CHAPTER-II

National Security in India: An Overview

When we speak of a national security of India, we do mean a set of basic principles, based on the core interests of the State that will shape the way in which different elements of national power will protect and further the interests of the Indian Republic. In particular, there is need to focus on the elements of a strategic doctrine which will identify the general missions and basic principles through which our armed forces, diplomatic and intelligence communities will seek to attain the national goals. Ideally, they ought to be publicly articulated so as to reassure the citizens and warn adversaries, actual and potential. In more practical terms, in the famously diverse country like India, a doctrine can provide clarity within the vast and disparate political, societal and governmental structure where, more often than not, people work at cross-purposes, often not intentionally but because they lack a clear understanding of policy and its imperatives. In the process, doctrine can help weld them together towards achieving a common purpose1.

India’s National Security Environment is determined by its geographical attributes, historical legacy, socio-economic circumstances as well as regional and global developments. India is the seventh largest
country in the world with an area of 3.2 million square kilometers, a land boundary of 15000 km., peninsular coastline of 7700 km, 600 island territories and an Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of 2.5 million sq. km. Island territories in the east are 1300 km. Away from mainland and virtually adjacent to India’s ASEAN neighbors. India shares its land boundaries with six countries like Bangladesh (4339 km); China (3439 km); Pakistan (3325 km); Myanmar (1380 Km.); Nepal and Bhutan and maritime boundaries with seven countries like Pakistan, Maldives, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Thailand, Myanmar and Bangladesh. It is important to discuss about the meaning definition of national security before outline the national security of India.

The concept of national security is one of the so-called old as nation state and it is a primary concern of all nations. In a secure nation, a person can presupposes a happy and contended life and consequently people will show high morale and good governance is possible in it. Recent terrorist attacks in India and the United States give us good reason to reevaluate the meaning of the concept of security. In traditional approaches, "survival" of a sovereign state, its territorial integrity and political independence (sovereignty) to be protected by diplomatic, intelligence and military capacities, i.e. ability to deter military aggression or to respond to her successfully was placed in the center of the security.
The concept of national security is directly related to the notions of both security and nation or state and national security means security of state. But writing in 1952, Arnold Wolfers made it clear that the idea of national security “may not mean the same thing to different people. The national security of a nation is directly related to the threats faced by the nation and visualized in the state. In 2008, Ann Fitz-Gerald acknowledged the similar view on differing definitions of national security in the contemporary period when she stated that “national security differs from country to country, and indeed from institution to institution.” This illustrates that the concept of national security is different from scholars to scholars, nations to nations, time to time. In the modern world, it is viewed in broader framework which includes not only military prism but also society and individuals from danger, which protects by a multitude of state and non-government entities, military and civilian, national and international sector, as well as state’s participation in the spheres of international and global security. This concept is also known as non-conventional security which acknowledges the need of protecting even the societal security, social security, national unity, national dignity and pride, national identity, energy security, environmental security, economic security, social security, national information resources and other state and national values.
The term of national security in the language of social science is a controversial concept. Notwithstanding the wide range of studies of security, published over the past sixty years, to conceptualize 'security' in a coherent and systematic way, no single universally accepted definition of security has been produced as it is a contested concept which defies pursuit of an agreed general definition and underdeveloped concept. Till the end of the cold war, the defining security concept concerned as a national agenda has been with the threat or use of force and associated concepts and strategies like war, deterrence, alliance, arms control, disarmament, and crisis management. But after end of cold war its definition brought out the diminishing chances of war or nuclear war in broad way and internal challenges to the state are being looked as major threat to the states' security. The term 'security' of a state generally means the preservation of territorial integrity, political independence, sovereignty and the economic prosperity of the people. The term security is ambiguous in content as well as in format and it refers to different sets of issues and values.

Although the ambiguity presents daunting problems to policy makers and contemporary analysts, it should not handicap the work of historians. Indeed, it should focus attention on central questions: How have policy makers assessed dangerous threats. How have different executive branch officials, government agencies, legislative committees, political parties,
economic interest groups, and ethnic communities defined core values. National security has been characterized Woofers as an 'ambiguous symbol' which, if used without specifications, 'leaves room for more confusion than sound political counsel or scientific usage can afford'.

Before defining security into further in international relations and theories, it is important to bring up to the standard literary meaning of the word "security". Cambridge dictionaries online explains the meaning of security as crime or attacks by foreign protection of a person, building, organization, or country against threats such as crimes and attacks by foreign countries. The International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences explains it as "the term 'national security' has long been used by politicians as a rhetorical phrase and by military leaders to describe a policy objective .... When modern social scientists talk of the concept, they generally mean the ability of a nation to protect its internal values from external threats."

Accordingly, the term security of a state in international relations primarily concerned with external danger or fear that a country might face in military terms and it is linked with war and the ability of the nation to deter, defend and attack. But the term security is an elusive term which resists definition. It is employed in a wide range of contexts and to multiple purposes by individuals, corporations, governments and academics.
Traditionalists in the field of security studies regarded the concept of security in exclusively military and state-centered terms, equating security with military issues and the use of force. This version of security was intimately linked to the realist approach which focus on military threats and the use of force 'complemented ideas of power and interest and the rather tough-minded approach to foreign policy which seemed appropriate for the Cold War years' These philosophical foundations were laid by Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes and Rousseau which depicts international relations as a struggle for power among strategic, self-interested states and international society is best described as a condition of international anarchy. According to this approach, the objective of national security is survival of the nation-state rather than the guarantee of international security.

As Buzan suggests, 'since the state ultimately rests on its physical base, the protection of territory and population must count as fundamental national security concerns'.with the emerging of new non-traditional threats like economic threats, social threats, lack of food etc. and globalization made cause to change the meaning of national security which concern not only the military threats but also the threats on non-conventional nature.

An example of a traditional definition of security, stressing the centrality of war, is given by Bellany as 'Security is a relative freedom from
war, coupled with a relatively high expectation that defeat will not be a consequence of any war that should occur.11 Walt defines security studies, and by extension the concept of security, as 'the study of the threat, use and control of military force', especially of 'the specific policies that states adopt in order to prepare for, prevent, or engage in war'.12 He emphasizes that military power is the central focus of the field, yet he concedes that 'military power is not the only source of national security, and military.

Harold Lasswell, a political scientist, in 1950, looks at national security from almost the same aspect, that of external coercion, "The distinctive meaning of national security means freedom from foreign dictation."13

While recognizing the need to segregate the subjectivity of the conceptual idea from the objectivity, Arnold Wolfers, talks of threats to acquired values, "An ambiguous symbol meaning different things to different people. National security objectively means the absence of threats to acquired values and subjectively, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked."14 In this respect, national security can be meant as a negative concept as absence of threats in the state worth security of the state. In another sense, if the state has the capable of curbing the threats caused by any source, the state is in the state of affairs of secure.
Berkowitz and Bock defined as "National security can be most fruitfully defined as the ability of a nation to protect its internal values from external threats." Security may be defined as a protective condition which statesmen either try to acquire, or preserve, in order to guard the various components of their polities from either external or internal threats.\(^\text{16}\)

These definitions of security are viewed negative in its approach in Sense that security is only concerned in nonappearance and tackling of threats. Simon Dalby, in negative perspective, he defined as "It is crucial to note the negative use of the term in this definition. Security is a term limited in usefulness for denoting desirable political situations because it is formulated as protection from some threat or danger rather than as promoting a desirable situation. Despite the positive value weighting usually ascribed to the term, analyzed even this simply, it appears a very limited term. It is defined in reaction to threats, and usually specifically to threats to the state."\(^\text{17}\) So, Security is something done by states for the state and its citizens. There is no obligation or moral duty of citizens to provide security. These military-dominated definitions of national security were inherited by the cold war era. The cold war structures of international relations outshined the conceptual development of national security.

In this context, Raymond Aron defined the concept of national security as "To want the maximum of security means to want the maximum
of power, which in turn means the greatest number of allies, the fewest possible enemies. In other words, the bipolar world adopted the concept of alliance security, namely the NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) and Warsaw Pact, and its main push was external threats. Under this point of view, war, aggression and nuclear deterrence are the main instruments of protecting a nation's core values or interests.

In post-cold war, with change of nature of threats and another impetus force of globalization, the concept of security was internationalized and its scope became broad. In internationalized concept of security, the security of the indigenous people of any region became secondary to the security needs of the larger system.

Afterward, in this atmosphere of strong faith in military power, several scholars objected to this modest definition of security.

From the early 1990s onwards, a number of major scholarly debates co-shaped thinking about security. The first signs of a trend towards the expansion of the definition of security can be traced back to the late 1960s, when Robert McNamara suggested that security implied the freedom of a state to develop and improve its position in the future: Security is development and without development there can be no security ... development means economic, social and political progress. It means a
reasonable standard of living, and reasonable in this context requires continual redefinition; what is reasonable in an earlier stage of development will become unreasonable at a later stage.\textsuperscript{19}

The end of the Cold War offered scholars of international relations and security studies, an opportunity to focus on subjects other than deterrence theory and balance of power. The nature of wars became different from the old wars in many ways which were based on goals, finance and methods of warfare. The influences caused to the studies of international relations and security studies to been believe to non-conventional security.

Richard Ullman was one of the first scholars to criticize the almost exclusive focus on military threat in conventional (realist) thinking of security who emphasized that 'defining national security merely (or even primarily) in military terms conveys a profoundly false image of reality.' He argues that the emphasis on military threats arising from beyond the borders of one's own country is doubly misleading.\textsuperscript{20} He argues that the emphasis on military threats arising from beyond the borders of one's own country is doubly misleading. First, it argues vigorous attention on the non-military threats undermine the stability of nations. Second, it presupposes that threats arising from within the state are somehow more dangerous to its security than threats that arising from outside state. Adopting a broader concept of security, Ullman contends that, a threat to national security is an action or
sequence of events that (1) threatens drastically and over a relatively brief span of time to degrade the quality of life for the inhabitants of a state, or (2) threatens significantly to narrow the range of policy choices available to the government of a state or to private, nongovernmental entities (persons, groups, corporations) within the state.²¹

The concept of security has been changed from “against” to “with” as it was considered as the ability of a nation to defense against the threats triggered military agents during cold-war while in present perspective it means to tackle with threats within the state. The concept is increasingly complex and multifaceted which include military, political, economic, societal and environmental dimensions, and the inter-linkages between them. Perhaps even most – the much greater threats to security come from internal conflicts, disease, hunger, environmental contamination, street crime, or even domestic violence. K. Subramanyam, in this line, defined security in wider perspective. He defines, at the very outset, a concept of national security that is total. According to him, national security does not mean merely safeguarding of territorial boundaries; it means, also, ensuring that the country is industrialized rapidly and develops into a cohesive, egalitarian, technological society.²² E.H. Carr explains "Scientists, social scientists, and historians are all engaged in different branches of the same study; the study of man and his environment, of the effects of man on his environment and of
his environment on man. The object of study is the same; to increase man's understanding of, and mastery over, his environment."²³ After the end of the Cold War and the subsequent impact It includes social security, environmental security, food security, personal security etc. All these security are encompassed in a term called human security by United Nation Development Programme Declaration in 1994 of a new phase of globalization, the rise of new types of security threats challenged the traditional perspective on security, with its focus on the survival of states. These new threats included such dangers as environmental pollution, transnational terrorism, massive population movements, and infectious diseases, such as HIV/AIDS.²⁴ Therefore, from the above mentioned views and discussions over meanings and definitions, the concept of national security encompasses more than military security. Broadly, national security is divided into two, traditional and non-traditional security. Non-traditional is practically confined in domestic affairs of the state.

This idea of human security was most famously introduced in the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Report of 1994. The UNDP asserted that human security has two main elements: protection from (1) Threats, such as hunger, disease, and repression, and (2) Sudden and harmful disruptions in the patterns of daily life. The UNDP also asserted that globalization creates the need to think about security in human rather than
state-centric terms: “In the globalizing world of shrinking time, shrinking space and disappearing borders, people are confronted with new threats to human security—sudden and harmful disruption in the pattern of daily life.” According to the UNDP, there are seven specific elements that comprise human security: Economic security, Food security, Health security, Environmental security, Personal security, Community security, and Political security.

The human security concept seeks to reframe the pursuit of security by placing individual human beings at the center of security concerns in the place of state security in the concept of national security. Conferring the theoretical foundation of human security is rooted in the theory of social constructivism, Fidler notes that “social constructivists would focus, thus, on the ideational move away from the narrow, realist concept of national security toward more expansive notions of security, such as human security, a shift that illustrates the power of ideas to shape how humans socially construct their relations globally.” A security threat can be construed as any menace to “the quality of life of individuals in human security.”

Thus, the problems of hunger, poverty, environmental degradation, underdevelopment, infectious diseases, and even natural disasters (such as tsunamis) as the most urgent security threats to the daily life of individuals are included in human security. Human security highlights
the interdependence of these various security concerns. In a similar way, Simon Dalby suggests with regard to the changing world atmosphere that "security needs to encompass the interests of the people rather than just states, in gaining access to food, shelter, basic human rights, health care, and the environmental conditions that allows these things to be provided into the long run." For instance, if one group or individual is threatened, many other communities are also likely at risk. Violations of human rights and human security in a state cannot be contained in that one state alone.

This perspective reveals an intrinsic aspect of human security: all humankind is inextricably connected. Thus, Jolly and Basu Ray argued that the concept of human security has at least four essential features of a national security because first, it is a universal concern relevant to people everywhere. Second, the components of security are interdependent. Third, human security is easier to ensure through early prevention. Fourth, and perhaps most relevant for present purpose, is the shift of the referent object of security from states to people. It focuses on people's security and sustainable human development rather than on territorial (state) security and armaments.

Economic security is a special element of human security and also a very important component of national security in contemporary era. Economic insecurity can arise from internal or external actions which affect
national economic policies, international financial position and trade policies. Natural disasters like flood, drought, earthquake etc. destroy the economic and social stability of the state. Economic security concerns access to the resources, finance and markets necessary to sustain acceptable levels of welfare and state power. The collapse of a military strong Soviet Union dramatized the importance of economic prosperity. Rise of Germany, Japan and China showed that economics was vital in any world order and has its definitive role in shaping the orders too. Amongst enduring interests of U.S.A, the economy given a high priority role based on Obama administration belief that “more influence comes from economic leadership than from military might.”  

As Buzan points out, “the normal condition of actors in a market economy is one of risk, aggressive competition and uncertainty”  

this insecure nature makes economic security hard to disentangle. The threshold of what is acceptable based on an inherent instability and what is a threat can be difficult to identify. As has been seen with the current economic crisis of world which was originated from the U.S.A., there is a significant amount of debate as to what parts of states’ economy should be “saved” by the government and what should not. The economic sector is also a clear example of how the different sectors interact with one another. Buzan discoursed the important linkage between economic security and military security. It is easy to see that they military security is dependent on economic security due to budget constraints and limits. If the
economic security is not sufficient, even military security cannot be made strong. Therefore, economic security can be considered a key indicator as to the general security of a state. If developed and developing countries are compared, it is clear that with economic security other levels of security become easier to establish the remaining security of the state and consequently the state can maintain the stability of the state.

The most striking threat in a country is the problem of food security. Food security means that all people at all times have both physical and economic access to basic food. This requires not just enough food to go round. It requires that people have ready access to food—that they have an "entitlement" to food, by growing it for themselves, by buying it or by taking advantage of a public food distribution system. The availability of food is thus a necessary condition of security but not a sufficient one. Food security is a 'flexible concept' as reflected in the many attempts at definition in research and policy usage. Food security as a concept originated only in the mid-1970s, in the discussions of international food problems at a time of global food crisis. Food security was defined in the Proceedings of the 1974 World Food Summit as: 'availability at all times of adequate world food supplies of basic foodstuffs, to sustain a steady expansion of food consumption... and to offset fluctuations in production and prices'. Hunger is usually understood as an uncomfortable or painful sensation.
caused by insufficient food energy consumption. Scientifically, hunger is referred to as food deprivation. Even in developing countries, per capita food production increased by 18% on average in the 1980s. And in South Asia, 30% of babies are born underweight—the highest ratio for any region in the world and a sad indication of inadequate access to food, particularly for women, who are often the last to eat in the household. Food insecurity is mainly caused by lack of foodstuffs, economy and instability of states affairs. Thus without food security, no security of a state may not be maintained by the state and without sufficient economy no food security can be guaranteed. These components are interdependent.

Health Security means to guarantee a minimum protection from diseases and unhealthy lifestyles. According to the United Nations, threats to health security are usually greater for poor people in rural areas, particularly children in both developing and industrial countries. This is due to malnutrition and insufficient access to health services, clean water and other basic necessities.

Environmental security refers to protect people from the short- and long-term ravages of nature, man-made threats in nature, and deterioration of the natural environment. Air pollution, global warming, caused by the emission of greenhouse gases give a great threat for life in all countries of world especially in industrialized countries. The World Commission on
Environment and Development clearly linked security with environment in its 1987 Brundtland Report: "Humankind faces two great threats. According to Human Development Report, 1994, personal security is a vital human security for people as their security from physical violence. In both poor nations and rich, human life is increasingly threatened by unpredictable violence caused by various sources like activities of terrorism, wars, natural calamities, ethnic conflict, rape, domestic violence, child abuse, accident abuse. Community security means to protect people from the loss of traditional relationships and values and from sectarian and ethnic violence. Traditional communities, particularly minority ethnic groups are often threatened. Political security is concerned with whether people live in a society that honors their basic human rights. Human rights violations are most frequent during periods of political unrest. Along with repressing individuals and groups, governments may try to exercise control over ideas and information.

India's first priority in policy of security is socio-economic development. At the same time, India believes that an assured level of regional stability is necessary for this development. To this end, India has traditionally pursued a broad policy of defensive defense. However military developments, and growing hostilities with Pakistan, have caused her to shift to a strategy of war prevention. The then Indian Prime Minister of India, P.
V. Narasimha Rao, summarized India’s national security policy objectives to meet these challenges in 1995 as the defense of national territory over land, sea, and air to include the inviolability of land borders, land territories, offshore assets, and maritime trade routes; internal security against threats to unity or progress from religious, language, ethnic, or socio-economic dissonance, the ability to influence other regional countries to promote harmonious relationships that support Indian national interests; and the ability to execute out-of-area operations to contribute to international stability.  

Since India became freedom from British, it had experienced five wars but in the fact that India’s armed forces have participated in 32 major military operations, India has historically taken an apathetic approach to national security issues. Since it was only unified in 1947, it has no long tradition of strategic thought as a nation. Recently, India has become conscious of the need for strategic defense. The funding of defense expenditures was also not considered a core priority and was handled ad hoc. It was only in 1995 that India was able to state a comprehensive defense policy, even though a partial one.  

Recently, there have been several bomb blasts in India, but we hardly witnessed any terrorist wearing a skullcap. Mumbai has been the most preferred target for most terrorist organizations; many are operating with a base in Pakistan. Over the past few years, there have been a series of attacks, including explosions in 11/7 local trains and
the 26/11 attacks, when two of the prime hotels, a landmark train station, and a Jewish Chabad house, in South Mumbai, were attacked and sieged.India is a vast country having wherein various ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic groups live together. This complexity and vastness has given rise to a number of national security problems. The Annual Report of 1997-98, in its opening chapter entitled "National Security Environment" stated that India's national security objectives are served by:

a) Defending the country’s borders as defined by law and enshrined in the constitution and protecting the lives and property of its citizens against terrorism and insurgencies.

b) Promoting further co-operation and understanding with neighbouring countries and implementing mutually agreed confidence-building measures.

c) Working with countries of the Non-Aligned Movement to address key challenges before the international community and engaging in cooperative security initiatives such as the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF).

d) Pursuing security and strategic dialogues with major powers and key partners.
e) Following a consistent and principled policy on disarmament and international security issues based on universality, nondiscrimination and equal security for all.

f) Having a secure and effective deterrent against the use or the threat of use of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) against India. 44

Unfortunately, India had no written defense policy statement, as indeveloped countries like the USA and others, even "after three decades of achieving independence."45 In his book, Minister Jaswant Singh, has conceptualized national security in broader terms encompassing economic development, food security, energy security, environment, demography, intelligence and nuclear.46 The Cabinet Secretariat Resolutions No. 281129.6.98/TS. of April 16, 1999 stated "The central Government recognizes that national security management requires integrated thinking and coordinated application of the political, military, diplomatic, scientific and technological resources of the state to protect and promote national security goals and objectives. National Security in the context of the nation needs to be viewed not only in military terms but also in terms of internal security, economic security, technological strength and foreign power. The role of the Council is to advise the Central Government on the said matters." 47 Internal security of India could not view as exclusively
or even primarily a military task. Government departments and agencies, state and local governments, the private sector, and individual citizens are required to perform many strategic, operational, and tactical level tasks in an integrated fashion for securing "domestic battle space". Success will depend largely upon the nation’s ability to achieve unity of effort at all levels of government.\textsuperscript{48} The scope of internal security in India includes emergency preparedness and response (both for terrorism and natural disasters); insurgency and left wing extremism; domestic intelligence activities; maintenance of law and order in aid to civil authority; protection of critical infrastructure and public safety; border security, both land and maritime borders; transportation security (including aviation, maritime and terrestrial transport); protection against chemical, biological and radiological threats; human it ira an assistance, and maintenance of essential services\textsuperscript{49}.

**Conclusion:**

The concept of national security is a contested concept but it is most important to all nations of state. The internal security problems should not be treated as merely law and order problems. All the dimensions i.e., political, economic and social should dealt with comprehensively at all levels. At times, the required measures will conflict with each other. Going too far in one direction could be counter-productive. These security requirements have to be met, but that does not mean giving these security agencies a free hand.
Striking the right balance is the key to success in meeting these challenges effectively. We need a comprehensive security policy that will be implemented effectively at all levels. India's national security is threatened by various agents both from internal and external. Unfortunately, till now, India has no national security strategy to such threats. Under which national institutions will be established to tackle this menace.
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