Sikh Disinformation Lab

MISLEADING

# Misleading: IANS interview frames whole Khalistan movement as a UK security threat

An IANS interview with British MP Bob Blackman, carried by SFIndian, presents the Khalistan movement as a direct and increasing threat to India and the United Kingdom. The Lab assesses the item as Misleading: the movement-wide characterization is unsupported, and a related claim about protective-security funding for Hindu and Jain temples is False.

PUBLISHED
27 October 2026

SOURCE POSTED
21 October 2026

NARRATIVES
Portraying Advocacy for Khalistan as Terrorism · Claiming Pakistan Controls Sikh Political Activism · Portraying Sikh Protests as Extremist Activity · Portraying the Sikh Freedom Struggle and the Events of 1984 and After Solely as Terrorism

## OUR ASSESSMENT

The significance of this article lies in an elected British parliamentarian framing the Khalistan movement as a direct security threat to the United Kingdom and using that assessment to advocate closer intelligence cooperation with India. He is the elected Conservative MP for Harrow East and has served in the House of Commons since 2010. His public position gives his statements political visibility and potential relevance to policy debates, although his views should not be mistaken for an official UK government assessment. The distinction between what he says and what IANS headlines is important: - IANS headline: “Khalistani extremism” as a direct threat. - Blackman's actual quoted description: “the Khalistani movement” as a direct threat. The interview does not identify which UK-based Khalistan organizations, activities or recent incidents substantiate that movement-wide characterization. It also does not explain how the proposal would safeguard lawful political advocacy from inappropriate surveillance or information sharing. This creates a clear CSIII information-integrity issue: a broad characterization of a diaspora political movement is presented through the authority of an elected foreign official within a counterterrorism and intelligence-cooperation narrative. The October 21 IANS interview features elected British Conservative MP Bob Blackman characterizing the Khalistan movement as a direct and increasing threat to India and the United Kingdom while advocating India's inclusion in the Five Eyes intelligence alliance. The article is significant because the allegation is advanced by an elected foreign representative and connected to a concrete intelligence-cooperation proposal, rather than appearing solely as editorial commentary.

Although the headline refers to Khalistani extremism, Blackman's direct quotation identifies the broader Khalistan movement as a security threat without specifying the organizations, incidents or intelligence assessments substantiating that characterization. The report also places Khalistan alongside Pakistani terrorism within a common security argument, without establishing an operational relationship between peaceful Sikh political advocacy and terrorist organizations.

The interview accurately attributes the statements, but does not adequately distinguish legally proscribed violent extremist organizations from lawful Khalistan advocacy or address transnational repression concerns affecting Sikh activists. Blackman's proposal represents his political position, not an official UK government or Five Eyes decision. Blackman's elected position, parliamentary responsibilities and publicly documented engagement with British Hindu community representation make the statement politically significant. His Padma Shri award and favourable remarks concerning Narendra Modi provide additional background but cannot independently establish improper influence or foreign direction.

The report does not examine documented transnational repression concerns involving Sikh activists or discuss safeguards against the misuse of intelligence concerning lawful political dissent. These omissions are particularly relevant given the proposed expansion of intelligence cooperation with India.

The interview was published by IANS and subsequently carried by SFIndian and other diaspora-oriented news publications. This demonstrates identifiable syndication and wider circulation of the parliamentarian's statements, not independent corroboration or proven coordination.

Record under N101 — Sikh Extremism and Terrorism Framing, with N103 noted only as contextual security association. The article is relevant to an existing campaign-level narrative concerning the international securitization of Khalistan advocacy, with particular emphasis on elected-official amplification and proposed intelligence cooperation.

## THE CLAIM

*Terrorism from Pakistan, Khalistani extremism direct threat to India and UK: British lawmaker (IANS interview)*

THE ANALYSIS

## What was published

On 21 October 2026, SFIndian carried an Indo-Asian News Service (IANS) interview under the headline "Terrorism from Pakistan, Khalistani extremism direct threat to India and UK: British lawmaker." The interview features Bob Blackman, the elected Conservative Member of Parliament for Harrow East, who has sat in the House of Commons since 2010.

In the interview, Blackman characterizes the Khalistan movement as a direct and increasing threat to India and the United Kingdom, and advocates India's inclusion in the Five Eyes intelligence alliance.

The Lab assesses the item as Misleading.

## What the review found

The statements are accurately attributed to Blackman. The problem lies in the breadth of the characterization and in what the report leaves out.

There is a gap between the headline and the quotation beneath it. The IANS headline refers to "Khalistani extremism." Blackman's quoted description refers to "the Khalistani movement." The distinction matters: one points to violent conduct, the other to an entire diaspora political movement, much of which consists of lawful advocacy.

The interview does not identify which UK-based Khalistan organizations, activities or recent incidents substantiate a movement-wide characterization. Nor does it explain how the proposed expansion of intelligence cooperation would safeguard lawful political advocacy from inappropriate surveillance or information sharing.

The report also places Khalistan alongside Pakistani terrorism within a single security argument, without establishing any operational relationship between peaceful Sikh political advocacy and terrorist organizations. It does not distinguish legally proscribed violent extremist organizations from lawful Khalistan advocacy, and it does not address documented transnational repression concerns affecting Sikh activists. Those omissions are directly relevant given that the piece advances a proposal to expand intelligence cooperation with India.

Blackman's elected position and parliamentary responsibilities give his statements political visibility and potential relevance to policy debate. They are not an official United Kingdom government assessment, and the Five Eyes proposal represents his political position rather than a decision by the UK government or the alliance. His Padma Shri award and favourable remarks concerning Narendra Modi are part of the public background, but they cannot on their own establish improper influence or foreign direction, and the Lab makes no such assertion.

The interview was published by IANS and subsequently carried by SFIndian and other diaspora-oriented outlets. That demonstrates identifiable syndication and wider circulation of the parliamentarian's statements. It is not independent corroboration, and the Lab records no evidence of coordination.

## The claims

**Claim 1: The Khalistan movement is a direct and increasing threat to the UK. Verdict: Unsupported.**

The assertion is not substantiated at the movement-wide level. The interview offers no named UK investigation, no cited intelligence assessment, no recent incident and no measurable trend capable of supporting a characterization of that breadth. A claim of an increasing threat requires evidence of change over time, and none is presented.

**Claim 2: Hindu and Jain temples receive no UK government protective-security funding. Verdict: False.**

As a general statement, this is contradicted by the record. The United Kingdom operates a protective-security scheme that covers temples and other faith institutions. For 2026 to 2027, the government allocated £5 million for Christian, Hindu, Sikh and other eligible faith sites.

## Context

The item is relevant to an ongoing pattern in which broad characterizations of Sikh political advocacy are advanced through the authority of elected or official voices and attached to concrete security and intelligence proposals. The amplification by an elected foreign representative, rather than by editorial commentary alone, is what gives this item its weight, and is also why the absence of specified evidence and of safeguards for lawful dissent is significant.

CLAIMS ASSESSED

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 01 | The Khalistan movement is a direct and increasing threat to the UK. | UNSUPPORTED |
| 02 | Hindu and Jain temples receive no UK government protective-security funding. | FALSE |

SOURCES


01 https://www.sfindian.com/desi/newsdetail.asp?id=1229070

02 Corrects the general assertion about temple security funding *Other · Retrieved 2026-10-27.*

03 Parliamentary findings about foreign-state intimidation and political freedoms *Other · Retrieved 2026-10-27.*

Sikh Disinformation Lab

# About Sikh Disinformation Lab

Sikh Disinformation Lab is an independent, evidence-based programme founded and hosted by the World Sikh Organization of Canada. It monitors, analyses and publicly documents disinformation affecting Sikhs.

The Lab examines claims against evidence, publishes assessments with that evidence attached, and tracks coordinated campaigns over time. Every published assessment names what was claimed, where it appeared, what the review found, and what that assessment rests on. Where an item makes several distinct claims, each is assessed separately.

Assessments are made against the methodology framework in force at the time of publication. That framework is public, versioned, and reviewed at each phase gate; a material change produces a new version rather than a silent edit. The full method is published at sikhdisinfolab.ca/method.

Corrections are dated entries, never silent edits. Where a published assessment is found to be wrong or incomplete, the correction is recorded against it and listed at sikhdisinfolab.ca/corrections. If you believe something published here is inaccurate, write to the programme and it will be reviewed.

Assessments are the responsibility of Sikh Disinformation Lab.

This project has been made possible with support from the Government of Canada.

> This document was generated from the published assessment at sikhdisinfolab.ca. The version of record is the one on the site, which carries any corrections issued after this file was made.