

UPHOLDING HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE TIME OF TERRORISM

*(Transcription of the speech in a meet organised by the PUCL
near Bangalore on 25th July 2009)*

K. Balagopal

I am asked to speak on one particular aspect which is not confined to Sri Lanka. So I may not refer much to Sri Lanka, what has happened in the northern part of Sri Lanka in the last few months. Basically what is involved is the counter insurgency operations of the various States. It could be Sri Lanka, it could be India. Naturally, we are more concerned about what is actually happening in India, has been happening and what is likely to happen. And these counter insurgency operations, these States have learnt from each other. If today we feel that what the Sri Lankan government believes as its success is being invited by the Indian State or may be even States in Pakistan, Bangladesh and so on. If they are taking confidence from that experience, it is not that what the Sri Lankan State has done is anything new. This is what all of them have been doing. I will try to pin point what exactly it means in operational terms. All of them have been doing the same thing as counter insurgency operations. What is new is, they feel it can succeed. Till now they were not confident that it can succeed. They repeatedly met with some success, then failure, some success, failure, now they feel..., they have come to the conclusion that it has succeeded in Sri Lanka, and that is what is new. The methods are not new, the ideas are not new, the intentions are not new.

And for us what is important is that this feeling that it can succeed can make them much more brutal, much more cruel, than they have always been, in the coming days. Which is reflected in the tone and voice of Chidambaram, the present Home Minister. Whatever may have been wrong with Shivraj Patil, he at least never talked like a sub-inspector of police. Chidambaram is talking like a newly promoted sub-inspector of police, put in charge of a police station, given a gun for the first time in his life. We used to feel its unfortunate that he is in charge of the economic policy of India. It is much more unfortunate that he has been put in charge of the policing policy of India. But this is a reflection of the apparent success in Sri Lanka, not a reflection of anything new that they have learnt.

The theme given to me is “Upholding Human Rights while Combating Terrorism”. There can be questions about the very language of the theme itself. That it would seem to imply that combating terrorism is a legitimate activity and how human rights have to be upheld while undertaking that legitimate activity; can be a question which can arise. There are many, I know, in the civil rights movement in this country who believe that there is no such thing called terrorism. What the State calls terrorism is all movements of liberation, which the State calls terrorism as an ideological expression. And therefore there could be no such legitimate thing as combating terrorism. That could be a point of view.

I don't fully agree with that, though I think the use of the word terrorism has to be and can be questioned. And I am uncomfortable with the word combating, even if it is to some extent a legitimate activity. Can it be called combating? Combating is a military term. Should we use it? These are questions.

Now what is ideological about the expression terrorism is not that there is no such thing as terrorism at all. But the State uses it as a general expression for all kinds of oppositional political violence which it does not want to handle by democratic means. All kinds of...., not all political violence, but all types of political violence which it does not like, which it is not comfortable with, which it does not want to handle democratically. There can be other types of equal mass violence which it does not call terrorism. In India we know very well that the violence of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad, Bajrang Dal, even though they are much more destructive than the violence indulged in by groups which speak in the name of Islam, that has never been called terrorism even by the Congress government, forget about the BJP government. So the word terrorism is used...., is as an ideological expression in this sense. That it is used by the State as an expression for a description of all kinds of oppositional violence which it does not want to accept as legitimate, which it does not want to, or does not intend to handle by democratic means. In that sense it is an ideological expression. But I don't think for us the word terrorism has to be altogether removed from the lexicography. It is there.

There are methods of political violence which differ in their nature. There is a type of violence which targets not its stated, proclaimed enemies, but the public in general, in order to create terror in society with the hope of cowing down the State, bending the State, or influencing the State, its policies. Those who are injured are not the targeted, declared enemies of the perpetrators of the violence, but the general public. Knowingly. It is not that something done accidentally, but knowingly. This is a

method of violence which does require a name and if terrorism is a name to be used for it, I think we should use it. And as far as we are concerned it is unacceptable. Whatever your aims you can't go around injuring ordinary people, public in the street, you can't open fire in a bazaar or a market or a train and blow up and so on.

Problem in using the word terrorism is two fold. One is, while such acts or incidents can be described as terrorist, the State uses the appellation terrorist for entire organizations, entire movements, entire political trends, which is bad. There is, including the Lashkar-e-Taiba , there is no organization which should be simply called terrorist. All of them even if they use methods of terror, even if they indulge in violence which can be described as terrorist, they have a social base, they have a social outlook and ideology, a political ideology, a political goal, aim, good or bad, you may like it, you may not like it, but they cannot simply be branded or simply called terrorist because that would focus entire attention on acts of terror that they participate in or indulge in, and to that extent I think the word terrorist organization or terrorist movement or terrorist is objectionable, though the word terrorism or terror as a description of certain acts of violence which injure the common public is a legitimate expression. Cannot be dismissed as illegitimate.

There are also other instances where it is a little doubtful whether one can use the expression. Normally a movement which believes in violence but confines its acts of violence to targeted enemies, to declared enemies, sometimes may indulge in actions which are aimed at, targeted at, knowing very well that it can also injure a lot of other people around. And if such a movement accepts that as, some name is being used, Americans invented it, collateral damage. Do we call it terror? Do we call it terrorism or not is a question that can be raised. It is happening these days. That they do say that we are attacking only so and so who is our enemy, some of them happened to be around and therefore they also got killed. or we had to take action. Is that acceptable? Firstly, can we call it terrorism? This can be a question to be debated.

But there are also the kinds of violence, which are... would like to take care to ensure that only targeted, declared enemies, are attacked. Once again it is not that one is saying it is necessarily good or bad. It is a characteristic of certain types of violence that need to be recognized, classified as different, separate. But the State when it uses the word terrorism conflates all these methods of violence. When the aim, when the nature of the politics, when the nature of the social orientation is not to its liking. It mixes all of them, conflates all of them and declares all of them as terrorism, while equally and even more terrorizing incidents, actions, perpetrated by

those who are not enemies, not perceived as enemies of the State, like in India Bajrang Dal or Vishwa Hindu Parishad or RSS, they may even be publicly disapproved, it may be said it is wrong, but it is never called terrorism. These problems are there when one looks at the use of the word terrorism. But I don't think for that reason one should say that the word terrorism itself is an ideological expression, there is no such thing at all. I have sufficiently indicated that there are certain types of violence which are to be described as terrorism and to my mind from a human rights point of view to be unequivocally criticized, opposed.

The question of combating is a different matter. I don't think the word combating should be used at all, it should be dealt with, it should be dealt with for this reason dealing with is a better expression than combating, for combating is a military expression, it seems to give the impression that what is to be done is to deal with it in a military fashion. It certainly should not, cannot, and can never be done in a humane way if it is dealt with only by military means. Dealing with is a better expression and then who is to deal with it? Not only the State, we should also deal with it. Methods of terror used by organizations which have political goals, social goals, an ideology, ideological orientation with which we may disagree, we may agree but it's a way of looking at the world. Many of us sitting here may not agree with the Lashkar-e-Taiba's understanding that the whole world has to be by force Islamized. But we do recognize its an opinion, its a view. It has to be dealt with, not combated. Dealt with, argued about, discussed, debated, that you can't impose one point of view, one religion, any point of view on the whole world. So combating is not the right word, dealing is the right word. And that dealing with is to be done not only by the State, but by all of us, all of us have to be party to it.

And then, we therefore have to look critically at what exactly the State is doing. The theme that is given to me would be to look critically at what exactly the State is doing when it uses the word terrorism indiscriminately to conflate all types of violence which are anathema to it, which it does not like, which it does not want to deal with by democratic means and uses only means of combat, means of policing, military means to handle. That is what is happening, and we should look at what exactly it is doing. What is crucial, I think, is a counter insurgency strategy which is common to all states, all countries. They learn from each other, they train each other. India has the distinction of having trained both the Tamil groups and the Sri Lankan army. Very few states are in such a great position, India has been in such a position. So it is common to the entire world system.

What is this counter insurgency strategy? What is crucial to it is that, when we address the State and we say, do not look at political violence as merely violence, look at the social, political underpinning to it, the ideology, the philosophy behind it, the political aspect of the State refuses to see this. They say we don't want....; in fact the most vocal exponent of this opposition has been Mr KPS Gill who goes around saying that any body who talks about the social roots of violence is in fact part of the violence, they are also enemies, they are also terrorists. He is quite open in this. He runs some thing called Center for Security Concerns, some thing in Delhi these days. But this is the point of view of the State.

That when we point to the social and political, ideological, philosophical roots of those who indulge in violence and say that we should deal with it, we should recognize it, deal with it, that is the best way to start dealing with violence, political violence. The State refuses to accept this dimension. But in its counter insurgency operations it clearly accepts, it clearly sees the social base of the violence. In its counter insurgency strategies the State is very clear as to where the social base comes from, and the essence of the counter insurgency strategy is to attack the social base so that the militancy is isolated, and can be militarily finished off. This is a crucial, central understanding that the states, all states all over the world have had in their counter insurgency operations. It is common to India, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, US, all countries. What they refuse to recognize politically, they do recognize in military terms, because they have to look at the reality if they have to handle it militarily and the reality is that there is a social base. There are people, it could be community, it could be a class, it could be a political society, a political community which believes in certain politics, it could be a combination of social classes, faced with a situation. Their recognition as a political reality is rejected, but their existence is recognized militarily because the counter insurgency strategy is to attack them, injure them, harm them, make them feel disgusted about the militancy itself, about the political violence which speaks in their name with some degree of support, may be not as much as is claimed by the militants, but some degree of support, some degree of sympathy, and thereby isolate the groups or organizations or the persons or the activists or the militants and then militarily finish them up . This is a very common tactic used.

What they now learnt from Sri Lanka is that they probably can succeed. I don't think that the peculiar situation obtaining in the northern part of Sri Lanka is to be replicated all over the country and all over the world and I don't think that it will

happen everywhere, but the real danger is that this confidence makes them much more brutal. And that is where the real danger for us comes, and that is where we need to speak about the need to deal with political violence, the totality of political violence, not merely what we can legitimately describe as terrorism. And dealing with is necessary because, and here again there could be differences within the civil rights movement in this country, very often it is thought that political violence by forces of radicalism, liberation is a problem only for the State. I don't think so; it can also be a problem for the people. Even the best intentioned, even the most targeted political violence, even when it functions with a deep sense of responsibility can create problems also for the people. We need to recognize this fact. Though primarily or in a major dimension, its a problem for the State. So dealing with it, addressing it, not merely supporting it, not merely hailing it, but addressing it from the point of view of the welfare of the people, the rights of the people is something essential for all of us, not merely criticizing the State's handling of political violence. So lets see... the whole thing has to put in that context.

We have so many instances... isolating the people..., Suresh spoke about what is happening in North-East. It happened in Mizoram, how many years ago? 35, 36 years ago, at a time when the civil rights movements in our country were not strong enough, aware enough, conscious enough to do something. It was finished in Mizoram, long ago. Relocate all the villages along, in centers where the army camps are there, then attack the militants and finish them up. Its being tried in Chhattisgarh in the form of Salwa Judum. Chhattisgarh is a State where, unlike in Andhra Pradesh where the police have taken on the entire task of attacking the Naxalites, the police practically don't do much there. They simply sit in their police stations and save themselves. That's all. So the State has decided it has a.... it needs a different way of handling. For the militants bring the paramilitary, CRPF and BSF and ITBP are there. For the ordinary people who are supportive of and part of the movement of the Maoists, create enemy within the local society and allow them to arm themselves or you arm them, create police personnel called Special Police Officers from them and give them a free rein to indulge in violence, turn the other way when they indulge in violence. This is once again the same strategy, what they refuse to recognize politically that there is a social base, they do recognize in their military strategy and that strategy is to identify the social base, attack it, so that it gets isolated, not only physically, but also mentally, politically, gets tired of the whole thing, they also come to the conclusion, let us reject the militancy altogether, whatever life we led we'll continue to lead, why should we go through all this suffering and then the militants

get isolated, you can try to..... Of course the militants have their own ways of countering this, may not be so successful, but that is the strategy they have been adapted and they.....

From the human rights point of view it results in so much injury to the ordinary people. The ordinary people who become the part of the entire situation because they have problems, because they have problems which have never been addressed by the State, by the establishment whose duty, responsibility it is, to address them. The people who from the very beginning you have neglected, whose needs, whose aspirations, whose interests you have neglected, maybe even opposed, maybe even destroyed, they turn to or they become sympathetic to, or from them arises a movement, which for whatever reason rightly or, we don't have to hail every armed struggle, but the possibility..., after all as the chairperson was saying even those who prefer that movements should be nonviolent would keep open the possibility that given India's experience with either parliamentary democracy or extra parliamentary non violent struggles, there is no guarantee anybody can give that they will be successful, that the Indian system will allow them to be successful, so the possibility needs to be kept open that some kind of armed insurgency may be necessary, may be a political choice, a legitimate political choice. This can't be ruled out altogether. So when that comes up from the very neglect, from the very complete non addressing of the issues of the people, the State again injures the same people, attacks the same people; makes them suffer much more, to force them to give up this choice that to some extent they have made, the support that they have... to some extent sympathetic to..., support to some extent they have given, is I think an extremely perverse way of administering or governing a nation, a country, a society and that's a fundamental objection to the whole strategy of counter insurgency that the human rights movement has. They had problems which you ought to have addressed. You failed to do so. Somebody came forward with their own methods either of resolving the problems right now or showing a future where it will happen and they have been attracted to it. You can't go and attack the same people, injure the same people and push them back so they go back to where they were having suffered much more injury in your strategy of so called maintenance of order, maintenance of peace. Now this is crucial to the whole thing and it is common everywhere.

In Sri Lanka... and India is a country where..., if you take Kashmir and the amount of violence the Indian State has perpetrated in Kashmir merely to silence what even in purely legal terms, in terms of international law is an entirely justified

demand. That you promised that you would hold a plebiscite, you promised to the United Nations, not just to us, you hold the plebiscite. That's all. But to silence that, the amount of violence the Indian State has indulged in. Or the people of Nagaland who were told ten years you live in India, then you decide. It will be open to you to decide whether you want to continue in India or not. That decision was not implemented, the army was sent there, and continues to be there and now in the name of peace talks, it is now clear to everyone, all that the Indian government has finally done is create a situation where the Naga people will forget what it is to struggle, what kind of a struggle can be undertaken? So that today even if they want to restart the struggle, they will find it impossible to do so and the Indian State is now happy. In the name of peace talks, in the name of discussions, political resolutions, this is what Indian State has succeeded in doing in Nagaland. Indian State that way is a much more.... basically its a Brahminical State unlike the Sri Lankan State and therefore its much more intelligent in manipulation and which it has successfully done in Nagaland, in many parts of the country. But this is what we are looking at, when we talk of the counter insurgency strategies and tactics, the amount of injury it does and we should also speak about, speak out openly about not merely physical violence, but the cunning, the politics of cheating, whereby you undertake to resolve an issue but in fact don't do so. In fact use that interregnum..., they have repeatedly said the LTTE will use every peaceful interregnum to strengthen itself. What have you been doing? Sri Lankan State or other states elsewhere, how they have utilized the interregnum of a peace talks or ceasefire, to collect information, to gather information, to infiltrate the movement, to create covert operatives within the movement. This also needs to be discussed, if you are going to talk about the LTTE's method of utilizing every peace interregnum to strengthen itself. This needs to be discussed.

And when the State says, when we say, that you must address.... Suresh referred to the... one expert group of the Planning Commission appointed, I was also part of it. Many people have misunderstood what was supposed to be done. The whole agenda was this. For forty years the Indian State in handling the Maoists has relied upon violence. It has only caused much more injury to the very people whose neglect has given rise to the movement. So how should the Indian State in fact respond? Rather than through military or police means within its constitutional obligations. That was the question being answered. It was not an advise to the government of India, but within its constitutional obligations what it ought to have done, what it ought to do, as a way of dealing with Maoism rather than sending the police and crushing the people. So point by point it was pointed out, look this is..., in

this area of minimum wages this is what the Maoists have done, in this area of self governance this is what they have done, in this area of land this is what they done. So why don't you do these things using the.... there is a legislation for minimum wages, there is a legislation called PESA for self governance, there are land reform legislation.... why don't you do all these things. ?

And the 11th Planning Commission report is before the government, the expert committee's report is before the government. Parallely, simultaneously, the Prime Minister himself, who is normally a soft spoken person, Manmohan Singh, goes on saying "the greatest internal security threat to the country is the Maoists." Its a ridiculous expression, ridiculous opinion even to those who don't fully agree or support the Maoists. It is ridiculous to say they are the biggest internal security threat. The Congress party can be the biggest internal security threat; its corruption can be the biggest internal security threat, its methods of manipulation..., not only Congress Party, all parties, their methods of manipulating the people is a great security threat. But then, that formulation leads to the conclusion that therefore we'll send the paramilitary, we'll send the military.

And when we talk of a political solution, we talk of addressing the real issues, we have to be very careful that we mean it in a genuine sense because they can very well say that, look we have done this. We had a discussion when we went to parts of Orissa where the CRPF has been going around killing tribal people in the name of hunting for Maoists. In Bhubaneswar, we had a press conference. Press people started saying, no you say that government should undertake development as an answer, when they undertake development the Maoists are coming in the way. So you reduce..., when we talk of handling, solving people's problems, addressing their grievances you reduce it to so called development. What is development? A huge road which will go from Vishakhapatnam in Andhra Pradesh to Rourkela in Orissa may be even beyond that. It will be 500 feet wide or whatever it is, because Andhra Pradesh government wants only 500 feet wide roads, nothing less than that. So that road will.... and this is supposed to be opposed, it will be opposed not only the Maoists, the tribal people will also oppose it. It goes through their jungle and they will not be travelling, in fact they will find it difficult to cross the road to catch their goats or their cattle which are on the other side of the road.

So we have to look at what exactly is being addressed in the name of addressing the people's grievances. Sri Lanka is the best example. Rajapaksa was interviewed by N.Ram, chief editor of one.... So rare to find such a senior journalist

interviewing a head of state in such sympathetic language. He is almost putting words in his mouth to justify what he wants to do and therefore that fellow was also very careless. He spoke like a zamindar speaking about his estate not as an elected president of a country and he openly said “let Tamils forget about federalism.” He didn’t say “let Tamils forget about secession”. Any head of state would say so, no head of state would say let them secede. He says let Tamils forget about federalism, this is the expression he uses. And Mr N.Ram doesn’t even say how can you say that, he says ok fine, let us continue. And what is the advise being given by the United States and by India to the Sri Lankan State? Implement 13th amendment to the Sri Lankan constitution. Now who prevented them? 13th amendment has been in force from 1987. 22 years it has been there. Who stopped them from implementing it, firstly? Secondly what is the 13th amendment? One paper has been given, I think written by a friend from Sri Lanka. Indians who know the Indian Constitution know the 13th amendment to the Sri Lankan constitution is a bad copy of the Center-State relations of the Indian Constitution. It’s a fact. It’s a copy and a bad copy. It copies India’s..., we ourselves are not greatly federal. In Sri Lanka there is this peculiar debate. They say India is federal we are unitary. India is half unitary, half federal, whatever it is. But even that was copied badly, the details... some of them are there in the article, one can on some other occasion describe...., ultimately it gives very little power to the provincial councils to legislate or to administer. And this then is now reduced to the political solution. What I am trying to point out is this.

Every word, every expression, not only terrorism but democracy, devolution, federalism, addressing peoples grievances, everything can be distorted. The struggle that we have against these states, these repressive oppressive establishments is also a struggle over language. I am not a hermeneutist or a post structuralist but we do recognize that language itself can be problematic and when we say they are using the word terrorism in a peculiar fashion which encompasses every form of violence, as I said in the very beginning, that is true. It does not say that we therefore refuse to recognize there can be methods of terror which are unacceptable. Similarly when they use the word human rights, when they use the word devolution, when they use the word federalism, they distort all of them. We should save; we should rescue the real meaning of those expressions and insist upon this. It is a very important part of our argument with, our debate with, our argument against these establishments.

So what is devolution? What could be devolution in Sri Lanka? Certainly not the 13th amendment, but repeatedly... and an ordinary newspaper reader who thinks

that O.K, there's some amendment to the Constitution, why don't you implement it? India says so, US says so and Rajapaksa says we'll think about it. It's a third priority for him. The first is rehabilitation and I think everybody who knows anything about Sri Lanka knows that most of them are not going to go back to their villages. He has openly said I don't want to send back to the jungles. When did it become jungle? It was their village, it is their village, their place of habitation, they had their houses which were destroyed in the course of this conflict, they had their lands, today he says I don't want to send them back to the jungle. So they will be in huge camps near Vavuniya or Vanni, Jaffna wherever. And what will happen to the land which is cleared? Suresh said about the Indian Ambanis and Jindals, their interests... one Pakistani company has already been given a contract for complete renovation of the railway line upto Jaffna from Colombo. Our Ambani, Mukhesh Ambani and some other Ambani they will get contracts. That land is going to be cleared for Special Economic Zones and various things. This is what happened with the tsunami rehabilitation 2004. Again India helped, India helped to clear the tsunami effected areas and land was mostly again given to various corporations.

So we have to be very careful when we talk about a political solution or resolving or addressing the grievances of the people. To look at what is in fact being done.... this is very important, because they will distort every word, because they will distort every expression, they will distort every concept. We are dealing with capitalism, neo liberalism which are extremely intelligent in this. As both the chairperson as well as Suresh said... for the whole thing there is a much bigger context that is the neoliberal ideology, philosophy which has overtaken the world. Which believes that absolute freedom to capital to go everywhere, to get profits is so vital, that it has no patience with addressing any grievances, no patience with looking at any grievances, no patience with looking at any rights which may be trampled in the process. This is now common to the entire world, establishments all over the world have this attitude and they have the full support of the capitalist companies and corporations which are behind them. So the possibility that was there earlier that they would look at some legitimate social and political context from which a certain form of violence has arisen, the possibility that was there, the possibility of having that kind of a dialogue and debate was there up to a point that's completely taken away because of the impatience... let everything be cleared, let us have what they call development. This is one of the most abused ideological expressions in recent times. For development get rid of everything. It could be Kashmir....I mean the United States' interest in Kashmir is not that they want Kashmiri's to have justice. They want

peace and as all of us know, a graveyard can be an extremely peaceful place. But they want peace everywhere. But this background is also there, which also we have to keep in mind.

When we have all this in mind, I think, when we talk of dealing with terrorism, the first thing that we need to criticize is the way the word terrorism is taken well beyond what it could legitimately mean to refer to all kinds of violence, political violence, social violence which the State finds itself unwilling to handle by democratic means. While simultaneously other kinds of violence may be even much more destructive...., I am talking about physical violence, I am not talking of the implied violence of a special economic zone and so on, even physical violence like that of what happened in Khandhamal and Mangalore, Udipi recently last year, which the State even when it clicks its tongue and says oh its very bad, it should not have happened, will not call violence because its part of their understanding of India, as an India which will gradually become a Hindu India dominated by Hindus, and therefore some violence in the name of or on behalf of Hindus is all right, it may be bad, but it is part of life, part of Indian society. On the one hand. On the other hand even political violence which is not necessarily targeted against the common people, against the public, but targeted only against the State machinery or some persons whom they declare to be their enemies with some kind of a reason which may be good, may be wrong, but its susceptible to dialogue, susceptible to a discussion, susceptible to debate. All that is clubbed together as terrorism.

In Orissa we heard about the terrorism of the Bajrang Dal, terrorism of the Christian community. Where was the terrorism? One very senior secretary of the revenue department of the Orissa government, happens to be a Telugu man, so we went there and we were discussing with him because he knows us, he would repeatedly say there is terrorism, fundamentalism on both sides. The fundamentalism of the Christians is saying that we have a right to convince some people and make them Christians. That is called fundamentalism. Equally Lakshmanada Saraswathi says nobody can be converted, I will beat them, I will kill them I will force them to become Hindus. That is also fundamentalism, both are fundamentalisms. The word fundamentalism itself can be used in an ideological way, in a distorted way. Now this on the one hand we should criticize.

Secondly we should insist even with an organization like Lashkar-e-Taiba, Jaish-e- Mohammad, or maybe even Al Qaeda, why maybe, even Al Qaeda that however objectionable their tendency to use violence of a terrorist kind against the

common public, against people in the bazaar, against innocent people, against unarmed people may be, nevertheless, it is not just terrorism, you can't just call them terrorists, there is behind them a strong ideological, social, political, argument, point of view which itself stems from historical injustice, which itself comes from historical injustice inflicted upon huge communities, classes, societies, in the last centuries, that we should insist. And we should insist that the focus of the establishment must be on that, on the political, social, ideological, historical background and deal with it, not combat it, deal with it. Deal with it by means which are humane, democratic, based on values of equality and justice.

Thirdly we should be very conscious of the way every word we use is distorted by them. That is not a call for giving up those words. Some people say don't use the word human rights because they have distorted it. Tomorrow you may say don't use the word democracy they have distorted it, don't use the word development they have distorted it. We don't give up these words, we rescue their real content, we rescue their democratic meaning, we rescue their real meaning for us, for the people, because they are capable of distorting everything. We can't give up language because merely they distort it.

And fourthly we need to be conscious as I said in the very beginning that political violence is a problem not only for the State, it can also be a problem for the people. The more arbitrary it is, the more of a problem it is, but even otherwise it can be a problem for the people. If it is arbitrary it gives the State an opportunity to pick up enemies, arbitrary violence creates unnecessary enemies. Every political movement has its enemies because of its politics. A Maoist movement has its enemies who are capitalists and landlords. They are given enemies you can't do anything about it. But if you use arbitrary violence, irrational violence you create more enemies who were not part of the structure of your politics, but unnecessarily created enemies. They can be used as the agents of the State and then your fight gets extended to those agents of the State who may in fact be part of your social base. This is a fact that we have recognized, whether it is in Punjab, the Khalistan movement, Kashmir or even the Maoists who are politically the most mature of all the fighters. If you take a count of the people killed by them the majority belong to their own social base and not to their declared enemies. This is a fact which can be verified by any one. It includes even the Maoists. When that happens, political violence is a problem not only for the State but also for the people. Even when it does not go to that extent it is a problem for the people. We have a duty to also address these groups and point out that your methods

of struggle.... we are not ruling out violence altogether, because I have already said that we can't really foreclose it, may be it is desirable to foreclose it. But it can't be foreclosed, given the kind of responses the Indian State has to democratic and peaceful methods and agitations, nevertheless, a sense of responsibility towards the people whose cause you are exposing, a sense of responsibility towards the people whose cause you are espousing to ensure that the injury caused to them is as little as possible. These are the four tasks that we have is what I feel from the point of view of the human rights movement. I thank you very much.