



RESEARCH PAPER

The Securitization of Sovereignty: India-Pakistan Rivalry and the Expansion of Non-Traditional Security Paradigm

Dr. Waseem Din

Freelance researcher & Writer

Corresponding Author

drwaseemdean@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Securitization refers to the process through which non-traditional security issues are deliberately made existential security threat by securitization actors, through speech acts, and demand extraordinary measures for the survival of the referent object with audience acceptance. Originating from the Copenhagen School, Securitization theory challenges traditional realist thoughts that limits security to military domain, highlighting that non-tradition threats can also endanger state survival. In the India-Pakistan Context, this study examines how sovereignty has been persistently securitized, turning it into a sensitive and contested issue despite both states have achieved minimum credible deterrence. It has sustained a perpetual security dilemma, huge trust-deficit and unending arms race that has led to economic strain and fragile diplomatic ties. Using qualitative methodology, the paper argues that de-securitizing sovereignty is crucial to reduce the security dilemma, alleviate mistrust and foster normalization, stability and enduring peace between the two rival states.

Keywords: Securitization, Sovereignty, Security Dilemma, Non-Traditional Security, India-Pakistan, Trust Deficit, Arms Race

Introduction

We are currently living in the nuclear age so we find ourselves in a paradoxical condition where survival of the state is very necessary from the evils of belligerent powers. Classical realists have pitched the humans to such a bizarre condition where concepts like power accumulation, nuclear capability, existential threats, balance of power, deterrence, wars, conflicts and the latest defense technologies matter more than peace, harmony and mutual co-existence etc. International anarchic system is also responsible for it (Booth, 1991). Under such condition security becomes a major issue for all states world over. Realist school of thought became more relevant than the other. This school of thought largely focuses on the traditional concept of security. But, with so much modernization of technology and latest developments in the world there emerged non-traditional concept of security as well (Baldwin, 1997). It was realized by the world that only traditional security for the existence is not necessary but many other issues have also cropped up due to these developments and they are also posing existential threats to the world as well. This may include environmental, political, economic, pandemics and some other societal issues etc.

With the advent of non-traditional concept of security, there emerged the Copenhagen School of Thought that focused largely on the above-mentioned issues that were threatening for the existence of humanity. They focused on the three conceptual tools of analysis i.e. sectors of security, regional security complex theory and the securitization theory (Buzan, Waever & Wilde, 1998). The issue that posed security threats were kept in the following different sectors. It includes military, political, environment, economic and societal security. All these are called the sectors of securitization. According to the Copenhagen School of Thought, in international relations something becomes a security issue when it is presented as posing an existential threat through the speech act and this threat needs to be dealt with immediately by taking extraordinary measures after it is

accepted by the audience (Waever, 1995) So, if we closely look at this definition we can say securitization is a process in which issues are made existential threat through the speech act but those issues are from the non-tradition concept of security. This concept of securitization was first introduced is to international relation by Ole Waever (1995) in mid-1990, in his book "Security: A New Framework for Analysis" (Buzan, et al., 1998).

Keeping in mind the Copenhagen School of Thought's proposition about the concept of securitization, we can observe it in the entangled India-Pakistan relations which mostly focus on the sovereignty issue from the day one of their existence. This sovereignty issue has been securitized and presented as an existential threat to the state of Pakistan vis-a-vis India and to the state of India vis-a-vis China. Both of these countries have used sovereignty to go through the securitization process and achieved nuclear weapons by allocating high defense budgets, even bypassing the poor conditions and basic needs of the people of their respective countries.

Despite having the credible minimum deterrence, although sovereignty has been secured permanently, yet this securitization phenomenon has started an arms race between these neighbors. It has created a security dilemma and due to this deliberately created security dilemma, there is an enhanced trust deficit between the two states that has pitched both of these countries into permanent enemies of each other for good.

In this research article securitization theory presented by "Ole Waever" and "Bary Buzan" of the Copenhagen School of Thought, has been discussed and India-Pakistan situation has been taken as a case study to elaborate this concept in details.

Literature Review

No real research study can be conducted without completely going through the already available research works that actually has presented the issue initially in its details. While doing this research article following literature has been reviewed that has enhanced the worth of this complex phenomenon of securitization.

Major themes of this research article on which literature has been reviewed are as under:

Theme 1: securitization and the Copenhagen School of Thought

Securitization theory has been introduced to international relations by Ole Waever in his book, "Security: A New Framework for Analysis" (1998). It is a process of state actors transforming subjects into matters of security by posing it an existential threat. Ole Waever & Barry Bazen (1983) and Jap de Wilde (1998) are of the view that it is an extreme version of politicization that enables extraordinary weapon to be used in the name of security. They belong to the Copenhagen School of thought which proposed it against the traditionalist's concept of security theory. They say issues that are securitized don't necessarily represent the issue which is essential to the objective survival of the state, rather it involve in constructing an issue into an existential threat.

On the other hand, Ken Booth and Richard Wyn Jone who represent the Aberystwyth School or Critical Security Studies emphasized to work with the tradition of Critical Theory which has its roots in Marxism. Traditionalists also criticized and raised the question as to where the border of widened and deepening of security concept is presented by the Copenhagen School of thoughts. They admit the sectors involved in the securitization but still emphasize that the attack or withdrawal of military forces must remain the main goal of strategic analysis (Chipman, 1991).

When we go through the concept of securitization present by the Copenhagen School of thought, although issues seem genuine which are securitized, yet one cannot disagree to a larger extent to the Aberystwyth School of thought regarding the social transformation by elucidating human emancipation barriers and possibilities. For traditionalists' criticism, it can be said that more than enough has been done on the traditional concept of security, but with the changing requirements of the world it is necessary to securitize and enhance the non-traditional security issues as well which are also a possible existential threats to humanity.

Theme 2: Security Dilemma

The security dilemma in IR refers to a situation in which, under anarchy, a state strengthens its security through military strength, key alliances and commitment to use of weapons which create an insecurity for other neighboring or regional states. Resultantly, other states also take parallel measures for their security enhancement, and due to this rising tension, it results in creating a conflict. John H. Herz book "Political Realism and Political Ideology" (1951), describes the security dilemma in the perspective of state security. Similarly, The British historian Herbert Butterfield described the same situation in his book "History and Human Relation" and referred to it as "the absolute predicament and irreducible dilemma".

On the contrary, defensive realist like Kenneth Waltz in his book "Theory of International Politics" says, as there is no central authority in the world and it is anarchic, so survival is the main motivation of every state. But he also goes on to say that, this anarchical structure of international system encourages states to maintain moderate and reserved policies. Whereas, the offensive realists like John Mearshimer assumes that states seek to maximize their power and influence to achieve security through domination and hegemony.

The concept of security dilemma is very old. Currently, this concept has been adopted as an excuse to enhance the state power on the one or the other pretext. But this concept seems more relevant from offensive realist point of action in the present situation of power politics and the hegemonic designs of the powerful states. In the name of balance of power, security dilemma has been created by almost all the states of the world. Although it is dangerous, yet it is relevant from the existence or survival point of view in this very anarchical structure of the world.

Material and Methods

Securitization of sovereignty is a pretty unusual area of research study due to sensitivity of the issue. As this does not fall under the quantification of material, so to define the issues of sovereignty, security dilemma and trust deficit, qualitative methodology has been adopted to conduct this research study. Through the use of descriptive approach whole issue has been discussed very candidly. Diplomatic correspondence, national archives, foreign office communiqués, newspaper articles and various survey reports are the methods that have been adopted to cement the relevancy of this issue. Moreover, securitization theory has been discussed elaborately, with its complete framework of analysis so that the issue could be analyzed on solid grounds.

Framework of Securitization

The concept of securitization is indebted to the Copenhagen School of Thought that emerged after the cold war. It was basically concerned with the widening and deepening of security concept applied to the analysis of state' foreign policy (Smith, 2005; Abrahamsen, 2005), construction of transnational crimes (Emmers, 2003), HIV/AIDS as security threat (Elbe, 2006), various divisions of war on terror (Buzan, 2006) and to the minority rights

(Roe, 2004). Recently immigration has also been taken into the securitization concept. It was Ole Weavers (1995) in mind 1990s who introduced the concept of securitization in international relations and it was fully recognized in his book "Security; A framework for Analysis" in 1998. *The most problematic issue with securitization is that it is normally taken as the construction of security and the assumption of security politics as negative and exclusionary.*

In this book Weaver defined security as a 'speech act', "with securitization referring to a particular issue as an existential threat. He defined these speech acts as securitizing moves that finally become securitization through audience consent" (Weaver, 1995, pp.56-57). According to Copenhagen School theorists, "in international relation any issue can become a security issue if it is posed as an existential threat to the state and extraordinary measures have to be taken to cope with it" (Buzan, et al., 1998). The securitization theory argues that an issue does not become a security issue because something constitutes an objective threat to the state. It rather becomes a security threat because a speech actor has posed something as existential threat to some object's survival. In this way the securitizing actor claims that such issue needs an extraordinary measure to be taken for the survival of the referent object. Securitizing actor performing securitizing moves (posing something as existential threat) must have to be accepted by the audience. It is only then possible that the issue would move above from the normal sphere of politics, and extraordinary steps could be taken in this regard. It is, however, noteworthy that Copenhagen School considers "security should be seen as a negative, as a failure to deal with issues of normal politics" (Buzan, et al., 1998). So, they prefer de-securitization i.e. issues removed from exceptional conditions to the ordinary public sphere.

According to Copenhagen School, state is referred as the main referent object. As mentioned earlier, there are three conceptual tools of analysis described by the Copenhagen scholars and one of the three is called the 'sectorization' of security. Various issues have been divided into these different sectors which include mainly, political, environment, economic security and societal security (Buzan & Hansen, 2009). To widen the security agenda concept into sectors other than military was a political decision. These sectors are not purely the analytical concept but are socially constructed by the Copenhagen school scholars, instead. In the framework of securitization all securitization acts have four components.

Referent Object: It is the very entity which is being threatened and has a legitimate right for survival. It may include States, political regimes, national identity, state sovereignty, environment etc. (Buzan, et al., 1998).

Securitization Actor: It is the elite that makes the securitizing move and presents certain issues as security threat through the speech act. They include political elites, lobby, pressure groups, government, international establishment etc. (Buzan, et al., 1998).

Existential Threat: It is an object or idea that is potentially identified as very harmful and existential threat to the state (Buzan, et al., 1998).

Audience: It is the target of securitization actor to which he has to persuade and to make them accept that certain issue is a security threat (Buzan, et al., 1998).

Copenhagen school theorists are a synthesis of classical realists and social constructivists. Copenhagen school's logic of security has been taken up by Critical Security Studies Scholars who follow the tradition of Gramscian critical theory and the Frankfurt School's critical social theory, both rooted in Marxism (Smith, 2005). It is based on the works of "Ken Booth and Richard Wyn Jones" (Jones, 1995). They not only criticize the traditional approaches but also re-conceptualized security studies by making human emancipation their focus. Booth argues that true human security can only be achieved, through a process

of emancipation by the people or group, if they don't deprive others of it (Booth, 1991). These were two basic schools of thoughts of securitization and they both agree on the broadening of security concept apart from their differences.

Sovereignty and the Security Dilemma

Securitization framework very candidly mentions the issues that are securitized and made existential threat through the speech act of securitization actors. Sovereignty is one of those issues over which the whole structure of a modern nation state is built on. States go to every length to remain sovereign over their territory and their internal state system. About ninety percent of wars in the world have been fought on the issue of sovereignty. Whenever the states try to accumulate power through various means and get it so, they become so independent in their attitude towards other states that they try to dictate them through the use of bluffs, threats or unnecessary intervention in their internal affairs. This is where sovereignty of other state comes under direct threat and if the state under threat is rather weak, her sovereignty is definitely compromised and it becomes a client state to the powerful aggressor (Buzan, 1991). "Sovereignty is the right of a governing body to exercise the legally acquired power over the specific territory of a state without any outside interference". This sovereignty is both internal over the affairs of a state, that the relevant government gets from the constitution of a country, and external over its independent relations with other states, in which all other states are bound to respect her territorial borders and would never interfere in her internal affairs, as well.

In the current anarchical international system where every state has to ensure its security through the self-help, sovereignty is the major issue that needs to be secured at all costs. For this purpose, states need real power to stop the powerful aggressors from challenging its sovereignty (Booth, 1991). To achieve this end, every state enhances its security, through all necessary means, so that no belligerent power could influence its internal affair and become an aggressor towards its external territorial boundaries through threat or the use of threat. This security is only ensured through the piling up of latest weaponry as missile technology, nuclear arsenal, sophisticated arms and ammunition, making alliances and by raising up its military strength (Glaser, 2014). Due to such suspicious efforts of a state, it creates a trust deficit in other states and a situation of uncertainty arises among them as to what are the intentions of that state for these efforts. In such situation where one state's security causes insecurity for another, due to which it increases its relative power for survival, it is called the security dilemma. Due to this security dilemma, there starts an arms race between the states for the balance of power equilibrium (Booth & Whaler, 2008; Jervis, 1978). Under such irrational arms race, states even exhaust their precious resources at the cost of their people's economic well-being and prosperity.

The term "Security Dilemma" was first coined by the German scholar John Herz. in his book "Political Realism and Political Idealism" in 1951 (Herz, 1951). It is also called the spiral model. At the same time Herbert Butterfield, a British historian, described it in his book 'History and Human Relations' in which he referred it as "the absolute predicament and irreducible dilemma" (Butterfield, 1951), (Roe & Paul, 1999).

John Herz elaborates it as follows, "group and individuals who live alongside each other without being organized into a higher unity.... must be.....concerned about their security from being attacked, subjected, dominated or annihilated by other group or individuals. Striving to attain security from such attacks, they are driven to acquire more and more power from others. This in turn renders the others more insecure and compels them to prepare for the worst. Because no state can ever feel entirely secure in such a world of competing units, power competition ensues and the vicious circle of security and power accumulation is on" (Herz, 1951, p. 157). He has described six aspects of security dilemma (i) anarchy, (ii) uncertainty and fear (iii) power competition (iv) self-defeating security due arms race (v) security dilemma because of war (vi) self-reinforcing vicious cycle (Herz,

1951). In the same way Robert Jervis and Herbert Butterfield also presented their aspects of security dilemma and they largely agree on these aspects on the whole (Jervis, 1978). Most appropriated example to understand the security dilemma is the beginning of World War I and the origin and end of the cold war. (Jervis, 2001).

There are three prior logics for the application of security dilemma i.e. fatalistic (enemies), mitigator (competitor), and transcender (friends). (Booth & Waever 2008, pp.143-144). Interestingly, fatalistic logic coincides with Mearsheimer's offensive realism under realist school of thought e.g. security paradox of cold war between NATO and Warsaw Pact states (Mearseimer, 1995, p. 82). In the same way Waltz's, structural realism also aligns with the fatalistic logic of security dilemma (Booth & Waever, 2008, p.143). These three logics create a sliding fear towards the other also.

In order to reduce the risks of war, security dilemma have to be alleviated. Under different schools of thought security dilemma can be alleviated in this way. As security dilemma is the theoretical linchpin of **Defensive Realism**, so they argue that 'it makes possible genuine cooperation between the states forgetting the fleeting alliance while facing the common foe (Shipping, September 2008, pp. 451-70). Against the optimism of defensive realist, **Offensive Realists** are convinced that 'security dilemma makes war inevitable'. Realist scholars have hardly used this concept (Mearseimer, 1995). **Neo-Liberal** scholars are of the views that 'alleviation of security dilemma is one of the functions of international institutions (Copeland 2000). **Liberals** on the other hand claim that 'democratic institutions facilitate people precisely because through them security dilemma is alleviated also (Doyle, 1983, pp. 205-35). **Constructivist** are of the view that 'alleviation of security dilemma is one of the channels through which remaking of anarchy is possible by reshaping the identity (Agius, 2013).

These were the school of thought which throw light as to how the security dilemma can be alleviated and wars can be avoided.

Sovereignty as a Securitized Construct in the India-Pakistan Rivalry

After completely going through the framework of securitization and thoroughly understanding the various aspects of security dilemma, now the whole framework of securitization would be analyzed in the prevailing India-Pakistan distrustful situation where both these nuclear powers confront with each other over their unresolved issues since 1947. From the day one of their independence, both these countries consider each other as foes and despite many efforts they could not bridge the trust gap that has created a situation of uncertainty in which both are not ready to normalize their poor and fractured relations. There are many elements that proved responsible for the present condition of their worst relations. Most important of these elements are the religious identify and the unresolved issue of Jammu and Kashmir, apart from many others. On the issue of Kashmir both countries have fought three complete wars and forth a near war but this issue could not be resolved, till now. It is the core reason of fractured relations and enhanced trust deficit, apart from the terrorism allegations levelled by both countries over each other.

In India-Pakistan rivalry sovereignty has always remained a core issue specifically with regards to Pakistan, as India has always kept a belligerent attitude towards Pakistan. The separation of East-Pakistan in which India played a nefarious role, apart from the mistakes of Pakistan, and later on India getting nuclear in 1974, when it conducted the nuclear test "smiling Buddha", further threatened the sovereignty of Pakistan. Then, the capture of Siachen Glacier in 1984 by the Indian army totally shattered all hopes of having any peaceful mutual co-existence alignment between each other. India never let any chance slip to defame Pakistan at all levels. On the other hand, Pakistan always felt itself insecure due to ever increasing defense purchases, staggering defense budget and latest technology pacts of India with Russia and Israel.

When on May 11, 1998 India conducted its five nuclear tests, Pakistan was forced to test its nuclear weapons because after that many Indian politician and defense analysts started threatening Pakistan that now it would have to live according to the Indian hegemonic desires. Again, questions arose over the sovereignty of Pakistan and it responded with six nuclear explosions on May 28, 1998. Now, both have become nuclear powers and have achieved credible minimum deterrence that has secured their sovereignty issue forever.

On the contrary, there started an arms race between both of these states, afterwards. As India is a larger economy than Pakistan so its defense budget is always higher than Pakistan's. Due to this difference, there became a security paradox between the two. The overt nuclear explosions by both created a security dilemma and that resulted in the arms race. India started piling up weapons and sophisticated technology on the pretext of China factor that it has a direct threat from her. So, beefing up its security and acquisition of modern weapons are to protect India from Chinese aggression. In this regard, 1962's Indo-China war and Chinese control of Tibet region is quoted by India to justify this pile up.

India purchased latest weapons that included latest fighter jets, nuclear submarines, air craft carrier, ballistic and cruise missile technology, missile defense shield, Submarine launched ballistic missiles (SLBM), drone technology and modernizing its military forces and weapons. From Russia to USA, France, Germany, Israel, Britain and Canada all countries did the contracts of defense purchases with India (Glaser, 2014). As India is a big market, so every country is ready to sell weapons and latest technology to India. This has brought India to one of the largest importers of weapons in the world.

This strategic imbalance has created a security dilemma between both of these countries. We have discussed earlier in this research paper that beefing up of one country's security paraphernalia creating insecurity for other neighboring or regional country is called security dilemma. This is exactly what happened to Pakistan's current situation. Pakistan perceived these Indian overtures as security threat to its existence and sovereignty. So, Pakistan also started to purchase arms and latest sophisticated technology from its allies like China, apart from the USA and West. Its defense budget started rising up and today it has reached to over Rs.2 trillion (\$9bn), whereas all other sectors have been ignored at the cost of defense. Pakistan got most of its weapons from the USA earlier on, and now China has also become its strategic partner and provides it latest weaponry. Presently, Pakistan has latest missile technology, F-16s, J-10, JF-17 thunder jets, Drone technology, latest submarines, ballistic and cruise missiles technology and more importantly the tactical nuclear weapons to respond in case of any hot pursuit, surgical strikes or any operation under India's Cold Start Doctrine or Cyber-attack. So, there exist an arms race between these two countries due to this ever-growing security dilemma and the trust deficit.

Moreover, there has been consecutive isolated incident after May, 1998 nuclear tests, which were either committed by the spoilers of peace, resulting in this irrational practice of piling up of weapons in the name of security, or issues created due to this security dilemma cropped up by actions & reactions of both states. We can notice a trajectory of actions in the name of terrorism and counter-terrorism phenomenon adopted by both of these states, raising threat perception and so this arms race is continued till now. After each good will gesture in the hope of normalization between them, some untoward incident took place within days or months and the whole peace effort converted into a nonstarter. We can see PM Atal Bihari Vajpayee visited Pakistan in February, 1999 and two months later Kargil conflict arises in April. Again talks, though inconclusive, between President Musharraf and PM Vajpayee were held through the Agra Summit in a congenial environment (Jones, 1995) and three months later Indian Parliament was attacked by the Jihadi terrorists. Then, Ceasefire Agreement and Musharraf's 4-point formula to resolve the Kashmir issue took place and two months later Sumjhota Express tragedy befallen. After some time CBM's adopted by the new civil government started talks and in November 2008 Mumbai attacks

happened. In the same way PM Modi visited PM Nawaz Sharif on December 25, 2015 and a week later on January 2, 2016 Pathankot attacks took place. Then, Uri attack in September 2016, Pulwama attack in February 2019 and the most recent Pahalgam attack in April 2025 depicts a gulf of trust deficit between both of these neighboring countries even after the lapse of more than seven decades of their independence, now. So, all these actions have created a chronic strategic rivalry and enhanced security dilemma to keep this arms race alive. Interestingly, both these states are doing it at the cost of their people's economic well-being and prosperity, overall.

What is more important to note in this research paper is that all this is being played in the name of securing the sovereignty, specifically in the case of Pakistan. So, this sovereignty issue is deliberately going through the process of securitization. As sovereignty could not be compromised, so it always becomes an existential threat for a state. But this logic seems irrational now. After being accepted as a nuclear state internationally, achieving credible minimum deterrence, having latest ballistic and cruise missile technology, SLBM technology, tactical nuclear weapons and full spectrum deterrence, sovereignty is completely secured and there is not an iota hope of being compromised sovereignty against Indian hegemonic designs (Glaser, 2014). But we see that sovereignty issue is securitized and deliberately made or portrayed as an existential threat by the securitization actors i.e. politicians and the defense elite, for the security of Pakistan. As securitization process needs extraordinary steps due to existential threat, so Pakistan is engaged in unnecessary arms race and rising defense budget in competition with India which is a much bigger economy and politically stable to bear these expenses. Securitization actors in Pakistan i.e. Politicians and defense elite have been busy in propagating this self-portrayed false existential threat mantra of compromised sovereignty issue against India, to make things unnecessarily more complicated. As sovereignty has already been secured, so the security dilemma is also deliberately created to keep parity with India in the arms race which is irrational and useless, keeping in mind the current economic woes of Pakistan. But all this is done at the cost of people of Pakistan's economic well-being and prosperity. It is totally irrational to defeat India in this arms race as India is far bigger economy than Pakistan. So, it is negatively impacting on the political, economic and social fabric of Pakistan.

Major Findings

Following are the major findings of this research study:

- Sovereignty has unnecessarily been securitized after gaining the credible minimum deterrence
- Securitization or speech actors i.e. Politicians and defense elite in Pakistan are more influential and powerful than the masses, who easily make inroads in their opinion making due to lack of their knowledge
- Security dilemma cannot be alleviated until confidence building measure (CBMs) are adopted to reduce the trust deficit with India
- Mutual co-existence is the only solution for the peace and prosperity of both these nations

Conclusion

As we know that the securitization process is done through the speech act by the securitized actor, while posing some issue as an existential threat, so we can easily understand the concept of India-Pakistan peace conundrum under the securitization framework. The sovereignty of Pakistan has been secured after achieving the credible minimum deterrence on May 28, 1998, but still this issue has been securitized and an arms

race is further moving on from nuclear warheads to the latest ballistic missile, cruise missile, sub-marine launched ballistic missile, high-tech artillery to the most dangerous tactile nuclear weapons. It has brought economic woes to the people of both these nations, specifically to Pakistan. This self-created security dilemma has further enhanced the trust deficit between both these countries. Now, the situation has raised to such level as both are not even willing to play or even want to shake hands with each other, what to talk about improved mutual relations.

The only solution left behind is to de-securitize (removing sovereignty as existential threat) the already secured sovereignty issue. This would alleviate the trust deficit and would stop the arms race between the two countries also. Through this act the self-created security dilemma would also recede and the chances of long-lasting peace would be ensured. This would finally bring the normalization of relations between these two nuclear states and the focus would be shifted from arms race to the development and prosperity of the country and its people.

Recommendations

In the light of above-mentioned major findings, following recommendations are made through this research paper in order to deal with this issue properly:

- De-securitization of sovereignty (removing it as existential threat) should be done after discussing with the stakeholders
- Confidence building measures (CBMs) should be restarted with India to enhance the trust deficit
- Arms race with India should be stopped, as this is irrational under current situation
- Democracy should be strengthened and democratic institution should be empowered to do their job according to the prescribed constitutional mandate to alleviate the security dilemma
- Securitization actors i.e. Politicians and defense elites in Pakistan should give

people a chance to step forward toward economic development and prosperity by desensitizing irrational issues as arms race with India

- Ties with India should be mended at all levels after ensuring security, as China has adopted this strategy after 1962 war with India

References

- Buzan, Waever & Wilde, (1998). *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. London: Lynne Rienner.
- Agius, C. (2013). *Social Constructivism In Contemporary Security Studies*. edited by A. Collins . Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baldwin, A. D. (1997). *The Concept of Security*. Review of International Studies.
- Barry Buzan and L Hansen. (2009). *Widening and Deepening Security*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Booth, K. (1991). *Security and Emancipation*. Review of International Relations.
- Booth, K. (1991). *Security in Anarchy: Utopian Realism in Theory and Practice*. International Affairs.
- Butterfield, H. (1951). *History and Human Relations*. London: Collins.
- Buzan, B. (1991). *People State and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post Cold War Era*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Doyle, M. W. (1983). *Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs*. Philosophy and Public Affairs.
- Glaser, C. (2013). *Realism*. Contemporary Security Studies.
- Glaser, C. (2013). *The Security Dilemma and the Ethnic Conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Glaser, C. (2014). *When Are Arms Race Dangerous*. International Security.
- Herz, J. (1951). *Political Realism and Political Idealism: A Study in Theories and Realities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jervis, R. (1978). *Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma*. World Politics.
- Jervis, R. (2001). *Was the Cold War a Security Dilemma*. Journal of Cold War Studies.
- Jones, W. (1995). *Message in a Bottle? Theory and Practice in Critical Security Studies*. Contemporary Security Policy.
- Ken Booth, N Wheeler. (2008). *Uncertainty In Security Studies: An Introduction edited by P. Williams*. New York: Routledge.
- Kydd, A. (2005). *Trust and Mistrust in International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mearseimer, J. (1995). *A Realist Reply*. International Security.
- Morgan, P. (2013). *Liberalism In Security Studies*. edited by A Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shipping, T. (September 2008). *Fear in International Politics: Two Positions*. International Studies.

- Smith, S. (2005). *The Contested Concept of Security in Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. London: Rienner.
- Waever, O. (1995). *Securitization and Desecuritization*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wendt, A. (1995). *Constructin Internation Politics*. International Security.