

## Global War on Terror: Pakistan's Contributions

Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema

More than seven years have passed since the tragic events of September 11, 2001 but the international community has still not been able to secure an agreed and universally recognized definition of terrorism. Without having defined terrorism the international community has already embarked upon a struggle to combat terrorism. While there are many who often commented that one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter, the exact difference between a freedom fighter and a terrorist movement is currently being deliberately blurred or inadvertently accepted as synonymous. The need to highlight the exact difference between those engaged in fighting for their freedom and those employing terrorist methods for certain objectives couldn't be under-emphasized. Since state is empowered to act against both the individuals as well as groups aiming for freedom or any other objective, it is imperative that one should attempt to define terrorism and its various categories. This paper attempts to define terrorism initially and then discusses important international developments before focusing on the impact of war on terror on Pakistan. Final section of the article deals with Pakistan's contributions in the ongoing war on terror.

### I

**Definitional Complexities:** Since there exists no consensus definition, different people and states have interpreted terrorism within the context of their own experiences and requirements. Either terrorism appears differently to different people or we deliberately search for a suitable interpretation reflecting our desires. Each of us has demonstrated a tendency to employ a definition that suits our national interests. In many we have all become selective in our choice of definition as terrorism appears to each of us rather differently. To the Americans it may mean the use of violence against the Americans by the extremists anywhere in the world including the homeland, to the Indians it may mean Pakistan sponsored infiltration of terrorists into the Indian Held Kashmir (IHK), to the Israelis it appears to mean the suicide attacks and other means of violence in Israel by the Palestinians and to the Pakistanis it may mean what the Indian security forces are doing in the IHK, engineering anti-Muslim riots and communal killings of the Muslims in which the state machinery is directly involved and the terrorist activities of the trained Indian agents in Pakistan.

No measures can be effective unless there is a clear and universally agreed definition of terrorism. What do we understand by terrorism and who, in our opinion, is a terrorist? What are the categories of terrorism? To arrive at a generally accepted definition is not an easy task. Part of the problem stems from the charged nature of the term. The term has been excessively used in order to condemn and characterize the behavior of the domestic as well as external opponents. Often the governments whose legitimacy has been challenged tend to expand the meaning of terrorism in order to include all forms of

organized protests as a means to discredit the opponents. One such case was the racist white regime of South Africa before the dismantling of the apartheid. Similarly many governments employ the term in order to divert attention from pressing domestic problems to external issues. It is generally an accepted panacea in most parts of the world that focusing on external adversary could provide the necessary respite from complex internal problems.

Many researchers have tried to define the term but were unable to provide a comprehensive definition of terrorism that would cover all of its aspects. Emphasis on dictums like 'today's terrorist is tomorrow's freedom fighter', 'terrorism to some is heroism to others', 'one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter' further made the task of defining somewhat difficult. Perhaps the most complex aspect of the definitional problem is the differentiation between a freedom fighter and a terrorist.

Another difficulty confronting the researchers engaged in working out a comprehensive definition is that acts of terrorism occur within a certain contextual framework and the researchers tend to focus more on the contextual framework rather than viewing it in a broader social phenomenon. Perhaps that is why most definitions are one sided. An act is viewed within certain context and defined in congruence with operative circumstances and power equations. Linked with it is the problem of who acts and who defines. Since the contemporary world is dominated by few powerful nations and the incumbent international political system can, at best, be described as anarchic, the acts defined by the dominant powers may be taken as legitimate and the acts defined by the others as illegitimate. This, of course, implies that in order to fully understand terrorism one has to examine the existing world order.

If one wants to genuinely understand the phenomenon of terrorism rather than using it for propaganda purposes, then the approach should cover both aspects of terrorism; what terrorism is and what terrorism is not. Like the definitional problem of peace, one can start by highlighting what terrorism is not. 'Terrorism is not an ideology but a strategy which may be used by individuals, groups or states for different purposes'.<sup>i</sup> While the sub-national groups and individuals use violent means as part of their well-calculated strategy, the state authorities also use terrorism to brutalize the target audience and to suppress the dissent. While the use of force by the state would be viewed as legitimate, the employment of force by sub national group or individual would invoke strong reactions.

**What is terrorism?** Literature on the subject of terrorism highlights the existence of innumerable definitions. While some focus on the perpetrator, others dwell on their purposes and techniques. However the two characteristics that distinguish terrorism from other forms of violence are that it is aimed at noncombatants and the violence is employed for dramatic purposes in order to instill fear in the target population.<sup>ii</sup> According to Oxford dictionary the word terror means extreme fear. If we accept this meaning then a terrorist is the one who attempts to instill extreme fear among the target audience as suggested above? Terrorism is defined 'as an act or threat of violence against non-combatants with the objective of exacting revenge, intimidating or otherwise

influencing an audience'.<sup>iii</sup> A generally accepted definition of a 'terrorist' is 'a person who uses or favors violent and intimidating methods of coercion'. The essence of this definition is the employment of violent methods in order to instill fear and influence the targets, which may be a government or a community or a particular individual. Terrorists are defined not by their goals but by how they opt to attain them.<sup>iv</sup> It needs to be highlighted that by this definition only a non-state actor is portrayed as a terrorist, which is not necessarily true.

A plethora of definitions is available with each one of them reflecting requirements of the changing political environments in different countries. How one defines terrorism reflects the thinking and profoundly affects the likely response. The US considers 'premeditated politically motivated violence perpetrated against non-combatant targets by sub-national groups or clandestine agents' whereas there are others who define terrorism as 'a process of deliberate employment of psychological intimidation and physical violence by sovereign states and sub-national groups to attain strategic and political objectives in violation of the law'.<sup>v</sup> If one examines and applies the American definition to the communal carnage that took place in the state of Gujarat (India) in Feb.2002 then one is bound to be amazed how it fits comprehensively yet no group was declared as terrorist. Another interesting feature of Gujarat carnage was that not only the state government was directly involved in the massacre of the innocents but also even the federal government did not actively influence the state government to refrain from such condemnable developments. While both India and Israel amply qualify within the American definition of terrorism but the definition itself excluded state as an actor and only included sub national actors. However the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) has cleverly differentiated between terrorism and international terrorism. According to CIA definition international terrorism means terrorism involving the territory or the citizens of more than one country.<sup>vi</sup> This CIA definition of international terrorism is also applicable to both India and Israel. An objective assessment of both Kashmir and Palestine disputes would place them in special category within the broader definition of terrorism.

According to the British Act of Terrorism 2000, 'terrorism means the use of threat of (a) action (b) threat designed to influence the government or to intimidate the public or a section of public (c) threat is made for the purpose of advancing a political, religious or ideological cause'. The Indian government defined terrorism in the Prevention of Terrorist Act 2001 as 'intentions to threaten the unity, integrity and security of India' and 'to strike terror in the people or any section of the people by using bombs, explosive substances, firearms or lethal weapons'. According to the Pakistani Anti-Terrorism (Amendment) Ordinance of 1999 'terrorism means to strike terror or create disturbances by using bombs, explosives, firearms or inflammable substances'.<sup>vii</sup> Similarly many countries have, in some form or in some enactments, defined terrorism but what stands out in various definitions is the selective nature of approaches. Each definition appears to be geared to deal effectively with one's own situation.

Confronted with the existence of so many definitions, the international community is still unable to agree upon a comprehensive and universally acceptable definition of terrorism. Perhaps seeking out an all-encompassing definition appears to be an illusive target. While

no one doubts that all acts of terrorism whether committed by an individual, a group or state authorities are condemnable developments, the question how does one categorizes act in which the loss of lives of non-combatants have taken place does need more scrutiny. The problem has become even more complex when one realizes that terrorism today is constantly undergoing all kind of mutations. 'New adversaries, new motivations, and new rationales which have emerged in recent years can couple with today's increased opportunities and capabilities to launch terrorism on a trajectory towards higher levels of lethality, mass destruction and mass killing, and to challenge the conventional knowledge about it'.<sup>viii</sup>

## II

**International Developments:** The death of the Cold war ushered in a new era of uncertainties. The departure of the Cold War not only resulted in the disintegration of the Soviet Union but also accelerated the process promoting the emergence of economic imperatives. During the Cold war the relations among nations were primarily governed by the political imperatives whereas after the death of the Cold War, the economic considerations acquired heightened importance. The political imperatives were relegated to the secondary position and the economic imperatives acquired the position of utmost importance.

Another development of far reaching consequences that resulted from the departure of the Cold war was the end of bipolarity. The incumbent bipolarity was replaced by a unipolar world dominated by only one super power. Not only the rules of the game began to be changed but also the resultant most powerful nation quickly adjusted to new realities. Cognizant of the vacuum created by the disintegration of the major adversary, many American thinkers began to fill the void by advancing their own recipes. Thus the ideas like Clash of Civilization (Huntington), End of History (Fukyama) gained wide circulation. This was American thinkers attempt to fill the vacuum by suggesting alternatives adversaries such as the Islamic World, China etc. To make Islamic countries as the new adversarial focus of the American wrath was the product of many sources such as the powerful and influential Zionist lobby in US. Almost all those elements/ countries that were involved in some sort of conflictual and adversarial relationships with an Islamic country or countries found the situation very attractive and quickly began to contribute their share in projecting Islamic countries as the likely future adversaries.

Factors contributing to the perceptions of enlarged China threat included its amazing growth rate (around 10%), its Socialist political system along with becoming a major Communist power, its increasing military capabilities and impact on regional security, rising Chinese nationalism, etc. Developments that have contributed towards the increased Chinese regional influence included 1) China's increased share in regional economies and accompanying impact on the economic development of the region, 2) the perception that China's territorial disputes with other countries had intensified, 3) China's rapid economic growth has also accelerated its military modernization process, 4) China had elevated reunification of Taiwan to a higher priority following the return of Hong Kong (1997) and Macao (1999). These factors were interpreted, at the time, as signaling

a new expansionist policy of China. Later the pragmatic Chinese policies were able to reduce the unnecessarily heightened fears of the Americans.

Apart from the above-mentioned vacuum created by the departure of the Cold War and the emergence of the unipolar world with USA as the super power six other significant developments acquired prominence following the departure of the Cold war. These included the revolution in information and communication technologies which in turn strengthened the concept of global village, evolution of the WTO (World Trade Organization), the weakening of the United Nations, the intensification of freedom struggles in Palestine and Kashmir, transformation and expansion of NATO, and the emergence of relatively more assertive Europe. In addition one needs to stress here that while the departure of the Cold War caused disintegration of the Soviet Union and later Yugoslavia, it also promoted integrative trends as well such as experienced by both the European Union and ASEAN etc.

**Tragic Event of September 11, 2001:** The tragedy of 9/11 initially stunned the Americans who could not believe that the most powerful nation on this planet could be hit in such a way and so easily. In a single event thousands of Americans died. Initially the Americans appeared to be shocked to the extent that they could not realize the intensity of accumulated resentment against the American policy pursuits. Instead the concentration was on what they view as the window of their vulnerability. Later they began to express anger in varied forms. To canalize this rising streak of anger, they began to search for targets. Since the Osama Bin Laden was already being sought after because of his alleged involvement in the Kenya bombing, it was decided to apprehend him. Those who had given him refuge were bluntly told to hand him over or face the consequences. Since Osama had taken refuge in Afghanistan and the then incumbent Taliban regime refused to hand him over, the Americans decided to wage war against Afghanistan in the name of war against terrorism-Osama being branded as a terrorist who organized and led a terrorist organization called Al-Quaida.

Following the 9/11 once again the rules of game seemed to have changed. Not only the sole super power has become much more assertive than what was the case following the death of the Cold War but it also advanced the doctrine of pre-emptive defensive strike. The posture that developed after the enunciation of doctrine of preemption was based on the belief that 'rogue states and sub-state paramilitary groups will simply not be deterred in the manner of the cold war era, and that they must therefore be handled in a much more robust manner, including striking first, even if there is no conclusive evidence of intent to strike the United States or its interests'.<sup>ix</sup> A close scrutiny of both the US led Afghan war as well as Iraq war clearly reflects this type of belief.

Four easily discernable factors seem to have contributed towards the aggressive and assertive American posture specifically after the 9/11. First the gradual emergence of a belief, specifically among the Republican Security community, that US was gradually losing out its natural post cold war dominant role. It was deemed essential that in order to make 21<sup>st</sup> Century an American Century an active, vigorous and assertive political and economic leadership needs to be demonstrated periodically. Gradual expansion along

with growing unity of the European Union coupled with myriad lesser threats to its political and economic threats were viewed as causing gradual erosion of US influence.

Second factor that seemed to have played a major role in surfacing this kind of thinking revolves around the emergence of a galaxy of hardliners under one administration. People like Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, and Condolisa Rice under the Bush administration provided an opportunity to practice the above-mentioned ideas. Third element that made contributions was thinking revolving around the notion that tough security measures 'would provide a substantial new impetus for the military industrial complex'.<sup>x</sup> The fourth factor was the actual attack on 9/11. It was not just the human cost that alarmed initially and later angered the Americans but the twin towers were viewed as the symbols of the American international economic influence and their loss hurt the Republican hawks rather badly.<sup>xi</sup>

The new National Security Strategy revolved around the perceived need to act first when US is considered to be under threat. During the Cold War deterrence strategy was deemed appropriate as the main adversary was subject to deterrence by virtue of its own vulnerabilities. The new strategy seems to be based on the belief that defiant or what the Americans call 'rogue states and the sub-state paramilitary groups will simply not be deterred in the manner of the cold war era, and that they must therefore be handled in a much more robust manner, including striking first, even if there is no conclusive evidence of intent to strike the United States or its interests'.<sup>xii</sup>

### III

**Global war against terrorism and Its Impact on Pakistan:** It is generally believed that terrorism is likely to persist for quite sometime because the issues which generate terrorism are unlikely to be resolved. Undoubtedly the war against terrorism would not only confront many obstacles but would also be a painfully long affair. Unless and until serious considerations are given to the factors that are and would continue to impede progress on this front, the war is going to be a long drawn pursuit. However if ample attention is extended to the factors spelled below, the chances of success would indeed multiply though even then no assurances of victory can be given.

Despite the inability of international community to evolve an agreed definition in a comprehensive sense, covering all the disputed areas and weaving a net of varied interpretations, the war against terrorism has already started following the formation of international coalition against terrorism primarily due to the accelerated efforts of the Americans after 9/11. The outcome does not seem very impressive. So far the war against terrorism or what has been projected, as terrorism has not produced impressive results. On the contrary the way the problem has been targeted; it is having adverse effects rather than the desired and visualized containment. The ugly reality is that the activities of terrorists have received unintended impetus and the canvass of terrorism is expanding rather rapidly.

The factors that are effectively impeding international community's collective efforts to control and eliminate terrorism include lack of agreed definition, no clear distinction between the freedom movement and terrorism, quick acceptance of prejudiced version of the situation, inadequate emphasis on the removal of root causes, the employment of only military approach, and half hearted chase of the funding sources. Undoubtedly the international community should have fully realized the significance of an agreed definition before embarking upon a war against terrorism. Second, the war against terrorism should not have started before making a clear distinction between a genuine political movement or a genuine freedom struggle and terrorism. The third factor that is effectively impeding the desired outcome of war against terrorism is the ready acceptance of prejudiced versions of the situation.

The fourth and perhaps the most important factor that has been so far ignored is the causation aspect. What causes terrorism? Injustice, deprivation, denial of legitimate rights in a comprehensive sense, excessive use of force are few developments that often give birth to undesirable violent approaches. At the international level injustice appears to be part of power politics and the operative international political system. Life within a state is far more regulated than is the situation of the states within the incumbent international political system. The legal systems of almost all states operate quite effectively. While there exists what is called international law in operative international political system, which is often referred as semi-anarchic in nature, there is no enforcement authority. The enforcement process appears to be heavily dependent upon the power and influence of the actors within the operative international political system. The second factor that gives birth to terrorism is denial. If a commitment is made, it is expected that the parties involved would fulfill their obligations. And if a commitment is made at an international level or in a universal body like the UN, one expects that the involved states or parties would live up to the expectations of the world body. The third factor that facilitates terrorism is called deprivation and especially if the forcible deprivation takes place it gives birth to seeds of terrorism. Anyone who has been deprived of his legitimate possession, he is likely to try his best to re-secure his lost possession. Deprivation of both the legitimate rights and material possessions cause complexities. Forcible deprivation is sometimes called forcible eviction or forcible displacement. Both cases give birth to resentment. Finally the social and economic inequalities along with widespread poverty also facilitate the advent of terrorism. Poverty gives birth to desperation and desperation could result in unwanted acts.

The fifth factor that has complicated the process of combating international terrorism is the use of word 'combating'. Combating is a charged word connoting some form of military approach rather than dwelling too heavily upon military approach only can best undertake fight against terrorism. The final factor that could provide enormous help in dealing with the problem how to eradicate terrorism revolves around chasing the sources of funding to terrorist organizations. Since the money trail is viewed as a long and rather difficult approach, not much has been undertaken in this regard. To secure desired results the above mentioned factors need to be subjected to serious considerations. It would also be a useful exercise if the promoters of war against terrorism look at themselves to ascertain why so much global anger is regularly expressed against them.

**Impact on Pakistan:** The 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the lingering civil war in Afghan war had severe repercussions for Pakistani state and society. Pakistan had to face a massive influx of nearly 4 million Afghan refugees — the largest in the world. Unlike Iran, which kept its refugees under tight surveillance by restricting them to border areas, Pakistan acted in a characteristic Islamic spirit of magnanimity by letting the uprooted Afghan Muslim brethren free to stay and move as they liked — often detrimental to its national interests. Today, after nearly 29 years of Soviet military intervention, Afghanistan remains a troubled and violent country. Although many refugees have left after 9/11, a sizable 2.6 million are still staying on in Pakistan.

When Afghan refugees streamed across the borders into Pakistan, they created a number of problems for the host country e.g., there were incidents of encroachment over lands and property, overgrazing of fields of local population, large scale deforestation, land erosion, illegal shanty towns, massive increase in rent ceilings, introduction of drug and Kalashnikov culture, intensification of sectarianism, increased competition for transport and construction businesses, housing and jobs and incidents of violence etc.<sup>xiii</sup> This had put a heavy strain on social services of an already underdeveloped NWFP province. More importantly, not only law and order situation deteriorated and problems like beggary, crime and immorality intensified. The issuance of travel advisories against Pakistan by US and other major allies impacted upon the investors and foreign buyers. This was followed by a spate of terrorist bomb explosions throughout the 1980s and early 1990s. The Taliban period provided some respite as it was able to control law and order in Afghanistan to a considerable extent.

After 9/11 and more specifically following US military strikes against the Taliban regime fell and in consequence many defeated Taliban crossed over the Pak-Afghan border and took refuge in the tribal regions of Pakistan. Incidentally, these regions, comprising of seven tribal agencies have close ethnic and family ties with each other. With varied interpretations of the Durand Line and the tribal areas traditionally enjoying a semi-autonomous status, it was not too difficult to mingle with the local people. Cognizant of the incumbent situation in tribal areas, they were able to carry out terrorist activities within Pakistan and against the Karazai government as well.

The presence of foreign militants in some parts of Pakistan and more specifically in FATA pose challenges to Pakistani society as violent acts increased when they along with Taliban elements and their mentors, Al-Qaeda, moved into the major cities. Afghan refugees in big cities are also infiltrated with these elements. Now the government is trying to register these refugees and make plans to repatriate them. But economic and security conditions in Afghanistan are so forbidding that they are reluctant to return to their war- shattered country. Some Afghan refugees who went back to Afghanistan after their long stay in Pakistan have also come back to Pakistan primarily because of extremely difficult situation in most parts of Afghanistan. Cognizant of extremely unattractive situation if Afghanistan and being fully aware of incumbent Afghan government's inability to secure even some semblance of law and order, many refugees have categorically refused to go back to Afghanistan.

After 9/11, some of Al-Qaeda leaders and Taliban have been using these areas as havens to escape detection and launch incursions on both sides of the border. Pakistan government has captured more than 700 Al-Qaeda leaders and operators, including Khalid Omer, Abu Zubaida and Libby from different areas. However military operations in troubled South Waziristan had forced them to move to other cities and places.

In many ways, it is mainly Pakistan that has borne the major brunt of the Soviet invasion, the adverse effects of Afghan civil war and the consequences of the post 9/11 war on terrorism. This has posed major dilemmas for policy makers in Pakistan. One, it has affected major development projects in these regions; secondly, it has forced the state to station many divisions of army for law and order. Not only nearly 120,000 troops have been stationed in FATA and more than 1000 posts have also been established but the government is relying heavily upon the local elders to check the activities of the militants. A three pronged approach consisting of political, economic and military approaches has been adopted which is paying the expected dividends.

In terms of damage to economy i.e., the loss of foreign direct investment and tourism the losses are indeed substantial. According to Pakistani Foreign Minister Shah Mahmood Qureshi Pakistan has suffered a monetary loss amounting to US \$34.5 billion dollars since 2001.<sup>xiv</sup> According to the estimates reportedly compiled by the Pakistani Ministry of Finance, the losses of \$5 billion have been estimated in foreign direct investment, more than \$5 billion in exports and \$5.5 billion in privatization.<sup>xv</sup> Moreover the image of the country has taken a massive battering which for the Pakistanis was an extremely unkind blow. Visa and job opportunities for Pakistanis from these areas to the Middle East are being increasingly curtailed. The strict checking at the entry point amounted to insults initially but later the situation began to improve.

Paradoxically, it was the Pakistani diasporas that actively contributed to national economic development of many countries in the Gulf, the ME and Europe (UK, Denmark, Germany and Norway) 1960s and 1970s. With trained professional armed forces, a responsible nuclear power and geopolitical salience, Pakistan is considered as a stabilizing force in a volatile ME and looked up to as a leading country to combat international terrorism since 9/11.

Another negative fallout has been the radicalization of some sections of its own society and the boost that it has given to religious political parties in the country that either rule or form coalition partners in the two bordering provinces. One manifestation of this is the introduction of a bill deemed to be a parallel legal mechanism to control check “vice and immorality.”

Pakistan was and is a major victim of terrorism, and this has been frequently acknowledged by notable US policy makers. On allegations that it was not “doing enough” in the war against terrorism, it needs to be mentioned that Pakistan had undertaken “extensive operations” against terrorists sometimes at the loss of considerable lives of its troops which nearly amounts to 400-500. Incidentally, this was also conceded and acknowledged even by the Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh.

It is little realized how harsh ground realities of the area make this task quite problematic and difficult for Pakistan. Part of the Pak-Afghan border consists of the rugged terrain of nearly 1,500 km (out of the total 2600 km) at the height of 10,000 to 15,000 feet with no communication infrastructure, which has enabled the foreign elements to fully exploit the geographical situation. Yet the Pakistanis have dealt with this menace with patience and courage despite the fact that no other country has paid so much as has been done by the Pakistanis. One major reason for such a resolve is that almost all Pakistanis view terrorism as a curse of the current phase of international world order and in order to eliminate this menace at home and abroad, they feel that they will have to carry their fight as long as it takes even if they have fight alone.

#### IV

**Counter Terrorism Strategy and Pakistan's Contributions:** Counter Terrorism Strategy: A strategy of counter terrorism entails both the direct as well as indirect measures. Among the direct and indirect measures are included a traditional military response, investigation of specific terrorist acts and consequential prosecution of the culprits, trade sanctions if a state is involved, improving security measures, strengthening intelligence network, preventive arrests, international treaties , accelerating economic and social developmental processes etc.

Counter terrorism strategy entails initial focus on correct identification of the major factors causing the terrorists activities in a certain region first and then making efforts to eliminate them with both short and long term strategies. Short term strategies are designed to deal with the terrorists directly either individually or collectively. An attack has to be responded in one form or the other. No country can afford to have its writ challenged by a NGO groups even though they may have been aided and supported by external elements. An individual country's military response is directly linked with its capability and appropriate trainings. As far as the collective approach is concerned perhaps the most important aspect in order to have an effective counter terrorism strategy is a better understanding of partners' motivation followed by a reasonable level of trust. Intelligence sharing, equipping the partner with necessary technology, sparing more troops for the job, effective coordination, and undertaking decisive strikes are some of the tools deemed essential for collective approach. Winning the hearts and minds along with well thought out economic and social development plans for the area people are part of the long term strategy.

**Pakistan's Contributions:** Any objective assessment of the contributions made towards combating terrorism would singularly place Pakistan right on top of the list. Once Pakistan decided to join the international coalition against terrorism, it went out of the way to cooperate in order to facilitate the collective efforts aimed to eliminate this menace. Undoubtedly some members of the international coalition paid nothing more than a lip service. In fact some even used the coalition to secure their own agenda by projecting and portraying indigenous freedom struggle as a terrorist movement. Despite such behavior, the coalition has not only survived but has also moved ahead but with a limited success.

Pakistan's efforts to curb terrorism pre-date the Sept 11 attacks and in this regard the government of Pakistan has undertaken several political, legislative and administrative measures.

**1. Cooperation with the UN:** Pakistan has followed all measures taken by the UN resolutions in controlling terrorism, e.g. it is a signatory to 10 out of 12 UN anti-terrorist conventions on suppression of terrorism bombings and signed OIC Convention on combating of international terrorism.

**2. Employment of Pakistani troops:** Pakistan has dispatched almost 120,000 troops to the tribal regions — an area where no Pakistani and earlier British troops during pre-partitioned India had ever ventured. Moreover nearly 100 check posts have been set up to monitor border traffic with Afghanistan and to effectively check the infiltration. The area is highly underdeveloped and has a tricky mountainous terrain with poor infrastructure. Federally Administered Tribal Agencies (FATA) consists of seven tribal agencies, of which South and North Waziristan was the scene of many armed clashes between government and terrorists since 2003.

**3. Apprehending and Killing of Al-Qaeda Terrorists:** By 2005 Pakistan had broken the vertical and horizontal linkages of Al-Qaeda and it virtually ceased to exist as a homogenous body capable of well-commanded, well organized operations, although individuals and groups keep on operating. Pakistan has been able to apprehend nearly 700 Al-Qaeda terrorists, deported some of them, killed 270 and wounded about 600 from its own territory.<sup>xvi</sup> While this has not only helped in weakening its leadership, it has certainly provided invaluable information in nabbing others.

**4. Rooting out Foreign Militants:** There seems to be some welcome development in some parts of Tribal areas South where some local tribal leaders are pitting themselves against foreign militants. It has vindicated the much-publicized truce between local tribesman and the government in North Waziristan that resulted in the peace agreement of September 25, 2006. The government authorities agreed to stop air and ground operations, return their weapons and materials seized; restore their privileges and remove military check posts in the area.

A similar agreement was signed in Wana about two years in South Waziristan but did not work. However later, tribal fighting had taken a new direction, where some local tribesmen of South Waziristan had turned against their foreigner compatriots, mostly Uzbeks. The March 2007 clashes had resulted in the death of nearly 150 foreign militants— mostly Uzbeks. This was the second time in that month that Uzbeks, supported by Waziri Yargulkhel had clashed with Zallikhels and Tojikhels, the sub-tribes of Waziris.

Most of the foreign militants, who came and settled into tribal regions in the wake of 9/11, were Uzbeks, Arabs, and Chechnyans. They got settled here with the consent of local tribal people through tribal hospitality, bonds of religion, intermarriages and the Jihadi cause. Their number ranges from 2,000 to 10,000, although the former may be a correct estimate.

**5. Sharing of Vital Intelligence:** Through sharing of vital intelligence with many countries, Pakistan has also been able to prevent attacks against other countries. In late August 2006 it extended important help by providing relevant information to UK government which in turn facilitated preemptive actions against some terrorists for using chemical explosives in passenger aircraft.

**6. Banning of Extremist Religious Organizations:** Pakistan has banned religious organizations and is taking steps not to let them re-emerge under different names, to collect open donations for Jihadi activities.<sup>xvii</sup> In fact some of these organizations were already regarded as a menace and were banned before 9/11 in February 2001.

**7. Instituting Madrassah reforms:** Madraasah reforms have been instituted, their registration done and educational syllabi revised and updated. However all Madrasshas, approximately 14,000 with one million poor students are not involved in terrorist activities. As NGOs they provide boarding, lodging and basic education to the very poor sections of society.<sup>xviii</sup> However Madrassah education needs to be modernized as it was also responsible for spawning sectarian hatred and in some cases militancy. Nearly five Waqfs who control these Madrassahs are in contact with the government and they have agreed to effect curriculum changes which would incorporate modern subjects like mathematic, science and computers etc.

**8. Ban on Hate Literature:** Banning of hateful religious publications has been done. This included 22 magazines, pamphlets and handbills and use of loudspeakers for fanning religious hatred. This ban is to curb sectarian terrorism that has been plaguing some sections of the society. A ban has also been imposed on use of mosque loud speakers for inciting sectarian hatred. Moreover at domestic level, Anti-Terrorism act, Anti-Terrorism Courts, de-weaponization drive, training and equipping of anti-terrorist police squads, establishment of a crisis management cell and educational programs in press and electronic media against extremism were undertaken. Admittedly, these measures are going to take time and need vigorous implementation.

**9. Syllabus Reform:** Text book reforms are well underway that will try to address extreme versions of events and history of Pakistan which means revisiting history specifically in contentious areas. It is going to take time for implementation.

**10. Setting up of Tripartite Commission:** Another contribution to war on terrorism is being part of Tripartite Commission comprising senior military representatives from Afghanistan, Pakistan and NATO's ISAF in Afghanistan. It regularly meets to review border security, intelligence sharing and how to deal with improvised explosives devices issues.

**11. Proposal for Fencing and Mining of Borders:** Pakistani authorities have repeatedly proposed and often reiterated the fencing and mining of the Pak-Afghan border to curb any militants' movement across the Pak-Afghan border. However President Karazai did not respond positively to the suggestion. In an interview, President Musharraf said that the base of terrorism lies in Afghanistan where five Taliban commanders control. In his

opinion, Pakistan was unnecessarily made a “scapegoat” for the Afghan government’s own shortcomings and failure.<sup>xix</sup> Earlier, Pakistan had proposed joint *Jirgas* of elders in the border regions to check any illegal movement.

**12. Anti-Terrorist Pacts and Extradition Treaties:** Pakistan has concluded anti-terrorist pacts with nearly 27 countries including Middle East countries. Pakistan has also joined SCO as observer member, and concluded treaties with some Central Asian states and Australia, a leading actor in fight against international terrorism; it has also signed agreements for exchange of information and intelligence, joint training, and capacity building.<sup>xx</sup>

**13. Promoting Islamic Renaissance:** As a long-term measure, Pakistan desires to play a leading role in Muslim Renaissance and has been periodically inviting eminent Islamic scholars to ponder over the real teachings and values of Islam. Inter-faith dialogue and policies of “enlightened moderation” are other measures to foster positive and benign image of Islam and diffuse extremism and terrorism. The recent Conference on Interfaith Dialogue that was called at the behest of Saudi King could further facilitate Pakistani efforts.

**14. President Musharraf’s Commitment:** At every national forum the former President Musharraf was at pains to alert and exhort Pakistanis to the dangers that extremism and terrorism pose to the unity of Pakistani state and the Islamic world. He often appealed to the moderate, silent majority of the Pakistanis to rise up and strengthen his hands against the obscurantist and regressive forces.<sup>xxi</sup> At the international gatherings, he also repeatedly stressed that terrorism is antithetical to the peaceful and noble teachings of Islam. It is, according to him, the outcome of the root cause of the unresolved disputes such as Kashmir, Palestine, Iraq and others.<sup>1</sup>

**15. Prime Minister’s Gilani’s Commitment:** The incumbent Prime Minister Gilani in an article categorically stated in April 2008 that his government would vigorously continue the war against terrorism. ‘Our strategy against global terrorism will be multifaceted. We will combine the use of force against terrorist and civil dialogue with those who, because of religious or ethnic considerations, were misled into supporting extremism’<sup>xxii</sup>

**16. Parliamentary Resolution:** In October 2008 a consensus resolution was passed in the joint sitting of Parliament which once again reiterated Pakistan’s determination to stamp out the menace of extremism, militancy and terrorism in all forms and manifestations that pose great danger to the stability and integrity of nation state.<sup>xxiii</sup>

## V

**Concluding Remarks:** So far what has been demonstrated clearly indicates that nations are defining terrorism in accordance with their own policy pursuits. Selective approaches towards the problem of defining terrorism as well as handling it are gaining more popularity than a collectively agreed definition and strategy to tackle terrorism.

Those nations that are involved in suppressing the freedom movements tend to project them as terrorism despite the fact that they know that some freedom movements have already been universally recognized even by the United Nations.

Undoubtedly the war against terrorism should not have started before making a clear distinction between a genuine political movement or a genuine freedom struggle and terrorism. Most of the existing political movements and freedom struggles have a long history. None of them started in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. What is perhaps intriguing is that these freedom movements are gaining momentum in democratic countries and the authorities in these democracies are employing state terrorism as an instrument of state policy. The Kashmiris and the Palestinians freedom struggles are too well known to be dubbed as terrorist movements.

Both the Kashmir dispute and the Palestine question started in 1947 and 1948 respectively. Both the Kashmiri people and the Palestinians are deeply engaged in securing freedom for their country. In case of Kashmir, the Indians cleverly devised policies to delay its resolution despite its governments have repeatedly and regularly pledged to hold plebiscite. Denying their legitimate right of self determination that has been acknowledged by the United Nations has tremendously influenced the Kashmiri's resolve to carry on with their struggle. To attribute the continuity of Kashmiri freedom struggle to what the Indians are regularly over-projecting as the terrorist's activities is nothing but another Indian attempt to dupe the international community. Despite being fully conversant with the real nature of Kashmiri struggle, the Indian efforts to confront the international community with a totally distorted picture is understandable provided one is reasonably familiar with India's long term objectives and periodically employed short term tactics. But what is indeed disappointing is that how easily the Indians are able to dupe many in the west. Either they are so gullible that they easily fall prey to Indian propaganda techniques or they deliberately generate this kind of impression because of other important considerations.

Similarly the Palestinians question cannot be treated as a case of terrorism. Israel's illegal occupation of Palestinian land has in fact strengthened Palestinians determination to carry on the struggle. The way the Israelis have killed innocent civilians including children, women and elderly Palestinians must put every humane individual to shame. Yet the guardians of peace and security seemed to have opted for tolerating the Israeli versions. What they need to recognize is that implicitly and inadvertently they are sanctifying Hitler's methods for elimination of all those who do not comply with the wishes of the incumbent regime.

The international community should work towards the elimination of all forms of terrorism and must opt for realistic approaches. Suppressive tactics to crush freedom struggles are unlikely to pay the desired dividends. On the contrary, the employment of strong-arm tactics is more prone to generate stronger violent reactions than to facilitate the advent of peace. It is imperative to influence all those states that are indulging in state sponsored terrorism to opt for a more humane and constructive approach.

Perhaps the approaches that can pay dividends are either a collective regional approach or an international collective effort. Both may produce the desired results if pursued with sincerity and honestly.

## Notes

---

<sup>i</sup> Weinberg, Leonard B and Davies, Paul, **Introduction to Political terrorism**, McGraw-Hill, Inc., USA, pp.1-17.

<sup>ii</sup> See Stern, Jessica, **The Ultimate Terrorist**, (Harvard University Press, USA, 200), pp.11-30.

<sup>iii</sup> Ibid.

<sup>iv</sup> See 'The Wrong War' by Grenville Byford in **Foreign Affairs**, Vol81, July-Aug. 2002, and pp. 34-43.

<sup>v</sup> See Patterns of Global terrorism, **Department of State**, April 1997, p.vi. Also see Stern, **Op. Cit.**, pp. 11-30. Also See 'Identifying a terrorist state' by Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema in **The News**, March 30, 2003.

<sup>vi</sup> See CIA definition of terrorism in 'The War on Terrorism',

<http://www.cia.gov/terrorism/faqs.html>

<sup>vii</sup> For details see 'International Laws to Control Terrorism: A Comparative Study' by Dr. S. Sanyal in **AAKROSH**, Vol7, No.22, Jan. 2004, pp.51-69

<sup>viii</sup> 'On Defining Terrorism and other Matters' by Kallopi Koufa in **Encyclopedia of International Terrorism** edited by Verinder Grover, Vol.1, (Deep & Deep Publications PVT.LTD., New Delhi, India, 2002), pp.9-13.

<sup>ix</sup> See 'From deterrence to pre-emption: The US military after 9/11' by Paul Rogers <http://www.opendemocracy.net/articles/view> PopUpArticle.jsp?id+2&articleId+142

<sup>x</sup> ibid

<sup>xi</sup> ibid

<sup>xii</sup> ibid

<sup>xiii</sup> For details see 'The Impact of Afghan War on Pakistan' by Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema, in **Pakistan Horizon**, Vol. XLI, Jan.1988, pp.23-45.

<sup>xiv</sup> **The Nation**, Nov.14, 2008.

<sup>xv</sup> See **Daily Times**, Nov.14, 2008.

<sup>xvi</sup> See Amb (rtd) Tayyab Siddiqui 'Terrorists and madrasses', in **The Post**, 18<sup>th</sup> October 2005.

<sup>xvii</sup> President Musharraf in an address to the Nation banned the leading extremist religious organizations on Jan.12, 2002. For details see the full address in **IPRI Journal**, Vol.II, No.2, Summer 2002, pp.97-105.

---

<sup>xviii</sup> See Pervez Musharraf **In the Line of Fire: A Memoir** , (London: Simon and Schuster5, 2006), pp.318-21.

<sup>xix</sup> See ‘Survival of Taliban: Musharraf says fault lies with Afghanistan’ in Daily Times, 15<sup>th</sup> November, 2006.

<sup>xx</sup> See ‘Pakistan, Australia ink counter terrorism pact’ in The Nation, June 16, 2005.

<sup>xxi</sup> Extracts of President Muaharraf’s address to the Nation as cited in ‘ Musharraf finds kind words for PPP’ in **Dawn**, November 16, 2006

<sup>xxii</sup> See **The Washington Post**, April 30, 2008.

<sup>xxiii</sup> For details see **The News**, October 23, 2008.