CHAPTER II

NATIONAL SECURITY MANAGEMENT:
REVIEWING IN THE PERSPECTIVES OF THE EVOLVING SECURITY REALITIES

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to do an academic-empiric assessment of the transforming description of national security management. Such an assessment has been carried out by taking into perspective some of the important parameters which have been stressed upon in response to the emerging security scenario at the larger level. The attempt of understanding these parameters in this chapter include: first, understanding the idea of national security existing in the settings of the defined security environment; secondly, understanding the background of the national security development defined by the emerging security situations; thirdly, understanding the practiced polices and strategies; fourthly, understanding the national security objectives; and fifthly, understanding the national security management framework. All these parameters are certainly interrelated, while defining the one depends on how the others are defined. For a comprehensive outlining of national security, It is stressed that, the focus should be upon some of the binding aspects which resolute that how national security management should be acted upon that at the functional level. Among these, three important aspects have been taken into elaborate discourse in this study. These include discoursing on “policy and strategy issues”, second, discoursing on “the ideal milieu and objectives” and third “the ideal framework” within which the understanding and the function of “national security management” should lump together.

This chapter seeks to answer the predefined research questions like: “what are the major emerging aspects and imperatives which should be attention while formulating internal security threats and threat dimensions?” and second, “what are the critical threats to be attention while attempting for the formulation of internal security management in India?” As per the pre-underlined research design, this chapter seeks to address the major objective that is “to formulate the emerging dynamics of threats, issues and challenges implicating India’s internal security and to understand those in the evolving policy perspectives”.
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Elaborately, this chapter deals with the evolving concept of national security by taking various security discourses including both the traditional and non-traditional dimensions. It tries to discuss that how the security studies is now getting enlarged by including the non-military threat into its periphery, and how the effort of broadening and deepening the referent objects of security gradually coming to the states attention. The chapter examines that how following the end of the Cold War, the trend of conflicts have changed, leading to the changing nature of conflicts in the world resulted into the rise of modern conflicts; and how the “the changing nature of the 21st c. warfare, which growingly involves the means of subversion enlarges the threats to national security, and how the war by nature is growingly becoming unconventional and asymmetric which reverse the theory of national power.

While dealing the management aspects, this chapter seeks to assess that “how the contemporary security management are reintroducing the emerging discourse of national security” and in the said analysis, the chapter goes to the extent of analysing that “how the emerging perspectives in understanding National Security which is redefined by the elements of national power and how the renewed assessment of national security is redefined beyond the state’s ability to preserve its physical integrity”. This chapter further examines the conditions and scenarios those factor in the evolution of India’s National Security Objectives; while on the side, seek to discuss the factors leading the emergence renewed national security objectives in terms of strategies including geo-strategy, policies, visions, doctrines. Further this chapter seek to emphasise the core Strategic objectives which should be redefined and disciplined while revisiting India’s National Security Management. The persuading effort as go by empiric understanding which stress that core strategic objectives must be disciplined and which should go by: making national Security Strategy “comprehensive and coherent”, by reformulating the vital national interests, by well-defined National Security Doctrine and with the continuous effort and search for the reinvigorated policy options.

2.2 The Evolving concept of National Security

The study of “(National) Security” since its inception has predominantly remained the affairs of dealing with the issues of war and peace with a distinct focus on the military-centric security problems. Until World War I, ‘national defence’ and ‘national security’ remained synonymous. In the post-cold war security studies, the
scope of and delineation of security studies *per se* has been getting widened (Singh, M. April 02/2014). Since the end of the Cold War, however, many security issues have become increasingly transnational. Now, the Research Field of Security Studies emerging to be multi-disciplinary involving diverse topics. The expanded version of ‘security’ is now becoming dependent on the exploration of the field of development studies, international relations, strategic studies, defense studies, and also the areas of internal laws, and humanitarian intervention. Also, social security and rights issues including the study of ethic, cultural, and human rights are becoming much important while interesting into the study of security in the contemporary times.

The end of the Cold War and its consequence led the focus of security to change rapidly. The concept of ‘Security’ of the time has gone enormous changed. While, the scope of the contemporary security has been getting widened, the new emerging paradigm of security is getting more inclusive. The new paradigm of security, seeks to embrace various social dimensions into its periphery, when the scholar of 21st C. are getting interested to see security studies more humanistic and more peace-oriented. Now security approaches are argued to be made more people centric where it is argued that, the protection of single individuals, the fulfilment of individual well-being that is addressing the existential insecurities would lead to absolute security prevalence in the world. It further argued that “"in a globalised world, security can no longer be thought of as a zero-sum game involving states alone rather it is a multi-sum principle based on comprehensive approach"” (Rodhan, A. & Nayef, R. 2007) involving “other security threats” which are beyond the state security apparatus or the state’s security purview of the beyond the purview of its traditional military and policing components to address (Ibid).

The changing discourse of “security studies” assumes importance for two important contexts: first, in the context to the changing global security order; and second, its transcendence from a nation-centric barrier to wider human centric paradigm. It is found to be no more limited within the purview of *internality and externality* of security confrontation of the nation states; rather it is now encompassing the whole range of regional, international, global as well as the non-traditional and human-centric security positions.

The study of security is now started to be seen in a wider perspective. There are many theories and advocates for this have emerged to support the widening security debate.
For example, the approach adopted by the Copenhagen School has been very important among others in the widening of security debate of the recent times. Though, this School does not disagree totally with the state-centric security approaches advocated by the traditionalists. But it seriously seeks to extend the range of issues which can be included in the security framework and widen the area of security threats. The proponents of this school envision security beyond issues of war and use of force. Therefore, Copenhagen School disagree with the traditionalists who, they feel, restrict security studies to the study of threat and military force and seek to explore threats to referent objects by sensitising threats both of military and non-military in nature. However, it is equally important to remember that this particular School seems to be very careful to avert the argument of the traditionalists, when the traditionalists argue that the Copenhagen School lacks coherence in their argument of security and brings suitability of security issues by restricting to those issues that are linked to survival and existential threats to referent objects requiring emergency measures.

Nowadays, the widened security definition ought to focus on the non-military agenda (Ciută 2005), when the threat realm is going complex and when the role of the non-military threats and the role of the non-state and sub-state actors are in rise. Now, its further, the scope ‘security studies’ is also enlarging with the emergence of ideological divergences in the affairs of states governance and in the making of international relations\(^1\). In such a condition, “there needs to be critical approach to security, where thinking level has to be expanded from recognition of the limitations of the understanding of ‘security’ in the light of traditional definitions. *To formulate* critical approach to security, an inclusive rethought of non-traditional and non-military challenges become essential (Hamre, J. 2000).

**2.2.1 Traditional vs. Non-Traditional Security Discourse**

While “Traditional Security Studies” is a “State-centric” security construct, the “Non-Traditional Security Studies” is broader in scope covering much of the non-military aspects of security. While traditional security studies has remained exclusively a realistic construct of studying security where the referent object is largely the State and its defense, on the other hand, in non-traditional security studies the referent

\(^1\) http://www.idsa.in/keyspeeches/InauguralAddressShriManmohanSingh
object is the study of threats, which transcend beyond the capacity and purview of the state-centric security and threaten the at the individuals levels. This now gradually recognised by the states with equitable importance. In the widened Security Studies, the emergence and identification of non-traditional security issues are now coming to the forefront of the States’ attention.

Now, the enlarged security studies seek to bring both of military and non-military threat into its periphery, while it also seeks to see the traditional and non-traditional security with similar importance. This is argued to be as the part of the effort of broadening and deepening the referent objects of security, which must be in states attention (Karacasulu, N. 2006:1-17). The changing discourses in security studies with the inclusion of non-traditional security objects has essentially reoriented the understanding of national security in a renewed and wider perspective (Walt, S. 1991: 211-239). Though it does not disagree to the prime-importance of the State-centric security approaches offered by the traditionalists, it advocates for the widening recognition of the referent objects (of security) and the re-conceptualization of security recognition. This set of approach seeks to extend the range of ‘security’ issues which can be included in the widen threat-framework, and be seen beyond issues of war and use of force.

Now, security issues of both traditional and non-traditional have started reinforcing each other. It becomes unavoidably important that the recognition of non-traditional threats which equally challenge the very existence of the state be in the national security attention (Hamre J. 2000). So it is now for the States to recognise the both as security concerns. Because, for a state, “any issue that “directly threaten the peace and prosperity and indirectly give rise to violence and undesirable political and strategic changes” should be considered as security matter (web source 1). So, in the contemporary security studies, looking at security challenges in a broader security framework emerges to be important (Ciută 2005).

2.3 Changing Nature of Conflicts in the World

Following the end of the Cold War, the trend of conflicts have changed, problems have been extended beyond the national boundaries, and many of the problems have dramatically gone regional and global (NIC: 2000). Problems of ethnic, religious and
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2 This important approach is adopted by the Copenhagen School
socio-cultural confrontations (like ethnic warfare) are emerging as the serious issues (Ibid). The growing transnational linkages, affiliation and implication of threat elements and threat modules, and transnationalisation and globalisation of threat dimensions making it more difficult to make a distinctive analysis of threats (Mazari S. 1999).

2.3.1 Rise of Modern Conflicts

Competing ideologies, lack of effective governance, rise of rogue regimes and transnational terrorist groups are some of the principal factors which remain responsible for the rise of modern conflicts in the world. The modern conflicts are seen to be causing many of the instabilities, internal conflicts and humanitarian crises those the States now face. On the other side, those States and the government which remain failed to provide security and ensure law and order, there prevails the greatest potential for the modern conflicts to take root (Bhonsle 2003:3-54). Moreover, observations suggest that where the intra-state conflicts have over-ride the inter-state conflicts, there prevail all possibility of conflicts between states and non-state actors.

There are several security concerns that the modern conflicts have generated while most of their impacts are found to be vicious. Modern conflict in many cases may involve the modern conventional wars implicating highest human and economic costs, where many of the States are far from the condition to defend themselves from such challenges (Bhonsle 2003). In such a scenario, the sub-state and non-state actors would resort to conducting wars with an ability to finance and arm to withstand these conflicts in many corners of the globe (Ibid). Other nature of the modern conflicts is that, it seeks to be more irregular and chaotic. This is where the conventional battles will gradually get replaced by bloody massacres, vendettas and barbaric assaults through non-conventional means. This will lead to the state face complex security challenges, bringing the civilian authorities and the armed forces to the point of converged action (Raufer 1999).

Following the end of the Cold War, the trend of modern conflicts has changed a lot. Newer and newer problems have been emerging, which are extending beyond the boundary of national security reach. Such conflicts are getting exploded at each and every sphere in the modern society demanding an assured level of competence in security management system (NIC: 2000). The complex human environment
challenges and reduces the idea of co-existence and undermines the legitimacy of mutual recognition (of one state by the other). This makes the broader international security environment increasingly disturbed and volatile. This makes the sovereign nation-states burdened with the sole responsibility to manage all problems to its national security at all costs, though at any cost the states cannot have absolute control over the growing non-traditional challenges, which are beyond its reach (NIC: 2000).

The world now continues to be in a state of transition. With international conflict becoming growingly anarchical, the conflicts within nation states are becoming more irregular and chaotic. This makes the conventional battles get gradually replaced by bloody massacres, vendettas and barbaric assaults through non-conventional means (Raufer 1999). Given such complex-going emerging security scenario, the distinction between external-and-internal, domestic-and-foreign security challenges becomes difficult to segregate, while the distinction of the nature and classification of security is getting blurred (Mazari, S. M. 1999). With the changing nature of threats, the kind of missions that armed forces want to undertake is expanding. This now compels to include the defense of the state from sub-conventional conflict, low-intensity border wars including insurgency and terrorism like situations, apart from the traditional battles. As the security environment is increasingly becoming complex, the concept of co-existence and mutual recognition of legitimacy (of one state by the other) are supposed to gradually lose its relevance. This condition would lead to the volatility of international security environment, putting the sovereign nation-states at the point of struggling hard to maintain their survival (NIC: 2000).

With the changing nature of conflicts, “wars are increasingly proving to be cost ineffective instruments of achieving strategic and political objectives” (Doval 2011). This makes all-out wars gradually become obsolete, and get replaced by the indirect and proxy-wars like terrorism, insurgencies and the other forms of militancy. Similarly, low-key conflicts and proxy wars would be used as alternative form of war to challenge the state (Antony, A. 2010). The tools of war are getting sophisticated, deadlier and devastating. The gravity of the changing security trend, as an outcome of globalisation, reinforces the fact that no nation today remains insulated from these threats because of global connectivity and technological advances (Kapoor, D. 2008). When the countries are no more remain insulated from the changes taking place around them in an interconnected and interdependent world (Mishra B. 2000), it is
becoming imperative for them to get influenced and affected by the global security effects (Kanwal, G. 2000:1591-1628).

2.3.2 The Changing nature of the 21st C. warfare

The end of the Cold War has led to what may be categorized as an era of strategic uncertainty. This now leads to the redefining of national security protection and warfare in their functional terms (Mishra, B. Apr.13/2000). Now the “era of all out wars is slowly being replaced by war by other means”, while the range of conflict is widening with the addition of new challenges (Kapoor, D. 2008).

Today’s mass wars are going more expensive in terms of human and material costs. This makes the states “no more inclined to engage in large-scale conventional warfare. The large-scale warfare or conflicts today are longer seen to cost-effective way to securing political, economic and diplomatic gains” (Anthony, A. 2009b). Because, today’s wars and conflicts are no more remains limited to the aim of capturing and holding territory, rather it is more aimed at influencing the heart and minds of the opponents. This consequently brings the large-scale wars and conflicts to a point of obsoleteness. This is making inter-state confrontation out-dated, while the idea of grand alliance of cooperation for mutual security interests become comparatively relevant (Chaliand 1994).

Further, present day conventional wars are gradually becoming multi-faceted and multi-dimensional, requiring the soldier on the battlefield supported by many more at the rear. Now a nation has to fight war at different fronts, ranging from conventional, diplomatic, economical to propaganda and psychological as well as over the cyber space (Bhonsle 2003: 3-54). Today’s warfare seeks to encompass “full spectrum of warfare in all dimensions: land, air, sea, space and info-sphere; and at all levels: tactical, operational and strategic”. It is supposed to be waged throughout the range of: peace, crisis, conflict, and return to peace. It is likely to operate both at the physical and cognitive levels concurrently to target both the hearts and minds of the opponents. Further, the character and the target of the 21st C. warfare will increasingly become offence dominant with enhanced exploitation of asymmetry. This will go more long in range, very lethal and precision to strike when carried out
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remotely, and therefore will become difficult to ascertain. Moreover, in modern warfare of 21st C., the chance of the involvement of the intelligence and disruptive elements will remain involved much earlier than the actual conflict. This will make the conflict stay much longer even after the cessation of hostilities (ibid). Most seriously the involvement of subversion means is going to grow in the warfare and conflicts of the 21st C.

2.3.3 Changing Warfare growingly involves the Means of Subversion

With the changing nature of conflicts and warfare today, the act of subversion becomes the alternative strategies to conventional forms of warfare. While, conventional warfare remained direct territorial conquests, subversion aimed at creating territorial disturbances to the extent of territorial disintegration of the enemy through the acts of subversions like treasons and sabotages within the enemy territory (Mazari, S. 1999).

Subversion is defined as 'overthrow' or 'ruin'. In a conflict relationship, when one intends to ruin the other, for this the act of subversion becomes a natural strategy. Chambers English Dictionary defines the word - means 'to overthrow; to overturn; to pervert'. While subversion is defined as 'overthrow’ or ‘ruin', in a conflict relationship, the one intends to ruin the other, for this the act of subversion becomes a usual strategy. With the emergence of alternative war strategy, war through the tactics of subversion targeting people’s psychology and convictions has emerged as the trend. It is aimed at direct targeting the hearts and minds of the people rather than for territorial grabbing per se (Mazari S. 1999). In the alternative war strategy, the minds of the dissenting groups are subverted through tactics for psychological warfare, and are prepared for militant type activities. While, the alternative war strategy is gradually becoming more indirect, its objective is to target all dimensions of the States and its citizens. The aim of alternative war strategy is to fight the opponents at various fronts, which is ranging from political, economic and psychological that up to a total-war. With war becoming more indirect, the Clausewitzian dictum of war: that is “war as continuation of politics” getting opposite with “politics becoming a continuation of
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4Chambers English Dictionary defines the word - means 'to overthrow; to overturn; to pervert'; while Subversion is defined as 'overthrow’ or ‘ruin'. In a conflict relationship, the one intends to ruin the other, for this the act of subversion becomes a natural strategy.

5If the mind of the dissident is won over, it becomes easier to make them the tool for the act of subversion. Psychological warfare in the form of effective propaganda is one of the tactics of subversion also. (Mazari S. M. 1999)
war by other means” (Ibid). In the study of alternative war strategies, therefore, the study of subversion becomes important. This helps for the better understanding for the study of armed insurgencies, violent movements including terrorism (Ibid).

Subversion becomes more relevant for the groups like the separatists, when they fail in their regular and full-scale warfare strategies (Ibid). Therefore, the movement of insurgencies and separatists struggle are supposed to gradually head towards the act of subversion tactics. When these elements fail before the heavy security apparatus (of the state) to sustain, subversion becomes easier tactics which help them to keep their perceived enemy engaged. Further, the act of subversion remains the most effective tool for the anti-state elements to “weaken the enemy state from within” and to keep the state apparatus dysfunctional (Mazari S. M. 1999).

It is found that often, the strategy of subversion suits to ethnic-centric manipulation. For act of subversion to get ground, the element behind takes ethnic conflicts into advantages and the isolated ethnic groups into confidence. (This happens particularly in the cases where sufficient degree of cultural and political recognition is seen to be absent). This makes for them easier to polarise them on sectarian or racists themes and exploit them for the acts of subversion. However, the involvement of these particular section are not let to be limited to the subversive activities, and they get gradually armed and organised into militant force to make the low-intensity conflict sustain within the territory of the enemy state. This then gradually shaped to form of organised crime and violent terror outfits. The creation of one militant ethnic movement does not stop to spill over, while the rise of equal and parallel similar movements. These trends and developments ultimately make the full-scale violent ethnic struggle to unleash within the part of the territory of the enemy state (Ibid). This ultimately demands for violent and repressive response from the government and its security apparatus (Ibid).

2.3.4 When “War” becoming Unconventional and Asymmetric

Over the years, the large scale war is getting replaced with the war-in-proxy. War is gradually becoming “invisible and highly unpredictable with no assured guarantee of success to the stronger” (Doval 2011). The probability of the nation states to engage each other in direct conflict has been receding while the emergences of indirect conflicts are in rise (Das, P. 2008). The patronization of armed groups operating in
the enemy countries will grow and gives a “new window of opportunity to weaker powers to take on their more powerful adversaries” through this asymmetric warfare (web source 2). This makes the weaker states capable to bleed their more powerful adversaries through Covert Action (CA) at a low cost, in a sustained manner and claim deniability (Doval 2011). For adversaries, civil society has become the battle ground, while “proxy war” becoming the best sophisticated means to bleed the adversaries (Ibid).

The analysis of “the changing security trend indicates that the conventional war as an instrument of state policy is becoming increasingly unviable, while the emergence of sub-conventional conflict and armed violence have been the emerging alternatives. This makes war becoming much indirect (web source 50). However, the declining of conventional warfare does not stop one State doing indirect interventions by generating low intensity conflicts in the enemy state to destabilise and weaken it. So, non-conventional conflict, indirect intervention or indirect conflicts are emerging as the alternative to conventional forms of war, which are likely to grow more serious further (Mazari, S. M. 1999).

The emergence of asymmetric powers has made the security challenges more dangerous. The sources and types of such threats have become more diverse and less predictable. This makes adversaries mostly remain out of control and unrecognised from the hands of the state and its security apparatus (Das, P. 2008), and thus let potential adversaries continues to grow (Kanwal, G. 2000: 1591-1628). Now, non-traditional and asymmetric means in the hands of the non-state elements have made them more empowered and more capable. This largely helps the non-state elements dare to challenge the states at their worst.

When, globalization has made the proliferation of WMD, it has made the asymmetrical power confident (Ibid). As asymmetry has been the weapon of the weaker state often, it has now expanded the “scope of alternatives strategies” in the hands of the weak states to challenge the powerful (Karacasulu N. 2006: 1-17). The growth of technological dynamics in security has made the asymmetrical power more daring. Such a condition has let the threats like extremism, fundamentalism, terrorism and organized crimes to flourish (Ibid).
The changing global security order out of globalisation effects makes countries prone to remote security threats, while most of these threats are asymmetric and unpredictable. Now the growth of asymmetrical challenges appears to be the greatest threat to widen the concept of national security in modern times. The challenges of asymmetry can be both armed and unarmed in nature, and can be far serious than the traditional threats. Though direct confrontation are supposed to reduce when the era of "all out wars" is slowly being replaced by "war by other means", this means is going to be unconventional, asymmetrical and non-traditional in nature (Kapoor D. 2008). When the threats of non-conventionality and asymmetricity are in rise and the emergence of trans-nationality of threats is becoming prominent (Šulović, V. 2010); the underling of traditional threats to be narrow (Ibid). Because, the mass wars are going to be more expensive in terms of human and material costs, this makes conflicts go more asymmetric (Chaliand, G. 1994).

In the traditional military approach, asymmetry can be defined as "acting, organizing, and thinking differently than opponents in order to maximize one's advantages, exploit an opponent's weaknesses, attain the initiative, or gain greater freedom of action (Metz, & Johnson. 2001)". This implies that asymmetrical threats are mostly to come in varied forms and modes that is contrary-to or beyond the dimension of the traditional strategic speculation (Bhonsle 2003:3-54).

The theory of asymmetrical warfare reverses the theory of national power. Through asymmetric means, a state can engage another state in conflict without attaining greater relative national and military power. Therefore, asymmetric means are often supposed to be the means for relatively weaker state which intends to put the relatively stronger state in a condition of proxy war or hostility. Though, it is equally a fact that the great powers will continue to ignore it, but its inconsequential appearance as a threat to national security is highly conceivable (Ibid 2003: 3-54).

Identifying the presence of asymmetrical threats is easier than to define. While “asymmetry focuses on how to place one’s strengths against an adversary's weaknesses” and where “the overall correlation of forces may help the adversary”; there remains no consensus about the nature of the asymmetric threat concept” (Web source 3). Still, the extensiveness of asymmetrical threats challenges the notion that “there can be any unified response to them” (web source 4). While, in common terms, “the asymmetrical threat concept is described as “how the weak might battle the
strong”; “dialogues deviate when arguing asymmetrical threats from states versus those posed by non-state actors” (Rubin, M. 2007). So, it is widely predicted that the asymmetric challenges as well as the asymmetric means will remain the major among the components of future threats (Ibid). Because, most in the future, adversaries are likely to seek advantage by using unconventional advantages to dodge and to undermine the national strengths while exploiting their vulnerabilities. So, the gravity of the asymmetric threats will not only challenge the established notion of security-deterrence, but also to a State’s security planning and implementation (Ibid).

Therefore, policy makers on security related issues have now clearly discern that the asymmetric nature of security problem will be serious threat not only to the existing defense strategy but more importantly to the strategy of threat prediction and defense planning. It is therefore becomes imperative that the current military plan should not only be done for conventional wars; rather it is also important to develop strategies to deter and defeat adversaries who will rely on surprise, deception, and asymmetric struggle to attain their objectives (QDR Report 2001 a.). So, rather than planning for large military operations or small wars targeting specific nation-states, it now becomes imperative that a country should develop strategies to tackle the unconventional, asymmetric threats and threats emanating from the means of subversion posed by both the state and non-state actors, who might seek to target the nation and its security(Rubin 2007)6.

2.4 National Security in the Changing Discourse

The 21st C. has been gradually transforming to be Virtual World, and this makes national security protection from ever-persisting vulnerabilities very serious. The contemporary security challenges to nations like insurgencies, terrorism etc. is beyond the national boundaries including many of the other threats to national security are going cross-border and global. So, the renewed perspective of National Security desires for understanding threats from viewpoints of global vulnerabilities that going beyond state-centricity to people-centricity. Because, there are threats and challenges, which cannot be countered effectively by the affected nation-state alone, as their manifestations are by nature global and found to be emanating from cross-border zones. Therefore, for a renewed vision of national security management, the state
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6 The Secretary of Defense of USA Donald Rumsfeld wrote in his country’s (USA) context.
must go beyond the obsession of understanding threats in an “armed-centric traditional perspective” to the understanding of threats in a “wider inclusive perspective” with equal focus on its new dimensions and news faces. To deal with the comprehensive range of threats, there should be equal importance paid to the non-traditional security fronts of challenges also. It is argued that for ensuring national security, side by side ensuring regional and global stability, the concept and recognition of security must go beyond the national boundaries and territorial defense.

National Security defense must now include broader range of threats and the conflictual interactions (within and among the states). For framing the renewed vision of national security defense, it becomes important to look at the “interconnected aspects of nations’ security”, apart from the cardinal of governing national security in a state-centric perspective, which must be based on the cooperative interaction security frameworks or principles made for regional, international, global, or the non-traditional and human-centric security cooperation. Contextually, the broadened security studies that offered by the non-traditionalists seems to be inclusive (Karacasulu, N. 2006: 1-17). What they argue that, with the widening of security challenges, the role and capacity of the state must be widened and at the best of State’s capacity the formulation of national security management can be as broad as possible (Mehta, A. 2009: 26-35). Moreover, keeping the growth of the transnational and asymmetric nature of national security threats in attention, the security management framework of a country, which is much state-centric, must evolve accordingly to meet these new emerging challenges effectively at the conventional level.

Transformation of security with the widening of security objectives is arguably traced to the limitation that the state-centric traditionalist and realist approach to security suffers from, as it restricts the application of security to threats only within the military realm (Walt, S. 1991: 211-239). This is in the sense that traditional approach of security predominately underlines national security as the “acquisition, deployment and use of military force to achieve national goals (Held & McGrew 1998: pp. 219-243)”. This approach, however, only recognise new threats that transcend traditional threats and that remain within the purview territorial defense and national borders.
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7 For example, Stephen Walt’s traditionalist perspective articulates a position that is state-centric and restricts the application of security to threats in the military realm (Walt, S. 1991: 211-239).
(Karacasulu, N. 2006: 1-17). So, it is argued that, the prominence of the approach of traditionalists or the realists will continue to be important. The extent, security remains as the freedom from military threat in an anarchic international system, the “effort to defend the survival of the nation-state through the use of force” will continue. This will keep security studies prominently remain as “the study of the threat and the use of military force”, and therefore, the pre-dominancy of the state-centric traditional approach to security will continue without trailing its resemblance (Walt, S. M. 1991: 211-239).

Effort of shifting security attention from state to individual yet found to be problematic. However, no doubt, it has transformed the contemporary security debate and has remarkable impact on security thinking. The new security debate raises the most critical question: that is ‘whose security’? This in explanation is “what to secure” or “what should be the referent object of security”? This involves the effort of shifting security attention from ‘state’ to ‘individual’. Because, when the non-military and non-armed threats threaten the survival of people and the state (Williams P. 2008: 4), then the question of bringing these threat factors into attention also as referent objects of security becomes unavoidable. In such a scenario, by keeping the factors which threatens the issue of survival, it becomes the obligation of the political-power that which security issue greatly affects and how it is to be acted upon (Ibid).

Contemporary security management discourse seeks to expand area of the security objects to be in focus, and identify neo-referent objects for the purpose (Šulović, V. 2010). As said by Buzan, ensuring better and comprehensive security, the referent objects are to be in focus 8. “Referent objects are those, that are seen to be existentially threatened and that have a legitimate claim to survival” (Buzan et al 1998). For, ultimate security to be ensured, the referent objects and the areas of security to be widened that without bringing its logical coherence into the dispute. This is quite challenging when the contrivality and overlapping of the new security objects over the old security objects are imminent (ISDP: web source). But, what should be the lists of the neo-referent objects (Buzan et al. 1998) and to what extent the area of security should be the expanded still remains the biggest dilemma (Šulović, V. 2010). So, how
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8 For Buzan both the state and the individuals can be the referent objects of security, as the security of the both are equally important.
to widen the focus of security while intending to keep the sole concept of security uncompromised is the serious challenge (Ibid).

While recognition of the new referent objects will be in emphasis, however, as the State remains at the heart of security, it is the State which will decide that “what objects should be given emphasis or what not”. And, if security of the State that is military-centric security will continues to be the priority, then there is less possibility that question of individual-centric security will come to be central. So, it is obvious, that the State must focus entirely on the ability to defend its sovereignty and its people from direct military or armed threats from outside or inside (Williams, P. 2008: 4).

When, the security object doesn’t refer to states alone rather to all human collectives, such an attempt brings remarkable impact on security thinking, and makes the military-centricity of security thinking get transformed (Williams, P. 2008:4). Though, state remains the most important focus of security studies, but it is no more remains the only focus. The transformed or the expanded “security studies” brings the other aspects of security into examination. For example, the political aspect brought into focus that by looking at the stability of states and government (Ibid); the economic aspect, that by looking at the resources for “sustenance of acceptable levels of welfare and state power (Ibid)”, and the societal aspects that by looking at the issues of identities and right protections (Ibid).

Thinkers critically argue that if the security of the state is in focus and perfectly ensured, then automatically the security of the individuals will suffice. Oppositely, focusing on the individual centric security issues will not only be problematic and compromising, but rather put heavy burden on state’s security apparatus which is limited in capacity. The review of the Post-Cold War security debates seems to be helping for coming out few answers to the emerging dilemma, when there is desire to widen the security studies and desire for the addition of new referent objects of security. When, it is widely acknowledged that there is more to security than purely military factors and the contemporary definition of security acknowledges political, economic, environmental, social and human among other elements those impact the concept of security (Mehta, S. 2009), broadening the concept of national security from the ‘military-centric security perspective’ to ‘a wider perspective by including the non-traditional threats are gradually becoming a point of state’s commitment.
From the above arguments, what can be concluded so far that, in response to the significant transformation of the world security scenario, the ‘whole idea of security’ has been substantially transformed in the post-Cold War era and has been becoming more inclusive. This necessitated to have a relook at the entire security discourses and to bring those to the point of necessary convergence and implementation for ensuring better security. When the ability of the state to perform the function of protecting the well-being of its people is said to be the best measure of State’s capacity, formulating the definition of security has to be definitely broad. The Indian scholars in this regard are of the opinion that this is not new for the country as such a formulation can be traced back to the days of ‘Chanakya’ and his work ‘Arthashastra’ (web source 5). Changes being naturally imperative; it is logically important to look forward to the new emerging challenges, while logically focusing on the core national security issues. Then, looking at the security in a broadest and collective sense should not be ignored; this in the sense, addressing the non-traditional threats which affect the sovereignty and territorial integrity cannot be overlooked. The question of the possibility of “catering to all non-traditional security threat as ‘security threats’ with limited state capacity” might be the argument; however, looking at the challenges to national security in a renewed perspective that by “keeping the all the existential challenges together” is not far from possibility.

2.4.1 Emerging Perspectives in understanding National Security

Understanding of contemporary national security is driven by the various ‘national perspectives’ which arise out of various parameters like the geography and the history of that country (Mishra, B. 2000). There are various elements of national power which in appropriate and aggressive blend constitute national security also⁹. These are, most importantly a country’s military power, technological competence, political resilience and maturity, human resources, economic structure and capacity including the industrial base, and the availability of natural resources (NDC: 1996). Assessment of national security (ability of protection) must include the ability of that country to preserve its physical integrity and territory, to control its borders, and to preserve its institution and governance from disruptions outside or inside apart from ensuring its economic and environmental balance (Brown, H. 1983:281). Therefore, the balance of

⁹From the Proceedings of Seminar on "A Maritime Strategy for India" (1996), National Defense College, New Delhi, India
all instruments of state power, state capacity and state policies is essential for sustenance of national security capacity of a country. *And, this has to be properly managed through appropriate governance by taking into all security variables and the ever apparent multi-dimensional threat factors. And for so, the state must ever try to emerge with its appropriate capacity, so that it ably continue maintaining the survival of its people and the territory intact.* Contextually, such explanation can be considered to be the most appropriate definition to “national security and its management” ever offered (Paleri, P. 2008).

However, there seems to be drastic changes in the new power rearrangements, where the other power factors governing the modern world system, those other than the military or hard power capabilities, will be ascribed. Given this security environment and that is with distinctive geographical expanse by way of remaining political, economic and cultural diversity, hardly any Asian states today are inclined to engage in large-scale conventional warfare. Because, for these states; large-scale conventional warfare is no longer seen to be the effective way of securing their political, economic or diplomatic interests (Anthony, A. 2009b). After the end of cold war, the world has largely remained unipolar, and now said to be gradually going multi-polar. The changing paradigm of the post-Cold War scenario has transformed the global security environment. This has led to the several changes and shifts in the national security outlook world over. In this new-emerging condition, the global power matrix gradually becoming central at the Asian continent. This is where India is a major stake-holder. This major shift in *power equations* may create volatility due to the qualitative rearrangement of power now taking place at the global level (Kapoor, D. 2008). In response to such a condition, India has also found to be in state of compulsion to reorient its security policies and policies and for so found to in the process of bringing several changes to them.

In the making of national security strategy; traditionally, the country’s focus largely remained on the military elements. This generally remained confined to the study of all about wars, which includes “how wars start”, “how wars can be avoided”, or if not avoidable, then how “those can be fought in the most efficient manner possible” (Farrell, T. 2010). Having been remaining centred at military instrument, nevertheless, India’s national security management largely remained passive, defensive, reactive and soft in nature. This is however now found to be unfavourable to India’s larger
security interests. This is now comprehended that, the making of internal security management strategies wider strategic matrix should be taken into attention (Singh, M. Oct. 22/2010). This must also take into account all the major determinants for the policy formulation to be complete and all-addressing. Issues those directly threaten the peace and prosperity of a country and its citizens, and indirectly give rise to violence and undesirable political and strategic change, whether those military non-military challenges to security are required to be taken care of (Manoharan, N. 2012).

Now the security arrangements like bilateral and co-operative relations with other states are seen to be the sustainable means. For example, in the area of the issues like border security, maritime security, counter terrorism and energy security, the emerging States seek to employ various levels of engagement towards meeting these problems. The Asian states, for example, including India, are now found to be gradually moving towards pluralistic security network of co-operative structures, which they feel to be the alternative as well as legitimate means to deal the security challenges those emerge in the 21st century world (Mukherjee, P. 2007). Security of these states therefore, now seen to be shaped on the larger framework of mutual co-operations and interactions (Ibid: Feb.5/2008).

So, with the emergence of multiple players and new stake-holders of national security, the discernment of national security is obvious to be multi-dimensionally influenced. It is now found to be influenced by the factors like: the conflicts over territorial expansion, the growing proxy wars and the growth of internal conflicts and terrorism in a country’s own homeland (Mishra, B. 2000). At the same time, the emergence of the non-state actors, the terrorist warlords and the ethnic chieftains, larger MNCs and the private players are the new powerful entities which will seriously factor to national security management (Kanwal, G. 2000: 1591-1628). In such an emerging condition, the principal effort of the basics of national security management will encompass two dimensions. These are: ensuring a country’s security from internal threats, and protecting the country from external aggressions or war. For so, countries will take various measures which include, maintaining effective armed forces, using intelligence services, keeping emergency preparedness measures, ensuring security of critical infrastructure, use of various diplomatic measures and using counterintelligence services.
In the changing security order, the political, economic, environmental, social and human factors will have direct implications on the national security (Mehta 2009). In such a scenario, national security will be essentially emerging as an amalgam of political, economic, military and techno-subjugated components (Karacasulu, N. 2006: 1-17). With the outnumbering non-traditional threats and as a consequence of the implication of globalisation and transnationalisation of threats, the states are no longer the sole controller of their national security. Moreover, the all-round-security of states are going out of the sole control of the states, when many a things in States’ control have gone globalised or becoming privatised (Ibid). In such a condition, the states are no longer in a position to ignore the effects of globalization and the role of private actors in forming national security policies (Cha V, D. 2000).

2.5 National Security Management: Renewed Perspectives

It is till the end of Cold War, the analysis and definition of national security management remained traditionally limited and centred at the management of a state’s security that is defending a state from hard security threats. Because, the concept of national security remained traced to the treaty of Westphalia, the idea of modern sovereign states, and national security remained limited to the notion of protecting the country from military threat and political coercion (Romm, J. 1993). However, with, the emergence of the expanded idea of security over the years, the periphery of definition and understanding of national security got expanded (Oladipo, B. S. 2012:80-88).

Now the renewed definition of national security management has been getting extended as the ‘trend of response’ to the globalization of security threats resulted out of the “rapid technological and communication developments” (Romm, J. 1993). With the security threats going wide, the definition of security is gradually becoming comprehensive, while its redressal is said to become multidimensional (Morgan 2007). Now, variety of definitions found to be existing providing an overview of the many usages of the concept “National Security and its management”. The idea of national security management now found to be gradually getting expanded and including threats other than the traditional ranging from the non-military and non-traditional (Romm, J. 1993).
Having been getting widened, nevertheless, the concept of national security still continues to be ambiguous. Still there are various perspectives in debates which tend to define “what national security is” versus “what national security ought to be”. As, there is no single universally accepted definition of national security and varieties of definitions in offer, they provide an overview of the many usages of this concept (Romm, J. 1993). Such a state of multipolar arguments makes the stand of the realist justified, which states that till the anarchy remains the order of world (Walt S. 1991: 211-239), the territorial approach to security must continue as paramount, and the armed-centric pattern of national security defense is necessary to remain significant. Though the state’s focus needs to be broadened but not alter, the country must seek all possible options to secure its legitimate interests, and must it maintain it by war if challenged (Lippmann, W. 1943).

Now it can be argued that, the focus of the country should not be broadened to that extent, where it becomes impossible for the State to concentrate on the existential threats, and fail to defend it with its limited capacity (Ohta, H. 2009). This argument makes it reasonably understood that though the concept of security has got widened, on the ground it will continue to remain almost a state-centric phenomenon at its core, while the widened focus will remain almost peripheral. Because, confronting a wide range of problem with limited state capacity, defending the existential challenge will remain at first option. Therefore, for the State and for the government, to address the military threat will continue to remain prime task of national security protection (Ibid). Such an approach may come to criticism, however, the use of force to preserve the national integrity and territorial sovereignty will remain the only last resort (Lippmann, W. 1943).

In the Indian context, it is felt that the factors other than military, like the political and diplomatic conflicts will pose threats to the survival and development of states (Chaudhuri S. 2011). Though the countries like India, may “seek to shift from narrow territorial or ethnic nationalisms to a broader civic nationalism” (Mishra, B. 2000), however, the things like identity-ethnicity centric extremist politics would not let it happen peacefully. In such a condition, the country will ever seek to focus on defending its core national security interest that is, its sovereignty and territorial integrity from the threat either internal or external (Ibid). As the given security environment will remain fluid and ever-shifting nature, the core national security
interests of the country will continue remain centred at defence from external aggression and internal unrest. In such a condition, India’s security attention is difficult to shift from a pre-importantly force-centricity security defence framework towards a broadly-focused security framework. The only way out is that the whole range of challenges should not be put aside, and the primary task of defending the state in terms of its integrity, and sovereignty, and the protection of its citizens must be the prime focus (Mehta, S. 2009).

India now very clear recognises that while its security environment is deeply affected by global and regional developments, there are numbers of emerging security trends, which now have important bearing on it national security (Ministry of Defense 2010-11: 1-8). Though the probability of conventional full scale inter-state wars is reckoned to have reduced, the adverse impact of conflicts and violence has made the global security and regional security matrix complex. The trend of low intensity conflicts and asymmetric threats taking into various forms pose serious security implications. These include the domestic and trans-national terrorism, narco-terrorism, cyber warfare and piracy (Ibid), which now found emerging as the potent threats despite several numbers of international efforts. Therefore, India gradually said to be moving towards bringing a pluralistic security order working through a network of co-operative structures to bring the legitimacy for dealing with the security challenges of the 21st century (Mukherjee Feb. 9/2007). Therefore, India’s security focus in terms of defending the expanded territory apart from the homeland is said to be based on such strategic norms.

2.5.1 Evolution of India’s National Security Objectives

The Post-Cold War Dynamics of Indian National Security has been witnessing a sea-change. The country is said to be largely undergoing a strategic transformation that from a ‘Third World non-aligned state’ to the ‘aspiring developed country’. India’s aspiration to be a developed nation including its real development on ground has, however, brought additional challenges to country’s security matrix. At the external front, India’s relationships with the United States and other European countries including Russia have gone deep-rooted. The county is in the process of making its remarkable foothold in different regions and counties across the world (Singh, J. 1995: 28-29). India’s security outlook is now seen to be connected to four important areas of focus. First it wants to maintain a clear military edge over Pakistan; second, it
wants to remain capable to deter a Chinese attack; third, it wants to be recognised as a great power globally; and fourth, it understands these are to be difficult but also makes all effort to make those attainable (Yglesias, M. 2010).

2.5.2 The evolving Strategic Objectives

There has been substantial alteration taking place in the India’s security management. India’s security framework now gets defined on the *changing power dynamics* within and those of the implicating actors. Although the post-Cold War elements and power structures continue to define the evolving Indian strategic planning, and the role military apparatus continue to remain important (in internal security management), India’s focus on national security making gradually going multi-dimensional and all-inclusive (Klair 2000). Now, India is found to be focusing on the complex security environment which challenges it from many sides as most of these challenges have direct implications both on the internal and external security of the country. This makes India’s security management planning to be necessarily intertwined, that by focusing on both the external and internal dimension. Further, the emerging security condition demands that the security planning in the country must be introspective, inclusive and comprehensive.

Though, the fears of escalation conventional wars have seemingly reduced; this condition however, has increased the *wars of proxy* through clandestine arms supplies to insurgents across national boundaries (Thomas, R. 1996). Though, the role and importance of the conventional forces and the centrality of military strategies in national security is questioned (Ibid), this keeps the role of the armed forces imperative. Now, the military developments in and around the neighbouring countries and the strategic changes in the international security order compel India to rethink over its security objectives. In this regard, the hostile-going Pakistan and the rapid-modernising military of China are seen to be the most compelling factors (Singh J. 1995). India largely sees these two countries as adverse, as these actors are in the constant effort of keeping India in trouble. Apart from these two countries, some of the other powers are also seen to be adverse to certain extent. While the problems in the region obviously linked to India’s security, these countries rid of many socio-economic problems are adding more to India’s security problem (Ibid). In the midst of complex ranges security, India tried to ensure an assured level of stability in the region and in the neighbouring nations.
With the widening of threats and the increasing in the conventional and non-conventional security challenges, the dynamics of security management in country is also given swift changes (IDSA: 2009). Many hindrances to India’s emergence are found to be considered as the threats to national security (Raman, B. 2011). The changing regional and global security dynamism affect the basic levels of India’s security concerns and have serious significant impact on the entire national security planning. These concerns can be delineated as, the concern of internal security, the concern of conventional/military/nuclear security, and the concern of non-traditional and human security (issues). Each of these concerns demand new policy priorities to be dealt with (Thomas R. G. C. 1996).

The contemporary India now evolves with many renewed strategic objectives with and tries best to emerge as a substantial global power. In this juncture, India aims to keep it in the well-strategic position so that the country can get rid of much of the complexities it continues to face. In this connection, the country understands that: if national security policy is left to remain ambiguous, it will undermine national security interests, and the desires for comprehensive management of national security will be left missing (Kapila a. 16th Sept. 2004). Further, the country understands that the spectrums of emerging security challenges cannot be tackled within the confines of national boundaries. This requires to be addressed through a cooperative approach, which needs to be based on the bilateral and regional co-operations (Mukherjee, P. Jan 29/2005). It is understood that the success of bilateral and regional co-operations can also harness the vast potential for the common good, while at the same time it can reduce the growing militarization (Anthony A. 2009b).

So far the pursuance of the co-operative security engagements goes; India has been in the process of tying up its defense relations with the South-East Asian countries. In this regard, the aim of the country remains at capacity-building of armed forces of those countries to deal with various security challenges. And such challenges principally include: the issue of maritime insecurities, the threats of transnational terrorism and threats of various organized crimes (Anthony A. 2007). India has been gradually becoming the part of various regional and sub-regional platforms for security engagements, and has been in the process of strengthening such forums for better security co-operations. Being largely surrounded by maritime domains, India is also in the constant process at the larger level of engagement with its Eastern, East-Asian,
Southern Asian and the distant neighbours for its maritime security. Because for India; maritime domain being the origin and platform of both the traditional and non-traditional security threats do matter to its security much (Mukherjee P. Jan 29/2005).

India remains in a complex state of confrontation over various fronts like border domain, maritime domain, and the threats from cross-border domain. As the means for sustainable solution of threat reduction from these fronts, India ever tries for continuous engagement with the partner countries of constructing “strengthened bilateral and co-operative framework”. Further, India focuses on the capacity-building of the armed forces of the partner countries to deal with the new emerging insecurities (Antony 2007), and creating co-operation framework for protecting the strategic sea-lines from traditional and non-traditional security threats, and facilitating humanitarian assistance (Mukherjee P. Jan 29/2005). The country also remains engaged for building and facilitating international institutions and norms to enhance the legitimate mutual security interests of all the states involved (Antony A. 2009b).

2.5.3 Core Strategic objectives of National Security Management

*National Security Strategy* is said to be the set of strategies, which are generally concerned with the relationship between the ‘powers’ the ‘use of power’ and their ‘objectives’ (Klain 2005). In its very etymological context, the term “strategy” is found to be defined as “the science and art of using all the forces of a nation to execute approved plans as effectively as possible during peace and war” (Deka, H. 2010). In contrast as scholars argue that, the study of national security strategy has not been so serious in the country. Rather, there has ever been the pervasive tendency to take ‘strategy’ very loosely and to cover every jumble of aspirations, intentions and fantasies.

However, ‘strategy’ has no meaning unless it incorporates a long-term perspective; a realistic and accurate assessment of the challenge; a clear definition of objectives; a quantified assessment and acquisition of resources required to secure such objectives; and the planned deployment of these resources within timeframes imposed by the conflict. Crucially, if there is a fundamental disconnect between objectives, tactics, resources and ground conditions, there is no strategy (Sahni, A. 2010).

Therefore, the study of national security strategy must be based on the assumptions about the nature of the geo-political environment, the significant actors in that geo-
political environment, and the characteristic manner in these actors interact with each other” (Boutin & Snyder 2008: 71). Because and as discussed above, India has been facing strategic threats to its national security, which have geographical, historical also cultural dimensions. This demands that India’s strategic culture must evolve by keeping all these dimensions in attention (Kapila, A. 16th Sept. 2004).

2.5.3.1 “National Security Strategy Making” must be Comprehensive and Coherent

Making coherent and comprehensive strategy should be one of the important agenda in the desire for the national security management reforms. Making coherent national security strategies can avoid the prevailing failures and weakness at various fronts of national security management. A coherent National Security Strategy can only be articulated and put in place when: first, there is focus at the “broader areas and issues of security challenges” (Mehta, S. 2009); and second, there is a coherent institutional arrangement at the apex in the affairs of coherent strategy formulations-while taking all measures that the core objectives of national security are not compromised.

However, it is since independence, the country has suffered much due to prevailing absence of the “tradition of strategic thinking” and due to the serious lacking of strategy-making culture (Kanwal, G. 2000: 1591-1628). The country has suffered out of the prevailing absence of matured strategy-making and long-term national security planning. Such a state of affairs has been ultimately resulted into not only the prevailing state of incapacity at various levels (Ibid), but has also led to the lacking of an integrated, long-term approach of national security management (Subrahmanym K. Jan 5/1999). Such a condition of lacking has been ended with security policy-making becoming largely ad hoc and the failure of the country in meeting new emerging threats (Chellaney, B. 1996).

So far the management of India’s national security is concerned; there is a prevailing sense that India may not have done adequately rigorous thinking on how to manage its pre-ordained ascendance that by remaining encircled by the challenge-sphere out of the geo-political conditions. This requires that India should pay greater attentions and do additional exercises on strategic issues, while also exercise continuous assessment on its national security objectives (Mehta, S. 2009). To keep the country secured at all fronts, attention must be given on all issues of importance particularly those areas and fronts which remain fragile and prone to insecurity. The country should give enough
attention to all areas of capacity-building and capability-enhancement in national security management not only of its own but also of those countries which contribute India’s national security interest (Ibid). For the advancement national security objectives and the enhancement of military instruments, the country needs to look at all efforts of military diplomacy, and such effort must go side by side with meaningful foreign policy (Ibid).

Formulating comprehensive National Security Strategy should go first among the requirements towards the national security reform. Similarly, in the accomplishment of any security reform, reform at the policy or strategic level must come first (Kanwal G. 2011). Since independence, while a national security consensus on strategic concerns has been lacking, the country also remained inadequate both in terms of the concepts and mechanics (Sisodia, N. 2011). The need of comprehensive National Security Strategy is that, it can facilitate inter-agency coordination enabling effective dealing with complex security challenges by facilitating long-term, integrated and multi-dimensional approaches (Reddy 2001).

“Comprehensive security strategy integrates all elements of national power to achieve national interests and objectives, both during peace and war (Kanwal, G. 2000: 1591-1628)”. When threats to vital interests pose imminent dangers, this pushes the security managers to resolve those threats. Instruments of state powers may encompass ranging from the military, the non-military powers and all other soft powers to pursue those objectives which are able to and can defend and advance the national interests (Deibel, T. 1993). A good level of strategic vision and foresight facilitate long-range strategic planning and the use of necessary level of force, whenever and wherever they are accurately needed (Kapila a. Sept. 16/2004).

Also, Comprehensive National Security Strategy can facilitate inter-departmental, inter-agency, multi-disciplinary strategic review by ensuring transparency and quickness (Defense Professionals 2011). It can bring various stake holders and the voice and opinions of all sections in the national security management and larger consensus to get a place (Sisodia N. 2011). This will ultimately enhance the legitimacy of the policy making, endorse the rationale behind key decisions on core issues, minimise knee-jerk reactions and ad-hoc decisions, and give larger sanction for the use of necessary level of powers and other instruments in the affairs of security management (Ibid). However the above desire to succeed, there is an unavoidable
necessity for the structural and functional adjustments as well as rejuvenation of the apparatus involved. And this should be carried out through well-sketched strategic visions (Kanwal G. 2011).

Comprehensive and coherent strategy making are said to be the outcome of long-term visions and envisioning security-planning in long-term perspective. Similarly, strategic decision-making ever calls for a “deep and involved thought process (Mehta, S. 2009)”. In exercising far sighted strategic vision, incorporating various “dimensions and levels of concerns as well various levels of threats and threat perception” has to be the practice (Kapila a. Sept.16/2004). Exercising serious thought process requires a set of intellectual framework and institutional arrangement to house them. This can only ensure National Security Planning to become coherent and long-term. To ensure the accuracy and success of national security management, the strategic establishment has to be made policy-based, firm action and result-oriented. Further, to ensure success and accuracy, all stake-holders of strategy making must work in close coordination, while there must be integration at certain points to complement each other’s efforts (Mehta, S. 2009).

In the formulation of comprehensive policy for national security management, there is need for the culture of long-term vision. This requires highly engaged and deeply involved security thinkers and planners with their active involvement in the political decision establishment or any decision planning at the apex level (Mehta, S. 2009). As an imperative of making of security policy and strategy, there is a need of high end and up-to-date qualitative and quantitative analysis of security threats (Sloan et al. 2001). This is essential for consistent and firm strategic planning. Because, for ensuring proactive security management; consistent and firm strategic planning is the prime requirement. For so, underlining of national security objectives must be clearly defined, resource configurations be evidently demarcated, while the resource- gap must be well-identified and lacking resources must be generated (Sahni, A. 2010).

The country often sees policy failure to recognise real-time threats and challenges, because, there remains confusion over national security matters. To overcome such confusion is therefore essential. This can clarify confusion, decide on government’s priorities and consolidate Government’s responses. Scholars are of opinion that all the strategic parameters are essentially taken into consideration while formulating
comprehensive security strategy, which can be “realistic, balanced and effective (Banerjee, A. 2014).

To bring comprehensive national security strategies in place, the entire practice of strategy-making must be renewed. The renewed national security strategy must refocus beyond the military threats and to include non-military threats and the growing role of the non-state actors. National security strategy should cover the overall aspect of national strategies including the military strategies (Deka H. 2010). This should be the science and art applied to the overall conduct of security planning and enforcement”10. “In the face of the prevailing challenge sphere to national security”, and “for ensuring the objective of effective and proactive security management in its place”, country’s strategic posture must be proactive, direct and quick-responsive (Kapila a. Sept. 16/2004).

2.5.3.2 Identification and Reformulation of Vital National Interests are essential

Further, for national security strategy to evolve, the identification and reformulation of vital national interests are essential. This provides the formation of strategic objectives and framework (Reddy 2001), with and within which the authorities and institutions can be engaged for essential planning to meet the emerging threats and ensure national security at the optimum level (Kanwal, G. 2000:1591-1628). Identification national security interest should go by the ultimate national security objectives (Swaminathan (b). 2008). “National survival is the only abiding national interest. All other interests can and do change from time to time (Kanwal, G. 2000: 1591-1628)” Therefore, a state must ensure its survival at any cost, and stand firm against those factors or elements, which pose threat to this interest (Collins J. 1973:14). Because, “nothing else matters, if the country is exterminated as a sovereign entity; and no other end is worth risking national extinction to attain (Ibid)”.

For India, the foremost national interest, its survival as a nation state, remains supreme. And, despite facing several wars and low intensity conflicts, the country paid prime attention towards maintaining its sovereignty and territorial integrity (Kanwal, G. 2000:1591-1628). So, among the vital national interests, the defense of the

---

10 The American Heritage Dictionary offers two meanings/definitions of the term “strategy”. First, it explains “strategy” “the science and art of using all the forces of a nation to execute approved plans as effectively as possible during peace and war”; and second, it is explained to be “the science and art of military command as applied to the overall planning and conduct of large-scale combat operations” (online dictionary 3).
homeland and the creation of a favourable world order or external environment therefore should remain important. These directly matter for the safety and security of the country, which cannot at any cost be let off (ibid). In the context of the changing nature of the threats those threaten integrity, stability and peace in India’s homeland, the evolution of vital interests as well as the reformulation of the strategies in the protection of these vital national interests are to be revisited and renewed. The reformulated and renewed vital interests may include the “physical security of territory, the safety of citizens, the economic well-being of society and the protection of critical national infrastructures from paralysing attacks, both physical and cyber-attacks (web source 6)”.

2.5.3.3 National Security Doctrine: an unavoidable imperative

In the exercise of national security policy, the place of a national security doctrine remains much important. National security doctrine is generally said to be a guiding formulation, which serves as the regulating track in the conduct security policy makings. This largely serves as the organising principle, which helps to identify and prioritise issues those matter for country’s security most (Deka, H. 2010). National security doctrine drives the involved authorities and commands to do fresh exercising in response to the emerging conditions and reorder the security priorities (Ghosh 2004). National security doctrine makes various establishments responsible and accountable in the affairs of security management.

While the absence of a national security doctrine creates dangerous vacuum, when it largely banks on conventional wisdom, it fails to give right direction to security planning and implementation (Raghavan, B. 2011). National security doctrine to be meticulous, it should be based upon an exact description of the security environment of a country side by side a long term vision and planning drawn by the security planners keeping several parameters in attention (Ibid). This must encompass the entire range of security policies necessarily including the military, diplomatic, economic and social dimensions.

National Security Doctrine reflects in a country’s routine security pursuance (Ali 2003). This reflects a country’s perpetual defense preparedness viz. at level of strategic, operational and the tactical those including its deterrent capability, ability of defense and the use of various means of defense like air, naval and armed power
An effective doctrine underlines the aggressors, the potential aggressors and the threat source, side by side “what should be country’s response” to these threats (Kapila, S. 2004). Further, this provides the templates on which the role force-planning, force structures and function of security apparatus can be configured (Ibid).

National Security Doctrine to be effective, it must constitute the plans and visions and principles, which underline the principles and parameters to address the attitudes and confront the capabilities of the threat and threat elements. Further, this should clearly spell out the routine measures of defense of boundaries both land and sea and the countries, which have significant influence over and within country’s various sphere of security interests. Moreover, this must explain the space of understanding and addressing the emerging security issues like terrorism and organised crimes (Sisodia 2011).

2.5.3.4 Search for Renewed Policy Options

Towards brining effectiveness to its entire affairs of national security management, India has been in the continuous exercise for renewed policy options. It is often criticised that in India, the overall objectives and goals of national security management remain ambiguous and undefined, while the policy objectives do not match with the development of the military machine (Daruwalla 1997). This applies to the both the cases of internal as well as external security management in the country. So far the case of country’s internal security management is concerned; the lack of effectiveness has always remained the issue. This is largely because of the outcome of the prevailing absence of active policy exercising. While there is a need for viable policy options towards ensuring effective and durable internal security management (Manoharan 2012), there has been often the absence of holistic approaches (Nalpat 1999), while at the implementation level, the response to threats have always remain uncoordinated. This has been resulted into the entire affairs of internal security management to be remaining reactive and ad-hoc to threats and events (Ibid).

National security policy has to be imperative, this has to be formed a “shaped policy framework” which can guarantee the parameters to protect of the core national interest from threats within and from threats without. An imperative security policy
framework can provides an overall framework to analyse the factors shaping the threats, while this can also provide the framework for their required containment. The shaped policy framework is important in the context that it helps the political establishment, security forces, armament policy, and defense strategies to integrate at a point (Leffler 1990: pp. 143-152).

2.5.4 Geo-strategic Imperatives defines India’s National Security Objectives

Geo-strategic imperatives seem to be as much important as the other imperatives\footnote{Other imperatives include the economic and social imperatives also shape the security concerns and objectives of the country.} which define the security paradigm and shape the construction of security concerns and objectives (Tanham 1992: 23). Geo-strategic imperatives involve the concept of strategic frontiers which delineates the territorial parameters of country’s territorial security borderlines. This enables the country to pursue its territorial defense in pursuit of goals, for example by the use of military forces, that in the national security protection (Ibid).

In India’s security management, geostrategic dimension continue to remain important. India’s strategic frontiers and priorities continue to define in the formulation of national security interests of the country. So far the case of India is concerned; the country considers its geostrategic interests to be extended from “the Persian Gulf to the Straits of Malacca across the Indian Ocean includes Central Asia and Afghanistan in the North West, China in the North East and South East Asia” (web source 7). This makes India’s strategic thinking extend to these horizons (Kapila 2003)\footnote{At the combined Commanders Conference (Conference of the the Indian Army, Indian Navy and Indian Air Force) former Prime Minister Vajpayee on November 1, 2003, made observations on India’s strategic priorities in terms of India’s geostrategic environment (Kapila 2003).}. As per the Ministry of Defense, India’s territorial security interests “extend from the Persian Gulf in the west to the Straits of Malacca in the east and from the Central Asian Republics in the north to near the equator in the south, underpin India’s security response”\footnote{Ministry of Defense, “Salient Features of the Security Environment”, Government of India}. In this context, what K. S. Bajpai (2009) observes remains important; he observes that:

In spite of Partition and the assertion of China’s control over Tibet, India remains at crossroads between West Asia, South East Asia, Central Asia and the Indian Ocean. As emphasised, India’s strategic frontiers are three concentric circles — from the Hindu Kush to the Irrawady, Aden to Singapore and Suez to Shanghai. In this coming decade we must seek to contain, if not
prevent, the growth of forces that could operate from those concentric areas to our detriment. Presently that means four vital interests: in the security of the Persian Gulf, the stability of Central Asia, the changing power equations in East Asia, and a range of Oceanic issues: tsunamis, piracy, helping small island states, keeping sea-lanes free (Bajpai K. S. 2009).

For India, its geographical size, strategic location, and socio-economic and military interest defines country’s security environment. While the country represents an immense cultural, geographical and topographical diversity, various physical parameters have the necessary implications on National security problems and their management (Vohra, N. 2008). In fact, since independence, India’s geopolitical vulnerabilities have been in ascendance. Among the major factors, the ascendance of China’s extensive defense posture and infrastructure, the step-by-step withdrawal of British from east of Suez, and an increasing American presence in the Indian Ocean have been the major causes. Now, India find itself remaining encircled by the various strategic rings which is said to be encompassing of the neighbours, the country like Pakistan which has fared to challenges Indian military power, and India’s Asian rival China, the Soviet Union, the Indian Ocean, as well as the distant great powers (Tanham, p. 23). Historically, though India for long considered the mountains and seas as ‘protective barriers’ against outside interference and invasion, but these fronts remained always open and vulnerable. History proves that India has been aggressed and attacked from the mountain passages in the northwest and northeast. Even the contemporary aggression from various sides like Pakistan and China are not from easy lands, rather from hilly and difficult terrains (Ibid).

Geographically, India is the seventh largest country in the world and is the biggest country in South Asia region (web source 8). In terms of geographical and topographical importance, It has ten immediate neighbours – China, Nepal, Bhutan, Bangladesh, Myanmar, Pakistan and Afghanistan being the mainland neighbours and Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Maldives being the maritime neighbours. In terms of the size of the boundary, India stakes 14818 Kilometres of land borders with a coast line of 7516.6 kilometres, and over 600 island territories (Das, P. 2009). In the East, the

14 Those countries like: Sri Lanka, Nepal, Bangladesh, and the Maldives, Pakistan, Myanmar, etc.
15 China is seen to be India’s giant Asian rival; the Soviet Union, India’s best friend and partner in the geopolitical sphere of Asia, and perhaps the world.
16 Invaders for centuries have come from the northwest passage, and Japan during the II world war attacked India from northeast i.e. Burma
island territories are 1,300 KMs away from the main land, which are physically much nearer to South East Asia. Moreover, the peninsular India is found to be much adjacent to “one of the most vital sea-lanes” which stretches from the Suez Canal and Persian Gulf to the Straits of Malacca (through which much of the oil from the Gulf region transits) (web source 11). It is important to mention that, this area has “attracted super power rivalries in the past and continues to be a region of heightened activity by extra regional navies on account of current global security concerns (web source 11)”.

Most importantly, India has land frontiers and maritime boundaries with many of the neighbouring countries. Except some of our hinterland States, e.g. Haryana and Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Delhi, all other States and some of the Union Territories have one or more land or sea borders required to be guarded (Vohra, N. 2008). India’s militarised borders with Pakistan and China have generated a variety of internal security threats ever since Independence (Ibid). 92 of India’s 593 districts are border districts in 17 states. Like all boundaries in South Asia, India’s boundaries are also man-made. India shares 14,880 kilometres of boundary with its neighbours (web source 9). India also has an Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of 2.013 million sq. KMs (web source 2). It is said that, “after the delimitation of the continental shelf, the sea area of responsibility of maritime agencies will increase to 2.9 million Sq. KMs, which would be almost equal to India's entire landmass (Das. P. 2009)”. This requires the country credible land, air and maritime force to safeguard its territorial security interests (ibid 2009).

2.5.4.1 Understanding Geopolitical Implications

Geopolitical Implications is one of geo-strategic imperatives which define India’s national security objectives also. The geopolitical implicating dimensions on India’s national security can be connected to its neighbourhood, its extended neighbourhood and up to the larger length of the Asia-Pacific Region. This in explanation includes its immediate neighbouring countries in the region of South Asia, the countries in the regions of Central Asia, South-East Asia, the Gulf and the Indian Ocean (Dahiya &
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17 India shares 14,880 Kilometers of boundary with its neighbours. with Pakistan (3323 km), China (3488 km), Nepal (1751 km), Bhutan (699 km), Myanmar (1643 km), and Bangladesh 4096.7 km.

18 Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) is a concept adopted at the third UN conference on the Law of Sea (1982). Whereby, a coastal state is having the jurisdiction over the exploration and exploitation of marine resources in its adjacent section of the continental-self taken to be a band extending 200 miles from the shore. (Definition: Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), from website. https://stats.oecd.org)
Behuria 2012). The specificity of Asia-Pacific Region is continuing as turbulent region beset by internal conflicts and political transitions and its impact on individual Nation-States having serious implications. Because, many of the internal conflicts in the individual states usually seek to get certain external connection and therefore, make it into challenges and confrontations within the country and between the countries. This makes the region subject to a continuing state of insecurity and increasing militarisation to the extent of the large-scale development of weapons of mass destruction also. The unresolved territorial and boundary disputes and competing claims of sovereignty is the other dimension of continuing problem in the region (Kanwal G. 2000: 1591-1628) though this is unlikely to cause sudden and high scale conflagration. In an increasingly globalised environment, India’s geographical area, strategic location, trade links and the EEZ involve security concerns and challenges (MoD 2010-11: 11). The growth of security challenges like terrorism, ethnic diversity, the proliferation of small arms, narco-trafficking and religious extremism have been the prevailing trend in the region which put at risk the security set up and alter the balance of power (Kanwal, G. 2000: 1591-1628).

2.5.4.2 Challenges to India’s Internal Security: underling major Geo-Political Fronts and Dimensions

Scholars have identified and categorised the threats and the dimensions of threats from various perspectives. These are for example the perspectives of geopolitics, the perspective of territoriality and from the perspective of the nature of threats. From the perspective geopolitics, the threat sources can be categorised to be from the fronts of internal, regional, extra-regional, and from the global dimensions. The security challenge facing India is diverse, complex and evolving. Security challenges to India is directly traced to its size, location, its historical legacy its emerging role in the multi-polar world (Web source 56).

From the perspective of territoriality the challenges and the sources of challenges to India’s national security are from the external dimensions, from internal dimension and most seriously the challenges spearheaded on the homeland but being perpetrated by the external elements. Threats from internal territory are found to be coming from: the less governed and difficult terrains or from the disturbed areas, from the border fronts and from the sea fronts. When the perspective of territoriality comes to question, the protection of sovereignty and territorial integrity comes to be the most
important and the central focus of national security management. India is confronted from challenges at all fronts of territorial dimensions (Web source 57), for example most of the wars so far have been fought at the internal and external front on territorial disputes or the breach of sovereignty. It remains apprehensive that the future conflicts flow out of unresolved territorial and disputes\(^{19}\). therefore, the consideration of territoriality in the internal security management has to be one of the primary concerns (Kanwal, G. Oct. 21/2010).

Challenges sphere to India’s security remains closely linked to its neighbourhood and the extended neighbourhood. India’s contemporary threat environment can be traced to it volatile regional sphere from which most of its insecurity emanates. The emergences of newer threats within India’s neighbouring countries are now implicating India seriously\(^{20}\) (Gupta, A. 2010). Some of important concerns are to: keep the probable armed conflicts/aggression at the lowest chance of manifestation, to remain highly cautious and responsive to the volatile and problematic scenario in the neighbourhood and their impact on the growth of internal challenges.

India feels to be challenged by the developing uncertainties in the adjacent countries within the Indian sub-continent. India will also continue to face extra-regional powers keeping it engaged through low-intensity conflicts (Web source 56). These include all the South Asia countries which are seen by many scholars within India’s regional dimension, including the neighbouring countries of China and Myanmar. While China has opened up multi-pronged strategic challenge frontiers to contest India, the hostile forces at various border fronts, and threats from the maritime borders from the directions of east, west and south has made India concerned at all terrestrial frontages. Apart from this, the threats of cross-border terrorism and the threat of nuclear proliferation in the neighbouring region will also remain the serious security concern (Singh, J. 1995).

Now, the prevailing inter-neighbourhood conflicts have thrown up newer challenges to the countries. While the direct confrontation in the region has reduced, the conflicts generated out of unconventional and asymmetrical means and conflicts of non-

\(^{19}\)It is said that the “future conventional conflict on the Indian Sub-continent will flow out of unresolved territorial and boundary disputes with China along the unsettled borders, and over Jammu and Kashmir (J&K) with Pakistan”.

\(^{20}\)It is said that the prevailing antagonistic political atmosphere and the absence of the adequate level of cooperation has made the region vulnerable. Security threats arising out of terrorism, climate change, organized crime, human trafficking, drugs trafficking etc.
traditional nature however have kept the region apprehensive. While, the external hostile factors will ever try to exploit the internal imbalances, several internal insecurities and an extended periphery of varying instability will keep India engaged (Mehta, A. pp. 26-35). Before such challenge, sustaining the momentum of its growth and development will remain the major challenge for the country (Mallik, A. 2008). This substantiate that what scholars argue “Kautilyan assumption of the intrigue of foreign powers as a threat to one’s own security still remains relevant” (Tanham, G. 1992:27). This is what out of which, India will continue to suffer from persistent fear and threats out of the foreign hands at work. For India, there remains close relationship between internal security and outside aggression, and ensuring internal unity cannot materialise unless and until the external defense that from outside aggression particularly in the form of intrusion is defeated. Because of the prevailing internal disunity, India’s effort remained failed to defeat the intruders (Ibid).

Geopolitical situation in the neighbourhood may change significantly, due to the emerging uncertainties impacting India to revisit its security policies (Dahiya & Behuria 2012). The changing nature of global security order and the changing geopolitical situation in the neighbourhood demands that the country should come up with polices to face the emerging challenges and explore opportunities to pursue greater engagement in the region. The country’s effort for enhancing structural and functional cooperation for better security governance in the region and in the extended neighbourhood21 may ensure stability in the region at various fronts from which the country is challenged (Mishra, B. 2000).

The challenges to India’s national security both at its internal and external fronts are going serious (Prakash, A. 2012). This is analysed on the growing deterioration of India’s strategic environment as the result of the developments like: the US withdrawal from Afghanistan, the growing intrusion of China into South Asia, the growing proxy-war games against India and most seriously the threats posed to India’s security out of Sino-Pak nexus (Ibid). So far the major threats from the internal fronts are concerned, the threats are identified to be the threats of insurgency, terrorism, and militancy, and organised crimes etc. which will largely remain sponsored and connected to the cross-border dimensions. Also, the huge illegal migration from Bangladesh, the open and volatile Nepal border, and the huge organised crimes

---

21 This includes the Persian Gulf, Central Asia, Indian Ocean region and Southeast Asia.
syndicate reaming in the region; all have their continuous impact to the growth of insecurity in the country (web source 56).

The other area concern includes the remaining geo-political tension particularly over Kashmir issue, and handling of the fundamentalist threats posed from Pakistan particularly the war waged by Pakistan at the border front and within Kashmir remain important contemporary concern (Menon, K. 2012). The current state of internal security scenario in India can be traced to the ‘two crucial sets of challenges’. These are the growing insurgencies in various forms, and the manifestation of terrorism in its various forms and nature. So far, the insurgencies are concerned; insurgencies at the front of NE, J & K, and Maoist dominated areas remains the areas of alarm. So far terrorism is concerned, it will continue to exist and take newer shapes in the homeland of India. This includes externally-sponsored terrorism, the home-grown terrorism, and terrorism emanating from the “conflict theatres”’ rid of insurgency and extremism problems. (These problems have been elaborately dealt in the next chapters). Therefore, keeping the above development in attention, India very clearly convinced of the fact that there is the need of a stable and peaceful regional as well as global environment to achieve the aim of growth and prosperity (MoD 2010-1:11-8), it becomes to see the global and regional dimension as the part of its security strategic perimeter. India remains concerned of the evolving dynamics of power rivalries in the region and their impact on the region and its own national interests (Ibid). The challenge, therefore, is to ensure the non-interference of these elements those try through various acts of sabotage and conspiracy to challenge India’s sovereignty and territorial integrity (Manoharan, N. 2012).

2.5.4.3 Understanding the Factors and Actors

The factors and actors which will continue to challenge India’s national insecurity are many. The actors constitute both the state actors and non-state actors. The state actors can be seen to be primarily the Pakistan and various state establishments in Pakistan like the ISI and its Army. The China will continue as the other actor of challenge. The non-state actors are here basically concentrated at the terrorists. The factors are numerous, however, the continuing territorial disputes the prevailing high-level of trust deficit are some of the important factors which seriously contribute to India’s security. In this regard, the primary challenges before the country includes: coping with China, to deal with Pakistan, to deal with the non-state actors and most
importantly to deal with the insurgents and terrorists in the country and sponsored across the borders (Mehta, S. 2009).

In the share of the contemporary challenges to India’s national security, the role of Chinese contribution remain a huge concern. This include, Chinese incessant efforts to open and control maximum multiple land routes to the India Ocean, its role in supporting various insurgencies in India, and its support to Pakistan’s anti-India strategies what keep India much concerned of. Other that China, the challenges the various challenges posed by Pakistan are of serious concern for India’s security management. The role of various state and non-state elements in Pakistan in perpetrating various forms of terrorism in India, which is one of most serious challenges that has kept India’s security management upset. Apart from these, the high-scale illegal migration from Bangladesh, and the organised crimes in-and-around India are the major issues of concern. These have been broadly discussed in the following chapters.

2.5.5 Terrorism: an emerging geo-strategic imperative which should be taken central in National Security Management

Terrorism is now identified to be emerging as serious issue out of the emerging geo-strategic imperatives. The trend and outcome of globalisation have also made the terrorism go international and global. The development like, *advances in telecommunications and improvements in international commercial logistics* (MoD 2010-1:11-8) in combination have let the terrorist activities to grow faster. Now terrorists are found to have the capacity to cause serious damage to global political and economic systems and intrude into even the most secure borders and territories (Ibid).

India is very close to the international hub of narco-trafficking and all of the activities on which the terrorist-financing depends. While, the threat of piracy and terrorism now emerging as the challenges (to international trade and safety of the sea lanes of communication), spread of piracy to areas closer to Indian western-seaboard has emerging to be a larger concern (Ibid).

Also, the effort of non-proliferation at risk when the activities of clandestine nuclear programmes including transit of chemical and biological weapons are in continuation; while the danger of these materials to be falling into the hands of non-state actors and the terrorists therefore remains concerning. Keeping this in attention it can be argued that, in formulating *internal security management* policy, terrorism should be the
central focus. The most important aim in the internal security management policy of the country has to be to make India a terror free that is from its root to its manifestation. The principal aim in this regard should be to formulate necessary policies to deal with these challenges from the very point of their genesis to the different forms of their manifestations. Because, it is various acts and ism of terror in nexus and interspersion becomes serious challenges of terrorism and serious threat to internal security. For instance, the proliferation of small arms supply based on the demand of small criminals and anti-socals elements later get into the genesis of larger criminal networks. Therefore, a minimum act of terror and violence even at minimum level needs to be seriously dealt with, as this is where the genesis and foundation of the large scale act of terrorism exist.

In this works it is argued that the activities like insurgencies, organised crimes including sea piracy, drug trafficking, arms trafficking, money laundering etc. should be considered as the associated activities of the Terrorists, and therefore, in the work it is argued that the counter-terrorism measures also include the measures to counter these activities also. When these issues remain a serious concern for India as its immediate neighbourhood remains a hub of the activities of the international terrorist organisations and criminal syndicates (MoD 2010-1:11-8), it should be a measure concern in country security management. All these aspects and facets of terrorism have been extensively dealt with in the following chapters.

2.6 Conclusion

Keeping the above illustration in consideration, the following narration can be drawn as the conclusion of this chapter.

The changing global security order and the transcendence of national security from a nation-centric barrier to wider human centric paradigm have made the study of national security multi-disciplinary and multi-dimensional. Now, the concept of security has gone enormous changed while the scope of the contemporary security has got widened. When the emerging paradigm of national security is getting more inclusive, understanding national security no more remain confined to the traditional notion, which rather seek to get extended. When the realm threats are going complex, the role of the non-state actors are in rise and emergence of ideological divergences are enlarging, in this condition, the approach to national security growing becoming
critical. Now, the ranges of conflicts have been extending beyond the national boundaries, while the problems of ethnic, religious and socio-cultural confrontations are emerging. The modern conflicts are in rise, which makes many of the instabilities, internal conflicts and humanitarian crises. The intra-state conflicts have over-ride the inter-state conflicts.

Though the concept of National security has got widened; it still remains almost a state-centric phenomenon. The changes those are felt to be taking place in the era of globalisation remain widely peripheral. Even the challenges of non-traditional nature are primarily expected to be dealt with by the state mechanisms. As the pattern of the contemporary insecurity to nation-states is found to be much conflict ridden, with an amalgamation of violence prevailed-highly terrorised environment, the need for sustainable way-out to understand and respond them may remain in remoteness (Burke 2007).

For the comprehensive management of security, the attention towards these “other security threats” will be taken together (Al-Rodhan 2007). This will need to also consider the emerging threats like organized crimes, insurgencies, terrorism and human trafficking etc. all in focus. So, most of traditional idea of national security management will remain significant. The demand of the time is that they need to be broadened and inclusive, not altered. As said, “any country will sacrifice its legitimate interests and if challenged, to maintain them by war” (Lippmann, W. 1943). Therefore, State’s primary focus will remain the externality and internality of the threats with the core desire to protect the sovereignty and territorial integrity. Given the fluid and ever-shifting nature of international security commitment, the core national security interests of any country will remain centred at defending it from external aggression and internal unrest. This will make national security attention to be pre-importantly force and military centric.

The study of the changing trend of remains important in the study of internal security. Internationally, the such analysis has remain significant, while the countries like the USA and UK have such changes in analysis and new approaches strategies have been followingly explored and pursued by those countries to meet the new challenges arising out of such changing trend. These countries are found to be reflecting their seriousness towards the changing nature security while their impacts have been seriously recognised. Taking the case of USA first, the US government’s National
Foreign Intelligence Board is found to have come out with the detail study and analysis of ‘the global trends in conflict in 2015’. These are broadly be categorised as: a. conflicts related to crime and terrorism, b. conflicts due to poor political management, c. conflicts due to demographic trends, d. conflicts due to scarcities, and, e. conflicts arising out of the problems of financial and infrastructural threats.

Similarly, taking the case of the United Kingdom, while endorsing the above mentioned conflicts as national security threats, the United Kingdom aims of this first National Security Strategy “to address and manage this diverse though interconnected set of security challenges and underlying drivers, both immediately and in the longer term, to safeguard the nation, its citizens (Govt. of UK 2008)”.

Issues like international terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, conflict in the failed states, pandemics, and trans-national crime as the new emerging conflicts are also found to be listed. The document says that the above mentioned threats and risks are driven by a diverse and interconnected set of underlying factors (Govt. of UK 2008). So far case of India including the Indian sub-continent and neighbourhood are concerned, all most of all of above identified conflicts of similar nature are found to exist (NIC 2000). In democratic countries, due to lack of public sanction for violence, the states generally maintain restraint to use modern war assets despite availing them. It also restricts the democratic countries to go for a large scale and mass war. Such restraints, however, hold-back the sub-state and non-state actors withstand the conflicts they carry out (Bhonsle, R. 2003). There are serious non-traditional security threats which have emerged as the internal security problems in the country. Threats like insurgency in different forms like: Maoism, Naxalism, insurgency in North-eastern India and Kashmir are some of the serious among them. Further, the issues of organised-crimes also bear the largest security implications. The nexus and linkage of the problems of insurgency and terrorism with organised-crimes creates serious threats to internal security (web source 51). All these have been elaborately dealt with in the following chapters.

It is argued that, the growth terrorism as a security threat which state that the concept of security be broadened (Smith, S. 2005). Moreover, terrorism being a non-traditional security threat and such attacks take place by non-state actors using non-traditional means; its explanation must go beyond the traditional approach (ibid: 57). However, the role of the state to fight terrorism will remain important, because, states remain the
principal actors having primary command over the overwhelming bulk of military power. It is only because the states remain the principal actors in the international system and as the States have primary command over the overwhelming bulk of military power, in the study of terrorism, the role of the state has to be important (Ibid). As security remains synonymous to survival, in the study of terrorism and war against terrorism (Williams, P. 2008: 180), the endorsement of the pre-importance of military-centric defense will endure (Booth, K. 2007:103).

In the study and analysis of terrorism as a security threat, the study of the role of non-state actors remains important. While, the contemporary national security is characterised by the rise of sinister non-state forces, the occasional merging of the ‘State’ with some ‘non-State’ entities of an evil-hybrid nature has remained as the worrying phenomenon (Mehta, S. 12/2009). While, the non-state actors like terrorists and insurgents are emerging with inexhaustible resources of money and arms and with fanatic ideological and religious inspiration with dangerous agenda in hand; their influence zone of these elements are spreading over land, sea, air, and also over the cyber domain (Das, P 2009:3) In such a scenario, the question: “where should be the direction of security efforts of the State should concentrate at, whether it is at the States (which sponsor insecurity in another State) or the non-State entities?” remains imprecisely addressed (Mehta, S. 12/2009).

Security Management is essentially to deal with the threats those requires immediate action, while simultaneously dealing with their driving factors (Mishra, B. 2000). Though the study of security is more than a study of threats (Buzan, B. 2000), however, it should be studied in the context that the threats which can be tolerated and the threats which require immediate action (Morgan, P. 2007). When the danger to the existence of nation states are still enduring with the continuing anarchical international security order, it becomes the paramount responsibility of a state to remain prepared so that it does not have to sacrifice its legitimate interests to avoid war and also remain able, if challenged, to maintain them by war22 (Lippmann, W. 1944). National security defense will remain predominantly considered as the defense of state from traditional hard security threats. This will sanction for the requirement to maintain the survival of

---

22 How far the concept of definition goes broad, this explanation of security given by Walter Lippmann still considered to be the most acceptable one
the state through the use of Power. This will ensure that the requirement of the position of advantageous military might to be highest.

When specific focus on military might is getting negotiated, it becomes important that the broader ranges non-military issues are in attention. It is not only the conventional enemies rather the non-state factors and actors are mounting serious. So, it now becomes the responsibility of the state for catering to the serious and unconventional security threats. This makes the responsibility of the state and its security apparatus expanded. However, with a limited state-capacity, how the state can respond to the area of expanded responsibility remains the question. The solution remains that the capacity of security apparatus are expanded and made fit to the new situation through necessary reforms with a renewed national security management system is put in place. The implication of globalisation challenges the notion that national security defence should only remain centred at the protection of national territory from hard-security threat (Nilufer, K. 2006:1-17).

When the nature and strategy of war are getting changed and threats going unpredictable, unmeasured, unmonitored, how the traditional set-up of national security defense will response to the requirement (Ibid)? However, how the State with its limited capacity can cater to these entire problems at a time, when it cannot at any cost leave behind defending the state from existential threats is the first question to be clearly resolved. When a wide range of problem the state is put to confront, with its limited capacity, it becomes the foremost responsibility of the State and the government to address the military threat to national security (Ohta, H. 2009). Therefore, it can be summarised here that, though the traditionalist notion of national security discourse might be criticised to be narrow to accommodate the present security scenario of problems, however, the use of force as the last resort to preserve the national integrity and territorial sovereignty cannot be ruled out. Similarly, the application of force or the military dimension of security cannot be overcome even the coming times.

While, ‘security’ of today has become indivisible, the lethality and scale of conflicts of today merits to mutually-assured destruction (MAD) (Ghosh P. 2004). This demands that the one of the principal objectives of national security management strategy ought to be to underline country’s plan for “the coordinated use of all the instruments of state power” for its survival at any given situation (IDSA: 2009:1-10). For so, national
security planning must incorporate the goals and components, and these should be appropriately outlined that by binding upon all the stake-holders in the affairs of national security protection (Kapila 2004a.). The present approach in countering the complex internal security threats is gradually going inadequate, and to meet this inadequacy, there is need to formulate comprehensive internal security strategy (IDSA: 2009:1-10). This should be based on passable approaches of management and on the basis of optimum threats analysis (Manoharan, N. 2012). Making of the national security planning should be dynamic and proactive in response to the changing security environment (Business Line: Mar.16/2011). The central objective has to be the reduction of the extent and severity of the threats, and maximisation of national interests in terms of gains of peace, stability and social well-being, has to be central goal (Raghavan, B. 2011). In the making of comprehensive internal security management strategy, the study and the understanding of the power elements are necessary. Such a strategy must be integrated and coherent and must emerge out of synthesising power elements which govern internal security. The major power elements including the political, socio-economic, enforcement and intelligence elements must be integrated. Further, the acts and affairs of national security strategy to succeed, the place and professionalism of think-tanks and media must be given its appropriate place. On the other side, the Indian media should emerge with necessary professionalism and should emerge specialised on the national security issues. All these issues have been further dealt with in the following chapters.