



ISSN Print: 2394-7500
ISSN Online: 2394-5869
Impact Factor: 5.2
IJAR 2017; 3(5): 686-691
www.allresearchjournal.com
Received: 10-03-2017
Accepted: 11-04-2017

Pavan Kumar
Guest Faculty and PhD
Candidate, INP, CIPOD/SIS,
JNU, New Delhi, India

Going beyond survival: The analogy of prodigious Indian defence expenditure and human security

Pavan Kumar

Abstract

According to SIPRI yearbook 2013, India's military expenditure in 2012 was US\$46.1 billion, ranking 8th, with 2.6% of the total world share. At the same time India is still among the poorest countries, with US\$1219 per capita income (nominal), ranking 142nd in the world. Also the per capita purchasing power parity (PPP) of India remained US\$3,608 (ranking 129th in World). According to World Bank's report 2012, the malnutrition level in children remained 47 %, which is double of sub-Saharan Africa. The irony of India being one of the largest spenders of military expenditure contradicts with harsh realities that India is facing in the form of growing poverty, health crisis, poor infrastructure and many other numerous problems. The overemphasis on one dimension of security that is essentially understood as threats emanating from beyond borders remains therefore problematic. Owing to the scarce resources, this debate of colossal defence spending needs retrospection and the ambit of security should be, therefore, expanded.

Therefore in this paper, I intend to explore the multidimensional meaning of security, the analogy between the stupendous defence expenditure on the one hand, which is maintained at the cost of copious domestic problems, of millions of malnourished children, growing farmer's suicide, increasing unemployed and uneducated young population on the other hand. What derives the states to spend on military budget excessively at the cost of security of its people which is more than survival? Why external threats are given priorities over internal threats? What comes in security first; can India become a great power without greatness in domestic sphere?

Keywords: Analogy, Indian defence expenditure, human security

1. Introduction

Issues of Security are primary objective for individuals as well as for groups. State is also a larger group who claims to provide the security to its citizens. Thomas Hobbes writes in his analysis in *Leviathan*, psychology of individuals and states in an anarchic environment lead them to be fearful and uncertain about the intentions of the others. There is a state of war of all against all. So need of a leviathan become urgent to solve the problem of anarchy and state of nature. There is a jungle out there. But in the state of nature in international politics, states are left with only one option for their survival that is self help and always prepared for war. This analysis which was later given a systemic shape by Kenneth Waltz in his Theory of international politics provided the background for considering state as the primary unit for survival and security.

Later after the end of cold war this analysis was challenged as more people were insecure in their home states. There was rampant poverty, unemployment and civil wars within the states. States whose primary responsibility was to give protection to its citizen were violation of the norms be it Indian army in Kashmir or Pakistani army in Baluchistan. States are spending a heavy amount of public money in the name of giving security from outside threats were at the same time were creating conditions for inside threats for the lives of citizens.

This paper which is focused in Indian state, will seek to problematize the state centric understanding of security. India who is the 8th largest defence spender in the world is also the ranks lowest when it comes to spend on education and health. In the name of providing security to its citizen it is creating a culture of militarization in the subcontinent and within the state also. The numbers of personnel deployed to solve the internal issues in Kashmir, North east and in resource rich areas of central India is serious issue which needs a discussion at larger level for the security of its citizens.

Correspondence
Pavan Kumar
Guest Faculty and PhD
Candidate, INP, CIPOD/SIS,
JNU, New Delhi, India

The paper is divided into 5 sections. First section deals with theoretical issue of survival in international relations theory and its applicability to Indian state in. This section will also discuss the dilemma of defence spending.

Second section will deal the concept of security. Why question of survival are not enough? What do we mean by survival and security and why survival plus are needed?

Third sections will deal with the concept of survival plus in theory and in Indian context its importance. Educations, health, security of Indian citizens are discussed in this section.

Fourth section deals with the interconnection of survival methods (Military expenditure) and security issues. It also goes into the question of politics of survival and survival plus.

Last section will ask for emancipator measures from scholars as well as from activist to fight against the unjust concept to free the humanity from all forms of exclusions and oppressions.

What is survival in international politics?

International relations as discipline have always been dominated by state centric view of Realism. For realist state is the coherent and unitary actor. Domestic issues also have importance but for theoretical usefulness state is considered as the most important actors in the international system. States are the units whose interactions form the structure of international political system (Waltz 1979 p.93, 95) [18]. Question of survival is about the survival of states in international system which is anarchic in nature. There is no world government and rule of law which can punish the violator and this left state in the position to adopt self help as the only way out for survival from the outside threats. Thomas Hobbes writes that there is a jungle out there and there is no rule of law in anarchy or state of nature (Hobbes ch.1, 13 cited in Forde 1992). self help is necessarily the principal of action in an anarchic order.

Therefore domestic politics is different from international politics in terms of ordering principle. Kenneth Waltz writes that a National system (comprised of individual) is not of self help. Public agencies help them from use of private force and violence [1]. But international system is anarchic where survival is at the stake and fear of cheating and relative gains always force them to build more capabilities (Mearshimier 2001). Capabilities are in terms of military capability because that helps to maintain your sovereignty and integrity. For military capability there are two options available in front of a state, one is internal balancing by building more defence capability and external balancing by making alliances (Waltz 1979 p.164) [18]. This game of power and struggle is evident more among the great powers who want to shape the world according to their interests. Small powers are concerned with their survival questions. But another reality of the international politics is that a state rarely dies. And to survive they have to maintain a certain amount of military capabilities. It builds its military capabilities in order to be autonomous and sometimes the military build-up is caused by the threat in the region rather than a single power abroad (Walt 1985). Indian case is much similar to this situation where it has "threats" from Pakistan and china, but the question is –can this threat be diminished with more arms or something else.

India's perceived traditional National Security Threats

Birth of two separate nations in 1947 laid the foundation for future conflicts. Pakistan and India were made two separate states on the basis of religion. e security configuration in the sub-continent was conditioned by the existence of two nation states whose creation and existence stemmed from religious antipathy, by the 'two nations' theory which held that Hindus and Muslims could only co-exist in separate nation states, and by profound mutual mistrust bordering on hatred. Partition was neither a complete nor a compulsory process. In India currently some 80 million-and Indian leaders have habitually assumed that the primary allegiance of the Muslim minority was towards Pakistan. They thus constituted an internal threat and a potential fifth column. This idea has become lodged in the public imagination. Following are the key perceived threat to India.

Pakistan

India has fought three major wars with Pakistan in 1948, 1965 and 1971. There was war in 1999 in Kargil also. Pakistan which was founded on the basis of religion has not achieved the goal of a democratic state. Recent completion of five year term of elected government should be considered as good sign for the stability of the neighbour state. India have dispute over Kashmir, Siachin Glacier, Runn of Kutch and other boundaries with Pakistan. Most of the time Pakistan is ruled by military dictators and USA has been giving military aids to Pakistan which has been used for terrorism against India. Issue of Kashmir is the most important issue for both the countries because for India when it wants to be great power and declares itself a secular state it can't give up Kashmir on the basis of religion. India has been using military forces and laws like AFSPA to suppress the voices of dissents.

There is no single authority in Pakistan to whom India can talk. Pakistan is divided among three rulers-military, mullah and mantri (elected representative). In the background of religious fundamentalism, anti India rhetoric's and acts of terrorism India considered Pakistan as a threat to Indian union.

China

India's borders (a significant part of which are disputed) cover nearly 7,000 km of its 16,000 km of land frontiers. Here it should be remembered that over 94,000 sq km of northeast India is claimed by China (not to mention another 60,000 sq km in northwest India occupied by Pakistan). Jawaharlal Nehru, first Indian prime minister considered Hindi Chini Bhai Bhai but in 1962 china did not respected this and India fought a war with china and lost it. India lost its territory to china in Aksai chin also. There is dispute over NEFA also and they consider Arunachal Pradesh as part of china. From that day India never trusted china again and started building weapons and strengthens its army, navy and air force. China became nuclear power in 1962 and India did explosion in response to this is 1974 and 1998 (as realist suggests). China occupied Tibet and India allowed Dalai Lama and others to live in Dharamshala in Himachal Pradesh. Today china is the fastest growing economy of the world and India serves as market to it, what kind of threats we can see from Chinese side. China is operating in South China Sea and claiming that this belongs to china. This shows its expansionist behaviour. Controlling sea lines of communication is very necessary for trade. Recent conflict

in Ladakh confirmed china's expansionist behaviour but at the same time solving the issue through negotiation is sign that they are changing their interest and expectations from each other.

Apart from these two threats to its national security India also have threats from Bangladeshi migrants and there has been history of LTTE. But at present both are not of a grave importance. India helped Bangladesh to get statehood but later it had border and water disputes with India.

Maritime security is has become the key concern of Indian security. As India becoming a key player in the region as china also trying to dominate sea lanes of communication Indian interest are at stake. Earlier when India had little aspiration it was confined to its land borders only but growing trade and terrorist attach through sea routes raised the importance of sea. In any meaningful geostrategic sense, India is a continental state, and hence a land power. It is true that India was colonized by European sea power. Nevertheless, India has not faced a threat on its shores, even remotely, since 1971, nor is one likely to emerge in the foreseeable future. India's main adversaries share disputed land borders with it. This is the geostrategic reality of Indian power.

Available option for Survival

According to realist logic of security China is a great threat to India because it shares border with India and is helping Pakistan also in arms build-up and other things. United States of America with 40 percent of share in world defence expenditure cannot be matched. Look on the defence expenditure of these countries-

China- \$166 billion, 2 % of GDP

India-\$46.1Billion, 2.5 % of GDP

Pakistan-\$6.9 Billion, 2.7 % of GDP

Bangladesh- \$1.5 Billion, 1.1 % of GDP

Sri Lanka- \$1.4 Billion, 2.4 % of GDP (Based on sipri year book 2013) From this analysis one thing is very clear and that is china is far far ahead to us in arms expenditure and capabilities to which we cannot match in near future, if we try to do we will be destroyed internally in many sectors like health and education. Expenditure in comparison to china will be foolishness. On the other hands Pakistan is far far behind in expenditure and capabilities. Apart from that Indian is a nuclear country who can deter any threats from the region. So question of survival is nowhere in danger. A heavy amount of defence expenditure is used to buy arms from USA, France, Israel and Russia. So in a sense India is spending a heavy amount on defence without any clear strategy.

Concept and definitions of security

Security is equated with survival in realist theory of international relations. Whenever we talked about security it was about the security of the state from external threats which is the result of realist domination in the discipline (Booth 2007). But it is not about merely survival. Security has meaning which is more than survival. Some of the definitions of security are as follows-Kenneth Waltz with other occupied the space of national security issues. For realist state was a unitary and rational actor and because of security dilemma state can't trust each other and the only solution for survival is building up more arms for its own survival or self-help. So national security means reduction in threats in military terms.

The traditional approach, which characterizes the period before and during the cold war, refers to national security as the security of the state and narrowly concentrated on military threats. According to Walter Lippmann, "national security is closely associated with the ability of a nation to deter an attack or to defend itself successfully if attacked. Security meant that a nation is secure to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice core values, if it wishes to avoid war and is able to, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war." This overwhelmingly military character of security is based on the assumption that principle threat to security come from beyond the border of a nation.

The modern approach, which characterizes the period after the end of the cold war, has extended the concept of national security beyond the above scope and defines it in a holistic sense. Apart from military concerns and national perspective, it covers almost all the non military aspects and non state factors of security from economic security to environmental security, and from societal security to human security. In this case there is no difference between national security and overall security. UNDP defines security as follows:

"With the dark shadows of the cold war receding, one can now see that many conflicts are within nations rather than between nations. For most people, a feeling of insecurity arises more from worries about daily life than from the dread of a cataclysmic world event. Will they and their families have enough to eat? Will they lose their jobs? Will their streets and neighbourhoods be safe from crime? Will they be tortured by a repressive state? Will they become a victim of violence because of their gender? Will their religion or ethnic origin target them for persecution?"

In the final analysis, human security is a child who did not die (because there was no shortage of food and medicine), a disease that did not spread, a job that was not cut (no unemployment), an ethnic tension that did not explode in violence (ethnic tolerance), a dissident who was not silenced (democracy). Human security is not a concern with weapons—it is a concern with human life and dignity." (UNDP, 1994:229). –Steve smith

Is survival equal to security?

In the powerful words of ken booth survival is about life and security is about living. Survival is about continuing to exist. It is an existential condition. But what is the importance of individual to just living without any dignity and basic rights. What is the point of living continuously in the conditions of fear, inequality discrimination, exploitation and oppression? It should be survival plus where individuals have freedom to make choices. Meaning of living is in the ability to ask the question why?

Security is not just about survival. It is about survival plus (Booth 2007 p.102). Security is a condition that is not difficult to define; in each case the starting point should begin in the experiences, imaginings, analyses and fears of those who are living with insecurity, ill-health or low status. Those who lack it can define it better than anyone else (Booth 2007 p.98).

Survival Plus and India

The main questions that are being asked today are security from what, when, where and how. David. A. Baldwin asked some questions regarding security in his article on concept

of security which includes Security for which values?, How much security?, From what threats? By what means? At what cost? (Baldwin 1997)

Health conditions

India has been ranked 136th, evaluated for human development index (HDI) - a measure for assessing progress in life expectancy, access to knowledge and a decent standard of living or gross national income per capita. The World Bank estimates that India is ranked 2nd in the world of the number of children suffering from malnutrition, where 47% of the children are malnourished (World Bank Report 2009) [21]. The prevalence of underweight children in India is among the highest in the world, and is nearly double of African countries. The UN estimates that 2.1 million Indian children die before reaching the age of 5 every year – four every minute – mostly from preventable illnesses such as diarrhoea, typhoid, malaria, measles and pneumonia. Every day, 1,000 Indian children die because of diarrhoea alone. Approximately 1.72 million children die each year before turning one (Sharma 2011). As more than 122 million households have no toilets, and 33% lack access to latrines, over 50% of the population (638 million) defecate in the open.(2008 estimate) This is relatively higher than Bangladesh and Brazil (7%) and China (4%)(UNICEF 2011).

Food security-Ensuring food security ought to be an issue of great importance for a country like India where more than one-third of the population is estimated to be absolutely poor and one-half of all children malnourished in one way or another (world bank report 2009) [21]. The 2011 Global Hunger Index (GHI) Report ranked India 15th, amongst leading countries with hunger situation (2011 Global Hunger Index Report". International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI).). There has been many emerging issues in the context of food security in India in the last two decades. These are:

- Impact of Economic liberalization on agriculture and food security;
- Establishment of WTO: particularly the Agreement on Agriculture under it;
- climate change challenge; crisis of food prices, fuel prices, and financial crisis;
- The phenomenon of hunger amidst plenty,;
- introduction of targeting in the Public Distribution System (PDS) for the first time in the 1990s; (vi) ‘Right to Food’ campaign for improving food security in the country and the Supreme Court Orders on mid-day meal schemes;
- Proposal for National Food Security Law (Right to Food); and
- Monitor able targets under the Tenth and Eleventh Five Year Plans similar to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) on poverty and women and child nutrition.

These developments in the last two decades have provided both opportunities and challenges for food and nutrition security of the country. FAO defines food security as a condition when ‘all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food which meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life’.

HIV/AIDS: Over a period of 17 years, India’s HIV-infected population has shot up from two persons to 5.1 million. According to official figures, which for methodological reasons almost certainly understate the problem, nearly one per cent of India’s adult population is now carrying the deadly virus, according to official sources. India’s HIV/AIDS infection rate has perhaps not yet reached the statistically and epidemiologically important one per cent mark among the general population, but let us also note that some Indian cities and regions are already reporting more than five per cent infection rates

Table 1: Governments Expenditure for survival and Survival Plus- Major Players

State/sector	Military (percentage of GDP)	Health (percentage of GDP)	Education (percentage of GDP)
USA	\$628 Bn, 2.5%	8.2	5.6
CHINA	\$166 Bn, 2.0%	2.89	4.0
RUSSIA	\$90.7 Bn, 4.4%	3.7	4.10
UK	\$60.8 Bn, 2.5%	7.7	6.3
JAPAN	\$59.3 Bn, 1.0%	7.4	3.8
FRANCE	\$58.9 Bn, 2.3%	8.9	5.9

Table 2: Developing group- Public expenditure of their GDP

State/sector	Defence (Percentage of GDP)	Health (Percentage of GDP)	Education (Percentage of GDP)
India	\$46.1 Bn, 2.5%	1.2	3.2
Brazil	\$33.1 Bn, 1.5%	4.1	5.8
South africa	\$4.6 Bn, 1.3%	4.1	6.0

Table 3: South Asia- Public expenditure of their GDP

State/sector	Defence (Percentage of GDP)	Health (Percentage of GDP)	Education (Percentage of GDP)
India	\$46.1 Bn, 2.5%	1.2	3.2
Pakistan	\$6.9 Bn, 2.7%	0.7	2.2
Bangladesh	\$1.5 Bn, 1 %	1.4	2.2
Srilanka	\$1.4 Bn, 2.4%	1.5	2.0

Sources: Budgets of respective governments

From the above table it is clear that India is one of leading state who spends a heavy amount of its GDP on defence

capabilities but at the same time it is far behind when it comes to spending on health and education. South Africa,

China, Brazil, France, Russia, USA, Japan, Saudi Arabia, UK, are in better conditions in these sectors. It is clear that Indian state is not serious about the issues of survival plus.

Politics of survival and security

Security is used as a by powerful to control those who are subordinated. It is a powerful tool. By referring something as the existential threat to the state and well being of its citizens, state get legitimacy to do whatever it wants to do. It is done by creating fear and insecurities among the citizens. (Booth 2007 p208, Balzacq 2001, waever 1995) ^[4, 19] ^[ii] One the security label has been attached to an issue, it changes from a being a problem to a priority for society. This is why it is important to challenge the discipline's predefined conception of security, which in turn leads to a conservative predefined agenda. This securitization planned to divert the attention of the citizens

Conclusion- the way forward

What can be the way forward to transcend this exploitative structure where one kind of understanding of security is given importance over all kind of understandings. It needs a emancipator project from the side of scholar as well as activist of freedom and emancipation. It includes lifting people as individuals and groups out of structural and contingent oppression such as war and poverty and inventing humanity (Booth 2007 p.110). It is about pursuit of bread, knowledge and freedom (Lovett 1997). The idea of emancipation is about the pursuit of bread or material well being, or freedom from Nature and scarcity; the pursuit of knowledge of truth, or freedom from ignorance, superstition and lies; and the pursuit of justice, or freedom from political tyranny and economic exploitation. (Lovett 1997 cited in Booth 2007 p. 111).

Finally I remember one line from Marcos ^[iii], when his image was tarnished by branding him gay by Mexican government. He replies- "Yes, Marcos is gay. Marcos is gay in San Francisco, black in South Africa, an Asian in Europe, a Chicano in San Ysidro, an anarchist in Spain, a Palestinian in Israel, a Mayan Indian in the streets of San Cristobal, a Jew in Germany, a Gypsy in Poland, a Mohawk in Quebec, a pacifist in Bosnia, a single woman on the Metro at 10pm, a peasant without land, a gang member in the slums, an unemployed worker, an unhappy student and, of course, a Zapatista in the mountains.

Marcos is all the exploited, marginalised, oppressed minorities resisting and saying 'Enough'. He is every minority who is now beginning to speak and every majority that must shut up and listen. He is every untolerated group searching for a way to speak. Everything that makes power and the good consciences of those in power uncomfortable - - this is Marcos."

And I think he spoke more than survival. He spoke for survival plus.

End Notes

ⁱ But this is not the reality in many parts of the world specially in developing societies or state. He argues that there is a public agency to protect citizens but where is this public agency when 53 Women were raped in Kunan Poshpora on February 23 1991 by armed forces, where is this public system when more than 100 dalits been massacred in Laxmanpur-bathe and bathani tola in bihar by higher caste militias and state did nothing in doing justice to them. Where is this public system when Adivasis are displaced from their lands with the help of local goondas, politicians and corporate houses their resources are looted? Where is this

public system when Thangjam Manorama was picked up at night on 10th July 2004, raped and killed by this system itself? Where is this public system when Soni Sori was tortured and raped in Police custody in 2011, Where is the public system when Maruti workers in Manesar are denied their basic right of going to toilet, So as in the case of states where self help is the only way to survival, in the feudal and capitalist system individuals also go by their logic of self help by organising themselves and resisting the violence and exploitation.

ⁱⁱ To understand the politics of security two movies are very useful and these are Matrix and V for Vendetta. In Matrix the politics of creating the truth is portrayed brilliantly. It also talks about how dominant ideas rule over the masses and through hegemony, few individuals with the help of these hegemonic institutions and values rule over the masses. In the Vendetta also the importance of ideas is portrayed superbly. To emancipate human society from all kind of exploitation, oppression and exclusion, we have to counter the hegemonic ideas by ideas only. Ideas are very powerful tool in eroding the support base of ruling class. In the words of Gramsci, war of position is as important as war of movement. One line from Vendetta- Behind this mask there is more than just flesh. Beneath this mask there is an idea. and ideas are bulletproof." Allen Moore (v for vendetta 1982)

ⁱⁱⁱ Subcomandante Marcos (date of birth unknown) is the spokesperson for the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN), a Mexican rebel movement. In January 1994, he led an army of Mayan farmers into the eastern parts of the Mexican state of Chiapas in protest of the Mexican government's treatment of indigenous peoples.

Marcos is an author, political poet, adroit humorist, and outspoken opponent of capitalism. Marcos has advocated having the Mexican constitution amended to recognize the rights of the country's indigenous inhabitants] The internationally known guerrillero has been described as a "new" and "postmodern" Che Guevara. He is only seen wearing a balaclava, and his true identity remains unknown. (goodreads.com)

References

1. Baldwin David. Concept of security, Review of International Studies, 2001; 23(1):5-26.
2. Bajpai Kanti. Human Security: Concept and Measurement Kroc Institute Occasional Paper, 2010.
3. Booth Ken. Theory of World Security, London, Cambridge University Press, 2008.
4. Balzacq Thierry. Securitization Theory: How Security Problems Emerge and Dissolve. London: Routledge, 2001.
5. Desai Rajan. Rising Military Expenditure in south Asia Focus on Global South, 2009.
6. Forde Steven. Classical Realism, in Nardin and Mapel, Traditions of International Ethics. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1992.
7. Henderson, Errol Anthony. Military Spending and Poverty. The Journal of Politics, 1998; 60(2):503-520.
8. Hou Na. Arms Race, Military Expenditure and Economic Growth, PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, Department Of Economics, 2009.
9. Kalim Rukhshana. Military spending and Poverty in Pakistan, Paper presented on 27 February 2013 at School of Business and Economics University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan, 2010.
10. Machiavelli Nicola. 1513, The Prince. Trans. Jonathan Bennett, 2010.
11. Morgenthau Hans J. Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace Alfred A. Knopf; New York (Calcutta) 1948.
12. Smith Chris. India's Ad Hoc Arsenal, New York, Oxford University Press, 1994.
13. Smith Steve. Singing Our World into Existence: International Relations Theory and September 11, International Studies Quarterly, 2004; 48:499-515
14. SIPRI Year Book, 2012.
15. The Hindi Newspaper reports.
16. UNDP Report, 2011.

17. UNICEF Report, 2011.
18. Waltz Kenneth. Theory of International Politics, Random House: New York, 1979.
19. Weaver O. Securitization and Desecuritization. IN R.D. Lipchitz (ed.), On Security, New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.
20. World Health Organization Report, 2011.
21. World Bank Report 2009, 2010, 2011.
22. Wolfers Arnold. National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol, Political Science Quarterly, 1952; 67(4):481-502.