

NATIONAL POLITICS FROM MILITARY PERSPECTIVE

By KAPT MOHAMMAD FIRDAUS BIN SUDIN (3013792)
Border Regiment

Politics has existed as long as humans have faced scarcity, have had different beliefs and preferences, and have had to resolve these differences while allocating scarce resources. National politics refers to the processes, actions, and dynamics involved in a nation's governance and decision-making at the national level. It includes the political institutions, players, policies, and disputes that affect the direction and operation of a country's government and public affairs. National politics entails the exercise of authority, the creation and execution of laws and policies, and the management of social, economic, and political concerns that impact the whole country. Political institutions, political parties, political leaders, public opinion and public society, policy development and execution, election and political campaigns, power dynamics and political rivalry, and foreign connections are all important components of national politics. The rules in any political environment affect who has power and how they can use it. Consider the rules that determine who can vote and how.

The operation of political institutions such as the executive branch, legislative bodies, and judicial systems is important to national politics. These institutions are in charge of establishing and implementing laws, making policy choices, and regulating government operations. Political parties are crucial in national politics. They represent many philosophies, interests, and goals for the country, and they seek political power through elections. Following that are political parties, which develop policy agendas, mobilise support, and engage in legislative procedures. They frequently battle for government authority and influence policy direction. While national politics are shaped by political leaders such as presidents, prime ministers, cabinet ministers, and party leaders. They are in charge of making strategic choices, leading their respective political parties, and representing the country at home.

Politicians frequently set the agenda, negotiate with other leaders, and give guidance on critical topics and policies (Herbet C Edeh, 2014). Furthermore, popular opinion and civil society activity impact national politics. Citizens aggregate ideas, tastes, and concerns are reflected in public opinion. It has the power to influence political discussions, policy agendas, and election outcomes. Advocacy groups, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), and trade unions all play important roles in advocating specific interests and holding political leaders responsible. Furthermore, national politics entails the development and execution of policies addressing a wide variety of concerns, such as the economy, healthcare, education, social welfare, defence, and international relations. Policymaking frequently requires lengthy arguments, agreements, and compromises among many parties. Policy implementation requires collaboration among government agencies and other stakeholders. Elections are also an important part of national politics in democratic democracies.

Elections provide residents the ability to pick their representatives and leaders. Candidates and parties engage with the public, articulate their policy positions, and seek popular support during political campaigns. Elections have a tremendous impact on the allocation of political power and can result in substantial changes in the national political landscape. Power dynamics and political struggle among many parties, factions, and interest groups characterise national politics. Political players struggle for power, attempt to control public opinion, and battle for resources and positions of authority (Fuad, 2022). National politics is characterised by power struggles, alliances, and coalitions. National politics cannot exist in isolation from the larger framework of international relations. Foreign policy choices, treaties, and global events all have an impact on domestic politics, and vice versa. National politics, in general, refers to the processes, institutions, players, and policies that determine a country's governance and decision-making. It entails exercising authority, developing and implementing laws and regulations, and managing social, economic, and political challenges. Understanding national politics is critical for

understanding how a country's government runs, how choices are made, and how national public affairs are managed.

When examined through a military lens, national politics gives a unique prism through which to comprehend the interplay between a country's military and civilian leadership. The military serves the Constitution through obedience to democratically elected civilian officials without regard for political party or partisan positions. The notion of civilian control of the military is a key premise in democratic societies, emphasising the critical role of civilian leaders who are elected or nominated to exercise power over the armed forces. This viewpoint examines the link between the military and the political system, examining how the military impacts and is impacted by political choices, policies, and the larger political landscape. Understanding national politics from a military standpoint demands an examination of key aspects such as constitutional frameworks, the role of political leadership in decision-making, the chain of command, oversight and accountability mechanisms, the promotion of professionalism and ethical standards, defence policy formulation, and the maintenance of democratic supremacy. We learn how civilian control of the military is maintained, how defence policies are established and executed, and how the military's expertise is used to protect national security interests by investigating these factors.

This viewpoint acknowledges that civilian control of the military is critical for defending democratic norms, protecting human rights, and ensuring national stability. It emphasises the importance of a clear and unambiguous chain of command, in which civilian authorities maintain ultimate power over the armed forces while depending on military personnel' knowledge. Furthermore, civilian control guarantees supervision and accountability, limiting power abuses and promoting openness in military matters. Furthermore, from a military standpoint, developing defence strategy is a joint effort involving civilian leaders and military specialists. Assessing threats, formulating national security objectives, and making educated decisions on resource

allocation, force composition, and modernization are all part of it. This interaction between civilian and military peoples creates the nation's defence posture and influences its ability to respond to new security problems. Finally, studying national politics from a military standpoint helps us better comprehend the difficult balance between civilian rule and military competence. It emphasises the need of keeping civilian decision-making power while harnessing military assets to protect national interests. We may get useful insights into the difficulties of governance, national security, and the maintenance of democratic principles inside a country by investigating the nuanced interaction between the military and the political system.

Examining national issues from a military standpoint involves looking into the link between a country's military and its political structure. It entails examining how a country's military impacts and is impacted by political decisions, policies, and dynamics. Consider civilian control of the military, national security and policy, military budget and resource allocation, influence on policy decisions, stability and national resilience, defence industrial complex, international relations, and military professionalism when looking at national politics from a military perspective.

Civilian control of the military refers to the theory and practise of ensuring that political power is exercised over the armed services by elected or appointed civilian officials (Jim Gorby, 2020). It is a key concept of democratic administration, emphasising that citizens, rather not the military, have the last say on defence and national security issues. Control of the military by civilians is often established in a country's constitution or legal structure. The constitution defines the form of government, the duties and responsibilities of civilian authorities, and the military's powers and limits. It establishes the link between the political leadership and the armed forces, ensuring that the military acts within civilian authority's limitations.

Civilian control refers to the way civilian authorities, such as the head of state, president, prime minister, defence minister, or appropriate governmental organisations, make decisions on defence policy, military strategy, and the use of force (Zaki Salleh, 2020). These leaders rely on military personnel for advice and experience, but they maintain the ability to shape and determine national security objectives, military actions, and budget allocation. There is a clear and unmistakable chain of command under civilian control, with civilian officials at the top exerting power over the military. This command structure assures that military personnel, regardless of rank or position, eventually report to civilian authorities. Civilian leaders choose top military officials, develop policies and directives, and have the authority to promote, reassign, or discharge military personnel. Civilian control includes procedures for supervision and accountability to guarantee that the military follows democratic standards and protects human rights. Legislative oversight committees, parliamentary scrutiny, or independent authorities in charge of overseeing military activity, budget distribution, and adherence to legal and ethical norms may be involved. Such measures of supervision aim to avoid abuses of power and to ensure openness. There is a clear and unmistakable chain of command under civilian control, with civilian officials at the top exerting power over the military. This command structure assures that military personnel, regardless of rank or position, eventually report to civilian authorities.

Civilian leaders choose the highest military officials, develop policies and directives, and have the authority to promote, reassign, or discharge military personnel. Civilian control includes procedures for supervision and accountability to guarantee that the military follows democratic standards and protects human rights. Legislative oversight committees, parliamentary scrutiny, or independent authorities in charge of overseeing military activity, budget distribution, and adherence to legal and ethical norms may be involved. Such measures of supervision aim to avoid abuses of power and to ensure openness. Civilian oversight fosters professionalism and ethical behaviour in the military. It places a premium on following legal frameworks, human rights norms,

and international humanitarian law. Civilian leaders are accountable for fostering a culture that values honesty, discipline, democratic ideals, and the rule of law. They create norms and regulations that regulate military behaviour, such as rules of engagement, prisoner treatment, and disciplinary processes. Civilian control delegated to civilians the authority to develop defence policies, create national security objectives, and allocate defence resources. Civilian leaders analyse threats, prioritise defence needs, and make educated choices on force organisation, procurement, modernisation, and budgetary allocations in conjunction with military specialists (Frankie D'Cruz, 2021). This guarantees that defence strategy is consistent with larger national interests and democratic goals. By preserving the supremacy of elected or appointed civilian authorities, civilian control of the military strengthens democratic norms. It guarantees that the military is used as a tool for national defence and security rather than as a separate political entity. Nations can reduce the likelihood of military coups, political instability, and the loss of democratic institutions by maintaining civilian rule. Finally, civilian control of the military is a pillar of democratic administration. It establishes the predominance of civilian power in defence and national security decision-making, supervision, and accountability. Nations can respect democratic values, safeguard human rights, and maintain stability and civilian dominance in the government of their armed forces by ensuring that the military functions within the parameters set by elected or appointed civilians.

Then there's national politics, which are vital in shaping a country's national security strategy. Politicians define national security interests, identify possible dangers, and develop policies to handle them. Based on the broader political aims, they distribute resources, including defence budgets, and make choices on force organisation, modernisation, and military capabilities. National security policy is frequently shaped by political leaders depending on their political interests and agenda. Domestic issues, ideological convictions, and electoral factors may all have an impact on these objectives. As a result, rather than solely strategic considerations, political

calculations may impact the military's objectives, budget allocation, and operational concentration. Furthermore, political involvement can have an influence on the distribution of national security resources. Defence expenditures are largely established by political procedures, and political leaders may prioritise other areas above defence spending. This can lead to insufficient budget for military modernization, equipment, training, and manpower, undermining the military's effectiveness and preparedness. Political influence can place operational limits on the military. To minimise international backlash or local resistance, political leaders may put limitations on the use of force, rules of engagement, or particular objectives. While these limits may be required for legal or political reasons, they can hamper the military's capacity to respond to threats and achieve military objectives. Political meddling can have an impact on national security decision-making processes.

Political authorities may disregard or ignore military advice, resulting in judgements influenced more by political factors than military experience. This has the potential to reduce the efficacy and efficiency of military operations and strategy. Foreign policy objectives are inextricably related to national security policy objectives. Political involvement can cause diplomatic or commercial goals to take precedence over military ones. This can lead to a misalignment of military capabilities and foreign policy objectives, thus jeopardising national security in the long run. Political meddling can have an influence on civil-military relations, or the connection between political officials and the military.

Excessive political meddling can weaken confidence and professionalism within the military, resulting in a breakdown in communication and cooperation. To sustain successful national security decision-making, it is critical to maintain a healthy mix of civilian control and military competence. In some circumstances, party politics may have an impact on national security policy. Different political parties or groups may hold opposing views on security issues,

defence priorities, or military operations. Political parties may utilise national security problems as political leverage or participate in polarised arguments, which can impede a coherent and united approach to national security. As a result, political meddling in national security policy can have both beneficial and harmful implications. Politicians must find a balance between addressing political concerns and guaranteeing the military's effectiveness and preparedness to protect national security. Maintaining an open and participatory process, including military experience, and taking long-term strategic goals into account are all critical in reducing the harmful impact of political meddling on national security strategy.

Political interference may have an impact on military doctrine, which specifies the ideas, norms, and methods that direct military actions. Political meddling in military doctrine has serious consequences for the military's performance, operational capabilities, and overall strategic direction. It will be consistent with political objectives and philosophies. Political involvement can cause changes in military doctrine to line with the government's political aims (Burhanudin Jalal et al, 2022). Military doctrine may be altered or reinterpreted to emphasise certain operational principles or strategic aims that represent the policy agenda of the government. As a result, the focus may move from traditional military objectives to other areas of relevance to the political leadership. Aside from that, political intervention can influence force structure decisions, which can alter military doctrine. Based on political reasons such as job creation, economic development, or geopolitical messaging, political leaders may prioritise various sorts of military assets or platforms. This can result in a mismatch between the military's operational requirements and the resources available, thereby affecting the military's effectiveness. Political influence can also have an impact on military doctrine's rules of engagement (ROE). ROE control the use of force by military troops and specify the conditions under which force may be used. Based on political concerns, political authorities may put constraints or rules on the military's use of force, which can hinder the military's capacity to respond effectively to threats or achieve desired objectives.

ROE control the use of force by military troops and specify the conditions under which force may be used. Based on political concerns, political authorities may put constraints or rules on the military's use of force, which can hinder the military's capacity to respond effectively to threats or achieve desired objectives. Furthermore, political influence can affect military doctrine's strategic aims. Political leaders may establish objectives or directives that impact the overall mission and operational emphasis of the military. This can have an influence on the military's resource prioritisation, troop deployment, and involvement in certain types of missions. Political meddling can have an impact on military culture and doctrinal adherence. The political context and the leadership's influence may alter the military organization's values, beliefs, and priorities. This can have an impact on professional growth, decision-making processes, and overall military performance. While political influence can have an impact on military doctrine, there should be a balance between political considerations and military knowledge. Military doctrine should be based on strong strategic thought, operational needs, and an evaluation of the changing security environment. In order to guarantee that political meddling does not undermine the military's effectiveness, flexibility, and capacity to safeguard national security, input from military personnel and subject matter experts must be included (Burhanuddin Jalal, 2021).

Political intervention can have an impact on military defence planning and strategy. Political meddling in defence planning and strategy can have an impact on budget allocation, force structure decisions, strategic priorities, and the overall effectiveness of military assets. Political intervention can influence the distribution of defence resources. The defence budget and resource distribution are determined by political leaders depending on their goals and agenda. Domestic objectives, economic restraints, and electoral calculations can all impact the amount of money provided to the military. This can have an influence on the military's capacity to buy and maintain current equipment, conduct training, and engage in R&D. Political intervention can have an impact on military force structure decisions, such as the size, composition, and preparedness of the

military. Political concerns, rather than strictly strategic objectives, may drive political authorities to prioritise particular types of assets, platforms, or military branches. This can result in force imbalances, insufficient preparedness levels, or a misallocation of resources based on operational demands. Political intervention can influence military strategic priorities. Political leaders can direct the military's attention to certain dangers, areas, or missions based on their political goals. This can have an influence on strategic planning, operational preparedness, and deployment decisions in the military. For successful defence planning and strategy, the alignment of political agendas with strategic realities is critical. Through international commitments or duties, political involvement can have an influence on defence planning and strategy.

Defence policy can be shaped by political leaders to fit with international conventions, treaties, or alliances. This can have an impact on the military's force posture, interoperability needs, and overall defence strategy. To achieve effective defence capabilities, political meddling should take into account the military's operational requirements as well as national security objectives. Political intervention in defence planning and strategy can have an impact on technical breakthroughs and research goals. Political leaders may prioritise specific technology sectors for political reasons such as economic development, employment creation, or industrial interests. This can have an impact on the military's access to the latest innovations and its ability to maintain a technical advantage in a dynamic security scenario. Political meddling can have an influence on defence planning and strategic decision-making processes. Political authorities may disregard or ignore military advice, resulting in choices that are dictated more by political reasons than military knowledge. This can jeopardise the military's capacity to successfully plan for and respond to security problems. Defence planning and strategy are inextricably related to national security policy. Political meddling may impact national security policy, which in turn influences defence planning and strategy. Politicians define national security interests, identify dangers, and develop

policies to confront them. Defence planning and strategy should be consistent with the broader aims and objectives of national security policy.

Finally, from a military standpoint, national politics is crucial in influencing military aims, capabilities, and operations. Political meddling has the potential to have serious consequences for national security policy, military doctrine, foreign relations, defence planning, and strategy. While political issues are vital, ensuring successful and efficient military operations requires striking a compromise between political interests and military skill. Political intervention in national security policy can impact it by prioritising specific objectives, providing resources, and placing operational limits on the military. It can influence force structure decisions and impose constraints on the use of force by aligning military doctrine with political interests. Political influence in international relations can have an impact on military cooperation, alliances, arms sales, and military operations. Furthermore, political intervention may have an impact on defence planning and strategy by influencing budget allocation, force structure decisions, and strategic priorities. To get the best results, political leaders must evaluate the military's operational needs, long-term strategic goals, and the changing security picture. Communication between political leaders and military experts must be open and transparent in order to guarantee that political meddling does not jeopardise the military's effectiveness, preparedness, and capacity to preserve national security. Balancing civilian and military power is critical for sustaining a strong and capable military while addressing political concerns and guaranteeing national security.

(3,241 Words)