



ISSN Print: 2394-7500  
ISSN Online: 2394-5869  
Impact Factor: 5.2  
IJAR 2015; 1(11): 59-63  
www.allresearchjournal.com  
Received: 14-08-2015  
Accepted: 15-09-2015

**Jagdeep singh**  
Assistant professor in Guru  
Nanak College Budhlada,  
Punjab, India.

## Terrorism: A Threat for India or World

**Jagdeep singh**

### Abstract

India and China-both-were reborn as a sovereign political entity in the middle of the last century. However, both have. Merited their bright and illuminating philosophy, geography and history, which had the capacity, not only to guide their respective nations, but the whole world. China's rebirth is attributed to the civil war between the Kuomintang (the old Chinese regime) and the new Moist forces, in which the old regime was completely defeated and ousted from the main land. India's rebirth is attributed to the partition of the subcontinent, into two units-the dominion of India and the dominion of Pakistan. China's Civil War was fought on basis of economic-cum-political philosophy, while the division of the Indian subcontinent was purely on religious basis-the two nation's theory propounded by Mohammed Ali Jinnah. It is interesting to note that at one stage, Jinnah was the staunch follower of Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tikal, the acknowledged secularist leader, who believed in the cooperation and active participation, of all the religions, sects, pants, castes and creeds of the Indian Society in accomplishing the ultimate goal of Swarajya.

**Keywords:** Terrorism, war, sovereign, Security Council, nuclear, Mass Destruction

### Introduction

Jinnah, however, propounded a theory near about 1937, that Hindus and Muslims were altogether a different creed and they formed two separate nations. They could not be a part of one single nation. It is also interesting to note that when this two nation's theory was propounded, there were few takers of that theory. However, when the resolution was passed in the national conference of the Muslim League in Lahore, in 1940, many eyebrows were raised, due to the vast change in the mental set up of the community.

During the Kuomintang (in China) and the British regime (in India), the borderline between India and China came to be fixed. This borderline was known as the McMahon Line. It was done sometimes in 1912. It was not invented by pure imagination as China now ways. The Himalaya was actually the dividing line between the two countries. It may be that the line was not actually carved on the soil. However, the existence of the Himalayas was itself the clear proof of the borderline. That is why in a number of scriptures and the Mahakavyas (Epics), India is described to be the nation, which lies to the north of the ocean and to the South of the Himalayas. This borderline was scrupulously followed and respected by the Governments of China and India, and its respective subjects, and is followed and respected by India even today.

China, thus, has been an illegitimate beneficiary of 42,735 sq. km. of Jammu and Kashmir's land. As if, this is not enough, China has of late, since 1957, secretly challenged the McMahon Line (the border between Chinese and Indian countries).

China consolidated itself politically, and has acquired the Imposition of a takeoff, to take a major leap forward. Those were the days when to be equipped with the nuclear capabilities was indeed to be a feather in the cap of the powerful nations.

United States of America, United Kingdom, France, USSR and China were the only countries possessing nuclear capabilities. It may be borne in mind that all these nations were the members of the Security Council of the United Nations. The first four were the founding members, while China occupied its seat as the successor of Kuomintang, who was one of the founding members of the United Nations, and the Security Council. Naturally, China entertained a strong ambition of becoming the leader of Asia.

**Correspondence**  
**Jagdeep singh**  
Assistant professor Guru  
Nanak College Budhlada,  
Punjab, India.

India was the only country, in Asia, which was comparable with China in size and population. Slowly but surely, it began to extend its wings in other parts of Asia. Its activities in Korea, Vietnam, and Magnolia were crowned with success, and this added to its confidence in spreading its activities in other parts of Asia also, particularly the Western Asia block, which was dominated by the Muslim population. The West Asian block consisted of small kingdoms or serfdoms. Pakistan had just come into existence, on the philosophy of two nation's theory. It proved before the whole world that the two nation's theory was potent enough to break the existing nations, and bring into existence the new nations. The Western Muslim block geared round Pakistan. All of them decided to have an Islamic bomb. Islam, which stood for peace, throughout, craved for the nuclear weaponry. Pakistan was a natural choice to assume the leadership of Islamic world.

Pakistan and the Western Asian countries had one thing in common, viz., the Muslim dominated population. This factor attracted the sympathies of the Western block towards Pakistan and the Kashmir problem. Looking to the geographical location of Kashmir, its proximity with Pakistan (which was the centre of attraction of the Western Asian block); China selected Pakistan as its reliable ally, for spreading its wings further in Asia. The generous and sumptuous gift of land from Pakistan proved to be the obligation. Secondly, China thought that in its border dispute with India, Pakistan would be a profitable ally, strategically. The border dispute with India erupted in 1962, and China entered into war with India. India giving shelter to Dalai Lama, and India's policy towards Tibet, left no doubt in the mind of China that in case of any Indo Chinese conflict in future, Pakistan would prove the best strategic ally.

On this political and strategic background, China decided to extend all cooperation to Pakistan, in making it a nuclear country. It extended all help in money, material and labor to Pakistan. After India Gandhi exploded, the bomb at Cochran, Pakistan made it a point to be a nuclear country by hook or crook, to counter India's power. It had already an ally like the United States, who from the very birth of Pakistan started giving military and civil aid.

China, with its anti US stance could not join the American block. The USSR was the natural ally of China, but the latter had some problems, which did not let them join the Soviet bloc. It joined hands with Pakistan, because Pakistan had already obliged them with the gift of chunk of land from Kashmir State. Thus from the very inception of Pakistan, China became their trusted and helpful neighbor. Pakistan is nuclear programmed was initiated by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, shortly after 1971 conflict with India. By that time, Pakistan was fully convinced that it could not surpass India in conventional warfare, and therefore, there was no other alternative, but to be a nuclear power. Second consideration was that while other civilizations like Hindu, Christian and Jewish had nuclear capabilities, the Islamic world alone lacked in that respect. After making up its mind, Pakistan had got a reliable ally in China, who had already obtained the place in the nuclear power structure. Thus 100 per cent of Pakistan's... nuclear programmed is China made. Other peculiarity of the programmed is that it is "solely aimed at India", as is explained by Lt. General Khalid Kiwi, Head of the strategic Planning Division of its National Command Authority before the team Physicists from Italy in 2003.

This programmed started most probably in 1987 and the nuclear bomb was exploded by China," for Pakistan in 1990. America took notice of Chinese efforts for Pakistan after explosion in 1990. That is why Presser's amendment did affect Pakistan till 1990. President Bush refused to certify on it till 1990, no cognizance was taken in 1987, 1988 and 1989. Enough to say that Pakistan became nuclear country by 1990.

China went on freely supporting Pakistan with nuclear capability knowing full well that the real beneficiary was the Bashkir-e-Tobias (Let), renamed as Jamaat-ud-Dawa (Jud), which perpetrated the Mumbai carnage. The Bush administration moved the United Nations in 2006 to have the Jud declared an International Terrorist Organization (ITO) under the Security Council Resolution no. 1267. China stepped in on three occasions to help Pakistan block moves for UN action against the Left. Ironically, even as China continued backing the Left, the armies of India and China were carrying out joint counter terrorism exercises codenamed "Hand in Hand" in Belgaum. The Bush Administration warned President Zadora against seeking Chinese support, when the UN Security Council moved to declare the Let as International Terrorist Organization in December 2008. While the Chinese leadership formally conveyed condolences on the loss of lives in Mumbai, the Chinese Government moved quickly to divert attention from terrorism perpetrated by an organization it had supported in the Security Council by calling on India and Pakistan to strengthen dialogue and bilateral cooperation.

At the same time, the government controlled media organizations in mainland China and Hong Kong launched an anti-Indian barrage claiming that the Indian Government's eagerness to declare that attacks were carried out by foreign forces was an attempt to cover-up internal contradictions. The official mouthpiece of the Communist Party-The People's Daily proclaimed in December 2008 that the attack was a major blow to India's big power ambitions.

Chinese hostility to Indian concerns was voiced more strongly by the scholars from the two governmental institutions-the China Institute of Strategic Studies (CASS) affiliated to the Foreign Office, and the China Institute of Contemporary International Relations (CICERO) affiliated to the State Council. The CASS scholars claimed that India was blaming Pakistan to enhance its control over the disputed Kashmir. A CASS scholar even stated that China can support Pakistan in the event of a war. The scholar asserted, in these circumstances, that China may have the option of resorting to a strategic military action in southern Tibet (Arunachal Pradesh) to thoroughly liberate the people there. The CICERO, in turn, claimed that the terrorists came from within India (*Times of India*).

Without any reason, China initiated the war against India, in 1962. It initiated aggression in the northern Arunachal Pradesh. All these overtures had a specific object behind. In addition, as pointed out earlier, free expression of opinions by the members of the non-political bodies like CICERO regarding options open to China appear non-diplomatic. Now, there is news that some dangerous weapons having Chinese markings were found on the streets and the main roads of Srinagar and other cities. There should be no doubt in the mind of anybody, that if there is a conflict on the issue of Kashmir, between India and Pakistan, China will be wholeheartedly supporting Pakistan morally and materially,

though not physically. China will definitely add strength to the arsenal of Pakistan.

China's war against India, its unilateral cessation, the growing influence of CASS, the reluctance of China in expediting settlement of the border dispute, and the declarations of CASS from time to time are to be viewed as different parts of the same chain. They are not sporadic utterances, but make one coherent chain. Soon after the Mumbai attack, the scholar from the CASS said that India is protesting too much, and China may, in the event of war, help Pakistan by sending its troops to Arunachal Pradesh, to liberate that area permanently. This does not appear to be an empty threat. More recently, Mr. Zing Luis, who happens to be connected with the CASS, has written an article, two or three days after India celebrated its 62nd anniversary of independence. The time of publication of the article is significant enough. To repeat, it was 2 or 3 days after the celebrations were over, and at the time when the thirteenth round of talks between India and China, regarding the border dispute were to be resumed. Looking to the stature of Mr. Zing Luis, who is intimately connected with CASS? It cannot be said, even by any stretch of imagination that the article was published without the scrutiny or consent of the Chinese government. The article conveyed that India was a "Hindu Religious State" and due to the caste system prevailing since centuries, the lower strata of the society is being exploited continuously, and hence the Union Government has become weaker and weaker. It was further claimed that India was ripe for disintegration, and hence China should take the lead, and help disintegrating India in 20 to 30 zones, with the help of Pakistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan and Nepal who are the friends of China. Even the strategy has been explained. The article says that with the help of Bangladesh, one Bengali Nation can be created. With the help of ULF A, Assam can be created as separate nation, so that the very cause of the border dispute with China can be eliminated (*Times of India*).

China wants to name these assisting nations, because it is certain that they will be loyal to her. This explains the whole paradox. So far, we were under the impression that it was only lei, which was managing the whole affairs from A to Z. Now, it appears that it is China who is manipulating the show. The N oxalate corridor covering the parts of Bihar, Jharkhand, W. Bengal, Orissa, Chhattisgarh, part of Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh is a shining example of China's ambitions. Maoist Government in Nepal, the primitive Bhutan, the fertile soil of Lagash (in Bengal) may be too willing to embrace the Chinese dragon. So far, we were surprised how a small country like Bangladesh could be bold enough to ignore the persistent request of India, to close the training centers of terrorists. Now it is clear. It has the strong hand of China on its book. About Pakistan, it is needless to say anything. So far, we were thinking that Fatalism and terrorism are separate institutions taking advantage of local problems. Now, China has coordinated the working of both the institutions, giving them the basic philosophy.

Let us now consider the position of USA. This country has taken consistently the biased view on the Kashmir dispute. At one stage, it was its case that the biased view was the outcome of the disinformation furnished by the UK government. We cannot forget that after the World War II and during the cold war period, America had an eye on Pakistan, as it could be profitably used as the best and

reliable ally to check Russian activities in Afghanistan. It was also used as a best ally to fight Taliban. After the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center and Pentagon, America thought that, Pakistan would be the best place to spearhead the attacks against terrorism. The strategic position of Kashmir in Central Asia cannot be lost sight of, and the country like America would never lose the opportunity not to befriend Pakistan. Looking from all these angles, America has never shown any miserliness in filling the arsenals of Pakistan. This, she has done from the word 'go'. It has also not been miserly in filling up even the nuclear arsenals of Pakistan. It has never let down Pakistan in money, men and material. What of that, at the time Bangladesh war, President Nixon did not lose any time in moving the seventh fleet to the Bay of Bengal. Even at the beginning of the twenty-first century, President Clinton did not hesitate to declare that the Kashmir problem could be solved only within the framework of the Security Council resolution passed in April 1948, though many members of the United Nations had altogether forgotten any such resolution because of the lapse of more than fifty years.

When Kashmir case came before the Security Council, Great Britain openly took a partisan stance, not because it saw any merits in Pakistan's defense, but only because the situation in west Asia demanded that they should take a pro Pakistan stand. However, for that purpose Mr. Noel Baker, the Labor Minister in Attlee's government exceeded his brief and misrepresented India's position to his own government. USA now says that they were the victims of disinformation. It may be true to some extent. As Das Gupta points out, they had accepted the position in 1948 that Kashmir legally belonged to India, by virtue of Maharaja's instrument of accession.

They also told Mr. Noel Baker that they were perturbed by the implications of the resolution sought to be introduced by Britain (which resolution could have allowed Pakistan to At the end of George Bush's term, his aides are reported to have handed over to Osama's transition team a lengthy review of policy in Afghanistan and Pakistan, concluding that the US has a far more at stake in preventing Pakistan's collapse than it does in stabilizing Afghanistan or Iraq. According to Sanger, the author of the transition report, it has recorded that "only one of those countries has a hundred nuclear weapons. For al-Qaida and other Islamists, this is the home game-for anyone trying to keep a nuclear weapon going off in the United States, it is our home game too."

Sanger has written about Pakistan's command and control over its nuclear weapons after a detailed session with General Khalid Kiwi (Red.), head of the Strategic Plans division. Kiwi has been doing this job since 2002, interacting extensively with the American media, think tanks. In the Pentagon and the State Department to persuade them that Pakistani nuclear weapons were quite safe and there were no risks of them falling into the hands of the Jihadist. However, the Americans are not convinced. Sanger narrates how Pakistani Prime Minister Yusuf Raja Giyani told President Bush during a meeting in Washington about the crackdown on a major Madras as even as American intelligence had the transcripts of the Pakistani Army giving advance warning to the Madras about impending raids (*Times of India*).

The American worries are mostly about the Jihadist. In the last year of the Bush administration, the Directors of National intelligence and the CIA undertook several trips to Pakistan to convince Perez Musharraf and General Kenai that the militants in the tribal area were now aiming to bring

down the government in Islamabad. Sanger says "the message was simple and direct. The Pakistani leadership needed to forget about India and focus on threat from within." President Osama echoed similar sentiments in interviews.

The New York report clearly conveys the concerns of Washington about Pakistan as the Osama administration is about to assume office. There will be skeptics in India who will insist that in this situation to the US is likely to succumb to Pakistani blackmail, and sacrifice India's security interests at the altar of trying to maintain Pakistan's stability, as they have been doing in the last eight years. On the other hand, there can be views that Americans are no longer likely to accept the degree of risk *vies-a-vies* Pakistan conveyed in this article and continued to be taken for a ride.

It is obvious that Osama is taking this challenge seriously. Vice President Joe Biden also visited Pakistan before the inauguration. Following the Mumbai attacks, diplomatic interaction between India and US has intensified. What is needed today is a strategic understanding at the highest leadership levels between India and US on the international threat arising out of Pakistan.

The US Congressional Bipartisan Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism in its report concluded "Were one to map terrorism and weapons of mass destruction today, all roads would intersect in Pakistan". The US is concerned about Pakistani nuclear weapons falling into the hands of terrorists, and becoming a threat to them. Pakistanis assert that their nukes are India specific. Therefore, there is a mutuality of strategic interest between the countries on the developments in Pakistan (*Times of India*).

This is the new public opinion, emerging in the United States, in view of the strategically changed circumstances within the globe. It will be difficult for the leaders all over the globe to neglect the new formulation, while fixing their policies and strategies. From the complete dark, a small ray of bright light will tremendously help India.

Hillary Clinton is developing a soft corner for India. She promoted bilateral relationship between the two countries. As a Senator, she cofounded and co-chaired the India caucus. She also visited India more than once. She intends to build stage III of the relationship with India as a key partner helping America shape the 21st century. The earlier two stages were (I) the cold war years; and (ii) post-cold war years up to the end of the Bush Administration, and the India US nuclear deal. She proposes to build ties on four natural pillars: (I) global security; (ii) human development; (iii) economic activity; and (iv) science and technology. Recent security related developments are likely to dominate interaction with the Indian leadership. The Pakistani President As if Zadora having admitted that "militants and extremists were created and nurtured in the country as a policy to achieve some short-term political objectives coupled with the reports of the Pakistani army and the lei offering to bring Afghan Taliban to the negotiating table with the US, provided the latter ensures that India's influence in Afghanistan is reduced, validate India's assessment that Taliban obtained safe heavens in Pakistan, with full connivance of the Army, which made the jihad groups as its instruments. The developments across the table will be interesting to watch.

History and strategic interests might have induced the USA and China to formulate their respective foreign policies.

These considerations might have forced them to give military aid to Pakistan. China was free from these restrictive considerations in as much as it came to the international arena, quite late. Its self-interest was the only criterion in formulating its policies. Of course, it received windfall when Pakistan gifted to it the chunk of land, south of the Sinkiang province. This unprecedented gift might have created in its mind a soft corner for Pakistan. Coupled with it, China's border dispute with India is the greatest asset for Pakistan. In today's context, China is the best reliable friend of Pakistan. If tomorrow there is a conflict between India and Pakistan, the latter will have to fight only on. One front. India will have to be prepared to fight on two fronts. As far as China is concerned, it will be foolish to expect any tilt in its policy towards India. After all the basic principle of China's foreign policy is their self-interest. Ethic and morality are unknown to *them*.

The militancy, not just in India but everywhere, when it corn promises the larger interest of the country has to be controlled. In this matter, at least, India deserves some sympathy in the task it faces. It is true that in combating terrorism some lives have been lost and certain human right.' violated. Unfortunately, it has even served the cause of militancy by giving them a reason to put a facade of a continuing revolution (just as Iranians condemn the USA whenever it suits them to sustain their Islamic revolution). Also, it presents an opportunity to Pakistan and vested interests in the USA to give it an international projection. The fact remains that India 'NO of her top leaders recently to terrorism besides thousands of other innocent victims. It is a matter of great pride, that despite spread of terrorism and lack of patriotism on the part of some militants for a country, which has given, they start and the opportunity to grow, India in general has looked progressively ahead with tremendous tolerance. The selection of three out of the eight Presidents from the minorities is a good example. Though now in America second time barrack Obama is president and he has been fighting against terrorism successfully but still lot has to be done. Indian PM Mr. Narendra Modi has cleared Pakistan that India won't start conversation until Pakistan stops terrorism.

India is going through a phase when strong decisions have to be made for a *greater cause* of the integrity and protection of innocent Jives. If President Abraham Lincoln made the decision of going to war with the Confederates for a greater cause of preservation of the Union, what is so wrong in India preserving her own? Particularly, when India, historically and unlike many other civilizations, has never annexed any other country but protected what belonged to her. Sometimes certain decisions are unavoidable even though unpleasant. The decision to use an atom bomb during the World War II was an unpleasant one, yet made (as we are told) for the greater cause of prevention of loss of lives of the Allied troops and fear of escalation of war. Likewise, the Gulf War to respect Kuwait's sovereignty and the Vietnam War to prevent spread of Communism in India and other countries. If a heavy price was paid in Vietnam to protect democracies, it will be foolish now to compromise an established democracy in India. Even President Bush reiterated a policy of no compromise when dealing with terrorism! The hegemonic ambitions of USA in this vital strategic religion both in the past and today has made this band of Islamic militants more intransigent. America's *pious* intentions for creation of a new world order obviously do not apply to this

region in view of its subtle encouragement to these fundamentalist groupings in Kashmir and not indicting Pakistan as a state sponsoring cross country terrorism. The Government of India has tried to play down the refugee problem since it smacks of religious strife. This approach represents a style which has been the cause of the problem. Not all Kashmiri Muslims are terrorists who wish to kill the Hindus; many Muslims have also been killed, and others *have* had to flee the Valley. The government must deal with the issue of murder of innocent Kashmiris as a problem of terrorism and human rights violation and it should deal more strongly with the terrorists in the Valley and their sponsors in Pakistan. The government of India should raise this question of continuing murder of innocent civilians by terrorists with sanctuaries in Pakistan in international forums. This terrorism in Kashmir is part of this sinister design of Pakistan to spread disorder there and in Punjab. The government of India must weigh the military option to force Pakistan to end this policy.

### References

1. Evans Alexander, Why Peace Won't Come to Kashmir, Current History. 2001; 100(645):170-175.
2. Jha, Shankar Prem. Kashmir 1947: Rival Versions of History (New Delhi : Oxford University Press, 1996, 54-88
3. Kashmir Study Group, 1947-1997, The Kashmir Dispute at Fifty: Charting Paths to Peace. New York, 1997, 10-60.