CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the investigation and analysis are discussed under three headings namely, characterisation of the impact of globalisation on national security, effect of globalisation on individual – society – state system, and the change in the nature of security Sectors

CHARACTERISATION OF THE IMPACT OF GLOBALISATION ON NATIONAL SECURITY

How do we characterise the impact of globalisation on national security? It is necessary to define, brand and typify it in measurable terms.

ASYMMETRY BETWEEN ECONOMY, SOCIETY AND POLITY

Research studies have shown that globalisation has created imbalances in the way national and global economies work. This arises from the fundamental asymmetry between the economy, society and the polity precipitated by the West promoted globalization (Figure 34). While the economy is being made global by globalizing the markets, social and political institutions remain local, national or regional. This incongruence is playing truant with the state-society system. No international institution is providing democratic surveillance of global markets nor address the problem of inequalities between countries.

The asymmetry between economy and society is giving rise to social injustice. There is a disjoint between formal global economy as designed by the IMF and the existing informal local economy. Instead of modifying the global economic rules and regulations to suit the local conditions, they are being imposed straightway resulting in mismatches. Also majority of the world’s people in informal economy get excluded from the globalizing markets. This has produced benefits to few and losses to many, both within and between countries. This unequal
distribution is creating division with huge winners and huge losers widening the gulf between North and South. The gap between rich and poor countries has increased (Figure 34). It has been reported that "in sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America, more people lived in poverty at the end of the 1990s than at the beginning of that decade (Tarja and William 2006).

The imbalances in global rules galore. Economic rules and institutions override the social rules and social institutions. Trade in manufactured products are being liberalized whereas that in agriculture remains protected everywhere. Goods and capital move freely but there is no freedom to the movement of people. In emergency, developed countries can have wider options of managing the macroeconomic policy on account of their greater capability and capacity whereas the developing and poor countries are constrained by the demands for adjustment. Many of the international policies have no relationship with the national ones. These imbalanced global rules bring inequalities and competition on unequal footing. Structural change sans social and economic provisioning for adjustment has induced uncertainty and insecurity to people and society.

Nothing is more damaging than the discordance between economy and the polity. A particular economic doctrine is driving the polity making the present globalization completely artificial. It negates the basic democratic principle that diversity of views are natural and it is a fundamental right of humanity to run its economy according to its philosophy. The prescription of one philosophy uniformly to every society is democratically unsustainable. This dichotomy is irreconcilable and unduping the democratic accountability.

**Institutional Deficiency**

There is no institutional backup either at international or national level for governance of this globalization programme which could meet the demands of people and countries in a
democratic manner. The international bodies like the United Nations, the BrettonWoods Institutions and the WTO have failed the people with their unfair decisions and no public accountability resulting in public distrust in globalization. Global markets are working in laissez faire way without any supervision and control from any quarter. An institution that could strike a balance between democracy and markets is just absent.

The terms and conditionalities of WTO have put severe limitations to government in respect of national economic policies with no room to maneuver. This has shifted power from the elected bodies to the transnational corporation and international financial institutions which is a direct abridgement of national sovereignty of the countries.

Security of job gone
Multinational enterprise have failed to respect the law and labour standards in which the states have fully cooperated. The economic base of developing countries is being progressively eroded by the policies of industrialized countries, the International Financial Institutions and the WTO. The privatization of public utilities such as water, electricity and health services is exacerbating poverty. Special Economic Zones are robbing poor of their livelihood and banishing greenery. Deregulation and the emphasis on shareholder value are going too far. Employers are playing “fast and loose with labour practices,” including the replacement of decent employment with insecure, informal, casual and contract work. The voluntary corporate social responsibility is simply an attempt at a public relations repair job without any real effect on mainstream business operations. What is required is a global system of industrial relations including global work councils, social audits of companies, and mechanism to monitor and verify the implementation of codes of conduct adopted by transnational companies.
*It is inhuman*

Objections are against unfair play and unequal competition with no room for poor and the deprived to participate. It is just inhuman and uncivilized, threatening traditional institutions such as family and school. It has come without any preparation either from national government or international institution, giving people a feeling that they “live in a world highly vulnerable to changes they cannot control”. Globalization has meant losing employment and livelihood. An Asian consumer said, “there is no point to a globalization that reduces the price of a child’s shoes but costs the father his job” (Tarja and William 2006). People liken it to “the recolonization of countries” and it has been “unwanted, foreign and forced on them”. It is just an “unequal combat”.

*Decline in social protection*

Many feel that globalization is an intrusion by foreign powers into their economic and political affairs. Globalization has eroded values such as democracy and social justice. Power is shifting from elected local bodies to unaccountable multinational corporates and posing a threat to cultural and linguistic diversity. The economic volatility of globalizing countries is a key issue haunting these states. It has been a heartless inhuman globalization with no concern for people, the poor, the hungry, the illiterate and those removed from metros. Workers can hardly trust the current model of globalization when they see everyday a decline in social protection and the imposition of an authoritarian workplace culture. People are worried over the unstable global financial markets which may have disastrous social consequences in many countries due to inadequate government policies and poor understanding of local conditions by IMF and foreign banks.
Unequal Competition

The WTO has promoted a paradigm of competition where the weak compete with the strong. "A conversation between a cat and a mouse is not a conversation, that led to the neglect of social and environmental goals leading to an unsustainable pattern of growth. It is deeply undemocratic and disempowering system". The challenge is the principle on which the global economy works. The slogan of the World Social Forum is “another world is possible”. In the process, the existing world is being destroyed.

DEMOBILISATION OF SOCIETY

It is observed that globalization has caused three developments namely, “demobilisation” of society, expanded security expectations and demands, and the declining incidence of war. They have left the state weakened but the society and individual strengthened (Figure 35).

“Demobilisation” simply indicates that people have switched themselves off from the process of war and many of the collective engagements for the state. Forces of globalization are creating tremendous psychological and physical disorientation, skew aspirations and expectations among people throughout the world. The futility of war and the need for peace have dawned on the people and people seek time and resources for their own development. If not at home, they look for opportunities beyond the borders. Individual is finding a new identity where he or she is looking at things from his or her own way and interest. His or her own physical security, food and nutrition, health and education, knowledge and material comfort have acquired importance to the level where he or she questions what the state can do for them. He or she is looking at the relationship between his or her country and others from the angle of self-interest whether that would help him or her advance the interest he or she is pursuing. The war and the mobilization for it is a big hurdle in his or her way of progress material or otherwise. The society is thus in the mood of demobilization.
Globalisation that is fostering the forces of democracy is encouraging citizens to question the desirability of war and an aversion for the same is building up. One may argue that citizens’ distaste of war is irrelevant because a professionalized military serves as a convenient buffer. It can also be argued that the revolution in military affairs (RMA) means “the separation of the military from the civilian, of combatants from non-combatants, of fire from society, of organized violence from everyday life” (Freedman, 1998). But this claim is not supported by the factual data of the last fifty years where civilian casualties of war have far exceeded the combatant casualties. Also, it has been noticed that at least in all constitutional democracies the dislike for war has permeated the military rank and file so much that “the concern for the safety of the individual soldier has reached new heights” (Spybey, 1996). Today’s soldier also thinks of a decent civilized life and in any case, soldiers are not soldiers always because most of their life is in the civilian society. The mood of public about the sight of “body bags” during the Kargil conflict buttresses this viewpoint.

Movement toward demobilization is also because of the access to the nuclear capabilities of India and Pakistan. This has made the war between two countries beyond the realm of reasonable conflicts. If nuclear capabilities were with only one state, things would have been different. But this being available to both the warring states, government and public are finding other avenues for the resolution of disputes. The conventional armed forces have thus been made redundant. This “redundancy feature” is also reflective of the “more general futility” of mobilization (Clark, 1999). This also supports the philosophy of “globalised military production” as against the doctrine of “national self-sufficiency” and a kind of “transparency” in the military procurement. “Military affairs” are thus acquiring the civilian complexion of transparency and issues of human rights in the globalised era. Military can no longer claim the preserve of isolation from civic life.
Human Rights enter the Security Dialogue

These developments mirror the move of security thinking from ‘unilateral’ to ‘multilateral’ arrangements so that “the use of force is subject to greater collective legitimation” (Ruggie, 2002). The original compact between state and society that had state security as the prime concern has been replaced by the human matters of food, clothing, education, environment and cultural identity. The unilateralism in war matters has now yielded to more complex, transnational bargain giving rise to multilateralism. Globalisation has therefore promoted a rising aversion to war in both civil and military life and is dousing the motive of mobilization and the patriotism of yesteryears is on the wane, military matters are getting civilized and very effectively, the singular compact between state and society has a new “global” player in the validation for the use of force. Society is thus inclined toward demobilization because the citizen is thinking of the war as a threat to his or her security and violation of human rights (Figure 36). Human rights that vouch for individuals rather than the state security have become the watch word for the measure of security and how effective the state has been in providing it. People are more worried about their “material” security rather than the military security. The result is, “the institutions of state security can no longer rely on unstinting societal support.” Globalising forces have tilted the balance of logic in favour of society and individual toward which has moved the centre of security dialogue.

EXPANDED SECURITY EXPECTATIONS AND DEMANDS:

In the globalised world people’s aspiration have been raised leading to increased security expectations and demands from the state. This brings us to the realm of individual and society. While globalization has reduced the possibility of war and there is a general public and military apathy toward mobilization, it has expanded the area of their security – expectations and demands galore. It has moved them toward other areas of insecurity and people are clamouring for more from state. The state is put under a dilemma. On the one hand, society is
unwilling to give unstinted support to the state for war mobilization, on the other hand, society expects the state to look after the other sectors of deficiencies, and, to spend more on other security – individual security, not military security (Figure 36). The state must acknowledge and address “all core human needs, not just brute physical protection from external enemies” (Haigh, 2006). Thus understood, the “security agenda” has extended and deepened to encompass all kinds of “individual and social goods: economic competitiveness, health, education, and welfare of citizen, ecological stability, effective command of knowledge and technology and cultural reproduction” (Clark, 1999).

This is a gigantic shift in the thinking about security functions of the state which is being contested by many scholars who contend that enlarging the scope of security massively has the risk of distorting the notion of its earlier precise meaning. Ole Waever (1995) argues, “the major problem with such an approach is deciding where to stop, since the concept of security otherwise becomes a synonym for everything that is politically good or desirable”. Herald Muller (2002) also vehemently opposes this manner of enlarging the security agenda saying, “what is the analytical utility of this term (security) if it covers everything on Earth?” This also entails “enormous difficulties associated with implementing total human security, because with the change in the referents of security, state political institutions must develop and evolve to keep pace, and for this reason alone, resistance – particularly from those in the more traditional security communities – is likely to be significant and persistent” (Haigh, 2006). However, these objections to enlarging the security agenda when seen in the light of the shift of referent object to individual and the changed equation between state and individual, lose their steam. This resistance also shows that the “ultimate” meaning of security is now subject to the wider canvas of human needs and aspirations. It is also “symptomatic of and represents divisions between society and state, divisions between those who clamour for more rights for individuals and those who want to maintain the sovereign rights of state.
The debate thus zeroes on to the question whether this duality of security of individual, and of state is real. If yes, what would be the new security structure? If no, what is the relationship between the security of the two? Do they add up or annihilate? Which one is more fundamental and how this anomaly can be reconciled in the contemporary time? The disagreement doesn’t simplistically mirror the divide between, say, the military – industrial establishment and those outside it. In fact, “the debate cuts across these cleavages, so that proposals to reframe security now emanate from inside the “security sector itself” (Channa, 2002).

The security of a state comprises all those organizations that have the authority to use, or order the use of force, or the threat of force as well as those civil structures that are responsible for their management. The security sector reform (SSR) which “embraces not only security from external threat, but also material, physical and social security” (Channa, 2002) has been adopted by the World Bank and the UN, by the security communities of various states like Germany, the UK, and the USA as well as by regional groups that include the European Union, and the NATO and the support is expanding. Security agenda now also include such threats as possession of weapons of mass destruction or global terrorism, and more unconventional security challenges such as environmental degradation, global inequality, human migration, organized crime, and communicable diseases such as SARS, HIV/AIDS (Coker, 2002). Waever (1995) however, terms this embracing of broader definition of security by traditional security establishment as a means to maintain its own societal relevance. It means, the establishment has an interest in securitizing an issue because of its “enormous power as an instrument of political and social mobilization (Buzan, 1992).
GLOBALISATION IS MAKING INCIDENCE OF WAR DIFFICULT:
ETHNIC NATIONALISM GIVING WAY TO CIVIC NATIONALISM

STATEHOOD WANING AND NEEDED ONLY FOR
COMMUNICATION AND DIALOGUE

Globalisation is spreading the transborder values and a world view in place of the national view. Especially in countries like India, which has large population but less opportunities, the youth look for employment and business beyond the national contours. The bond between the state and the individual is bound to weaken with such global centrifugal forces acting on people leading to the fall in national spirits. Impetus to statehood comes basically from the nationalistic sentiments that appeal to the shared ancestries of “folk memory, custom and tradition” in such ways as to represent a sort of ‘religious surrogate’ (Smith, 1995). That ethnic nationalism under the influence of globalisation is giving way to civic nationalism, in which popular sentiment is based on political rather than cultural demands with human rights movement in the lead.

This has also been the cause for augmenting security in various other sectors. What India witnessed during freedom movement was the political movement against colonization that crystallized around nationalist movement. Intensity of ethnic feeling – the passion – is the fuel that ignites the conflict. The perennialists contend that nationalism precedes war, and war is prior to the state. Statehood can’t come into being without the passion which should be sufficient to mobilize people to war. According to this logic, nationalism is a necessary condition for statehood. Under globalizing condition when nationalism is on the decline, war clouds are not allowed to gather. And the statehood would be waning. But a society would still need a state to serve as a modern entity for communication and dialogue.
Individuals and Society abhor War

Structure of the modern state is such that it feeds on nationalism that is exploited by it to serve the power of the state through what is called Westphalian circularity: state needing more and more resources from society while society and individuals being fed more and more of nationalism and patriotism. Globalisation has changed all that. The individual is asking today “What I get in return for the resources I supply to the state?” He or she seeks not only food, health, education, physical and emotional safety but also avenues for growth and prosperity – a peaceful life where his or her mind and body can grow. This society therefore abhors war which is an obstacle to his or her growth and is considered only as an “enabling potential of the state”, serving its own interests. The individual in the globalised environment has shown its cards and placed the demands of its own security. The societies are putting forward to the states the way of avoiding war and the way of progressing peace process. Society has become a vocal force to connecting directly to the global voices for constructing peace where there are points of conflicts. State is not allowed all the power to declare war. Society dictates what state should do.

The Figure 36 gives a logic diagram detailing the effect of globalisation-induced demobilization, larger security demands and rarity of war on the national security. Individual has taken the central stage for any security dialogue. State is no more assured of unstinted support for any war effort. States are now forced to think of ways other than war for their security. The trend shows dialogue, cooperation and sharing would be the security norm tomorrow. Society’s reluctance to mobilize itself is a cause for the state to go for globalised military production and procurement.

MARKET FORCES ARE UNDEMOCRATIC AND CAUSE COMMERCIAL WARS AND INSECURITY

Optimists argue that the expansion of market forces and the economic interdependence promoted by globalisation would have pacifying influence on international relations because
increased trade and investment among and between nation states would encourage international cooperation and prosperity. Raymond Vernon (1971) predicts that the expansion of economic interdependence through market transactions would demolish artificial national boundaries and facilitate “sovereignty at bay” giving a unified world government ensuring a perpetual global peace. Rosecrance (1986) while identifying two types of international systems: one based on the territorial system and the other on an oceanic or trading system, concludes that the world peace and international security can be best served through the expansion of the trading system because international trade reduces conflict and enhances cooperation among states. John Mueller (1989) of the Manchester School advocates the capitalist path to peace and security. This “capitalist peace” thesis has also been elaborated by the idea of “democratic peace” thesis articulated by Bruce Russett (1993) who offers a secondary causation between market forces and international peace and security. His thesis is that democracies do not go to war with each other because of the norms of peaceful conflict resolution embedded in democratic political culture and the structural and institutional constraints associated with democratic politics of checks and balances, dispersion of power, and the need for public debate.” And he adds further, democracy can be attained by economic development and growth. Example of East Asian NICs, such as South Korea and Taiwan were cited as the telling evidence for the linkage between economic development and democracy. If it is so, India should not have been a democracy. The argument of Russett that expanding market forces in terms of trade, investment, and manpower promote international peace and security by fostering democratic transition, opening and consolidation is misplaced because the very market reforms imposed under WTO have neither a democratic mandate nor a democratic governance. In fact, the present market liberalization is promoting monopolization of capitalist and market profiteers. Also the logic that higher economic performance promotes democratic forces does not have empirical evidence.
A lot of wrongly placed assumptions has been made in the liberal optimist perspective. One such unrealistic assumption is that the primary actor in the international system is not government, but individuals and firms that go beyond government control. Will their going beyond government control, work in the long run and can the state remain simply an onlooker? Will it not bring anarchy even at the state level? Another wishful assumption is that increased economic interdependence in trade and investments is mostly “symmetric” and “benign”, and by itself promise increased welfare for all parties. In fact, globalisation as pursued has been proved to be asymmetric that maligns the developing and poor countries’ socio-economic life. Welfare for all the involved parties? But what about the poor people who are not even a part of this game of trade and investment? They suffer. Still another misplaced assumption is that the economic interdependence brings about positive spillover effect to political, social and cultural dimension in such a way as to enhance the mutual understanding and trust. But the fact is otherwise. Globalisation has only brought misunderstanding and mistrust among nation-states. It is not the economic interdependence that drives the market forces but the competitive zeal to outdo the other, which kills whatever understanding exists causing political, social and cultural dissonance. Therefore, the so called network of economic interdependence does not promote economic and political integration but cultivates mutual suspicion and cut-throat competition through the creation of vested interests in the free market; and are the breeding grounds for future wars.

The whole logic of Immanuel Kant (1957) behind her statement that, “the spirit of commerce, which is incompatible with war, sooner or later gains the upper hand in every state is wrong. In fact, it has been shown that commerce has been the cause of most of the wars in the past. The assumption that the power of money is the most dependable of all power (means)– is ignoring the power of people. Another misleading assumption used is that market forces reinforce international peace and security by crafting and spreading democratic values and
institution throughout the world. Market forces are not spreading democratic values and institution but killing them because of the absence of any democratic functioning in their operation.

Arguments of capitalist and democratic peace protagonists are contested by structural realists who postulate that expanded market forces and economic interdependence negatively affect international peace and security (Waltz 1979). Their views give primacy to politics over economy. They contend that military power is substitutable whereas economic power is simply a subset of military power. Economic interdependence is an extension of statecraft and helps national security only if it is managed within the framework of national interest. They are also of the view that unchecked, unruly and spontaneous interdependence can threaten national and regional security. The second world war is cited as an example wherein an unmanaged economic interdependence and the subsequent depression resulted in the exchange of hostile “beggar-my-neighbour” policy among the European countries by precipitating the war of tariffs. Proliferation of naked mercantilism bred hostile perceptions that led to the rise of Nazi Germany’s military adventurism.

The links among the market forces, power cycles and major conflicts are ominous (Gilpin 1981, Modelski and Thomsen 1939, and Doran 1983). The economic interdependence facilitates the diffusion of economic power because increased exchanges of goods and services across national borders bring about uneven economic results. And such an international system creates the space for misperception, misunderstanding and even escalation to overt conflicts (Waltz 1979).

Expanded market forces are leading to uneven patterns of economic growth wherein growth of major powers is stagnant due to the law of diminishing return whereas non-major powers enjoy
faster rates of growth. This divergent rate of growth between major powers and non-major powers is bringing the situation of confrontation between the two (Organski and Kugler 1980). This is manifest in China's transformation where link-up with capitalist market forces has turned China into a major power role. With its sheer economic and military power, China is now a threat to the existing power structure in the world including the stability and order in East Asia.

Even from Marxists' viewpoint, the economic interdependence is nothing but a disguised and deceptive expression of the capitalist division of labour. The expansion of the capitalist division of labour leads to the inevitability of hegemonic wars among imperial or neo-imperial powers in search of their market niches. This also causes the deepening of class conflicts. Both threaten national security. Lenin (1939), in this regard, is very emphatic when he says that imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism. Therefore, this capitalist led market forces is bound to produce hegemonic wars among powers that are seeking to have their markets of influence.

Students of the "dependencies paradigm" also reject the positive correlates of economic interdependence and security. They find the term "inter" a misnomer. Economic relations between developed and developing countries can't be one of interdependence. It is one of asymmetric, not symmetric interdependence, and dependency by perpetuating unequal exchanges. The effort to break this "dependent ties" with core capitalist countries can create "internal conflict within the periphery" and also "between the core and the periphery as a whole" (Figure 9). The neoliberal capitalist design of globalisation is such that there are dangers to the "periphery from the economic centre" (Raul Prebisch, Argentinian Economist).
GLOBALISATION-INSPIRED PLURALISM IS DIVISIVE

The research studies have shown that globalisation has been breeding and promoting divisive plurality in the society detrimental to the integrity of the state. Buzan et al define societal security as “the sustainability within conditions for evolution, of traditional patterns of language, culture, and religion and national identity and custom”. (Buzan, Waever, and De Wilde, 1998). Globalisation is not encouraging that sustainability of the evolution but is damaging the existing societal identity and customs. It is not enriching its vitality but is creating a sense of self-condemnation and deprecation. A kind of societal segmentation is on the increase leading to the rise of disunity and strifes of all complexion. Society today is much more divided on the lines of caste, religion, languages, faiths and beliefs. Whatever little unity was achieved in the cold war period is being destroyed. This is causing discord and divergence of views even on issues of national importance. People are divided on every matter leading to the absence of national-consensus even on the question of state integrity (Figure 37).

National security represents the security of the society, that includes the individuals of varied faiths, customs, cultures, languages and religions. This is where globalisation has adversely enlarged the domain of differences. Globalisation is directed in one way, from west to east, and inspired and controlled by the economic and technological might of the west. This one-sided view of the ideologies and philosophy is deseating the nativity and dignity of people.

**Individual joins the main agenda of security**

Globalisation has brought new threats, threats germinated with values from across the border. These threats have shifted the focus to internal securities. It is like fighting the enemies within. The decade of 1990s witnessed the emergence of conflicts with the disintegration of the states, civil wars, and insurgency of various kinds. In most of the cases of the Baltic republics, the former Yugoslavia, Moldava, Sri Lanka, Kurdistan, Central Africa and elsewhere, what was
being contested was not the control of a particular state's levers of power, but the identity of that state and the shape of its borders. The conflict was not state-centric but societal, individual distinctiveness. These conflicts required to have a view of security that could explain the origin of conflicts within societies, between majorities and minorities, between groups with different conceptions of what their cultural, linguistic, religious and historical icons of "the nation" should be or the values that should underpin it. Globalisation is causing the eruption and creation of such sub-nationalism in the poor and developing world.

These conflicts could be explained as security gap, and / or legitimacy gap because of poor governance and / or performance gaps because the states have not been able to meet human needs. Each of them points toward the gap in meeting the security needs of individuals or groups of individuals (Figure 38). They are attributed in large measure to the development deficiencies (Figure 37). These intra state conflicts have been amply demonstrated to be reconciled through developmental efforts (Figure 39) that bridge also the gap between the security of the individual and that of the state. This is how individual security joins the main agenda of peace, security and development and acquire the omni character touching the oppressed down below to the intrastate conflicts and onto the transnational affairs (Figure 40).

If the state abides by the social contract, and provides support to people in their welfare, people would provide security, development and peace to the state internally and externally both. Individual security becomes the core of all denominations of security and determine the performance and effectiveness of national and international security. The analysis also attests the hypothesis that there is no contradiction between development and security. Every step in this direction is also a step towards reducing poverty, achieving economic growth and preventing conflict (Figure 41).
GLOBALISATION HAS INCREASED INEQUALITY

Increase in global inequality because of corporate globalisation is evident from UN Human Development Report (1999, 2000) which says that the world income distribution among households in the last ten years has shown a sharp rise in inequality. While economic gap between rich and poor is widening in most countries, economic growth has stagnated in many developing countries, leading to income disparities between rich and poor countries by order of magnitude out of proportion to anything previously experienced (Pogg, 2000). The income ratio between the richest and the poorest countries, just before globalisation in 1973 was about 44 to 1. By 1998 it had jumped to 74 to 1. The number of persons below the international poverty line since the end of the cold war rose from 1.2 billion in 1987 to 1.5 billion in 2002. If the current trend continues this figure is likely to reach 1.7 billion by 2015. This proves that in the beginning of the 21st century, the bottom 25% of world population lives on less than $140 a year; while the world’s 200 richest people have doubled their networth to more than $1 trillion between 1994 and 1998. It is found that the assets of the world’s top three billionaires are more than the combined GNP of all the least-developed countries and their 600 million people (Pogg, 2000). This speaks of the nature of the economic and social dynamics operating under the globalisation.

GLOBALISATION AIDS ACCUMULATION NOT DISTRIBUTION:

THE E-CURRENCY IS DEPRIVING THE POOR THEIR DAY TO DAY LIVING

Globalisation is not only an attack on the most tender aspect of humanity but is basically causing a massive flow of wealth from the poor to the rich of the world. By the late 1990s asserts Sheehan (2000), it was increasingly recognized that economic growth reduces poverty only if accompanied by specific economic and social policies, directed to that end, and it was these policies that have been absent in the post-Cold War period characterized by the
dominance of market forces with states not only remaining a mere spectator to the miseries being heaped on the poor and the deprived but acting as a helping hand to the capitalistic neoliberalism.

Provision of food is a crucial element in the security of the undeveloped and the developing countries. Western view blames the bulging world population rising from 5.4 billion in 1991 to 6.2 billion in 2002, expecting to cross 10 billion by 2050. However, there has been a massive increase in per capita increase in food production which had little impact on the starving people. It has been seen that the third world produces much of the food grain but it is the West that consumes the most. The problem, therefore, lies in the social, economic and political factors that determine the food distribution. Why is it that somebody is able to access to the food while others are not. Amartya Sen (1981) in a research on the causes of famines finds that "hunger is due to people not having enough to eat, rather than there not being enough to eat". He concludes that it was the "cash economy" that killed Bangladeshies in 1974 famine not a shortage of food as such. It was their inability to purchase food, not the availability of it that killed them in mass. It is the purchasing power that determined the entitlement to food, which for poor has direct relationship with employment.

The big dichotomy between the tangible elements required for someone to survive and be secure, such as food, clothing, education, and the capability to pay for them to get entitled has been made sharper in this globalised market economy fuelled by not only "cash currency" but by "e-currency", relegating the "have-nots" further down the "living index".

GLOBALISATION HAS REDUCED THE FREEDOM FROM WANT

Insecurity of this kind is mostly not because of the absolute lack of resources. This could be seen in the case of "global hunger and starvation" from the fact that "enough grain is produced
to provide every person on earth with 3400 calories per day. In fact, if we include other foodstuffs such as vegetables, fruits, nuts, fish and meat also every person could get forty pounds of food everyday. It is not the resource crunch that is responsible for global hunger and starvation but the “lack of access” and the “maldistribution of food”. This hunger and starvation have not found global attention. The western, capitalist world view looks at poverty as the “inability of people to purchase adequate quantities of food and other necessities”. The onus is placed on the individual not the state. This neoliberal view too has been globalised. Result is, number of people starving is increasing day by day under this neoliberal world view. It is becoming clear that ideas like poverty and development reflect particular ways of thinking about reality and social values and are ideological construction that have decisive political implications for the security of the people in general and the poor in particular.

The responses of the IMF and the World Bank to the issue of poverty and development have had also been supportive of this Western view which has played havoc with the plight of poor everywhere. Developing countries borrowed heavily during 1970s for development. But these lending institutions increased the interest rates on loans while commodities prices fell. These countries came to the stage of debt defaulting and were forced to accept the prescription of the IMF and the World Bank of structural adjustment which was designed for the Third World countries to adopt market-oriented policies. This policy, though, helped western governments’ goal of preventing large-scale debt defaulting, the poor in the third world paid heavily in terms of governmental withdrawal from healthcare, education, agriculture and social welfare. Globalisation has thus increased the fear of structural violence and reduced the freedom from want.
ECONOMICS DETERMINE THE NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY

In the modern, high technology, globalised economy, states are forced to outsource the production source in other countries to benefit from lower labour costs and to concentrate on high-level services at home, owned and operated by one's own nationals. This is causing fears of economic vulnerability, specifically in the specific area of defence production where the country is dependent for supply of crucial military component on country which has been outsourced. This suggests that such states would become less secure as they become more vulnerable to political disruption of crucial supplies. This paradoxical situation has been called "economic security dilemma" by Crawford (1995). However, Richard Rosecrance (2002) contests this view and says that "in an interdependent world, political rivals will not be able to exploit such security vulnerabilities, because they will themselves be adopting the same strategy and exposing themselves to the same vulnerabilities as the countries that have outsourced the entity." "As globalisation accelerates this trend, states become materially dependent on production of essential commodities over which they have little or no control" (Sheehan, 2006). Buzan (1991a) however, says that "market forces do not operate with national security concern in mind, they are about the maximization of profit in a highly competitive supply-and-demand situation." This means economic security, and economic efficiency would dictate the direction of the policy for national security in the globalised era.

SOCIETAL DIVISIVENESS CAUSED BY GLOBALISATION

Breakup of the USSR, the revival of aggressive national self-determination on account of ethnic, linguistic and religious identities fuelled by the impact of globalization have left many peoples feeling societally insecure. Examples include both the Russian minorities and the ethnic majorities in Estonia and Latvia, the Hungarian minorities in Romania, Slovakia, and Yugoslavia, and non-white or non-Christian immigrants in many countries in Western Europe. Initial phase of globalization thus saw, societally an international system that was fraught with parochial demands and disruptions across the globe. It is only superficial element of a global
society that has emerged in terms of the use of English as a common second language, prompted by the commercial interests and bolstered by information economy. The world is more fragmented, and inward looking, and actions are goaded by self-interest rather than by the spirit of a global society (Sheehan 2006).

The anarchy of the international systems has penetrated the confines of states that are still struggling to find social and cultural cohesion. Security was defined as “pursuit of freedom from threat” (Buzan 1991a) where the state became the focal point for security because in the absence of world government, states are the “framework of order” as well as the “highest source of authority”. Globalisation has introduced the flaw of “statelessness” wherein states while withdrawing from their obligation towards their citizens also find sovereignty loss. This is causing a widespread internal security problem. The total internal peace has given way to the thinking that even internal security could only be relative in the globalised era. (Thakur and Narsimha Rao 2007c).

CENTRALITY OF STATE LOST

The relationship between individual and national security in the backdrop of this globalisation – fostered internal security conundrum has become more distinct with states themselves becoming, in most cases, a major source of threats to their individuals. This has led to the formation of social groups that are being recognized as important security actors. This has put the states on leash all the time and acting as the assurer of security to individual security as subordinate to state security (Buzan 1991a). As the globalisation progresses the security equation between individual and state is becoming more acute. The question is, can individual security remain subservient to the state security in the globalised era? Buzan and Waever (1997) rule out individual security as the basis of security analysis, because in their view, “the state cannot be reassembled from individual-level attributes; it has “sui generis” state-level
attributes and one has to see the state itself as a unit of reality.” This is a point of contest because if the individual has “sui generis” state-level attributes then it is all the more proper to consider the individual security as a unit of analysis.

Steve Smith (1991) criticized Buzan and Waever’s realist-inspired ontological preference for the state and termed their definition of security as “vague and restricted” which only deal with the existence of conflict and violence. The assumption that security is just for states, is arguable. Martin Shaw (1994) too criticized Buzan’s work as nothing more than “caveats to a state-centered notion of security”. However in the work after 1991, Buzan (Waever et al 1993) showed himself increasingly open to the centrality of non-state security actors in particular sectors, and noted that “having established the existence of society as a second possible referent object for security along side the state, it became very difficult to refuse to accept the possibility of other potential referents emerging (Buzan and Waever 2003). As the other authors explored the security agenda forward, the state-centric approach was found to be inadequate in dealing with many of the issues confronting the world, and Buzan, in publications after 1991, seem to be agreeing to the centrality of non-state security actors in particular sectors (Waever et al., 1993). Thus the state lost its “bounded territoriality” as well as the “centrality of power”, giving up its primacy in security discourse.

**HOW DO WE CONSTRUCT NATIONAL SECURITY WITH WEAKENED STATE AND STRENGTHENED INDIVIDUAL?**

How then, do we construct “national security”? How do we conceptualise security when borders are silent but internals are boiling? How do we reproduce the “national ideal” without which the state loses much of its justification and power? The national ideal is in making with civic nationalism which is under fermentation. Political rights rather than the cultural demands are in the lead. Political rights for which again individual is the focus is the rallying point for this national ideal. Though external threats are fading, war within states -- intrastate or civil
wars – have resurrected with vigour. But what the states have been doing? The greatest threat
to security comes from the state itself when in civil wars, citizens are forced to run from the
state, when citizens are illegally held up, tortured, raped and killed. External wars have
debated but the state’s monopoly over violence is being misused with impunity. And the
individual and the society suffer. In terms of the relationship between state, society and
individual, the effect is the same (as in case of external threat) and even more extreme. The
individual remains on the receiving end. It is therefore necessary to examine the effect of
globalisation on the individual, society and state relationship in terms of security.

The Westphalian compact between citizen and state rested on the ability of the state to protect
its citizens from external enemies against which the citizen paid taxes and human resources.
External threats have almost vanished but internal threats of all kinds have emerged instead
with vengeance. Citizens now demand security from these internal threats, and security from
the threat by state itself. So also he or she now demands public services, a stable rule of law,
and support from various cultural and social policies and eventually respect for individual
rights and human dignity. Thus, security would have two functions – one purely the external
security functions of the state – involving defence and external affairs and the internal security
functions of the state that would include the safety from the internal threats from unsocial and
anti-social elements and the state and the public services of various kinds.

What are these public services? They are the various support required to be given to citizens
and societies for their security in the fields of economy, societal, political technological,
environmental etc. The researcher defines them as security sectors. Developments in these
areas strengthen individuals and society and provide security to them. They become important
ingredients for the analysis of security. Therefore, they must be discussed to bring out their
significance for the security paradigm. The structural and functional relationship of the
individual, society and state and the performance of the system in security sectors together characterize the security environment as well as help conceptualise security paradigm. The research would therefore next consider the way individual – society – state system has been influenced by globalization in security terms.

EFFECT OF GLOBALISATION ON INDIVIDUAL-SOCIETY-STATE SYSTEM

The research has exposed the fault-lines of the individual-society-state system in the globalised world that have immense significance for the security of each of the constituents of the system. The results of the analysis also reveal the imbalance created in the system and its ill-effects. How can we bring stability to the system? Who has to be protected? State or individual? Whose security? Who is the referent object of security? How can we put back the individual-society-state system to an order?

Globalisation driven by the market forces under the influence of economic, political, societal and informational processes has impacted the working of and the relationship between individual, society and the state. The claim of the state for being the sole referent object for security has been eroded. Individual has been left alone to fend for itself. Insecurities have mounted. It is, therefore, imperative that for a better understanding and evaluation of security the inter and intra relationship of the three viz., individual, society and state be deciphered.

Society and state have always been adversarial. When society has strengthened, state has always been left weakened and vice versa. The concept of a distinct civil society was weakened and made highly contingent, before the appearance of the forces, unleashed by globalization in the twentieth century, since “society” remained in the clutches of the state”
(Haigh, 2006). This has been identified with “a rule-governed society” based on the consent of
groups, or, a society based on a “social contract” among individuals” (Kaldor, 2003).

CIRCULARITY OF INTEREST OF STATE AND INDIVIDUAL:
SECURITY RELATION GOT STRAINED

Security of state and individual was defined in a narrow spectrum in the “Westphalian
Contract” wherein the state’s protection to citizens was assured against the taxes and other
resources the citizens gave to it and also the authorization to use them. The state power and
security were solely dependent on the material and human resources of the citizens. This
system brought the state and the society in an organically interactive association mutually
beneficial to each other and was sustainable (Figure 42). This is how the Westphalian state
consolidated under this system.

The possibility to increase the taxes prompted the state to have professional military through
which it could also wage war and increase power. The state used revenue to develop more
sophisticated weapons, which in turn, required more and better-trained men, so that “the
desirability of a standing army over the ad hoc formation became even more clear (Wallerstein,
1974). Thus, society, mediated through the institution of this professionalized military was
made the chief instrument of its own safety (Figure 43). However, this military was used less
for the protection of society per se and more for state’s own interest that related to the
mobilization of resources in the pursuit of power (Dandeker, 1993).

The predominantly externally facing military organization required that there should be a
pacified domestic population. This forged a close identity between citizen and state. This
relationship got reinforced as the state matured. The development of full democracy brought a
major change because democracy meant that matters of war and peace which had been
previously determined by “princely ambitions and dynastic considerations” were put before
those who had the biggest stake in the outcome, namely the people themselves (Hirst and Thompson, 1999). This meant that the decision to risk citizens' lives in a full democracy rest with them. Internal as well as external security of state is his or her choice because it is he or she who organizes and manages the instruments of security.

Under the impact of globalisation this circularity of interest between individual and state has got distorted because state gives protection to individual only partially now. Loyalty of citizen to state under this scenario gets branched out to global institutions, civil societies and NGOs. This has further downgraded the security of the state (Figure 44). State is thus not the sole recipient of loyalty of its citizen. The space between citizen and the state has been occupied by a host of actors at global and local levels, including civil society, NGOs some of which may be of dubious character. Security space with fluid relationship between individual, society and state has therefore been vitiated and made complex.

**BASIC UNIT OF SECURITY BECOMES THE INDIVIDUAL SECURITY NOT THE STATE SECURITY:**
**PROTECTION OF RIGHTS BECOMES THE MEASURE OF SECURITY**

On the side of individual, human rights enter the security debate as one of the measures of individual security. It can be noted that the movement towards a deeply revised and greatly expanded concept of security has its origin in the global human rights discourse, which insists upon individual, not the state, as the focus of and justification for the control and exercise of coercive force. The basic “unit” of security is therefore, no longer the state, but the individual and his or her human need (Figure 36). The United Nations Development Programme’s 1994 Human Development Report also has sought to put the individual, not the state, at the centre of the picture, and to focus on his or her interests at the expense of the traditional state-centric approach. The report sets up a hierarchy of security tasks or functions that the truly legitimate state must perform. They are: it must ensure the physical security of the individual citizens, it
must strive to secure their political and social rights, and it must safeguard their identities – the identity of individuals and of society at large. This is important because the state is now legitimized "less by its relationship with a given piece of territory and more by its ability to ensure the political rights of its citizens" (Barken, 1998).

Rice (2005) too defines weak states as those that suffer from significant gaps in providing security to their people, which show large gap in meeting the human needs and those that exhibit poor governance (Figure 38). Provision of individual security is thus the measure of the state’s strength. Individual is, therefore, the basic unit of security, not the state. Universality of the individual can also be gauged by the fact that he or she is the source as well as the object of security and insecurity (Thakur and Narsimha Rao 2005b, Figure 45). Both the external threat as well as the internal threat have individual as the originator and the target (Thakur & Narasimha Rao 2007b). Therefore, if the human security needs are taken care of, the security of the group, the community, the state and the globe also would be ensured. Individual thus becomes the focus of any security discussion.

**NO DUALITY BETWEEN STATE AND INDIVIDUAL AND THEIR SECURITY: ONLY SHARED IDENTITY BETWEEN STATE AND INDIVIDUAL CAN PROVIDE SUSTAINABLE SECURITY**

The two, individual and state can not be seen from separate prism. They can exist only together when they complement each other, not confront each other. All the efforts toward security of individual are also the endeavour toward the security of the state. They cannot be opposing and annulling each other, nor can they exist independent of each other. The state sovereignty has its legitimacy only in a satisfied, happy society, whereas societal identity need support and promotion from state’s power. Both need each other for survival. There is therefore no dualism between state and individual and their security. Everything that strengthens security of society also strengthens state security.
Haigh's postulates (2006) for the bifurcation of security into two streams that serve two distinct referents namely state and society and also his assertion that there is no shared identity of state and society are proved erroneous through the analysis presented above.

There can be only one referent object, the basic one, the security of which also provides security to all others. And, also that there is shared identity between the individual and the state, so also is the shared security. The two can't be separated. However, it is true that the state can no longer aspire to an exalted or exclusive position in the political order of things (Haigh, 2006). The state can exist only when it is recognized by individuals and society within the state and allowed and authorized to function as an integrating and as overseeing institution with full knowledge that it owes its legitimacy only when it performs certain necessary functions that ensure the security of individuals and society in various sectors.

Even if there is no shared identity of state, individuals and society, one identity has to be created for survival and sustenance of the three: that shared identity may be a combination of the identities of individuals and the societies within the state or one can be evolved. Only the shared identity of state, individual and society is found to sustain them in a democracy. The Christian Europe, the Christian USA, the Christian Russia, the Muslim Saudi Arabia and the Muslim Pakistan have shared identity with their society without much difficulty. But India with its multi-religious and multilingual societies need to share their strength with the Indian state for survival of both. Chechnya is troubling Russia for separation with its different identities. Can not two individual and societal identities, multiple identities of societies exist in one state? If answer is no, where is the end? India has thousands of faith, each faith having its own societal identity needing separate state? So will be the case of all those countries with multiple faiths, including USA, European countries in the long run. Does it mean only
monolithic society like Saudi Arabia can exist? And India should be split into another hundreds of states catering for each of its societies? The state, the individual and societies must evolve one shared identity for their security.

Amartya Sen attributes the existence of conflicts to the absence of multiple identities that can be pursued only through development efforts in economic and social and many other areas. Development gives multiple roles to individuals because of which he or she is able to see the connectedness, sharedness among the different identities (Figure 46). That creates harmony and peace internally as well as externally.

State is required to perform functions that individuals and societies cannot do. External affairs, protection of borders and protection of citizens from internal turmoil, and disaster, maintenance of social harmony and many other functions that only state can perform. Structural bifurcation of security into two streams of individual security and state security would thus be dangerous for the survival of both the society and the state. An organic unity that promotes the interests of individual, society and those of states would only give peace. An individual or a society may outgrow the state and may have its existence in various states, but that doesn’t mean they should distinguish themselves away from the particular state they belong to. A society that nurtures the state which helps it sustain its vitality would be enriching itself culturally, socially and economically. Security of individual and society is provided by the state and the security of the state is provided by the individual and the society; one needs the other, and that mutuality binds the two, doesn’t divide the two, provided the mutuality of roles of either is understood and implemented: consonant with each other, not dissonant to each other.
WHOSE SECURITY?

Even the globalisation inspired by information and communication technology has shifted the balance of security dialogue toward individual – the humble individual. For non-traditionalist “wideners”, state remains the referent object, whereas for non-traditionalist “deepeners”, individual becomes the referent object. Non-traditionalist “wideners” have simply widened the security sector from military to economic, environmental, etc. They have thus included in their definition the overall “development” aspect of the state also, not only military strength. Non-traditionalist “deepeners” ask the question: Why state? It is individual, who needs security – not through military (Figure 47) but through emancipation”.

Traditionalist security thinkers, non-traditionalist wideners and non-traditionalist deepeners – each of them has a demarcated area of issues and the referent objects. While the area of issue is expanding, there is a definite shift of referent object to individual (Figure 48). The concept is, one can widen the issues from military sector to economic, societal etc., but that developmental efforts won’t be sustainable if there are people who are in abject poverty, illiterate and malnutritioned. For security to be sustainable, emancipation of the individual in all its dimensions must be prioritized. This grass root security efforts would serve the purpose of widening the security agenda as well as enable us to acquire the military might for they are organically related. Focus on “individual” first, not the state because the individual and the state are again organically connected.

CONTRACTUAL OR ORGANIC?

Globalization has thus unsettled the existing model of the state and brought in a new dynamic reality in which individuals, societies and states are growing not as a single, fully formed, unproblematic entity, but as evolving entities with multiple and pluralistic complexions having diverse problems, generating new threats to individuals, society and state that can’t be identified yet. The fact is, threats are not static with time and space but are dynamic the way
globalization has created newer threats worldwide. They are not passive that just operates structurally but are interactive that is organic in character. Ferdinand Tonnies (1955) has made a distinction between “gemeinschaft” (an organic sense of community) and “gessellschaft” (a contractual sense). It would be a folly to use individual, society and state simply in contractual sense and insulate the effects of globalization through structural adjustments. Waever’s (1989) formulation of “societal security dilemma” is suggestive of the society being seen as an organic existence. It is only when individual, society and state are seen as a highly coherent, organic entity that the influences and cross currents of globalization can be nuanced, its outcomes factored and a viable conceptualisation drawn.

THE RISE OF CIVIL SOCIETY

The 1970s and 1980s witnessed a constitutional transformation when this relationship between state and the society was questioned. Mary Kaldor (2003) argues that during this period, it was realized that “the overthrow of the state from above was not feasible” but then the “state’s irresponsibility” was also not palatable. This is how Latin American and East European dissidents found it necessary to “changing the fundamental relationship between state and society by “withdrawing” from the former to create instead “islands of civic engagement” wherein citizens could cultivate powers of self-organization and autonomy (Haigh, 2006). Kaldor believes that “civil society” thereby became “a useful concept in opposing militarized regimes” (2003). It was the beginning of the contemporary state-society rift”.

It is interesting to observe that the concept of civil society became useful in two separate continents, for people belonging to two different ideologies but aimed toward the same purpose. The Latin Americans were Marxists whereas the East Europeans were neoliberal Capitalists aided and abetted by American Capitalists. The two movements took place at the same time without any communication or cooperation between them. Haigh (2006)
emphatically holds that globalisation was behind this seeming coincidence. Even the East European dissident George Konrad uses the word “globalization” in his “Anti-Politics”(1982). Marc Williams (2005) beautifully narrates the link between globalization and the growth of civil society, and affirms that the latter was made possible by “global economic integration, advances in communication technology, and the renewed impetus given to international politics by the end of the cold war”. He claims that the two antithetical movements – one led by Latin American dissidents (who were Marxists) and the other led by the East European dissidents who were anti-Marxists “shifted civil society from an analytical construct to the activist realism, filling the democratic deficit” of state. It may be noted that the states concerned were all signatories to applicable international human rights legislation.

The creation of this new delineated entity called “civil society” has a close correspondence with globalization. Its emergence was prompted by two factors, one, the vital support from activists elsewhere – North American human rights groups in the case of Latin America and the West European neoliberal Capitalists in the garb of peace and human rights proponents in the case of East Europe. Second, domestic societies’ direct appeal to the international community for help, brought to limelight the moral weight of global human rights norms against the states in question. Not that civil society didn’t exist earlier, they did exist but were dormant, not finding any expression. Globalization gave them a voice, confidence and an expression of identity. Globalization brought to bear the norms of human living, human rights against the all powerful state that betrayed their citizens’ trust and caused interpenetration of the two separate realms – inside (the state) and outside (the state), “we” (inside the state) and the “other” (outside the state), breaking the traditional barrier between states, creating a “continuity” of sort in the international relations. That human voices of distress could be heard beyond the borders, was a very important development for the twenty first century. It also indicates the organic link between peoples of all races which would be discussed later.
Globalisation as Interpenetration Into the Individual-State Relationship

But then, this “interpenetration” also created conceptual difficulties when the forces “inside” went to “employ” the forces “outside” to undermine an institution – the state, which though existed on their behalf, had wronged them. This process by which the civil society’s appeal to the international community bounced back, as it were, and put pressure on governments to tolerate certain activities, was called the “boomerang effect” by Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkiner (1998). The “boomerang effect” is an Euro-American construction to legitimize the disintegration of the USSR. They don’t use this “boomerang effect” term in case of Latin American Marxists boomerang on their side. In fact capitalists-led globalization is being abused to disintegrate many other societies and are called as boomerang effect to serve their interest. There are dissidents in the United States and Western Europe, but the globalisation, as it is led by neo-liberal capitalist world, they have been successful in keeping them under simmering wraps.

“Boomerang effect” is being used through globalization in two ways: first by altering the relationship between states and the international system so that the latter’s support for the former is no longer unconditional, and second, by means of communication technologies through which citizens and groups are increasingly able to establish partnerships across the state boundaries – and ever more frequently in spite of or against them. It is now very clear that USA and European countries are using this “boomerang effect” to serve their market interest against their adversaries by creating and stoking internal divisions in the developing countries. “Boomerang effect” makes use of the external agents, the way Americans did in east Europe in the name of pink revolution. Using the communication technology and with the help of external support for the demands of the locals, genuine or false, a situation is created and is termed as “boomerang effect”. The capitalist forces led by the US have specialized in
this art through CIA and even the doctrines of “regime change”, ‘pre-emptive strike’ have been tested for this slang. Internal rift of any kind even in a democracy is made politically relevant, or is activated by creating favourable external conditions – which in many cases is giving the impression that globalization as “interpenetration” is a sine qua non. Williams’ (2005) suggestion that “structural changes at the global level have created a space for autonomous political participation” within states, is being cited as reason for the exploitation by capitalistic forces to destabilize democratically elected or otherwise well-established genuine developing countries’ governments.

**Deficit of Stateness**

At this stage, it would be worthwhile to evaluate the state as a provider of capital, goods, services and ideas in the context of globalisation wherein these items freely cross the continents without any interruption. If these commodities are being facilitated to be supplied to citizen and society reasonably by the state, there won’t be any reason for an individual or society to look anywhere else for support. Otherwise, the very stateness of the state is suspect.

Haigh (2006) has investigated the model of the state as “provider of essential goods” against the “sovereignty loan”, the authority given by individual to the state to use them. Each citizen in domestic society pays in terms of various services offered and taxes and so has a major stake. If the state can deliver adequate return on the investment made by citizen and the society – which means, it acts in the best interests of its “shareholders”, the stakeholders - then the state can be perceived to have legitimate authority. If it doesn’t, then it is in a “potential state of alienation” of individuals and the society upon which its very existence is based, and can no longer fully count on that individual and society for vital support. Giving an adequate return on the investment made by citizen and the society is a measure of “stateness” – the capability and the execution of the capability to meet the obligation towards its people. The
question is, is the state able to satisfy the conditions of that stateness so that it does not alienate its people.

What is the nature of the capital, goods, services and ideas that the state should deliver to its people? Ian Clark (1999) categorises them into: physical security, economic well-being and the (re)production of culture and identity. The boundaries between them are not always well-defined, and there is a substantial overlap. The environmental, political, and societal security has also been included later that fits well with the broadened agenda of security (Thakur & Narasimha Rao, 2007a). If the state is able to secure these needs for its people, it has earned its legitimacy, otherwise not.

*Security Demands on State have increased*

Kal J Holsti (1996) has opined that “in the implicit contract between individuals and the state .. the most fundamental service purchased is the physical security”, irrespective of whether the people are poor or rich as Suketa Mehta (2004) also avers: “in the anonymous city, in the close quarters of the slum, the overriding interest is law and order, stability. More than water, more than housing, more than jobs, the Bombayite wants personal safety.” State “can hardly exercise authority or expect loyalty in return”, if it can not supply this good. Under globalizing scenario there is a discrepancy in ensuring the physical security of individuals by the state. Globalisation has enlarged the security domain of individuals to the field of economy, politics, societal and environmental and individuals expect the state to provide the security in these areas too. Security of identity of individual and the security of the being – the human security are gaining importance and the individual is looking forward to the state to get them. Globalisation has simply expanded its obligation toward the individual which are becoming difficult for the state to fulfill. Overall the gap between the demands from state and supply of
it has increased manifold introducing strain in the relationship between the two. Thus the concept of security is radically recast, and in this recasting the relationship between the state and its people is both altered and destabilized (Haigh 2006).

*State Capacity to manage Security has been diminished*

Provisioning of security has undergone significant material changes under globalizing conditions. Here the researcher will analyse the important issues involving major material changes in security provisioning and underscore certain ideational elements that seem to be having deep and permanent impact on the terms of the security deal that has all along connected the citizen and the state.

Technology inspired globalisation has made the technologies developed for war as well as for peace easily accessible to all. The secrecy of a product used earlier as an edge in war is no longer very much applicable, because even if a country has the edge, the same is bridged in no time under the influence of globalizing forces. Globalisation in a sense has the tendency to equalize “the haves” and the “have nots” of weapons. Technology inspired globalisation has therefore exposed the diminished capacity of a state to manage all the variables of its security environment on the terms of its choosing.

*Breach of Security compact between Individual and State*

Security “deregulation” adopted by states after cold war or privatization of security provisioning has meant outsourcing security related jobs to private players as part of liberalizing the economy. This benefits the capitalist forces, no doubt, but harms the security of the state itself. The growing tendency of the state to “privatize” or “contract out” or “outsource” important elements of their security and defence services involve concomitant “leakage” or “loss of secrecy” to the point where similar or the same weapons of destruction
could be available with non-state actors and terrorists who could challenge the Weberian-style state’s monopoly on legitimate violence. It is definitely a questionable development, wherein security is ceded away from the organs of the state through its own auspices in the name of market reforms and in its presumed interests. This is leading to a rise in the number and capabilities of other less scrupulous actors, may be its own enemies, insurgents, terrorists within the country and the many dissatisfied groups who might be waging various wars against the state. ULFA, J&K terrorists, Maoists, other terrorists and the like are the beneficiaries of this kind of globalization of defence material procurement. This has acquired such a proportion that their recent attempts to contain it have, more or less directly, resulted in the overthrow of the states themselves. And what is surprising is that even then various developing and not so developing states have not learnt any lesson from such incidents and continue to pursue market reforms putting the security of such states in jeopardy. These and other globalization processes also illustrate the material breach of the original security compact between the individual and the society on the one hand and the state on the other.

**The Legitimacy Deficit**

This security bargain had entrusted the state with a (Weberian) monopoly on violence as a means of ensuring the protection of individual and society. But with the globalization of security and its instruments, such a monopoly cannot be sustained and the individuals are being killed with impunity by terrorists, naxalites and Maoists and the society is bewildered to find itself defenceless in protecting its security. And things are evolving in the manner that the state can no longer make key security decisions and guarantee security to its citizens. This means, the state has reneged on the terms of its contract with the society, the loyalty and support of which is now increasingly and for perfectly legitimate reasons suspect. Daniel Deudney (1995) calls it "legitimacy deficit", by which the society calls the state apparatus into question when the latter’s security performance does not live up to its promise.
State can't exist in isolation of its people and the environment. State Security therefore can't be conceived without the seeding and strengthening of the physical security, economic wellbeing, environmental sustainability, societal and cultural security of its people and above all the human concern for them. People need society and its security. They also need environmental security. All these form the foundation on which state security is established. The physical, economic, cultural/identity security, societal and environmental security are necessary for the security of individual and society. If the state can't provide them to the people and the society, the irrelevance of the state looms large in the minds of people and the society. As the base of the pyramid shrinks the people, society and the state system becomes unstable that leads to anarchy.

_Security is the Socialist View_

The debate on economic security according to Buzan and the Copenhagen school has centered around the views of the mercantilists, the liberals and the socialists. The mercantilists prioritize politics and see the state as the key actor, required to provide the security for the operation of firms and markets. They regard the economic realm as self-contained with the role of the state limited to protect the state’s frontiers, to regulate a secure internal market and pursue an external policy for business to operate efficiently. What happens to the individual doesn’t enter into their scheme, the individual remains a tool in the hands of merchants of business and market. "Economic liberals on the other hand believe that the market should operate free from the interference of state, which is required only to provide law and external military protection and to support the social fabric in a strictly limited number of areas where the market fails to do so" (Sheehan 2006). While mercantilists want the state protection in and out, liberals see the state in a minimalist perspective. It is the socialists, the followers of Karl Marx, who find economics underpinning the entire social and political reality and want that the
state interfere and organize the economic system to achieve the social and political goals of
justice and equality for the economically weak as against the strong. It is only in the socialist
view that the individual enters into the scheme of security. In the other two, he or she is
required to fend for himself or herself. This security bias toward advancing the interest of the
economically weak is imperative in a large country like India with a large population that is
still struggling to stand on its feet.

What happens to the people who are impoverished and poor, with no resources to pursue a
living? He is being thrown aside while the economy moves on with neoliberal capitalists
taking advantage of the situation liberally. How can a state survive where a larger and larger
population is being pushed into deprivation, creating social tension? Can the policy and
programme of national security be pursued in the absence of cooperation from the millions and
millions of hungry mouth and unemployed?

What is the implication of liberalization under the philosophy of globalisation for the state and
for the individual who is below the poverty line? To the state it means lift all controls, leave
people to do whatever they wish to. It implies, those who are resourceful can reap benefits
more and more, can even manipulate things to their advantage at the cost of the poor. It also
implies, poor has lost a patron, a protector, his or her rights to live have gone and can't defend
himself or herself. The individual security is gone, and as the market forces operate, their
number would go on swelling, the number of people who are poor, hungry, dissatisfied, would
go on increasing. Well, then in a globalised atmosphere, a little enlightenment would suggest,
why this poor should be aligned to the state, why not change the loyalty to another state? And
the way Indian economy is being liberalized, and is being pursued, their number would
outnumber the ones who are affluent and satisfied. Can the state remain secure in that instance
despite the induction of military arms and weapons? This kind of liberalization strikes at the very root of individual security which in turn is a sure recipe for an insecure state.

**DEFENCE INDUSTRIAL BASE:**
**INDIVIDUAL SECURITY SO VITAL FOR MILITARY**

Relationship between economy and security can also be discussed with the defence industrial base as the security agenda. Military spending has to be sustained by a national economy that is generating the necessary financial and technological resources. The latter two demand a human capital that is productive and creative. The question is, what percentage of human capital in India belongs to that category? It is totally insignificant and needs to be augmented the way China has done. That can't be done without proper and sufficient attention to the individual security in expanded form.

In the West, economic security has simply been the part of a traditional military security agenda. They have had a strong economic base which is not the case with India. India is yet to have a strong economic infrastructure for which building up of human resources is essential. Development of human resources demands, India invest in individual security, the importance of which to the national security is highlighted by the technological element for the defence industrial base. Defence needs advanced, new and innovative technologies — and ever changing technology. How can a state deliver this in the absence of a satisfied, happy, creative workforce? We can't procure them even if we are prepared to pay any price. They are not just available. We have to develop and produce ourselves because all kinds of sanctions and restrictions have enveloped India. A self generating defence industrial base is a prerequisite for national security and that is just not possible without adequate empowerment of individual.

In the literature often the reference is about military security — referring to the traditional national security — giving the impression that national security is nothing but military security.
There is nothing as military security. This simply means national security provided by military through protecting country's borders. National security is achieved by protecting borders through military, by strengthening economic foundation through raising production efficiently and by exploiting human resources through empowering everybody, especially those who are poor, and marginalized, by creating a homogenous, harmonious social relations and by protecting environment through measures that don't imbalance the natural equilibrium. Each of them – military, economic, societal, environment is a component in which state should endeavour to do well. The importance of these components has been changing with time, for example, the end of cold war has reduced the importance of military and brought to the fore the implication of economic might. Globalisation has put states on notice that if they don’t look into societal problems, they are in trouble.

OVER EXPLOITATION OF ENVIRONMENT FOR BIGGER MARKET:

INDIVIDUAL IS THE SUFFERER

A mad rush has begun to capture the natural resources wherever available and over – exploitation of it for a bigger cake in the world market. The result is, the exasperated ecology is giving up, which is visible in the form of melting glaciers and rising sea level. Simon Dalby (1998) argues, globalisation is at the centre of the real problem of environmental deterioration. For him, it is the pressures of globalised world and the operation of post modern capitalism, that are the culprit, rather than population growth per se, because of “the accelerating processes of globalisation that are interconnecting the world’s economies and cultures in ways that often operate to undercut traditional economies and challenge the sustainability of agricultural and survival practices.” Globalisation has encouraged people consume uninhibited that has been placing further pressures on the ecological resources, increasing pollution, waste and many a time undegradable waste. Even the modes of production under globalisation have assumed
unsustainable proportion. The life styles of people are far more demanding today on global resources.

All the four major environmental components of security namely, disruption of ecosystems caused by the agricultural or industrial human activities, energy-involving depletion of natural resources, pressures due to major population movements and excessive consumption and food scarcities and uneven food distribution are under greater strain in the globalised condition creating severe human suffering (Figure 49).

*Environmental Security is about the Sustainability of Human Civilisation*

Economic activity that is the vehicle of this human civilization has used the environment only as the resource. The existing levels of human civilization need the preservation of the ecosystems, the former dependent on the latter. Humanity can survive and progress economically and sustenably only if environmental balance is not destroyed. Thus environmental security is a problem of coping with the dynamics of post industrial cultures.

The very existence of this civilization depends on the survival of the environment. Buzan, Waever and De Wilde (1998) therefore point out that the environmental security problem is for the human civilization. How does humanity adapt to the new constraints that its activities clearly place on the environment? (Sheehan 2006). It is the environment as the sustainer of humanity that we come to. If environment is robbed and plundered without being replenished, this human civilization itself would come to a grinding halt. The sustainability of the civilization is dependent on the environment. All the physical and material prosperity, and life style we talk about is derived from the environment in some way (Figure 50) and there is a limit to it. Environmental security is about the question of maintaining the equanimity of human with the nature.
Buzan, Waever and De Wilde (1993) find the question of the referent object in environmental security as interesting. To be specific, people, researchers and scholars started getting worried over the imbalance in environment caused by their own actions (which supposedly have had improved their standard of living) only after they found that the damaged environment won't be able to sustain human life – global warming would cause deaths, deluge, draughts and deforestation.

It is for the protection of ourselves that today we talk about environmental security. In fact we should be categorical that it is the individual security that we can get if we protect our ecology, that if we promote ecological equilibrium we shall have ecological harmony that would give us societal, cultural and political sustainability. In one go, nurturing our eco not only protects us from ill-health and disease but is also a vehicle for higher economic activity and better support for military strength. It would not be wrong to say that environment is basis for all the issues of security beginning from the individual security.

Environment in any case can't be the referent object because it is the vital means of our existence and development for which human being is at the centre of focus. Human being is the referent object for whatever security we talk about: environmental, economic, societal or political or even military (Figure 50). Even military is protecting borders of a state whose raison d'etre is human being. In peace time too when natural disasters hit a population, military is called to help the human being. In the case of internal disturbance also, if warranted, military comes as a shield for the oppressed and the destitute. All these are at the call of national security caused by national emergency. Thus whenever we say state is the referent object, by that it is understood that human life and human value are at stake and they
have to be protected. The logic of environmental security, therefore, takes us to the view that individual security is the focus of the environmental security as well as of national security and that there is no contradiction between them.

CHANGE IN THE NATURE OF SECURITY SECTORS

The work shows a remarkable change brought by globalisation in the nature of security sector. Military has just been forgotten about and in place has come a host of other sectors of security namely economic, societal, environmental and so on. It is not only the number of security sectors that has been enlarged but the very quality of it has seen an expansive and normative rise. It is not only technology, information, knowledge and wisdom that people talk securing about but are also seeking more and more space for their existence, identity, values and dignity. And the sector of security is just expanding in all dimensions. It means individual wants security in totality – not only physical but also psychological and all that constitute and define a human being.

Security sectors are areas in which individual, society and state have to be developed and protected. They are not fighting fields, but fields of endeavour (Figure 51). They are not limited to economic, environmental, societal and political domains, nor does technology set the boundary. It is just in the mode of an expansive thinking with inclusivity being the main feature. Thus poverty, destitution, illiteracy, ill health and many others are attracting the attention. Taking security to ideational plane from identity to value system, belief and any specific characteristic is being pondered. Nature of security sectors is becoming more perceptual belonging to the realm of ideas than physical. It is now accepted that security cannot remain a dogmatically fixed concept but must be dynamic in space and time. The way security thinking is changing with technological revolution, it must be flexible enough to don different role from providing food to the hungry to protecting beliefs and value systems. In
any case, security sector can no longer be mapped objectively with negative notion and doctrines but has to allow for subjective and yet positive desirable action.

Military security is sharing the platform along with economic, societal, environmental and political and many others. Economic security is a centuries-old approach to thinking about security and is even the provider of military might to the country. However, "no clear definition of what is meant by that phrase seems to have emerged" (Neu and Wolf, 1994). Barry Buzan (1991a) stated that "economic security concerns access to the resources, finance and markets necessary to sustain acceptable levels of welfare and state power", which identifies two different approaches to the concept of economic security.

While the "acceptable levels of welfare" suggests that the material well-being of a country's citizens is in itself a security issue, involving among other things, the issues of poverty, health levels, employment levels, and overall economic and political stability; the reference to "sustaining state power" relates to an approach to economic security that is rooted in the belief that a prospering economy and healthy tax base are necessary for the maintenance of military and diplomatic capabilities for country's defence.

The traditional thinking in literature on security suggests as if the two approaches are not in harmony with each other and are cited to be in tension all the time. "If you spend on "welfare", you can't maintain "military" and vice versa". This thinking that the two contradict each other has been proved empirically fallacious. The logic that an economically strong state can afford to spend more on military holds the truth of reality, so also is the truth that it can spend more on welfare; for an affluent society can not only defend its borders through acquiring military hardware but also develop in various fields of culture, societal development,
political values and environmental protection and promotion. And this will be the society that would also be creative, will be feared and respected.

Economy seems to be the major provider of strength and support to military, technology, societal well-being, cultural identity, political ethos and interests and environmental protection. Strength and weakness of each of these other sectors also strengthen and weaken the other sectors. For example, new technology is the enhancer of economic power. This lateral relationship is also borne out by the fact that a society with a strong cultural bond shows greater resolve to fight economic and military crises, its cultural strength acts to preserve societal prosperity and its cultural value is depicted in the way politics is conducted in the country. Each one is a reflection of the other. A country can’t fight invaders by military might alone. It needs political resolve, societal support, cultural unison and economic muscle. This interdependability of security sectors is fundamental to construct a security system for the globalised world.

NEW SECTORS OF SECURITY AND THEIR INTERDEPENDENCE

Between 1940s and 1980s, security studies remained isolated to strategic studies, mainly because strategic specialists tend to have generally a narrow band of expertise and are essentially military strategists, interpreting security through the military angle. Also a major part of strategic analysis pertains to policy-domain of national governments and are consequently inclined to be highly ethno-centric. All put together strategic studies lead to a narrow national security perspective. This has dissuaded analysts from analyzing security for its interdependence and the more broadly systemic aspects of the concept.

Security of states and individuals and populations should be seen as being crucially affected by a range of issues, not merely the military capabilities. It is also true that these new threats be
political values and environmental protection and promotion. And this will be the society that
would also be creative, will be feared and respected.

Economy seems to be the major provider of strength and support to military, technology,
societal well-being, cultural identity, political ethos and interests and environmental protection.
Strength and weakness of each of these other sectors also strengthen and weaken the other
sectors. For example, new technology is the enhancer of economic power. This lateral
relationship is also borne out by the fact that a society with a strong cultural bond shows
greater resolve to fight economic and military crises, its cultural strength acts to preserve
societal prosperity and its cultural value is depicted in the way politics is conducted in the
country. Each one is a reflection of the other. A country can’t fight invaders by military might
alone. It needs political resolve, societal support, cultural unison and economic muscle. This
interdependability of security sectors is fundamental to construct a security system for the
globalised world.

NEW SECTORS OF SECURITY AND THEIR INTERDEPENDENCE
Between 1940s and 1980s, security studies remained isolated to strategic studies, mainly
because strategic specialists tend to have generally a narrow band of expertise and are
essentially military strategists, interpreting security through the military angle. Also a major
part of strategic analysis pertains to policy-domain of national governments and are
consequently inclined to be highly ethno-centric. All put together strategic studies lead to a
narrow national security perspective. This has dissuaded analysts from analyzing security for
its interdependence and the more broadly systemic aspects of the concept.

Security of states and individuals and populations should be seen as being crucially affected by
a range of issues, not merely the military capabilities. It is also true that these new threats be
addressed with the same sense of urgency and commitment of resources that were previously limited to the maintenance of military balance of power and projection of military force. It thus becomes possible, by widening the security agenda, to foresee the threats that are not currently met by state policies, but are nevertheless encountered by individual social groups, and movements.

Security should be considered in two dimensions. First, at which level of security we are talking about: individual, state, or international level, because the type and nature of security at each of these levels are different. Second, the nature of security threats need to be expanded to be inclusive of the dispossessed and poor and not only exclusive to the powerful (Thakur & Narsimha Rao 2006a). Buzan(1991a) identified five major sectors that affect the security of human collectivities, namely the military, political, economic, societal and environmental. While military security pertains to the two-level interplay of the armed offensive and defensive capabilities of states and states’ perceptions of each others’ intentions; political security concerns the organizational stability of states, systems of governance and the ideologies that give them legitimacy (Krugman 2005). Economic security means the access to the resources, finance and markets necessary to sustain acceptable levels of welfare and state power (Hanumantha Rao 2005). Societal security relates to the sustainability of the traditional patterns of language, culture and religions and national identity and custom, within the acceptable conditions of evolution whereas the environmental security is about the maintenance of the local and the planetary biosphere as the essential support system on which all other human enterprises depend (Menon 2005). This process of analysis and expansion is by no means limited to the categorization of Buzan.

If protecting borders of the country is the job of the national security, whose job is it to protect individuals from the maladies in economic, societal, political and environmental fields. Can
nation keep protecting boundaries while its people are starving, socially being exploited, have their rights violated and keep suffering from environmental degradation (Parsai 2005)? If people suffer from these problems for whom the country’s borders are being protected?

In this globalized world, the national security problem is required to be viewed in terms of a general systemic security question where each individual, and the system—have a part to play, where economic, societal, and environmental factors are as important as political and military are. (Buzan, 1991a). The growing interaction and interdependence could be seen across all the dimensions of the broader concept of security (Sheehan 1996b). The world today is characterized and typified militarily, economically, environmentally, socially and politically by the very concept of globalisation. Once it had been recognized that security did not have a single, fixed meaning, the potential breadth of its meaning can be subjected to the process of analysis and negotiation (Thakur and Narsimha Rao 2005a).

ALL SECURITY SECTORS ARE RELATED
The discussion so far has demonstrated that national security cannot be achieved without achieving the securities required in different security sectors of economy, environment, societal, political, etc. The question arises whether these sectors are separate, standalone subjects and counter each other or are connected and complementary. From the days of “The Wealth of Nations” of Adam Smith who discussed the relationship between “defence” and “opulence” (Hitsch, 1960), the link between economics and national security has always been a subject of lively discussion, with the former being seen subordinate to the latter. While security is directly related to the practice of politics”, economics assumes one of the important dimensions of the practices of “security politics”. However, the “politics” and the “economics” are so intimately and “intrinsically” webbed together that we can’t talk one independent of the other. This phenomenon was also amply demonstrated by the 1973
economic and political shock of the Organization of Petroleum – Exporting Countries (OPEC) oil embargo when Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye (1977) argued that “military security issues were not always the primary concern for states and under certain conditions economic issues might supercede military matters”. It is so because it is the economic resources and power that directly define the power muscle of the country and has influential bearing on the broadened approach to security.

ALL SECTORS OF SECURITY ARE INSEPARABLE PARTS OF THE SECURITY AGENDA

Each broadened sector defines a core subject for concern and analysis but the sectors interrelate and overlap in a variety of ways. Sectors might identify distinctive pattern of issues but they remain inseparable parts of the total. These five sectors today are recognized for governmental programmes and practice but newer issues are cropping up with the wave of globalisation. For example, gender relations or female dominated security concerns have been getting focus in security discourse but could also be a part of societal, cultural or political framework.

Globalisation led by liberal capitalism has produced more losers and only few winners. The central issue is that these losers can not participate in the market game of globalisation and have remained on the receiving end, resulting in rampant starvation, forced suicides, induced crimes, depleting resources, environmental instability, suffering minorities and deprivation of all kinds among weaker communities along with malnutritioned babies and starving foetuses and hungry expectant mothers. The very humanity is at peril with these new dimensions of insecurity haunting individuals, families and home of not only in Asia and Africa but even in the prosperous America and Europe. How do we fit this new dimension of individual security into the broadened agenda of security viz., economic, environmental, societal and political? Each facet of these threats to humans arises because of the sheer neglect of the broadened
sectors namely economic, environmental, societal and political security of individuals and communities.

The growing interaction and interdependence of sectors is visible across all the dimensions of the broader concept of security. This interdependence – even for security has been enabled by the advances in technologies and military capabilities leading to the coinage of the terms like “mutual assured destruction”, “planet wide war” and the possible elimination of the human species through nuclear war, or even the elimination of the human species through the “nuclear winter” (Sheehan 1996b). Political ideas of democracy are getting globalised, and the “western industrial democracy” has emerged as the standard route to development worldwide. But it is also leaving out a much larger population to under development, malnutrition and illiteracy. The distributive justice has just been absent in the political and economic philosophy of this globalisation. It has remained exclusive globalisation where everybody is not participating, where sufferers are more than gainers. Economic globalization for global market of production and services, trade and finance has failed as a measure of economic and national security (Thakur and Narsimha Rao 2006b) because sectors of security are not being treated interactively.

COHERENCY OF THE DIFFERENT SECURITY SECTORS IS IN TERMS OF THE INSECURITY CAUSED

Events and intellectual debates since 1980s had the effect of revealing the inadequacies of the existing, limited definition of security. However the discussion that followed had not produced a consensus on a broader understanding of the concept. Critics have also argued that if expanded too far, the concept would cease to have any clear meaning at all. Arguments have been advanced “for resisting broad definition of security because although a case could be made for including such things as pollution, disease, and economic failure as security threats,
that would also represent an exclusive expansion of the definition. Stephen Walt (1991) asserted that if the field was defined too widely, its intellectual coherence would be destroyed.

On the one hand, there is a need for security approach to be more critical. On the other hand, it is alleged that broadening the security concept has the risk of the concept becoming less coherent, and the security agenda becoming overloaded. This criticism of incoherency is incompressible because insecurity can be caused through the happenings in any of the sectors of economic, environmental, societal or political or military. So long as it is insecurity that we are dealing with it is consistent. In fact, Ken Booth (1997) questions, if there is an incoherence: “to maintain the traditionalist ("intellectually coherent") concept of security simply perpetuates statist, militarized and masculinized definitions of what should have priority in security terms, and to do that leaves the agenda in the hands of the traditional strategic / security specialists.”

The criticism of conceptual broadening in terms of conceptual incoherence and non-academic definition doesn’t hold good with the widening role of the government and democracy. Security issues dominate governmental policy agenda and also generate political action and resource allocation in a way that other aspects of the policy agenda do not. Should not the issues of everyday struggle for survival, the “existential security” for billions of ordinary human beings worldwide attract the government attention for policy priority and resource allocation (Patnaik 2005)? Should not the issues of healthcare, poverty, human rights, environmental degradation and many such other concerns that do not form part of the traditional military security agenda get security prioritization? Government is a means to an end – the protection of not only state borders, but also the protection and improvement and the well-being of its citizens and the central concern should be how this could be done and how
people of all denominations could be made secure. Coherency of the widened sectors has to be seen in terms of the lowest denomination of security level.

The objective of review of security concepts should not be just “broadening” the meaning of security by extending the same logic to new sectors, but it should be about “deepening” the understanding of security. The security that has remained surfacial, concerned about only defending the body of the state must be thought of as concerned about the soul of the state, the individuals, their concerns, their problems and feelings. Securing their existence both physically and intellectually, maintaining and promoting their peace, harmony and progress amidst the growth and prosperity of their values, ethos and culture would secure people. “Deepening” also means challenging the existing conceptions that limit its application and instead exploring the implications of working with a “richer concept” of security, a “holistic concept” that would ensure security of the state as well as the soul of the state. And this approach has the potential of changing the practice of politics itself (Booth, 1997). This deepening would also clear the problem of incoherency and conceptualisation would take us to the fundamental issue of the humanity.

Globalisation has unearthed a lot of issues and opportunities which place limitations to working with the narrow definition of security (Subrahmanyam 2005). Enlarging the scope of security makes it possible to address new issues of environment and human rights and also to gain deeper understanding of older ones such as how the military security is related to economy and society, politics and environment and gives scope for comprehensive thinking and action. Globalisation has brought out the fact that the concept of security can be applied to various fields and can be handled at various levels of individuals, groups of individuals, society, community and linguistic and religious minorities, and national and international levels.
Research also reveals the fact that the feeling of insecurity begins in mind and the confidence of security also comes first in mind – both shaped by external and physical setting. Therefore, there is a need to consider the human aspects of feelings, values and ethos that engage his or her mind and take sector of security to a wider and deeper human plane.

There is a direct relationship between military security and the strength and weakness displayed by economy, societal bond, political maturity, and the environmental well-being. One cannot think about military security while being economically weak, socially fragmented and politically disintegrated. External strength can only reflect the internal one. It is internal strength displayed by its strong economy, societal harmony and political sagacity that gets reflected in the external strength and international standing (Ghosh 2005).

**IS USE OF FORCE A PRECONDITION FOR A SECTOR TO BE CLASSIFIED AS SECURITY SECTOR?**

Traditionalists have also been worried that an expanded security definition would lead to a loss of focus. Any dilution of the concept would deviate the state from the attention of main line of security, giving rise to a free for all demand for every sector to be declared as a security sector. Stephen Walt (1991) recommends “more restricted” meaning of security which should be limited to analyzing “the conditions that make the use of force more likely and the security studies should be about the ways that the use of force affects individuals, states and societies, and the specific policies that states adopt in order to prepare for, prevent, or engage in war.”

But there are situations warranting the use of force (military actions) because of deteriorating environmental pollution, when the state is incapable of handling large scale human suffering in the course of normal state functioning, and also there are cases requiring military intervention when human rights of a particular community are being violated on a large scale. If we don’t
declare today a particular sector a security one, the sector when mismanaged would create a
c Condition for military intervention. There are situations, for example, extreme poverty that
rarely invites the attention of states which have got used to see them as a common problem and
state has never used force / military to improve the situation. Does securitization mean that
military only has to be used? No, the emergency measures are also handled by civil
organizations. In fact, there are sectors, other than military that deserve to be clubbed with
"security" in managing its affairs because failure in doing so would make the state weakened
in military terms. If we declare them initially itself a security sector with contingent resources
and attention, we don’t have to use the force later. Use of force is a failure of the political class
to manage the sectors in a peaceful environment. Force can’t be a precondition for a sector to
be designated as a security one.

Security can’t be caged into the confines of militarized thinking of force and its structures.
The concept must be expanded to include the situations where borders of human values are
being breached, where economic malaise is breaking the individuals allegiance to the state and
where environmental degradation is consigning this civilization to the inferno of death and
destruction.

Isolation of security to the limits of military has weakened its relationship with other sectors of
national and social importance. This weakening of the relationship has been mainly caused by
the narrow conception of security. What is required is a study of “security of a system”
wherein military security and other sectors are understood and their relationships and
interdependencies are deciphered and delineated. Can country afford to compartmentalize the
issues as military and civil even in this globalised world where there is a marked shift toward
civilizing the military?
In fact Deudney (1990) and Huysmans (1995) object to the securitization of problem such as the environment and migration because “the danger involved in hyphenating security lies in the militarization and confrontational attitude produced by the traditional conception of national security”. Robert Walker (1997) and others, on the other hand, foresee an inevitable expansion of security that would include issues that are not military in nature because the way questions regarding security are so closely implicated in the whole legitimization of the sovereign state. Should not the use of military whether for protecting the borders or protecting the weak individual be considered an aberration and a failure of the civil society? A concept that gives the civility a more creative, productive, and protective role in the matters of security, is emerging.

WITHDRAWAL OF STATE FROM ITS OBLIGATION

Resistance to securitization of new sectors or security sector reforms has taken a different form in India and many other developing and poor countries. Well, securitizing of many more areas means, more involvement, more responsibilities and more expenditure by the state. Instead, the Indian government looks the other way and proclaims that all these sectors would be taken care of by reforms and by the full play of market forces. It has been a sheer “withdrawal” of state as security provider even from what existed during the era of cold war. The government in the name of liberalization, have allowed private players to open education – shops and, health-markets to provide services which had been state’s duty all these years. Security sector reforms whether environmental degradation, social and economic inequality, food insecurity, health and education provisioning and the basic amenities don’t have any meaning because the state has simply switched itself off with the plea that privatization would take care of these sectors, resulting in a large number of farmers’ suicide, increase in malnutrition, children’s deaths and increasing poor-rich gap. In case of India it is not expansion of security agenda but
shrinking of it and even demolition of existing security agenda is taking place in the name of labour reforms (Thakur & Narasimha Rao 2005f). If state can’t manage a sector, the dictum is, go for reform which only means open it for private parties and allow them to loot poor and the disadvantaged. And this trend is evident in all the sectors of security in India. It is also said that government’s job is to govern, not to do business. Fine, but why then the government owned institution like HUDA auction lands at exorbitant price, thereby increasing the prices of not only land but even the prices of essential commodities because of which poor suffer most.

To put it mildly, the move toward an extended arena of security is inspired by the solemn feeling towards the individual citizen’s plight that has remained ignored at the core of state’s power and has aggravated in the globalised era. It requires an ethical state power to recognize the need to meet basic human needs and endeavour to meet them, not to shirk from its duty toward its citizens. This ethical understanding is totally absent in the thinking of the main political forces in the country. The result is deteriorating human condition in the wake of drummed up reforms.

SECURITY – SECTORS ARE MEANT TO ADD NATIONAL VALUE:

WHY NOT NATIONAL SECURITY IN TERMS OF NATIONAL VALUE?
- SECURITY IS ABOUT VALUE-ADDITION

The monolithic view of security around the realist tradition is not only too narrow in scope for the realities of the globalised world, but it also distorts objective reality. In reality, there is no fixed concept of national security. The operational definition of national security is largely contextual (Moon 2006). Therefore, the diagnosis of, and prescription for, security will vary from country to country depending on the nature of its vital national values. These vital national values can be identified in terms of economy, ecology, communal, societal and political, and many values of human interest.
The question here boils down to, is if globalisation is enhancing the economic value of the state and the people. The multiplicity of national values along with the security context leads to diverse security dimensions. During periods of acute economic depression or external economic disturbance, economic issues may displace other core problems in the hierarchy of national values (Knorr and Trager 1977, Kranse and Nye 1975). Economic security, in the Western developed countries has very much emerged as a primary policy concern. Maintaining international competitiveness and ensuring citizens' welfare have been the vital security agenda even in the United States (Sandholtz et al 1992). Economic security, in the developing world is a question of life and death. Underdevelopment, chronic poverty, unemployment and deteriorating living conditions are all pervasive which prompt the states to go for development programmes ensuring public welfare which constitute important national values. In reality, however, very few developing states regard economic issues as national security concerns. Increasing military spending amidst poverty is evidence of this trend. But globalisation is exposing the neglect these states have exhibited by not attending to the economic necessities of their society and people.

Economic value of national security becomes vital because of its extensive spillover effect on other national values. Underdevelopment and deprivation degrade national morale and precipitate social unrest that furthers internal fragmentation. Such internal faultlines can also trigger hostile actions by potential or actual adversary. An economic crisis may trigger a legitimacy crisis, tempting the ruling regimes to create an imaginary enemy and to provoke a self-induced national security crisis in order to avert internal threats to the regime. The case of the Argentina invasion of the Falkland Islands illustrates this point. A weak economy also undermines the base of military power. The comparative economic value of poor and developing countries has been declining during the globalisation.
ECOLOGICAL VALUE – A QUESTION OF ORGANIC SURVIVAL
IMPACT ON ECOLOGICAL SECURITY

For free-market advocates, globalisation of market forces is the one answer to ecological problem. They say, the law of supply and demand, coupled with technological progress can not only resolve the current ecological dilemma, but also expand the new horizon of abundance (Simon and Kahn 1984). However, those who see sustainable development as the ultimate remedy for ecological insecurity, see market forces as an evil which not only depletes non-renewable resources, but also undermines environmental integrity. Unrestrained market forces precipitate over-consumption and also worsen the tragedy of the common people. This endangers not only particular nation state but also the entire global system (Herman 1993).

Organic survival of national population depends on the ecological balance of the physical environment (Pirages, 1978, Myers, 1989) more than the physical protection of nation-states from the external military threats. This reasoning derives from the reality that the national population constitutes the main component of the nation state, and this population cannot survive without proper resource space to enable it to nourish itself and to expand. Thus keeping pace with the rising domestic economic and resource demands either through external expansion of ecological space or by domestic adjustment is a crucial security issue. Though a number of historians (Toynbee 1961, Mc Neil 1980) have opined the importance of ecology by documenting the rise and fall of national populations as an interface with environmental constraints, the same has been overshadowed by the anthropocentric paradigm that has dominated the Western civilization since the Renaissance. However, the organic survival as a national security concern is more relevant for the developing countries than the West. While population in the developing world is bulging, they lack the domestic resources and technology to meet the population pressures. Chronic food and energy shortages are recurring news. Therefore the organic survival of national population is a vital national value.
Environmental integrity is as pressing as resource scarcity. And environmental issues go beyond national boundaries and threaten national and global security (Lipset 1959, Deutsch 1953, Geertz 1963). Over commercialization is depleting the natural resources as well as is causing environmental degradation under globalisation. Ecological value has witnessed a receding trend and is a cause of worry for the national security.

COMMUNAL VALUE

Failure to ensure social and political integration in multi-communal societies can also pose emergent threats of national and social disintegration. Recent empirical examination of the role of communalism in modernization and political and social change reveals that communal factors engender serious security vulnerabilities for many nation states. Communal conflicts often erupt when a certain group perceives that country’s globalisation will disrupt the status quo, thus threatening the traditional authority of the communal leaders. Along with this there is also a perceived threat to communal identity that the progress and modernization are advancing at a disproportionate rate. Some communal groups are doing better than others. This perceived discrimination, warranted or noted, polarizes the disenfranchised groups and causes it to retract from society rather than try and overcome the disparities.

This retraction, many a time is the cause for the demand for greater autonomy. One can even see the secessionist mentality developing as the gap grows between communal groups enjoying wealth and prestige and the other groups which have not been integrated by globalisation. The secessionist threat affects the national integrity. It is the type of threat that attacks the perceived vital national values expressed in “state” terms because secessionist demands may produce territorial disintegration and political fragmentation. In addition to internal fracture, communal conflicts impact the conventional notion of national security. It has been seen in the
case of Lebanon, Yugoslavia, Sri Lanka and Kurds that such conflicts usually invite external intervention, which in turn jeopardizes the security of both the nation and the state. Thus domestic fragmentation and the ensuing social unrest weaken the state both internally and externally. In view of these threats, communal harmony is an essential national value for the state. As is evident from the analysis, communal value content of national security has been receding very fast.

**SOCIETAL VALUE**

Societal security involving war, stability and wellbeing in a given society is a new security agenda. Threats to social stability and wellbeing are increasingly transnational in their origin, and non-governmental actors have emerged as the sources of new threat. Transnational network of organized crimes, drug rings, and terrorism underscore this new formidable threat to vital national and global values. These threats destroy the social fabric of nation states and undermine the military, economic and cultural security.

The above analysis shows that security can’t be defined solely in terms of military and strategic terms. Military security remains critical, but can’t overshadow other security concerns. In the globalised era, other national values such a preservation of economic wellbeing and prosperity, organic survival of the national population, communal harmony, and societal stability have become as important as political and territorial survival. These values, however, are not automatically translated into security concerns. Such translation is a function largely of the patterns of threats directed against these national values nurtured and shared contextually.

**NEWER INSECURITIES AND NEWER SECTORS OF IDENTITIES**

Societal groupings – may be national groups, or religious, or any racial, or other groupings, are dynamic in time and place. Globalisation, with the glut of information, is influencing societies
world wide, their formation and reformations and even stoking up older identities. It is fuelling the architecture of new interest groups for some purpose, with some factors, because information technology is making people aware about their needs, their aspirations, new realities and their new locus. Their needs have got a multifold jump in the Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. The result is that the societies which were considered till now homogeneous find themselves mushrooming with a large number of different ideologies and beliefs. Individuality of identities has thus gained momentum in the globalised world, with every group identity trying to protect its individuality and interest. This has been called as the concept of “identity security” (Sheehan 2006). Anderson (1989) has argued that such identity communities are self-constructed “imagined communities”.

There has been a proliferation of these imagined communities today. Though there may be objective factors such as language or location in the construction of identity, it is always a personal and political choice to identify with some community by emphasizing some factor or factors in contrast to others. Globalisation has allowed people to find new moorings, new identities, new personalities and new cultural tag each pulling in different directions which has increased the vulnerability of societies and states to insecurities from different sources. These sources are not the widened security sectors but newer in their origin. Most of them arise and are born from the mixes of information in different combination in the human mind in a particular environment. One can imagine the magnitude of such complexes hitting a state internally (Figure 28) and creating insecurities of all kinds. But most of these insecurities have their origin in the unfulfilled basic needs in the Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. These insecurities, though are of abstract character, require physical solutions in terms of developmental needs of food, clothing, shelter, health, education, opportunities and protection (Figure 28). And that can be provided in terms of the security of society, economy, environment, culture, technology and politics. The question of provisioning of security
through development in societal area, in economic, and other areas brings development as the major agenda of security.

It is important to note that all these five sectors of security are not to be treated in isolation. They are complementary and the absence or malfunction of one would weaken the other sector. The individual needs economic and societal security. An economically strong country, with societally harmonious society and political synergy and environmentally supported nation can defend itself from foreign invasion. A country that is not militarily well supported can’t provide peace to its citizen for development. These five domains though are key concepts, they do not exhaust the list of possible contenders. Globalisation has increased and is still increasing the list from gender issue, to poverty, to migration and so on.

Each of the five sectors defines a focal point for analysis, and also a way of ranking priorities, but they interrelate and overlap in many ways. They do not contradict each other nor are retardant to each other. In fact they are promotive and supportive to each other. Sectors might identify distinctive patterns, but they remain inseparable parts of the complex whole” (Buzan, Waever and De Wilde, 1998). The way globalisation is forcing integration of politics, societies and economies and environment, security cannot remain confined to the corridors of borders but integrate different facets of social life of individual, society, state and the world. While widening the scope of security would capture the changing needs of the world, various groups of society who were ignored all these years would like to “securitize particular issues so that they get priority of funding by governments (Thakur and Narsimha Rao 2006a).

Thus security sector has acquired an overall, integrated and comprehensive dimension of human and state development that covers not only economic, societal, environmental, political and technological, knowledge and wisdom but is also seeking more space and time for human existence, identity, values, ethos and dignity.