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This paper describes why the number of Pakistani terrorists and acts of terrorism are on the rise in India and in the United States. By examining the global jihadism movement in Pakistan as an unintended consequence of the Indian Partition, Pakistan can be viewed, as an antacid abstract with few roots, and with it, so is the identity of the Pakistani. Many Pakistanis are looking for what every human being needs: a sense of belonging and identity. For some of them global jihadism is a religious expression of this frustration. By examining terrorism and personality traits of terrorists, this paper suggests that because several Pakistanis have found a sense of belonging within jihadist movements, Pakistani terrorism geared towards the West is likely to increase.
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I. Introduction

This past May, Faisal Shahzad, an American citizen with Pakistani roots, coolly drove a smoking 1993 Nissan Pathfinder SUV and parked it into the heart of Times Square. He had acquired the car just three weeks prior from a craigslist advertisement. The car contained a rifle cabinet packed with more than 45 kilograms of fertilizer. Shahzad left the car running and casually walked out of the vehicle. With thousands of people constantly moving through Times Square it was not long before the vehicle began to worry several people and was quickly reported to the proper authorities. The terror plot to blow up a busy part of Times Square was foiled just in time.

U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder announced the arrestment of Faisal Shahzad a few days following as Shahzad’s plane was cleared for takeoff: “Faisal Shahzad was arrested in connection with the attempted car bombing in New York on Saturday. Mr Shahzad, an American citizen, was taken into custody at JFK Airport in New York as he attempted to board a flight to Dubai,” said Holder in a press conference. Shahzad had returned from a three-week visit to Pakistan, where he reportedly visited his wife and had reportedly been taking part for five months in Pakistan Jihad camps (Weiser, 1).

Though we may never know the true reasons behind Shahzad’s planned attack, there have been several speculations. Firstly, Shahzad’s family, like many other American families, had fallen victim to the economic crisis to hit the United States and the world. He was forced to sell his family’s home and began to rent a
new home. The financial woes of his family may have contributed to his terrorist actions. Shahzad was unable to obtain the “American Dream” of financial stability and prosperity. Were Shahzad’s actions a result of his lack of success living in the United States? The answer is probably not due to the fact that he was able to afford several long trips to Pakistan.

Another likely contributor may have been online radical Muslim lecturers that Shahzad had taken an interest in. Known for his extreme views and criticism of the United States and the west, Anwar al-Awlaki, a Yemeni-American cleric, may have had a lot of influence on Shahzad’s beliefs. Did Shahzad’s dissatisfaction with his financial position ultimately push Shahzad into a path of Muslim extremism?

His inability to successfully assimilate in the United States and radical Muslim teachings probably did fuel Shahzad’s dissatisfaction with his own living situation. However the factor that seemed to have pushed Shahzad over the edge, were his visits to his native homeland of Pakistan. In fact, within a seven-year period, Shahzad had visited the country on ten different occasions. Evidence shows that “Shahzad was outraged by the campaign which the Pakistani army--under intense American pressure--has been waging against militant groups in the tribal areas of northwest Pakistan, flanking Afghanistan... America's drone attacks against Taliban targets in the tribal areas have aroused particular fury, as well as fierce anti-American feeling, because of the civilian casualties they have caused and because they are seen as intolerable infringements of Pakistan’s sovereignty” (Seale, 1). Shahzad was recruited into Tehrik-i-Taliban, one of the many groups operating
under the Taliban. In his time in training he learned how to build a bomb, which he then tried to recreate in Times Square (Wesier, 1). Shahzad tried to seek revenge against the United States, by his planned act of terror (Seale, 1).

Since the initial arrest of Faisal Shahzad, a few others have been arrested in relation to the failed terrorist plot. Shahzad is believed to have ties with the Pakistani Taliban. Though it is still unclear who is responsible for this failed attack, one thing is sure: Terrorism, and specifically terrorism with Pakistani origins, is still a very real threat to the United States and is unlikely to go away any time soon.

As in the United States, Islamic motivated terrorism with links to jihadist groups in Pakistan has hit India and other countries across the globe over the past several years. In November 2008, a series of terrorist attacks were carried out in Mumbai. “Jihadi groups, believed to have been trained and armed by shadowy elements in Pakistan, have mounted numerous attacks against India in the last decade, of which the most spectacular was the November 2008 terrorist attack on Mumbai that killed more than 160 people. Arriving by boat, the commando group attacked a train station, two hotels, a Jewish center and a bar (Seale, 1)”. In response, the United States has been pressuring Pakistan to control their homegrown terrorist cells within their country. Shahzad may have been fighting against the United States demand.

Pakistani terrorists have grown quickly from the local to the global scale. There are three categories of subnational and transnational non-state entities, which can be broken down into the categories of: ethnic, religious and ideological.
These non-state entities “[pursue] interests detrimental to the national interests of the states” they are fighting against (Dekmejan, 1). In the book: Spectrum of Terror, the author, R. Hrair Dekmejian divides political violence into separate categories. Moving from micro to macro political violence there is: Individual terrorism such as assassins and bombers. Next, there is Subnational terrorism, which is classified by ethnic nationalists, religious militants, ideological radicals and hybrid organizations. Moving on, transnational terrorism is defined by terrorist groups that cross boundaries of sovereign states. Pakistani terrorists are quickly moving across the spectrum from the individual to transnational.

Angry and frustrated people have found refuge in the jihad training camps in Pakistan. According to Dekmejan, Subnationalist group’s successes are often dependent on: “(1) the popularity of their cause, (2) the effectiveness of leadership and organization, (3) changes in their objectives, (4) the strategic rationale for violent actions, (5) the nature of state responses ranging from negotiated settlement to repression, mass killing and genocide, and (6) the role of external powers and world conclusions” (Dekmrejan, 12). Pakistanis are still outraged by disputed lands a part of India, and now, by the United State’s latest campaigns.

There are often several contributing factors that motivate individuals or organizations to commit acts of terrorism. An individual or organization’s motivations for terrorism are often influenced by the organization or person’s history. Furthermore, “the time and place in which terrorism occurs are relevant to the motivations behind terrorism for many reasons. The socialization of members of
a society or subgroup with regard to violence and its justification must be considered” (Mahan & Griset, 10). Often there is a “cycle of revenge” where one group retaliates from violence committed against them (Mahan & Griset, 10).

Several other scholars offer other explanations for the motivations behind acts of terrorism. For example, Laurence Miller’s description includes: “a three-stage process. Stage one begins with unacceptable conditions: “It’s not right.” Stage two follows with resentment and a sense of injustice: “It’s not fair.” In stage three the cause of the injustice is personified: “It’s your fault.”” (Mahan & Griset, 10). Though this explanation does not always reign true for the motivations behinds terrorism, it does offer a model that works well for others. Other scholars such as Martha Crenshaw and Jerold M. Post approach the issue of motivations from a psychological perspective. Crenshaw focuses on the psychological forces, which create the motivation for terrorism, while Post focuses on “psycho-logic”, which “is constructed to rationalize acts they are psychologically compelled to commit. Individuals are drawn to the paths of terrorism to commit violence” (Post, 25; Mahan & Griset, 10). Other psychological explanations focus on family background, upbringing, and social structure (Mahan & Griset, 10).

In Terrorism in the Twenty-First Century, Cindy C. Combs identifies group dynamics, religion, age, sex, education, economic status and location to be key contributors to the motivation behind acts of terrorism. Group dynamics “helps to shape terrorist thought and action” (Combs, 61). Usually these groups are fanatical, believing that they know the real truth and only they can change what they perceive
to be not true by violent action. Usually terrorists are motivated more by unfairness than a particular political event (Combs, 61). Group dynamics also contributes to the group’s extremity: “If it is true that the a terrorist’s sense of reality is distorted...then the greater the association the terrorist enjoys with his or her group of fellow terrorists, the greater the distortion will be” (Combs, 61). In other words, an individual’s thoughts and ideas are greatly influenced by that of a group, even more so in the case of a terrorist.

When religion is an added component to the group dynamic, ideas can become even more extreme. When using God as justification, the reality of a situation is slanted. Instead of truly dealing with the present, religion uses the future to deal with the present: “Religious zealots committing acts of terrorism are assured by their religions and its leaders that their acts are acceptable to a higher morality than may currently exist” (Combs, 62). When religion is involved as a source of justification for terrorism, it is more difficult to moderate action with reason, which greatly contributes to a terrorist’s motivation (Combs, 62).

There is reason to believe that terrorism inspired by extremist Muslim rhetoric and stemming from Pakistan is now the greatest threats to India and the United States. However, in order to understand the threat that now faces these countries, one must look into the deeper context of what terrorism is, who is a terrorist and why terrorism occurs. This paper seeks to explain why the number of Pakistani terrorists and acts of terrorism are on the rise by examining the global jihadism movement in Pakistan as an unintended consequence of the Indian
Partition. Pakistan is a invented construct with few roots, and with it, so is the identity of the Pakistani. Pakistanis are looking for what every human being craves: a sense of belonging and identity. Global jihadism is a religious expression of this frustration. With a building pressure on Pakistan from the West, more and more Pakistanis are expressing their feelings of isolation through acts of terrorism.
II. Pakistani Terrorism: It is an Issue of Identity

Terrorism has greatly influenced the development and politics of states. Yet, there is a clear lack of consensus for both a locally and internationally recognized definition of terrorism. Terrorism is a political, legal and military issue and because of its many aspects, “its definition in modern terms has been slow to evolve. Not that there are not numerous definitions available-there are hundreds. But few of them are of sufficient legal scholarship to be useful in international law, and most of those are legally useful lack the necessary ambiguity for political acceptance” (Combs, 8). Within the United States alone, the definition varies from organization to organization.

2.1 Defining Terrorism:

The United States Code, published by the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the U.S. House of Representatives, definition of terrorism states: “as premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetuated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or “clandestine agents” (Title 22, Chapter 38, §2656f ; Mahan & Griset, 3). The Code of Federal Regulations, published by the executive branch agencies of the United States defines terrorism as “the unlawful use of force and violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives”(28, C.F.R. Section 0.85 ; Mahan & Griset, 4). Another definition used by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)) describes terrorism as aggressive actions “ that appear to be intended to intimidate or coerce a civilian population; influence
the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or affect the conduct of the
government by mass destruction, assassination or kidnapping and occur primarily
outside the territorial jurisdiction of the United States or transcend national
boundaries in terms of the means by which they are accomplished, the persons they
appear intended to intimidate or coerce, or the locale in which their perpetrators
operate or seek asylum” (FBI, 2006; Mahan & Griset, 4). Furthermore, a separate
definition exists within the FBI for domestic terrorism (Mahan & Griset, 4). The clear
lack of a concise and national definition of terrorism, within the Untied States, is
worrisome. Living in the United States, terrorism is a very real part of our lives. How
can we know the threat if we do not have one clear definition of it?

Scholars have also contributed to the discussion of defining terrorism. Bruce
Hoffman defines terrorism as “deliberate creation and exploitation of fear through
violence or the threat of violence or the threat of violence in political change”
(Hoffman, 2006, 41; Howard & Sawyer, 2004, 23; Mahan & Griset, 4). Jessica Stern
argues that terrorism is “an act or threat of violence against noncombatants with the
objective of exacting revenge, intimidating, or otherwise influencing an audience”
(2003, p. xx, Mahan & Griset, 4). Another well-known scholar, Walter Laqueur
defines terrorism simply as “the use of covert violence by a group to achieve
political ends” (2001, p. 79; Mahan & Griset, 4). Laquer echoes the opinion of many
of his peers.

R. Hrair Dekmejian’s definition of terrorism is used, which states: “The
strategic use of force or the threat of force, beyond the bounds of international law,
against human and material targets carried out by any individual, subnational group, transnational organization, or state to achieve a political objective in pursuit of its perceived self-interests” (Dekmejian, 20). Political motives, violence or the threat of violence, the ignition of fear in innocent bystanders and acts being directed at a particular audience are all crucial components of Terrorism (Combs, 10).

Several Indian scholars have also added to the definition of terrorism. In the book Terrorism in India, the editor S.C. Tiwari describes terrorism as “generally recognized as a special method of struggle to obtain specific political results and that there are at least five major participants in the process of terror: - (a) the perpetrators of violence; (b) the immediate victims; (c) the wider target group or society which the terrorists seek to intimidate; (d) ‘the neutral’ bystanders within the society experiencing terrorism; and (e) the international public opinion, in so far as it is aware of these events” (Tiwari, xi). He specifically goes on to mention that for an act to be labeled terrorist there needs to be a specific threat of violence and threat to others. The rules of war do not apply to the act, and the act must be done publically in order to gain publicity. In other words it must be a part of specific strategy in order to gain attention from a greater audience (Tiwari, xi). Another contributor in Tiwari’s book is P.D. Sharma who writes that all terrorists “All terrorists primarily aim to arouse the mass of the people to a realization that constituted authority is no longer safely entrenched or unchallenged. The acts may be conceived as an advance notice of what may be expected from mass action. Death and destruction to them are not ‘mere threats’, but a part of programme of action (Sharma, 50). They believe that eventually others will join them in their objectives.
One last academic scholar worthy of note is Eqbal Ahmed, who is a well known and highly acclaimed anti-colonialism scholar, noted that the “terrorist of yesterday is the hero of today, and the hero of yesterday becomes the terrorist of today. This is a serious matter of the constantly changing world of images in which we have to keep our heads straight to know what terrorism is and is not” (Ahmend, 1889, p.20; Mahan & Griset, 4). Ahmed classifies terrorism into five distinct groups: state terrorism, religious terrorism, criminal terrorism political terrorism, and oppositional terrorism, which all use terrorism methods to resist the government (Mahan & Griset, 4). The scholarly definition of “terrorism” continues to vary depending on the background and discipline of the academic.

Terrorism is a crime under international law. Furthermore, being labeled a terrorist has real world consequences for all parties involved. If an organization or individual is labeled a terrorist, the label places negative attributes onto their political ambitions: “Quite simply, freedom fighters could be seen as rebels, extremists or separationists, and a national liberation movements could be described as insurrections depending on perceptions and whether the question is addressed by those who question the regime in power or are sympathetic to the regime in power. Moreover, rebels, extremists or seperationists have been converted to patriots and freedom fighters on the achievement of independence of a country; hence the definitional problem has become more acute in the post-colonial era and in the decades following the Second World War” (Chari, 34). Many times the label of “freedom fighter” and “terrorist” are used on the same individual or organization, bringing even more confusion to the debate (Mahan & Griset, 3).
2.2 The Terrorist Mind: Psychology and Belief

Ideology

Terrorism is often examined through a narrow lens. We look at the act of terrorism, without ever truly examining who is the terrorist. Where does the terrorist come from? What is his or her background? Why did the terrorist commit the act? The mind of the terrorist is vital in understanding terrorism.

There are common traits found in the individuals who commit these types of violent acts. The terrorist feels inferior to his larger enemy, but morally superior. He feels as if he has been wronged and terrorism is a means through which he can retaliate. The act of terrorism is the result of this distaste for the larger enemy. Through terrorist acts, the terrorist believes that they can gain power through the use of fear. Terror gives a feeling of power to the powerless.

There is no real way to understand and predict human behavior. A terrorist act is even harder to understand (Mahan & Griset, 1). The definition is in a constant state of change. It evolves based on the new political situations and the way that nation states and political entities process and respond to these events (Combs, 9). Terrorism is also viewed as a form of political violence and a type of warfare.

Terrorists often use the media to deliver their messages and look to it as a measure of their success: “The act of terror...[is] designed to convey a message to individual target groups and the general population. Political terrorism, therefore, contains an element of theatre. In this manner, the world has been converted into the stage for terrorism’s drama. The principal actors on that stage are the terrorists
and the agencies of the State, with the audience comprising the target groups, the general population and the international community. The audience is equally, if not more important than the actual victims of terrorism” (Chari, 34-35). The ever-increasing amounts of communication technologies widen the stage for terrorist organizations. Television, radio, print media and the Internet bring live coverage of events to viewers across the globe.

For the terrorist, there is usually an ongoing personal struggle. This may include events of embarrassment, repression, or harassment. Secondly, the terrorist is expected to have extreme views and beliefs. His or her beliefs are more extreme than others in his or her situation. Thirdly, for the terrorist there is very little room for flexibility. Events and decisions are seen in terms of black and white. There is a need for responsibility, blame and retaliation. Lastly, a terrorist usually holds “a capacity to suppress all moral constraints against harming innocents whether due to instinct or acquired factors, individuals, or group forces” (Maham & Griset, 11). Beliefs of morality are discarded in order to achieve the act of violence.

Many terrorists experience violence growing up. They often come from marginalized communities, where they feel neglected. Often these areas experience violence, death and destruction as a part of everyday life. They know from firsthand experience that violence hurts those involved. Terrorists believe that if they use violence against their mighty enemy, it will hurt them as well (Ardila, 12). Acts of terror allow individuals who feel wronged to feel powerful through the use of fear (Ardila, 10).
A terrorist’s commitment to his ideology is unbending. There is no room for negotiation or compromise: “In many ways terrorists do not grow, they are stuck in the rut of their unbending ideology. A malignancy of the mind which is the principal comorbid of psychopathology of terror” (Navarro, 25). A terrorist holds onto an unbreakable idea or passion. This indestructible passion is what drives the individual into violence: “To terrorize, a terrorist must have an idea, a thought, a passion, a hatred, an ideology so fixed and rigid, that he can carry out a violent act without reflection, remorse, or hesitation” (Navarro, 26). The idea is set in stone and the terrorist’s mind in unchanging: even hard evidence will fail to impact his core beliefs (Navarro, 26).

Many terrorists also suffer from “Magical Thinking”. They are convinced that “somehow the destruction of that which [they] despise or hate will somehow cure the ills of the world” (Navarro, 34). Their beliefs are set on achieving unrealistic goals and “they see themselves as sacrifices for their deities, and they count on the approval and the backing of their culture. These beliefs give sense to their lives, symbolic forms to achieve immortality through their own deaths” (Ardila, 12).

Hijackings of planes have not stopped people from flying. Terrorist attacks on buses, have not stopped people from taking public transportation. People continue to go to work in lower Manhattan despite the destruction of the World Trade Towers. Americans continue to have presence in the Middle East despite the attempts to get rid of them and India continues to thrive despite terrorist activities in and around its borders.
The rigidity of the terrorist’s ideology ultimately forces the terrorist into seclusion. Family, friends and hobbies are eventually pushed out of the individual’s life because of their greater commitment to their ideology. This leaves the individual further isolated and longing for a group that shares similar interests and beliefs. A group provides “its members the emotion of invulnerability, which ensures them some degree of encouragement for obvious risks of dangers. Additionally, [the group] helps to rationalize the wrong doing and gives morality to its members to justify their selves...[stereotyping allows] members of the group [to] dehumanize their enemies and justify to kill the others in mind” (Navarro, 74). The terrorist’s dissatisfaction with the world around him is advanced by his stubbornness and in his unwillingness and inability to adapt to the conditions that surround him. His unbreakable ideology makes the world and its processes into black and white terms. The group reaffirms the terrorist’s beliefs, isolating the individual further from reality (Navarro, 27).

Take for example, Ramzi Yousef, a conspirator in the 1993 World Trade Center bombings. Yousef’s ideology, stubborn and unchanging and his dissatisfaction for the world around him, made it easy to justify the terrorist attack. Yousef’s beliefs “became unbending road maps or templates to action which [he] pursued without remorse...supremely committed to their respective ideologies, [he] remains defiantly unrepentant” (Navarro, 27). Yousef is clear example of how ideology pushes individuals into extremist measures such as terrorism (Navarro, 28).
**Personality Traits of a Terrorist**

In Eric Hoffer’s “True Believers” mass movement paradigm, he identifies the key members that make up mass movements. Firstly, there are the leaders. The leaders are select in number and are the members of the group who are usually the most educated. These leaders have charisma, a grand vision and a plan of action (Navarro, 28).

These leaders are welcoming to the next category, the follower. The followers seek to fill a missing gap in their lives: “Those who see their lives as wasted and spoiled tend to crave equality, fraternity, and order that comes from mass movements. Terrorist organizations remarkably fill this void” (Navarro, 28). In the study: *Theories of Prism: Individual Capital and Frustration*, the authors find that individuals who turn to terrorism, instead of other methods of confrontation, traditionally come from backgrounds of poverty and lack of education: “violence, terrorism in particular is predominantly an option for the people who have lower social, cultural or economic capital. People who have higher levels of capital would be more likely to follow a different path other than violence” (Gunes & Ozeren, 31). Many scholars have found that terrorists do not do well in school, and have little successes in their careers later on in life. They are usually loners, and outsiders (Navarro, 55). Terrorists feel lost and are on a search for power. They have a deep faith in their ideologies and its potential to lead them to better lives. However, these individuals hardly commit terrorist acts on a transnational level. Most commit acts
of terror locally. Their fame is limited to their immediate area and they are quickly forgotten about.

While an unbending ideology is critical in understanding terrorism, it is important to look at other personality traits of terrorists and terrorist groups. One trait of a terrorist is the ability to view the world in two distinct ways: “Psychological splitting is a “primitive way to look at the world, much as a predator does, dividing the world between that which is useful and suddenly useless, with no middle ground” (Navarro, 37). The world is separated into black and white and there is no room for movement in between. Psychological Splitting is dangerous because it dismisses the importance of history. Therefore, there is no learning from past mistakes. Psychological splitting also has a serious impact on the terrorist’s relationship with other people. If the terrorist feels betrayed by an individual, the terrorist can transform from friend to foe in a matter of seconds (Navarro 37).

During the events of September 11th, Flight 11’s flight attendants, Madeleine Amy Sweeney and Betty Ong, described a horrific scene of how ordinary passengers transformed into murderous hijackers. They were sitting in their seats in one moment and following the flight attendant’s orders. The next moment these individuals took over the plane in a bloody fight: “The docile terrorist sitting in the aircraft suddenly [became] mass murderers. A chilling example of “splitting” at work” (Navarro, 38). In physiological splitting there is no middle grounds. The world is put into simple terms: “Its is a rhetoric of “us” against “them”, kindness against evil, with
idealization of “us” and projection on them”, of all that is bad” (Kiknadze, 55).

Deeper anger with society starts from within (Kiknadze, 55).

Another character trait found in terrorists and especially the leaders of terrorist organizations is narcissism. Narcissistic individuals see themselves as special and unique. They see themselves as the only ones with the capability of being right. They are the only ones capable of fully understanding an issue and the only ones with the right solutions to their problems. Take for example, Osama bin Laden, who is a textbook example of a narcissist. Bin Laden sees himself as a self-righteous struggler for the holy land, Saudi Arabia, and the only way to fight for the holy land is through jihad. Narcissists are uncompromising and most often lack compassion or empathy for others. Due to the lack of feelings, “narcissists have primitive objective relationships, which are functional rather than meaningful. They see themselves as important even without achievement and may feel entitled to unlimited success, fame, fortune, or sex, usually by taking shortcuts.” (Navarro; 39).

Narcissistic individuals are strongly grounded in their beliefs and hold little patience for those who are opposed to their views (Hare, 75-89).

Narcissistic characteristics combined with feelings of neglect and inferiority lead many terrorists to suffer from feelings of being incomplete. Many a time, these individuals feel forgotten or disregarded by society. “Consequently they attempt to ameliorate what is missing from their lives by subscribing to powerful ideologies which give them purpose, comfort, and meaning (Hoffer, 147; Navarro, 41). These individuals feel powerless and as a result turn to groups who offer them might. This
longing for power and feeling of having been forgotten explains the continued success of al-Qaeda in Afghanistan. Terrorist groups, such as al-Qaeda, promise a better life and a richer future. Moreover, religion contributes an even deeper context. Jihad in the context of religion promises a holy and meaningful experience, in the pursuit for power (Navarro, 41)

Another personality trait found in terrorists, however often forgotten, is fear. It is fear that drives hatred and ideology. “Irreconcilable fear is deep within its subconscious, it gives form to their unbending ideology, it lies nestled within the pathological psyche of the terrorist” (Navarro, 43). These fears can range from people to change that spark the hatred and motivate the terrorist’s core beliefs.

Furthermore, there are core fears that come with the unbending ideologies of terrorists. There are fears of being caught, while trying to pursue an act of terrorism. There are fears of failure, the inability to follow through. These personal fears are principal, but most importantly there is the fear of loosing one’s leaders: “So much is usually at stake; so much has been entrusted to these malevolent charismatic leaders that often the mission becomes one of protecting the leader at the expense of committing further terrorist acts” (Navarro, 46). The leader of the terrorist organization provides guidance and power for the individual. Without the leaders, the followers would go back to the feelings of being incomplete and forgotten.

Narcissism, incompleteness and fear are significant personality traits of terrorists. These characteristics lead to strong and inflexible ideologies. Fear pushes the terrorists into passionate hatred and courses of violence. Both India and the
United States suffer from terrorism. These terrorists use violence and fear tactics to create fear in their enemies. Terrorism allows these individuals and groups to feel powerful against their much larger adversaries.

*Jihadism: Why Personality Counts*

Jihad, or Holy war, is not a new concept in Islam. It occurs when non-Muslims threaten a Muslim territory (Mendelsohn, 40). In fact, the concept of Jihad has been around since the founding of the religion. In recent years, the popularity of Jihad has grown at a rapid speed. Traditionally reserved for leaders, it is now acceptable for ordinary members to kill and hurt others in the name of their God. In the 21st century Jihad revitalized and found a new following. Before Jihad was found in only certain populations. Now it is an accepted form of fighting for many Muslims across the globe. Jihad has grown from local to global and is gaining popularity with Muslims all over the world. Jihad has become a source of mobilization and unification. Jihad is no longer limited to just a few states; it is a worldwide issue affirming radical ideological beliefs (Mendelsohn, 38). Holy wars carried out by terrorist attacks are now at the forefront of the United States and Indian political agendas.

In his book: *Combating Jihadism: American Hegemony and Interstate cooperation in the War on Terrorism*, Barak Mendelsohn, identifies three major events which led to the transformation of Jihad from the local to global scale. Jihads reemergence first occurred during the war in Afghanistan during the 1980s. The United States, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia encouraged young Muslims from across
the Middle East to come to Afghanistan to help fight off the Soviet army. After all, a non-Muslim entity outraged Muslims from all over the world: “This war led to the revival of the notion of Jihad as a collective duty; for many of the volunteers who came to central Asia to wage or support the military effort, it installed the belief that jihad was the solution to the ummah’s weaknesses and the key to returning it to its early days” (Mendelsohn, 38). Not long after, jihadism grew out of control and was soon exported to other countries. The call to jihad in Afghanistan unified individuals from all over the world, particularly the Middle East, in their strong beliefs and gave them practical battleground experience. The withdrawal of Soviet troops gave the Muslim militants a feeling of victory, and that jihad was a successful method of fighting for ones goals (Mendelsohn, 38).

During the 1990s, “Osama bin Laden and his al Qaeda network provided an organizational and ideological base for a jihadi movement comprising members from different nations, a global reach, and ideology with global scope” (Mendelsohn, 38). The events of September 11th made Jihad in the local a part of a greater movement against the infidel (Menelsohn, 38). Within the Jihad movement, the Pakistani became a part of this much larger movement and gave many Pakistanis their first real feelings of belonging.
III. **Partition: The Roots of Pakistani Identity Problems**

In 1757, the British East India Company conquered the land that is now known as India and Pakistan from the Mughal Dynasty. The British occupied the land until 1947. Based on the two-nation theory, “Hindus and Muslims who lived in India were two distinct, different, and at times antagonistic cultural entities…. These two cultural entities in India had a historical and civilizational backdrop, an identity, and a self-image of their own, having different sets of characteristics, yet, in the context of Indian politics, each one's identity and unity was parasitic on the other” (Ahmed, 56). Ignoring the different cultures and ethnicities that fell underneath “Hindu” and “Muslim”, the British partitioned the large landmass into India, a state for Hindus, and Pakistan, a state for Muslims. The region known as Kashmir remained a disputed territory. In 1965, the tensions over Kashmir lead to full-scale war. The dispute over Kashmir still remains in effect today, and often leads to cycles of reoccurring violence (Ahmed, 58).

The British first began their rule over India in 1857. The diversity of India's population has created tensions and political problems for India before its independence from the British on the August 15, 1947. Terrorism committed by radical Hindu factions was prominent in India prior to 1939. The violence for the most part, targeted their British occupiers. However, after the years 1939 and particularly 1945, Muslims, Sikhs and a few radical Hindu groups predominantly began to use terrorism as a means to reach their political objectives (Laqueur, 150).
At the time of the end of the British Empire’s rule over India, India was partitioned into two separate states. One land mass was India, which would serve the Hindu population. The other country created was called Pakistan, a state for the Muslim population. Pakistan was to be the country created for the Muslims of India. Pakistan would be a country that would preserve their rights, religion and culture. The hope was to bring peace and create an end to Hindu and Muslim clashes in the land region (India).

After the 1947 partition, it was hoped that the newly formed country of Pakistan would become a powerful strong state for the Muslims in the region. The country would not only preserve Muslim rights and interests, but it would grow hopefully to be something much more powerful. In fact, many envisioned Pakistan would become a Muslim homeland—a place for all Muslims.

The lead up and aftermath of the British partition had an important impact on the very identity of the Pakistani. From the very beginning, Pakistan has had the daunting task of trying to create its own character. The Pakistani identity had to be different from the Indian identity and this character would have to be realized and accepted across the globe. It was imagined that a strong Pakistani identity would emerge after the partition. Instead of establishing a unified national identity, Pakistan was built upon the common dislike towards India, and separated ethnicities. Feelings of abhorrence towards India from the partition and the resulting conflict over Kashmir still plague the Pakistani identity today. Pakistanis
inability to establish a strong national identity has lead many individuals to turn to jihad and other terrorist methods in their search for identity (Jaffrelot, 7).

3.1 Problems From the Start

It is obvious that there are clear reasons for why Pakistanis have chosen terrorism, opposed to other ways in which to address issues of Pakistani identity within the context of Pakistani and Indian confrontation. Firstly, many Pakistanis still blame India for internal problems and lack of belonging based on the lines of Islam and Hinduism. There is a real sense of longing for power. Pakistanis feels powerless against the Indian state, which is big and strong and not easily moved. W. Howard Wriggens described the relationship between India and Pakistan as: “the simple fact of size and strategic and economic asymmetry...However unjustified Indian leaders may have thought, Pakistan's over-riding concern vis-à-vis India was fear, fear of India's size, the size of its army...and fear compounded out of infrequent public statements by prominent Indians regretting the tragedy of partition and reiterating the inherent unity of the subcontinent” (Hussain, 267). In many ways the tension between the two countries is necessary in order for Pakistan to function as a country. By creating a form of cold war, Pakistanis have found a common threat in India.

Part of the problem has to do with Pakistan’s confusion over the nation and nationalism. “Nationalism is an ideology, be it based on territorial or ethnic notions” (Jaffrelot, 7). The French Sociologist Marcel Mauss, described the nation as: “a society materially and mortally integrated, with stable and permanent centralized
power, well established borders, a relative moral, mental and cultural unity of its inhabitants who consciously adhere to the state and its laws”. Under the nation, sub-national identities are dismissed. Pakistan on the other hand, has relied heavily on ethnicity as a source of derived identity. Therefore, “Pakistan appears to be an unachieved nation precisely because of the persistence of ethnic identities, which may even be described as ‘nationalities’. The ‘two-nation theory’ gave the country a nationalist ideology-it has even been described as an ‘ideological state-which has been formulated against India, the ‘other nation’. But it did not endow Pakistan with the sociological qualities of a nation” (Jaffrelot, 7-8). Even the commonality of religion, has created tension and eruptions of fighting between Sunni and Shias Muslims (Jaffrelot, 8). Nationalism against the other nation, India, seems to have hobbled the formulation of a national identity instead of creating the nation, which they had dreamed of.

Muhammed Ali Jinnah, the creator of the idea of Pakistan on the Indian Subcontinent and its first leader, “wanted to build a strong state relying on the threefold principle ‘one nation, one culture, one language’” (Jaffrelot, 8). He believed that Pakistan was the only way to keep safe Muslim welfare and interests. He believed that Muslim interests could not compete with the newly emerging Indian state. His threefold principle was his ideal, coming from the Muslim provinces of Raj, where he faced social decline and was a minority within the region. In fact, the United Provinces’ Muslim leaders had been preparing for the Pakistani state after the British policies implemented following the 1857 ‘Revolt’. Properties were confiscated and the Muslim elite were discriminated against by governmental
proceedings, as well as the introduction of democracy to the region. As minorities in these regions, the Muslims had more to lose and therefore a lot more to gain from their own state (Jaffrelot, 9). It was this fear of decline and marginalization that led to the foundation of a state for Muslims. In fact, “the first Muslim separatist movements resulted from the reaction of the Muslim elite from Northern India, whose privileged position came to be challenged by the rise of Hindu intelligentsia, a group which benefited from its more rapid assimilation into the English-medium educational system and the anti-Muslim bias of the British till the late 19th century” (Jaffrelot, 10). As a direct result of these British policies, political parties and organizations like the Muslim league were formed, with the goal of fostering Muslim unity and preserving the language of Urdu, which was promoted as the language of the Muslims.

Where Muslims were the minority, the idea of Pakistan and preserving Muslim rights began to spread. On the contrary, in places where the Muslim populations were the majority, such as Punjab or Bengal, Muslims were more content because they ruled over themselves (Jaffrelot, 11). For the Muslims who felt marginalized by the British, they remained hopeful that Islam and Urdu could unite and promote mobilization among Muslims across the subcontinent.

After the emergence of the state of Pakistan, the rifts in Pakistani identity began to emerge. One of these rifts was based on the competing visions of the Pakistani state. The Mohajirs sought a state based on the doctrine of Islam. The Punjabs, on the other hand, had seen Pakistan as the direct result of Hindus
threatening Islam and their social rights. The Mohajirs immediately gained a lot of influence in the newly established state; both the president and the prime minister were Mohajirs. Within ten years, while the Mohajir’s Muslim doctrine remained intact, the influence transferred to the Punjabis who had already begun to identify with the same ideology. They had already adopted Urdu as an official language (Jaffrelot, 18).

While these two groups remained influential, the Bengalis, on the other hand, were ignored and discriminated against, despite the fact that they formed a majority of the population. One example of discrimination against Bengalis occurred in March 1949, when “the Constituent Assembly appointed a Basic Principles Committee which submitted its report in September 1950. It recommended the establishment of a federal democracy. The Punjabi representatives immediately objected that East Pakistan should not be allowed to be in a position to dominate West Pakistan simply because the Bengalis were in a larger number” (Jaffrelot, 18). Furthermore, by making Urdu the national language, Bengalis were left angry and mobilized to preserve their own language, literature and culture. The fight between the Bengalis and the central government did not end without violence and spurred a Bengalis nationalist movement.

The Bengalis are just one group who turned to separatist movements in Pakistan because of unfair policies of its leaders. The Sindhis, the Baluchis, and other groups have had or still do have separatist movements in Pakistan. The failure of
Pakistani leaders to unify the different peoples who make up Pakistan has contributed greatly to its failure to establish a Pakistani identity (Jaffrelot, 30-34).

Sectarianism, as a substitute identity, has become a serious source of conflict in terms of national identity. The author, Miriam Abu Zahab, describes Pakistan having been lost in its national identity: “Pakistan has never been a nation-state; highly fragmented, it has failed in integrating the people into a nation by making their Pakistani identity their most treasured possession” (Zahab, 77). Instead of the nation, individuals were forced to identify with other fragmented identities. This included: caste, ethnic group, language or sect of Islam.

For those who found a source of ethnic identity in the 1970s, it was almost immediately outlawed and viewed as disloyalty. During the 1980s and the Afghan war, identity was linked to religious Islam (Zahab, 77). “Ziaul Haq’s Islamization policy...meant state monopoly on religion and dominance of a particular sect, and brought...theological differences to the fore” (Zahab, 79). General Zia’s Islamization campaign was predominantly Sunni in scope and infuriated Shia. The campaign was also a direct threat to Shia social status in Pakistan. As a result of the Afghanistan and war and the Iranian Revolution, Shias were further mobilized and empowered (Nasr, 87). Outside Shia influences were using Pakistan to further their own political ambitions.

Sunni and Shia violence has erupted frequently in Pakistan’s short history. Since the 1980s both Sunni and Shia parties have emerged responsible for promoting violence. These parties include: “Sunni Sipah-e-Sahaba Pakistan
(Pakistan’s ‘Army of the Prophet’s Companions’ or SSP, established in 1984) and its allies, the Sunni Tahrik (‘Sunni movement’, established in 1993), Tehrik Nifaz Shariat-I Muhammadi (‘Movement for Protection of Muhammads Religious Law’, established in 1994), Lashkar-e-Jhangvi (Jhangvi Army’, established in 1990), Lashkar-e-Taiba (‘The Army of the Pure’, formed in 1997-8), and Tehrik-I Jafaria Pakistan (‘Pakistan’s Shia Movement ‘ or TJP, formed in 1979) and its militant offshoot, Sipnah-e-Muhammad (‘Army of Muhammad or SM, formed in 1991)” (Nasr, 85). It has not helped the situation that many of these groups receive funds from outside of Pakistan. Saudi Arabia has been known to send financial support to Sunni groups in Pakistan, while Iran has also helped support and mobilize Shia groups in the region (Nasr, 32). These groups promote a sense of belonging and places for individuals who feel disconnected to the government in Pakistan. Clashes among Sunni and Shia groups have further given rise to the Pakistani Taliban (Nasr, 85). The Pakistani identity has become fragmented: “It has metamorphosed from religious schism into political conflict around mobilization of communal identity” (Nasr, 86). Now sect of religion has given way as a form of political identity and violence has erupted because of it.

One case of sectarianism occurred in Central and South Punjab, where political schisms during the 1970s, led to a lot of resentment among the local populations. Since partition, the Pakistani government had ignored South Punjab. In both Central and South Punjab, the areas are poverty stricken with the exception of a few wealthy landowners who have maintained their wealth over the years by turning their land into orchids and then using machines instead of some of the
experienced laborers in the area. With other medium landowners moving in, much of the rural population has been turned away from their traditional jobs and have no land to go to. Fast moving social and economic changes, rapid paced urbanization, the addition of new classes, and a powerful unchanging ruling elite lead to extreme poverty and social inequalities in the region. “Sectarian militancy in this context can be described as a reaction to a growing sense of insecurity and hopelessness resulting from uneven distribution of resources, as a revolt of uprooted and marginalized periphery deprived of access to the political arena” (Zahab, 79-80). With the lack of industrialization and education, and the malfunction of traditional structure, sect became a source of identity. Sectarianism serves as a platform of shared anger and frustration and a chance at power in a region that has pushed them into poverty (Zahab, 80).

In Punjab, education was hardly ever made available to children because it was believed that with education, the children would leave for the urban areas and would therefore neglect their social end economic role as laborers. Since there was a real lack of proper education in Punjab, madrasas, began to increase in number during the second half of the 1990s. The madrasas came into being because of “religious parties radicalized foreign influences started receiving foreign funds which they then used to launch campaigns in favor of their programs” (Zahab, 115). These madrasas, have become successful: “Not all madrasas are sectarian but the sectarian have multiplied. In a feudal environment where violence is part of the socio-political culture and is even valued, the sectarian madrasas identify with the parties which protect them, preach violence for enforcement of their kind of Islam
and the elimination of other sects” (Zahab, 83). Religious political parties align themselves and operate many of the madrasas. The Madrasas are known for teaching violence and hatred towards other sects of Islam. Jihad or Holy War is not only for the non-Muslims, for the madrasas, the infidel has become members of other sects of Islam. Poverty and no real access to education forces these young children of rural peasants towards extremism and violence.

In madrasas, students are given an education, food, lodging, and most importantly a place to belong. Classes are taught in Arabic, which even the teachers do not fully understand. Students are taught good behavior and obedience through physical abuse. The students of the madrasas are cut off from the rest of the society and find a purpose in life by serving their religion. The madrasas give their students’ families a respectful place in society: “The parents gain respect of the local mullah for sending their children to these schools, a hadith says that the parents of a hafiz-e Quran will be blessed with a luminous crown on the Day of Judgment” (Zahab, 83). The madrasas give their students a place to belong and a future. Due to fact that there is a real lack of Pakistani national identity, individuals who have been affected negatively by change have turned to or in the case of madrasas been taught to seek an identity within religion that puts emphasis on hate towards the Pakistani other with a varying belief system (Zahab, 84).

Many who have failed or dropped out of the Urdu system of education lack a real education, and therefore job qualifications. Their lack of education has left them feeling isolated from the rest of society. Their families are too poor to support them,
and they cannot rely on the government to help them. They are left stranded, searching for a sense of belonging and a longing for a charismatic leader to take them to a better life. In South Punjab, where Shias traditionally held a lot of land and power, “religion has become a tool and a social demarcation rather than a faith, the members of the other sect are viewed as rivals and as a threat to the material status of one’s community. Sectarianism has been used as an umbrella for the struggle of the emerging classes against more entrenched interests” (Zahab, 86). The new challenge to the Shia landowners are the Sunni middle class. Many of the Sunnis come from an anti-Shia ideological background and as a result tension and violence that has escalated over the past decade (Zahab, 85).

Instead of unifying the Muslim people in Pakistan, religion has become a source of conflict and a source for national identity. Extremist groups now rival the traditional religious parties, who have failed to portray the true vision of Islam. Sunni versus Shia tensions have turned into endless rounds of violence: “The rivalry has degenerated into a chain reaction of vengeance and tit-for-tat killing in a society where revenge is viewed by most as a natural sentiment linked to ones identity and ones honor”(Zahab, 87). This religious frustration has taken a real toll on the Pakistani identity. Many people feel like the government has failed them. Many come from poverty and little education. With no real feeling of belonging in Pakistan, it is easy to see how religion would serve as a foundation for a source of identity. However, the different sects of Islam, have created further divides among the people: “There is no dearth of unemployed young people who are looking for a solution to their economic problems and who think that an Islamic revolution is
long overdue in Pakistan” (Zahab, 124), The act of Jihad is applied to the general
Pakistani society. Hatred towards the other is a religious mission and can be easily
spread to places across the world. Pakistanis have fallen victim to helplessness and
despair and are turning to other means of identity.

Unfair governmental policies and identity confrontations have lead to a
changing view of Jihad among many of Pakistan’s citizens. Jihad became an accepted
tool of combat against the Soviet’s take over of Afghanistan. With the success of
Jihad against the Soviets, many Pakistanis and Muslims across the world see Jihad as
a suitable way of achieving a goal. The lack of a Pakistani national identity has
pushed Pakistanis into finding alternative identities and into the comforting hands
of Jihadist movements.

Jihadi movements can be seen as early 1800s in the Indian subcontinent. But
it was not until 1927, when Abul Kalam Azad Muhammad Ilyas Kandhalawi declared
that Jihad should be used upon the Hindus, who are the true enemies of Islam. Jihad
has remained an important part of Pakistani identity-or lack there of. During the
1990s, Pakistanis became even more reliant upon Jihadi movements to foster a
sense of national identity: “The end of economic prosperity, added to a huge
demographic growth, drove many low and middle class people into unemployment.
The political instability as well as corruption of the ruling class, helped to reanimate
the underground myth of an ideal Islamic paradigm. Last, but not least, the seizure
of power by some very privileged groups convinced the destitute classes that they
did not have a future in their own country” (Boivin, 107). Additionally, with the end
of the Afghan war, Pakistani-sponsored Taliban gained a foothold in Afghanistan. Instead of the Jihadi movement coming to a close, the Jihadi movements were exported to the Kashmir and gained in popularity (Boivin, 107). With no real place to call home, poverty and an unclear national identity to relate to lead to a lot of frustration, which has played a large role within Jihad in Pakistan and across the globe.

3.2 India After Partition

Since India’s independence from the British Empire, it has had an ongoing struggle against terrorism. India has worked hard at building a strong state: “The problem has to be seen in the context of the fact that the Indian state alone has the monopoly of the use of force and the state derives its legitimacy by striving to realize the values which the Indian people have reposed in the constitution…If the Indian people lose faith in democratic, peaceful and legal methods of bringing about changes in our society then the cult of violence would progressively become a growing and menacing reality in India which will ultimately destroy the tenuous civic order that exists today (Tiwari, viii). The importance of democracy is apparent in Indian Society. However, there has been a “widespread feeling [that] has grown in India that our democratic processes often remain opaque even to the deeply felt and just grievances of one or the other sections of our people” (Tiwari, vii). This “deeply felt and justice grievances” have created a lot of problems in modern Indian society (Tiwari, vii).
India’s fight for independence was met by two distinct courses of action. One pushed for terrorist acts targeting the British. Bhagwati Charan, an active member of the Hindustan Socialist Republican Association (HSRA), supported terrorism as a means to end British rule: “Deliberate misrule has reduced us to paupers, has bled us white. As a race and as a people we stand dishonored and outraged...we shall have our revenge, a people’s righteous revenge on the tyrant” (Charan, 1930, excerpted in Manan & Griset, 42). Charan and the HSRA committed deliberate acts of terrorism. For example, they through bombs off public gallery in the Legislative Assembly and attempted to blow up a train station. They also shot a police officer. Charan died when a bomb blew up in his hands (Manan & Griset, 42). Terrorism created power for the Charan and the HSRA, after feeling oppressed by their more powerful British occupiers.

The other movement, headed by Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, urged for a non-violent resistance: civil disobedience and nonviolent tactics. Gandhi was highly educated and it was his movement that ultimately succeeded. There are however, many scholars who believe that the terrorist activities contributed greatly in liberating India from the hands of the British: Individual in nature, the terrorists held the belief that Indian independence can be bought about by a series of revolutionary outrages calculated to instill fear into the British officials and drive them out of India” (Sharma, 59). The Wahhabis, a puritanical Islamist sect, created a lot of violence in India, working hard against the British colonialists. These terrorist methods occurred through out India but especially in Bengal and the upper part of
India. This method of action later spread to the Punjab area, Untied Provinces, Delhi, Madras, Bihar and Orissa (Sharma, 59).

The Republic of India, today, is the seventh largest country in the world, covering 1,222,559 square miles of land and holds the second largest population of 1,198,003,000 people as of 2009. India’s population is made up of a variety of peoples: Indigenous, invaders and others who have migrated to the land over time. India is a diverse country. Though the official languages of India are Hindu and English, several other languages are spoken across India’s great landmass. Most of the Indian population practices Hinduism, but there are several others who practice Islam, Sikhism, Christianity, along with several other religions (India). Most importantly it is successful and India’s citizens have an Indian Identity.

3.3 Pakistani Terror in India

When creating a new state, nation-building exercises require some individuals involved to give up some of their own interests for the interest of the state. This however, has the potential to upset minority publics: “The minority politics when vulgarized to manipulate cruder power at the hustings activitizes these sub-groups into fanaticism and fundamentalism. The terrorist tactics represent an articulate attempt to create missionaries, Messiahs and martyrs for a so called cause which can electrify the insecure and blinden the ignorant to fight under the leadership of self-appointed fascists” (Sharma, 49-50). There are several types of terrorist movements operating in and around India. These groups hold a variety of views and
goals specific to where it is located and religious and ethnic background of those involved (Tiwari, x).

Terrorism in India has predominantly been concentrated in Kashmir and Punjab. These conflicts stem from both, ethnic and religious clashes that have been ongoing since even before the time of India’s independence from Britain (Laquer, 151). The Indian government chose to ignore the sensitive situations in Kashmir and Punjab: “In regard to reconciling these factions, the Hindu Indian government has shown little political acumen. It might have been impossible to pacify the extremists among the Muslims in Kashmir and the Sikh in Punjab, but this was a strategy the Indians did not even really try” (Laquer, 151). This promoted further outrage within Pakistan and has caused the anger and frustration, so often found within a terrorist’s motives. For Pakistanis, terrorism has created a sensation of power and muscle against the state that ignored them and has not allowed Kashmir to become a part of Pakistan

Since 1990, over twenty thousand people have been killed from terrorist attacks in Kashmir. However, the terrorism in Kashmir and throughout India did not make it to the world stage until 1998, when both India and Pakistan detonated nuclear devices (Laquer, 150). Kashmir’s population is largely made up of individuals who converted to Islam at some point early on in history. Kashmir was traditionally religiously secular, Gandhi going as far to call it: “an island of secularism on the Indian subcontinent” (Laquer, 151). Kashmir is part of the de facto border between India and Pakistan, created at the end of the India-Pakistan
War in 1949. Kashmir, along with another state, Jammu, became a constitute state, a state a part of India, with its own government and guiding legal documents. This decision was headed by the then Hindu rule of Kashmir. The legality of this issue has been fought over ever since: “In the next half-century the Kashmir issue would be a primary trigger of Indian-Pakistani wars and armed confrontations as well as interactive terrorism between India and Kashmiri separatists and Islamist groups” (Dekmejian, 111). The tensions that have seemed to always exist between Kashmir and the Indian government continues to be a source of conflict.

After India’s independence, his government took the action of arresting one of Kashmir’s highly acclaimed leaders, Sheikh Abdullah. This act, increased political tensions and also gave Pakistan a role in the conflict. Furthermore, Kashmir’s population is split with two different political goals: The first wants its own independent state. The other wants to become a part of Pakistan. Pakistan has been giving important political and monetary support to the Muslim extremists who want this dream to become a reality. By Pakistan supporting the Kashmiri separatist movement, Pakistan has helped transform this conflict into a Jihad, or holy war, and in the process has shaped the acts of violence into terrorist acts: “The general strategy of the Islamic radicals has been to attack and murder the local Hindus (called Kashmiri Pandits) and Sikhs and so force them to leave the region” (Laquer, 151). As a result, houses have been destroyed and people have been murdered. Several Indian accounts state that the violence targeting the local Hindu populations are “trying to exterminate the Hindu population of Kashmir or at least drive them to fall so that the region will become a part of Pakistan” (Laquer, 151). One of the
Kashmiri Muslim groups *Harakat Al Ansar* continued to detonate terrorist attacks in India's major cities, including New Delhi (Laquer, 151).

Problems in Kashmir began to grow during the 1980s, due to conflict with the central government in New Delhi and local politics within Kashmir. In 1987, the United Muslim Front, a political part, lost the election and its wake sparked debate on whether the election had been tampered with. As a result violence erupted the following year: “In July 1988, the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF) bombed two sites in Srinagar, followed by kidnappings in exchange for militants held in Indian Jails” (Dekmejian, 114). This terrorism was sponsored by Pakistan. In the 1980s, Kashmir was just a separatist group within India. In the 1990s, the separatist group took on a radical Islamist face (Dekmejian, 108).

Pakistan, a weaker and smaller country than India, came up with several strategies in order to confront its enemy in order to annex Indian-controlled Kashmir. It firstly created several important military alliances with the United States and China. This allowed Pakistan protection from the United States and aid. From China it was able to gain nuclear capabilities. Next, Pakistan adopted a radical Islamist ideology and identity. In fact, “Pakistani decision-makers, sensing an Indian window of vulnerability in Kashmir, have sought to exploit a notion of Muslim confraternity to support the insurgents. On the other hand, Islam has also been used as a vehicle to mobilize a disaffected population and challenge the writ of the Indian State in Kashmir” (Ganguly, 179). This enabled Pakistan to mobilize its citizens along with the Muslims in Kashmir to carry out holy war in India, creating several
terrorist organizations dedicated to killing the Hindu infidel through Jihad. Terrorist attacks carried out by these organizations include: Hindu massacres, car bombs, suicide bombings, land mines and other explosive devices (Dekmejian, 114).

Actions taken by Pakistan were seen as “rational responses of a weaker power seeking to equalize a stronger neighbor” (Dekmejian, 113). The actions taken by Pakistan were in order to create power against India (Dekmejian, 113). Pakistan is a weaker and more vulnerable country than India and chose to fight against India through acts of terrorism, where it enjoyed a limited amount of success. They felt stronger helping the smaller extremist groups in India and these acts allow Pakistani’s the feeling of power against their massive enemy of India. Though there have been several attempts to figure out a lasting peace, India and Pakistan have reached an equilibrium based on nuclear power (Dekmejian, 118).

Terrorism is often “expressions of [a terrorist’s] individual pathologies such as paranoia, identity crisis, cognitive disorders, and a feeling of inferiority, helplessness, rejection or marginality” (Dekmejian, 25). An act of terrorism can be committed because of personal vengeance to a range of psychological pathologies (Dekmejian, 25). One scholar, Eric Erikson believes that terrorists “are in a state of “patienthood” that must be remedied through some “medium of salvation”” (Dekmejian, 25). These individuals are unable to handle their own personal problems, and therefore, “project their individual patienthoods upon society and, in their attempt to universalize their personal pain, could focus on the destruction of a leading figure or monument” (Dekmejian, 26). Though the acts of
violence are usually political in nature, the reasons behinds are usually due to conditions of deprivation and a want of fame and glory (Dekmejian, 26). This is clearly what is occurring in India. Terrorism creates a feeling of power for the Pakistanis who commit the act, filling the void of deprivation by making others feel their pain. Terrorism and the act of Jihad give a false sense of belonging and purpose in world where they feel discriminated. Acts of terrorism against India by Pakistanis create a feeling of influence and power for the powerless.

The individuals and groups responsible for terrorism in India, feel inferior to the massive and strong state. These terrorists feel that they have been served an injustice by the state. Terrorism allows them to feel powerful, by taking out their pain and frustrations on innocent people. The act of terrorism is often more important than the overall goal. In a sense, the injustice done to the terrorist is passed on to others, and the terrorist feels a limited sense of power above the state and above the individuals they see to have done them wrong.

3.4 Jihad and the Pakistani Identity

The attacks of September 11th have had a lasting impact on Jihadism in Pakistan and the Pakistani identity. Jihad was put into the spotlight and the attacks were glorified across the region. As a result of the attacks of September 11th, The United States began a long process of applied pressure onto the Pakistani government. The United States has demanded that Pakistan gain control of its tribal areas and Jihadist movements. The pressure from the United States, since the 1990s, and its actions in Iraq and Afghanistan have infuriated many Pakistanis. Through the
course of terrorism, Pakistanis have reclaimed Jihad as a means of personal retribution. Pakistanis have now immigrated to countries covering the globe. The West offered many a dream of stability and identity, but even in these Western countries, Pakistanis cannot hide from their lack of a concise national identity. This explains why Jihad against Western states has become the ultimate frustration of the Pakistani identity.

The two state solution, did not bring an end to Muslim and Hindu clashes on the subcontinent. There were three more wars between India and Pakistan that occurred in 1948, 1965 and 1971 (Hussain, 266). In 1971, a new country, Bangladesh, was formed, which resulted from fighting with Pakistan. Since the late 1990s, India and Pakistan have threatened each other with nuclear overtones: “The Indian nuclear test explosions of 11 and 13 May 1998, and Pakistan ‘s rival nuclear tests two weeks later have unleashed a new strategic dynamic which has gave implications for the cause of peace and stability in South Asia” (Hussain, 266). The Pakistani and Indian conflict seems to be important to the very function of Pakistan and the people living in Pakistan. The reasoning behind this fact is that Pakistani and Indian rivalry has become a source of identity for the Pakistani character.

3.5 What’s Next?

This accounts for the recent terrorist attacks that occurred in Mumbai in 2008. Lashkar-e-Taiba or LeT is a well-known terrorist organization throughout India and Pakistan and is now gaining a following internationally. LeT has carried out several attacks in India on the behalf of the struggle in Kashmir. They were also
behind the 2008 attacks in Mumbai, where popular hotels for westerners, along with a Jewish center were attacked. The LeT led attacks on Mumbai represented more than just an attack on India. It was an attack on the West and the Jews. The only surviving Mumbai terrorist, Ajmal Kasab, reported to the authorities that the terrorists have been ordered to target American, British and Israeli citizens “because they have done injustice to the Muslims” (Kahn, 1). It brought the global Jihadist movement into the very heart of India.

It is certain now that Pakistanis are often finding themselves in Jihad movements as acts against those who do not belong. Now we see a larger phenomenon. Pakistanis, who have migrated to other countries, including western countries, are now making their debut as the next Pakistani terrorists. The lack of a real Pakistani identity has now crossed continents and the United Kingdom and the United States are the first to feel the global Pakistani frustration.
IV. Conclusion: Pakistani Identity and the West

After the massive terrorist attack of September 11, 2001, the United States declared a war on terrorism. The War on Terror continues to be fought today, often concentrated on Al-Qaeda and its strong holds in Afghanistan. Yet, what seems to be missed by the United States and its western allies is Pakistan’s crucial link to the war on terror. Pakistan’s internal issues remain unresolved. The lack of a Pakistani identity and Pakistanis acceptance into the global jihadist movement, as a means of identity, should greatly concern western states. Moreover, the fact that American citizens with Pakistani roots are now joining the fight against the United States and the west should be at the forefront of United States foreign policy and the War on Terror. The recent foiled attack planned by Faisal Shahzad exemplifies Pakistanis emerging position at the forefront of terrorism.

Today, the most notable terrorist threat in the United States comes from radical Islamic terrorism, specifically Pakistani terror. These terrorists are not only from the Middle East; several of them have United States citizenship and are angered by the United State’s continued pressure on Pakistan to control terrorist cells within the country. Pakistani terrorism in the United States is not a new phenomenon and needs to be looked at more closely.

One of the first incidents of Pakistani terrorism transpired in 1993. Three significant events occurred that were fueled by Muslim fanaticism. Firstly, on January 23, 1993 a shooting occurred at the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) headquarters in Langley Virginia: “nearly a decade ago on traffic-choked Chain
Bridge Road in Langley. Just before 8 a.m., Kasi stepped out of his Izusu pickup truck, shouldered an AK-47 and began firing methodically at motorists waiting to turn in to CIA headquarters” (Davis & Glod, 1). Mir Aimal Kasi, a Pakistani, was the first of many willing to die for his cause. It was reported that he was unhappy with the United States’ foreign policy, which he felt hurt Muslims across the globe. Kasi fled to Pakistan and in 2002 was caught and extradited to the United States. He later received the death sentence for his crimes, which injured three people and killed one (Davis & Glod, 1).

The bombing of the World Trade Center’s northern tower on February 26, 1993, was a sign of far worse things to come. Ramzi Yousef, who’s real name was Abdul Basit Mahmoud Abdul Karim, was the son of a Palestinian mother and a Pakistani father. He had grown up in Kuwait city and had had a family in Pakistan. His actions were reportedly motivated by his devotion to the Palestinian cause and his hatred for the Jewish people (Wright, 202): “On February 26, 1993, a rented Ford Econoline van entered the World Trade Center’s massive basement parking garage. Inside the truck was Ramzi Yousef. It was unclear if bin Laden sent him, but he was the product of an al-Qaeda camp in Afghanistan, where he had learned his bomb-craft. He had come to America to oversee the construction of what the FBI later determined was the largest improvised explosive device the bureau had ever encountered. Yousef lit four twenty-foot-long fuses and fled to a vantage point just north of Canal Street, from which he expected to see the building fall” (Wright, 201-202). The attack was meant to knock out both towers, by having the Northern tower fall into the Southern tower. Though their terrorist attack did not go as
planned, they still managed to kill six people and injured over a thousand others (Wright, 203). Yousef, with his Pakistani roots, was the first of his kind to successfully launch a full-scale terrorist attack on American soil. He, along with the other terrorists, felt like their wants and needs, along with countless others, were being ignored. By taking on other individual’s burdens, they validated their cause and actions. For Yousef, there was no alternative action, and their actions of terror were completely justified.

Later that year, another terrorist attack plot meant to target other popular American landmarks was foiled. Omar Abdel-Rahman, a radical New York sheikh and recognized leader of the group, Al-Gama’a al-Islamiyya, known for its connections with al-Qaeda, masterminded the planned attack. "Sheikh Omar Abd al-Rahman, a radical religious scholar...[had] courted bin Laden, hoping to secure his financial support for their pet projects, including the assassination of President Muhammad Zia ul-Haq of Pakistan and President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt who, in their opinion, had become apostates"(Williams, 77). Targets included: the George Washington Bridge, the Lincoln and Holland Tunnels, the FBI New York City headquarters, and the United Nations building. Other plans consisted of kidnapping President Nixon, assassinating the former Egyptian president, Gamal Abdel Nassar, and potentially hitting Jewish targets. The reasons behind the attack were made clear by Rahman, at his conviction trial: "The United States, he said, was Islam’s greatest enemy, a country intent on wiping Islam from the face of the Earth. The case against him, he said, was simply a part of this campaign, an attempt to silence him because of his religion" (Gladwell, 1). To Rahman, the United States was the
ultimate enemy, a threat to his religion, and his core beliefs. He felt that the Pakistani leader at the time, along with the Egyptian President, was not doing the jobs successfully and in the true path of Islam. The networks that these individuals were an active part of provided the structure and confirmation of their beliefs and actions (Chaliand & Blin, 322).

The foiled planned attack in Times Square highlights the new ambitions of Pakistani terrorist organizations. Lashkar-e-Taiba is increasingly working on international terror plots: “Lashkar's fingerprints have been found on anti-Western attacks and plots from Afghanistan to Iraq, Dhaka to Copenhagen...Shortly after [the] Mumbai [terrorist attacks], Pakistani authorities arrested alleged LeT communications specialist Zarar Shah and reportedly discovered on his laptop a list of 320 potential targets, most of them outside India--including sites in Europe” (Kahn, 1). Furthermore, not long after the Mumbai attacks, David Coleman Headley, an American-Pakistani was accused of gathering surveillance for LeT during the Mumbai attacks. After gathering information from Headley, U.S. authorities found further evidence of a planned LeT terrorist attacks, targeting the Danish Newspaper office that published the 2005 cartoon of Muhammad. Not long after the arrest, other LeT members were charged with planning attacks on the United States and United Kingdom Embassies in Dhaka (Kahn, 1). Gathering from the recent arrests, the executed terrorist attack in Mumbai and the planned terrorist attacks against Western targets, LeT and other Pakistani militant groups are going to increasingly pose a terrorist risk at home, in the United States, and abroad.
LeT runs its training programs openly and is estimated to have trained over 200,000 people from India to North America. Increasing pressures by the Untied States have left many Pakistanis angry, because of the sensitive situation. LeT is well known for its charity work in Kashmir and Punjab. It helps to provide the most basic of services including: blood banks, schools, clinics and an ambulance service. Furthermore, “Pakistan's military may hesitate to go after Al Qaeda in the tribal areas, but it's even less eager to confront Lashkar at its base in the country's heartland... LeT and the Pakistani Army draw many of their recruits from the same poor Punjabi areas, often from the same families, and LeT's humanitarian wing worked alongside the Pakistani military to help civilians displaced during the Army's campaign to retake the Swat Valley from the Taliban” (Kahn, 2). Pakistan now finds itself in a hard place. LeT has provided not only structure but also a sense of identity for many who feel as if they do not belong. The United States pressuring Pakistan to monitor and get rid of these groups makes the situation even more delicate, which is why Pakistani terrorism towards the west shows only signs of increasing.

The greatest threat to India and the United States is Pakistani terrorism fueled by the lack of a Pakistani identity and extremist Muslim rhetoric. After discussing the deeper context of what is terrorism, who is a terrorist and why terrorism occurs, it is clear why Pakistani terrorism is predictable and why Pakistani sponsored terrorism against India and the West will most likely be on the rise in the future. Pakistani terrorists and acts of terrorism are on the climbing because of the very problem of Pakistani identity, or the lack of one. Since the
partition between India and Pakistan, Pakistan has struggled in creating a unified Pakistani identity. Pakistan tried turning towards hatred towards India and separatism only to still is dealing with the same issues after sixty-three years of independence.

The global jihadism movement in Pakistan has become as an unintended consequence of the Indian Partition. Pakistanis are looking for what every human being craves: a sense of belonging and identity. While many of the madrasas’ former students become martyrs on the local level, in areas such as Kashmir and Punjab, we now see educated individuals with Pakistani backgrounds at the forefront of terrorism in the West. Many Pakistanis have found a source of identity in the global jihadist movements. These groups have become a place of belonging, along with a way to vent frustration. With a building pressure on Pakistan from the West, more and more Pakistanis are communicating their feelings of isolation through acts of terrorism.
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