


Research Article

ULFA and the Question of Terrorism: An Evaluation Under International Law and United Nations Norms

Dr. Chitta Ranjan Boruah*

Lawyer, Gauhati High Court, Assam, India

Corresponding Author: *Dr. Chitta Ranjan Boruah

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18384125>

Abstract

The classification of insurgent movements as terrorist organisations remains one of the most contested issues in international law and political theory. The United Liberation Front of Asom (ULFA), since its formation in 1979, has been alternately viewed as a liberation movement, an armed insurgent group, and a terrorist organisation. This research paper critically examines whether ULFA's activities and organisational character satisfy the legal and normative criteria of "terrorism" under international law.

The study analyses United Nations perspectives, international legal instruments, state practice, and domestic responses of the Government of India, alongside perceptions of the people of Assam and North-East India. A comparative analysis with historical freedom struggles, revolutionary movements, and secessionist conflicts is undertaken to contextualise ULFA's trajectory. The paper argues that while certain phases of ULFA's activities align with internationally condemned terrorist conduct, the organisation cannot be assessed in a legally simplistic or monolithic manner. The paper concludes that international law favours contextual, conduct-based classification rather than blanket political labelling, and emphasizes peaceful transformation, dialogue, and constitutional engagement as lawful pathways.

Manuscript Information

- **ISSN No:** 2583-7397
- **Received:** 10-11-2025
- **Accepted:** 28-12-2025
- **Published:** 26-01-2026
- **IJCRM:** 5(1); 2026: 301-304
- **©2025, All Rights Reserved**
- **Plagiarism Checked:** Yes
- **Peer Review Process:** Yes

How to Cite this Article

Boruah C R. ULFA and the question of terrorism: an evaluation under international law and United Nations norms. Int J Contemp Res Multidiscip. 2026;5(1):301-304.

Access this Article Online


www.multiarticlesjournal.com

KEYWORDS: ULFA, Terrorism, International Law, United Nations, Insurgency, Self-Determination, Assam, North-East India, Armed Movements

1. INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of terrorism has emerged as one of the gravest threats to international peace and security in the post–Cold War era. Yet, international law continues to grapple with the definitional ambiguity of terrorism, particularly when armed movements claim political self-determination or resistance against perceived injustice.

The United Liberation Front of Asom (ULFA) arose in Assam against a backdrop of political alienation, economic grievances, cultural anxiety, and historical consciousness. While the Indian state has officially designated ULFA as a terrorist organisation under domestic law, the international legal position demands a more nuanced evaluation grounded in conduct, intent, targets, and compliance with humanitarian norms.

This research paper examines whether ULFA qualifies as a terrorist organisation under international law, or whether it represents a complex insurgent movement shaped by regional history and socio-political conditions.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The central problem addressed in this study is whether ULFA's activities, objectives, and operational methods satisfy the legal criteria of terrorism under international law, or whether its character is more accurately understood as an armed insurgency with political motivations.

- The issue raises critical questions concerning:
- The absence of a universally accepted definition of terrorism
- The distinction between terrorism and liberation movements
- The role of state narratives versus people's perceptions
- The transformation of armed movements over time

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the present study are

- (i) To examine the concept of terrorism under international law
- (ii) To analyse the United Nations views on terrorism and insurgent movements
- (iii) To assess ULFA's activities in light of international legal norms
- (iv) To study the position of the Government of India
- (v) To analyse public perception in Assam and North-East India
- (vi) To conduct a comparative study with global revolutionary and freedom movements
- (vii) To evaluate whether ULFA can be legally classified as a terrorist organisation
- (viii) To suggest lawful and peaceful alternatives under international standards

4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- Does international law provide a clear definition of terrorism?
- Do ULFA's activities fulfil the legal elements of terrorism?
- How does the United Nations distinguish terrorism from self-determination movements?
- How do public perceptions differ from state classifications?

5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a doctrinal and analytical methodology.

Primary sources include UN resolutions, international conventions, judicial decisions, and customary international law. Secondary sources include academic literature, government reports, human rights documentation, and comparative historical studies. Qualitative analysis and legal reasoning form the core methodology.

6. CONCEPT OF TERRORISM UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW

6.1 Absence of a Universal Definition

International law does not provide a single, universally accepted definition of terrorism. Political disagreements—especially concerning liberation movements—have prevented consensus.

6.2 UN Sectoral Conventions

-Various UN conventions criminalise specific terrorist acts, such as:

- Aircraft hijacking
- Bombings
- Financing of terrorism

-These conventions focus on acts, not political ideology.

6.3 Key Elements of Terrorism

From international practice, terrorism generally involves:

- Use of violence or threat
- Targeting civilians or non-combatants
- Intention to create fear
- Political or ideological motive

7. UNITED NATIONS' VIEW ON INSURGENT MOVEMENTS

The United Nations condemns terrorism unconditionally, yet recognises

- The right of peoples to self-determination
- The legitimacy of political struggles when pursued peacefully
- UN General Assembly resolutions distinguish between armed resistance against colonial domination and terrorist violence against civilians.

8. ULFA'S ACTIVITIES: LEGAL ASSESSMENT

The legal assessment of the United Liberation Front of Asom (ULFA) requires a careful examination of its methods, objectives, targets, and evolution over time, viewed through the lens of international law, international humanitarian law (IHL), and human rights norms. International law does not criminalise political objectives per se; rather, it condemns specific forms of violent conduct, especially when such conduct violates the principles of distinction, proportionality, and necessity.

8.1-Armed Actions and Civilian Impact

One of the most decisive criteria in determining whether an organisation's conduct amounts to terrorism under international law is the nature of violence employed and the identity of the targets. Numerous international instruments and UN General Assembly resolutions consistently emphasise that intentional

attacks against civilians or non-combatants, regardless of political motive, constitute prohibited acts.

-During certain phases of its armed struggle, ULFA engaged in activities such as:

-Bombings in public places

-Kidnappings of civilians and public officials

-Extortion affecting traders, tea garden workers, and ordinary citizens

-Targeted killings and intimidation campaigns

When such acts resulted in civilian casualties, economic disruption, and widespread fear among the population, they clearly fell within the scope of internationally condemned terrorist conduct. Under international humanitarian law, even in non-international armed conflicts, armed groups are bound by Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions, which prohibits violence to life, hostage-taking, and cruel treatment of persons not taking part in hostilities.

Therefore, to the extent that ULFA's actions deliberately targeted civilians or created terror among the civilian population, such conduct aligns with the functional definition of terrorism recognised in international practice.

8.2 Political Objectives and Ideological Character

Unlike transnational terrorist organisations driven by religious extremism or global ideological agendas, ULFA articulated a regional, political, and ethno-nationalist objective—the assertion of Assamese identity, political autonomy, and control over regional resources. From the standpoint of international law, the existence of political or self-determination claims does not automatically legitimise violent means, nor does it automatically categorise a movement as terrorist.

International legal doctrine distinguishes between

-Political motivation (which may be legitimate), and

-Methods of struggle (which may be unlawful)

ULFA's ideological foundation places it closer to armed insurgent movements rather than global terror networks such as Al-Qaeda or ISIS. However, international law remains clear that political objectives cannot justify attacks on civilians. The legitimacy of a cause does not absolve an organisation from responsibility for violations of humanitarian and human rights norms.

Thus, ULFA's political character mitigates simplistic labelling but does not immunise it from legal accountability for prohibited conduct.

8.3 Evolution and Organisational Transformation

A critical and often overlooked element in international legal analysis is the dynamic nature of armed movements. International law increasingly recognises that organisations may evolve over time, shifting from violent insurgency to political engagement.

ULFA's later participation in

-Peace negotiations with the Government of India

-Ceasefire and suspension of armed activities

-Dialogue-based political processes

demonstrates a process of transformation, which international conflict resolution frameworks encourage. The United Nations, in multiple peace processes worldwide, has acknowledged that armed groups may transition into political actors once they renounce violence.

This evolutionary dimension weakens arguments for a permanent and immutable terrorist classification, especially when the organisation demonstrates a willingness to abandon violence and engage in lawful political processes. International law favours rehabilitation and peaceful integration over perpetual criminalisation when genuine transformation occurs.

9. GOVERNMENT OF INDIA'S VIEW

From the standpoint of state sovereignty and constitutional order, the Government of India has consistently designated ULFA as a terrorist organisation under domestic legal frameworks, particularly the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act (UAPA). This classification is grounded in the state's obligation to:

-Protect national unity and territorial integrity

-Maintain public order and internal security

-Safeguard citizens from violence and coercion

Under domestic law, any organisation that employs armed violence against the state, challenges sovereignty, or threatens civilian safety may be lawfully designated as a terrorist entity.

9.1 Legal Justification under Domestic Law

The Indian state's designation is legally justified within its municipal legal system, as ULFA:

-Engaged in armed rebellion against the state

-Disrupted governance and public infrastructure

-Undermined constitutional authority through violence

International law recognises the right of states to enact counter-terrorism legislation and to preserve internal security, provided such measures comply with human rights obligations.

9.2 Limits of Domestic Classification in International Law

However, international law draws a conceptual distinction between domestic legal designation and international legal classification. While a state's perspective carries significant weight, international law does not accept state narratives as conclusive. Instead, it evaluates conduct against objective legal standards.

Thus, India's classification of ULFA as a terrorist organisation is

-Valid under Indian law

-Influential but not determinative under international law

-International legal assessment requires a broader, conduct-based, and contextual evaluation beyond state security frameworks.

10. VIEWS OF THE PEOPLE OF ASSAM AND NORTH-EAST INDIA

Public perception plays a crucial socio-legal role in assessing the legitimacy and character of armed movements. In Assam and the wider North-East region, perceptions of ULFA have

historically been deeply divided, shaped by lived experiences, cultural identity, and political marginalisation.

10.1 Supportive Perceptions

A section of the population perceived ULFA as:

- Defenders of Assamese cultural and linguistic identity
- Resisters against economic exploitation and demographic anxiety
- Voices articulating long-standing regional grievances ignored by mainstream politics

From a sociological perspective, such support reflects structural alienation rather than endorsement of violence. International law recognises that movements often gain legitimacy in communities experiencing perceived injustice, marginalisation, or exclusion.

10.2 Critical and Oppositional Views

Conversely, a significant portion of the population associated ULFA with:

- Fear, instability, and economic disruption
- Loss of civilian lives and livelihoods
- A culture of coercion and forced compliance

For these individuals, ULFA's actions eroded social trust and undermined everyday security. International human rights law places paramount importance on the rights of civilians, regardless of political context.

11. Relevance in International Legal Analysis

International law acknowledges that legitimacy cannot be determined solely by popular support or opposition. However, public perception remains relevant in:

- Understanding the socio-political roots of insurgency
- Designing sustainable peace and reconciliation mechanisms
- Evaluating the prospects for peaceful transformation

A nuanced approach recognises that popular sympathy does not legalise violence, but it underscores the need for political solutions beyond purely militarised responses.

12. FINDINGS

- International law lacks a uniform definition of terrorism
- ULFA's violent acts against civilians align with terrorist conduct
- Political objectives alone do not justify violence
- ULFA cannot be uniformly classified across all phases
- Transformation and dialogue weaken terrorism classification

13. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that ULFA cannot be categorised in absolute terms as either a terrorist organisation or a legitimate liberation movement under international law. Certain activities clearly violate international humanitarian and human rights norms, warranting condemnation. However, international law mandates a conduct-based, contextual, and evolutionary assessment, not blanket political labelling.

The path forward lies in democratic engagement, constitutional accommodation, cultural protection, and peaceful political

participation. International law ultimately prioritises peace, dialogue, and human dignity over armed confrontation.

REFERENCES

1. United Nations. Charter of the United Nations. San Francisco, 1945.
2. United Nations General Assembly. Resolutions on terrorism. New York: United Nations; various years.
3. United Nations. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). New York: United Nations; 1966.
4. United Nations. International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). New York: United Nations; 1966.
5. United Nations. United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. New York: United Nations; 2006.
6. Shaw MN. International Law. 8th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2017.
7. Brownlie I. Principles of Public International Law. 8th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2012.
8. Hannum H. Autonomy, Sovereignty and Self-Determination: The Accommodation of Conflicting Rights. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; 1990.
9. Saul B. Defining Terrorism in International Law. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2006.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial–NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) license. This license permits sharing and redistribution of the article in any medium or format for non-commercial purposes only, provided that appropriate credit is given to the original author(s) and source. No modifications, adaptations, or derivative works are permitted under this license.

About the corresponding author



Dr. Chitta Ranjan Boruah LL.B., LL.M. (Human Rights), M.C.J. (Media Law), M.A. (Public Administration & Oriental Studies), M.Phil. (Political Philosophy) M.Phil. (Oriental Studies), PhD (Philosophy), D.Phil. (Mass Communication), LL.D. (Sikkim Alpine University), Lawyer, Gauhati High Court/Author/Scholar