

## Editorial

The first quarter of the calendar year, also the last quarter of the fiscal year in India, is budget season. Eagerly awaited, the annual budget is not just a report card on the country's economic and financial status, but also lays out the government's vision of the forthcoming year and its priorities. Defence has been a core segment of the Finance Minister's annual budget presentation and is looked forward to by the community. In his budget speech this year, the Finance Minister did not refer to the defence outlay. Still, there were some changes. One of these changes is the reduction in the number of detailed demands for grant (DDGs) from eight to four. In 'Reorganisation of Defence Outlay for 2016-17: A Tepid Affair', Amit Cowshish points out that this reorganisation of demands is not confined to the Ministry of Defence (MoD): the total number of demands presented by the Finance Minister as a part of the union budget has been brought down from 109 to 96 in the budget for 2016-17 by merging some existing demands with other demands. The rationale behind this is to provide 'a holistic picture of budgetary allocations', exercising 'effective expenditure management', and 'to facilitate effective outcome oriented monitoring of implementation of programmes and schemes/projects and to ensure optimum utilisation of resources'. In a detailed perspective, Cowshish analyses the reorganisation of the MoD's demands, and its effect on the budget; what this reorganisation has achieved, in particular with reference to the stated objectives of the exercise; and suggests steps that could be taken to make the new demands outcome-oriented.

Another key issue relating to defence is that of civil-military relations, a term that has been avidly discussed in the public domain for some time. Rajneesh Singh's article, 'Equilibrium in Higher Defence Organisation and the Need for Restructuring', deals with the necessity of identifying and maintaining equilibrium between the two key constituents of higher defence organisation (HDO), namely, civil bureaucrats and military officers. The relationship between the two is a delicate one. Though protocol issues between the various appointments have been defined

by the government, there is a need for greater clarity in the working relationship between these two constituents. It is precisely this lack of clarity that has become a source for the undercurrent of hostility between them. It is but obvious that such a state of affairs is not good for the health of the system. Singh's article highlights the imbalance in the relationship between these two key constituents, which is largely a result of the flawed structure of the HDO and its systems and processes. If left uncorrected, this may have an undesirable impact on defence policy and security.

India, and indeed many other countries the world over, have been affected time and again by terrorist activities. However, an increasingly worrying phenomenon is that of 'radicalisation', when seemingly normal, educated, articulate and assimilated people, more often than not quite young, get radicalised and become involved in terrorism and extremism. What prompted European Muslim youth, for example, to leave their often idealised lives on the continent and join the Islamic State? Radicalisation doesn't always have an external dimension and countries are seeing such citizens turn on the state itself—the terrorist attacks in Brussels in March 2016 being a case in point. Discontent is often fuelled and sustained by the increasing reach of social media. Thus, states are recognising the clear and present danger of radicalisation and are working on ways and means to address this pressing issue. This issue of the journal carries a timely and pertinent article titled 'Countering the Threat of Radicalisation: Theories, Programmes and Challenges' by Adil Rasheed. The article discusses how, in recent years, rising instances of home-grown terrorism, lone-wolf operations and growing polarisation within societies have upstaged the global military struggle against major transnational terrorist organisations. As the dissemination of radical ideas and related violence increases, over 40 governments around the world have decided to develop their own counter-radicalisation and de-radicalisation programmes, in keeping with their socio-political and cultural particularities. Rasheed analyses some of these counter-radicalisation theories, policies and programmes developed by various countries in recent years with the aim of facilitating further research and developing a comprehensive counter-radicalisation policy in India.

International Relations (IR) theory and literature is largely western-centric. As the subalterns rose to challenge western-dominated history some decades ago, we see an increasing critique of western-centric IR theory as well. Many scholars and researchers are looking at indigenous texts such as the *Arthashastra* and finding the relevance of non-western

thought in the field of IR. Readers would recall that we carried an article by Michael Liebig titled 'Statecraft and Intelligence Analysis in the Kautilya-*Arthashastra*' in the October-December 2014 issue. In this issue, we have Malay Mishra's contribution titled 'Kautilya's *Arthashastra*: Restoring its Rightful Place in the Field of International Relations'. Mishra opines that India's rise in the twenty-first century has resulted in renewed attention on the country, especially in the sphere of strategic thought. This focus has brought into limelight ancient India's pioneering text on polity, Kautilya's *Arthashastra* (KA). Contingent with that is a growing interest in exploring the relevance of KA in the contemporary world. *Arthashastra*, a masterpiece in its own right, is a comprehensive compendium on all matters concerning a state, including administration, law and order, economics, diplomacy, military, war, intelligence and, above all, ethics or dharma. This article is an attempt to reveal the tenets of *Arthashastra* in a simple form and establish their contemporary relevance, both theoretically and practically, thus restoring a rightful place to KA in the field of IR.

Also included in the issue is a commentary on the recently released Australian Defence White Paper 2016. In 'Australia's 2016 Defence White Paper: An Indian Perspective', Udai Bhanu Singh opines that it demonstrates that a growing convergence in strategic approaches can be discerned as Australia looks West and India begins to 'Act East'.

Y.M. Bammi contributes a detailed review essay titled 'Revisiting the 1965 War', wherein he reviews three recent publications: *The Monsoon War: Young Officers Reminisce*, by Amarinder Singh and T.S. Shergill; *1965 Turning the Tide: How India Won the War*, by Nitin A. Gokhale; and *Brave Men of War: Tales of Valour 1965*, by Rohit Agarwal.

The issue also includes three book reviews: Abhijit Bhattacharyya reviews *1962: The War That Wasn't*; Manas Dutta reviews *War and State-Building in Afghanistan: Historical and Modern Perspectives*; and Tushar Srivastava reviews प्राचीन भारतीय राजनय में गुप्तचरों का महत्व [*The Importance of the Spies in Ancient Indian Diplomacy*].

