This thesis looks at the internal security of India in the light of the origin, role, organisation, changes and the performance of four major paramilitary forces in India. They are: the Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF), the Border Security Force (BSF), the Indo-Tibetan Border Police (ITBP) and the National Security Guard (NSG). In security studies, the traditional focus has been on threats from outside the borders of a country. Increasingly, the focus has shifted to domestic sources of insecurity and problems of violence internally. While a great deal is known about India's and, indeed, about Third World security with respect to external threats, much less is known of conceptions of internal security. Ironically, one of the biggest gaps in knowledge is the use and organisation of force internally.

In India's case, for instance, much is known on India's armed forces and national security doctrines with respect to external threats. Much less is known systematically about the use of force internally. Given that all over the Third World, internal conflicts and violence are seen to be virtually the primary source of threat to security, security studies must pay greater attention both to the causes and the management of internal violence. This thesis, by focussing on the paramilitary forces in India, hopes to make a
contribution to the study of how internal conflicts and violence is managed by this increasingly popular instrument of the Indian state.

The Indian case is, in some sense, both unique as also of greater relevance to the Third World. India functions as a plural democracy, and at the same time, right from the moment of its independence, has witnessed violence from a variety of internal sources often aided and abetted by outside powers or sources. The Indian state has used various instruments to combat internal violence and has not been shy of using large scale force when necessary. Thus, India is unique in having both democracy and unity even while deploying force to quell violence. In this sense, India is increasingly relevant to the contemporary Third World. This is so with the movement towards democracy in the Third World. Many Third World countries face or may face situations similar to India, that is, the desire to maintain democracy while, at the same, time preserving national unity and order against threats from internal sources. How India has managed to preserve democracy and used force internally is potentially a model for other Third World countries.

I. Internal Security in the Third World

In the International Relations literature, the realist paradigm has dominated the debate on security. The realist viewpoint on
security is based on two major assumptions. First, security is synonymous with the security of the state against external threats, and secondly, these threats are primarily military in nature and require the building up of military capability, if the security of the state is to be preserved. Arnold Wolfers sums up this realist position aptly: "security rises and falls with the ability of a nation to deter an attack or to defend it."

During the Cold War, the neo-realist paradigm had a great influence on the discourse of security. For neo-realists, the sources of conflict are in the international system and inter-state relationships. This understanding grew out of the realist demarcation between domestic order and international anarchy where war is an ever present possibility. Given the absence of an international authority to ensure compliance, states rely on their own capabilities to ensure security. This self-help system results in what the realists call a "security dilemma" which results in arms races that threaten the overall security of the system. This realist worldview was heavily influenced by the existence of nuclear weapons, great powers rivalry and the balance of power. The
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underlying concern was that since nuclear wars were too dangerous to fight, security was synonymous with nuclear deterrence and nuclear power balancing.

Even those scholars who had a different worldview and talked about international society and complex interdependence were concerned about external dimension of security. As Martin Wight writes, "If there is an international society, then there is an order of some kind to be preserved and maintained or even developed. It is not fallacious to speak of a collective interest and security acquires a broad meaning. It can be enjoyed and pursued in common." ³

These major theoretical formulations, particularly the realist school, viewed Third World security from a great power perspective and in this way underestimated conflicts in the Third World. The neo-realist assertion that the Cold War was a period of stability had little relevance to the Third World because the Third World was the scene of 98% of all international conflicts since 1945.⁴ According to K.J. Holsti, out of 164 armed conflicts between 1945 and 1995, all

³ Martin Wight, "Western Values in International Relations" in Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight, eds., Diplomatic Investigations (London: Allen and Unwin, 1966), p.103.

but five were located in the Third World. Holsti has excluded anti-colonial wars from this data. If one includes these figures, the concentration of conflicts would appear to be more alarming. A close look at these conflicts reveals the limitation of neo-realist arguments that systemic factors can explain international conflicts. The large majority of conflicts were intra-state in nature. Their cause was in the domestic polity rather than in the external environment. According to Holsti, out of 164 conflicts since 1945, 77% were domestic conflicts. If we include anti-colonial wars, the percentage would be much higher. Furthermore, if one looks behind many conflicts which appear to be inter-state in nature the sources are in the domestic politics of one of the participants. Therefore, domestic variables have greater explanatory capacity in regard to Third World conflicts.

After the end of the Cold War, attempts were made to broaden the security agenda to include internal sources of conflicts. The focus on the military dimension of security is being re-examined and the definition of security is being broadened to include economic and ecological dimensions and the overall well being of the people. Azar
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and Moon define security more broadly: "Security in the context of Third World states does not simply refer to the military dimension as is often assumed in Western discussions of the concept, but to the whole range of dimensions of a state's existence which are already taken care of in the more developed states especially those of the West.... For example, the search for internal security of the state through nation-building the search for secure systems of food, health, money and trade as well as the search for security through nuclear weapons." Nicole Ball argues that economic and military security are highly interdependent and internal military conflicts often arise when elites are unwilling to alter exploitative social and economic relations and political systems which work to their advantage.

Caroline Thomas also stresses the economic dimension of security not only in terms of internal security of the state but also in terms of a secure system of food, health, money and trade. She also notes interdependence between military and economic security when the failure to meet individuals' basic needs reinforce the problem of internal security as regimes that are perceived to not be working in the interest of people arm themselves to protect themselves against
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democratic unrest. K.J. Holsti links the security of the Third World countries with the overall nation-building project. According to him, there are four major problems confronting the Third World countries; "First, the definition and integration of political communities; secondly, the sustenance of territorial coherence and the maintenance of state integrity; thirdly, developing principles of legitimacy; and fourthly, economic, social and political development. These issues are all related in a broader problematique, the state building and sustenance project. External factors are involved in all these but their role is seldom crucial."

Mohammad Ayoob prefers to define security in relation to vulnerabilities that threaten to bring down or significantly weaken state structures, both territorial and institutional as well as the regimes that preside over these structures and profess to represent them internationally. This definition, as Mohammad Ayoob points out, assumes the primacy of political variables in determining the security that states or regime enjoy. Different types of vulnerabilities including those of economic and ecological varieties become integral
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components of this definition of security only if and when they become acute enough to take on overtly political dimensions and threaten state boundaries, state institutions or regime survival.\textsuperscript{11}

All these redefinitions of security have one thing in common, namely, that the territorial and political survival of the state is the key to security. Only then will states be able to ensure the well being of people through the management of social conflict, the establishment of foundations of economic growth, and the existence of harmony among ethnic, linguistic and religious groups to protect certain core values which are the guiding principles of the state.

These issues become even more important if we examine their relationship with the external environment. In a number of cases internal conflict in the country spills over into neighbouring countries affecting regional security and inter-state relationships. Conversely, internal conflict in one country can be aggravated, stimulated, aided and supported by external powers and sources. This external support may be in different forms. It could be moral or ideological support, it could be in the form of a proxy war or it could

be outright military intervention. In all these cases internal conflict could have serious regional or international ramifications.

In the contemporary world, the utility of war as a rational instrument of state policy to gain political objective is being seriously questioned.\(^\text{12}\) One reason for this is that the revolution in military affairs (RMA) has made war a very costly affair. Wars to seize territory with alien populations have become untenable.\(^\text{13}\) The lethality and destruction caused by conventional war is often greater than the objective to be achieved. Also, the advent of nuclear weapon has made conventional war irrelevant.\(^\text{14}\) Therefore, high intensity conventional wars are not normally resorted for the kinds of reasons that generated such wars in the past. In such a situation, internal conflicts of various types occur: low intensity conflict, insurgency, terrorism, revolutionary war, protracted war, proxy war. These are far more common than inter-state war. As Liddle Hart says, “This is


the only kind of war that fits the condition of the modern age." For external powers involvement in such conflicts is emerging as the most preferred strategy. While they can be initiated at modest cost, the defending nation has to spend many times more to defend itself and to counter it. Multi-ethnic multi-cultural and multi-lingual societies are more prone to such conflicts because these differences can be used as the most potent factors to be exploited to hurt a country, to break its unity, fragment it, create insurgency, terrorism and other social turbulence.

Thus, the management of internal security is not only important in terms of the survival of Third World states but also an effective instrument to manage inter-state conflicts. In this context, it is important to understand the sources of internal conflicts. When and how do they develop into violent conflict and what structures and institutions do states have to counter them?

II. Sources of Internal Conflict

Third World states face the problem of domestic conflict from a variety of sources. The common manifestations of such conflicts are in the form of armed conflict between the state and a community or between different communities within territorial boundaries of the
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state. The causes of such conflicts vary from one state to another. Also, there is seldom a single factor that cause armed violence within a state. Often, it is a combination of various factors and processes which is responsible for eruption of violence. The changing nature of the state, the changing pattern of relationships between state and civil society, or between different communities, uneven economic development, external factors or complex inter-relationships between all these factors are potential causes of conflict. Under what circumstances do these cleavages in society and the state develop into armed conflict? The literature on the causes of domestic violence provide some insight but they are not generalisable to all armed conflict in the Third World. Still, it would be appropriate to examine some explanations on the causes of internal conflict.

Barry Posen argues that different communities living together for a considerable period of time are likely to take up arms against one another in the face of collapsing central authority. This argument gained ground after the disintegration of Soviet Union and the collapse of Communist regimes in Eastern Europe which gave rise to ethnic violence there. Two explanations are given to explain the eruption of violence in such a situation. First, political opportunists
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exacerbates ethnic tensions and promise to provide security for communal groups against their enemies. These elements become active when state authority collapses. Secondly, ethnic tensions are indeed primordial rather than situational and they are suppressed under a strong state. The weakening of state authority results in the re-emergence of primordial loyalties.\textsuperscript{17} Theda Skocpol also links internal conflict with weakening of state structure. Developments within the international state system, such as defeat in a war or threat of invasion, may weaken the coercive power of the state, providing critical opportunity for revolutionary groups.\textsuperscript{18} Mohammad Ayoob, while highlighting the problems of weak states, suggests that the process of democratisation may, in fact, exacerbate the problem of internal security. Ayoob sees internal conflicts as a part of the state building process. State making and internal conflicts are two sides of the same coin. Until the process of state-making is completed conflicts will continue to characterise the Third World.\textsuperscript{19}


\textsuperscript{18} Theda Skocpol, \textit{States and Social Revolutions} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979), p.23.

\textsuperscript{19} Mohammad Ayoob, n.11, pp.265-70.
These state centric explanations throw little light on individual or group motivation to revolt against state authority. The individual calculations, organisation of social groups and social structures are equally important to understand the causes of internal violence.

Stephen R. David applies the neo-realist paradigm to explain internal conflict in the Third World. According to David, "It is more accurate to assume an international order and domestic anarchy where the greatest threat to most states stems from development within state rather than external to them.... Internal conflicts happen for much of the same reason that cause wars between states. People or groups seeking to maximise their interest unchecked by any coercive power will conflict with one another. Internal wars are stopped when one group become powerful enough to impose its will on other challengers. Key neo-realist concepts like balance of power and security dilemma are, therefore, as applicable to internal conflict as to inter-state conflicts."²⁰

Charles Tilly also sees group behaviour as a source of internal conflict. To Tilly, groups in power seek to maximise their collective interest by attempting to remain in power, while groups out of power seek to maximise their collective interest by seizing power. Internal

conflicts are more likely to begin when the incumbents hold on power is weakened thus creating an opportunity for their replacement. 21

Another set of theories see individual motivation or frustration as a source of conflict. Thomas Hobbes' understanding of human nature provides an insight into conflict in society. According to Hobbes, people naturally seek to gain at the expense of others in the absence of an authority. 22 In such an environment, people live in a constant state of fear and there are no opportunities for individuals to better themselves. In such a situation people agree to obey the orders of a sovereign. The latter, in return, ensures an environment under which people are safe from one another and free to pursue their self-interest. Internal war occurs when people believe that the sovereign can no longer provide them with the safety they require. The key to prevent internal war for a government, therefore, is to retain enough coercive power to discourage any would be challenges to existing authority.

Ted Gurr, on the other hand, focusses on the other side of the human nature: a sense of relative deprivation among the population. People feel deprived when they perceive that their capabilities or

22 Quoted in K.J. Holsti, n.10, p.110.
opportunities are not adequate to achieve goals and positions to which they feel entitled. In other words, their value expectations exceed their value capabilities. If a group of people who experience deprivation blame their problems on the political system, a revolutionary political movement may occur.\textsuperscript{23} Along the same lines, James Davies argues that internal violence occur after a long period of rising expectation, followed by a sharp reversal in which expectations are not fulfilled.\textsuperscript{24}

These individual centric explanations offer little guidance to explain now a sense of deprivation or an urge for self-realisation is transformed into mass political activity. There is little light shed on the mobilisation or organisation of movements.

Another set of explanations emphasise the structural changes in the society due to internal or external factors and their potential to develop into conflict. Chalmers Johnson argues that a society is normally in a state of equilibrium with its values and environment comfortably synchronised.\textsuperscript{26} In this circumstance, one might also say


that state has legitimacy. In case new values are introduced or the environment changes either from within or from outside the country and the authorities fail to re-establish the equilibrium by adjusting either values or environment, a conflict may occur. Samuel Huntington argues that “social and economic change – urbanisation, increase in literacy and education, industrialisation, mass media expansion – extend political demands, broaden political participation.”26 Those changes in the society, if not channelised properly by expanding political institutions, lead to violence and internal conflict. The state responds in such a situation, as Joel S. Midgal argues, by enforcing its rule on social organisations. The result is conflict between the state and social organisations. If a situation of accommodation is not achieve in this process, the state may resort to use of force to ensure compliance.27

These structural approaches are helpful in understanding the causes of disequilibrium in a society and the government’s rule in creating or correcting it. But it is important to understand that not every case of structural disequilibrium results in armed conflict between state and a community or between different communities.


Under what circumstances does a situation of conflict develop into an armed violence or protracted armed conflict? Russell Hardin talks about "tipping events". There are sudden changes, even random events, which result in disintegration of long-standing relationships in a society or between communities and the state. In India, for instance, Operation Blue Star in June 1984, when the Indian army stormed the Golden Temple in Amritsar (Punjab) to flush out terrorists, was a 'tipping event'. It alienated a large section of the Sikh community from the national mainstream and gave further impetus to terrorist violence in Punjab.

To sustain an armed struggle against the mighty state, by the social group or a particular community, a strong ideological and organisational backing, adequate financial resource, arms and ammunition and a strong conviction that they will gain from such struggle are necessary. Social tension and existing conflict in society or between society and the state provide an opportunity or a fertile ground to launch such a movement. In the contemporary world, such movements often get organisational, material and moral support from across the border. The technological revolution has empowered the individual against the state. Easy availability of weapons, the revolution in mass communication and the easy availability of
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28 Quoted in K.J. Holsti, n.10, p.118.
financial resources through organised crime and narcotics smuggling have made it easier even for a small group of individuals to take up arms again the state and wreck havoc in society. It has become relatively easy for external powers or sources to exploit racial tensions in one country to further their political interest. And this has influenced the response of state to a particular incident to social tension in a great way.

III. The State and the Use of Force

Among other measures to manage internal conflict, the state has the authority to use force. It is the ultimate responsibility of the state to ensure internal security, to promote democracy and development and to ensure harmony among different cultural, linguistic and religious groups living within its territorial boundaries. The coercive power of the state is not a constant measure. It exists relative to the powers of other contending groups, perceptions of threat and the ideology of the state. While an authoritarian regime uses coercive measures for the perpetuation of the interests of the ruler, a democratic regime uses force against its citizens as a last resort. Here, the use of force is justified as a legitimate means to ensure internal stability, to promote democracy and development. A democratic regime must be perceived by most of its citizens to be
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legitimate. The citizens must share the belief that in spite of shortcomings and failures, the existing political institutions are better than any other that might be established. In addition, the citizens must feel that only the government can use force, if necessary, to influence the behaviour of citizens. Max Weber's concept of state rest on these dual characteristics of legitimacy and force: "a state is a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory."30 However, there is a complex relationship between these two characteristics of the state. As Kuldeep Mathur says, "Coercion, accepted as the defining characteristics of the state, has a dual character. It guarantees the reproduction of domination and order and suppresses challenges to state authority. In course of time, it helps to create conditions that allow for voluntary obedience of law and their legitimisation. Yet, coercion also undermines legitimacy. Continuous use of force to suppress dissent, resolve social conflicts, and maintain order may lead to the erosion of legitimacy and undermine the capacity of the state to rule."31 Thus, states stand in a paradoxical situation regarding the use of force – force may ensure


compliance, but at the same time frequency of its use may
delegitimise the state. States seek legitimacy because legitimacy
makes the use of force unnecessary or minimal. A regime that is seen
as legitimate has time on its side; it can use various other measures
of conflict resolution and even when it is inefficient or ineffective in
its efforts, citizens will continue to acknowledge and obey the
authority of the state. In a democratic setup, it is possible that a
social group or a community ceases to accept the legitimacy of the
regime, they may organise to overthrow it, and the government may
have to use violence to defend the system. In that case, the use of
force must be carefully explained by the government and if a
considerable segment of population accepts the government's
explanation, the system will remain intact. As Juan Linz says, so
long as confidence in future improvements in the system is
maintained among larger sections of the population, the use of force
will be regarded as legitimate and tolerated as a necessary part of
social change. Thus, the stability of a democratic state depends on
the way it responds to social conflicts arising in society and the way it
uses force.
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IV. The Case of India

India functions as a plural democracy. Various ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic groups live together in this vast country of more than one billion people. This complex diversity and vastness has given rise to a number of internal security problems. India's internal problems have a bearing on its relationship with neighbouring countries. Out of four wars that India has fought since 1947, except for the war with China in 1962, all other wars had their origins in the domestic conflict of at least one of the participants.

With Pakistan, India has a dispute over Jammu and Kashmir where a secessionist movement exists. While India says that the accession of Jammu and Kashmir into India is final and problems in Jammu and Kashmir are an internal matter, Pakistan claims that India has forcibly occupied Kashmir against the will of its people. Since the early 1990s, the involvement of Pakistan in Kashmir has taken the form of a proxy war. The Ministry of Home Affairs Annual Report 1998-99 says, "There has been a significant change in the nature of militancy in Kashmir. Foreign mercenaries from across the border dominate the scene, thereby giving Pakistan a stranglehold over prominent secessionist militant groups which are being used by ISI of Pakistan for bringing in a communal divide, ethnic cleansing and for
extending the militancy to Jammu and beyond." The acquisition of nuclear weapons by both India and Pakistan has complicated the problem further. The existence of nuclear weapons in the subcontinents has rendered high intensity conventional war hazardous. India is likely to face limited wars or unconventional war in Kashmir until the problem is solved to the satisfaction of both the countries. In May-June 1999, large scale intrusion by foreign mercenaries and Pakistani soldiers in the Kargil region almost brought the two countries to the verge of full-scale war. In the last week of December 1999, an Indian Airlines plane, IC 814, was hijacked on its way to Delhi from Kathmandu. India had to release three militants in return for the safety of the passengers. In sum, Kashmir is the most serious internal problem with regional and international security ramifications, that India faces at present.

India faced another secessionist movement in Punjab in the 1980s. The movement was for a separate Sikh state, 'Khalistan'. That movement also got active support from Pakistan. The problem was solved with the installation of a popular government which
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addressed the outstanding problems effectively. Side by side, large scale force was used to curb the militancy and effective measures were taken to stop the assistance coming from across the border. In both Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir one factor was common. Local political problems, if not handled properly developed into bigger crises which were then exploited by the external power Pakistan to serve its interest. The Indian government then had to use large-scale force to ensure stability and territorial integrity.

There are a number of secessionist movements in the North-Eastern States of India also. There are strong insurgency movements in Nagaland, Assam, Manipur and Tripura. According to the government of India, there are eleven militant organisations active in different parts of the North East. Large scale migration from Bangladesh has exacerbated the problem. Assam, which was relatively free from major political violence till 1979, was drawn into the vortex of insurgency beginning with the agitations on the foreigners issues and subsequent formation of United Liberation Front of Assam (ULFA). This was further aggravated by the Bodo problem and Bodo-Santhal clashes. The insurgency in Manipur
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assumed an ominous character in the late 1960s. The insurgency in Nagaland has been a major factor since independence. In Tripura, it was the large scale influx of Bengalis that sowed the seeds of discontent. The Tripuris became a minority in their own state.

All the major insurgent groups in the North East use the territory of neighbouring countries for training and hideouts. Apart from this, the complex relationship between narcotics, small arms and militant organisations have sustained the movement. India is sandwiched between the two largest drug producing zones in the world. In the North East, cross border vigilance is poor. Mizoram, Manipur, Nagaland and Arunachal Pradesh have a long international border with unguarded and rugged border points. These are the major areas of small arms and narcotics smuggling. According to Tara Kartha, ULFA is heavily involved in narcotics smuggling. The revenue generated from this trade is used to purchase arms from the flourishing arms market in South East Asia. On the western side, the Golden Crescent, consisting of Afghanistan, Iran and Pakistan, has been identified as the most active and largest producer of poppy and

---


39 Ibid.

40 Ibid.
heroin. Since the 1980s the strong nexus between narcotics, small arms, and militant organisations in Afghanistan and Pakistan is having a devastating impact on the region.41

The smuggling of small arms, infiltration and the trans-border movement of terrorist organisations has brought the question of border management to the fore. Apart from the cross border activities of militants, there is large-scale migration from Bangladesh creating serious problems in India, particularly in the North-Eastern states. Therefore, the issue of border security has become an integral component of internal security management. How India manages its borders will be key to the overall strategy to contain internal conflicts.

Apart from secessionist movements, India faces a number of other internal security problems. They are communal and caste tensions, the various Naxalite movements, organised crime and frequent breakdown of law and order.

Since independence India has been wracked by communal violence, particularly between Hindus and Muslims. Communal violence not only results in large scale loss of lives and property but also fostered a sense of insecurity among minority communities. This

insecurity was exacerbated by the fact that local police are perceived as communal by the minority communities.\textsuperscript{42} In the early 1990s, during the Ram Janmabhoomi-Babri Masjid dispute there were communal riots in different parts of the country. Given the growing activities of fundamentalist organisations in both the Hindu and Muslim community, the issue of communal tension, fuelled by communal organisations and communal politics, remains a potential threat to internal security.

Naxalite violence also poses threats to internal security. Naxalite violence emerged in the 1970s following the failure of the Indian state to ensure equitable land relations. Social and economic inequality is the root cause of the problem.\textsuperscript{43} At present Naxalites are active in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra. There are a number of extreme left wing organisations, The People's


War Group (PWG) being the most popular among them. The ultimate aim of the Naxalite movement is the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat through armed revolution. The usual tactics employed to achieve this purpose is guerrilla warfare and selective killings of "class enemies". At present Naxalites are equipped with sophisticated weapons including land mines and have active links with other militant organisations.\(^{44}\)

India is also being buffeted by the rise of a number of social and political movements that turn violent if not properly handled. At the heart of these problems are the failure of the state to evolve appropriate grievance redressal mechanism at the grassroots level. In the absence of such mechanisms, the state interprets these movements as law and order problems and uses force to manage them. The process of modernisation and democratisation has made people conscious of their rights. As Rajni Kothari says, "the state is facing the greatest challenge from those very people who are being increasingly politicised by the expansion of democracy but are not satisfied with the pace of socio-economic change."\(^{45}\) He finds that lopsided development together with the lack of emphasis on


\(^{45}\) Quoted in Kuldeep Mathur, n.31, p.338.
institutionalising democratic norms have rendered the Indian state weak and vulnerable to a variety of social challenges. The result is that the state assumes confrontational postures vis-à-vis the various sections of population. The social scene then becomes marked by violent protest and agitation.

V. The Indian State and the Instruments of Force

Apart from other measures to maintain internal order, the Indian state resorts to the use of force to deal with a variety of internal security problems. Force is used when a particular challenge to state authority or social tension turns violent. The purpose is to curb violence and maintain order to facilitate the smooth functioning of state institutions and social order. The motive behind the use of force is to protect and promote the values enshrined in the Constitution; that is, preserving territorial integrity, internal stability, democracy, economic development and a harmonious relationship between different cultural, religious and linguistic groups. Thus the coercive apparatus of the state functions within a democratic framework.

Four types of organisations exist in India for the maintenance of internal security. They are: local police; state armed police; paramilitary forces, and the armed forces. The local police and the state armed police are under the jurisdiction of State governments;
the paramilitary forces come under the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Central government; and the armed forces function under the Ministry of Defence at the Centre.

The use of these different organisations reflect the level and type of violence that the Indian state has to deal with. At the initial stage of a violent conflict, local police and State Armed Police handle the situation, since the maintenance of law and order is the responsibility of State governments under the Constitution. When violence is intense and sustained, resulting in extensive casualties, Central paramilitary forces are brought in to assist the State governments in the maintenance of law and order. Failure to stop violence at this level produces aid to civil by the armed forces.

The term paramilitary forces are used for a variety of forces that exist between the armed forces on the one hand and the local police on the other. Technically, the paramilitary forces are police organisations because they are headed by officers from the Indian police service. The Coast Guard and Rashtriya Rifles are exceptions as they come under the Ministry of Defence. These paramilitary forces are organised on the pattern of army infantry battalions. On the basis of their broad roles, these forces represent a mix of duties performed by the army and police. At one end, they perform a police role by helping civil administration in the maintenance of law and
order; at the other end, they perform army like operation in counterinsurgency and anti-terrorist operations.

Four types of arguments have generally been put forth for the raison d'etre of paramilitary forces: first, they minimise the intervention of the armed forces in domestic affairs; secondly, the State police may have to face tasks where their resources and lack of proper training would make it impossible for them to handle the situation; thirdly, the ultimate authority to maintain internal security rests with the Union Government, so it is advisable for the Union to be prepared for any contingency; and fourthly, the need for the specialised force structure to deal with specific problems like border security, protection of public property, protection of VIPs, and to handle specific threats like hijacking or hostage taking and other terrorist violence.

The first paramilitary forces were raised in the 18th and 19th century to extend the control of British rule in north-eastern and north-western India. In order to maintain the newly-conquered territories, lying far from presidency towns, special local units such as the Punjab Irregular Frontier Force were raised. In the North-East, the Assam Rifles, initially named Cachar Levies, came into existence, and in the North-West, a number of Levies of Pathan tribes were similarly raised. These forces were locally recruited but were
officered by army officers. Later, some of these forces, particularly the Punjab Irregular Frontier Force in the North-West, were converted into the regiments of undivided Indian Army. In 1939, the Crown Representative Police was raised to assist the princely states in the maintenance of law and order.

After independence, circumstances demanded a strong central government in a federal polity. The framers of the Indian Constitution were greatly concerned about security which is clear from the debates of the Constituent Assembly as well as the provisions of the Constitution. Internal and external threats were seen as equally menacing and careful attempts were made to arm the Union government to deal with centrifugal forces. The Union government was entrusted with the responsibility to protect the State from internal security threats though day-to-day police functions were made a State subject. Thus any grave threat to internal security called for central intervention.

Since the attainment of independence, a large variety of paramilitary forces were raised at different points of time to meet different requirements. These paramilitary forces are under the Ministry of Home Affairs and its apex body is the Central Police Organisation. It has got a variety of units under its control. These are classified as Line, Mixed and Staff units. Under the line units,
there are various forces. They are: the Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF), the Border Security Force (BSF), the Indo-Tibetan Border Police (ITB), the Central Industrial Security Force (CISF), the National Security Guard (NSG), the Railway Protection Force (RPF). Staff units are meant especially for institutional, academic and coordination work. The organisations under staff units are: Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel National Police Academy (SUPNPA), Bureau of Police Research and Development (BPRD), Central Forensic Science Laboratory (CFSL), National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), Directorate of Coordination, Police Wireless, Institute of Criminology and Forensic Science, and the Central Detective Training School (CDTS). Under mixed units are: Intelligence Bureau (IB), Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) and Research and Analysis Wing (RAW).

The forces under ‘line units’ are generally called paramilitary forces. Apart from this, there are a number of forces which are not directly under the Central Police Organisation but qualify to be paramilitary forces. Forces under this category are Uttar Pradesh Provincial Armed Constabulary (PAC), Bihar Military Police (BMP), Rajasthan Armed Constabulary (RAC), Punjab Armed Police (PAP),
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and so on. These are reserved forces under the respective State
governments.

Lt. General M.L. Chhibber has classified paramilitary forces
under three categories.\textsuperscript{47} They are: first, forces guarding the borders
such as the BSF, ITBP, AR and the Coast Guard. Each was initially
raised to meet specific border security problems. Secondly, forces to
maintain law and order as a supplement to the regular police force.
These include the CRPF, the CISF, the RPF, the Home Guards and the
State Armed Police. And thirdly, forces that contribute to the
nation's development. The main force under this category is the
Border Road Organisation.

VI. The Study

I have selected four major paramilitary forces for
comprehensive study. They are: the CRPF, the BSF, the ITBP and the
NSG. The basis of selection of these four forces are two fold. First,
these forces, over a period of time, have emerged as the principal
instruments in internal security management. The CRPF, which was
created for a limited purpose to assist State governments in the
maintenance of law and order, has since become an indispensable
force for the maintenance of law and order. Also, the Force is playing

Services Institution of India, 1979).
an important role in counterinsurgency and anti-terrorist operations. The BSF was created in 1965 to guard the India-Pakistan international border during peacetime. In the course of time, the BSF has diversified into other fields also. At present, the force is deployed in large numbers in various internal security operations. The study of the BSF assumes added significance in the light of the growing nexus between internal violence and the external environment. At present, border management has emerged as a key area of internal security. ITBP was raised in 1962 as a guerrilla-cum-intelligence-cum-border guarding force to guard the India-China border in Tibet. Since its inception, ITBP has redefined its role on a number of occasions to meet the emerging threats to internal security. The NSG came into existence in 1986 to meet the challenges posed by terrorist violence. All these forces have grown into versatile, multidimensional forces capable of meeting diverse challenges. As the threat to internal security is complex, diverse and multi-dimensional, these forces are trying to cope with the changing internal security environment.

Secondly, a study of these four forces would give a overview of not only the changing nature of internal security threats but also the changing role of the Indian state. The frequent and large scale use of these forces points to the changing nature of the Indian state vis-à-vis internal security threats.
Each force has been studied along five dimensions: origin, role, organisational structure, changes, and performances. First, under what circumstances were these forces created? What role are they supposed to play? How and why has their role diversified over a period of time? What changes took place since their inception? And what factors influenced those changes? How have these forces performed in discharge of their duties? What internal and external factors have influenced their performance? The purpose is to assess the importance of these forces as instruments of internal security management. All these questions are related to a larger problematic: the organisation and use of force internally in a democratic country.

There are five chapters in this thesis. The first four chapters look at the CRPF, the BSF, the ITBP, and the NSG respectively. The fifth chapter assesses the role of the paramilitary forces in Indian democracy.