INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW

MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Follow this and additional works at: https://www.ijlmh.com/

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (https://www.vidhiaagaz.com/)

In case of **any suggestions or complaints**, kindly contact **Gyan@vidhiaagaz.com**.

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript to **submission@ijlmh.com.**

Terrorism in India: A Study with Specific Reference to Human Rights

VEDIKA YADAV[1], ABHIRANJAN DIXIT[2] AND POONAM RAWAT[3]

ABSTRACT

India, a country that is characterized by its wide range of differences, it has an intricate dilemma, know: finding a middle ground between ensuring safety and protecting the basic entitlements of its people in the battle against terrorism. This complex problem arises from multiple origins, such as Kashmiri secession, religious fanaticism, and left-wing insurgency. While prioritizing public safety is of the utmost importance, counter-terrorism efforts have sparked apprehensions over potential infringements on human rights. The UAPA and similar laws have faced criticism due to its capacity to facilitate arbitrary detentions, and discriminatory profiling, right? This article examines the intricate task that India must be undertaking in order to maintain a fragile equilibrium. The statement underscores the importance of strong legal structures, transparent inquiries, involvement of the community, and a vigilant judiciary in addressing terrorism while upholding human rights, you see. International collaboration and tackling the underlying factors of terrorism are also vital components. India has the potential to become a global leader in addressing this worldwide problem by giving equal importance to security and human rights, like totally.

Keywords: Terrorism, Religious fanaticism, Entrenched Problem.

I. INTRODUCTION

Terrorism permeates the fabric of Indian society, contrasting with the vivid tapestry of its democracy. Violence looms ominously over the snowy mountains of Kashmir and the busy cities. Nevertheless, the task of combating this threat poses a formidable difficulty: balancing the preservation of national security with the protection of the fundamental liberties that characterize a democratic society. This essay explores the complex balancing act that India undertakes, managing the imperative of public safety while safeguarding the fundamental rights of its residents. Multiple reasons contribute to this intricate situation, including the enduring conflict over Kashmir, the increasing prevalence of religious fanaticism on both sides, and the underlying dissatisfaction of left-wing movements. Although it is undeniable that strong security measures are essential, their execution has sparked worries over potential infringements

---

on human rights. This part will analyses the difficulties and worries that emerge in this intricate process of finding a balance, examining the concerns related to counter-terrorism laws, the possibility of discriminatory actions, and the accusations of human rights violations by security personnel. Furthermore, we will analyses the challenges in efficiently countering terrorism while simultaneously tackling the underlying factors that contribute to its escalation. By recognizing these difficulties, we may establish the path for a more sophisticated comprehension of India's battle against terrorism and examine possible resolutions that give importance to both security and fundamental rights.[4] Terrorism, which refers to the deliberate utilization of violence or intimidation with the purpose of attaining political objectives, has had a significant impact on India. From the devastating Mumbai attacks of 2008 to the current conflict in Kashmir, these acts cause great human misery and damage the fundamental structure of society. Nevertheless, the battle against terrorism poses an intricate quandary: guaranteeing the safety of the country's inhabitants while maintaining their fundamental liberties. The purpose of this article is to provide clarity on this crucial matter. The article will analyze the difficulties and worries that emerge in India's intricate process of maintaining a fragile equilibrium. We will examine the issues related to counter-terrorism legislation, the possibility of discriminatory practices, and the accusations of human rights violations by security forces. In addition, we will analyze the challenges in effectively countering terrorism while simultaneously addressing the underlying factors that contribute to its escalation. By recognizing these difficulties, we may facilitate a more sophisticated comprehension of India's efforts to combat terrorism and examine possible resolutions that priorities both security and fundamental rights. In essence, the objective is to discover a course of action that enables India to completely overcome the problem of terrorism while being committed to its democratic principles. This article examines the complex problem of terrorism in India, investigating its underlying roots, the impact on human rights, and the difficulties in finding a sustainable equilibrium between security and justice.

II. THE 20TH CENTURY: A CENTURY OF TERROR

World Wars and Anti-Colonial Struggles: The 20th century witnessed a dramatic escalation in terrorism. World Wars I and II saw widespread violence and state-sponsored terrorism. Anti-colonial struggles in Asia and Africa often employed violent tactics to achieve independence.

Ideological Extremism: The rise of totalitarian ideologies like fascism and communism led to state-sponsored violence and terrorism. The Cold War further fueled political violence and

---

[4] Richard English, Terrorism: How to respond, Oxford University Press, 2009.

proxy wars across the globe.

Rise of Modern Terrorism: The latter half of the 20th century saw the emergence of modern terrorist groups with global reach. Groups like the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) and the Red Brigades in Italy used violence to achieve political goals and stuff. They were involved in violent acts and terrorism and stuff and all that, you know, and like, terrorism was like, so bad, and yeah**.**

Just like, a bunch of violence and terrorism was happening, you know, because of ideologies and like, wars and stuff, and yeah. Lots of violence and all that jazz and stuff like that, you know. Terrorism was kind of a big deal and like, everyone was involved in it and stuff, you know. Violence and stuff was crazy, right!?! Lots of bad things happened because of it, you know.

(A) The 21ˢᵗ Century and the Rise of Global Terrorism

The 9/11 Attacks and the War on Terror: The events that occurred on September 11th, 2001, were a significant milestone. Al-Qaeda's emergence and the ensuing War on Terror exerted significant influence over worldwide security matters for an extended period of time. Emerging Types of Terrorism: New forms of terrorism have emerged in the 21st century. Unaffiliated individuals who are often influenced by radical views but do not have formal connections to established organizations' have emerged as an increasing danger. The utilization of the internet for the dissemination of propaganda and the recruitment of individuals has presented novel obstacles.

III. THE HUMAN RIGHTS COST OF COUNTER-TERRORISM

The Indian government's counterterrorism initiatives have garnered attention for their potential violations of human rights. The Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act (UAPA) has faced criticism due to its provision of broad powers to the police, allowing them to arrest and imprison individuals without adhering to normal legal procedures. Concerns have arisen over the claimed utilization of torture, arbitrary detentions, and enacted encounters (extrajudicial murders) by the security forces, particularly in regions with heightened security measures such as Jammu and Kashmir. These actions have raised concerns about the erosion of basic rights. Furthermore, engaging in discrimination against individuals on the basis of their religion or ethnicity might intensify the marginalization faced by particular communities.[5] A major issue revolves around the UAPA's provision that grants the police the authority to carry out arrests and detentions with

---

[5] Brogan and others v. United Kingdom 1999

limited legal supervision. This has a direct impact on the rights of individuals and presents potential hazards to their liberties. The fears have been exacerbated by accusations of torture and orchestrated confrontations. Human rights organizations have expressed concern over the behavior of security personnel in certain places.

(A) Roots of Discontent: Why Terrorism Takes Root

Gaining insight into the determinants that prompt individuals or collectives to engage in terrorism is essential for devising efficacious counter-terrorism tactics. Terrorism in India has complex and interconnected roots. Socio-economic disparity refers to the unequal distribution of wealth, resources, and opportunities within a society. This can lead to poverty, high unemployment rates, and limited access to education and opportunities, which in turn can result in feelings of pessimism and social isolation. This fosters animosity towards the government and renders individuals more vulnerable to extreme ideologies that pledge a profound transformation. The reports published by the National Human Rights Commission of India (NHRC) consistently emphasis the connection between socio-economic marginalization and susceptibility to radicalization. Political grievances such as historical injustices, political disenfranchisement, and separatist aspirations can also serve as contributing factors to terrorism. Factions within India, such as those in Kashmir advocating for self-determination, experience marginalization from the political framework and employ violent means to express their frustrations. Religious extremism: Religion, when used, can become a powerful instrument for justifying violence. Radical readings of the scriptures, combined with interfaith conflicts and a feeling of religious victimization, can foster an atmosphere that is favorable to terrorism.

(B) The Human Cost of Terror: Shattered Lives and Lost Potential

The impact of terrorism on human rights is undeniable. Loss of Life: Innocent civilians, including women and children, often bear the brunt of terrorist attacks. These acts result in a significant loss of life, leaving families shattered and communities devastated. Fear and Insecurity: Terrorist attacks create a climate of fear and paranoia, disrupting everyday life. People become hesitant to travel or congregate in public spaces, hindering economic activity and social interaction.

Disruption of Livelihoods: Terrorist attacks often target infrastructure and public spaces, disrupting economic activity and livelihoods. Reduced tourism, damaged businesses, and job losses can have a cascading effect on entire communities.

Erosion of Trust: Terrorist attacks can also erode trust between communities and between citizens and the government. Profiling based on religion or ethnicity during counter-terrorism

operations can further alienate communities and create a sense of injustice.

IV. ANTI-TERRORISM LEGISLATION: A DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD IN INDIA'S FIGHT

India's legislative arsenal against terrorism comprises a complex web of laws with the noble aim of safeguarding national security. However, these laws often find themselves at the center of heated debate, raising concerns about their potential to infringe upon fundamental human rights.

(A) The Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act (UAPA) was enacted in 1967

This legislation grants the government the authority to classify an organization as "unlawful" if it determines that it is engaged in actions that pose a threat to the unity, integrity, or security of India. Although the UAPA is essential for addressing terrorist groups, it faces criticism due to its expansive interpretations of "unlawful activities" and "terrorist organization.[6]" This lack of clarity can result in the arbitrary categorization of individuals and the violation of their rights to freedom of speech and assembly. In addition, the UAPA permits the detention of individuals without a trial for a maximum period of 180 days, which gives rise to concerns over the protection of due process and the possibility of authorities abusing their power.

The act empowers the Indian government to designate an organization as "unlawful" if it deems it is involved in activities which are threatening India's unity, integrity, and security.

UAPA grants broad powers to authorities for arresting and detaining suspected terrorists. It allows for detentions without trials for up to 180 days, which can be further extended with the court's approval

Search and Seizure

The act allows for searches and seizures without a warrant under specific circumstances related to suspected terrorist activity! It's important to remember the necessity of securing our nation's safety from any potential threats. It's a crucial responsibility that must not be underestimated.

Overbroad Definitions: argue that the act's definitions of "unlawful activities" and "terrorist organization" are overly broad and ambiguous. This ambiguity, like, creates a risk of misuse and possibility for designating legitimate organizations as unlawful, you know, based on political dissent or affiliation with certain ideologies. This is kind of a problem because it can lead to unfair targeting and negative implications.

Due Process Concerns: The super extended period of detention without trial raises some real

---

[6] See E. Herman and G.O' Sullivan, The Terrorism Industry: The Experts and Institutions that Shape our view of Terror, New York, Pantheon Books, 1989

concerns about due process rights. Critics argue that this provision allows for, like, like prolonged arbitrary detention, thereby violating the right to a speedy trial. It's not cool, you know.

Discriminatory Profiling: There's been some talk about allegations of discriminatory profiling based on religion or ethnicity concerning arrests and detentions under UAPA. Critics argue that the act disproportionately targets Muslim communities, fostering alienation and mistrust, which is majorly not okay.

Lack of Judicial Oversight: The act grants some seriously powerful powers to, like, executive authorities, with somewhat limited judicial oversight during the investigation stage. This lack of oversight raises concerns about maybe possible abuse of power and like, violating fundamental rights! Such issues, like, should be addressed and corrected for proper justice

(B) The Prevention of Terrorism Act (POTA) was enacted in 2002.

POTA, enacted in response to the 9/11 attacks and the Parliament attack in Delhi, provided law enforcement agencies with extensive authority to make arrests, detain individuals, and conduct investigations. Nevertheless, the legislation received harsh condemnation due to its oppressive aspects, such as the acceptance of coerced confessions as valid evidence. Moreover, there were complaints over its biased implementation, with a disproportionate focus on Muslim neighborhoods. As a result of these problems, the POTA was revoked in 2004.

The Prevention of Terrorism Act (POTA) bestowed extensive powers upon law enforcement authorities, enabling them to arrest and detain individuals with enhanced authority. Police officers have the authority to apprehend individuals believed to be involved in acts of terrorism without the need for a warrant. These individuals can be held in custody for a maximum period of 90 days, which can be extended for an additional 180 days with the agreement of a court.

Confessions and Evidence: Confessions given to a police officer, even if gained by coercion, were acceptable as evidence in court. This provision has generated concerns over the possibility of obtaining forced confessions and undermining the right to a fair trial.

Bail restrictions: The Prevention of Terrorism Act (POTA) has substantially increased the difficulty for anyone accused under the act to get bail. This imposed a significant onus on the defendant to establish their innocence prior to the trial.

Designation of Terrorist Organizations': Like the UAPA, POTA granted the government the authority to classify organization's as "terrorist" if they were found to be engaged in activities that posed a threat to India's security.

Criticism of POTA

The act's extensive authority for apprehension, confinement, and restricted bail terms were perceived as draconian and susceptible to possible abuse. Critics contended that it fostered an atmosphere of apprehension and had the potential to selectively single out political dissidents or marginalized communities. The erosion of due process is evident in the debate around the admissibility of coerced confessions and the restrictions placed on bail rights, which have generated concerns regarding the extent to which due process is being followed. The application of POTA was discriminatory as it disproportionately targeted Muslim populations, exacerbating their marginalization and fostering discontent. The absence of judicial control in the act has given law enforcement agencies substantial authority, but with less scrutiny from the judiciary. This has led to worries regarding the lack of responsibility for possible misconduct.

(C) The National Investigation Agency Act of 2008.

The National Investigation body (NIA) was founded by this legislation as the primary body tasked with investigating and prosecuting offences related to terrorism. Although the NIA's centralized strategy is intended to enhance investigation efficiency, there are still concerns about its ability to circumvent state-level supervision procedures.

Key Features of NIA

The NIA is a federal organization that has authority over the entire nation and operates as a centralized investigative body. It has the authority to assume control of investigations from state police units and conduct investigations into acts of terrorism that occur across state borders without requiring their previous consent. The objective is to address jurisdictional obstacles and enhance coordination in investigations.

Specialization and Expertise: The NIA consists of personnel who have undergone specialized training and possess extensive expertise in conducting counter-terrorism investigations. This expertise is designed to improve the efficiency of investigations.

Expanded Authority: The NIA legislation bestows upon the agency extensive powers to carry out searches, seizures, arrests, and interrogations. This enhances the ability to conduct more resilient investigations.

The legislation establishes specialized courts to expedite the trial process for crimes that are probed by the National Investigation Agency (NIA). The objective is to accelerate the legal proceedings for terrorism cases.

Criticism of NIA

Centralization and Federalism Concerns: There are arguments suggesting that the centralized approach of the NIA diminishes the authority of state police forces and intrudes upon their jurisdiction. This can lead to conflicts between federal and state authorities. The absence of independent monitoring is evident in the act, since it bestows the NIA with substantial powers but provides only minimal channels for independent scrutiny. Detractors contend that this can result in possible instances of power abuse and infringements of human rights. The NIA prioritizes investigation above prevention, with a primary focus on examining previous acts of terrorism rather than implementing measures to address the underlying causes of terrorism. Potential for Misuse: The extensive authorities bestowed upon the NIA give rise to apprehensions over the possibility of misusing these powers to selectively target persons or groups on the basis of their religion or ethnicity.

V. CHALLENGES AND CONCERNS: STRIKING THE RIGHT BALANCE IN INDIA'S FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM

India's endeavor to combat terrorism poses a multifaceted dilemma - balancing the imperative of national security with the protection of its citizens' fundamental rights. This section will explore in greater detail the particular difficulties and anxieties that emerge while trying to achieve this intricate equilibrium. The inclusion of provisions that permit prolonged imprisonment without a trial and the acceptance of coerced confessions give rise to significant apprehensions over the preservation of due process rights.

(A) Investigation Procedure:

Transparency and accountability are crucial, as it is imperative to strictly comply to legal procedures throughout investigations. This encompasses explicit protocols for the gathering of evidence, methods of questioning, and safeguarding of witnesses. Independent oversight systems can enhance openness and enforce accountability for any wrongdoing by authority. Ensuring the Protection of Human Rights: It is imperative to provide specialized training to investigative agencies to ensure the preservation and enforcement of fundamental rights. This encompasses the prohibition of torture, unlawful detentions, and pressured confessions. It is essential to establish explicit protocols for managing confidential data and upholding personal privacy. Community Engagement: Establishing trust with communities is crucial for conducting investigations successfully. Engaging proactively with local residents can facilitate the collection of vital information and promote collaboration.

Strengthening the Legal Frame Work

Revisions to counter-terrorism laws such as UAPA are necessary to provide precise definitions of "unlawful activities" and "terrorist organization." This minimizes uncertainty and safeguards against the misapplication of these rules to single out individuals or communities on the basis of their religion or ethnicity. Due process guarantees should clearly ensure the rights of suspects, such as the right to legal representation, prompt trials, and the ability to submit a defense. Imposing restrictions on holding individuals in custody without a trial and guaranteeing that protracted detentions are subject to court supervision are essential measures to protect against abuse of power. Proportionality: Counter-terrorism measures should be commensurate with the magnitude of the threat they are intended to mitigate. Excessive force or intrusive surveillance measures should only be utilized in rare situations with appropriate court authorization.

(B) **Role of the Judiciary:**

The Indian court plays a crucial role in safeguarding fundamental rights and acting as a check on the power of the executive branch. Engaging in proactive efforts to confront and combat discriminatory behaviors, as well as guaranteeing expeditious legal proceedings for individuals accused of terrorism, are crucial responsibilities. The judiciary has the authority to assess the constitutionality of counter-terrorism measures and verify their adherence to both the Indian constitution and international human rights legislation. This autonomous evaluation acts as a crucial measure to prevent possible instances of misconduct. An authoritative and autonomous court cultivates public confidence in the legal system. Ensuring fair and unbiased trials, including for individuals accused of terrorism, is essential for upholding the credibility of counterterrorism efforts.

(C) **Role of the Media:**

Investigative journalism is essential for uncovering human rights abuses and ensuring that those in power are held responsible for their actions. Investigative journalism has the ability to illuminate possible instances of misconduct that may occur during investigations or detentions. Responsible Reporting: Nevertheless, it is the duty of media organizations to provide factual information and refrain from sensationalizing. It is crucial to engage in sensitive reporting that refrains from inciting violence or exacerbating community tensions when covering acts of terrorism.

Facilitating Public Discourse: The media has the potential to actively encourage and support discussions among the public regarding the fundamental reasons behind terrorism and the significance of safeguarding human rights. Facilitating interfaith comprehension and

establishing an environment that welcomes a variety of perspectives can foster a society that is more harmonious and all-encompassing.

India may achieve a more balanced approach to counter-terrorism by enhancing these four key elements: investigation procedures, legislative frameworks, an autonomous judiciary, and a responsible media. This method can efficiently mitigate the menace of terrorism while simultaneously safeguarding the fundamental rights and liberties that form the foundation of a robust democracy.

(D) Obstacles in Maintaining Human Rights:

Overly expansive counter-terrorism laws, such as the UAPA, provide extensive authority to government bodies, giving rise to apprehensions over possible abuse and infringements of procedural rights. The absence of legal proceedings and the absence of judicial supervision create a setting conducive to violations of human rights. Discriminatory Practices: Security measures frequently exhibit a disproportionate focus on particular populations, mostly determined by their religion or ethnicity, resulting in feelings of isolation and exclusion. The relationship between security forces and human rights violations: The presence of torture, arbitrary detentions, and extrajudicial executions perpetrated by security agents erode confidence in the system and foster an atmosphere of intimidation.

(E) Challenges in Ensuring Effective Counter-Terrorism

The underlying factors that contribute to terrorism, such as social, economic, and political problems, cannot be effectively addressed just by security measures. Resolving these issues demands long-term solutions.

Countering the dissemination of extremist material, both online and offline, is essential in the effort to avoid radicalization and recruitment, especially among young people. Effective international collaboration is necessary to disrupt the activities of terrorist groups that have safe havens in neighboring nations. Effective counter-terrorism necessitates the implementation of a strong intelligence collection and sharing system among various authorities at the national, state, and local levels. The process of simplifying information sharing and breaking down bureaucratic silos has many challenges. India's extensive borders present a formidable challenge in terms of thwarting the infiltration of terrorist organizations'. Enhancing border security measures, in conjunction with international collaboration, is imperative. Capacity building is crucial for providing law enforcement and security agencies with the essential training, skills, and equipment needed to effectively confront terrorism. Human rights concerns arise when counter-terrorism efforts have the potential to violate the rights of individuals, which can in turn

erode public trust and cooperation. It is crucial to achieve a harmonious equilibrium between security and individual rights.

Challenges in Social Sphere. The internet and social media platforms are increasingly utilized by terrorist groups for the dissemination of propaganda and the recruitment of individuals, leading to online radicalization. Developing creative techniques is necessary to counter internet radicalization while ensuring freedom of expression is not violated.

Community engagement is crucial in preventing the formation of extremist ideologies, as alienation and distrust among different communities can foster an environment conducive to radicalization. Establishing connections between communities and cultivating confidence in the government is essential for the successful implementation of counter-terrorism measures. The media has a crucial function in influencing public perception. It is crucial to engage in responsible journalism that refrains from sensationalism and instead fosters societal cohesion.

(F) **Striking the Right Balance**:

Legal Reforms: It is crucial to revise counter-terrorism laws in order to guarantee compliance with due process, judicial monitoring, and measures to prevent arbitrary detentions. Implementing rigorous investigative protocols with explicit standards and impartial supervision can effectively mitigate human rights abuses and foster public confidence. Community Engagement: By actively encouraging interfaith conversation, tackling social and economic inequities, and cultivating a feeling of inclusiveness, we may effectively combat extremist narratives and build a stronger and more resilient society. The media and civil society have crucial functions in ensuring accountability of authorities and promoting human rights.

VI. RELEVANT CASE LAWS

1. Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab[7] highlighted the need of ensuring due process rights in the context of counter-terrorism investigations.

2. People's Union for Democratic Rights v. Union of India[8] questioned the extensive authority to detain individuals under the UAPA.

3. In the case of National Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Pranay Sethi ,[9] the court confirmed the constitutionality of POTA (Prevention of Terrorism Act), but imposed certain restrictions on its application.

---

[7] Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab AIR1994 SC 330
[8] Peoples Union for Democratic Rights v. Union of India Writ Petition civil NOo.310/2001
[9] National Co. Ltd. v. Pranay Sethi 2003 (6) SCC 681

4. The case of Teesta Setalvad v. Union of India[10] brought attention to the issues surrounding the improper usage of POTA, which ultimately resulted in its repeal.

5. The case of NIA v. Zahoor Ahmad Shah Watali[11] confirmed the authority of the NIA to investigate acts of terrorism that occur in different states.

VII. CONCLUSION

India's battle against terrorism is a multifaceted and unceasing endeavor. While prioritizing public safety is of utmost importance, it is crucial to strike a meticulous balance within a democratic system - protecting national security should not be achieved at the expense of fundamental rights. This article has explored the several complex problems that India encounters in this effort. The origins of terrorism in India are convoluted, encompassing various factors such as socio-economic inequalities and unresolved political issues like the Kashmir dispute, as well as the emergence of religious extremism. In order to effectively combat terrorism, it is necessary to implement strong security measures and also address the root causes of terrorism. The security apparatus has various challenges, including the need to enhance intelligence sharing, bolster border security, and provide law enforcement with the requisite skills. These challenges necessitate ongoing efforts to achieve steady progress. However, guaranteeing security is merely one component of the equation. There are significant worries over the possibility of human rights violations arising from counter-terrorism laws such as UAPA and POTA. The use of too broad definitions, extended detention without a trial, and accusations of biased profiling pose a significant risk to erode public trust and hinder cooperation. Striking a harmonious equilibrium between ensuring security and respecting the rights to due process is crucial for achieving sustainable success in the long run.

*****

---

[10] Teesta Setalvad v. Union of India W.P.(C) 295/2004
[11] NIA v. Zahoor Ahmad Shah Watali (2017) SC 10 1