Developing Strategic Culture
Role of Institutes of Higher Education and Think Tanks

Gautam Sen

Contents

Developing Strategic Culture
Role of Institutes of Higher Education and Think Tanks

Preamble

We must today be realistic about two central arguments concerning the effects of the Cold War on international security before attempting to examine the development of Strategic Culture and the role of Institutes of Higher Education (HE) and Think Tanks (TT).

> "First, that very little has changed: International Relations (IR) are likely to be as violent in future as they have been in the past. Second, that cooperation as well as competition has been a feature of international politics in the past and the post-Cold War era has opened up an opportunity for an even more benign system of international and global security to develop"

The above observation entails that irrespective of the status of the nation state in the comity of nations, participating in the concert of nations, the nation states will not individually be part of a global symphony of nations. They may choose to have their behaviour and actions dictated, as during the Cold War era, by two super powers acting as conductors. It seems that the Cold War has returned. The movement may be thus in actions, activity, perceptions and policy formulations from the traditional realism to a more contemporary neo-realism.[1] It is within this matrix of neo-realism, reflecting a more robust, optimistic, independent, and yet interdependent world that the strategic culture of emerging major powers will develop independently. The game changer of international environment will thus be a--

> *"Refinement of neo-realist perspective (which reflects a more optimistic view of future international security)" to be considered under the "headings of 'contingent realism', 'mature anarchy', 'liberal institutionalism' and 'democratic peace'*[2]*"*

However, it will be well worth cautioning that despite the tremendous changes associated with the process of globalisation, there will be a continuity of tension between national and international security. Therefore, it is difficult to predict a paradigm shift in international politics since the process of globalisation will have major effects also on national security. The development of *"neo-strategic culture"* in the 21st century will also have to take into account many traditional issues and concerns related to the crisis of identity, clash of cultural and civilisational precondition, and the ugly face of terrorism, including the advent of the non-state actors on international stage which in significant proportion increase the complexity. All the above issues have to be factored in while conceptualising the "evolution of strategic culture" of any nation state without diluting the cultural and civilisational praxes or the legacy of strategic culture ensconced in the history of the state.

Information explosion leading to a possible universal knowledge-based society in the 21st century entails that the role of Institutes of Higher Education will be seminal for stability in the evolution of global international politics, including that of India and China. The inputs into strategic culture by the Institutes of Higher Education will have to be essentially policy relevant, and in accord with what Nehru called "adventure in ideas"[3]. This will uphold what was enunciated in "Swaraj in Ideas"[4]. The think tanks will have to bridge the gap between the realm of ideas and the domain of public policy making without forgetting that while theory cannot substitute judgment and experience, it catalyses both. Think tanks therefore will have to produce policy oriented outputs not based on strong opinions and advocacy, but drawing on detailed studies based on empirical evidence, privileged information, if any, and by incorporating social science methodology to aid policy making. The policy makers with executive responsibilities cannot always find time and energy for theoretical ideas and empirical evidence. They could draw upon the input of think tanks and institutes of higher education. It is this concert of effort by the town and gown which will be essential to give shape to the strategic culture of the 21st century for securing the nation state "without sacrificing the core values, and to resort to war except when inevitable and be able to maintain them [values] to secure victory in such a war [if challenged]", as observed by Walter Lippmann.

Proposition

This paper is Indo-centric in its deliberations and will attempt to examine the concept of building strategic culture in the Indian context and the role that Indian Institutes of Higher Education and Think Tanks must play in this regard. Strategic culture is status neutral and hence, has the same value of operation for any nation state – large or small, powerful or weak, developed or developing. Strategic culture implies the use of force or resistance to force for promoting and protecting the interest of the state and for promoting national interest by implementing a well defined national security policy. Notion that there will be equilibrium, allowing a nation state to survive without the use of force, is a gross misinterpretation of history and such a situation has never arisen. Strategic culture and use of force are inseparable in many situations and their acceptance is fundamental to the existence of strategic culture. There was a time in the history of India when strategic culture prevailed but that period was very short - from Chandragupta (circa 320 BC) till the end of Asoka's rule[5]. However, it needs to be pointed out that *"Ahimsa"* as a doctrine had been promulgated in India 300 years before the time of Buddha. The dark period of Indian history after Harshabardhan and the beginning of the alien Imperial Rule from the 11th Century (Mughals followed by the British) saw the demise of strategic culture in India. The body blow to strategic culture in India was also due to the fact that both the Mughals and the British actively supported mercenary soldiering in India, resulting in the common and the educated equating soldiering in general with mercenary services which implied support to the alien rule. They could never visualise Indian soldiering in Indian patriotic context.

It must be noted and recorded that the end of the alien rule in 1947 was not associated in the mind of the new rulers with war but with the doctrine of "Ahimsa". With the advent of Indian independence, strategic culture was considered to be irrelevant and the contribution of the Indian National Army was swiftly forgotten and deliberately rubbed out of public memory. But for the Chinese invasion, we might have continued in the same manner. It will be essential to interpret Onkar Marwah, who cautions us indirectly that the lack of strategic culture in India can be reversed if "India's strategy is 'smart', selective, and consensually sustained by insulation from ad-hoc re-direction or neglect due to the periodic democratic changes".[6]

A series of military debacles in the post independent period of India possibly shook the faith of the educated class and the educationists in India's capacity to make war to their advantage and keep the aggressors out. The entire corpus of learning in India and the entire educational system had excluded "war" as a subject of study on which highly cultivated and educated minds needed to dwell on. It was only in the Xth Plan documents that for the first time Defense and Strategic Studies was considered essential for inclusion as an integral part of undergraduate and post graduate studies in Indian Universities. Historically, war making is a national enterprise and not that of an individual's choice. I must strongly caution that if the best of minds were not to engage in study of war and the implications of war making academically to contribute to all aspects of the "Art and Science of war" within their academic institutions, then the matters will be left in the hands of the professional leading to potential hazards and inadequacy. This luxury is no longer available in the 21st century when cyber war, biological war and nuclear proliferation have besieged the globe. It also means that conventional warfare, guerilla wars and terrorism will never be outdated.

Conceptualising Strategic Culture

The Global Context

Strategic culture[7] has been defined as "that set of shared beliefs, assumptions, and modes of behavior, derived from common experiences and accepted narratives (both oral and written), that shape collective identity and relationships to other groups, and which determine appropriate ends and means for achieving security objectives". The academics as well as the professionals in the field of strategic studies and public policy making have been actively debating for nearly two decades to arrive at a consensus. Literature on strategic culture have been appearing from the time of the Cold War. Several writers in the late seventies and early eighties initiated the process of analysing strategic culture. This was primarily to focus on the difference between the nuclear strategies pursued by the erstwhile Soviet Union and the United States. Academics were lead by the likes of Snyder (1977), Gray (1981, 1986) and Pipes (1977) as these distinguished authors illustrated the differences and brought to focus distinctive national approaches

to evolve strategic nuclear policy based on two distinct streams of political ideologies. It is also interesting to indicate that Marxist-Leninist theory of the "inevitability of war between the proletariat and the capitalist class" underwent not only revision but also total transformation. In the erstwhile Soviet Union, Stalin postulated the Marxist–Leninist theoretical premise that war was not only inevitable between the capitalists and the proletariats, war was therefore in theory possible and in practice winnable. It was Khrushchev who brought about the first revisionism by indicating that though war was inevitable, and in theory possible, but in practice may not be winnable. The last part of revisionism occurred during the reign of Gorbechev when he rationalised that war is neither inevitable, nor in theory possible, nor in practice winnable. Most of the strategic culture responsible for the arms control negotiations between the two super powers was influenced by the change in perception of the inevitability and occurrence of war employing nuclear weapons or otherwise. There is no doubt that both sides were intent on avoiding mutually assured destruction without ruling out the possibility of total nuclear war.

Research following out of strategic culture in the post-1986 period and more so after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, for a considerable period was consigned to "academic backwater"[8]. There was very little conceptual development of strategic culture and research was shifted to empirical analysis of states and regions based on comparative military balances with scant attention to theory or methodology. This was in marked contrast to the Snyder, Gray, Pipes-era. We see in this period the emergence of defense analysts from amongst the non-nuclear but emerging developing states, especially India who had conducted a nuclear test but had not yet weaponised. However, from the mid 1990s, a revival of interest to study the relationship between culture and strategy was initiated which opened a number of old debates and brought to the fore new ones. The renewed interest was revived, first by scholars like A I Johnston[9] (1995) who attempted to provide a comprehensive theory of strategic culture and second, through the emergence of a debate to integrate cultural approaches with researches in the area of international relations. This has had a major significance since many scholars have started seeing in the study of cultural approaches the possibility for contributing towards an alternate way to theorising. This

strengthened the dominance of realist theories in strategic culture. These two trends have permitted the scholars researching in strategic culture to address a number of complex theoretical issues and push the debate for re-assessment of the traditional varieties of new strategic formulation.

Philosophy of India's Security Perspective Leading to Possible Development of Strategic Culture

An indepth study of the problems related to the cultural and civilisational aspects of our national security calls for a truly multidimensional perspective[10]. Many components of social science disciplines must come together for the formation of an integrated theoretical orientation. The problem of national security for a country like ours, which has experienced a series of catastrophes from within and a continuing threat from without, has to be formulated in terms of the larger goals and the aspiration to which this civilisational community has committed itself. Briefly, we may think of three such objectives namely,

- National stability and integrity
- Cultural, Social, Political and Economic aspirations and compulsions
- Peace and stability in our relations with other states whenever possible.

The problem of national security for a country, therefore, must be seen in terms of these larger goals. If this may be called the cultural dimension of the problems of national security, we also have to look at the problem from the political perspective. Here we have to consider a complex interaction between our perceptions of our neighbors beyond the borders as well as those of the larger major powers including their objectives. This must necessarily also include the remaining superpower. It is within this matrix of relationships that the specific goals of our security policy will get structured.

The cultural and political aspects of the problem create a texture of task and priorities of decision-making and the possible options for action. The actualisation of our objectives as modulated and structured requires an adequate process of institutionalisation, ranging from the economic to the administrative and the legal. The institutionalisation of our national security efforts itself creates further problems and difficulties. Hence all the three dimensions, viz. the cultural, socio-political and institutional enter

in a complex interaction calling for skills and patterns of leadership at all levels of the problems. Therefore we need to arrive at multiple dimensions of leadership. This calls for a creative response to the complexities of the problem. In this whole endeavour, the role of the social scientists becomes seminal. A clear articulation of various facets of the situation, their complex relationship and also the sharp awareness of the possible contributions, tensions and pressures that must be overcome. Hence, the contribution of scholars in the cultural and philosophical disciplines is vital for examining the normative aspects of the problems of security in the light of ideals to which we are committed, i.e. national security, social justice and global peace.

Issues and Perspectives

Security today is no longer the responsibility of the armed forces alone. The world in the post-Cold War period has been overtaken by the information technology revolution leading towards the formation of a knowledge society. However, military will continue to play a significant role in the sphere of nation-state as the international system today empirically cannot do away with the nation-state as a unit of analysis. However, every nation today has to be more concerned also with the non-traditional aspects of security that include ecology, environment, pollution, energy, population, economics, and the rights of the unborn. A comprehensive view of security includes the use of military force as a coercive measure which will continue to remain central to the concept of power. Therefore, security as a notion has become all-pervasive and needs to be defined as the complex interaction between the culture and the capability of any nation-state. This complex interaction between the cultural, technical and civilisational pre-conditions requires the interaction of the educated and trained manpower, including that in the universities[11]. This would call for emergence of new methodologies of research and cooperation. It will be prudent to note that the universities will continue to incubate and conduct investigation related to the evolution of science of the discipline of security studies. The adaptation of the conceptual paradigms may have to be left to the professional and government organisations with suitable interphases. As of now these interphases are missing.

Developing Strategic Culture for National Security Policy Making

Ever since India gained independence in 1947, policy making in areas related to defense and foreign affairs has remained in the purview of Government of India. Nehru, all through his 17 years as Prime Minister of India, remained the sole master and architect of formulating India's defense and foreign policy. No bureaucrat or his fellow politician could hold a candle to him in these areas as he saw them. Non-Alignment was the strategic framework both for foreign policy making and defense outlook. The concept of formulatig a national perspective of strategic thinking was anathema. The nearest policy paper on "India's Strategic Perspective"[12] came to be written by late Field Marshal Sam Manekshaw, who was a Colonel serving in the Army Headquarters under Gen Kariappa. However, this brief was never put up at the cabinet meeting in which Gen Kariappa was present. After that, the prepared note was quickly forgotten. By early sixties, the Institute for Defense Studies and Analysis (IDSA) had been set up by the Ministry of Defense, which has continued to be manned, except on very few occasions, by civil servants from the IAS and MEA in the Director's position.

The emphasis all through the Cold War period was rooted in carrying out defense analysis and giving feedback to the Government of India on all aspects of defense matters. Obviously this was considered satisfactory by all concerned. We are not too sure even today that actual decision making related to India's strategic posture, the future of the purpose of India's military power, the restructuring of India's national security apparatus, modernisation of the Armed Forces as well as the non military matters related to human security in the form of Disaster Management[13], Internal Security, Terrorism, and issues related to Naxalism and Counter Terrorism, is based on the actual deliberations in the NSC or if it takes place inside the closed walls of various Ministries of the Government of India.

It appears that there are minimal direct institutionalised academic inputs from any of the 634 Universities of India[14] or from the IITs, IIMs, the institutes of national importance like the Indian Institute of Science, Institute of Economic Growth, Institute of Social and Economic Change, Centre for the Study of Developing Societies etc. to the NSC. None of the open civilian organisations where teaching and research are carried out in Science, Technology, Social

Sciences have ever been permitted, nor have been inspired to do so on their own, to evolve organic or symbiotic relationship to any deliberations pertaining to any of the Government organisations including the NSC, which today is responsible for formulating the National Security Policy. However, it must be stated that there have been a few instances when the academic community in the National Capital has been trying and in some cases been successful to be called by various Ministries to give its expert opinion, looking through their discipline oriented conceptual lenses to various Ministries or the Government sponsored think tanks.

The Theoretical Construct

In the post-1945 period, the developed countries of the world lead by the super powers developed the area of strategic studies as an integral part of the social science disciplines taught in the academic institutions of higher education. Of course, the advent of nuclear weapons and the subsequent arms race primarily between the two super powers resulted in the advancement of the theoretical construct of the deterrence theory and the associated intellectual inputs for strategic policy making which graduated from massive retaliation to graduated flexible response for the employment of the nuclear weapons in a possible total nuclear war situation. The world became bipolar in nature and all the nation states became part of this, including the non-aligned states. Nuclear proliferation, though inevitable, took time to occur and rapidly became a reality with the end of the Cold War in 1991. By 1998, with India and Pakistan becoming nuclear weapons state, the world entered the era of multi-polarity.

The inevitability of multi-polarity and the inherent dangers of the possibility of nuclearisation taking place in Iran and North Korea has at last set the agenda for a country like India to deeply rationalise her strategic thinking and evolve policy formulations to safeguard her national integrity and sovereignty in the fragile political atmospherics prevailing in amongst her Southern Asian neighbours. With an assertive and ambitious China rising as an economic and manufacturing giant in the world backed by impressive growth rate, rise in GDP and the GNP along with per capita income, India's security concerns are no longer at conventional levels of conflict management. Indian defense policy makers initiated and managed to graduate her strategic thinking at

geostrategic levels to arrive at the minimum credible deterrence in the post-1998 period.

Simultaneously and almost by way of parallel processing, the UGC appointed the Mishra Commission to evaluate the status of the Departments of Defense and Strategic Studies (DDSS) in Indian Universities. The recommendation to continue DDSS was accepted by the UGC. The Xth Five Year Plan Document on Higher Education recommended that Defense And Strategic Studies (DASS) must remain an integral part of higher education and the State and Central Universities in India must offer the courses in it. It endorsed the necessity to introduce DASS in the main academic infrastructure of Indian Universities. The Mishra Commission also recommended a standard syllabus for DASS to be adopted by all universities and colleges in India.

It is significant to point out that the issues pertaining to teaching and research in DDSS have come a full circle. In Dec 2010, the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) formed a high-power Committee/ Task Force to standardise DASS in Indian Universities. The Committee recommended that existing Departments of Defense and Strategic Studies be broadened by incorporation of National Security Studies with full financial support to develop required academic and administrative infrastructure. On 19 Aug 2013, Minister of State for Human Resource Development Shashi Tharoor said in written reply to a query that, "The UGC has decided to support the upgrading of the departments of defense and strategic studies in 10 universities in the country with necessary inputs from DRDO." He further stated in the Rajya Sabha that "in order to amend or modify the existing syllabus, the UGC has formed an expert committee to review the existing syllabus of Defense and Strategic Studies at undergraduate, postgraduate and M.Phil. levels."[15]

Coming to the present situation in which NTI Report and the Think Tank Report are doing rounds, Indian think tanks and those who lead them have to do an in depth introspection by ascertaining where they stand intellectually, and if at all they have any influence on public policy issues. Indian think tanks engaged in core strategic policy making have been capital city-centric. They have been manned mostly by serving bureaucrats and members of the retired community of civil servants and service officers. They lack the support from

the intellectual community of the country – something that needs to be addressed seriously.

Indian Dilemma

It is worthwhile to note that India unfortunately has been unable to operationalise rigorous strategic analysis incorporating theoretical and discipline oriented research to quantify India's national interest, role, goals and objectives of her Armed Forces - in essence to rationalise the purpose of Indian Power.

The powerful iconic influences of a number of defense policy analysts, who belonged to the bureaucracy, working collaboratively with those from the world of journalism controlling the print media all through the period of Cold War and till Pokhran II, have had a negative effect on Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) and research in the last sixty years. IHE have not been able to achieve congruence/singularity between higher education and strategic/public policy making considered essential for the formulation of an independent and indigenous strategic thinking or strategic policy making platform to contribute towards developing strategic culture in India. Stephen Cohen also locates Indian strategic culture within the strategic elite. Cohen is far more specific in his analysis. For instance, he brackets the Indian strategic elite within political factions or particular actors. Ironically even today, defense policy making and analysis are highly advocative in nature based on individual perceptions with strong opinion resulting in preferential involvement of "trusted manpower" to project India's strategic and foreign policy or to restructure national security reforms in the changed atmospherics of an emerging China poised to play a global role in the future balance of power paradigm. Specifically there has been no change. In essence, there has never emerged an institutionalised effort to bridge the gap between the realm of ideas and the domain of public policy making in matters of national security including strategy or strategic culture in India.

The result is nearly catastrophic. "India is the only BRICS country with no institute in the World's top 200" as per the Indian Express of 12 Sept 2012 quoting the PISA ranking. Needless to say, the report also includes the Indian think tanks for their failure to deliver any impact through their publications

or the individual writings of their researchers. The report is scathing when it states that "Not a Single Indian University or Institute has made to the top 200 of the Quacqarelli Symonds (QS) rankings[16] – the most respected global ranking of Institutes of Higher Education."

Whether India, in the absence of a congruence between Higher Education and National Interest, will be able to come up to the mark and truly act as an independent variable to tip the balance for or against the US or China in a future balance of power competition in the Asian Subcontinent is yet to be seen. Emergence of role of any strategic significance for India in the Asia Pacific region is no more than a distant dream in these circumstances. The sheer lack of understanding of the role of military power in furtherance of national intent by the Indian political elites, the bureaucratic mishandling of national security affairs in the last sixty years, the lack of participation by the corporate/private sector in national security matters plus the total neglect of the universities and institutes of research by the Governments in power in the last six decades have lead to an enormous brain drain from India in the key areas of Strategic Analysis and this requires extensive development of soft power by integrating a multidisciplinary methodology to safeguard national interest and national integrity.

India has developed a casual habit of deliberating on international security issues in a benign but insipid way, as was evident from the Indian participation at last year's "Shangri-La Dialogues"[17] in Singapore. In contrast, the US Defense Secretary Leon Panetta minced no words by declaring that US will be redeploying her major naval capabilities in the Asia Pacific region. While the large number of academics, policy makers, researchers could be identified from all around the world; the few faces from India were none other than the familiar ones who parachute into any international conference with the welcome addition of the Congress party spokesperson Manish Tiwari. The Indian Defense Minister managed to squeeze in 13 political meetings on the same day with various important political participants within a period of some four hours as the news report stated his American counterpart meanwhile spared time selectively for a couple of them. So much about India's sensitivity on matters Strategic Affairs. However, it is heartening to note that this year's Shangri-La-Dialogue was taken more seriously by India and the Defense Minister made his presence felt in the proceedings.[18]

Overview

With Pakistan emerging as a chronic case of a failed state, the US has very little options but to advocate a strong Indo-US strategic partnership to checkmate China by bending over backward to accommodate the Indo-US nuclear programme. This may have the potential to ensure that the Indian State becomes a part of the forward Strategic Policy Doctrine of the United States, like the NATO countries fulfilled a similar role during the Cold War period. There is but one major difference. NATO allies did develop their independent nuclear policy. France even at that time officially stated that though she was in no position to tip the nuclear balance for or against either of the super power, yet had produced enough nuclear force structure to raise the cost of any nuclear confrontation between the super powers to an undesirable height.

France not only evicted the US-NATO Headquarters from French soil and made it shift to Brussels, the positioning of NATO's Strategic Nuclear Forces in France was of a totally different order as compared to what was placed in other NATO alliance countries in Europe. Also, France went on to build a strong civilian nuclear powered energy source, which still provides for 72% of her power requirement.

China's role in the global readjustment of balance of power, her quest for creation of a super Nation State by expanding the geographical limits beyond the territorial waters, which were earlier confined to land locked autonomous territories of Tibet and the regions around the Amur and Ussori rivers, is significant. Coupled with this has been her effort to negotiate with Pakistan. This has resulted in her expansionistic policies in Ladakh region. This extended geographical area will define her role in the Asia Pacific region; provide the required depth in defense needed for the deployment of her future strategic nuclear forces. Of course, one should not forget that China faces internal problems arising out of corruption at the highest levels, which includes politicians and government officials. She is now faced with foreign/security related problems with North Korea, Japan and Myanmar. Unlike the United States, the Chinese strategic outlooks and her global deliberations have not been able to give her any hard core "Client States" with the exception of North Korea or Alliance Partners who can form an axis in politico-military-strategic terms. Without the benefit of geographical

factors which had aided the former Soviet Union, China has remained at a disadvantageous position preventing her from developing an axis of power to counter the bipolar world during the period of Cold War and presently due to the emergence of a multipolar world which cannot be prevented from becoming firmly operational.

China's successful attempts in the areas of mergers and acquisitions covering the fields of science, technology, export of human resources and "turnkey" operations related to infrastructural development abroad, and now in the area of education, sports and allied areas continue to be impressive. In the "QS World University Ranking for 2012", which has been quoted earlier, China has seven Institutes in top 200 while India has none. Another interesting feature is the "Impact Factor" of published Chinese research outputs in the last five years, which is between 30 and 67. The US is well aware of this "soft power" that is exponentially growing in China.

The purpose of contemporary American power has been to protect her international trade, further free enterprise system, export democratic system of governance outside the US, and the cultural integration of the US citizens locally and globally for social transformation. The US represents a complex bio-eco system to optimise the limits of human intelligence and talents to protect the hybridised social structure by permitting the best of human capabilities to jell into a unified whole in the United States. Not long back when the Chinese Premier told his Singapore counterpart that China will ultimately lead the world because she can pick the best of talent from her vast 1.3 billion population, the Prime Minister of Singapore smiled and replied, "Mr. Prime Minister, while China has access to her 1.3 billion to choose the best of human talent, the US has perfected the art of choosing the best of human resources from the 7 billion world population to work inside and outside the United States for the cause of US national interest". The best example that one can site in favour of US capabilities in this direction is to indicate that two Indians, now naturalised American citizens, lead in performing the projection of American Strategic Policy in Asia and man the International Space Station.

One of the global assessment report states, "Since World War II, the United States has relied on a global network of military bases and forces to protect its interests and those of its allies." The same report analyses US

global security interests and in great detail, focuses on specific threats that the US faces in East Asia, Europe and the Middle East. The US is in confrontation today, directly or otherwise, with some 20 armed conflicts under way around the world. The recent assertiveness of China in the South China Sea and her military modernisation in the past five years has made the US sit up and make a serious assessment of the new emerging maritime situation in the Asia Pacific region. The US has seriously noted the tremendous changes that have occurred in the international environment and a major debate has at all levels been going on in the United States to determine what will be the role of the US, especially because China is emerging, despite the challenges she faces, as a military, economic and "soft power".

While it will be essential for us to assess the future involvement of US military presence overseas – a presence which she had maintained all through the period of Cold War. We must note the world wide protest from the Islamic nation states due to a video denigrating their religious sentiments, followed by the preplanned attack on the US Consulate in Libya precipitating in the killing of the US Ambassador. This resulted in America to induction of Special Forces for the protection of American citizens serving or residing in a number of countries. Such threats to US National interest will largely be from the Middle East and African countries and the US will not be able to dilute the global presence of US Combat forces, Air Force bases and active duty personnel. The politico-military budgets are poised to be increased. This with the added desirable US naval presence to counter the Chinese assertiveness is bound to see a major escalation of American defense budget as compared to the allocations made in the last five years. A review carried out on the existing "US Strategy and Defense Document" and the Department of Defense's (DoD) "Strategic guidance document" has already tabulated and

"Identified a list of seven discrete and enduring interests: (1) protect U.S. allies and partners from state adversaries (2) promote U.S. influence in key regions (3) dissuade military competition and arms races (4) protect Americans from terrorist attacks (5) restrict the flow of illegal trade and the proliferation of dangerous materials (6) ensure the flow of commerce and key resources (7) respond to humanitarian emergencies and regional conflicts."

It is apparent from the happenings around the world at geo-political, geo-economic and politico-strategic levels, that the emerging reality of the presence of a multipolar world cannot be prevented from becoming an integral part of perhaps a new world order taking shape. In this new emerging world order, the US is bound to face tougher challenges to maintain her preeminent position of the past six decades of contemporary world history. This challenge is not insurmountable for the United States. China, with all her attributes and even the conglomerate of some 20 developed countries of the world, will be far away from being a serious competitor to the US and her abilities to utilise global human resources and talent inherent therein to further US national interest. Similarly, no country in the world in near future and at least till 2030, can supersede the US in developing an operational form of governance to further and protect her national interest to retain a preeminent position of power and influence in world affairs through a system embedded in transnationalism and selective internationalism. As long as the US remains the preferred destination for the best of human talent and human resources, it will be well neigh impossible to deny the US the world status that it has enjoyed since the end of the Second World War.

It is also necessary to indicate that 2030[19] will be a benchmark in world affairs. The projection is that India's GDP will increase to US $80 trillion and her urban population will touch 720 million. These will have wide ramifications on Global Geopolitics. International scholars and their cohorts are well aware of these ramifications more so because India has rich cultural and civilisational preconditions/ dispositions. It has become an open society in which the Media today is seemingly already out of control, which the political system considers to be sometime anarchic. With passage of time and integration of Indian economy with the global economic practices, be it the liberalisation of the economy and now the tussle for FDI in retail and civil aviation, the political system is under pressure from the civil society with active support of the judiciary and is bound to make a classic rationalisation and redefining of India's National Interests. One has to merely travel on National Highway No 4, between Pune and Bangalore, to get the feeling of change in the Indian subcontinent. One can easily maintain an average speed of 75 to 80 km per hour, which is equivalent to that in the best of the Autobahns in Germany. This intimation of prosperity

makes the compulsion of changing attitudes to the cultivation of strategic culture real.

Recommendation and Observations

Developing strategic culture to take on the challenges of the 21st century is now essential for India. Following observations are pertinent:

- Recognise the fact that the IHE sector, with various centres of advanced studies and research, constitutes 634 Universities with 33,023 colleges with total enrollment of 16.78 million students. These 634 Universities include 65 Institutes of National importance, 43 Central Universities, 129 Deemed Universities, 100 Private Universities and 297 State Universities.
- India has been listed with 292 think tanks. Worldwide there are 6545 think tanks.
- None of the Indian Universities is listed in top 200 and none of the think tanks in top 50 in the world.
- So far no Government endowed think tank is affiliated to any degree granting IHE in an institutionalised way. Individual experts in think tanks may be recognised as research guides by Universities but not institutionalised as between institutes and Universities as recognised research centers.
- Under the existing rules of the Universities, expert staff in think tanks and other organisations working on key research areas are ineligible to be research guides if they are over 65 years age. Hence by default, a large amount of manpower from think tanks becomes ineligible to be part of the academic partnership or ineligible to apply for research grants available in various granting agencies ranging from the UGC to ICSSR, DST, DBT etc.

Strategy to synergise the relationship between the various government organisations, think tanks, research establishments, universities with their research centers is now of critical need. Steps have to be taken in a concerted way. India must allow the young researchers to become analysts to provide quality research outputs. Nothing can be more strongly recommended than this vital aspect.

Conclusion

The Indian researchers and the think tanks and institutes of higher education have an onerous task to shift from the legacy of defensive defense analysis to a more complex goal oriented strategic analysis, to capture the global intellectual space in the research journals and book publications, to learn to discard advocacy-based perceptional analysis to more empirically verifiable methodology incorporating statistical methods, to stop crying foul when Indian institutions are not given a place in world ranking and last but not the least, to root out plagiarism which has started growing and continues to taint the high and mighty in amongst the academic and the non academic community who are supposed to contribute towards the growth of knowledge in the area of Public Policy making. It is heartening to note that the Indian Universities are now incorporating software to check all PhD theses against plagiarism. China is today faced with this problem amongst her researchers and the authorities have accepted stringent actions have to be taken.

Indian political leaders, at least at cabinet level, must attempt to write their own speech and reflect on issues based on their long experience of their political career. There is thus an urgent need for the political class not only to get educated but contribute towards the development of strategic culture by encouraging the academic community to take proactive partnerships with the think tanks, research institutes, and forming partnerships with the corporate sector which now has a major stake in affairs of national security and national integration.

Researchers like to think originally and do not like their writings or even their thoughts to be plagiarised. Secondly, when political elites write independently, it gives a window to the researchers to interpret their perceptions independently. In an open society it is highly essential to protect the intellectual property rights on one hand and to provide a transparent and undiluted political vision to the researchers to undertake strategic analysis. It is time for India to deeply introspect strategically to take on the challenges of power politics in the 21st century and develop her own strategic culture.

Notes

*I wish to acknowledge the intellectual inputs from Lt Gen Ashok Joshi, PVSM, AVSM (Retd) while preparing this paper for Presentation at CLAWS Seminar on "Building Strategic Culture, 30 August 2013."

1. John Baylis, "*International and Global Security in the Post Cold War Era*", P.253-257. Key Neo-realist assumptions are (a) The international system is anarchic. They do not mean by this that it is necessarily chaotic. Rather anarchy implies that there is no central authority capable of controlling state behavior, (b) States claiming sovereignty will inevitably develop offensive military capabilities to defend themselves and extend their powers. As such they are potentially dangerous to each other, (c) Uncertainty, leading to a lack of trust, is inherent in the international system. States can never be sure of the intentions of their neighbours and therefore, they must always be on their guard.(d) States will want to maintain their independence and sovereignty, and, as a result , survival will be the most basic driving force influencing their behavior.,(e) Although states are rational, there will always be room for miscalculation. In a world of imperfect information, potential antagonists will always have an incentive to misrepresent their own capabilities to keep their opponents guessing. This may lead to mistakes about 'real' state interest.

2. Baylis, op.cit.,. p. 253.

3. See Jawaharlal Nehru, Convocation Address, Allahabad University, 1947. Nehru stated "A University stands for humanism, for tolerance, for reasons, for progress, for the adventure of ideas and for the search for truth. It stands for the onward march of the human race towards even higher objectives" He asked Universities to lay stress on "Those standards of thoughts and actions which make an individual and a nation." He concluded by stating that "If all is well with the Universities all is well with the nation".

4. K C Bhattacharya, Swaraj in Ideas, Visvabharati Quarterly 20, 103-114 (1954) (lecture delivered by Krishna Chandra Bhattacharya (1875-1949) in October 1931 under Sir Asutosh Memorial Lectures series, organized at Chandernagore by Charu Chandra Roy.) K C states in the very beginning " We speak today of Swaraj or self-determination in politics. Man's domination over man is felt in the most tangible form in the political sphere. There is however a subtler domination exercised in the sphere of ideas by one culture on another, a domination all the more serious in the consequence, because it is not ordinarily felt. Political subjection primarily means restraint on the outer life of a people and although it tends gradually to sink into the inner life of the soul, the fact that one is conscious of it operates against the tendency. So long as one is conscious of a restraint, it is possible to resist it or to bear it as a necessary evil and to keep free in spirit. Slavery begins when one ceases to feel the evil and it deepens when the evil is accepted as a good. Cultural subjection is ordinarily of an unconscious character and it implies slavery from the very start. When I speak of cultural subjection, I do not mean the assimilation of an alien culture. That assimilation need not be an evil; it may be positively necessary for healthy progress and in any case it does not mean a lapse of freedom. There is cultural subjection only when one's traditional cast of ideas and sentiments is superseded without comparison or competition by a new cast representing an alien culture which possesses one like a ghost. This subjection is slavery of the spirit: when a person can shake himself free from it, he feels as though the scales fell from his eyes. He experiences a rebirth and that is what I call Swaraj in Ideas."

5. A major part of the credit for the building of the Maurya Empire goes to Chanakya. He was also known as Kautilya, and Vishnugupta. He had been a teacher at the Takshila University when Alexander started invading India. Since the King of Takshila and Gandhara had surrendered to Alexander, Chanakya sought help from other kings to unite and fight against him. Porus (Parvateshwar), a king of Punjab, challenged Alexander at the Battle of the Hydaspes River. However, he got defeated in the battle. Chanakya also sought help

from Dhana Nanda, the ruler of Nanda Empire, but was refused. After this incident, he started instilling the idea of building an empire that could fight against foreign invasion into his disciple, Chandragupta. Chanakya became his mentor. Kautilya's teaching was contained in 'Arthashastra', which was no longer extent until it was 'rediscovered' and printed in 1909. The treatise is addressed to Vijigishu or would be Conqueror. Kautilya's model of interstate relations includes (a) Peace treaty or alliance, (b) Inimical and hostile actions, (c) Indifference, (d) Aggression and campaigning (e) Seeking of shelter in difficult times, and (f) Peace with one and war with another. These options are not premised on any 'moral' principles; they reflect Kautilya's 'realpolitik'. It is important to remember that this churning and crystallization of thought took place in the wake of the defeat of Porus at the hands of Alexander. Starting from a small principality, Kautilya visualized one single state across the entire Indian subcontinent which he defined in geographical terms; he called it 'Himavat'. Such was the vigor of strategic culture introduced by Kautilya, that the Mouryan Empire ultimately included Afghanistan. See R.P. Kangle,(ed.), *Kautiliya Arthashastra*, MotilalBanarasidass, Banaras, UP re-printed in 1992.

6. See, Onkar Marwah **"Strategic Parity for Peace: Engaging China in the 21ˢᵗ Century"**, in Third K Subrahmanyam Memorial Lecture, (National Institute of Advanced Studies, 30 July 2013, Bangalore). He states "The India-China relationship is likely to be the most complex, perhaps the most competitive relationship between two of the world's mega-states in the twenty-first century. Their cooperative interactions will be edgy and formal, often brittle – irrespective of public professions to the contrary. Presently, the military and economic might of China is substantially higher than India's, but this will be of less relative significance after the next 10-to-15 years – provided that, in this intervening period, India's strategy is 'smart', selective, and consensually sustained by insulation from ad-hoc re-direction or neglect due to the periodic democratic changes of our political dispensations. Beyond the 15-year period, and given the precedence, India can – despite its governance and implementation deficits – acquire relative-sufficiency in military, technical and economic wherewithal to be able to confront China along the full spectrum of strategic, political and economic challenges. The task for India is to traverse from 2015 to 2030 without falling victim to, (1) domestically, our self-imposed shortfalls, (2) regionally, China's military and diplomatic programmes and stratagems, and (3) globally, the consequences beyond our control of interplays in the International System. To achieve our strategic national objectives, the need is to implement interlinked policies simultaneously and parallel along all the three preceding separate vectors; be sensitive to their different step-level functions; and factor in their variation in time-scales for composite and maximal results by 2030. That is the least needed to measure up to the challenge posed by China's authoritarian, determined, top-down, well-planned and coordinated framework of national policies.

7. Darryal Howlett, "The future of Strategic Culture", *Defence Threat Reduction Agency*, USA, 2002, p.3. Also see See Kerry M. Kartchner, Summary Report of the Comparative Strategic Culture: Phase II Kickoff Workshop, Defense Threat Reduction Agency Advanced Systems and Concepts Office (Washington, DC: February 13, 2006).

8. Darryl Howlett, op., cit., provides an explanation of the debate on strategic culture

9. A I Johnston, "Thinking About Strategic Culture" in *International Security*, Volume 19, Number 4, Spring 1995, PP. 32-64. He states that he has attempted to "assess the progress that has been made in studying strategic culture, examines the conceptual and methodological problems in the literature, and offers some possible solutions. It also suggests some caution about using strategic culture as an analytic tool." He begins "by reviewing the literature on strategic culture and argue that the dominant approach to strategic culture is at the same time under-determined and over-determined, and has so far been unable to offer a convincing research design for isolating the effects of strategic culture. On the basis of this critique he "then offer a definition of strategic culture that is

observable and falsifiable, and suggest a number of ways of conceptualizing its relationship to behavior". Finally, he suggests that the link between strategic culture and behavior should be approached with a great deal of care.

Research on the symbolic elements of strategy suggests that strategic culture may not have a direct independent and societal-specific effect on strategic choice. At the same time, literature on group formation and in-group-out-group differentiation suggests that a wide variety of disparate societies may share a similar realpolitik strategic culture. Thus strategic culture may have an observable effect on state behavior, but contrary to much of the existing literature on strategic culture, it may not be unique to any particular state"

10. Gautam Sen (Ed), *India's Security Concerns in a Nuclear Age*, (New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 1986), p.5.

11. The First Education Commission known as "Radhakrishnan Commission" was instituted by the Government of India in 1948 with the scope of enquiry set forth in the resolution of the Government of India, Ministry of Education, No. 55-5/47-D/3, dated the 4th November 1948, with Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, M.A., D. Litt., LL.D., Spalding Professor of Eastern Religions and Ethics at the University of Oxford as Chairman and Dr. Tara Chand, M.A., D. Phil. (Oxon.), Secretary and Educational Adviser to the Government of India. The commission in its voluminous report of 776 pages noted in the pre-emblem the role of the Universities and observed that "The Impact of Political Change-Great as were the changes that had taken place in the political and economic conditions of Indian society in the years that preceded the transfer of power on August 15, 1947, considerable as was the progress in education during that period, they are less great than the changes that have been crowded into these few months of freedom. The academic problem has assumed new shapes. We have now a wider conception of the duties and responsibilities of universities. They have to provide leadership in politics and administration, the professions, industry and commerce. They have to meet the increasing demand for every type of higher education, literary and scientific, technical and professional. They must enable the country to attain, in as short a time as possible, freedom from want, disease and ignorance, by the application and development of scientific and technical knowledge. India is rich in natural resources and her people have intelligence and energy and are throbbing with renewed He and vigor. It is for the universities to create knowledge and train minds who would bring together the two, material resources and human energies. If our living standards are to be raised, a radical change of spirit is essential." Further that the "Universities as the Organs of Civilization-He indeed must be blind who does not see that, mighty as are the political changes, far deeper are the fundamental questions which will be decided by what happens in the universities. Everything is being brought to the test of reason, venerable theologies, ancient political institutions, time- honored social arrangements, a thousand things which a generation ago looked as fixed as the hills. If India is to confront the confusion of our time, she must turn for guidance, not to those who are lost in the mere exigencies of the passing hour, but to her men of letters, and men of science, to her poets and artists, to her discoverers and inventors. These intellectual pioneers of civilization are to be found and trained in the universities, which are the sanctuaries of the inner life of the nation". The Commission made a specific observation on war and peace, violence and conflict by stating that there is a role of the University to usher "Positive Peace" and elaborated that "Peace is not the absence of armed conflict. It is the positive establishment of just and humane relationships among the peoples of the world, the development of mutual confidence among nations. Universities can make a significant contribution to world peace. As their very name implies, universities are suited for fostering an active appreciation and understanding of other cultures. In the world of letters, science, art, music, there have been no effective national boundaries. The citizens of that world are -peoples of all nations for whom words and equations, images and sounds have meaning. Through the work of

the universities we can widen the citizenship in this world republic of arts and science. This is the task of the UNESCO which attempts to give a soul and a conscience to the United Nations which are the body-politic of the new world. Modem man cannot regard himself as an Indian or a Chinese, or an European or an American. He is the heir to the world's culture."

12. Personal Discussion with late Lt. Gen E A Vas. (1984) He was the former GOC-in-C Eastern Army.

13. National Disaster Management Authority of India has carried out excellent work on mitigating natural disaster and has evolved a variety of standard operating procedures through their Quick Response Force.

14. UGC, Higher Education In India at a Glance Report February 2012. www.ugc.ac.in Accessed 20 August 2013.

15. ZEE News, "Defence studies syllabus to be upgraded in universities, 19 August 2013", http://zeenews.india.com/home/defence-studies-syllabus-to-be-upgraded-in-univers_870171.html Accessed 20 August 2013.

Following the report, the Vice Chancellors of those University having Departments of Defence and Strategic Studies (DDSS) were invited by MHRD for a meeting held on 17 September 2013. It is understood that Syllabus on National Security Studies will be revisited with inputs from all concern and future Centre of National Security Studies (CNSS) will be established within the DDSS where they exist. While five CNSS had already been earlier announced, and now two more have been announced to be established within DDSS of Allahabad and Gorakhpur Universities after the 17 September 13 Meeting.

16. See the exhaustive report by James G. McGann, "2011 GLOBAL GO TO THINK TANKS REPORTAND POLICY ADVICE" (Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program, University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, PA USA) The report can be accessed at the Program's website: http://www.gotothinktank.com.The report's publication is the culmination of an eight-month process involving the support of think tanks and experts from every region of the world. A snapshot of the range of experts and peer institutions participating in this year's ranking process is as follows:

- 793 expert panelists for all the regional and functional research categories
- 150 journalists and scholars with expertise spanning politics, think tanks, and civil society
- 55 current and former directors of think tank programmes and networks
- 40 public and private donors
- 100s of think tanks
- 25-30 intergovernmental organizations
- 120 academic institutions

Further, the author was pleased to highlight the increasingly global reach of the rankings, as reflected in the following statistics regarding this year's report:

- 6,545 think tanks from 182 countries were invited to participate in the process
- 1,500 plus individuals from 120 countries participated in the nominations and rankings process
- Think tanks were nominated, and subsequently ranked, in 30 categories
- A total of 5,329 think tanks were nominated

A total of well over 25,000 nominations were received across the 30 categories

- 202 think tanks were nominated as the worlds top think tank

17. IISS, THE 11TH IISS ASIA SECURITY SUMMITTHE SHANGRI◻LA DIALOGUE OUTLINE AGENDA at the Shangri◻La Hotel,22 Orange Grove Road, Singapore 258350, 1– 2 June 2012.

18. IISS, THE 12TH IISS ASIA SECURITY SUMMITTHE SHANGRI◻LA DIALOGUE OUTLINE AGENDA at the Shangri◻La Hotel,22 Orange Grove Road, Singapore 258350, 31 May – 2

June 2013.

19. See for details in **National Intelligence Council,** "GLOBAL TRENDS 2030:ALTERNATIVE WORLDS"

Christopher Kojm, Chairman, National Intelligence Council writes:

"Global Trends 2030: Alternative Worlds is the fifth installment in the National Intelligence Council's series aimed at providing a framework for thinking about the future. As with previous editions, we hope that this report will stimulate strategic thinking by identifying critical trends and potential discontinuities. We distinguish between megatrends, those factors that will likely occur under any scenario, and game-changers, critical variables whose trajectories are far less certain. Finally, as our appreciation of the diversity and complexity of various factors has grown, we have increased our attention to scenarios or alternative worlds we might face. We are at a critical juncture in human history, which could lead to widely contrasting futures. It is our contention that the future is not set in stone, but is malleable, the result of an interplay among megatrends, game-changers and, above all, human agency. Our effort is to encourage decision makers—whether in government or outside—to think and plan for the long term so that negative futures do not occur and positive ones have a better chance of unfolding. I would like to point out several innovations in *Global Trends 2030*. This volume starts with a look back at the four previous Global Trends reports. We were buoyed by the overall positive review in the study we commissioned, but cognizant too of the scope for needed changes, which we have tried to incorporate in this volume. Our aim has been to make this effort as collaborative as possible, believing that a diversity of perspectives enriches the work. We have reached out to experts far beyond Washington, D.C. We have held numerous meetings, many in universities, in Indiana, Texas, California, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Colorado, Tennessee, New York, and New Jersey. We also sponsored a public blog which featured blog posts and comments by experts on key themes discussed in *Global Trends 2030*. The blog had over 140 posts and over 200 comments. As of mid-October, it had 71,000 hits and had been viewed by readers in 167 different countries. To ensure that the blog posts can continue to be consulted, we are linking them to the web and e-book versions of the final published report. We expanded our engagement overseas by holding meetings on the initial draft in close to 20 countries. Many times this was at the invitation of governments, businesses, universities, or think tanks. One beneficial outcome of the NIC's quadrennial efforts has been the growing interest elsewhere in global trends, including elaboration by others on their own works, which we encourage. Because of the widespread interest in how *Global Trends 2030* is seen elsewhere, we have detailed the reactions of our international experts to the initial draft in a special box following the introduction. In this volume, we expanded our coverage of disruptive technologies, devoting a separate section to it in the work. To accomplish that, we engaged with research scientists at DoE laboratories at Sandia, Oak Ridge, and NASA in addition to entrepreneurs and consultants in Silicon Valley and Santa Fe. We have also devoted strong attention to economic factors and the nexus of technology and economic growth. Finally, this volume contains a chapter on the potential trajectories for the US role in the international system. Particularly overseas readers criticized previous editions—for not discussing at greater length the US impact on future international relations. We believe that the United States also stands at a critical juncture; we have devoted a chapter to delineating possible future directions and their impact on the broader evolution of the international system. Scores of people contributed to the preparation of *Global Trends 2030*, and we have sought to acknowledge the key contributors from outside the NIC in a separate entry. Within the NIC, Counselor Mathew Burrows was our principal author in addition to orchestrating the entire process from beginning to end. He was assisted by Elizabeth Are's as senior editor; Luke Baldwin, who established the first-ever NIC

blog; Erin Cromer, who oversaw logistical support; and Jacob Eastham and Anne Carlyle Lindsay, who created the design. Dr. Burrows worked closely with regional and functional National Intelligence Officers, who reviewed and contributed to the draft. Among NIC offices, the NIC's Strategic Futures Group under Director Cas Yost rates special mention for its participation across the board in Global Trends-related work. I would especially like to acknowledge the work of the late senior analyst Christopher Decker who provided critical help with the forecasts on global health and pandemics before his untimely death. I encourage readers to review the complete set of *Global Trends 2030* documents, which can be found on the National Intelligence Council's website, www.dni.gov/nic/globaltrends, and to explore possible scenario simulations using the interactive material. We also have published the work in an e-book format so readers can download it for their use on a tablet. These formats are available for downloading from our website. As with our previous Global Trends studies, we hope this report stimulates dialogue on the challenges that will confront the global community during the next 15-20 years—and positive and peaceful ways to meet them."