COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL SECURITY: CONTEMPORARY DISCOURSE

*Ehsan Mehmood Khan, PhD**

Abstract

National security has evolved both into a discipline of study and a sphere of policy application. It is a commonly used phrase in strategic literature and international statecraft. The modern concepts of national security arose in the 17th century during the Thirty Years War in Europe and the Civil War in England, and it was considered in terms of state sovereignty. In the aftermath of World War II, the concept of national security evolved into superpower contestation, also called the Cold War. During this period, national security had been seen through the prism of military security of the state against external threats – traditional security. In the US, the national security concept transited into a normative paradigm when President Truman signed the National Security Act on July 26, 1947, which also led to the establishment of the US National Security Council. Some 21 variants of the National Security Council exist in 51 countries today. The concept of national security is also seen from the prism of the concept of national power and elements of national power that include diplomacy, information operations, military, economic, financial, intelligence operations and law enforcement – commonly referred to as DIMEFIL. States either have national security policies or strategies and some – including Pakistan, publish an unclassified version for public distribution. Contemporary national security discourse adjusts to and even shapes the geopolitical environment. It has gradually evolved into a concept called comprehensive national security. It is an inclusive framework that encompasses all internal and external affairs of the state and society. Comprehensive national security helps safeguard both national security interests and human security requirements.

Keywords: Comprehensive National Security, Traditional Security, National Power, Geopolitics, Human Security, Statecraft, DIMEFIL.

National security has evolved into a discipline of study and an important policy sphere. It is a commonly used phrase in strategic literature and international statecraft. However, no universally acceptable definition of national security exists. Different statesmen, scholars, strategists and nations think of national security differently. Each idea is context-specific, environment-specific, and requirement-specific. The concept of national security, ostensibly new, has evolved with human

---

*The writer is PhD in Peace and Conflict Studies, the author of *Human Security in Pakistan* (published 2013) and serving as Director-General of the Institute for Strategic Studies, Research and Analysis in National Defence University, Islamabad, Pakistan. His areas of study include comprehensive national security, strategic studies, military strategy, hybrid warfare, peace and conflict studies, and research methodology.

perspectives and experiences over the centuries. As of today, it has become an interdisciplinary concept encompassing a host of disciplines, such as political science, international relations, policy studies, security studies, strategic studies, peace and conflict studies, economics, and communication studies. As such, it can be termed as a discipline of national security studies and merits a comprehensive and cross-domain intellectual inquiry.

National security, which has been seen through the prism of military security of the state against external threats, also known as traditional security, has gradually evolved into a concept called comprehensive national security. It is an inclusive concept that considers all internal and external affairs of the state and society to safeguard both state security interests and human security requirements. It can be termed as a 360-degree perspective on the subject. This paper contains a conceptual perspective on comprehensive national security and elaborates its all possible dimensions.

Scope

Inter alia, this paper explicates the construct of security, the traditional concept of national security, the evolution of the comprehensive concept of national security, the concept of national power (determinants and elements), national security policy/ strategy, and contemporary discourse on national security. The level of consideration and analysis is global/national and concept-oriented.

The Concept of Security

The word 'secure' entered the English language in the 1530s from Latin *Securus,* meaning free from danger, safe and tranquil.[1] The concept is as old as human history and has existed in varying forms, contexts and applications among people from all religions, cultures, creeds, communities, tribes and regions, albeit in a rudimentary form and not as refined as of today. It generally remained knit around the defence and survival of the socio-political entities against external threats. The Chinese, Egyptian, Carthaginian, Sumerian, Macedonian, Mesopotamian, Persian and Athenian recorded history testifies that they had a keen societal sense of the concept of security, but traditional state security often took precedence over the security of people at large. The Peloponnesian War (431-404 BC) has been an ancient epitome of the traditional national security concept and its application between the two strong states, Athens and Sparta, with Persia – a major power of the time – playing its part in the conflict. It was a pure display of realpolitik wherein, during the Athenian-Melian Dialogue, the phrase "the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must" acquired an enduring meaning that remains relevant today.[2]

The security concept has existed throughout history and has remained overshadowed by the phenomenon of war. War is one of the constants of history and has not diminished with civilization or democracy. In the last 3,421 years of recorded history, only 268 have seen no war.[3] Approximately 90-95% of known societies engaged

in at least occasional warfare throughout history, and many fought constantly.[4] The conflict remained the key expression of national security and, more than any other event or process, has changed the world map perpetually during the ancient civilizations, the middle ages, post-World War II and the 21ˢᵗ century. National power remains the currency of national security and continually acquires newer meanings and manifestations.

Definitional Diversity

As mentioned earlier, there is no standard definition for national security in the strategic lexicon. Everyone who has debated the subject has seen it through the prism of a given context and setting. So, the subject has a broad range of understanding and application and cannot be taken as a conceptual monolith. A western philosopher believes that "a nation has security when it does not have to sacrifice its legitimate interests to avoid war, and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by war."[5] Another political scientist considered that "the distinctive meaning of national security means freedom from foreign dictation."[6] According to yet another, "Security, in an objective sense, measures the absence of threats to acquired values, in a subjective sense, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked."[7] It is of note that the concept of national security is inextricably linked with the idea of national interest. Both these terms took centre stage in international politics during and after World War II. Hence the definitions of national security given hitherto are principally state-centric.

The scholars of the Copenhagen School of Securitization first departed from the traditional conception of security. They defined it as: "Security is about the ability of states and societies to maintain their independent identity and their functional integrity."[8] Likewise, several other conceptions of security were introduced later. The concept of security witnessed horizontal and vertical expansion and developed into an all-inclusive construct. Nevertheless, from the above-given definitions and explanations, one can conclude that security denotes an absence of threat, as has been posited by Arnold Wolfers. Ideally, yes, but is it possible? Which state of the world today does not face an external threat or at least an internal challenge? Indeed, all do. Thus, it is the capability to deal with the threat that works to create an environment of security. Therefore, capability has to be evolved alongside the development of threats or challenges.

National Security – Threat and Response

The construct of security is found on the pillars of threat and response. 'Threat to whom?' denotes the security referent, 'by whom' is the threat *per se*, and the response by the securitizing actor. It is a security referent that forms the overarching character of security. For instance, if the security referent is state alone, it signifies traditional state security. In contrast, an individual being the security referent implies human security. In case, individuals, communities and state are security referents at the same time, it indicates comprehensive national security. In certain cases, the entire globe is under

threat, e.g., in the case of climate change and global warming. It points to global security. A threat, *per se*, could come from within or without and in several forms depending on the security referent and the environment. The state is a chief securitizing actor in all cases: global security, state security and human security. However, some non-state actors and social structures also play their part in responding to and mitigating the threat.

National security is not something involving routine challenges to the people. It encompasses their identity, safety, security, and freedoms. Thus, every threat facing a state or society may not be a national security threat. What and what not is a national security threat can be determined from the intensity of the threat. Always find a 'big idea' within the fabric of a threat to define its limit, level, or intensity. The best way to do this is to establish clear criteria for what exactly constitutes a threat to national security. Is it really a threat to our state or nation as a whole? Is the threat existential or non-existential? Can it be sustained, or must it be eliminated? Does the nation have the proper means to defeat, contain, or influence it if it must be eliminated? If not, can the nation obtain those means at an affordable cost and within a reasonable timeframe 'to make a difference?'

National security threats may be defined as: threats to the territory of the state; threats to national integration; threats to national identity; threats facing political inclusion of a community; physical threats to the citizens of the state; massive health threats to the people of the state; economic insecurity posing a threat to existence or sovereignty of the state; economic insecurity at micro level posing grave challenges to a significant part of the population; and non-traditional threats including cyber, climatic, environmental and resource scarcity. Thus, the threats facing the state's survival and people are national security threats.

The Modern Concept of National Security

The modern concepts of national security arose in the 17th century during the Thirty Years War in Europe and the Civil War in England.[9] In 1648, the Peace of Westphalia established the authority of the nation-state over internal and external affairs. Thus, the Westphalian idea of national security revolved around state sovereignty. However, the term national security had yet to be coined and popularized. The earliest recorded use of the term national security was by Yale University undergraduates when they debated the question "Does the national security depend on fostering domestic industries?" in 1790.[10] However, there is little doubt that it was used purely in the sense of traditional state security. To mention, the National Security League (NSL) was founded in the US in December 1914 and remained functional until 1942.[11] NSL emerged on the national political scene at a "Conference of Peace and Preparation," which was conducted in New York City. Many of its ideas would become national policy in the US.[12]

It is important to understand the meaning of 'nation' in the phrase national security. To be sure, 'nation' is a much broader expression than an ethnic community, a state or a country both in meaning and application. The term 'nation' has evolved over centuries and has become all-inclusive and more comprehensive in contemporary usages in modern statecraft or geopolitical applications. That is why the term like state security is narrower than national security. Accordingly, the term national security goes beyond the traditional notion of physical security of the state even though it remains to be an important part thereof.

The concept of national security was overshadowed by colonial interests in the 18th through 20th century and remained knit around great power multipolar conflicts. The post-WW II traces the modern etymology of the phrase can be found in an August 1945 Senate hearing by the US Navy Secretary said: "Our national security can only be assured on a very broad and comprehensive front... I am using the word security consistently and continuously rather than defence. The question of national security is not merely a question of the Army and Navy. We have to take into account our whole potential for war, our mines, industry, manpower, research, and all activities that go into normal civilian life."[13]

The traditional concept of national security focuses on the survival of the state: physical security aspects of the state against external threats (chiefly military response) to include national defence, national integrity and national sovereignty. After World War II (during the Cold War), national security was seen through the lens of the global environment created by bipolar contestation. Nevertheless, the demise of the Cold War and the emergence of the US as the sole superpower in the world diminished the threat of superpower conflict and paved the way for new concepts of security such as non-traditional security, human security and comprehensive security.

The evolution of the concept of national security through the ages may be synthesized into seven phases of recorded history: imperial security during the age of empires; state sovereignty in the aftermath of the Peace of Westphalia in 1648; colonial interests in 18th through 20th century; Great powers multipolar contestation during the world wars of the 20th century; Great powers bipolar contestation during the Cold War of the 20th century; comprehensive national security in a unipolar world order after the collapse of the USSR; and comprehensive national security in a multipolar world order in the 21st century.

Human Security and Its Place within the Concept of Comprehensive National Security

The traditional concept of national security considers the state as the core security referent, and it denotes around 193 referents (the UN member states). However, the concept of human security considers all (about 8 billion) human beings as security referents. Human security is concerned with the complete cycle of human life from birth

to death and takes into account people from different creeds, cultures, classes, professions, needs, aspirations and human security challenges.

The concept of comprehensive national security took root from the ashes of World War II and continues to evolve as such. The US President Roosevelt's 1941-State of the Union Address encompassing freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want and freedom from fear can be taken as one of the sources of comprehensive national security debate that started later. To note, the 'four freedoms' symbolized the American war aims (or the source of inspiration) as it joined the allied war effort in World War II.[14]

Academic and policy endeavours to break away from traditional security concepts continued during Cold War. Comprehensive security is one such concept of Japanese origin. Prime Minister Masayoshi Ōhira commissioned a private study group in the Nomura Research Institute in 1978. It came up with the concept it called comprehensive security. The idea was that Japan should, in the light of its constitutional limitations, provide for its own security on a 'holistic basis.'[15]

In the 1990s, the Copenhagen School of security studies introduced a new and comprehensive framework of analysis for security studies examining the character and dynamics of security in five sectors: military, political, economic, environmental, and societal. It covered traditionalist and constructivist views, thereby embracing both traditional and non-traditional dimensions of security.[16] However, the security debate by the Copenhagen School chiefly remained knit around Barry Buzan's Regional Security Complex Theory (RSCT).

In the 1990s, the concept of human security started evolving. Dr Mahbub ul Haq is one of the key proponents and contributors to the concept. Departing from the traditional concept, he once exclaimed, "I firmly believe that the world is entering a new era in which the very concept of security will change – and change dramatically. Security will be interpreted as: Security of people, not just territory; Security of individuals, not just nations; Security through sustainable development, not through arms; Security of all the people everywhere in their homes, in their jobs, in their streets, in their communities, in their environment."[17] With the demise of the Cold War, the statesmen, scholars and strategists of the world were able to look away from traditional security threats. It generated a healthy debate on the very idea of security. Thus, the concept of human security developed a stronger root. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) introduced Human Development Reports (HDR) in the 1990s based on Human Development Index (HDI).

Economists like Dr Mahbub ul Haq were the architects of HDR, a report based on HDI developed by Dr Mahbub ul Haq. While the first four reports debated the concept of human development, financing, global dimensions and people's participation, HDR-1994 introduced new dimensions of human security, thereby giving a normative paradigm to the concept of human security. It moved human security from the academic space to the policy domain. It introduced seven sub-sets of human

security: economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security and political security, with threats facing each facet as deemed relevant. Human security is a comprehensive approach that calls for integrated application. The concept is people-centred, multi-sectoral, context-specific and prevention-oriented.[18] Comprehensive national security is a balanced mix of state security and human security endeavours by a nation, thereby taking care of both traditional and non-traditional threats.

Institutionalization of National Security

The concept of national security was given a normative/legal paradigm after the signing of the National Security Act on July 26, 1947 (NSA-47) by US President Truman. This act centralized the control and functioning over different military services by creating the National Military Establishment (later named the Department of Defence in 1949). All military departments, including the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, were put under command National Military Establishment with other departments and agencies of the government concerned with national security.[19] For coordination of various national security matters, a high-powered National Security Council (NSC) headed by the President was established. NSC was instituted to advise the president on domestic, foreign, and military policies related to national security.[20] A National Security Resource Board was also founded. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) was also part of NSA-47. CIA grew out of the World War II Office of Strategic Services (OSS), which was the agency of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to coordinate intelligence activities in enemy territory. It may be noted that NSA-47 strengthened the traditional national security structure based on the US experiences in World War II.

The idea of NSC drew attraction around the globe. As of today, the institution of the National Security Council exists in 51 different counties with the same name or such variants as Federal Security Council, National Security Commission, National Security Committee, National Security Office, National Security Division, Security Council, National Committee on Security Affairs, High Council of Security and Committee for Safeguarding National Security. For instance, Australia has a National Security Division of the Prime Minister and the Cabinet.[21] France has *Secrétariat général de la défense et de la sécurité nationale* (Secretariat-General for National Defence and Security).[22] India has National Security Council since 1988, Iran has a Supreme National Security Council since 1989, China has Central National Security Commission of the Communist Party of China (CPC) since 2013, Japan has National Security Council since 2013, South Korea has an Office of National Security since 2013, North Korea has State Affairs Commission since 2016, and Pakistan has National Security Committee since 2013 (formerly National Security Council).

The Concept of National Power

As part of international statecraft, the idea of national security is firmly linked with the concept of national power. Morgenthau notably articulated: "International politics is a struggle for power… A political policy seeks either to keep power, to increase power or to demonstrate power."[23] It may be noted that Morgenthau has debated this attribute of geopolitics in terms of political power. The phrase national power was coined and popularized later. While discussing the elements of national power in a seminal work on international relations, Fredrick Hartmann noted: "In a more formal sense, power is the strength or capacity that a sovereign nation-state can use to achieve its national interests."[24] What and what not constitute national interest is a broad subject and needs an exclusive discourse. According to Palmer and Perkins, "National power is a vital and inseparable feature of the state system."[25] Various studies and international experiences show that power is both a means and an end. It is challenging to measure national power and is rather considered in relative (not absolute) terms. For instance, if we say that Russia is a very powerful country, the question is, "in comparison with whom; the US or Belarus?" Power has a dynamic character and impermanent nature. It continues to shift and shape and swing between the nation-states.

Power may take two forms: the power to dominate (offensive) and the power to preserve (defensive). Each definition is context-specific. It can be defined as: "Power is the ability of a nation-state to deal with external and internal challenges, thereby shaping the environment to pursue its interests and realize the national purpose."[26] Modern scholars and statesmen classify power as hard, soft and smart. Hard power is the use or threat of use of force, together with coercion and sanctions, to influence the behaviour of the target state. Soft power is the ability to shape the preferences of others through appeal, charm and attraction. The currency of soft power is culture, diplomacy, ideologies and human rights themes. Smart power combines hard and soft power to attain the policy ends. An American scholar notes:

> *Power is one's ability to affect the behaviour of the others to get what one wants. There are three basic ways to do this: coercion, payment and attraction. Hard power is the use of coercion and payment. Soft power is the ability to obtain preferred outcomes through attraction. If a state can set the agenda for others or shape their preferences, it can save a lot on carrots and sticks. But rarely can it totally replace either. Thus, the need for smart strategies that combine the tools of both hard and soft power.[27]*

The Elements of National Power (EoNP)

One of the earlier explanations of the instruments of national power was given by E. H. Carr, a political scientist, wherein he examined US-USSR relations before World War II. He believes that power is an indivisible attribute of a nation; however, for the purpose of discussion, political power in the international sphere can be divided into three categories: (a) military power (b) economic power (c) power over opinion. He argued that 'the supreme importance of the military instrument lies in the fact that the

ultima ratio of power in international relations is war' and that economic instrument is closely associated with military power.[28] Carr maintains that the military is the most important element of power for a nation-state and serves both as a means and an end. Carr was right in that he looked at the case through the prism of World Wars and huge war machines playing their part in big power relations. His explanation appears to be seminal in the discourse on elements of national power.

Later, the US National Security Strategy – 1988 mentioned four elements of national power to include diplomatic, informational, military and economic. It is famously known as the DIME construct. The US NSS-1988 further notes, "We have an exceptionally diverse array of instruments for employing the various elements of national power." These instruments include: (a) moral and political example (b) Military strength (c) Economic vitality (d) Alliance relationship (e) Public diplomacy (f) Security assistance (g) Development assistance (h) Science and technology cooperation (i) International organizations (j) Diplomatic mediation.[29]

DIME construct was expanded into DIMEFIL during the Global War on Terror (GWOT). The acronym DIMEFIL is in use in the National War College of the National Defense University, Washington, D.C.[30] Another variant, MIDLIFE, is also in use. Robert Worley noted in 2012, "For decades, the acronym DIME has been used as shorthand for the diplomatic, informational, military and economic instruments of national power… A more recent acronym, MIDLIFE (military, informational, diplomatic, law enforcement, intelligence, financial and economic), has gained some currency reflecting the greater complexity in the ways and means of pursuing national security."[31]

These elements of national power act as the means for attaining strategic objectives of national security. National power comprises several facets that may be called the determinant, and what determines/contributes to power has been answered differently by different scholars and schools of thought. Organski categorizes them as: National determinants to include geography, population and natural resources, and Social determinants to include diplomacy, military, informational, ideological and economic.[32]

Seyed Hadi Zarghani, an Iranian scholar, in his PhD thesis "The evaluation of the variables effective on national power and designing of the model for measurement of national power of countries," identified six different levels of power to include: extra-global power, national power with global effect, national power with regional effect, national power with local effect, and weakened national power.[33] He has evaluated various theories about foundations and elements of national power and variables and indexes affecting national power. He has used the nine most relevant variables, originally discussed by another Iranian scholar Mohammad Reza Hafeznia, to include political, economic, cultural, social, military, territorial, astro-space, transnational and scientific, and technological variables.[34]

The Determinants of National Power

It is important to study and comprehend the factors that determine or contribute to the making of national power. It is the sum total of a number of constituents such as geography, natural resources, population, leadership, quality of governance, the extent of economic development, industrial capacity, technology, military potential, ideology, national values and morale, diplomacy, and foreign support.

National Security Strategy

Each nation has an overarching policy or strategy that guides or governs the affairs of the state. Different nations use different names or titles. The US National Security Strategy (NSS) is a report mandated by the Goldwater-Nichols DoD Reorganization Act of 1986. The first US NSS was issued in 1987 by President Reagan, and since then, 17 NSS have been issued by six different presidents, including US NSS in 1987 and 1988 by President Ronald Reagan; 1990, 1991 and 1993 by President H.W. Bush; 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999 and 2000 by President Bill Clinton; 2002 and 2006 by President G.W. Bush; 2010 and 2015 by President B.H. Obama; and 2017 by President Donald Trump. President Joseph R. Biden, Jr. issued Interim National Security Guidance in March 2021.[35]

National security strategy, called national security policy or given varying names by different countries, is a kind of grand strategy of a nation. It remains to be a matter of debate whether all nations have a grand strategy or not. There are two schools of thought; one upholds that only great powers have a grand strategy, and the other posits that even the smaller powers have a grand strategy. According to Dr Hanna Samir Kassab, grand strategies are overall survival strategies of states. He notes:

> *All states have grand strategies as all states seek or function to survive as independent political units. The survival threats to great powers and weak states are fundamentally different. Great powers pursue prestige against other great powers seeking the same... On the other hand, weak states suffer from systemic vulnerabilities given their stark underdevelopment. Weak states trade whatever political power they have to a great power for aid or other types of economic assistance.* [36]

To be sure, the grand strategies of great powers and weak states are diametrically different both in ends and means. In the case of weak states, survival as a state (with a given purpose) is the prime objective, while the great powers strive to retain their supremacy and pre-eminence. Dr Kassab has also tested the following hypothesis in his book: "The more vulnerable the state, the more it seeks aid to survive. The more powerful the state, the more it seeks prestige to protect its position."[37] According to R. D. Hooker, Jr., Grand strategy can be understood simply as using power to secure the state.[38] Colin Gray defines grand strategy as purposeful employment of all instruments of power available to a security community."[39] Hew Strachan sees grand strategy as

forward-looking, aspirational, and oriented on preventing or managing great power decline.[40]

Even while grand strategy is a process, it embraces major acts and events to sustain. For instance, World War I & II have been grand strategic undertakings. The Marshall Plan of 1948 had been a grand strategic venture. NATO has been a grand strategic scheme, and so are the so-called Indo-Pacific security constructs QUAD and AUKUS. The Warsaw Pact has been a grand strategic initiative. The Cold War (and the containment of communism) has been the US grand strategic endeavour. The Global War on Terror (GWOT) has been the US grand strategic undertaking. China's BRI is a grand strategic initiative for economic connectivity. European Union is an embodiment of the grand strategic vision of European leadership. All these are endeavours to secure the states and sustain global power. The national policies or strategies of the states, especially those of major powers, manifest their grand strategies.

At any rate, the US NSS manifests its grand strategy and meets the definitional objective of Hew Strachan: preventing or managing great power decline in the face of a rising power – China. Let us view the construct of the US National Security Strategy – 2017, which is as follows: Pillar I – Protect the American people, the homeland, and the American way of life; Pillar II – Promote American prosperity; Pillar III – Preserve peace through strength; and Pillar IV – Advance American influence across the world. The following continents and regions have been discussed separately: Indo-Pacific, Europe, Middle East, South and Central Asia, Western Hemisphere and Africa.

It is typically the grand strategy of a great power, which seeks to protect the homeland and project power and influence abroad. If we evaluate the US NSS from 1987 to 2017, we find seven main expressions of the US grand strategy: containment of communism; strategic competition with the USSR; non-traditional security threats; the global war on terror; engagement of the allies; cooperation with China, Russia and other nations; and full spectrum strategic competition with China and Russia.

Nevertheless, national security policy or strategy of the states other than great powers primarily focuses on the security/survival of the states and the prosperity of their people.

Comprehensive National Security of Pakistan

The comprehensive national security of Pakistan is considered to be the combination – indeed a fine balance of - state security imperatives and human security requirements, i.e., taking care of both traditional and non-traditional security threats and external and internal challenges. It denotes the defence of 8342.966 kilometres of Pakistan's territorial frontiers[41] and 881,888 square kilometres[42] of Pakistan's territory against external and internal security challenges. It also involves the human security of over 230 million people in Pakistan.[43]

As we discussed earlier, security is a response capability against a set of threats or challenges, which continues to evolve in character and intensity. Islamabad Security Dialogue held in 2021 identified eight major challenges posing a threat to Pakistan's security: great power competition between China and the US; gross violations of international law and norms by India; the precarious peace situation in Afghanistan; Iran's international isolation; the COVID pandemic; obsolete system of governance; political instability within the country; and the advent of modern technologies and artificial intelligence.[44] It may be seen that the security environment in Afghanistan and the COVID-19 situation have changed, and the other threats and challenges are also evolving. To be sure, Pakistan is located in a troubled geo-strategic region of the world, which has held hostage the comprehensiveness of national security imperative due to external existential challenges that led to several wars and warlike situations during the last 75 years. Global security issues and the great-power competition also affect Pakistan's national security pursuits.

Pakistan is facing several non-traditional challenges, both from within and without. Climate change, glacial melt, floods, water scarcity, heat waves, droughts, pandemics and other health security issues, violent extremism on various grounds (such as religious, ethnic and political), terrorism, food insecurity, population explosion, financial and economic challenges, cyber threat, information and cognitive challenges, energy insecurity, various governance challenges, and human security issues of various shades and grades.

In sum, the security of Pakistan can be understood in comprehensive and inclusive terms, and it denotes that both the territorial security of the state and the human security of the people have to be part of the national security calculus.

National Security Policy of Pakistan

Over the last 75 years, several visions, policies and initiatives have been introduced in Pakistan. The process of formulating the National Security Policy began in 2014. It took two successive federal governments and about eight years for the policy to evolve. National Security Policy 2022-2026 was launched on January 14, 2022.[45] It is the first policy – named as that – that deals with comprehensive national security issues. It notes: "A country is as secure as its most vulnerable citizen. The safety, security, dignity, and prosperity of citizens in all their manifestations will remain the ultimate purpose of Pakistan's national security."[46] It sets the tone of national security priority in favour of human security.

A part of the said policy, containing 62 pages, is for public distribution, while the remaining policy is classified. Led by introductory pages and a national security framework, it discusses six main pillars of national security: national cohesion, securing our economic future, defence and territorial integrity, internal security, foreign policy in a changing world, and human security.

It outlines principles that inform the formulation of policy and its implementation: whole-of-government approach, inclusivity, self-confidence and resolve, introspection and pragmatism, proactiveness, prioritisation, and consistency. However, the policy has to be reviewed periodically to contend with the emerging challenges and keep it aligned with the global, regional and national security environment.

Contemporary Discourse on National Security

National security discourse is changing in line with the emerging realities and complexities of the global environment. However, each country has its own strategic issues and, thus, an understanding of national security. As discussed earlier, the debate on national security in intellectual, political and strategic circles started in the US around the great wars of the 19th century and accelerated after World War II. The debate principally revolved around state security needs, especially in the wake of superpower contestation during the Cold War. However, it continued to transform and has reached the point wherein economic security is taking centre stage of the national security discourse even in great power competition. Let us see how it evolved in the US national security strategic thought.

Earlier, economic processes were part of both foreign and domestic policy but studied in terms of the prosperity of people. In the first ten national security strategies from 1986 to 1998, the economy was considered as economic progress, cooperation, strength, opportunity, competitiveness, system, growth, development, environment, benefits, stability, economic prosperity, etc. In the US NSS-1999, economic security was mentioned as: "Freedom of navigation and overflight are essential to our economic security and for the worldwide movement and sustainment of US military forces."[47] However, it was still evolving to be an inevitable part of national security. The US NSS-2000 noted: "[Economic cooperation] has led to numerous economic and financial agreements/reforms in international institutions that bring stability to the global marketplace that is so essential for America's economic health and economic security."[48] It was discussed in the context and under the heading "Economic Benefits that Promote Prosperity."

The US NSS-2006 used the phrase economic security and mentioned it as: "We will continue to take all necessary measures to protect our national and economic security against the adverse effects of their bad conduct."[49] It may be noted that national and economic security are being distinguished herein though placed together. The term economic security was not used in the US NSS-2010 and 2015. The US NSS-2017 saw a transformation in the very concept of national security, wherein it noted: "Economic security is national security."[50] Interim National Security Strategic Guidance-2021 also mentions it as: "...at the center of our national security strategy, our policies must reflect a basic truth: in today's world, economic security is national security."[51] It may be seen that it took a superpower over a century to realize that economic security cannot be

separated from national security. In fact, *economic security is national security* (even though the US has been the number 1 economy in the world since the 1920s).

In China's case, the term "national security" encompasses both domestic/ internal and foreign/external security and, therefore, has a much broader connotation.[52] China's national security concept, since 1996, has been based on diplomatic and economic interaction. China's peaceful rise seeks to reassure nation-states that China's rise in military and economic prominence will not be a threat to peace and stability and that other nations will benefit from China's rise.[53]

The Indian concept of national security hinges on regional and global power ambitions and seeks to develop in military and economic terms. According to Professor Harsh V. Pant of the Delhi-based Observer Research Foundation (ORF), National security debates and discourse are, quietly but surely, undergoing an almost revolutionary transformation. He goes on to note: "From a rising China to the pressures of climate change; from the challenges of counter-terrorism to a seemingly never-ending COVID-19 pandemic (the four Cs), the old order is collapsing much faster than the ability of nations to create the foundations of a new one."[54] India's alignment with the US and its allies in support of their Asia-Pacific strategy and containment of China's rise is an important part of its national security policy in the 21st century.

National security thought and conception of each nation is in accordance with the major existential challenges it faces, which continue to evolve and shape.

For instance, terrorism perpetrated by the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) remained the key national security challenge for the state from the 1970s to 2009, when LTTE was finally defeated at the hands of state security forces. In the case of Maldives, the environmental challenge is a key existential threat. At the current rate of global warming, almost 80% of the Maldives could become uninhabitable by 2050, according to multiple reports from NASA and the US Geological Survey.[55]

In early 2022, the economy became the biggest national security challenge for Sri Lanka. The country defaulted on debt for the first time in its history and faced the worst financial, food and fuel crisis. People revolved. President Gotabaya Rajapaksa resigned and fled the country after thousands of people entered the presidential palace demanding the president's resignation. The country underwent the worst kind of socio-economic crisis and political instability. Likewise, various parts of the world faced. These have been cited as an example to state that national security thought and challenges are not the same for all nations and do not remain the same for any nation. Everything changes with time. It may be termed as security dynamism.

Overall, national security discourse is evolving. Great power competition remains to be a *sine qua non* of the evolving global order. New centres of power are emerging at the national and international levels. In the case of some weaker countries, the state is being challenged as a political entity or institution from within. The security discourse has seen a new trend – security dialogue – in different parts of the world,

wherein policymakers, strategists, security analysts, statesmen and academics gather to discuss various security issues facing the states, regions, and the globe at large. The examples are Islamabad Security Dialogue organized annually in Islamabad, Pakistan, by the National Security Division of the Government of Pakistan. It is a platform for critical thinking and robust intellectual discourse on some of the most pressing global challenges and opportunities confronting the world at large.[56] Margalla Dialogue is a multi-faceted security dialogue organized and hosted by Islamabad Policy Research Institute. Manama Dialogue has been held annually since 2004 in the Kingdom of Bahrain. It is a central element of the Middle East's security architecture. The IISS Shangri-La Dialogue is Asia's premier defence summit. It is a unique meeting where ministers debate the region's most pressing security challenges, engage in important bilateral talks, and come up with fresh approaches. [57] The Quadrilateral Security Dialogue (QUAD) is a strategic security dialogue between the US, Japan, India and Australia.[58] Initiated in 2007, ostensibly as a forum for dialogue, it turned into a kind of security alliance viewed by some as Asian NATO. It was envisioned to establish an "Asian Arc of Democracy" to eventually include countries in Central Asia, Mongolia, the Korean Peninsula, and other countries in Southeast Asia. This denoted inclusion of almost all countries on the periphery of China save for China itself. Indeed, it raises China's eyebrow because of the role of QUAD in the 21st century's geopolitics, especially in the Asia-Pacific.

Conclusion

The concept of national security has taken centuries to evolve and is still shaping in line with the global, regional and national security imperatives. Each nation, whether big or small, has its own conception of national security in consonance with the challenges it faces and the means it can apply to contend with these challenges. The non-traditional security challenges and human security issues have found vital space in the national security discourse of nations and the globe at large. However, it does not subside the imperatives of traditional state security needs. Thus, a fine balance is needed to comprehend and apply the concept of national security by all stakeholders of a nation– people and institutions.

The global strategic security environment is transforming at a pace faster than ever before. Likewise, domestic imperatives of the states are transfiguring due to demographic pressures and resource demands. Hence, only the strategically competent states that can align their national security policies with the global realities and domestic obligations of the 21st century would be able to attain the national security objectives. Strategic competence is an amalgam of strategic capability and strategic intent based on the national power potential of a given state. In sum, national security policies and practices of the states of the world would remain pertinent only with global relevance and fulfilment of domestic responsibilities. On the whole, the state, as a politico-geographic entity, would remain only as secure as its people.

References

1   "Securus," *Online Etymology Dictionary*, https://www.etymonline.com/word/secure (accessed October 19, 2021).

2   Thucydides, 1951 quoted in Dennis J. Sandole, *Peace and Security in the Postmodern World: The OSCE and Conflict Resolution* (London: Routledge, 2007), 25.

3   Will Durant and Ariel Durant, *The Lessons of History* (New York: *Simon* & *Schuster, 1968), Chapter-XI.*

4   Lawrence H. Keely, *War before Civilization: the Myth of the Peaceful Savage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 28.

5   Walter Lippmann, *U.S. Foreign Policy: Shield of the Republic* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1943).

6   Harold Lasswell, *National Security and Individual Freedom,* quoted in Joseph J. Romm, 79.

7   Arnold Wolfers, "Security as an Ambiguous Concept," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol LXVII, No 4 (December 1952): 481-502. Also quoted in Czesław Mesjasz, "Security as an Analytical Concept," Cracow University of Economics Cracow, Poland Paper presented at the 5th Pan-European conference on International Relations, in The Hague, 9-11 September 2004: 5.

8   Barry Buzan et al., *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc, 1997).

9   Kim R. Holmes, PhD, "What is National Security?" *Heritage*, October 7, 2014, https://www.heritage.org/military-strength-essays/2015-essays/what-national-security (accessed October 19, 2021).

10 Dr Prabhakaran Paleri, *Integrated Maritime Security: Governing the Ghost Protocol* (New Delhi: Vij Books, 2014), 104.

11 Mark R. Shulman, "The Progressive Era Origins of the National Security Act," *Pace Law Faculty Publications*, January 1, 2000: 290.

12 "The National Security League and Preparedness for War," *The Advocate of Peace*, Vol. 77, No. 7 (July 1915): 158-159.

13 Joseph J. Romm, *Defining National Security: The Nonmilitary Aspects* (New York: Council of Foreign Relations Press, 1993), 3.

14 "The Four Freedoms," *The National World War II Meusum, New Orleans*, https://www.nationalww2museum.org/war/articles/four-freedoms (accessed December 22, 2021).

15 Kevin J. Cooney, *Japan's Foreign Policy Since 1945* (New York: East Gate Books, 2007), 106.

16 Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (Colorado and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998).

17 Mahbub ul Haq, Reflections on Human Development (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 115; and Keynote address by Dr Mahbub ul Haq to the conference organised by the Evert Vermeer Foundation in The Hague on March 16, 1996.

18 UN Human Security (HS) Handbook-2009: Human security in theory and practice, UN Trust for Human Security, http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HS_Handbook_2009.pdf (accessed January 12, 2013), 55-56.

19 "Text of the original 1947 National Security Act," https://global.oup.com/us/companion.websites/9780195385168/resources/chapter10/nsa/nsa.pdf (accessed December 15, 2021).

20 "National Security Act," https://www.britannica.com/topic/National-Security-Act (accessed December 15, 2021).

21 "National Security," https://www.pmc.gov.au/national-security (accessed December 15, 2021).

22 "Secrétariat général de la défense et de la sécurité nationale ," http://www.sgdsn.gouv.fr/ (accessed December 15, 2021).

23 Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York: Alfred. A. Knopf, 1973), fifth edition (originally published 1948), 27.

24 Fredrick H. Hartmann, *The Relations of Nations* – sixth edition (New York: Macmillan, 1983), 41.

25 N. D. Palmer and H. C. Perkins, *International Relations* (New Delhi: CBS Publishers, 2001), 6.

26 Definition by the Author.

27 Joseph S. Nye Jr., "Get Smart: Combining Hard and Soft Power" *Foreign Affairs* 88, no. 4 (2009): 160–63.

28 E. H. Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), 109.

29 "National Security Strategy of the United States," *The White House*, January 1988: 7-8. E-version available at https://history.defense.gov/Historical-Sources/National-Security-Strategy/ (accessed January 3, 2022).

30 *A National Security Strategy Primer*, ed., Steven Heffington, Adam Oler and David Tretler (Washington D.C: NDU Press, 2019), 56.

31 Robert Worley, *Orchestrating the Instruments of Power* (Sterling, Virginia: Potomac Books, 2012), 6.

32 A. F. K. Organski, *World Politics* (New York: Knopf Inc. 1958), 124-155.

33 Seyed Hadi Zarghani, *Measurement of National Power: Definitions, Functions*, Measurement (LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing, 2017), 3.

34 Mohammad Reza Hafeznia, *Principles and Concepts of Geopolitics*, quoted in Ibid.

35 "Interim National Security Guidance," *The White House*, https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/NSC-1v2.pdf (accessed July 13, 2022).

36 Dr Hanna Samir Kassab, *Grand Strategies of Weak States and Great Powers* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 1.

37 Ibid, 12.

38 R.D. Hooker, Jr., "The Grand Strategy of the United States," INSS Strategic Monograph, *Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University,* Washington D.C. USA, October 2014: 1.

39 Colin Gray, *War, Peace and International Relations: An Introduction to Strategic History* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 283.

---

⁴⁰ Hew Strachan, "Strategy and Contingency," *International Affairs 87*, no. 6 (November 2011), 1281–1296. According to Michael Howard, Strategy is more properly limited to the deployment and use of armed forces to attain a given political objective. See Michael Howard, "The Forgotten Dimensions of Strategy," Foreign Affairs 57, no. 5 (Summer 1979), 975. But to be sure, it is purely military strategy that deals with employment of military element of national power – just one of the many strands of grand strategy.

⁴¹ It includes 2611.56 km of Pakistan-Afghanistan border, 599.1 of Pakistan-China border, 2100.595 km of Pakistan-India border, 202 km of working boundary, 861.493 km of Line of Control, 909.278 km of Pakistan-Iran border, and 1058.94 of coastline. For details, see "Survey of Pakistan," http://surveyofpakistan.gov.pk/ (accessed July 21, 2022).

⁴² It includes 796,095 square kilometres of four provinces and Islamabad Capital Territory (ICT), 72,496 square kilometres of Gilgit-Baltistan, and 13,297 square kilometres of Azad Jammu and Kashmir.

⁴³ "Pakistan Population (2022) - Worldometer," worldometers.info (accessed July 21, 2022).

⁴⁴ "Islamabad Security Dialogue – Event Report," National Security Division of Pakistan (March 2021): 13.

⁴⁵ National Security Policy of Pakistan, 2022-2026," *Office of the National Security Advisor, Government of Pakistan*, https://onsa.gov.pk/ (accessed July 25, 2022).

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ "A National Security Strategy for a New Century," *The White House*, December 1999: 12. All US national security strategies since 1987 may be found at https://history.defense.gov/Historical-Sources/National-Security-Strategy/ (accessed July 25, 2022).

⁴⁸ "A National Security Strategy for a Global Age," *The White House,* December 2000: 11.

⁴⁹ "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America," *The White House,* March 2006: 21.

⁵⁰ "National Security Strategy of the United States of America," *The White House,* December 2017: 17.

⁵¹ "Interim National Security Strategic Guidance," The White House, March 2021: 15.

⁵² Yun Sun, "Chinese National Security Decision-making: Processes and Challenges," *Brookings*, May 6, 2013, https://www.brookings.edu/research/chinese-national-security-decision-making-processes-and-challenges/ (accessed July 27, 2022).

⁵³ In 1996, Chinese scholars generated a new idea for China's foreign policy. Called the New Security Concept (xin anquan guan), this policy argues that the Cold War mentality of competing and antagonistic blocks is outdated. It argues that the international sys- tem is moving towards relaxation, and that peace and development are the main themes of the time. Elizabeth Freund Larus, "China's New Security Concept and Peaceful Rise: Trustful Cooperation or Deceptive Diplomacy?" *American Journal of Chinese Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (October 2005): 219-241.

⁵⁴ Harsh V. Pant, "The national security discourse is changing," *Observer Research Foundation*, September 10, 2021, https://www.orfonline.org/research/the-national-security-discourse-is-changing/ (accessed, July 25, 2022).

⁵⁵ Daniel Manzo, et al. "Facing dire sea level rise threat, Maldives turns to climate change solutions to survive," *ABC News*, November 03, 2021, https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:UKemmL31u-sJ; https://abcnews.go.com/International/facing-dire-sea-level-rise-threat-maldives-turns/story%3Fid%3D80929487+ & cd=6&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=pk (accessed July 29, 2022).

⁵⁶ *Islamabad Security Dialogue*, https://islamabaddialogue.com/ (accessed July 29, 2022).

⁵⁷ *The IISS Shangri-La Dialogue*, https://www.iiss.org/events/shangri-la-dialogue/shangri-la-dialogue-2022 (accessed July 29, 2022).

⁵⁸ Sheila A. Smith, "The Quad in the Indo-Pacific: What to Know," Council on Foreign Relations, May 27, 2021, https://www.cfr.org/in-brief/quad-indo-pacific-what-know (accessed July 29, 2022).