

CENTRE FOR LAND WARFARE STUDIES (CLAWS)
REPORT OF
NATIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES WORKSHOP (9-11 FEBRUARY 2011)

The annual workshop on National Security Challenges was conducted for senior officers of the Armed Forces, civilian services, intelligence agencies, central police organisations (CPOs) and para-military forces over a period of three days from 9-11 Feb 2011. During this period, eminent speakers gave their views on various issues impinging on India's national security concerns. The workshop terminated with a decision making exercise for the participants.

Day 1

Opening Remarks: Brig Gurmeet Kanwal, Director CLAWS.

The Director welcomed all participants to the National Security Challenges Workshop. He stated that this is an annual event and the present workshop is the second one being conducted by CLAWS. The aim of the workshop is to give the participants an opportunity to reflect on major issues impacting India's national security. South Asia faces many challenges and can be easily called the second most dangerous place after West Asia. While India is far from being an island of calm, it is surrounded by a sea of instability. The issues put out for the three-day conference were thus important in terms of India's security imperatives.

Keynote Address: Lt Gen AM Verma, AVSM, SM, VSM, DGMO

There has never been any period in time when societies, communities and countries have lived in total peace and harmony, free of dispute and conflict. In the 21st century, some old paradigms are being challenged. It is believed that conventional wars or industrial wars, as Rupert Smith calls them in *The Utility of Force*, are things of the past and are likely to be replaced or are being replaced with new kinds of warfare such as fourth generation warfare, in which one side is a non-state actor; or fifth generation warfare, in which one side may not even know they're at war. In their book, *Unrestricted Warfare*, two Chinese colonels have stated that direct combat must be used alongside tools of economics, diplomacy, terrorism, proxy wars and propaganda. The implementation of all these tools can be seen in the global community today. In *The Accidental Guerrilla*, David Kilcullen talks of hybrid warfare, which combines new actors, with the technology of new ways of waging wars. However, Kilcullen goes on to confirm that the traditional, or old, threats of war and conflict, continue to exist.

There are different forms that conflict can take, in the world today. Thomas Friedman, in *The World is Flat*, suggests that there are forces which are holding back the 'flattening of the world', and the important one amongst these forces is the traditional, old-fashioned, economy-destroying war. Apart from the ground realities, even scholars believe that war is not a thing of the past. In the past few decades, the world has seen the occurrence of the Gulf War as also the conflict in Sri Lanka, wherein there was the

as-yet unprecedented occurrence of a non-state actor which had acquired the capabilities of a conventional force, military-wise. The following can therefore be inferred:

- Space exists for a conventional conflict.
- Irregular forces might acquire state-like conventional capabilities.
- Disingenuous application of conventional capabilities can overcome irregular forces.
- The possibility of warfare is not a thing of the past. War as a means to further policy objectives continues to remain a reality.

Internal stability and freedom from external interference has always been essential for the growth of cultures and societies. The centrality of military security continues to dominate the orientation towards a nation's security. With the end of the Cold War, countries have begun to rely increasingly on themselves for their security needs. Post 9/11, terrorism has become a common threat across the world. Today, the concept of national security has widened to include diplomacy, and economic, military and political power. These factors are synchronous with maintaining effective armed forces and internal security agencies to defeat and deflect terrorism. A nation's level of security rests not just on the physical manifestation of security through the armed forces, but also on the physical, mental and moral wellbeing of its people.

India's rise to global stature is inevitable, perhaps even indisputable, given its importance as a growing economy, a rising demographic advantage and hi-tech industrial base. However, the geostrategic environment in the region is volatile, mainly due to the conflict in the Af-Pak region. In addition, the political situation in Myanmar, Bangladesh and Nepal continues to be in different stages of volatility, while Sri Lanka has just about concluded one chapter in the violent ethnic conflict that plagued them for a whole generation. In the larger interest of comity within the region, India must try to come to points of mutual accord and must do so in the knowledge that it will have to shoulder greater responsibility. With China, cordial relations will be an important challenge in the years to come.

India's rising profile in the world today is threatened with crippling internal security challenges, such as Left Wing Extremism, separatist movements and ethnic insurgencies. Some other challenges which are also detrimental to development are money laundering, communalism, regionalism among others. Internal and external security problems must be confronted both in the physical as well as the cyber realm. In the years to come, climate change and energy needs will be significant factors in the security environment. Food and water scarcity, the spread of diseases, mass migration and a reliable supply of energy to meet operational needs, is inescapable. Energy efficiency, particularly, can be a force multiplier. India must also investigate alternate conceptions of operational energy use.

In the age of globalisation, no country can act and survive in isolation. And the importance of regional and global organisations will only grow in the years to come. In

South Asia and the world, differences cannot be allowed to overcome the advantages to be enjoyed through cooperation.

India's Strategic Environment: Amb Kanwal Sibal, former Foreign Secretary

India faces numerous challenges, all of which are well known. While the events may change, the basic issues remain the same. India faces all possible strategic problems possible in the theory of international politics. The question therefore remains of determining the choices we have and how these can be put into practical policies.

India has unsettled border disputes with Pakistan and China. Despite efforts from the Indian side, these remain unresolved. India's relations with its other neighbours too are not very optimistic. Nepal is a sensitive area. Even though we have open borders with them and have enjoyed old links, we are still unable to manage the situation there. Our relations are presently stable with Bangladesh owing to Sheikh Hasina's government, but it may not remain so in the future. Strong Islamic forces are emerging in Bangladesh which may lead to instability. Our relations with Sri Lanka are on an even keel but Chinese increasing influence in the country is bound to make the situation both unpredictable and detrimental to Indian interests. Sri Lanka is playing a balanced game with both, India and China.

Terrorism remains the biggest challenge facing India and this gets exacerbated by the ongoing conflict in the Af-Pak region. The presence of anti-India Taliban groups and groups like the Haqqani's further worsen the situation especially as terrorists now have access to new technology and are staging dramatic acts. While many aver that terrorism has no religion, one cannot rule out the fact that the current global phenomenon of terrorism has its roots in the extreme form of Islam. There is a significant need to reform the Islamic world and its leadership needs to address the issue to counter the spread of fundamentalism. A global effort to this end is required but this is difficult to organise. US policies in Afghanistan, Middle East and Israel have also contributed to the problem. While Islamic fundamentalism is on the rise in many parts of the world, its rise in Pakistan is more worrisome as illustrated in the recent killing of Punjab governor, Salman Taseer.

Nuclear proliferation in our neighbourhood is another area of concern. A Q Khan's activities and the China-Pak nuclear nexus are the causative factors. Recent reports assert that Pakistan has around 100 warheads, but the world appears to be mute on the subject.

The China-Pak friendship confronts India with a two front situation and China's military modernisation has security implications for India. China is also sending calculative signals to the world, the latest being its new 'stealth' capability in the aerospace and naval sector. China considers the South China Sea as its core national interest and its strategic goal is to weaken US presence in the Far East. It is working towards increasing its influence in the Indian Ocean Region. Because of the volatile international financial system and China's assistance in creating more jobs in the US, there is no reaction to China's belligerent rise in the region.

Pakistan may collapse or become a failed state if financial and military support from the US and China is withdrawn. An imploding Pakistan will have its spill off effects on India also.

The Indian Ocean region is very critical because of the global trade and energy trade that it facilitates. We need to focus on this area and enhance our naval capability to secure out interests.

The domino effect of the revolution in Tunisia sparked protests in Egypt, Yemen and Jordan and are continuing to affect other countries in the Arab world. The Gulf region is a source of our energy requirements and a large number of Indians work there. It is hence important to ensure stability in the area. Also, the current wave of unrest in the Islamic world may affect us and we should be very careful about it.

What are the choices that we have? Should we strengthen our relations with the US or remain non-aligned and practice independence?

It's important to diminish tensions wherever possible and strengthen our relations with our neighbours. We also need to build up nuclear deterrence and focus on economic and military enhancement. We should not get stuck with the US alignment and ignore Iran. This would prove very costly for the nation. Nor should we send wrong signals to Russia by buying too much from the US. There are also some not so sensible options like settling the border with China on Chinese terms and giving concessions to Pakistan.

Discussion

While Pakistan's failure may give some people emotional and historical satisfaction, it would unleash a lot of unwanted forces and create further instability in the region. Therefore, Robert Blackwill's plan for the bifurcation of Afghanistan will not work.

India should not propose talks with Pakistan. By doing so we are sending wrong signals to them. When we talk about Kashmir, we should just confine ourselves to the issue of terrorism sponsored by Pakistan.

Sub-Conventional Warfare – A Strategic Perspective: Lt Gen Prakash Menon, AVSM, VSM, Phd, former Commandant, NDC

What has changed in conflict is the ability of small groups to inflict maximum damage and with increased lethality. While terrorism may seem to be a new concept, it is not actually so. Clausewitz determined war as 'organised violence for political purpose' and terrorism falls into this idea of war. Al Qaeda uses this to achieve political ends.

War has both an objective nature and a subjective one. The latter refers to how combat is to be fought and what tools are available for conflict. Fourth generation warfare is not

a new beast in the sea. It is effect-based warfare. Similarly, net-centric warfare is the principle; it is not a new type of warfare but a new tool.

Sub-conventional conflict, which I refer to as irregular warfare is aimed and directed at the population and the political process. The counter strategy hence must keep the people as the centre of gravity for without the people, irregular warfare cannot be won. In such kinds of conflict, use of force is but one factor, the others being factors like diplomatic, political and social. If strategy is the bridge between means and ends, then how does one apply the means to win political loyalty? It should not be totally about strategy but should be about the ultimate effects too. Keeping this in mind, the force application has to be applied accordingly. India conducts people-oriented operations unlike the operations undertaken by the US and Pakistan which are based on application of maximum firepower. The latter course has the disadvantage of alienating the very public which is to be protected and invite a backlash as being seen in the conflict in the Af-Pak region. It is important to mainstream the people and take out the aggressive streak. Therefore, we should ensure minimum collateral damage and prevent 3rd degree torture. While there is a certain degree of ethical dilemma, we have to overcome this challenge.

Discussion

The Army should not be engaged in prolonged irregular warfare. The Armed Forces Special Powers Act, 1958 or the AFSPA was enacted because of a political problem. It is important to protect your own people but political compulsions will always prove to be a challenge and will always remain supreme.

In order to embark on a strong perception management campaign, the central plank has to be truth. Dynamics of CI Ops changes rapidly posing a challenge to security forces. The political process must lead to problem resolution. As this has not taken place in recent years, it has led to a continuation of internal security problems.

Stability in Af-Pak and India's Interests: Amb Satish Chandra, former Deputy NSA

If stability in Af-Pak is taken to be the establishment of peace, law and order, and good neighbourly relations, then this stability is in India's interests. However, if stability in Af-Pak is envisaged as a strong dispensation of the region, which is inimical, that is not in India's interests. In fact, it could be argued that such a situation would be even worse than the current state of affairs, because if India has a stable neighbourhood that is prejudiced against it, it would not be a healthy circumstance. Therefore, it is unfortunate that terms such as 'stability' are used rather loosely in India, particularly in government circles, without a deeper appreciation of its implications.

The term 'Af-Pak' is also contentious, being as it is an artificial construct coined by the United States. The US regards Afghanistan and Pakistan together under this construct, as comprising one theatre of operations diplomatically and one challenge for its overall policy of dismantling and defeating the Al Qaeda. They fashioned this approach as they

were unable to address the 'War on Terror' effectively in Afghanistan, without effectively denying the Taliban and Al Qaeda safe sanctuary and support in the border areas of Pakistan. The intrinsic and basic flaw in this approach is that although Afghanistan and Pakistan share many commonalities, they are inherently very different countries. Pakistan has aided and abetted the Taliban and Al Qaeda in the past and continues to do so even now. Afghanistan on the other hand has always held a contrary stance. Pakistan views certain terrorist groups as strategic assets and uses them as instruments of foreign policy. The US has compounded this error by seeking Pakistani support against these forces, by holding out carrots, when it should've been threatening with sticks and coercion.

With regard to Afghanistan, the US is going to adhere to its plan of thinning down forces on the ground, commencing in July 2011. This process will continue gradually. The outcome of the withdrawal is not clear and many imponderables exist. However, the dice seems to be weighted in favour of the Taliban. Quite naturally, India will and should view a Taliban takeover or exercise of power with some concern. However, India's apprehension of a Taliban regime may be quite exaggerated. There is always the possibility that a Taliban dispensation in Kabul may not be a client instrument of Pakistan for all time to come, not just because it has leverages in that country, but also because the Durand Line issue will be there to keep the two sides apart. In the past, even while the Taliban were in power, they made efforts to get the Durand Line settled, without much success. One may also expect Pakistan to come out with a heavy hand against Afghanistan, which will also cause some alienation.

India's options are relatively limited. It has, at best, been a marginal player in Afghanistan in recent times. What India should do is to provide financial and technological support and continue its programmes of economic cooperation, which have earned an enormous amount of goodwill with the Afghan people. India should also develop and deepen contacts with all sections in Afghanistan. Its standing amongst the Pashtuns is currently not the best, a situation which should be rectified. It should also intensively develop coordinative approaches with regional players like Russia and Iran, relations with whom have diminished for a variety of reasons. At the same time, India should also reach out to the Taliban and develop contacts with them. Once in power, their national interests, over time, will lead them to view India more favourably – unless, of course, India treats them as untouchables now. It must also pursue a much more activist diplomacy to counter Pakistan's assertions that India is using its presence in Afghanistan to promote terrorism in Pakistan's southern regions. One step which India should not take is to supply Afghanistan with soldiers, i.e. 'boots on the ground'. Such a step would be counterproductive, expensive, and has no dearth of downsides to it.

With regard to Pakistan, India must recognise the reality of that country. Pakistan is a nation still in search of an identity. It was established on the basis of the Islamic religion, but that wasn't sufficient to keep it together, nor was it enough to build unity in the country. They have found value in anti-Indianism as a glue to hold the country together. Even the most well-meaning and reasonable among Pakistanis, below the surface, reveal a strong anti-Indianism.

There is institutional poverty in Pakistan. Not one institution, barring the media, is in good health. The bureaucracy is badly crippled and depleted, with a rot that was set in motion by Bhutto, with Zia hastening the rot by insisting on 20 per cent recruitment from the armed forces, and Musharraf completed its emasculation by shifting powers at the local level. The military dominates governance, and even today, despite its diminished popularity, the Pakistan Army is without a doubt the single most important institution in Pakistan, calling all the shots, more often than not, from behind the scenes. The very serious governance deficit in Pakistan may be attributed, in large part, to the Pakistan Army.

Pakistan suffers from many crippling fault lines which have been further exacerbated by mis-governance. Shia-Sunni violence plagues the country, along with regional tensions, a raging civil war in Balochistan, *Muhajir*-Sindhi confrontations, and landlord-tenant tensions in rural life. In the economic sphere, it is barely shy of a breakdown at this point in time, surviving solely on the dole from the US, China, Islamic countries and international organisation.

The spread of *jihadi* culture in the country is a direct outcome of the Pakistan state's and the Pakistan Army's deliberate cultivation of terrorists and of strengthening Islamic fundamentalism in the country. Javed Ahmed Ghamidi, a Pakistani Islamic scholar and preacher of some repute said, "Extremists have become stronger because they have street power behind them, and the liberal forces are weak and divided. If it continues like this, it could lead to the destruction of Pakistan." This statement is important because there is a persistent belief in India that there is an active civil society in Pakistan which must be catered for – one must be sceptical of such an entity, and it may well need to be discounted as it is too weak a breed to be able to make much of a difference.

India needs to understand very clearly that a friendly Pakistan is out of the question, therefore, a stable Pakistan is the wrong thing to pitch for. It is a country which has a single-point agenda of hurting India's interests, if not destroying them outright. In a sense, India itself has been responsible for the calamities wrought upon it, because in all the actions that Pakistan has undertaken against India – from 1947 till date – including the Khalistan situation, the 1993 blasts and riots, the insurrection in Kashmir, the hijacking – India has never penalised Pakistan. On the contrary, many Indian diplomats had even praised Pakistani leaders such as Musharraf, forgetting, perhaps, that he was the architect of Kargil. India needs to do the following:

- A vigorous campaign to project Pakistan as a terrorist state.
- Cessation of all dialogue with Pakistan, whether comprehensive or composite
- The US must be convinced to end their policy of molycoddling Pakistan.
- India should reconsider weapons' purchases from any country which also provides weapons' assistance to Pakistan.
- India should exercise full rights over the waters of the Indus, as legally permitted to it by the Indus Waters Treaty.

- India should be prepared for another 26/11, which would necessitate covert action (which must be authorised). Contingency plans must be prepared.
- Linkages must be revived with Iran and Russia.

These political and diplomatic measures must be accompanied by certain internal measures as well:

- India must take a relook at security systems including its nuclear deterrent.
- A Chief of Defence Staff (CDS) must be created.
- Mainstreaming of the Muslim community must be carried out, and there should not be even the slightest chance of a repetition of the Gujarat riots.
- The alienation in Kashmir should be effectively addressed on a bilateral basis between India and Kashmiris. Pakistan has no place in this situation.

Discussion

There is a viewpoint that Pakistani society is changing and there is a growing lobby, particularly amongst the younger generation, which is interested in developing ties with India. However, it must be kept in mind that the strength of the state and the Army in Pakistan is such that such friendly sentiments may never be the case with the majority. Also, while it did accept the aid that India supplied during its floods, it refused to do so bilaterally, insisting that the aid be routed through the United Nations.

While there is considerable economic and political fallout in India because of a perpetual conflict with Pakistan, it is worth noting that Pakistan has not held back in its actions against India. While the Taliban takeover in Afghanistan may not be completely positive for India, it won't be any worse than consistent Pakistani actions against India.

Foreign policy is only 5-10 per cent of a country's strength. Therefore, India must reinforce its internal security and stability in order to deter incoming action, as also be able to inflict pain outwards.

While India does not presently have any involvement in Balochistan, it would not be out of place for it to consider involvement of a financial nature, or even insofar as weapons' supplies are concerned, given that the Baloch have been severely victimised by the Pakistani state. However, the involvement of any external forces in Balochistan would be the tipping point therein.

In case of a US withdrawal from Afghanistan, it would require Pakistan's support in a lesser degree – an eventuality that India should exploit.

While anti-Americanism may well be higher than anti-Indianism in Pakistani public opinion, one must not forget that the key enemy for Pakistan is still India.

The Blackwill formula of partitioning Afghanistan, i.e. holding on to the north and leaving the south to the Taliban, is not advisable, as not only is the south the region where the

writ of terror runs large. And even if the south is consistently bombed to prevent terrorism from rising, such a partition will not lead to hermetically sealed regions. Apart from this reality, the Afghans will never be in favour of such a move.

India's Energy Security Imperatives: Ms Shebonti Ray Dadwal, Research Fellow, IDSA

Energy security plays a vital role in national security. Energy is not only vital for economic development but also has implications for other sectors, including defence. In fact, defence sector is one of the largest single consumers of energy. When policymakers advocate changes in the way we use energy for commercial and residential sectors, it also means that these vulnerabilities pose a vital national security risk for the nation. Since all economic activities require energy, the sustained availability of energy at affordable prices is a major concern of governments. How to alter energy consumption patterns to bring down the prices of oil and reduce vulnerability to imports is now a national security imperative.

Changing imperatives: The four traditional elements of global energy security in the 1970s were supply sources, demand centres, geopolitics (concentration of reserves) and market structures. These have in fact all changed over the past 30 years.

Indian energy scenario: India accounts for 17 per cent of the world's population. It accounts for 5 per cent of global energy consumption. India has limited available fossil fuels (coal, oil and gas). As a result, India's dependency on import is increasing. India's dependency on import of fossil fuels is rising: 70 per cent for coal in 2030 (14 per cent 2001), 94 per cent for oil in 2030 (75 per cent 2001), and 24 per cent for gas in 2030 (21 per cent 2001).

Current Challenges for India: Rapid economic growth needs huge energy inputs. Imports of oil, gas and coal is rising. It is projected that India will be the 3rd largest oil and gas importer by 2020. However, per capita energy consumption in India is 500 kilograms of oil equivalent (kgoe) that is still low. World's per capita energy consumption average is 1800 kgoe. There will be five-fold increase in energy induced CO₂ emissions between 2006 and 2030. Electricity sector accounts for 29 per cent of total CO₂ emissions.

The 3S: Sufficiency, surety and sustainability:

- **Sufficiency:** Energy security means it should have adequate energy resources to conduct critical missions.
- **Surety:** Ensuring resilient energy supplies that are accessible when needed.
- **Sustainability:** Energy supply must be available at the lowest cost while considering all requirements, as well as impact to mission, community, and environment.

Coal: If domestic coal production continues to grow at 5 per cent per year, the total (including proven, indicated and inferred) extractable coal reserves will run out in

around 45 years. Coal is considered as a large and reliable source of electricity globally. It is about 1/6th as capital intensive as natural gas per unit of delivered energy. However, coal has been linked with climate change. Debates continue on account of its high carbon content.

Natural Gas: Natural gas produces 50 per cent less CO₂ emissions. Natural gas faces problems in imports (transport and infrastructure). Projects like Iran-Pakistan-India (IPI), Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan-India (TAPI), and Myanmar-Bangladesh-India (MBI) are not feasible. LNG imports though promising, involves continued dominance of West Asia. India needs for SLOCs security and pipelines 'Unconventional' gas (shale gas, coal bed methane, gas hydrates).

Hydropower: Hydropower is currently generating electricity about 28,000 MW and has potential to increase around 148,700 MW. At least 14,000 MW capacity is under various stages of development. 15,000 MW is estimated potential from small, mini, and micro-hydel projects. Of this, about 2000 MW is exploited at present.

Nuclear: India is currently producing 4000 MW with nuclear and it will go up to 20,000 MW by 2020. There are several problems in producing electricity with nuclear. But low availability of domestic resources of uranium is the biggest problem. It is necessary to expand drive for uranium exploitation in the country (Jharkhand, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and Meghalaya), but is still at an exploratory stage. India should tap the international uranium markets.

Renewable Energy: Renewable energy (RE) is viewed from energy security perspective and not climate change. It is based on India's need for secure, affordable, and environmentally sustainable energy to address principal economic and development challenges that the country has been facing. From 2002 onwards, renewable grid capacity has increased almost five times and it is the fastest growing sector. It comprises 10.90 per cent of total grid installed capacity, contributing 4.13 per cent to the electricity generation mix.

Wind Energy: All sectors of RE are being developed. Wind power programme is the fastest (12,800 MW) contributing around 75 per cent of grid-connected RE power installed capacity. The level of capital subsidy being provided depends on the renewable resource and region, and varies from about 10-90 per cent of project cost.

Solar Energy: There is focus on developing solar energy. A target of 20,000 MW grid solar power, 2000 MW of off-grid capacity, including 20 million solar lighting systems and 20 million sq. m of solar thermal by 2022 has been set. The Union ministry of new and renewable energy (MNRE) plans to cover about 10,000 villages from biomass-based systems and over 1000 villages from solar power.

Word about China: China is busy in securing oil and gas fields around the world. It has invested around \$1,000 billion over 10 years. It is the leading producer of wind turbines.

It is making massive investments in electricity grid. It has stricter fuel-emission standards than many OECD countries, including the US.

Way Forward: The following measures can make positive contributions to energy security:

- Demand reduction: Energy conservation/ Energy efficiency requires across the board.
- Acquire new technologies and enhance R&D.
- Enunciate policy for low-emission coal-fired technologies and carbon capture and sequestration (CCS).
- Diversify supply sources.
- Enhance domestic supplies.
- Clean production (clean coal, CCS).
- Enhance nuclear generation capacity.
- India should enhance energy cooperation and diplomacy.
- India should decrease dependency on import of energy. It should increase domestic production through NELP (New Exploration Licencing Policy).
- India should buy foreign assets (coal, oil and gas).
- Create strategic petroleum reserves.
- Reform energy sector across the board.
- Improve efficiency/reduce energy intensity.
- In India, the share of RE should increase in overall energy production and consumption.

Day 2

China, Peaceful Rise or Strategic Challenge: Bharat Karnad, Centre for Policy Research

It is important to understand and analyse as to what is happening on the factual terrain in China. The rise of China is peaceful only in so far as it remains uncontested. According to the Chinese, good relations can be maintained as long as it is on China's terms where it would set the agenda. The US appears hesitant in clashing with China since it has developed a deep inter-dependent relationship with Beijing, which would hurt both nations in case they were to clash.

As far as the geo-strategic paradigm in Asia is concerned, India is China's sole challenger in today's context. A nation is judged by the enemies it keeps. Wars of annihilation are different from wars of manoeuvre. China has the upper edge in military terms since it is placed on a plateau from which it is rather easy to fight down; whereas India's operational capability is undermined owing to having to fight upwards. India has made a diplomatic blunder by giving up its 'Tibet card' so easily. In 2004, Prime Minister A B Vajpayee formalised Tibet as a sovereign concern for the Chinese. Thereafter, the Tibetans living in India are not even allowed to protest in a democratic fashion, which is very unfortunate. The Tibetans strongly feel that India has sold them out. While India is

providing all these privileges to the Chinese, on the other hand, the Chinese relentlessly raise the issue of its claim to the entire Indian state of Arunachal Pradesh at every given forum.

India should take comprehensive steps to ensure that the Chinese rise does not remain peaceful. The weakest link in India's deterrence chain is the frail political will which contrasts starkly with the decisiveness and focus of Chinese leadership.

New Delhi needs to absorb a fact that it's poised for a non-marginal war against a superior adversary namely, China. India needs to reassess its threat perception with respect to China which has largely gone unaddressed. To counter the Chinese challenge, India's military needs to substantially upgrade its capability to undertake offensive operations in the mountains. New Delhi also needs to seriously work upon its strategic reach against China and move out of its comfort zone of maintaining a defensive deterrent strategy.

China has chosen to undertake the asymmetric route (cyber war) to counter a superior adversary – US and plans to counter India, an inferior adversary through the conventional method. Given that India is currently in a situation of asymmetry with China as far as the force structure is concerned, it needs to re-energise the "Tibet" card. Hard power needs to be matched with the same and thus India should also achieve nuclear parity with China.

With the assistance of the massive infrastructure build-up in the areas bordering India, China will be able to assemble 22 divisions in two seasons along with airlift capabilities. The regular exercises being held in Tibet are proof of the intent behind. Having put the Taiwan issue in the back-burner, China reportedly is moving 1/3rd of its short-range ballistic missiles (SRBMs), of which quite a few are nuclear-tipped, into Tibet. China has stated that it would be prepared for fighting a war on the periphery in the next three decades. This is a source of concern and we must prepare accordingly.

China's military capabilities like targeting a moving carrier with missiles are aimed at challenging the US. We need to ask ourselves, whether with such an adversary, are we really prepared to be ready for what we call a "two-front" war?

**Complexities of National Security Decision Making Process:
Gen VP Malik, PVSM, AVSM (Retd), former COAS**

India's defence and security report card for last six decades has been positive in spite of reactive strategic policy and strategic/tactical surprises by enemy over the years. It has been possible primarily due to the prompt and selfless reaction of Armed Forces. The credit for this is due more to operational planning and its meticulous execution on ground by our armed forces rather than strategic foresight.

National security decision-making is impacted heavily by inter-personal relations and personalities of decision makers at national level. Thus it is imperative that individuals responsible for providing inputs for decision-making should have such qualities and work towards the overall national aim. The leader must be competent, bold and assertive. Service chiefs are still respected by our politicians and bureaucrats. However, we have to rise above petty personal gains and have the moral courage to face national scrutiny.

Prior to Kargil conflict, Service Chiefs were invited to attend Cabinet Committee on Security (CCS) meetings only on required basis. CCS meetings didn't pay desired importance to defence matters since it was pre-occupied with national security issues. Post-Kargil, a deliberate attempt to improve the national security decision making apparatus has been made, but it has still not reached the desired standard.

The national security mechanism based on recommendations of Kargil Review Committee has been restructured and to large extent has improved the synchronisation between various key players in national security decision making process. However, attitudinal changes required to implement these recommendations are still lacking. Chief of Defence Staff (CDS) as recommended by Kargil Review Committee has not been appointed till date by the government. Integrated Defence Staff (IDS) has been created but it remains a headless organisation till today, severely impacting its efficiency. The coordination at operational level has improved but at strategic level it still falls short.

National security decision-making during peace time is institutional and the decision-making loop is long and tedious. Service chiefs are not invited to attend the CCS meetings, therefore, are not in the national security loop. No initiatives are being taken at strategic level to improve the synchronisation amongst various key players impacting National security decision making. All these agencies continue to work in water tight compartments. Coordination between Ministry of External Affairs (MEA) and Ministry of Defence (MoD) is lacking.

Decision-making during a war like situation is quite different as compared to peace time. During war, CCS is very responsive to the Service Chiefs, but this is unfortunately lacking during peacetime. If CCS doesn't give attention to requirements of defence forces during peacetime, it would adversely affect our preparedness for war. This aspect needs to be urgently looked into. However, for a sound politico-military decision making process, consensus amongst all three service chiefs is also desired.

Discussion

The probability of full scale conventional wars between nations is gradually receding as an option for settling disputes. Most conflicts in future will occur in the form of sub-conventional/Unconventional/ low intensity conflicts. Security forces personnel will continue to find themselves employed in non-traditional roles characteristically found at the lower end of the spectrum of conflict. At Line of Control (LOC) a junior leader today is expected to understand political consideration while a politician is required to

understand the complexities of military operations. In a sense, the separation between strategic, operational and tactical level of conflict is blurring. We can also expect very rigid political terms of reference during operations in future and train ourselves for it. The orders to evict Pakistani intruders without crossing LOC and limiting the escalation during Kargil conflict is a fine example of rigid political term of reference. Hence, to achieve a continuous control of escalatory ladder it is absolutely essential to keep military leadership in national security decision-making loop.

Political definition of goals and military objective is complex. As political goals are uncertain and indirect, the military has to learn to anticipate political directions keeping in mind the political decision making culture of our democracy and train to meet those challenges. Mobilisation of International support during war is absolutely essential. Ensure minimum casualties and collateral damage will be supportive of this aim.

To stand tall in front of nation and political masters, we in the defence forces must have courage of conviction and maintain a clean record. Our senior officers must have the moral courage to stand up for what is correct for the nation and for the defence forces. The role of the senior leadership in this aspect is vital.

Every nation requires strategically effective advice from military leadership to its political leadership. However, our military leaders today are not in a position to render strategic advice, since they probably are not adequately trained for it. We have to generate strategic discussions to train our military leadership today. We must demonstrate understanding of strategic issues to win over the confidence of decision-makers at national level.

War is a continuation of politics, therefore, synchronisation between political masters and military leadership is absolutely essential. However, higher directions of war can't be given in water tight compartments. The turf wars between various agencies involved in national security decision-making is detrimental to the national interests. There is a need to review the present higher defence control system in the country. The oversight by Parliamentary Standing Committee on Defence expenditure has not been very effective since most of its members don't understand the nuances of national security and don't have national perspective. The intelligence agencies have a major role in feeding accurate assessment to national security decision-makers. However, the coordination amongst intelligence agencies needs improvement. The democracy has its own ramifications and will continue to function under uncertainties and associated limitations. It is imperative that all organs of state including military work in a coordinated and cohesive manner to guard our national interests.

**Nuclear Deterrence in Indian Context – Air Commodore:
Jasjit Singh, AVSM, VrC, VM (Retd), Director, Centre for Air Power Studies**

Nuclear deterrence is meaningless if it is not credible. Though there is no check list of what constitutes credible deterrence, it should be in the eyes of the adversary and not in our own. India has adopted the doctrine of No First Use (NFU). The doctrine lays down

the principles and concepts which lay down the strategy and the tactics to be followed. The document places heavy emphasis on survivability. To ensure this, we have to think like the enemy. We have to analyse as to what could be his targets on our soil. The document will then translate into the counter strike strategy. Interestingly, all wars that India has fought have been counter attack. The credibility of deterrence relies on ability and the capacity that is available when deterrence fails. There is no way to check whether credibility has been successful, it can only be judged. In the Indian context, it is our capability to strike back if deterrence fails.

During the Cold War years, no nuclear weapons were used by the rival groups. That does not mean that the deterrence was credible, because nuclear capable countries did brandish their weapons at times. If our adversary uses nuclear weapons, what should we base our nuclear strategy on? The first point to be considered is the ability to counter strike and thus survivability becomes important. Another important question is as to whose survivability is more important – the war head, the delivery mechanism or the national command authority. The most important is the survivability of the warhead and delivery system. The next crucial aspect is the communication system. Today's communication systems are space based and they can be destroyed. If that happens, deterrence will fail, without any nuclear weapons being fired.

The centres of vulnerability have to be identified to guarantee survivability. The first vulnerability is the delivery system. If the enemy can neutralise all the airfields capable of launching nuclear weapons, then the deterrence of aerial strike has failed. Added to this is the vulnerability of the communication system. Therefore, the placement of the delivery system is important as it is an effective counter to the enemy's first strike even with leadership and communication failure.

There are certain essentials for credibility, communication being the most important one. Fibre optics are most likely to survive and thus should be strengthened. Another way to maintain communication could be sending up a low orbit satellite which will provide communication for a short while. This can be backed up by another quick launch low cost satellite, e.g. a micro satellite. The next essential is to increase the accuracy of ballistic missiles; which means that we have to build missiles to make the adversary's missiles redundant. In an environment which is nuclear, our conventional capabilities should be superior, so that we can make the adversary's weapons unusable. Next, we should have a credible threat of punishment and target the technological and industrial areas of the enemy. When the enemy launches a missile there is no way of assessing the type of warhead it is carrying – nuclear or conventional. To cater to all possibilities, ballistic missile defence should be built up. However, here lies a contradiction, survivability requires dispersal of capabilities. The more these are dispersed more places are required to be covered by ballistic missile defence. This is costly and takes time to build up.

Nuclear disarmament is written into the nuclear doctrine. However, it should be global and non-discriminatory. Disarmament is important because nuclear weapons complicate Indian security issues and is a national security imperative.

Discussion

India's weapon stockpile is adequate vis-à-vis our adversaries.

The Pakistan army will not allow its nuclear weapons to fall into the hands of *jehadi* elements. The only risk in the safety of the nuclear weapons of Pakistan is if the army splits along fundamental lines.

Economic Security in the Indian Context: Dr Mohan Guruswamy, Chairman and Founder, Centre for Policy Alternatives

Economic security, in the context of politics and international relations, is the ability of a nation-state to follow its choice of policies to develop its economy in the manner desired. Historically, conquest of nations have made conquerors rich through plunder, access to new resources and enlarged trade through controlling of the conquered nations' economy. In today's complex system of international trade, characterised by multi-national agreements, mutual inter-dependence and availability of natural resources etc, economic security is an important component of national security.

Comprehensive National Power (CNP) is a putative measure, important in the contemporary political thought of the People's Republic of China, of the general power of a nation-state. Unlike most Western concepts of political power, Chinese political thinkers believe that CNP can be calculated numerically by combining various quantitative indices to create a single number held to measure the power of a nation-state. These indices take into account both military factors (known as hard power) and economic and cultural factors (known as soft power).

CNP is notable for being an original Chinese political concept with no roots in contemporary Western political theory, Marxism-Leninism, or pre-20th century Chinese thinking. Within Chinese political thought, the main goal of the Chinese state is to maximise China's CNP. The inclusion of economic factors and soft power measures within most CNP indices is intended to prevent China from making the mistake of the Soviet Union in overinvesting in the military at the expense of the civilian economy.

Asia's share of GDP exceeds that of European Union and the United States, but is GDP really a key measure of CNP? However, everyone is excited about India because it shows the most rapid growth potential of the BRIC countries. Price Waterhouse Coopers (PWC) also said in its report that by 2030 the top 10 world economies could be China, followed by the US, India, Japan, Brazil, Russia, Germany, Mexico, France and Britain. The current 10 largest economies, according to 2008 data from the International Monetary Fund, are the US, Japan, China, Germany, France, Britain, Italy, Russia, Spain and Brazil.

The report also pointed to an increasing share of global GDP taken up by China and India, compared to the US and the European Union. As per PWC, the proportion in 2010 will be 20 per cent for the US, 21 per cent for the EU, 13 per cent for China and 5

per cent for India. But by 2030 that will have changed to 16 per cent for the US, 15 per cent for the EU, 19 per cent for China and 9 per cent for India. Jim O'Neill, chief global economist for US investment bank Goldman Sachs, forecast last November that China will overtake the US by 2027 – 14 years earlier than a previous Goldman Sachs forecast of 2041 made in 2003.

While these aspects look positive, it is important to question grim realities of India. One grim external factor is India's oil production and consumption pattern. We import majority of the resources needed in the country and added to that, we have failed to industrialise. Almost 94 per cent of our working class is employed in un-organised sectors. One important reason for the large share of FDI into China going to the manufacturing sector is its efficient and competitive labour market

The average labour cost in China was about \$729 per year during 1994-99. In India, the corresponding figure was much higher at \$1192 indicating an advantage for China in terms of lower labour costs. However, recent reports suggest that this advantage is largely going down. Concentration of FDI in Services is not necessarily a good thing. Manufacturing creates jobs. The industrial sector in China employs 22 per cent of its total labour force and accounts for over 50 per cent of its GDP. In India, however, only 17 per cent of the labour force is part of the industrial sector and it only accounts for around 26 per cent of GDP. Services sector does not have a similar employment effect, largely for the skilled workforce. As of 2002, according to NASSCOM figures, IT only employed 820,000 personnel or about 1.8 per cent of the workforce. By 2008, this only went up to 2 million.

Some of the grim realities of India are:

- 62 per cent of agricultural land is rainfed. 64.8 per cent of the population is linked to agriculture for livelihood either as cultivators or as agricultural laborers. Rural workforce is about 320 million. Overall agriculture scenario is bleak.
- According to the revised norms over 40 per cent of the population is BPL.
- 83.5 per cent of all households (176.5 million) are below median per capita of Rs.17,736 per annum. Income inequality – Gini coefficient increasing.
- Regional imbalances growing.
- 34.6 per cent illiterate.
- Employment in organised sector stagnating at around 31 million for past 5 years.
- Government capital expenditure for development now down to less than 12 per cent of budget.

It is imperative that the Indian government takes the following actions:

- Industrialise to create jobs.
- Educate and provide a way to impart vocational training to youth for jobs in industrial sector. Reduce undersupply.
- Invest in irrigation to reduce ecological damage and increase farm productivity. Consolidate holdings.

- Build infrastructure. Eliminate bottlenecks in roads, ports and railway connectivity.
- Speed reforms to make power sector profitable and investment worthy, labor productive and India investment friendly.
- Address regional inequality issues.
- Reform government and decentralise

Day 3

Internal Security Challenges: Shri GK Pillai, Home Secretary, Government of India

We are still struggling with some of the hangovers of Partition. Fortunately, our Constitution was well drafted by bringing in much of inclusiveness. Fifth and Sixth Schedules have given a sense of belonging and self governance to many historically marginalised communities. Constitutional guarantees to panchayat raj through 73rd and 74th amendments were one of the best things that we did for ourselves. Apart from giving voice to the grassroots, the setup has created avenues for future political leadership. Our major strength, overall, is our vibrant and functioning democracy.

Situation in the north-east has improved dramatically. Violent incidents are only sporadic. Insurgency remains as one of the largest industries in the north-east today in the form of extortion and kidnapping; ideology is no more a motivation. Left Wing Extremism has emerged as a potent force to deal with. This was mainly because of the failure of the state governments to act promptly and adequately. Maoists are now moving to other areas from Central India. In Jammu & Kashmir, the situation is by-and-large satisfactory; we have now reached out to the people than just focusing on the elite. Terrorism in the hinterland is another issue that haunts our internal security. We could break some modules, but there are many sleeper cells that are active. The latest threat has come in the form of pirates who have managed to reach up to our shores. India also confronts several non-military security threats in the form of bad governance, illegal migration, cyber terrorism, environmental degradation, climate change, organised crime, and counterfeit currencies. Forces in Pakistan especially have been pumping counterfeit currency through Nepal, Malaysia and Dubai. The most disturbing factor is linkage between terrorism and organised crime.

Our response to these multiple threats has so far been good. We have set up regional hubs of NSGs; the Multi Agency Centre has been strengthened. We have set up the National Investigating Agency. We have also been concentrating on strengthening and modernisation of state police forces. Our media management has also been good. A lot however still needs to be done.

We are the most under-policed country in the world. Present police-population ratio is just 128 per lakh. Our plan is to raise police-pop ratio to 220 by 2016. It is also true that most police forces are concentrated in urban areas catering to middle and upper

classes. This has made it easy for the Maoists to declare un-policed areas as “liberated zones”.

We have presently eight lakh vacancies; it will take at least a decade to catch up. The onus lies mainly on the states, but this aspect is being pursued. It is important to have transparent, merit-based recruitment system to ensure effectiveness of the force. We also have to emphasise on mid-career training and on creating quality training infrastructure. It would be preferable if the capacity of the state police is enhanced rather than on increasing the deployment of central forces in states.

Yet another issue is poor population-judges ratio that is just 1.02 per lakh. Criminal justice system requires reforms. In this regard, response from state governments is not satisfactory. To improve accountability, the Justice Accountability Bill is on the anvil but has opposition. There is also an urgent need to amend Bar Council of India Act to churn out good lawyers.

There are also several governance issues that have to be sorted out in a timely manner. People’s expectations have been increasing. Illegal migration in the long run will pose a very serious challenge. For instance, by 2030 when Bangladesh gets affected by climate change, of them may come to India. As a result of environment degradation, people will be fighting over food and water in the future. Cyber terrorism is another silent threat that will increase in intensity in the future. Thousands of Indian computers are hacked everyday by the Chinese and the Pakistanis. Such attacks will increase further in the future. In the coming years, because of ‘youth bulge’ and their rising expectations, India is expected to be more turbulent. We do not have an internal security strategy mainly because of several conflicting views on the subject. Things, however, are improving and ways and means will be found to effectively tackle all our challenges.

Meeting the Maoist Challenge:

Dr Mohan Guruswamy, Chairman and Founder, Centre for Policy Alternatives

Left Wing Extremism (LWE) is India’s war on India. In this war, mainly the tribal areas are affected, being the epicenter of LWE. The shift from social democratic based policies towards market based system accelerated India’s growth in nineties, which is further likely to grow to double digits in near future. At the same time the country faces a huge challenge in the young profile of the population to meet the aspirations of the youth. The problem gets compounded with the growing number of people living below poverty line, even though the trend may show a dip in percentage terms since independence.

Adivasis are believed to be the aboriginal people of India and in official-speak they are known as Scheduled Tribes or ST’s. The Constitution of India, Article 366 (25) defines Scheduled Tribes as *“such tribes or tribal communities or part of or groups within such tribes or tribal communities as are deemed under Article 342 to the Scheduled Tribes*

(ST's) for the purposes of this Constitution". The 2001 Census classified 84.33 million persons as Scheduled Tribes, corresponding to 8.2 per cent of the total population, of which more than 50 per cent live in central region. A long process of turning forest areas into a source of revenue and timber, and exploitation of the mineral resources, has led to deforestation, loss of livelihood and displacement of peoples.

The failure of Hinduisation to provide for any improvement in the status of the *Adivasis*, and failure of the government to provide even modicum of development has given room for newer kind of proselytisms like Maoism. The creeping encroachment of the Christian missionaries who with their deep pockets and pocketbook conversions promise an exit from the material drudgery of life have further compounded the problem. The V and VI Schedule of the constitution under Article 244 were instituted to provide protection to tribals; however the various governments have failed to deliver on this. Under Schedule V the governors down the line have failed to administer these tribal areas and have never exercised their power in safe guarding their legitimate interest. While the UPA government has drafted the Scheduled Tribes (Recognition of Forest Rights) Bill in 2005 but it has failed to act upon it due to pressure from various lobbies.

Mineral Wealth Woes: An International Labour Organisation (ILO) funded report on India's indigenous population claims that more than half the country's mineral wealth is obtained by violating the rights of tribals. In 1991, out of the 4,175 mines in the country, 3,500 were in tribal areas. The report highlighted that between 1950 and 1991 at least 2,600,000 people were displaced by mining projects of which only 25 per cent received any resettlement. Also, the profits were all cornered by the mining industries with a pittance being paid as royalty to the government. While the government is now considering raising the royalty rates, how much of this will trickle down to the people is questionable. In 2007 the Andhra Pradesh government, reneged on pre-election promises and signed agreements with Jindal, South West and Anrak to mine bauxite near Vizagapatam. This is estimated to displace over 100,000 tribal's while creating jobs for a mere four hundred.

How large is the Red Corridor: M. Ganapathi , General Secretary, CPI(Maoist) while commenting on Prime Minister's statement had said *"We are indeed flattered by such statistics. But one thing we can understand from the Prime Minister's statement, i.e. how much of a nightmare we have become to the reactionary ruling classes of India. It is an exaggeration to say that Maoists control that many districts, but our influence goes beyond that."* By keeping the reply conveniently vague, Ganpathy highlighted the impact of or relevance of red corridor.

The Growing Cost of Maoist Extremism: There have been 5800 Naxal-related violent incidents in the past three years. The statistics reveal that the ratio of government fatalities from Maoist-related violence is more than those recorded during the peak of Kashmir insurgency. Though 107 Maoists have so far been killed this year, in the last 6 weeks alone Naxalites have killed 108 CRPF soldiers and 136 civilians, causing strident demands that the Indian Army be deployed in the affected region.

What has fanned the spread of Maoism?

Some of the reasons are:

- Failure to provide good governance, development, un-abetted corruption and non implementation of V/ VI Schedule.
- Continued isolation and exploitation of tribals and their homelands.
- Inability of the Indian elite to see it as anything more than a law and order problem, there by reliance on force rather than reform of government.
- Absence of local self government and any say in managing their affairs.
- The role of outsiders, Hindu revivalists, Christian missionaries, Maoists and the conflicts between the proselytisers.
- Rising expectations due to education and television.

Clearly the government needs to think its way through this more carefully and with far greater intelligence than it has shown itself capable of so far. It must be able to distinguish *Adivasi* aspirations from Maoist intentions. The former needs to be nurtured while the later needs to be defeated. But the problem is that this is beyond the capability of the public administration apparatus we have in place now. So what needs to be done? Some suggestions are:

- Implement the provisions of the Indian Constitution with regard to the tribals.
- Create self-governing districts in tribal majority areas.
- Give tribal people ownership rights over community lands and designated forest areas.
- Create a new Civil Service for tribal areas.
- All royalties and income flowing from mineral and forest wealth should directly flow back to tribal areas.
- Compute the outflow of wealth so far and create a specific fund for tribal areas to build social and economic infrastructure

Discussion

Development and security have to be under taken simultaneously. There is a need to revitalise the leadership. The accountability has to be fixed for authorities responsible for governance; otherwise giving money to same authorities under INP scheme, who in first place itself were responsible for the current situation, will never reach the tribals. There is a need to create a separate civil administration stream to cater for the ground realities of the tribal areas. Mechanisms to be instituted to ensure that the funds allotted for the tribal areas are spent for their development. The present system of command of CPOs by IPS officers at higher ranks has glaring deficiencies. The leadership structure and training for CPOs involved in Maoist operations should be on the lines of Indian Army, having their dedicated cadre at all levels.