prophet), is a struggle to put an end to strife and conflict, not to create or foment it, as is being done today. The holy Islamic word is being grossly abused and exploited to launch murderous attacks on defenceless and unsuspecting civilians. It should be noted that in almost all terrorist attacks in India in recent years, about one-fourth to one-third victims have been Muslim civilians. The general public, particularly the Muslims, should be made aware of the dangerous deviation of the self-styled jihadis and the horrendous implications of their acts and views.

Indian Muslims need to introspect on another point: whether the shrill and persistent propaganda that they are a prosecuted and oppressed community in India is helping or hurting them. This propaganda has no factual basis whatsoever. True, the Indian Muslim community suffers from certain inequities and disabilities, but this is substantially true about other communities too. There is nothing in the Indian Constitution, in India’s democratic political system or its secular ethos that inherently discriminates against Muslims. Nevertheless, the propaganda that Muslims do not get justice in India, echoing similar poisonous propaganda that the Muslim League had mounted before 1947 as a rationale for its demand for India’s Partition, is being systematically conducted both within and outside the country. This has naturally influenced a section of educated Muslims, radicalizing them in the direction of terrorism.

It is high time right-thinking Muslims asked themselves an important question: Should Muslim grievances be addressed within the framework of India’s democracy and secularism, or through the agenda being advanced by the SIMI/IM?
While jihad against India has been the focus and main agenda of the religious fanatics, the Kashmir issue, Babri Masjid demolition and Gujarat riots have become the convenient reasons for the so-called liberals, secularists and human rights activists to justify the actions of the terrorists and fundamentalists. It should be realized that open feeding of excessive narratives of victimization give terrorism aid and succour and make the national leadership incapable of combating terrorism. So instead of amplifying, ignoring, glorifying, justifying or explaining their activities, there is a strong need to isolate, condemn and denounce publicly and repeatedly the merchants of death. It is heartening to note that in recent months, many organizations and institutions in India have come out against terrorism and condemned those who perpetrate it in the name of religion. Muslim clerics in India, for instance, have issued fatwas (religious edicts) stating clearly that terrorism is a repulsive act of war against the basics of Islam and is strictly forbidden. In February 2008, the Darul Uloom Deoband and other organizations held a rally declaring terrorism un-Islamic and against the Koran and exhorted the Muslims to continue their loyalty to their motherland. Similarly, in the aftermath of the Mumbai terror attack, many Muslim organizations refused to allow the burial of the dead bodies of the terrorists in any Muslim cemetery, as they considered these terrorists as having profaned the teachings of Islam. Similarly, there were reports that lawyers refused to defend individuals accused of such offences.

The divisive nature of India’s political process has considerably affected the efficiency and performance of the country’s governance institutions which play a major role in the origin, containment and elimination of terrorism, because it is a well-known fact that the state institutions, cannot, beyond a point, remain unbiased if the larger political process that underpins them continues to be conflict-ridden.

This has been clearly evident from the way most formal and informal political institutions operate in India. The main cause of their decay has been attempts by the politicians to erode the substance and autonomy of democratic institutions in the interests
of personal rule. It has been a common complaint that politicians interfere with the police and investigations, don’t prosecute the perpetrators of crimes, and use commission of inquiry reports selectively. Whenever obstacles come in the way, such obstacles are sorted out, modified or rectified to suit the short-term and narrow interests of the party in power. There is an impression that anyone in politics has immunity from punishment—or even arrest—and can act with impunity. State officials do not act, or they simply walk away from the scene of a crime because they know they will never be held accountable for criminal dereliction of duty (e.g. as reported in the *Hindu* on 8 January 2010 as well as most print and TV media, the two Tamil Nadu ministers who calmly and unconcernedly watched a police officer on duty for their protection writhe and cry in pain in the middle of the road for about half an hour on being bombed, instead of immediately sending him in their official vehicles to hospital).

While the nature of power politics has undermined the credibility of all democratic institutions, the politicians would always decry the constitution and blame the parliamentary system for all ills. It is actually the non-performance of the institutions of governance, the selective use or even abuse of these institutions that have caused much resentment and alienation.

It may be noted that in politics, it is not issues but trust and credibility that are central. If politicians have credibility, they can survive horrendous mistakes; if they do not have credibility, there is a cloud even over their good deeds. Second, weak institutions disable the state from being effective mediators in social conflict. Part of what institutions do is to provide authoritative mediation of facts. The state faces a credibility of crisis when it is easy to impugn the facts it produces as partisan. Under those conditions, every group feels more entitled to continue believing what it was predisposed to believing, because there is no authority they can trust. The crisis can deepen when there is no authoritative mediator in civil society either. By treating institutions as mere instruments for short-term goals, by using them selectively, governments undermine their own authority. In those circumstances, even when they do the right
thing, they are not trusted. In part, the Congress’ capacity to mediate social conflicts declined precisely because its institutions were not trusted.

Institutions of governance must be independent, strong, and never subordinate to the party’s and the leadership’s demands. Although in recent years, numerous damaged institutions have been rebuilt (at least to some degree) and have begun to function in more autonomous and non-partisan ways (e.g. the federal system, the courts, the Election Commission to mention a few), yet much is still desirable.

**DEmocracy as a solution to India’s terrorism problem**

Democracy as a solution to India’s present and future terror problem depends on the motives of the terrorist group. For those who are fighting for regional autonomy or equality within the existing order, democracy could be a wonderful method. But if those who believe or exhort their followers to launch jihad against India or want to convert it into what they call *Dar-ul Islam*, or simply reject democracy, constitutionalism and rule of law on religious grounds, democracy cannot achieve much.

With this in mind, it can be mentioned that democracy can be helpful for India to combat terrorism in three ways. First, there is a need for greater institutional reforms. Second is the need for successful policy intervention at the appropriate level. Finally, India should support democracy promotion in its neighbourhood, especially in Pakistan and Bangladesh.

Institutional restructuring can take place at three levels: the police and intelligence level, so as to pre-empt and prevent terrorist activities; in the post-attack scenario, to minimize the casualties related to terrorist assaults; and at the broader governance level.

**GreAter institutional reforms**

It is well-known that India’s police—with minor exceptions—remain overwhelmingly undermanned, under-resourced and
primitive in their day-to-day functioning. There is also a perception that the police force is not objective and even biased. It is known to carry out fake encounters, abuse human rights, and communalize issues related to terrorism. Moreover, the state police have been made an instrumentality of the ruling party and the political leadership exercises undue pressure on it for quick results. Such pressure leads to over-reaction and the use of disproportionate force and thereby aggravates the situation.

Similarly, the country’s two main intelligence agencies, the external-oriented Research and Analysis Wing and the domestic-focused Intelligence Bureau, have long been at odds. As a result, critical information on various terrorist groups has not been shared in a routine, seamless and timely fashion. This has led Indian policy makers to work in the dark, or the state police forces are not suitably alerted in advance. If the country has a well-endowed and trained intelligence apparatus acting without political interference (as distinct from accountability), it could provide pre-emptive intelligence that could abort terrorist acts and lead to arrests. It would also prevent indiscriminate arrests and all that follows. But when intelligence is inadequate and follow-ups incomplete, indiscriminate arrests follow, which lead to further alienation.

It is worthwhile to mention here that a lot depends on the police and the investigative agencies how they deal with or are allowed to deal with terrorists or terrorism-related crimes. If they do not believe someone is innocent until proven guilty, then they might achieve exactly the opposite of what they wanted to achieve. Guantanamo Bay, for example, has created more terrorists than it detained. It has perhaps taken out some potential terrorists, but the resentment at this kind of treatment of people who may or may not have been part of the terrorist scene has created an atmosphere where people feel they should do something against this injustice. So unless India improves the quality and functioning of its police, intelligence and investigative agencies, it will remain acutely vulnerable to further terrorist penetration and attacks. In this context, the media also have an important role to play. They should distinguish between a suspect and an accused, and to brand anyone as a terrorist before the court verdict is out.
Similarly, there is a need to put proper crisis management protocols in place. Despite repeated demonstration of the vulnerability of the country’s cities to terrorist strikes, not one urban centre has invested in the resources to deal with the fallout from major attacks. The recent terrorist attacks in Mumbai revealed serious deficiencies in areas of crisis response and management in India. The terrorists were able to inflict severe casualties in Mumbai because the city police, the first responders, did not engage them. Their weapons were obsolete, and they were not trained in that type of conflict, i.e. urban warfare. Moreover, the city’s firemen were slow to respond. They failed to coordinate their actions with both the local police and national paramilitary forces and suffered from inadequate equipment. Similarly, Mumbai, with 18 million people and the fourth-largest metropolitan region in the world, did not even have a single Special Weapons and Tactics Team nor a helicopter to carry SWAT teams sent from New Delhi to Mumbai. The commandos who ended the siege had to wait for hours to be transported, first, from their base outside New Delhi at Manesar, then, from the Mumbai airport to the sites. The terrorists had hotel floor plans, but the commandos did not; terrorists used GPS and Blackberries and monitored news coverage, while the commandos did not have advanced communications. The terrorists even monitored civilian cellphones and text message traffic to glean information about what the police were doing, as well as ‘breaking news’ of TV channels. Dozens of lives might have been saved had the system invested in highly-skilled emergency response teams of the kind London or New York have.\textsuperscript{132}

The Mumbai attack also highlighted the need for restructuring India’s governance institutions at all levels. The civilian population in the terrorism-affected areas complains that the civil administration seldom pays them a visit to listen to their grievances and sort out their problems. Such complaints are more in remote areas, where, thus, the youth join militancy as a source of livelihood or to avenge the atrocities allegedly committed against them by the security forces. Similarly, funds released for developmental purposes are not utilized properly and there is widespread corruption, with some
funds getting channelled to terrorist groups with the connivance of civil officials.

Moreover, terrorist-related cases are prolonged to such a length of time that it defeats the basic principles of justice. Even otherwise, courts are also so overloaded with routine law-and-order and other cases that they are left with little time to deal with militancy cases. Also, terrorists captured by the police seek the refuge of India’s constitutional system as such cases are dragged on for decades. For example, the 1993 Mumbai Bomb Blast Case has not yet concluded. Terrorists use this refuge to ensure themselves prolonged spells in prison until such time their accomplices can secure their release in hostage swaps, e.g. Mohd Azhar released with others at Kandahar in the IC-814 plane hijacking from Kathmandu.

Finally, there is a need to enlist communities in the fight against terror: it is not merely a matter to be sorted out between the terrorists and the policemen. The terrorists can be isolated only if the community is mobilized, encouraged and educated to help the state by providing clues, warnings and assistance in investigations. This can happen only when the political leaders give up their habits and strategies of dividing the communities. Thus, fighting terrorism requires professional policing and investigation, good governance, effective justice delivery, and above all, a unified response from the people.

**APPROPRIATE POLICY INTERVENTION**

It is widely accepted that the perception of neglect and underdevelopment bring frustration and a feeling of alienation among the people. To a large extent, such policies have an economic basis, because poverty, material insecurity and growing inequality play important roles in creating such negative feelings which are only exploited by the terrorists for their nefarious purposes. There are also problems of social exclusion, lack of a political voice, and even perceptions of being badly served by the mainstream media and other institutions which can have such an impact. It is futile to believe that greater repression will increase security in such a
scenario. This should be addressed directly through responsible and responsive state policies. The government has to work towards more equitable and inclusive development that does not generate feelings of alienation and resentment among disadvantaged groups.

A successful counterterrorism policy also needs to address a far larger problem—a problem no number of well-equipped police officers can solve. In many areas scarred by the appalling communal violence, SIMI was seen as an armed militia defending a besieged and vulnerable community—not as a criminal organization that must be crushed. While this perception is profoundly misplaced, its existence points to India’s depressing failure to act against the perpetrators of crime and violence and inability to provide physical safety and security to its vulnerable people. In a complex society like India, such mistakes of governance extract a heavy price—both in the immediate and long term. Those ruling the country must realize the seriousness of the situation. A soft, myopic and vote bank–centred approach will only embolden India’s enemies. Thus, terrorist violence can be managed and contained if the democratic and administrative institutions remain strong and effective, and are seen as fair and impartial by all sections of the society.

DEMOCRACY PROMOTION IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD

Finally, India needs to be more supportive in Pakistan’s and Bangladesh’s attempt to bring democracy and build accountable and responsible governance institutions. It needs no intelligence that a major threat to India from radical extremism comes from the negative fallout of its growth elsewhere in the region. Pakistan and Bangladesh have become havens for radical religious groups, including Al-Qaeda. Such developments in the immediate neighbourhood are bound to affect India. India has unsettled borders with both countries, and the problems of governance and insurgency in these states aggravates the situation.

Two other factors in these countries contribute to India’s potential difficulties. First, both countries have a huge democracy deficit. Both Pakistan and Bangladesh have witnessed military coups
against established democratic governments and the involvement of the military in politics has resulted in religion being exploited for political purposes for two reasons. One, military regimes, lacking legitimacy, turned to religion and supported religious parties to remain in power. Zia-ul Haq in Pakistan and Zia-ur Rehman in Bangladesh used Islam and Muslim political parties to legitimize their rule. Two, in order to strengthen their military rule, they kept democratic parties away from politics, thereby providing space for the ascendance of religious parties. Second, both Pakistan and Bangladesh suffer from massive problems of malgovernance. Fortunately, democracy has returned to both countries and the ruling coalitions now confront the daunting task of stabilizing democracy, building accountable governance institutions and dealing with the problem of terrorism and religious extremism. They need to be encouraged and supported. How can India support democracy promotion in Pakistan?

One way of supporting democracy is to shed any belligerent posture by India against Pakistan on the issue of terrorism that would weaken the fragile democratic institutions in that country, and provide some relief to the beleaguered and socially unpopular Army. Not doing so would directly play into the hands of groups that want to reduce the strength of the fragile democracy and allow the Taliban and other extremist groups on the western border to function with greater abandon. For instance, in the midst of the crisis triggered by the attacks on Mumbai, Baitullah Masood, the leader of Tehrik-e-Taliban-e-Pakistan, offered to have his men ‘fight alongside the army’, if India were to attack. The Pakistani Taliban militants offered a ceasefire in the tribal areas, and a Pakistani military spokesman described the militants as ‘patriotic’. As Ayesha Siddiqa has argued while delivering the 14th Prem Bhatia Memorial Lecture in New Delhi:

Pakistan must be helped and supported and not merely run down as a problem child of the region that could only be dealt with through force. [She argued] The use of force is bound to prove counter-productive. All those elements that are unfriendly in Pakistan and India will draw greater inspiration if India was to ever consider the use of force.
However, many in India still believe that Pakistan can never make a successful transition to democracy, given the overwhelming might and overarching power of its military. Nor that Pakistan can overcome its permanent hostility to India unless the Pakistani military’s worldview—that Pakistan is surrounded by dangers and needs to be active in destabilizing its neighbours—is changed. That, therefore, it is best to deal with a Pakistan having a military leader, or someone assured of the Army’s support.

This is an erroneous belief. It ignores the military’s role in supporting the Al-Qaeda and the Taliban and destabilizing regional security. This position is also deeply inconsistent with India’s advocacy of democracy on a global scale.

The above discussion shows that more democracy, not less, can be a useful tool in combating terrorism and extremism. As Prime Minister Dr Manmohan Singh has aptly remarked, ‘democratic methods yield the most enduring solutions to even the most intractable problems’. However, India has to prove that democracy can deliver good governance, justice and development opportunities to all.
Among the comity of nations, Pakistan is the worst hit by the scourge of terrorism, which poses a serious threat to the integrity, stability, progress and internal security of the country. The Islamist militancy in Pakistan’s western borderlands, which include Balochistan, the North-West Frontier Province (NWFP) and FATA have emerged as the major threats to peace, stability and socio-economic development in Pakistan. Nonetheless, the terrorist threat is not confined to FATA, NWFP and Balochistan only. According to the South Asia Terrorism Portal (SATP) report, ‘Pakistan Assessment 2009’, the settled districts of NWFP, Punjab, Sindh and capital Islamabad all have been subjected to increasing terrorist incidents in the year 2008. The assassination of Pakistan’s most popular opposition leader, Ms Benazir Bhutto, during her election campaign in Rawalpindi on 27 December 2007, the Marriott Hotel bombing in Islamabad on 20 September 2008, and attack on the Sri Lankan cricket team on 3 March 2009 in Lahore were three high-profile terrorist acts which had shaken the body structure of the Pakistani state. This is why the majority of the political leadership in Pakistan now, including the main opposition leader Nawaz Sharif, accept the fact that the real threat to Pakistan’s integrity and solidarity does not come from India or any other state actor, but from the non-state actors active inside Pakistan.

In our case study of Pakistan, we shall focus on terrorism in FATA (including Swat) and Balochistan only, because these two regions have become the sanctuaries for terrorists and most of the terrorist acts in other parts of Pakistan are planned specially in FATA. Furthermore, terrorism has its political roots in these two regions, whereas in other areas of Pakistan, it is more an
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administrative problem concerned with law and order. Terrorism in Balochistan appears has two faces, one linked with Baloch ethno-national movements which have developed secessionist tendencies, and the other of Islamist militancy linked with the Taliban and Al-Qaeda. Some US intelligence reports suggest Mullah Omar, the head of the Taliban movement, and Osama bin Laden, the Al-Qaeda chief, the two most wanted men in the war against terrorism, are hiding in Balochistan. On the other hand, FATA and Swat are the two regions where local grievances are mixed with the pan-Islamist agenda of Al-Qaeda and the Taliban. Swat is a Provincially Administered Tribal Area (PATA) and not a part of FATA, but we include it in our studies just to draw some parallels between the peace agreements signed by Musharraf’s military regime in FATA and by the current democratic regime in Swat.

The significance of FATA and Balochistan for the purpose of our study also lies in the fact that, together, these two regions share Pakistan’s 1,900-mile-long porous frontier along Afghanistan, better known as the Durand Line. This is the international border which was recently termed the most dangerous international border on Earth by US President Barack Obama in his new policy speech on Afghanistan. The Durand Line was drawn by the British in 1893 and divided the Pashtun and Baloch tribes of the area along the international borders of Iran, Afghanistan and British India and what later became Pakistan in 1947. This colonial division of the Baloch and Pashtun tribes on the Kurdish model sowed the seeds of permanent conflict in this region.

We know the motivation for terrorism is quite different in FATA and Balochistan, but they do share some common roots of problems which make them easy targets of terrorist and separatist movements. First, the British colonial state and later the Pakistani praetorian state failed to assimilate these two regions in the mainstream administrative and political structure of the country. Second, both these regions have been denied their democratic right of people’s representative governments even when the other parts of Pakistan observed civilian democratic dispensations. Though Balochistan has seen some brief intervals of representative provincial
governments, its popularly elected governments have never been allowed to function independently.

Furthermore, over the last 62 years of its birth, Pakistan has oscillated between a decade of civilian-democratic administration followed by a decade of a military-hegemonic political system. This makes Pakistan a very interesting case study, because it enables us to understand the impact of authoritarian and democratic structures on terrorism in the same political, social and economic conditions. In our case study of Pakistan, we shall give a good look at the two alternatives available on the ground in Pakistan. First, we shall probe whether military rule in Pakistan was a helpful factor in controlling the surge of terrorism in FATA and Balochistan, or it was a part of the problem, and then see if democracy can work as a conflict-resolution model for terrorism in FATA and Balochistan.

MILITARY RULE IN PAKISTAN: PART OF THE SOLUTION, OR PART OF THE PROBLEM?

Certain sections in academic circles believe that military rule performs far better as compared to democratic governments, specially when it comes to dealing with threats like terrorism, because they say that the army’s principle of ‘unity of command’ is essential in such situations. They contend that the unified, strong, powerful and efficient leadership which can be provided only by the military can make the difficult and unpopular but necessary decisions which politicians would certainly dare not because of their constituency-based politics.

In fact, the supporters of this line of thinking view terrorism as purely a military issue, which they believe requires strong military action. The same group in Pakistan and abroad viewed Pakistan’s military ruler, Gen Musharraf, as a saviour against the religious militancy in Pakistan. Glorifying Musharraf’s policies in the so-called ‘war on terror’, Fareed Zakaria wrote in The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad, ‘Musharraf has been able to promote these policies precisely because he did not have to run for office and cater to the interests of feudal bosses, Islamic militants
and regional chieftains.\textsuperscript{142} Musharraf got the credit for and full backing of some Western scholars and governments despite the fact that all these groups mentioned by Zakaria were important allies of Musharraf’s façade of ‘real democracy’ in Pakistan during 2002–8.

With this backdrop, when we look at the military regimes in Pakistan and their role in the origin, rise and growth of terrorism in Pakistan, the historical evidence shows that the performance of military governments has been disappointing. Rather than resolving the political problems associated with terrorism, military rulers over the years have further compounded the issues with their high-handed policies and plunged Pakistani society in further confrontations and fragmentations. Therefore, we argue here that military rule in Pakistan has not been a part of the solution, rather, we assert that it has been a part of the problem.

**MILITARY RULE AND THE DENIAL OF DEMOCRACY IN BALOCHISTAN**

The secessionist and terrorist tendencies in Balochistan have its roots in the Baloch ethno-nationalist movement which is a part of the larger problem related with the ‘national question’ in Pakistan. Similar, but less hostile, ethno-nationalist tendencies exist in the other two smaller provinces Sindh and NWFP against the so-called Punjabi domination of the Pakistani state. Military rule is often equated with Punjabi rule by the smaller provinces in Pakistan, because Punjab province has the lion’s share in the military and civil bureaucracy. In fact, the perennial problem of military rule in Pakistan during the last 60 years has blocked the path of democratic solution of the ‘national question’ in Pakistan and provoked ethno-national hostilities.

The recent Baloch uprising which started in 2004–5 during Musharraf’s military rule was not a new phenomenon in Balochistan politics; rather, this was the fifth insurrection of its kind in Balochistan during the last 60 years. Before that, in 1948, 1959, 1962 and 1973, Baloch nationalists revolted against the central government and a military operation was launched on each
occasion. This shows that right from 1948 and throughout the last 62 years, the Pakistan Army has been at loggerheads with the Baloch nationalists.

According to the political science theory, military rule is anathema for federalism, because it undercuts the very roots of the federal structure. The most basic characteristic of federalism is, ‘a guaranteed division of power between central and regional (provincial) governments’, and the constitution of the country is considered as the guarantor of such a division of power. When the military intervenes, the constitution is always the first casualty, and so is the division of power between the federation and the federating units. The federating units come under direct central control and the federal structure is put on hold until the mutilated or new handmade constitution is revived. This leads to bad feelings in the federating units, and their confidence in the federation is completely shaken. Specially when a federating unit has a strong sense of under-representation in the central government’s power structure, military rule further alienates the federating unit, and its leadership starts thinking about opting out of the federation.

The first martial law, which was imposed on 12 October 1958, produced exactly the same results in Pakistan. To make things even worse, Ayub Khan provided constitutional cover to his military rule through a handmade constitution in 1962 which imposed permanent central rule over the provinces by removing the post of elected chief minister and ruling through an unelected provincial governor (in fact, Ayub’s handpicked man) who ‘could hold his office during the pleasure of the President’. Thus, a decade-long direct military rule in East Pakistan (now Bangladesh) enhanced the alienation of East Pakistan’s political leadership to a level where the break-up of Pakistan by 1971 became almost unavoidable. Avoiding democratic elections for 23 years, and then refusing to accept the electoral verdict of Pakistan’s first general elections with adult franchise held in 1970 which required the transfer of power to East Pakistan’s Shaikh Mujib-ur Rahman proved a fatal blunder. Thus, military rule and prolonged denial of democracy pushed Pakistan to the dismemberment of East Pakistan in 1971.
On the other hand, just a day before the imposition of first Martial Law in Pakistan, an Army operation was launched in Balochistan to suppress the movement started by the Khan of Kalat for the reestablishment of an independent state of Kalat in Balochistan, as was the central government’s One Unit scheme which brought Balochistan under the provincial government in Lahore (Punjab). The imprisonment of the Khan of Kalat by the Pakistan Army sparked a nationalist rebellion in Balochistan led by the Chief of the Zehri tribe, Nauroz Khan. The brutal manner in which this rebellion was crushed left lasting imprints on the minds of Baloch nationalists. Artillery, tanks and aerial bombings over Baloch villages were used to crush the revolt. Nauroz Khan finally surrendered along with his men on guarantee of safe conduct and amnesties for his men. But Nauroz Khan died in Kohlu prison, and five of his comrades were hanged in July 1960 on charges of treason in contempt of the amnesties agreed upon earlier. Such high-handed tactics always prove counterproductive because they provide secessionists a high moral ground, and ultimately secessionism comes back with a better resolve. In this case, the next Baloch revolt came just in two years in 1962 against Ayub Khan’s local self-government scheme, ‘Basic Democracies’, and his decision to construct military cantonments in Balochistan. This revolt again was crushed ruthlessly by a military operation without resolving the genuine political issues at hand.

Among the provinces of Pakistan, Balochistan has been ruled like a colony by the central government in Karachi and later in Islamabad. Until 1970, it was even denied the status of a full-fledged province with a government responsible to an elected legislature. Before the imposition of ‘One Unit’ in 1955 which arbitrarily united the whole of West Pakistan as one unit, Pakistan continued the colonial policy of treating Balochistan as a special administrative zone. In 1948, the founder of Pakistan, Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah himself constituted a governor general’s advisory council and a ministry of states and frontier
regions to directly rule Balochistan as a governor general’s province as a stop-gap arrangement until the constitution of the country was formulated. Balochistan was divided in two main divisions, which included the semi-autonomous states of Balochistan named Kalat, Kharan, Las Bela and Makran, and the so-called ‘Chief Commissioner’s Province of Balochistan’ (also known as British Balochistan), which included the leased areas of Quetta, Noshki and Naseerabad and two agencies Marri and Bugti, and north-eastern Pashtun districts Pishin, Loralai and Zhob.

ELECTIONS OF 1970: A DEMOCRATIC OPPORTUNITY LOST

The 1970 general elections and installation of the Baloch and Pashtun nationalist alliance National Awami Party’s (NAP) chief minister and governor in Balochistan in 1972 provided the central government in Islamabad a golden opportunity to assimilate Balochistan in the mainstream and ameliorate their feelings of alienation inflamed during Ayub’s and Yahya’s military rule. The nationalist forces in Balochistan were not satisfied with the degree of provincial autonomy granted by the 1973 Constitution, but they supported its unanimous passage and were willing to work under a democratic dispensation. But this window of opportunity was lost when the civilian government of then Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto dismissed the NAP Ministry and imposed governor’s rule in Balochistan, citing treason charges against the provincial cabinet. Bhutto then launched a full-fledged military operation against the revolt of the Marri and Mengal tribes led by Nawab Khair Bukh Marri, which continued until Bhutto’s removal through a military coup in 1977. During this military operation, 3,300 military personnel and 5,300 Baloch guerrillas (along with hundreds of innocent women and children) were caught in the crossfire.

Nonetheless, most of the Baloch leadership did not hold Bhutto and his elected government directly responsible for that military operation. They are of the view that Bhutto at one stage wanted to pull out the Army from Balochistan, but that the ‘Punjabi establishment’ and the military generals in Islamabad persuaded
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him not to call off the military operation. Commenting on this episode, then deposed Balochistan Chief Minister Sardar Ataullah Mengal in an interview with Lawrence Lifschultz in 1983 also blamed the so-called ‘Punjabi establishment’ more than anyone else. He said:

It was not because of one ‘bad’ government or a few ‘bad’ elements within a government that we were being deprived of our rights. Rather it was part of a clear and calculated policy on the part of the dominant Punjabis that no rights would be allowed to the ‘minority’ nationalities, or indeed the ‘majority’ nationality in the case of the Bengalis prior to 1971.

However, the situation improved somewhat during the democratic interlude of 1988–99. During this period, several Baloch nationalist leaders rose to the post of chief minister of Balochistan, including Nawab Akbar Khan Bugti and Sardar Ataullah Mengal’s son Akhtar Mengal. This helped to bring Baloch nationalist leaders in the political mainstream of the national politics, which calmed the voices of secessionism in Balochistan. Nevertheless, most of the Baloch grievances remained unheard and unresolved during this phase as well.

MUSHARRAF’S MILITARY RULE AND BALOCHISTAN CRISIS

After 1978 and up to Musharraf’s military rule, Balochistan was relatively calm, but it appears as if Dr Shazia Khalid’s gang rape in January 2005 in Sui Balochistan, which allegedly involved an Army Captain and three personnel of the Defence Security Guards (DSG) had pelted a stone in the still waters which stirred the waves of violence in Balochistan. Dr Shazia was a doctor in the Pakistan Petroleum Limited (PPL) hospital in Sui gas field in Balochistan, a part of Nawab Akbar Bugti’s stronghold. This led to a storm of violence in Sui and Dera Bugti by the Baloch Liberation Army (BLA) against the police’s cover-up of the security personnel allegedly involved in the crime. Furthermore, the old
Baloch grievances (regarding the exploitation of natural resources in Balochistan, specially the issue of gas royalty; marginalization of ethnic Balochis at the hands of ethnically dominant Punjabis who control the central government in Islamabad; the historical Baloch demand of provincial autonomy; Baloch share in civil and military bureaucracy) which were brewing since 1947, all resurfaced, along with new grievances created specifically by Musharraf’s dictatorial regime.

As anticipated, Musharraf’s military intervention brought more centralization and significantly enhanced military–bureaucratic control of provinces. He placed the 1973 Constitution in abeyance from 1999 to 2002 and the provinces were controlled directly by the central government in Islamabad through its handpicked governors, most of them retired military generals. Further, like his predecessors Ayub and Zia, Musharraf introduced a new devolution plan, Local Government Ordinances (LGOs) 2000, and like Ayub’s ‘Basic Democracies’, claimed that his local bodies provided the people of Pakistan ‘democracy at the grass-root level’. However, in reality, in the name of decentralization, it was an imposition of unitary government as the central government controlled the district governments directly without devolving any powers to the provincial governments. The Baloch nationalists saw this new system of local bodies based on non-party elections with great suspicion, and blamed Musharraf for trying to ‘undercut established political parties and drain power away from the provinces’.  

The events of 9/11 provided Musharraf’s military regime much-needed US financial assistance to consolidate his power and entrench state control over the democratic opposition with the full backing of Bush’s America. In the election of 2002, at national level, Musharraf used his dictatorial powers to manipulate the election results and sideline the two most popular opposition leaders and two-time prime ministers, Ms Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif, with the help of his tailor-made King’s party Pakistan Muslim League (Quaid-i-Azam), well-known as the PML(Q). On the other hand, in Balochistan, by using similar tactics he was able to marginalize the popular Baloch nationalist elements for the first
time in Pakistan’s electoral politics with the help of the PML(Q) and the religious alliance Mutahida Mujlis-i-Amal (MMA), specially the Jamiat Ulema-i-Islam led by Maulana Fazlur Rahman. These two parties jointly formed the coalition government in Balochistan from 2002 to 2008. This emboldened Musharraf to take a strong line against Baloch nationalist elements and suppress their genuine grievances by force.

BALOCH GRIEVANCES

The law-and-order problem in Balochistan started in 2002 when Sardar Akbar Bugti demanded a revision for the rates of gas royalty for Balochistan to bring them at par with those of Sindh and Punjab, but the Musharraf Government refused to give any concessions. Balochistan receives only Rs. 27 for a unit of gas compared to Rs. 170 and 190 per unit respectively by Sindh and Punjab. The explanation given for this discrepancy is that this rate was evaluated for Balochistan when natural gas was discovered in Balochistan in 1953, whereas Sindh and Balochistan get better rates because their gas rates were evaluated much later. In one of his interviews with famous Pakistani journalist Irshad Ahmed Haqqani in September 2004, Sardar Ataullah Mengal ridiculed this argument by telling a small story. He said that assuming that one purchased a house for three lakh rupees [one million equals 1akh] some time ago, but now the market value of the same house was three crore [one crore equals 10 million] rupees, he asked whether one would now sell the same property at its original cost.

In Balochistan, Musharraf’s military regime inflamed some other contentious issues as well, which included the construction of Gwadar deep sea port without addressing genuine Baloch concerns, thousands of political disappearances at the hands of Pakistani intelligence agencies, and the construction of cantonments in Kohlu (the stronghold of Marri Sardar), Dera Bugti (the stronghold of Bugti Sardar) and Gwadar. The Baloch leadership has serious concerns over the establishment of cantonments in the above-mentioned three areas because they feel they are meant specifically
for controlling Balochis and not to fight any foreign power, because they argue that these three areas have no adjacent international border.\textsuperscript{162}

Baloch opposition of Gwadar and other mega-projects in Balochistan was brushed aside by Musharraf, calling it simply an anti-development stance of feudal Baloch sardars. But a closer look at the Baloch point of view reveals that they have a point. Baloch leaders complained that the people of Balochistan were given no stake in Gwadar and other mega-projects, and people from outside (specially Punjab) were brought in to work in Gwadar as workers, technocrats and industrialists. Nawab Aslam Raisani, now chief minister of Balochistan from the Pakistan People’s Party (PPP), complained in an interview with the International Crisis Group in July 2007 that, ‘Eight million people from outside will be settled in Gwadar and a similar number in Somiani. Where will we Baloch go?’\textsuperscript{163} Explaining this problem further, Sardar Attaullah Mengal expressed the actual Baloch fear that these people will then get the right of vote, and if one Karachi is implanted in Gwadar, that will reduce the Baloch population to one-fourth in political terms.\textsuperscript{164}

THE VIOLENCE IN BALOCHISTAN

The violence started in 2001–2 in Akbar Bugti’s stronghold Dera Bugti with sporadic attacks on gas installations in Sui, but soon spread to most of the Baloch-dominated districts of Balochistan, specially the strongholds of the other two Baloch Sardars, Nawab Khair Bux Marri and Ataullah Mengal. By the year 2004, the movement became more violent. In 2004, around 30 bomb attacks took place in Quetta alone, and in a high-profile case, three Chinese engineers working on Gwadar deep sea port were abducted and murdered in cold blood in May 2004 and Gwadar airport was attacked by rockets in the same month.\textsuperscript{165} However, after Dr Shazia’s gang rape in January 2005, protests and violence multiplied manifold. According to a \textit{Dawn} report, in just four days after the incident, the insurgents fired 14,000 rounds of small arms, 436 mortar and 60 rockets, and the \textit{Nation} reported that
approximately 1,568 ‘terrorist’ attacks took place between January and April, 2005. Then on 14 December 2005, when President Musharraf was in Kohlu to inaugurate one of the three cantonments there, he was attacked with rockets and the next day the Maj Gen Shujaat Zamir Dar, Inspector-General, Frontier Corps (IGFC) and his deputy Brig Saleem Nawaz were wounded in machine-gun fire on the Army helicopter.

The violence continued to increase during 2006, 2007 and 2008. Especially after the death of Bugti Sardar Nawab Akbar Khan Bugti on 26 August 2008 in a massive military operation in the Bhamboor Hills, an area between the cities of Kohlu and Dera Bugti, riots broke out all over Balochistan. Then chief minister of Balochistan, Jam Muhammad Yousuf, was informed by the security agencies that rioters had set ablaze or damaged 93 government buildings, 87 shops, 31 houses, 28 banks and 37 vehicles in just four days in various parts of the province, including the capital, Quetta.

MUSHARRAF’S RESPONSE

Instead of addressing the genuine Baloch grievances and finding a political solution for a political problem, Musharraf threatened the Baloch nationalists of dire consequences in a televised interview on Geo News on 11 January 2005, ‘It is not the 70’s that they can climb the mountains, they will even not know what and from where something has come and hit them.’ These threats materialized when Musharraf launched a full-fledged military operation in Balochistan from 17 December 2005 and killed the most prominent Baloch nationalist leader behind the current insurgency, Nawab Akbar Khan Bugti, in his hideout in Bhamboor Hills. Thousands of political disappearances and targeted killings of Baloch nationalists at the hands of Pakistan’s intelligence agencies were used as a strategy by the Musharraf regime which caused widespread resentment in Balochistan.

In handling the Balochistan crisis, Musharraf and his military elite completely disregarded the political moves made by even their...
own governments at the centre and in Balochistan. The provincial assembly of Balochistan had passed a unanimous resolution against the construction of cantonments in Balochistan on 23 September 2003, but in utter disrespect to the Balochistan assembly and provincial government, Musharraf went ahead with his plan. Musharraf and his cronies in the military and bureaucracy in Islamabad sabotaged the peace efforts started by the president of PML(Q), Shujaat Hussain, by sitting over the findings and recommendations of the two parliamentary committees led by PML(Q) Senators Mushahid Hussain and Wasim Sajjad. Finally, the killing of Sardar Akbar Bugti, who was really forthcoming in his negotiations with those two committees, dealt a death blow to the peace efforts and plunged Balochistan in a deeper crisis.

Later, Mushahid Hussain confessed in an interview, ‘I think the problem vis-à-vis Balochistan is the mindset in Islamabad which feels that only through a strong centre and strong-arm tactics can the Baloch population be controlled.’ In his interview, Mushahid did not blame Musharraf personally; rather, he held the ‘Islamabad mindset’ responsible. Explaining the ‘Islamabad mindset’, Mushahid said, ‘The “Islamabad mindset” stems from the civil and military bureaucracy and a number of leading politicians also believe in that.’ Thus, military rule in general, and permanent stakes of the military and bureaucracy in Pakistani politics in particular are responsible for the continuation of the Balochistan crisis.

Hence, we can say that the denial of democracy and the preponderance of civil and military bureaucracy in Pakistani politics have been the root cause of the Balochistan crisis. Because of the preponderance of these forces in Pakistani politics until 1970, Balochistan was denied a representative government, and finally, when it came, it was undemocratically removed within eight months of its installation. In fact, had Pakistan’s first constituent assembly been able to give the country a new constitution within two years of Independence, as envisioned by the father of the nation, Mohammad Ali Jinnah, during his speech at Sibi Durbar on 14 February 1948, and had a truly representative government been installed in Balochistan in the early 1950s, Balochistan—and
perhaps even the East Pakistan crisis—could have been avoided.

The preponderance of the military and bureaucracy in the politics of Pakistan never allowed the democratic process to take root in Pakistan. In Balochistan and other smaller provinces, military rule and the ascendancy of the civil and military bureaucracy in political affairs is equated with Punjabi rule, therefore, feelings of alienation in Balochistan and other smaller provinces are always on the rise during military rule. On the other hand, the military leadership in Pakistan has shown total contempt towards ethnic nationalism, which has been the main reason for their high-handed attitude towards Balochistan. This contempt is evident from Gen Zia-ul Haq's famous statement about ethnic identities that he would ‘ideally like to break up the existing provinces and replace them with fifty-three small provinces, erasing ethnic identities from the map of Pakistan altogether’.\textsuperscript{172}

ISLAMIST MILITANCY, MILITARY RULE, AND THE DENIAL OF DEMOCRACY IN FATA

Over the period of the last eight years or so, militancy in Pakistan's FATA has emerged as one of the biggest threats to peace and development in Pakistan and Afghanistan. The scourge of terrorism in FATA poses the greatest challenge of the day to the people, the new democratic government of Pakistan and the international community at large. Several high-ranking officials in the US administration and the US Army have predicted that the next 9/11 might come from FATA.\textsuperscript{173} In fact, after the US-led military intervention in Afghanistan in 2001, FATA has emerged as a sanctuary for the Taliban and Al-Qaeda militants. The US and Afghan governments allege that the Taliban and Al-Qaeda use FATA as a base to regroup, rearm and launch cross-border attacks on the US-backed Karzai Government in Kabul. On the other hand, the Pakistan Army and its security forces are involved in direct combat operations in unsettled areas of FATA, specially North and South Waziristan, Bajaur and Kurram Agencies and the settled area of the beautiful Swat valley against the Pakistani brand of Taliban.
It is an irony of fate for the people of Pakistan that the military despot Gen Zia-ul Haq was hired by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to oust the Soviets and create all the mess which is now known as terrorism, and later they were made to suffer for another decade at the hands of another military dictator, Gen Pervez Musharraf, who was entrusted with the task of fixing that mess. It was just like ‘heads I win, tails you lose’ for the military dictators in Pakistan vis-à-vis the democratic forces and the people of Pakistan. The US-supported military dictators in Pakistan forced democracy to wait for the sake of their so-called strategic interests and political expediencies.

In this section, we shall study how military rule under both Zia and Musharraf encouraged terrorism in the FATA region, and why, despite Musharraf’s anti-terrorism drive, terrorism actually thrived during his rule. We try to establish a case here that military rule has been a part of the problem vis-à-vis the Islamist militancy and terrorism, therefore, it cannot be a part of the solution. We shall also try to find out whether military rule and the denial of democracy in FATA were factors in abetting terrorism in Pakistan.

FATA AND AFGHAN JIHAD UNDER ZIA

Military rule in Pakistan and Islamist militancy have gone hand in hand. It is an open secret now that Islamist militancy in Pakistan was fanned by the Pakistani intelligence agency Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) and the American CIA during the Afghan jihad in the 1980s to oust the Soviets from Afghanistan. It was none other than Pakistan’s third military ruler Gen Zia-ul Haq who politicized Islam in Pakistan and strengthened the Salafist/Ahle-Hadith version of Islam which was much lesser known in Pakistan before him. It was during his rule that Muslims from all corners of the world, including Afghanistan, Chechnya, Bosnia, Africa, the Middle East, Central Asia, the Philippines, Myanmar and southern Thailand, came to Pakistan and made the FATA region a base for launching the decade-long Afghan jihad. This is why two-time prime minister, the late Benazir Bhutto considered Gen Zia, ‘the person most
responsible for turning Pakistan into a global centre for political Islam’.¹⁷⁵

All the problems now associated with terrorism in Pakistan—like religious militancy, mushrooming of madrassas (religious schools) and extremist groups in Pakistan and sectarian violence—have their roots in Zia’s times and policies. In the first six years of Zia’s military rule (1977–82), only 151 new madrassas were established, but when military pacts were signed with the US and economic and military aid started pouring in, in the next six years about 1,000 more seminaries were added.¹⁷⁶ This is why Ahmed Rashid blames both Zia and the then US President Ronald Reagan for launching the global jihad in Pakistan which sowed the seeds of Al-Qaeda and the Taliban in FATA and turned Pakistan into the ‘World Centre of Jihadism’.¹⁷⁷ This is why there is consensus in academic and political circles that the modern form of Islamist terrorism is a by-product of the Afghan jihad fought in the 1980s under Pakistan’s military ruler Gen Zia and fully supported by the Reagan Administration of the US.

In this great game, FATA region was used as a recruitment and training ground for the Afghan jihad, and, in fact, as a forward point from which the Afghan resistance actually took off. According to one estimate, 104 out of the 278 tented refugee villages in the NWFP were established in refugee tribal areas, mostly in Bajaur, Kurram and North Waziristan which became small centres of the proxy Afghan war.¹⁷⁸ Five FATA agencies, Bajaur, Mohmand, North Waziristan, Khyber and Kurram became a direct war theatre, as the ‘Afghan Mujahideen’ launched ambush operations in Afghanistan from their bases in FATA and the Soviet Army used aerial bombardments on those FATA agencies to flush guerrilla fighters out.¹⁷⁹

During the Afghan jihad, a symbiotic relationship emerged between the Afghan refugees, Arab and African mujahideen and the local population. They intermarried and benefited financially from this relationship. The Afghan war enhanced local economic activity and increased wealth dramatically in the region. FATA became a centre of a weapon industry and poppy cultivation. Darra Adam
Khel’s bazaar in the Khyber agency became the central exchange point for the sale of confiscated Russian weapons and American and Chinese weapons. The poppy crop doubled from that in 1982–3, and by 1988, about 200 new heroin refineries were established in Khyber agency.

Zia and Reagan both wanted the highest returns from the Afghan jihad. Reagan was looking at a comprehensive victory against the Soviet Union in the Cold War, whereas Gen Zia wanted to install a ‘pro-Pakistan Islamic government’ in Afghanistan to secure so-called ‘strategic depth’ against India. According to Ahmed Rashid, Zia’s definition of ‘strategic depth’ even stretched up to the Islamized Central Asia. But all this had a blowback effect on both the US and Pakistan after 9/11. The seeds of extremism and fundamentalism which were sown by Zia and Reagan to evict the Soviet Union were harvested with high returns later on by their political heirs, Bush and Musharraf. Nonetheless, in this great game, the real sufferers are the people of Afghanistan, Pakistan and also the US.

DENIAL OF DEMOCRACY AND PRIMITIVE LOCAL ADMINISTRATION IN FATA AND SWAT

According to Art. 246(c) of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, FATA constitutes seven agencies, namely, Bajaur, Mohmand, Orakzai, Khyber, Kurram, North Waziristan and South Waziristan, and four tribal areas adjoining the settled districts of Peshawar, Kohat, Bannu and Dera Ismail Khan, whereas, according to the Section (b) of the same article, Swat falls under the Provincially Administered Tribal Areas (PATA). Swat District is part of Malakand Division, which comprises Malakand District, Buner District, Swat District, Shangla District, Upper and Lower Dir Districts, and Chitral District.

Unlike FATA, which comes under direct control of the centre, Swat is part of PATA, which comes under the NWFP chief minister and is represented in NWFP’s provincial legislature as well. Furthermore, unlike FATA, which came under the draconian
Frontier Crimes Regulations (FCR) laws during British rule, Swat enjoyed a kind of self-rule under a princely state status during 1849–1969 when it was included in NWFP as PATA. Unlike FATA, in Swat the Political Parties Act (PPA) was introduced and all mainstream political parties of Pakistan, such as the PPP, the Awami National Party (ANP), different factions of the PML, and Jamaat-e-Islami (JI) have a significant presence.¹⁸⁴ In the 2008 elections all National Assembly and Provincial Assembly seats in Malakand Division were secured by the secular parties PPP and ANP, whereas JI had boycotted the polls, otherwise they also possessed a significant vote bank in Malakand Division.

Many in academia associate FATA’s emergence as a sanctuary for the terrorist elements to its primitive local administrative structure and the denial of democracy in FATA. We have earlier noted that FATA is not included in the mainstream administrative structure of Pakistan and that, unlike other parts of Pakistan, the people of FATA have been permanently denied their democratic right of people’s representative government at regional level. The state machinery of Pakistan, which includes the regular police, the Army, judiciary and parliament, do not have a say in FATA. Article 247 of the 1973 Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan says it all. Clause 3 of this article reads, ‘No act of parliament shall apply to any Federally Administered Tribal Area or any part thereof’, and Clause 7 of the same Article further states, ‘neither the Supreme Court nor a High Court shall exercise any jurisdiction under the constitution to a Tribal Area.’¹⁸⁵ On this situation, a member of the National Assembly (MNA) from FATA complained, ‘We are elected representatives from FATA, and we can technically make laws for the rest of the country but not for FATA.’¹⁸⁶

Constitutionally speaking, FATA comes under the direct supervision of the president of Pakistan and NWFP’s provincial governor exercises executive authority in FATA as the president’s representative. However, in practice, the federal government exercises nominal control over FATA with the help of the more-than-a-century-old oppressive colonial administrative and legal structure, the Frontier Crimes Regulations (FCR), 1901 of the British period.
Under FCR, a seasoned bureaucrat with sweeping administrative and judicial powers is appointed as the political agent (PA), an administrative head for each FATA agency. But the PA has certain limitations as far as his territorial jurisdiction is concerned. FATA territory is divided into inaccessible areas, administered areas, and protected areas, and the PA has direct jurisdiction only over the administered areas, like roads, government offices and other government installations. In the other two kinds of territories which make the bulk of the FATA territory, local and official jirgas (tribal councils) have the final say.

Thus, in FATA, local jirgas and tribal customs are more important in the lives of the common man than anything else. These jirgas decide cases on the bases of pashtunwali, the tribal code of honour and behaviour based on melmastia or hospitality; nanawati, the belief that hospitality cannot be denied even to a criminal or fugitive; and badal, the right of revenge. This is why FATA has always been a safe haven for the criminals and fugitives from other parts of Pakistan and the surrounding areas. Thus, criminals and fugitives know that once they enter FATA and become a local guest, then the tribal people would fight unto death for their life and security. These local customs and traditions along with the primitive legal, political and administrative structures in FATA have been badly exploited by the Taliban and Al-Qaeda forces in the name of the sacred religion of Islam.

Since 1996, people of FATA do elect their representatives for the national parliament in Islamabad, but are still not represented in a provincial legislature at the regional level. Before 1996 when Benazir Bhutto’s democratic government introduced adult franchise in FATA, some 35,500 maliks, about 10 per cent of the total FATA population, constituted the Electoral College for the elections of the National Assembly. According to the ICG report, adult franchise had ‘significantly diluted the electoral influence of maliks’, who previously manipulated the whole electoral process in FATA. Still, maliks and PAs had considerable influence over the electoral process in FATA because political parties were not allowed to work in FATA, as political activities were banned here.
Thus, persistent denial of democracy and ‘FCR-style tribal management’ in FATA, what Joshua T. White terms a ‘highly unstructured personalist governance’ model provides an environment which is most suitable for the terrorism unleashed by the local and international Taliban and Al-Qaeda. This decadent, primitive and oppressive administrative structure made it very easy for the terrorists to make inroads in FATA and create a safe haven for themselves, from where they can plan and conduct acts of terrorism in Afghanistan and the settled areas of Pakistan.

MUSHARRAF, WAR ON TERROR, AND FATA

No doubt FATA was already an important strategic area because of the Afghan jihad in the 1980s and then the Afghan civil war in the 1990s, but it received international attention only after 9/11 when Bush started the ‘war on terror’ campaign in Afghanistan and suddenly FATA became a full-fledged war zone. In 2002, Al-Qaeda and Taliban forces fleeing from Afghanistan took refuge in the bordering areas of FATA and Balochistan. Ahmed Rashid blames Musharraf for providing safe passage to Al-Qaeda and the Taliban in FATA and Balochistan in that crucial initial phase by not deploying Pakistani forces along the areas bordering North and South Waziristan and Balochistan. In June 2002, Musharraf moved a division of troops into Tirah Valley in Khyber Agency and Parachinar in Kurram Agency, but, ‘from January 2002 until the spring of 2004, the military did nothing to stop the extremists from consolidating their bases in South Waziristan’. On account of this soft approach of the Musharraf regime, South Waziristan became the first sanctuary and Angur Ada in South Waziristan the first headquarters of Al-Qaeda from where military operations were launched in Afghanistan in 2002.

In March 2004, Musharraf finally launched an ill-conceived military operation in South Waziristan on immense US pressure without proper planning and coordination with the local administration. The military used helicopter gunships, fighter bombers and heavy artillery in this operation, which displaced more
than fifty thousand people and created immense ill-will in the local population about the Pakistan Army and the federal government. The operation was termed a complete failure by independent observers, because the Army was made to suffer heavy losses and no ‘high-value target’ was captured, as boasted earlier by President Musharraf on CNN on 18 March. Furthermore, within a month, Musharraf was obliged to sign a one-sided peace agreement with the militants at Shakhai on 24 April 2004. This agreement could not succeed, and another military operation had to be launched in September 2004 with around eighty thousand troops. This time, the militants fled to North Waziristan, where almost the same story was repeated, which resulted once again in a failed peace agreement signed on 5 September 2006 in Miramshah, the capital of North Waziristan.

There was a structural flaw in the Musharraf and Bush Administration’s war on terror campaign in FATA. They relied exclusively on military strategy to dismantle terrorist bases in FATA while totally ignoring the political side of the conflict. Whatever little Musharraf did on the political side actually backfired, because he did not allow political freedom for the people of FATA, and no serious attempt was made to include FATA in the mainstream of Pakistan. The two peace agreements signed by Musharraf, rather than bringing permanent peace, strengthened the hands of the militants by providing them much-needed free space to regroup and reorganize themselves in those areas. A closer look at those two peace accords which were made with the militants indicates a structural flaw in their basic approach considering the security paradigm only. In fact, those peace agreements surrendered the territory and local population of FATA to the mercy of the local Taliban on a verbal guarantee from their side that they would not target the Pakistani security forces and would not launch attacks on the Karzai Government.

Another of Musharraf’s blunders was his decision to bypass the political agents (PAs) and tribal maliks in those military operations and in the peace accords with the militants. Musharraf relied heavily on the support of the religious alliance of MMA, especially Maulana
Fazlur Rahman’s JUI(F) to reach those peace agreements without taking into confidence the pro-government elected representatives of FATA. A pro-government senator from Khyber Agency, Senator Hamidullah Jan Afridi, complained that the federal government had ‘kept FATA legislators completely out of the loop on whatever goes on in our constituencies’. This resulted in the collapse of the age-old system of political agents and maliks in several tribal agencies. Thus, a political and administrative vacuum was created, which was bound to be filled by the local Taliban and the religious parties because no political activity was allowed in FATA.

Recently, a good deal of literature has emerged which reveals that Musharraf kept on playing a double game with the US in the war on terror. Critics blame Musharraf for being soft and duplicitous in his dealings with the Taliban. New York Times correspondent David Sanger, in his book, The Inheritance (January 2009), shares some intercepted intelligence information to prove the duplicity of the Musharraf regime towards the Taliban. However, one quite obvious sign of this duplicity was a line of argument which usually came from his government sources about the need to differentiate between the ‘good Taliban’ and the ‘bad Taliban’. The Musharraf regime continuously pleaded with the US administration to enter into a political dialogue with the ‘good Taliban’ and include them in political power-sharing in Kabul to satisfy the Pashtun discontent over perceived under-representation in the Karzai Government.

Nonetheless, Musharraf kept the Bush Administration satisfied with his cosmetic steps, for instance, he: banned certain militant groups in 2002; introduced madrassa reforms: took some scattered military actions against militants; and captured or killed and handed over to the US some high-profile terrorists like Abu Zubaydah in March 2002, Amjad Farooqui in September 2004, Abu Faraj Al-Libbi in May 2005, and one of the alleged 9/11 masterminds, Khalid Sheikh Mohammad in March 2003. On the other hand, despite all this, during Musharraf’s rule, terrorists kept on strengthening their position not only in FATA and Balochistan, but they also achieved the capability of attacking any major city in Pakistan. Suicide bombing, which was not known in Pakistan
before 9/11, became a routine affair. Despite Musharraf’s reforms, the number of madrassas in Pakistan rose from 7,000 in the year 2000 to 11,000 by 2003 and 13,000 by 2006.\textsuperscript{197}

Despite all this, Pakistan’s military dictator Gen Pervez Musharraf was a trusted US ally in the ‘war on terror’, and because of his so-called important role in the war on terror, President Bush had always turned a blind eye to the voices of democratic forces and the civil society in Pakistan. Bush adopted ‘democracy promotion’ as an instrument of his foreign policy for combating terrorism in the Muslim world, but in Muslim Pakistan, his administration always supported the military dictator and gave him a free hand to destroy the democratic opposition.

From all the above discussion, we can conclude here that military rule in Pakistan has not been a part of the solution against the scourge of terrorism in FATA and Balochistan; rather, it has been a part of the problem. Military rule has to rely on direct military strategy for dealing with the terrorists, because, intrinsically, it has a tendency of avoiding the political path which is otherwise necessary ‘to isolate the terrorists from the local population’. Even when they try to take the political path, they are sure to falter, because they cannot allow the level of political freedom which is required in such cases. As pointed out in our theoretical section earlier that, ‘military operations enhance the sympathy for terrorists among the local population and the affected area becomes a breeding ground for terrorism’, the same has happened in the case of FATA and Balochistan, as both have become breeding grounds for terrorism.

**DEMOCRACY AS A CONFLICT-RESOLUTION MODEL FOR TERRORISM IN FATA AND BALOCHISTAN**

In this section, we would see how far we can apply the grand strategy for democracy as a conflict-resolution model for terrorism in our case studies of FATA and Balochistan that we developed in our theoretical discourse. In this regard, the most basic and the most important strategy identified in this grand strategy was to isolate terrorists from the local population, or, as conflict-resolution
experts Fisher and Ury would call it, ‘separate the people from the problem’. Isolating terrorists from the local population would mean denying terrorists the social support at the local level by denying them the high moral ground, and by making their claim of fighting for a great cause meaningless.

Here, we must reassert that the nationalist movement for Balochistan which has developed certain terrorist tendencies is starkly different from the Islamist terrorism committed by the Taliban and Al-Qaeda elements in Pakistan. Terrorism in Balochistan, like the Bengali movement in the late 1960s, is a reaction to the state repression and persistent denial of Baloch rights by the Pakistani state for the last 63 years, whereas the Islamist terrorism of the Taliban and Al-Qaeda has a self-imposed pan-Islamist agenda which goes beyond the territorial limits of the Pakistani state. Therefore, they require a different kind of response and a different set of strategies. For example, addressing the local Baloch grievances can directly impact the level of terrorism in Balochistan, whereas the same cannot be said of Islamist terrorism. At most points, we shall see that local grievances and terrorist demands have more divergence than convergence in case of Islamist terrorism. Nevertheless, in both cases a democratic response must address the genuine local grievances, while terrorists’ demands can be disregarded if local grievances are effectively separated from the terrorists’ demands.

To isolate the terrorists, the first two dimensions of the four-point policy framework given by Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Miall in Contemporary Conflict Resolution, i.e. ‘prevention’ and ‘persuasion’ can be very useful. Under the ‘prevention’ dimension, the root causes of terrorism, like inequalities, injustices, poverty and lack of democratic opportunity in Balochistan and FATA have to be addressed. But we know this would take a long time and it will require peace as a prerequisite. Nevertheless, this process must start, and people need to see that democratic government is serious in addressing their genuine grievances. Simultaneously, under the ‘persuasion’ dimension, we need to identify the ‘moderates’ among local groups in FATA and Balochistan and bring them in the mainstream by persuading them to adopt the path of political
accommodation and find out the consensus solutions of the problem with their cooperation. Once terrorists are isolated, their ‘hard-core irreconcilable’ elements can be dealt with by military action with the help of the ‘denial’ dimension.

DEMOCRACY AS A CONFLICT-RESOLUTION MODEL FOR TERRORISM IN BALOCHISTAN

We have already observed that it is the denial of democracy and consistent deprivation of Baloch rights which pushed Balochistan to this stage where we see resurgence of a strong secessionist movement there. The vast majority of Baloch nationalists, which include Sardar Awarullah Mengal, Nawab Akbar Bugti, Ghaus Bux Bizenjo and Dr Abul Hai Baloch, participated in the parliamentary politics of Pakistan in the 1970s and 1990s and fought for the democratic rights and the provincial autonomy of Balochistan within the constitutional framework of Pakistan. But because of the Musharraf policies, which we explained earlier, a huge trust deficit was created in the Baloch leadership towards Islamabad, and because of this, several Baloch leaders are now losing hope in the parliamentary democratic struggle. After the assassination of Akbar Bugti in August 2006, the Jamhoori Watan Party (JWP) of Sardar Bugti and the Balochistan National Party (BNP-M) of Sardar Mengal resigned from the parliament and almost all Baloch nationalists boycotted the National Assembly elections held in February 2008.

Thus, during Musharraf’s military rule, veteran Baloch nationalists started abandoning the parliamentary politics, and, resultantly, the leadership went into the hands of a young Baloch leadership which formed several militant organizations like the Balochistan Liberation Army (BLA), Baloch Republican Army (BRA), Balochistan Liberation Front (BLF), Baloch Liberation United Front (BLUF), and People’s Liberation Army (PLA), responsible for most of the acts of terrorism in Balochistan. The BLA, which surfaced in 2000, is the most prominent militant organization among them. It was headed by Mir Ballach Marri, son of Nawab Khair Bux Marri until he was killed on 21 November
2007, allegedly by the security forces.\textsuperscript{198} Nawab Akbar Khan Bugti’s grandson, Brahamdagh Bugti, founded BRA, another important militant network, and is leading an armed struggle allegedly from Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{199} Former Senator Sanaullah Baloch, while completely dissociating his BNP-M party from the ‘violent political agenda’ of Baloch militant organizations, blamed Musharraf for the rise of militancy in Balochistan. He said, ‘government has convinced the people of the futility of political activism, the result is an increase in violent activism’.\textsuperscript{200} Nonetheless, most of the mainstream nationalist parties, including Sanaullah Baloch’s BNP-M, being fed up with the parliamentary struggle, at least tacitly support these militant groups and consider their mission a just Baloch cause.

In the case of Balochistan, isolating terrorists and tracing the ‘moderate forces’ as defined by Neumann and Smith in \textit{The Strategy of Terrorism} is not a difficult job. All those nationalist Baloch elements who shun violence and believe in non-violent struggle constitute the ‘moderate forces’. On the other hand, isolating terrorists (militant Baloch nationalists) from the local population in Balochistan would also be not that difficult if Islamabad (which includes the civil, military and political establishment in Islamabad) is willing to address the genuine Baloch grievances. Understanding the dynamics of Baloch nationalist politics, we can say that if ‘moderate forces’ in Balochistan can be satisfied with a political settlement, then militant groups should also be expected to cease their violent activities. Otherwise they would surely be isolated and lose the mass support which they enjoy at the moment.

The ‘prevention’ and ‘persuasion’ dimensions should have been the focus of the PPP-led political administration in Balochistan and at the centre. The PPP Government could have easily persuaded the ‘moderate’ Baloch nationalist forces to back the government reforms in Balochistan, provided genuine progress was shown at addressing the core Baloch grievances. In this regard, certain confidence-building measures were required from the new democratic government in Islamabad, like an immediate end to the Army operation in Balochistan, the deployment of Levies instead of the police force in the province, and release of all the political prisoners
and ‘missing persons’ would have paved the way for a meaningful dialogue. The deployment of Levies is significant here, because they are recruited from amongst the locals, whereas the police and Frontier Constabulary (FC) both have non-Baloch majority. In fact, all of these points were included in the PPP’s resolution in the parliamentary party meeting of the PPP (Balochistan) chaired by PPP Co-Chairman Asif Ali Zardari in Islamabad on 24 February 2008, immediately after the PPP’s success in the 2008 elections.201

Nonetheless, the democratic regime of the PPP, which came into power in the wake of the February 2008 elections, started on a positive note. Immediately after coming into power in February 2008, PPP Co-Chairman Asif Ali Zardari straightaway apologized to the people of Balochistan for the way the Baloch were treated by Islamabad in the past. He pronounced, ‘The PPP, on behalf of the people of Pakistan, apologizes to the people of the province of Balochistan for the atrocities and injustices committed against them and pledges to embark on a new highway of healing and mutual respect.’202 This apology was also important in the context of PPP founder Zulfikar Ali Bhutto’s role in the military operation in Balochistan in 1973. Furthermore, several politically motivated cases against Baloch nationalists were withdrawn and some prominent Baloch leaders were released, including Akhtar Mengal, the former chief minister of Balochistan and Akbar Bugti’s grandson Shahzain Bugti. On the other hand, militants also responded positively when the BLA, BRA and BLF jointly announced a unilateral ceasefire in September 2008 in the wake of Ramadan, which continued until January 2009.203 On missing persons, the PPP Government claims that they have released the majority of the missing persons, but the Baloch leadership still contends that hundreds are missing.

However, what actually precipitated a new crisis later was the inability of the PPP Government to stop the military operation in Balochistan and deploy Levies replacing the police in more than a year’s rule. Because of the continuation of military operations in Balochistan despite the ceasefire, tension between militants and security personnel kept rising in 2008. The three militant organizations which had earlier announced the ceasefire called it off
in January 2009, complaining about the new political disappearances in Balochistan.\textsuperscript{204} A new crisis erupted in Balochistan when three Baloch nationalist leaders, Ghulam Mohammad Baloch, President of the Baloch National Movement (BNM); Lala Munir, a member of BNM; and Sher Mohammad Baloch of the Baloch Republican Party (BRP) were allegedly picked up by the intelligence agencies from the chamber of Advocate Kachkol Ali in Turbat on 3 April 2009 and later killed in mysterious circumstances.\textsuperscript{205} Widespread riots broke out immediately in Turbat, Quetta, Khuzdar, Karachi, and other Baloch-dominated parts of Balochistan.\textsuperscript{206} Almost all Baloch nationalists blamed Pakistani agencies directly for killing the three nationalist leaders, and called for UN investigations because they expressed complete mistrust of the Pakistani security and intelligence agencies.

Commenting on the apology of President Zardari while the military operation continued, veteran Baloch nationalist Hasil Bizenjo said on a private TV channel, ‘this is like [if] someone places his foot on your foot and says sorry but does not pull back his foot’. Here, the question is whether we can blame the democratic government squarely for this fault. PML(Q) Secretary General Mushahid Hussain, speaking from his personal experience of working in a parliamentary committee for Balochistan under Musharraf, in his comments on Zardari’s apology said, ‘May be [that is] all that the “hawkish” military establishment would allow.’\textsuperscript{207} Baloch nationalists have been complaining about the so-called ‘Islamabad mindset’ since the 1970s. It is obvious that Balochistan policy is not completely in the hands of the political government, therefore, unless Islamabad changes what Sanaullah Baloch calls its ‘militarized mindset’ towards Balochistan, no concrete positive development is possible in Balochistan.\textsuperscript{208}

If that is the case, then the most logical question which critics of democracy in Pakistan often make is what difference democracy will make in Pakistan anyway. To answer this, we must identify the actual problems of Pakistan. We have already established that military rule in Pakistan has never been a part of the solution; rather, it has been a part of the problem. Hence, if someone imagines that
as democracy is not delivering, therefore, military rule could be an option, then he is completely mistaken. We need to understand here why democracy is not delivering in Pakistan. Actually, it is not more democracy which is causing problems in Pakistan, but less of it which has hindered the process of healing in Balochistan.

Nonetheless, a consensus is emerging among all political forces regarding Balochistan which is expected to provide the democratic government led by the PPP an opportunity to take the Balochistan issue head on. The PML(N) led by Nawaz Sharif, which is the main opposition party in Pakistan and leads the coalition government in Punjab Province, has recently announced that it would fight for the rights of the Baloch in the same manner as they marched to Islamabad for restoration of the judiciary in March 2009. The presence of Changez Marri, son of the most prominent separatist Baloch leader Khair Bux Marri in this press conference was also observed with keen interest by several political observers. The PML(N)’s clear stance on Balochistan is very meaningful, because it is Punjab which is always blamed by the Baloch nationalists for their sufferings, and if a majority party in Punjab is supporting the Baloch cause, then it would be extremely difficult for the establishment in Islamabad to continue to keep Balochistan in the same position. Other important political forces, which include the PML(Q), Mutahida Quami Movement (MQM), ANP, Jamat Islami, Jamiatul Ulema-e-Islam (JUI) Fazalur Rahman group are also supportive of peaceful resolution of the Balochistan issue.

The PML(N) has also called a ‘national conference’ to achieve consensus on a ‘New Social Contract’ for addressing the grievances of all provinces, including Balochistan, based on the 1940 Lahore resolution. The idea of a ‘New Social Contract’ was earlier floated by PPP Co-Chairman Asif Ali Zardari before the February 2008 elections, and ANP chief Asfandyar Wali elaborated this in a TV interview to Asma Shirazi of ARY One World. The government has already backed this idea, and the National Conference or All-Parties Conference (APC) are expected to follow suit sooner than later. If a consensus emerges in such a conference with clear-cut policy guidelines for Balochistan, FATA, Swat and provincial autonomy, it
would be a great achievement for the democratic forces in Pakistan, and then democratic government would be in a far better position to deliver on the threat of terrorism.

If we look at PPP Senator Raza Rabbani’s 15-point ‘formula’ tabled in the Upper House to address the Balochistan issue, and President Zardari and Prime Minister Yousaf Raza Gilani’s previous statements along with PML(N) chief Nawaz Sharif’s and Information Secretary Ahsan Iqbal’s statements, we can see good ground being covered by the two national parties on two of the most important historical constitutional demands of Balochistan, viz. provincial autonomy, and the National Finance Commission (NFC) award. Regarding the NFC award, Mr Rabbani and Mr Ahsan appear to agree on behalf of their parties that, ‘NFC should be constituted according to the population, size, revenue generation and backwardness of the provinces’. This would concede one of the historical demands of the smaller provinces of Balochistan, Sindh and NWFP.

In the last NFC award which was announced in 1996, population was the only criterion which favoured densely-populated Punjab province at the cost of the other provinces. The democratic government of the PPP-led coalition has already constituted the NFC, which was due some seven years back. The NFC award is under discussion at the time of writing (September 2009), but one can hope that this time around all four provinces of Pakistan would be able to achieve a consensus award, because in the changed political environment, bigger brother Punjab appears to be somehow ready to accommodate the grievances of the other provinces.

Even more important—rather, the single most important Balochistan demand—is their historical demand for maximum provincial autonomy, which would give them ownership over their resources. The chief minister of Balochistan, Nawab Aslam Raisani of the PPP, also called for a ‘new social contract’ based on the 1940 Pakistan Resolution in April 2008. The 1940 Lahore Resolution of the All-India Muslim League which later came to be known as the ‘Pakistan Resolution’ provided for ‘autonomous and sovereign constituent units’. After Independence, the nationalist forces in the
smaller provinces of Pakistan have been demanding the maximum provincial autonomy, to the extent of limiting the federal list to defence, currency, and foreign trade, on the basis of this resolution, which they say provided the basis for the federal union in Pakistan in 1947.

So far, the PPP and PML(N) have both not clearly stated their party policy regarding provincial autonomy, but both had agreed to the Charter of Democracy (CoD) signed in May 2006 to do away with the concurrent legislative list to increase the powers of the provinces vis-à-vis the centre.\(^{213}\) Although Mr Ahsan mentioned the Pakistan Resolution of 1940 in the same statement, yet, knowing the political background of the PML(N), it is really hard to believe whether the PML(N) would be willing to grant provincial autonomy to that extent.\(^{214}\) Nonetheless, from the statements of Rabbani and Ahsan, it appears that the two parties are somehow now ready to go beyond what was already promised in the 1973 Constitution for meeting this historical demand of the smaller provinces. In this regard, the proposal put forward by the Mushahid Hussain committee that, 'the Federal List should be limited to the core functions of the Federation, i.e., Defence and national security, Foreign Relations, Federal Finance and Currency, Communications and inter-provincial harmony, coordination and national solidarity', could become the starting point for discussion before the newly-constituted special parliamentary committee on constitutional reforms headed by PPP Senator Raza Rabbani.\(^{215}\)

If these two major constitutional issues are sorted out, other issues concerning Balochistan should not be difficult to handle. Nonetheless, issues like putting an end to the military operation in Balochistan, the issue of missing persons, deploying Levies in place of police, rationalization of the royalty formula to ensure a uniform rate for all provinces, Baloch grievances on mega development projects (specially Gwadar deep sea port), and Baloch concerns on construction of the cantonments in Kohlu, Gwadar and Sui, have to be sorted out in consultation with the ‘moderate’ Baloch representatives. Regarding Gwadar port, Islamabad needs to agree to what Sardar Attaullah Mengal in his interview with Irshad Ahmed
Haqqani in September 2004 called the ‘irreducible minimum’ Baloch demand of ‘giving the provincial assembly of Balochistan a right to decide about the right of vote for the new settlers in Balochistan’.  

DEMOCRACY AS A CONFLICT-RESOLUTION MODEL FOR TERRORISM IN FATA AND SWAT

We have already recognized in our earlier sections that in case of FATA and Swat, separating terrorists from the local population should be the keystone of our democracy as a conflict-resolution model for terrorism. We know Musharraf’s military campaigns in South and North Waziristan and US drone attacks in FATA proved counterproductive—rather destructive—simply because they failed to separate the terrorists from the population. Therefore, the democratic government must be very careful while using the military option. It must be used only as a last resort when all other options have already been exhausted. Furthermore, before resorting to the military option, a concerted attempt should be made to take as many stakeholders on board as possible. Isolating terrorists as much as possible would always be key to the success of a military option.

As for Balochistan, the same ‘prevention’ and ‘persuasion’ dimensions should be used in case of FATA and Swat as well. To prevent the local population from being attracted and intimidated by the terrorists, some semblance of rule of law and a constitutionally-guaranteed administrative structure is a must. Issues like social inequalities, injustices in-built in the system, extreme poverty and lack of democratic opportunity should be the focus of all development packages for FATA and Swat. Resolving these root causes in our ‘prevention’ dimension would help in delinking the local problems of these regions from a demand for implementation of the Taliban brand of shariah by the extremists. The Taliban should not be given an opportunity to cloak their vested interests in the garb of a general demand for justice and people’s affection for their religion.
This will help in the ‘persuasion dimension’ to convince all the stakeholders in Pakistan and the people of FATA and Swat to join the war against Talibanization. Changing the perception about the war against the Taliban and Al-Qaeda in Pakistan, and making it a Pakistani war instead of an American war fought by Pakistan, is extremely important for winning this war against the Talibanization of Pakistan. If the local people are persuaded that the Taliban are not involved in a ‘true Islamic jihad’, but are simply fighting for their personal power and the imposition of a very narrow-minded definition of Islam which has nothing to do with the Islam as propagated by the holy Prophet, that will help in a great way to isolate the Taliban locally as well as at national level. If the local population refuses to be used as a ‘human shield’ for the Taliban during military operations, and most of the political forces, the media and civil society groups are behind the military operation, then the chances for success for military operations will multiply manifold.

Thus, once terrorists are isolated effectively from the local population, military operations as part of the ‘denial’ dimension should take place. Here, we must point out that the ‘denial’ dimension must be accompanied by the ‘coordination’ dimension, otherwise we will see a repetition of what happened in the cases of North and South Waziristan during Musharraf’s rule. The militants defeated in South Waziristan by the Pakistan Army fled to North Waziristan in September 2004 and fought a new war in there without losing much of their energy. The job of this ‘denial’ strategy should not be restricted to make the Taliban flee from one particular area and shift their bases to the other area. Rather the strategy should be to surround them from all corners and break up their terrorist networks and arrest their activists, and cut off the financial and military supplies used for the acts of terrorism from all possible corners. This is where the ‘coordination’ dimension becomes important for the success of the ‘denial’ dimension.

Finally in ‘coordination’ dimension, Pakistan will need the support, good-will and cooperation of the International and regional actors directly involved in this conflict. Without their
full support, trust and backing it would be extremely difficult to surround terrorists from all corners and disrupt their military and financial supplies because most of the FATA agencies share the international boundaries with Afghanistan. Therefore, tripartite cooperation involving Pakistan, Afghanistan and NATO forces would be required to dry the resources of terrorists. In this regard the mutual trust and coordination of intelligence and information sharing has been lacking so far. Musharraf and Karzai were often seen at logger heads during last eight years. In this regard, what Prime Minister Yousaf Raza Gilani describes a ‘regional approach’ and ‘international approach’ would be required. Apart from the above three, Iran, India, Russia and China are also important stakeholders in the Afghanistan conflict. In this regional approach all these important regional nations must be on board and they all must agree that they would no more play games with each other. The support of the international community, the UN and other donor agencies would be of immense help to sustain the process of economic and political developments in FATA and Swat.

Nonetheless, the most problematic part in dealing with FATA and Swat would be to find out the ‘moderates’ and get their cooperation for the establishment of peace in the region. In case of both FATA and Swat it is quite a difficult job because the indoctrination done by the Taliban and Al-Qaeda is extremely successful here and unlike Balochistan the presence of mainstream political parties is very nominal especially in FATA. That creates a huge problem because the moderate forces are not available in FATA to fill the vacuum even if terrorists are defeated militarily. Therefore administrative reforms in FATA on democratic lines with the consent of the people of FATA would be required to strengthen the political institutions which can fill up the vacuum created by the primitive and decadent administrative structure.

We know historically FATA and Swat both have had the administrative problems and that they are not properly included in Pakistani mainstream. It is here as well that democracy with its power-sharing mechanisms, inclusive procedures and accommodating structures can play a pivotal role in bringing FATA
and Swat in the political mainstream of Pakistan. The CoD calls for including FATA in NWFP province ‘in consultation with them’, i.e. the people of FATA. But reportedly, the people of FATA and Swat have strong reservations on being included in NWFP in a regular provincial structure. They want to preserve their tribal customs and some level of ‘self-rule’. A separate provincial status for FATA and Swat might be an answer.

In this regard, the policy makers in Pakistan must keep in mind that it is not necessary to find a solution for FATA’s or Swat’s administrative problems in equation with the other provinces of Pakistan and under the current federal structure. There are several administrative mechanisms which have been used successfully to resolve such conflicts. For example, ‘asymmetrical federalism’, which provides for special powers for a problematic region, or ‘autonomy’ with proper constitutional arrangements, might be the right approach for FATA and Swat. To probe this idea properly, full-fledged separate research is required, which is beyond the scope of this research. Nonetheless, the mental logjam that any out-of-the-box solution which leads to new constitutional arrangements is non-negotiable must be revisited in Pakistan. The federal government may completely take over the responsibility of securing the international border with Afghanistan, then ‘autonomy’ or ‘self-rule’ may be granted to FATA and Swat with some necessary conditionalities regarding maintaining the rule of law and basic human rights.

The new PPP-led democratic government in Islamabad has introduced some reforms in FATA which are a step in the right direction, but a lot more is required to be done to bring peace in FATA and establish the writ of the government in this troubled region. On 14 August 2009, on the eve of the 62nd birthday of Pakistan, President Asif Ali Zardari, after consultation with all stakeholders in FATA, announced the introduction of the Political Parties Order (2002) and brought in certain changes in the FCRs to remove some of the draconian clauses from that colonial law. This can be termed as the first major step towards democratization of FATA and including FATA in the political mainstream of Pakistan.
With the introduction of the Political Parties Order (2002), the people of FATA have got their basic human right of forming political associations, and thus, for the first time, political parties of Pakistan are allowed in FATA. On the other hand, changes in FCR include setting up a FATA appellate tribunal with powers similar to those of the high courts, asking the FATA administration to produce accused before the authority concerned within 24 hours of arrest, giving people right to appeal and bail, excluding women and children from the Collective Responsibility Clause of the FCR, and envisaging audit of accounts by the auditor general. These changes are welcomed overall by the people of FATA, but they rightly call them ‘insufficient’.

The FATA Reforms Movement, a group of politically active citizens of tribal areas, has demanded introduction of phase-wise reforms like those of Gilgit-Baltistan, where a kind of self-rule, a so-called ‘province-like status’ was granted recently to the area by the Gilgit-Baltistan Empowerment and Self-Governance Order (2009). In fact, parallels cannot be drawn between the two, because, unlike Gilgit-Baltistan, FATA is a completely different story, and, therefore requires different treatment. Furthermore, the issue of terrorism has no link with Gilgit-Baltistan, whereas FATA, unlike Gilgit-Baltistan, is not connected with a plebiscite in Kashmir. Therefore, rather than ‘a province-like status’, FATA can easily be given complete provincial status, provided necessary constitutional amendments are made and the people of FATA are properly consulted.

**APPLYING DEMOCRACY AS A CONFLICT-RESOLUTION MODEL FOR TERRORISM IN SWAT**

Prime Minister Gilani ordered the military operation in Swat and Malakand Division in his address to the Nation on Thursday, 7 May 2009 to flush out the militants and restore the writ of law. This military operation resulted in the displacement of hundreds of thousands of internally displaced persons (IDPs) from Malakand Division and Swat. Nevertheless, the military operation
in Swat has been quite successful as compared to the previous military operations conducted by the military regime of Gen Pervez Musharraf in Swat and South and North Waziristan. Peace has been restored in most of the areas in Swat and Malakand Division as the writ of the government has been established and life has started coming back to normal in most of the Swat and Malakand areas. It will be quite interesting for the purpose of this research to study the Swat operation in the light of what we have prescribed for FATA in the earlier section, and compare it with the previous two peace agreements signed by the Musharraf regime in South and North Waziristan and the military campaigns there.

In the case of the Musharraf campaigns in FATA, there was no serious attempt to isolate the terrorists from the local population. Further, the blunder he made was to sign a direct peace accord with the Taliban rather than looking for any ‘moderate force’ or using the tribal maliks or PAs in FATA. This legitimized Taliban control over South and North Waziristan and gave them an opportunity to crush all other power centres in the regions controlled by them. On the other hand, in Swat, the ANP Government used Maulana Sufi Mohammad of Tehrik Nifaz Shariat-i-Muhammadi (TNSM) as a ‘moderate’ force and signed a peace agreement with him. This made Sufi Mohammad responsible for the implementation of the accord on the militants’ side. Several objections can be raised about Sufi Mohammad’s selection as a ‘moderate’, specially because of his role in the Afghan jihad and then leading a caravan of about 10,000 fighters to Afghanistan in 2001 in support of the Taliban against the NATO forces. Nevertheless, Sufi Mohammad meets the criteria set by Neumann and Smith’s definition of ‘moderate’ as he shunned violence and signed a six-point agreement with the NWFP government in April 2008 to facilitate a dialogue with the ‘Pakistani Taliban’ before being released by the NWFP government on 21 April 2008.²²²

Later, it was proved that using Sufi Mohammad as guarantor helped to clear the ambiguity about violation of the agreement, and made it possible to put direct blame on the militants when they violated the agreement. When the Taliban in Swat tried to enhance
their influence beyond Swat by entering Buner and Shangla districts of Malakand Division in violation of the Swat agreement, the NWFP government was able to put pressure on them through Sufi Mohammad. Although they did not vacate Buner and Shangla completely on Sufi’s pressure, still, this time it was clear that the violation had occurred on their side. This was a huge problem with the Musharraf agreements, as both sides blamed each other and ambiguity always helped the militants to put the whole blame on the Musharraf Government. This clarity in one way helped the government to show the people of Swat and of Pakistan at large that the Taliban were not sincere in the implementation of shariah in Swat.

The ANP-led NWFP Government and the PPP-led federal government (both are allies in the two set-ups) made a concerted effort this time to give peace a chance in Swat, which helped to isolate the militants locally and at the national level. A peace agreement was signed between the NWFP Government and Swat-based Taliban militants with the help of Sufi Mohammad on 21 May 2008 whereby the Tahik-i-Taliban Pakistan (TTP’s) Swat faction led by Fazlullah, the son-in-law of Sufi Mohammad, accepted the writ of the provincial and central governments of Pakistan. On the other hand, the NWFP provincial government in consultation with the central government, promised to implement Shariah-e-Muhammadi (the Islamic law) in the Malakand Division. Then it took about a year for the NWFP Government to come up with the draft Niazam-e-Adl Regulation (NAR, 2009) in March 2009. This NAR 2009 was on the lines of the 1995 and 1999 Nizam-e-Adal regulations which were signed but not implemented during the Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif periods respectively. During this one-year-long drafting period, there were several occasions when the fate of the peace deal appeared doomed, but the unwavering support of the ANP provincial government saved this deal despite some obvious violations by the Taliban.

As soon as this peace deal was signed by NWFP Chief Minister Amir Haider Khan Hoti on 9 March 2009 and passed on to the federal government for the signature of President Asif Ali Zardari,
a great debate began in Pakistan. Among the people of Pakistan, a sizeable majority of the Islamists of various shades, including rightist intellectuals, politicians, retired generals, bureaucrats and journalists, used to see the Taliban as what Dr Mohammad Wasim describes ‘good boys gone berserk’. About them, Dr Wasim said the Taliban are ‘(slightly or massively) overzealous about the implementation of what is dear to believing Muslims’. This group supported the NAR right away and created tremendous internal pressure on President Zardari to sign the NAR immediately. On the other hand, liberals in Pakistan, including the elements of the left among intellectuals, bureaucrats and NGOs saw NAR as a surrender of the state’s sovereignty to the perpetrators of the acts of barbarism and terrorism. This group vehemently criticized NAR and blamed the ANP and PPP for abandoning the path of liberalism and secularism which was enshrined by Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan (‘Bacha Khan’) and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, the founders of the two political parties.

Understanding this great divide, and perhaps not being so sure himself about the success of NAR, combined with US pressure, President Zardari avoided signing the NAR for more than two months. Finally, when the ANP threatened to pull out from the federal cabinet if NAR was not signed by President Zardari, the federal government decided to take NAR to the parliament on 13 April 2009, in spite of the fact that, constitutionally, the parliament had no authority to legislate for the Malakand Division. In the parliament, a unanimous resolution was passed on the same day in favour of NAR and President Zardari signed immediately afterwards. Only the MQM as a party criticized and abstained, while well-known journalist Ayaz Amir criticized NAR against the party line of his PML(N).

This whole democratic exercise of a very open debate in the print and electronic media for more than two months and then a parliamentary resolution provided NAR great moral authority. This also proved that despite immense international and internal pressures, the ANP and PPP Governments at provincial and federal level remained true to their word. From then onwards, the onus for implementing NAR was on Sufi Mohammad and the Taliban
of Swat. In his immediate reaction, a jubilant Sufi Mohammad declared that the goal of shariah was achieved, therefore, the Taliban should lay down their arms and take part in the welfare of Swat. Earlier, the government had even agreed to Sufi’s demand that the militants would surrender their arms to a qazi, not the government or military.

Political developments in the next few weeks convinced many even among the Islamists that not only were the Taliban more interested in their vested interests than in the implementation of shariah, but the Islamists for the first time also came to realize that the Taliban’s brand of shariah was unacceptable even for them. The Taliban of Swat initially called for more concrete actions, but later refused the surrender of arms bluntly, saying, ‘weapons are like zewar (jewellery) for men’, therefore, there was no question of surrendering the weapons. This was a clear violation of the peace agreement. The intentions of the Taliban were further exposed when they moved to Buner and Shangla and started patrolling openly with their weapons, violating another part of the peace deal. They beheaded their opponents, hanged their bullet-ridden dead bodies on poles, set the houses and petrol pumps of their opponents ablaze and flogged women in the areas controlled by them. The Taliban’s medieval and savage thinking was also revealed from barring female patients from being examined by male doctors, targeting schools, and stopping the administration of polio drops, all of which they labelled un-Islamic. Thus, the Taliban’s rule of just a few weeks in Swat made it evident to the Islamists that the Taliban-style shariah was unacceptable for them as well, because the way of life which the Taliban portrayed was far from the lifestyle which Islamists practice in their routine life in Pakistan.

Sufi Mohammad’s controversial statements calling democracy, the constitution, and parliament un-Islamic helped in isolating the Taliban completely. Sufi Mohammad did not spare even the mainstream religious leadership. He told the media that he had refused to offer prayers behind former JI chief Qazi Hussain Ahmad and Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam-Fazl (JUI-F) chief Fazlur Rahman because ‘they seek to justify democracy’.

This
enraged the religious elite, who were earlier very soft towards the Taliban. Ahle Sunnat parties (Sunni parties’ alliance) termed Sufi Muhammad ‘a rebel of Shariah and the Constitution of Pakistan’ in a national convention in Rawalpindi and called the Army, the Supreme Court and parliament to ‘fulfil their obligations for the protection of the country’s Constitution’. On the other hand, eight parties of the Barelvi school of thought formed an alliance under the banner of Sunni Ittehad Council (SIC) to wage a joint struggle against Talibanization of Pakistan and termed it the ‘Save Pakistan Movement’. The Tableeghi Jamaat Pakistan, having a large following in all corners of Pakistan and which always avoided speaking on political issues, had earlier denounced enforcement of shariah at gunpoint in clear terms and had condemned extremism and militancy in the name of Islam at the conclusion of a three-day congregation on 28 April 2009. This clear-cut and brave opposition to the ideology of the Taliban from different religious schools was unprecedented in the history of Pakistan.

This is exactly what only democracy can deliver, and what a dictatorship simply cannot. Just a few weeks earlier what was called ‘an American war’ suddenly became ‘Pakistan’s national war of survival’. Hamid Mir, well-known anchor of Capital Talk on Geo TV and a renowned Pakistani journalist, reported that because the Taliban had lost local support, they were panicking as the locals were not ready to become their ‘human shields’ and were leaving the area in a large numbers. Even Gen David Petraeus, chief of the US Central Command, recognized the national character of the anti-Taliban drive in Pakistan and said, ‘not just the president and the prime minister but also even the opposition leaders, virtually all the elements of the political spectrum and the people in addition to, of course, the military’, were galvanized in this drive.

Thus, ‘isolating the terrorists’, a key point of our conflict-resolution model, was achieved to an extent before launching the military operation (the denial dimension) in Swat and in Malakand Division. The terrorists were isolated with the help of ‘persuasion’ by using the peace deal and by exposing their ulterior motives. With the help of the Swat peace deal, the NWFP Government succeeded
in separating the people’s genuine demand for speedy justice and the enforcement of *Nizam-e-Adal* from the terrorists’ agenda of the enforcement of the Taliban brand of shariah. Therefore, once peace is restored in Swat, NAR must be implemented in the true letter and spirit to meet the historical demand of the people of Swat. The Taliban might have broken the agreement, but the government must not break its promise with the people of Swat. The implementation of NAR would be key in winning the confidence and goodwill of the people of Swat.

But the ‘prevention’ dimension, which is one of the most important parts of this strategy, was not addressed properly. A proper administrative structure is still missing in Swat which would take over responsibility once the militants are flushed out. Therefore, even though it is hoped that the military would be successful this time to flush out the terrorists from FATA, we know that the recurrence of terrorism in Swat can only be averted if ‘prevention’, along with the other three dimensions of the grand strategy are properly implemented. Therefore, once peace is restored in Swat, administrative reforms and economic and political development of Swat must become a focal point.

The ‘coordination’ dimension would also hold a key in the final success of this military operation and the anti-Talibanization drive. President Zardari rightly says that terrorists are not just a problem of the Pashtun belt or of Pakistan, but it is a global phenomenon, and, therefore, it requires a global effort as well. The hundreds of thousands IDPs must get the immediate attention of the international community and the response should be commensurate with the 2005 earthquake. The UN, US, UK, EU, Saudi Arabia and other Muslim countries must chart out a plan together with the Pakistan government to address this great challenge, because if these people are not taken proper care of, then that will strengthen the hands of terrorists. A loud and clear message must go to the people of Swat and Malakand Division that the international community is with them in their fight against the terrorists.

The role of the US and Afghanistan along with India would be paramount among the international community. Apart from financial
support from the US, Pakistan would need the US restraining itself at this point from taking unilateral actions, specially drone attacks. Pakistanis have been convinced now that this is Pakistan’s own war of survival, but continued American drone attacks can change the mood of public opinion once again in favour of terrorists. Similarly, India and Afghanistan should also be careful in their statements on Pakistan. If India can restart the peace process with Pakistan and the two South Asian neighbours can show some tangible progress towards resolving their disputes, that will go a long way in dealing with the terrorist threat in Pakistan. Then the Pakistan government would be in a far better position to pull back its Army from the eastern border and concentrate singlemindedly on the terrorist threat.

Success in Swat and Malakand Division should mean securing this region from any future militant takeovers by creating strong administrative institutions and developing democratic norms. This will require a concerted effort on the part of consecutive provincial governments of NWFP and the current and future federal governments in Islamabad. A success story in Swat can then be replicated gradually in FATA as well. But all this hinges upon Pakistan continuing on the path of democracy.
Conclusion

Terrorism is considered one of the most serious challenges to national security. But when the targets of the terrorists are democratic and multicultural states, the damage is much greater. In the light of this background, we conducted a study entitled Democracy as a Conflict Resolution Model for Terrorism: A Case Study of India and Pakistan and tried to find answers to the four questions that we raised in our Introduction.

The first was whether there is an empirical relationship between ‘democracy and terrorism’, and our respective case studies on India and Pakistan confirmed such a durable relationship. On India, we found two aspects of democracy—the formal (electoral democracy), and the substantial (the way democratic institutions operate and function)—influence the terrorist incidents in the country. We found, for instance, that when electoral democracy was denied in states like Punjab and Kashmir because of political considerations, it created massive discontent and terrorist upsurges in these states. On the other hand, when democracy was allowed to function, it had a cooling effect on terrorist violence in Punjab and Kashmir and to some extent Mizoram in the North-East. Similarly, in the case of Pakistan, we found that terrorism flourished in Balochistan, FATA and Swat because, unlike all other Pakistani regions, political freedom and democratic structures were the weakest in these three areas. During the course of this study, we also established that military rule in Pakistan has not been a part of the solution for terrorism in Balochistan, FATA and Swat, but has been a part of the problem. A political and administrative vacuum allowed by military rule provided terrorists a sanctuary in these territories.

On the substantive aspects of democracy, we found that these have a positive effect on terrorist incidents in a country. If people feel frustrated and alienated because of the perception of neglect and underdevelopment, the police and investigative agencies are not objective and even biased, the youth join militancy as a source of
livelihood or to avenge the atrocities allegedly committed against them by the security forces, funds released for developmental purposes are not utilized properly because of widespread corruption at all levels of governance, or terrorist-related cases are prolonged for a great length of time because the courts are overloaded with routine law-and-order cases, then there is something seriously wrong with the country’s democracy and democratic institutions. Our two case studies clearly demonstrated that terrorist violence can be managed and contained if the democratic and administrative institutions remain strong and effective, and are seen as fair and impartial by all sections of the society.

The second question was whether democracy can be a factor in fighting terrorism. Our answer is certainly yes. We consider democracy, with its inclusive procedures and accommodating institutions, as the best antidote to terrorism in the long term. Democracy and democratic institutions can integrate the disgruntled sections of society by accommodating their legitimate concerns through power-sharing mechanisms and help in reducing desperation and helplessness, which are the breeding grounds for extremism and terrorism. Even though we consider democracy and democratization as good strategies to deal with the scourge of terrorism, we do not, however, accept imposition of democracy through coercive means as the right means of containing terrorist violence. Also, we neither claim that democracy can combat all forms of terrorism, nor do we argue that a democracy deficit alone can explain the rise of terrorism in India and Pakistan because, in our opinion, factors that cause terrorism differ from country to country, and even between different regions within the same country. However, we certainly feel that the muddled nature of the political process and the failure of the governance institutions to deliver basic public services have a role in the continuation and perpetuation of terrorist violence in democratic societies.

The third question was whether democracy can work as a conflict-resolution model for terrorism. Our study of terrorism as an asymmetric conflict shows that direct military strategy suggested by the realists does not pay off against terrorists, because civilian
deaths resulting from military operations enhance sympathy for terrorists among the local population, and the affected area becomes a breeding ground for terrorism. Therefore, the basic problem in dealing with terrorism is how to isolate terrorists from the local population, or, as conflict-resolution experts Fisher and Ury suggest, ‘separate the people from the problem’.

We know international terrorists like Al-Qaeda cannot succeed unless they have some local support base. Similarly, the Naxals who have recently flourished in India with the support and sympathy of the local tribal population cannot be defeated unless the locals are won over. It is here democracy and its conflict-resolution techniques could be very helpful. We consider democracy best for providing the enabling environment to isolate terrorists locally. By addressing the root causes like inequalities, injustices, poverty and lack of democratic opportunity, democracy can make a difference to the social milieu that causes terrorism or generates sympathy for the terrorists. Moreover, democratic elections, local self-government institutions, and activities of the mainstream political parties in the affected area would help in bringing the people of the troubled regions into the national mainstream. Methods like negotiations, mediation, agreements and peace accords could also be used to make peace with moderate local actors. However, although democracy, with its power-sharing mechanisms, inclusive procedures and accommodating institutions has a better chance of delivering a lasting peace in conflict-ridden areas, yet an appropriately-crafted set of democratic institutions according to the specific requirements of those regions would be crucial for promoting sustainable and durable peace.

In our case study on India, we established that democracy can help to reduce the terrorist threat, provided there is no opportunistic and subjective interpretation of the issue of terrorism both by the government and the opposition parties, and the democratic and administrative institutions remain strong and effective and are seen as fair and impartial by all sections of the society. Moreover, appropriate policy intervention at various levels can also reduce the feeling of alienation, frustration and resentment among the
disadvantaged groups that become the cannon fodder for militant and extremist groups.

In the case of Pakistan, we found that democracy, as an inclusive and participatory system, has the capacity to resolve the issues relating to ethno-nationalist and pan-Islamist terrorism in Pakistan. In our study of Balochistan, FATA and Swat regions, we demonstrated that democracy possesses ‘the cure for terrorism’, provided both the formal and substantial aspects of democracy are carefully nurtured and cultivated in those strife-torn areas. In this regard, commitment and consensus among democratic forces would hold a key in the final analysis. We have already noted that in Balochistan as well as in Swat and FATA, the PPP-led coalition government has achieved a certain level of cooperation from the main opposition PML(N) Party led by Nawaz Sharif. If this cooperation between the two national parties of Pakistan, the PPP and PML(N), continues on key issues like Balochistan, Swat, FATA and war against the Talibanization of Pakistan, then there are good chances of democracy succeeding against terrorism. On the other hand, if these two fail to cooperate, nothing could be said even about the future of democracy in Pakistan. The leadership on both sides appears to understand the dynamics of the political chessboard in Pakistan, therefore, one should hope that this time they will not let down the people of Pakistan.

The fourth was what policy relevant options can be learned from India–Pakistan experiences that could be useful for others facing similar challenges. There are many. First, democracy, both in its formal and informal aspects, can be a cure for terrorism, although it cannot combat all forms of terrorist violence because the motives of the terrorist groups are not the same everywhere. Second, opportunistic and subjective interpretation of the issue of terrorism by the government and the opposition not only results in myths, confusions and falsehoods, it also leads to lack of adequate and sufficient governmental and institutional response to combat terrorism. Thus, consensus on vital issues is a must in a democratic and federal set-up. Democratic and federal societies cannot fight terrorism effectively if there is no bipartisan political support or
unanimity between federal and federating units on most vital issues affecting national security. Third, institutions of governance must be independent, strong and never subordinate to the party’s and the leadership’s demands. This would not only ensure their fairness and impartiality, but also their capacity to deliver basic public services, preventing further resentment and alienation among the affected populace. Finally, as there is not just a single cause of terrorism, similarly, there is also no one-size-fits-all kind of democratic solution for terrorism. To say it in other words, while democratic principles have much in common all over the world, in practice, the ground rules governing them differ from one country to another. That does not make one such country less or more democratic than others, yet, these peculiarities have to be taken into account when devising strategies to combat terrorism.
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