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I teach kings the history of their ancestors so that the lives of the ancients might serve them as an example, for the world is old, but the future springs from the past.

—Djeli Mamoudou Kouyate, Griot, in *Sundiata—An Epic of Old Mali*

“…But progressive research shows that every culture and every civilization has its own ‘miracle,’ and it is the purpose of historical investigation to reveal it. This cannot be achieved by seeking to discover identical values in every civilization, but rather by pointing out the significant values of each culture within its own context. This demands considerable honesty, as shortcomings have to be admitted in the same way as achievements are proclaimed.”

—Romila Thapar in *Asoka and the Decline of the Mauryas*

Frontiers are indeed the razor's edge on which hang suspended the modern issues of war or peace, of life or death to nations.

—Lord Curzon of Kedleston, Viceroy of India (1898-1905) and British Foreign Secretary 1919-24
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Today, China and India, in that order, are amongst the fastest growing economies in the world. They are also the third and fourth largest military powers on the globe. To many viewers, including those in China, India may not appear as a serious challenger to China geo-politically and economically in the near future. Yet, both countries entertain great power ambitions and have been steadily moving to achieve that status in the world. Hence, a strain of rivalry runs through their perceptions of the other, especially since their historical spheres of influence overlap substantially in today’s Southeast Asia.

The defining feature of Sino-Indian relations since the establishment of each country as a modern nation in the decade of the 40s has been the border war they fought in 1962. It marked the first confrontation between the two largest states in the world. The war was dwarfed by a contemporary sequence of events, potentially much more dangerous, now known as the Cuban Missile Crisis. Yet, that does not diminish the significance of the events of 1950s and early 1960s that brought these old civilizations to war. Since then, bilateral relations have swung from the heady bonhomie of the early 50s through the sustained estrangements of the 60s, 70s and 80s to the slow normalization of relations in the late 80s and 90s.

The motivation for this paper can best be described as a one that emerged progressively and changed substantially with time. At a fundamental level, my curiosity in this theme is ensconced within my larger interest in Chinese and Indian history and Sino-Indian relations. However, what drew my attention to the 1962 war was a recently declassified Government of India, Ministry of Defense report on the war. Starting with that report I attempted to explore the current scholarly wisdom on the causes and
consequences of the war. My efforts led me to deliberate on what can be termed as strategic culture and thinking and its role in bilateral negotiations and the ensuing war.

There is a lot that has been written about this war and Sino-Indian relations. I do not claim a mastery of all the details that abound. But by focusing on an area that has thus far been largely ignored or overlooked, I hope to add to that already burgeoning scholarship that has invested itself in studying various elements of this dispute. A lot of the work that exists on the subject is anecdotal in nature. Structural analyses have also been conducted, but none has looked at possible differences that could have arisen from vastly different historical experiences. This paper provides a comparative analysis of such potential differences by employing a historical optic in exploring the traditions of strategic thinking in India and China. More than forwarding a major theory itself, it advocates the need for further research in this area. In that sense it is a research note for a much larger undertaking.

In bringing this effort to fruition, I have received support from many quarters. First, and foremost, I would like to thank my father, Partha S. Ghosh, for it was while discussing the GOI report with him that the seeds of this paper’s final shape were sown. Gratitude is due as much to Prof. Paul Smith, who served as my advisor, and who is, even more importantly, responsible for introducing me to the study of China. I would also like to thank Professors Alex Kitroeff and Paul Jefferson who were both helpful with comments and criticisms as the ideas in this paper developed. Thanks are also due to Margaret Schaus at Haverford College’s Magill Library for invaluable research tips and help in locating material.

Arunabh Ghosh

Haverford, PA
April 14, 2003
I. INTRODUCTION

In March 1959, the Dalai Lama, the spiritual and political head of Tibet, following a failed revolution against Chinese rule fled to India seeking asylum. Along with him came 100,000 refugees. Much to the annoyance of China, they were warmly received in India where the Tibetan movement enjoyed a great deal of public support. The ensuing Tibetan crisis proved to be the catalyst that brought the already simmering relations between the two countries to a boil. Following the establishment of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) in 1949, the decade of the 50s had witnessed a progressive degeneration in Sino-Indian relations, which came to center more and more on disagreements over their common border. Through the late 50s each country had accused the other of transgressing over its sovereign territory. Diplomatic efforts had been on since the early 1950s to resolve what both sides had initially admitted were minor border disagreements. In the next three years, these tensions continued to mount as Indian and Chinese leaders parlayed, even meeting in New Delhi in April 1960, to find a peaceful solution to what was fast translating into a major border disagreement.

In India’s eyes such efforts were an utter failure as China persisted with her “encroachments” and military maneuvers. On September 9th 1962, India finally took the decision to ‘evict’ the Chinese from certain sectors. Then, on the night of October 19th/20th, the Chinese launched a massive attack in several sectors, which took the Indians by surprise. Battle was joined on several fronts by both sides along the border.

By the middle of November, the Chinese controlled the Aksai Chin region in the northern area of Ladakh in Jammu and Kashmir State, and had also crossed south across the McMahon Line in NEFA. As the Indian army continued to suffer reverses, the

---

1 The maps of the two major areas of disagreement—Aksai Chin and the North East Frontier Agency—are provided in Appendix A and B.
2 “The frontier between Tibet and Assam in British India, negotiated between Tibet and Great Britain at the end of the Simla Conference (October 1913-July 1914) and named after the chief British negotiator, Sir Henry McMahon...” Delegates of the newly formed Chinese Republican Government were also present at the conference but refused to acknowledge or sign the treaty claiming that Tibet was a part of China and had no independent power to discuss its borders with another country. (Encyclopedia Britannica Online, accessed December 19 2002). The Indian state of Assam is in the northeast of India, where she shares borders with China and Myanmar. NEFA was renamed Arunachal Pradesh by a constitutional amendment in 1986.
Chinese, without prior notice, announced a unilateral ceasefire effective from midnight November 21st/22nd. They withdrew all their forces behind the McMahon Line in NEFA, but continued to hold on to Aksai Chin.

In India the military humiliation and lesson in realpolitik prompted major military spending and a re-evaluation of Nehru’s idealist approach to foreign policy. The Indians felt deeply aggrieved and deceived by what they classified as China’s duplicitous behavior. Since the establishment of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) in 1949, India had vigorously sought to work towards Asian unity. In Nehru’s idealist and non-aligned vision he regarded India and China as the leaders of the emerging third world. According to him such a central place in the global order was predicated on their historical greatness and past standing in the world as founts of civilization. Hence, Nehru and the Indian foreign policy establishment, which he dominated, went out of their way to welcome and support the newly formed PRC: India was one of the first states to formally recognize the PRC in 1949.3 In 1954, the two countries had signed the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence, one of whose main points was that all bilateral disputes would be peacefully solved.4 Hence, the Indians felt deceived and betrayed by China’s attack.

The Chinese view of things was, understandably, different—otherwise things would not have led to war. The Chinese, much like their Indian counterparts, were emerging from several years of foreign—western—domination. As a result, they too were actively constructing or reconstructing their national project. They were also attempting to situate their country vis-à-vis the superpowers and, needless to say,

---

3 The popular phrase “Hindi-Chini bhai-bhai,” translated roughly as “Indian and Chinese are brothers” may have amused the Chinese, but also highlighted the lengths to which the Indian establishment and elites adopted this idea and posture.

4 Popularly known as the Panchsheel Agreement. The word “Panchsheel” (also spelled as “pancasila”) denoted “Five Taboos” in the ancient Buddhist scriptures governing the personal behavior of Indian (later Chinese and other foreign) monks. India’s first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, picked the term to be applicable to international behavior of the modern states. When Nehru proposed to use Panchsheel as the basis for the first India-China agreement on May 15th 1954, called the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence, the Chinese Premier, Zhou Enlai, readily agreed. They five principles are:

1. Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty;
2. Mutual non-aggression;
3. Mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs;
4. Equality and mutual benefit, and
5. Peaceful coexistence

ideology and communism played their roles in this process. They justified their expansion into Tibet by calling it a ‘liberation,’ claiming that Tibet was subordinate to China. The Chinese welcomed Indian friendship in the early years and stated the hope of resolving all outstanding border issues through diplomacy. Yet, the question of differing perceptions of where the border lay remained. They claimed that the ensuing friction magnified to the point where they were left with no choice but to militarily deal with Indian aggression and interference in their domestic affairs.

As a result of the war, diplomatic ties between the two nations virtually broke down and it was not until the late 1980s that prime-ministerial visits were re-initiated. Since then relations have progressively improved. Yet, tensions and a level of distrust still persist with each alleging the other of entertaining ambitions of dominating the entire Southeast Asian region.5

Indian writers dominate a majority of the scholarly literature on the dispute and the 1962 war. Next in terms of frequency come western analysts. Scholarly Chinese accounts make up by far a small minority of the total. The topic is also one which has been dominated by a high level of ideological rhetoric, with many of the works originating in times when the United States and the Soviet Union sat across an iron curtain, forestalling the others ambitions. More than exhaustive, the following short discussion is meant to be representative of the various approaches that have been taken by scholars and officials writing about the war and the decade preceding it.

Many of the early Indian and western works are tainted by a certain emotional sympathizing with the perceived victim of aggression—India. This was the dominant strain in the early years following the war. The ideological leanings of the authors played a distinct role in maintaining this viewpoint. They were concerned with communist China’s rhetoric against democracy and capitalism. Some notable representative works are those of P.C. Chakravarti,6 Parshotam Mehra,7 Leo E. Rose, Margaret Fisher, and Robert Huttenback,8 and John Rowland.9

5 Indian leaders claimed that India’s nuclear tests in May 1998 were conducted with China in mind, not Pakistan.
6 P.C. Chakravarti, India’s China Policy (Bloomington: Indian University Press, 1962)
Alistair Lamb’s detailed study on the evolution of the Sino-Indian border dispute heralded a more rigorous scholarly approach. Using then available government documents Lamb provided a thorough analysis of how the contemporary border dispute was an outcome of the power politics of colonial empires. By studying the claims—legal as well as non-legal—of both India and China, as well as their origins in the past 100 years, he attempted to present an impartial analysis of the dispute.

The 70s witnessed a more level playing field with books such as Neville Maxwell’s *India’s China War* laying the blame for the conflict largely at India’s doorstep. This book is still considered prejudiced by many in the Indian establishment, but few would deny its relevance in the trajectory of analysis of the dispute. Among those that have taken issue with Maxwell are B.N. Mullik, the then Indian Intelligence Bureau (IB) chief, and K. Subrahmanyam. The works of Karunakar Gupta have provided a balanced approach to the dispute by analyzing governmental and official policies.

A notable Chinese contribution has been that of Xeuchen Liu. Liu has looked at the Sino-Indian dispute through what he calls two big and two small triangular security relationships in Central Asia:

From the late 19th century to the end of World War II, the big triangular relationship involved Britain, Russia, and China, and the small triangular one involved British-India, China and Tibet. Since the end of World War II, the big triangular relationship has involved the United States, the Soviet Union, and China, and the small one has involved, China, India, and Pakistan.

---

15 Liu, p. 5.
His study, thus, focuses on the larger geopolitical imperatives at work. In this he is not unique as others, including Gupta mentioned above, have looked at the issue through these optics. But his is the first such systematic analysis on such a large scale.

Several books have also solely been devoted to the actual war itself. The report, which served as the initial spark for this manuscript, is among them. Most such works have concurred in concluding that the Indian military machine was woefully ill prepared for the war on several levels—logistical, tactical, strategic, etc. According to the report the situation was exacerbated by the fact that the army was undergoing a major internal transformation. As a result, India failed to avoid a war when it was least prepared for one—“a typical case of changing horses midstream.”

Some studies have also focused purely on structural causes that led to and influenced the outcome of the war. Prominent amongst these are the works of Yaacov Vertzberger and Steven Hoffman. These have looked at India’s military defeat by studying the role of institutions and the bureaucracy in policy making processes. Arthur Stahnke has focused on the place of international law in China’s strategic and tactical outlook by investigating the Sino-Indian conflict as a case study.

C.V. Ranganathan and Vinod Khanna’s new book on India and China relations provides the latest addition to this literature and also symbolizes the current state of the field. They claim that there were several domestic reasons—including the crisis created by the failure of the Great Leap Forward—within China that forced Mao’s hand in entering into a war with an evidently friendly neighbor. They are critical of the leadership on both sides, highlighting their rigidity and unwillingness to make any brave steps in the face of domestic political considerations or ill-held beliefs. What emerges then is “a tale of mutual misperceptions and missed opportunities.”

---


17 Sinha and Athale, p. xxiii.


From the above short discussion, it is evident that the existing literature has approached the study of the dispute and the war from manifold perspectives. Hence, without having access to vital government documents from both sides, as well as a strong grasp of all the existing scholarship on the matter, it is doubtful that any additional useful contributions can be made. Yet, I believe that there is another approach that has as yet not been fully explored. While in no way dismissing the excellent and insightful works cited above, the present study aims to look at a broader concept over a broader sweep of history and asks whether that helps us in better understanding the events of the 50s, as well as the eventual military confrontation that ensued. A key question is: were there only immediate—defined as those that can be traced back to McMahon—causes or are there other optics that can further inform the imperatives behind the dispute and the war.

It is clear that India miscalculated. But can we attribute other factors to this miscalculation than those that have already been brought up? Indeed, why was India caught unawares? That it was has already been explored by previous research. Why did Nehru, widely considered the only leader of the Indian nationalist movement vintage to have a grasp and knowledge of foreign affairs, as well as an extensive understanding of Indian and global history, pay such scant attention to the military dimensions of foreign policy? How could he ignore the fact that military power and diplomacy go hand in glove with each other? Was his reading of history, especially Indian history, incomplete, or rather, was there nothing that could train him appropriately for the job he was entrusted with? Mao Zedong, in contrast, had studied the Chinese military classics and his favorite text was Sun Zi’s *The Art of War*, from which he drew many of his ideas for a people’s war.22

What role did the nationalist movements in each country play? The Indian nationalist movement was essentially an intellectual movement against the Raj, the highest conceptual efflorescence of which was the articulation of the hitherto unfamiliar theory of non-violence. There was no recognition of an enemy in that paradigm, let alone that of the use of force. On the other hand, the Chinese nationalist movement witnessed a

---

harmonious blending of military and Marxist ideology, first against the Republicans, and subsequently against the Americans.23 Were [and are] not the leaders of the two nations a product of their cultures?

Such questions impel a more textured analysis of the traditions of strategic thinking in each country, and a look at what roles these traditions could have played in defining the actions each country took in those years.24 It is interesting to note the absence of the word strategic in the opening lines of the recently declassified Government of India report:

Ever since she became free, India, for various historical, political, geographical, cultural, and sentimental reasons, wished to revive her ancient contacts with the people of China.25

Does this imply that strategic considerations were not a factor in determining India’s policy towards China?26 Indeed how did each country approach the other immediately following the arrival of their respective modern identities—Indian independence in 1947, and the establishment of the Peoples Republic of China in 1949? And how did/does the historical self-conception of each country determine its strategic posturing?

This, in turn, brings us around to the larger question of whether India had a strategic culture historically to speak off. Did China? This is not as blasé as it sounds—of course strategic thinking existed; but are there grounds for a more textured analysis?

At a broad level,

Strategic culture questions ahistorical and acultural explanations of strategic choice by rooting strategic preferences deep in history and culture, and not predominantly in system structure, or the distribution of state capabilities, as the dominant structural-realist paradigm in the international-relations literature does.27

And armed with this awareness, we can look again at the conflict and see if this helps us unearth things that were earlier invisible. The goal, thus, is to look at differences
between India and China through their history in the context of strategic thinking, which may have contributed to the creation of such vastly different perceptions, policies, and goals regarding each other.

This paper does not presume to provide major hypotheses of its own. Rather, it advocates the vast research undertaking that could result in them. In other words, it advocates the need to look at each country’s historical experiences and analyze how they could have affected the country’s strategic culture and decision-making during the decade of the 50s, as well as how it shapes their current views and deliberations. Thus, the question is not “what” China or India’s strategic culture is or whether we can recreate unequivocal linkages between historical experiences and resultant developments in strategic culture. Rather, the simple question is do India and China’s histories advocate such a study. We do this by attempting to locate traditions and evidences of strategic thinking in their histories. If evidences of traditions of strategic thinking can be unearthed, then this aspect may have significance not only in the context of the 1962 war, but also for bilateral and foreign relations in general today.

Analytical studies of strategic culture have only recently taken off and the present analysis will steer clear of entering into that contemporary political science debate. But before presenting our approach, we will look at the field of strategic culture study and what it has to say. Our approach will be contextualized with reference to the existing framework.

Such a study is eminently feasible for India and China, since both have enjoyed long and illustrious histories. Furthermore, as states in which cultural nationalism has played a dominant role in defining nation and identity, the impact of oft cited long and glorious histories becomes all the more important to analyze. Yet, while there exist studies of Chinese strategic thinking, there is a complete paucity of literature focusing on India. George Tanham has observed, “literature on the subject is meager, and few persons inside or outside India have studied it or thought much about it.”\footnote{George K. Tanham, \textit{Indian Strategic Thought—An Interpretive Essay} (Santa Monica: RAND, 1992), p. 2.} For China the
situation is better, with not only contemporary studies having been conducted recently, but also evidence of strategic treatises extant through the past millennia.  

It is hoped that this short note will expand the approaches taken to study the dispute and the war. It is also hoped that it can provide fertile grounds for further thought on how history is vitally linked to the ways in which states interact, especially in an international state system that includes ancient as well as contemporary political and cultural entities. The awareness of different strategic trajectories is also important for policy makers to acknowledge. Thus, such a study is relevant both as a historical exercise, as well as a note for current and future policy-makers. Indeed, leaders and thinkers have to heed the differences and be aware of their possible implications, in the same manner in which they stridently declare their country’s civilizational, cultural, and historical greatness.

***

Even an initial study such as this is hampered at several logistical levels. Among the primary problems encountered is the lack of widely available Chinese primary and secondary sources on the war and border disagreement. The exact opposite is the case for India. Primary sources such as government white papers as well as scholarly and journalistic works from India abound, and virtually inundate what little there may be from China. Connected to this problem, and perhaps an explanation for it, is the lack of openness in the Chinese decision-making process. Again, India presents a diametrically opposite scenario. Almost everything is known about the deliberations of the Indian leadership and bureaucracy during the years of the dispute and conflict. Ranganathan and Khanna’s work, cited earlier, speaks to this end. Language too presents a problem since many of the Chinese sources have not been translated into English. When looking at

---

29 Two recent studies on China’s strategic thinking and posturing are Mark Burles and Abram N. Shulsky, *Patterns in China’s Use of Force—Evidence from History and Doctrinal Writings* (Santa Monica: RAND, 2000) and Michael D. Swaine and Ashley J. Tellis, *Interpreting China’s Grand Strategy—Past Present and Future* (Santa Monica: RAND, 2000). Ancient China’s military treatises are compiled under what is known as the *Seven Military Classics*.

30 The Chinese did release a publication after the war in 1962: *Sino-Indian Border Question, The*. Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1962. The publication contained letters by Chou En-lai, and statements of the government of the People’s Republic of China which attempted to show that India and her hegemonic ways was the blame for the conflict.

31 This is another area of research—the Chinese decision-making process—that can further inform the general scholarship on the Sino-Indian dispute.
historical experiences, however, Chinese record-keeping tendencies outshine India’s and provide a fuller picture of Chinese concerns through the centuries.

***

The paper is divided into seven sections. The introduction is followed by a discussion of strategic culture and the place of international borders—since the 1962 war was essentially one over disputed borders—within the framework of strategic thinking. The idea is to review the prevailing wisdom about strategic culture and to introduce an analytic framework that will be useful in examining Indian and Chinese history for our purposes. Section three will employ that framework to explore India and China’s experiences over two millennia. Building on that framework, section four will forward some basic propositions about their strategic cultures. From this broad sweep we will return to the 20th century in section five and in section six, narrow that down even further by looking at some of the events during the years leading up to the war from the vantage point of our propositions. The paper will conclude with a discussion on the relevance and requirement for more detailed research in these areas.
II. STRATEGIC CULTURE—an appraisal and a framework

The study of strategic culture is very much a nascent and developing field. Its origins can realistically be traced back to the early 1980s when interest in the links between a state’s behavior and its culture grew. This initial interest was stimulated by the cold war and, as a result, the focus remained largely U.S. and Soviet Union centered. A basic theoretical dichotomy extant in strategic and strategic culture studies is the structural-cultural divide.

The problem for culturalists is to explain similarities in strategic behavior across varied strategic cultures. Conversely, the problem for structuralists is to explain differences in strategic behavior across strategic cultures when structural conditions are constant.32

But what has driven research in this area is largely the carrot of possible implications of the study of strategic culture in understanding behavior, balanced by the stick wielded in caution against being blasé with its application.

Alastair Johnston has provided a broad overview of the development of the field by dividing it into three generations.33 The first generation, which emerged in the early 80s under the shadow of the cold war, suggested that strategic thought consistently led to one type of behavior. This initial framework had several drawbacks, most notable being that it implied the discounting, though not complete negation, of “historical, geographical, and experiential conditions,” as factors affecting strategic thinking.34 As Johnston challenges:

To what sources does one look as repositories or representations of strategic cultures? For which time periods should these sources be taken? Why are certain historical periods considered formative sources of strategic culture and others not? How is strategic culture transmitted through time [if at all]? Does it change appreciably through its transmissions? None of these questions is explicitly answered by first generation.35

Furthermore, its deterministic cause and effect relationship between culture and strategy was also found wanting:

33 Much of the brief overview provided here is based on Johnston’s works. For a detailed description and analysis of the development of the field, see Alastair Ian Johnston, “Thinking About Strategic Culture,” and Cultural Realism—Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History.
34 Johnston, “Thinking about Strategic Culture,” p. 38.
Upon examination, however, many seemingly obvious differences in military behavior and outlook that initially appeared to be related to cultural differences turn out to be either non-existent or just as plausibly explained by non-cultural factors.\textsuperscript{36}

The second generation, emerging in the mid 80s, attempted to address some of the shortcomings of the first. A central implication was that strategic culture was an outcome of historical experiences. The basic approach was one that looked to study the vast difference between attitudes and declarations of leaders, and the actual motivations for their ensuing actions. Under many such studies strategic behavior across states was observed to fit into certain patterns—even though their cultures posited very different posturing. As a result, the second generationists argued that historical experiences and culture had little place in formulating contemporary strategy. Hence, culture had no perceptible impact on behavior. But any generalization remained tenuous since many states were also seen to not act in larger identifiable patterns, regardless of their posturing.

The third generation, working in the 90s, “tends to be both more rigorous and eclectic in its conceptualization of ideational independent variables, and more narrowly focused on particular strategic decisions as dependent variables.”\textsuperscript{37} Third generation scholars contend that culture is an outcome of recent experiences and not deeper historical ones, but that culture and historically rooted notions about war do impact strategy.\textsuperscript{38} Johnston explains variations in the strategic behavior of nations by tracing them to differences in the minds of strategic elites. Rosen presents a potential limitation to this:

> It is clearly circular to study the behavior of leaders, infer from that behavior certain subjective perspectives, and to then use those inferred perspectives to explain the same set of observed behavior.\textsuperscript{39}

To this Johnston himself agrees by claiming that “one of the problems that plagued cultural analysis, however, has been precisely the difficulty in determining the relationship of attitude to behavior.”\textsuperscript{40} Rosen himself advocates looking at social


\textsuperscript{37} Johnston, “Thinking about Strategic Culture,” p. 41.

\textsuperscript{38} Johnston, “Thinking about Strategic Culture,” p. 42.

\textsuperscript{39} Rosen, p. 14.

\textsuperscript{40} Johnston, “Thinking about Strategic Culture,” p. 52.
structures since they are more easily studied than elite beliefs. Furthermore, social structures may have ideational bases and hence may be an indirect way of approaching elite beliefs. To review, a state’s historically and culturally based notions about the ends and means of war limit the strategic choices of decision-making, as the first and third generation argue, or they do not, as the second generation holds.

Definitions

At this stage, it may be useful to provide some definitions, keeping in mind the controversial and imprecise nature of the field. Rosen posits that

Strategic culture...is in many ways a concept applied...to the subset of political-military decision-makers, to capture the beliefs and assumptions that frame their choices about international military behavior, particularly those concerning decisions to go to war, preferences for offensive, expansionist or defensive modes of warfare, and levels of wartime casualties that would be acceptable.

Johnston’s own preliminary definition reads:

Strategic Culture is an integrated “system of symbols (e.g., argumentation structures, languages, analogies, metaphors) which acts to establish pervasive and long-lasting strategic preferences by formulating concepts of the role and efficacy of military force in interstate political affairs, and by clothing these conceptions with such an aura of factuality that the strategic preferences seem uniquely realistic and efficacious.

He subsequently refines it further along the ideational base touched upon above. In looking at strategic culture as an analytic tool, Johnston provides grounds for caution: one, that strategic cultures may exist, but they may not have any noticeable behavioral effect; and two, that different states may share a common strategic culture. In further correlation to those points, he argues elsewhere that the existence of a strategic culture in any society is potentially falsifiable and that, assuming its existence, researchers can make falsifiable and significant predictions about the effects of strategic culture on behavior. These arguments are more applicable to the modern state system in today’s world—where WMD, nuclear weapons, and global telecommunications have

---

41 Rosen, p. 7.
42 Rosen, p. 12.
43 Johnston, “Thinking about Strategic Culture,” p. 46.
44 Johnston subsequently provides a new approach to studying the role and impact of strategic culture. See, Alistair Johnston, “Thinking about Strategic Culture,” and Cultural Realism.
45 Alastair Ian Johnston, “Thinking About Strategic Culture,” p. 55-56
46 Johnston, Cultural Realism, p. 248.
leveled the playing field substantially. Looking at earlier stages of history can still open up interesting questions. Furthermore, one cannot expect all countries to adapt in similar ways or as quickly. Hence, it is perhaps all the more instructive to look at the early years of the two states as modern countries, when past historical and experiential factors may be at their strongest in influencing strategic policy.

The larger picture emergent is that culture’s impact on strategic thinking is not fully understood. However, the value of studying strategic culture cannot be denied. Even with caveats, the possibility that strategic choice is in large measure determined by values or assumptions with roots deep in a state’s ideational history is an intriguing one both theoretically and in policy terms…strategic culture holds out the possibility that structural realpolitik explanations are dependent on the presence of prior realpolitik strategic cultures, since without realpolitik interpretations of interests and capabilities, changes in these variables are meaningless and therefore indeterminate.47

Additionally, Raymond Cohen in his book, Negotiating Across Cultures has argued that cross cultural differences have significant effects on diplomatic negotiations.48 Cohen rejects the notion that a single international diplomatic culture has developed. Among his recommendations are the need to study the language and history of the other culture. I make a similar case to look at historical experiences and how they may have impacted culture and in turn, or directly, strategic thinking.

**Borders and Boundaries**

Allied to strategic culture, and to security studies in general, is the analysis of borders, which were at the core of the Sino-Indian dispute in the 20th century. When looking at relations between states it is natural to

Also be interested in those structural characteristics of the international system which may serve to constrain (or encourage) the opportunities for interaction and affect the likelihood that certain kinds of actions and interactions will take place.49

---

49 Harvey Starr and Benjamin Most, “The Substance and Study of Borders in International Relations Research,” in International Studies Quarterly, Volume 20, Issue 4 (December 1976), p. 581-620. Starr and Most’s work is subsumed, as they claim on p. 583, by the broader research enterprise directed towards the study of the diffusion of international war during the period 1946-1965.
In the modern world, borders have been the common meeting grounds for states. However, much like the study of strategic culture, borders were of little interest to students of international relations until a few decades ago.\textsuperscript{50}

Stephen B. Jones explores the importance of borders and their ideational link with their geographical and historical milieu.\textsuperscript{51} According to him modern concepts of boundaries can be traced back to the concept of natural boundaries. “This doctrine was a product of the Age of Reason and of nationalism chafing at old restraints.”\textsuperscript{52} Jones proceeds to discuss the interplay of nationality and imperialism with boundary concepts. The contractual concepts of boundaries—“two countries should agree on a line and stick to it, as individuals agree to property lines”—emerged as an outcome of these developments.\textsuperscript{53} If one includes power politics into the equation, then the boundary “is not only a line demarcating legal systems but also a line of contact of territorial power structures.”\textsuperscript{54} This distinction has particular relevance to the Sino-Indian case, and we shall return to it in section six.

\textit{Our analytic framework}

In this paper the focus is to locate evidences of traditions of strategic thinking in India and China. The term tradition is used to address any level of continuity in strategic thinking, though it does not imply any necessary cohesion in doctrine over years and eras. Based on the discussion thus far in this chapter, it would be useful to present an analytical framework with which to compare India and China. Since we are not entering the definitional debate on strategic culture and behavior but merely questioning whether it is valid to think of a link, we can be more lax in establishing this framework. It has been noted that historical experiences may have an effect on the strategic thinking of a country. Therefore, the framework will consist of breaking down historical experiences

\textsuperscript{50} Starr and Most, p. 582.
\textsuperscript{52} Jones, p. 248.
\textsuperscript{53} Jones, p. 251.
into logical constituent factors which could each be viewed as possible indicators of and influences on traditions of strategic culture. These are *Geography, Political Developments and Systems, Structural Comparisons of Society, and Cultural Norms and Practices.*\(^5^5\) Needless to say, these four categories are not disjoint. Geography is the only one amongst the four that is not open to transformation based on its interactions with the other factors. The latter three, however, not only interact with each other, but with geography as well to continuously evolve.

\(^5^5\) Such a breakdown is largely synthetic but helps us approach the question at hand in a systematic manner. Keeping this in mind, distinctions between these factors should not be over-emphasized.
III—ANALYTIC COMPARISONS ACROSS TIME

*Geography*

To begin on a slightly facetious note, India and China were set on the path of confrontation over 200 million years ago when the Indian landmass began its slow but inexorable voyage bridging the Tethys Sea towards the Asian plate. About 60 million years ago the two land masses collided leading to the formation over time of the tallest mountains in the world. This event then laid the foundations for Sino-Indian conflict in the 20th century.

Geography has played a critical role in shaping Indian and Chinese history, as well as in defining their concepts of national greatness and security. China and India’s current political boundaries differ somewhat from their historical boundaries. The current boundaries of both include areas that no earlier Indian or Chinese empire had fully controlled. Hence, our look at their geography will focus more on the regions these countries are in, than on their current borders.

The South Asian region is one that is hemmed in by geographical features on all sides: to the northwest and northeast are the Hindu-Kush and Himalaya mountain ranges, and to the southwest and southeast, the Arabian Sea and the Bay of Bengal. These features have earned the region the sobriquet of a Subcontinent, with India being the dominant nation. Rivers and mountains further divide the subcontinent. The Vindhyachal Mountains divided the region roughly into north and south zones. The north is largely composed of the alluvial plains of the Indus (2800 km) and the Ganges (2500 km), whereas the south is hillier with mountain ranges along both coasts, and a plateau in the center. The entire region has been densely populated, with the northern and eastern plains particularly so.

---

56 The figures provided are ballpark estimates. Information about tectonic plates can be accessed at numerous website on the Internet. Some examples are: [http://www.earth.rochester.edu/ees201/Fleming/flemingz1.html](http://www.earth.rochester.edu/ees201/Fleming/flemingz1.html) and [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/1138262.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/1138262.stm)

57 The southern extremities as well as much of the current northeastern India was never under any Indian Empire, save the British. Similarly, the Chinese empire’s heartland consisted of the fertile river valleys of the east and a corridor along the Steppes in the north for the upkeep of the Silk Route. Tibet was only occasionally under any direct Chinese control, and the frontier regions of the Steppe was often an untamed frontier.

China by contrast is largely mountainous. Its principal ranges are the Tien Shan, the Kunlun Shan, and the Trans-Himalayan chain. Tibet lies in the southwest and the Gobi Desert is situated in the north. China proper consists of three river systems: the Yellow River (Huang He), 3415 miles (5,464 km) long; the Yangtze River (Chang Jiang), the third-longest river in the world at 3940 miles (6,300 km); and the Pearl River (Zhu Jiang), 1380 miles (2,197 km) long. Much of the region’s population has been centered along the coast and these fertile river valleys in the east.

These geographic features have had domestic as well as international implications for both country. On the domestic front, the subcontinent retained a curious mix of appearing secluded—owing to its mountainous northern and watery southern boundaries—yet witnessed several sporadic but often pervasive invasions. These invasions mostly focused on the fertile agricultural plains in the north, thus leading the north to have a largely land-based strategic orientation. The large agricultural areas in the north also provided for the development of larger kingdoms than in the south, where smaller coastal kingdoms were the norm. While the north synthesized the culture of the invading Aryan-speaking peoples with its own, the south retained strong elements of its older Dravidian language roots. Furthermore, along with agriculture, the nearness of large water bodies also provided the south with a richer maritime tradition. Different river systems within the region, especially in the central and southern areas, also contributed to the rise of distinct languages and cultural nuances. Thus, while from the outside the subcontinent might have appeared as one neat geographical unit, within it there was substantial diversity.

Externally, the Indian subcontinent enjoyed a central geographical position in the pre-modern world.

On a map of the eastern hemisphere, India appears to lie at the intersection of imaginary lines stretching from southern Africa to far northeastern Russia and from Australia to the United Kingdom.60

It is, however, unclear whether its inhabitants had a clear impression of the possible implications of this.61 This central position translated into a strategic one vis-à-vis

60 Tanham, p. 3.
international trade throughout history. Both land based and sea based trade found India on their routes. It has been argued that a substantial amount of the goods along the silk route were actually brought down to northwest India along one of its branches, from where they were shipped to Europe. Janet Abu-Lughod has described what she calls an Indian Ocean trade that gradually replaced the silk route in dominance in the early centuries of the second millennium C.E. India, again, was located centrally in these maritime trade routes.65

China’s geographic features ensured that most of her population was concentrated along the river valleys in the east and north east of the region. She was always open to attacks from the Steppes which were inhabited by nomadic war-faring tribes. There was comparably far lesser diversity that that witnessed in the Indian subcontinent. The presence of rice growing regions to the south provided areas where the state could expand its control. From a global standpoint, China was at one end of the great trading systems of the first and second millennium C.E. China much like India was self sufficient in most terms, and did not conduct trade out of necessity. The Silk Route earned its name from the Silk that originated in China. In return, the only item the Chinese required was horses. In later years, with maritime trade taking over, China continued to trade, but again, not out of necessity.

On the whole, the geography of the two countries placed them at important positions in the global trading system but also exposed them to threat from foreign/frontier peoples. China was especially susceptible along her northern frontiers, while India was less so given that access to the subcontinent was limited to just half a dozen passes through the Hindu Kush and the Himalayas. Geography also played a

61 This is reinforced by the fact that Indian states never attempted to involve themselves in the trade, remaining happy to serve as the conduits.
62 This advantage persists till today, with India being along many important maritime trade routes.
65 However, there seems to have been no conscious effort to control any element of this trade.
67 In later years, especially following the economic revolution in the late Sung, and especially during the Ming, this demand also included Silver from the new world. See Mark Elvin, The Pattern of the Chinese Past. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1973).
substantial role in limiting easy contact between people from either region, with India’s geography contributing to a culturally unified, albeit nuanced, zone.

**Political Developments and Systems**

Both regions can trace the existence of political structures back several millennia. Urban life in India has been traced back to the Indus Valley civilization which reached its peak by 2500 B.C., and covered at its most expansive much of modern Pakistan, the Indian states of Punjab, Gujarat and Rajasthan and may have extended further east across the Ganges plain. The earliest Chinese dynasty was that of the Shang (1766-1122 B.C.). However, the first political unification of significance in both regions came several centuries later.

Hermann Kulke and Dietmar Rothermund have discussed early state formation on the Indian subcontinent, which they claimed proceeded in three phases.\(^{68}\) By the sixth and seventh century B.C. 16 *mahajanapadas* emerged after a period of competition.\(^{69}\) This stage was followed by the imperial phase wherein one *mahajanapada* established its dominance over the others. A large, subcontinent wide empire was established in the 4\(^{th}\) century B.C. by Chandragupta Maurya. The *Arthashastra* [on Material Gains], a treatise on political economy originated in this period though its final form was rendered as late as 250 C.E.\(^{70}\) The Mauryan Empire [322–185 B.C.] lasted roughly 140 years and controlled most parts of the subcontinent. It was the first empire confronted with what would prove to be the fundamental problem for any ruler hoping to maintain his hold over the entire subcontinent—the governance of a diverse people, with a multiplicity of languages, religions and customs.\(^{71}\)

---

\(^{68}\) Kulke and Rothermund, p. 57

\(^{69}\) Kulke and Rothermund define Janapada as tribal principalities of a definite area. Maha is a prefix used to denote great or large.

\(^{70}\) The *Arthashastra* is attributed to Chandragupta’s Prime Minister, known by the names of Kautilya and Chanakya. However, it is not seen as the work of one man alone. See Stanley Wolpert, *A New History of India—Sixth Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 57. More from the *Arthashastra* shortly.

\(^{71}\) By this time, in addition to Hinduism, Jainism and Buddhism had emerged as new religions with growing number of followers.
These challenges were addressed in a most unique way by Chandragupta’s grandson, Ashoka, the Mauryan Empire’s most famous ruler.\textsuperscript{72} Ashoka’s long reign is also the first fairly well documented era in Indian history. Ashoka based his rule on \textit{Dhamma}—the word is Pali or Prakrit for the Sanksrit \textit{Dharma}, which in turn means righteousness or religion. Thus he employed a cultural tool to command the loyalty of a disparate mass of people. Dhamma served as the glue for a region that was not a national unit in any modern sense, but was politically governed by a centralized monarchy.

If such a political system was to succeed it was inevitable that there would have to be some national factor in that multi-cultural society of the time. \textit{Dhamma}…might well have acted as a cementing force throughout the country.\textsuperscript{73}

The problems confronting Ashoka have not changed for India’s leaders today. Indeed, Romila Thapar has argued that

In contemporary India, the image of Asoka has gathered about it, its own cult in the popular mind. Concepts of ahimsa and the panc-sila (panchsheel) policy are associated with his ideas. It is felt that a long political tradition beginning with Asoka, of conscious non-violence and toleration of all beliefs political and religious, continued unbroken through centuries culminating in the political philosophy of Gandhi. The fact that the work of Asoka as a monarch, was almost erased from Indian history and thought, cannot be overlooked. The political value of Asoka’s ideas was successfully buried in the oblivion of the past. In the Indian secular sources Asoka remained largely a name in the dynastic king lists, as obscure during the later centuries as the script in which he had had his edicts engraved. A few medieval inscriptions of no great importance do refer to Asoka. But his association of Asoka with \textit{Dhamma}, which was an unconventional policy in terms of politics is not recorded. No later king of any standing, tried consciously to adopt these principles as the basis of his policy.\textsuperscript{74}

Such a political disregard for Ashoka’s ideas and policies, whatever the historical and circumstantial reasons, resulted in an extended period of fragmentation in the subcontinent.\textsuperscript{75} Larger empires continued to exist in the north, but the south persevered with its own dynamism and freedom from them, as did regions in the east.

Following the collapse of the Mauryan Empire, there was a period of large empires in the north of the subcontinent. But these were never able to extend their

\textsuperscript{72} Hermann Kulke and Dietmar Rothermund, A History of India, p. 64.
\textsuperscript{73} Romila Thapar, \textit{Asoka and the Decline of the Mauryas} (London: Oxford University Press, 1961) p. 215.
\textsuperscript{74} Romila Thapar, \textit{Asoka and the Decline of the Mauryas}, p. 214. Hermann Kulke in his studies on the Ganga Dynasty of Orissa has shown that the followed a similar strategy about a 1000 years after Ashoka by owning up the Jagannath cult—a non Aryan deity—because it had mass appeal.
\textsuperscript{75} Kulke and Rothermund have discussed problems faced by empire builders in India which made expansion of regional kingdoms into empires difficult. It is interesting to note that the modern concept of secularism as India’s nation-building strategy is also in a way a policy to make the national appeal as broad-based as possible: the Indian national emblem and the national flag both carry Ashoka’s emblems.
control south beyond the Vindhyas. Most notable amongst these is the Gupta Empire [320-540 C.E.], widely regarded by Hindu nationalists as the acme of Hindu cultural efflorescence. But the south witnessed a variety of kingdoms which allied with each other to thwart the north just as often as they fought amongst each other for regional dominance.76

From the 6th century to the 15th century, the entire region experienced continued political fragmentation.77 The 10th century marked the entry of Islam into the region, which established its permanent presence in Delhi by the early 13th century. These armies, like the preceding armies of the Huns and other invaders entered the subcontinent through the passes in the Hindu Kush. Their rule continued to be centered around the northern plains.

In the south, independent kingdoms continued to flourish.78 During the first millennium and a half Indian culture also traveled across the Bay of Bengal into Southeast Asia and firmly established itself there.79 While initial contacts were made from the Tamil Nadu region of India, by around 1000 C.E. cultural contacts between between Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa and Southeast Asia were just as common. However, this did not translate to any clear political influence.80

The second major reunification of the subcontinent occurred under the Mughals, descendants of the Mongols who a few centuries earlier had controlled lands from eastern Europe to China. The Mughals faced the exact problems that Asoka had provided answers for. Under Akbar [1556-1605 C.E.], widely regarded as the greatest of the Mughals, was established a system of efficient administration.

His effective control over northern and central India was, in fact, greater than that of either the Mauryas or the British, and after conquering those regions he established stable administrators within them, creating a pattern followed by his Mughal descendants as well as by early British administrators.81

In Akbar’s imperial unity project two things figured prominently—his religious syncretism enshrined in the concept of fusing Islam and Hinduism epitomized in his

76 See Wolpert, chapter 6; and Kulke and Rothermund, chapters 3 and 4.
77 Kulke and Rothermund, chapter 3.
78 The largest Empire in the South was that of Vijayanagar [1336-1565 A.D.].
79 For an analysis of India’s impact on Southeast Asia see Kulke and Rothermund, A History of India, p. 152-160.
80 Kulke and Rothermund, p. 163-156.
81 Woolpert, p. 129-131; in particular, for information about the Mansabdari system.
experiment of Din-i-Ilahi and his faith in the efficacy of a standing army, which was possible through the expedience of keeping a huge bullion (silver and gold) reserve. Yet, Mughal rule at its most expansive still did not control the southernmost areas of the Indian peninsula, nor did it have control over the northeastern regions.

The third period of unified rule under was under the British [1858-1947 C.E.]. It was during this period that the first seeds of modern Indian nationalism were sown. Thus, the enduring feature of much of Indian history politically is one of regional fragmentation punctuated by three large empires covering most of the subcontinent. Furthermore, the political outlook was dominated in the north by the threats emanating from central Asia. The south, especially the coastal regions, owing to maritime trade and a consequently pronounced sea-ward orientation, was largely insulated from events in the north.

The first centralization of China is seen to have occurred in 221 B.C. with the establishment of the Qin dynasty. The preceding centuries had witnessed competition amongst several existing kingdoms, with the period [770-221 B.C.] identified as the Warring States period. The Qin dynasty was followed by the Han [206 B.C.–220 C.E.], from which all subsequent Chinese draw the name of their ethnic identity. From then we see a more or less continuous progression of dynasties centered around, for the most part, the north, but controlling much of the agricultural south.

The major competition for any Chinese power came from the Steppes which were inhabited by nomadic peoples skilled in warfare. The threat they posed remained a constant source of worry for every Chinese empire starting with the Sui in 581 A.D. Following the Sui, China experienced long stretches of dynamic rule, interspersed with occasional situations of political unrest. The consolidation process begun under the Sui was carried out under the Tang [618 – 907 A.D.] resulting in the establishment of a central Chinese core. The expansion of land and sea-based trade led the Tang to try and

---

82 British political presence actually began a century earlier with the Battle of Plassey in 1757 when the British won control of the territory of Bengal. But it was only after the suppression of a major uprising in 1857 that Queen Victoria officially transferred control of Indian territories from the East India Company to the British Crown.
control it to fulfill its political agendas. The Tang made tight restrictions on their borders and people were not allowed to leave the kingdom without the approval of the emperor. Xuanzang, the famous Chinese Buddhist scholar and traveler, had to illegally escape from China to make his 16 year long pilgrimage to India in the 7th century C.E.

The Sung Empire [960-1270 C.E.] succeeded the Tang and was accompanied with the rise of several strong Steppe polities, most notable being the Khitan Liao and the Jurchen. The building and upkeep of the Great Wall during this time serves as a testament to the Chinese obsession with their northern frontiers. Scholars have identified the Sung period “as a turning point in the long sweep of Chinese History.” The causal factors of this change were both external as well as internal, with some of the internal factors themselves emerging as a reaction to external threats. The constant fear of invasion by the nomadic Khitan Liao combined with a revolution in agriculture, the development of new technologies including printing, and improvement in infrastructure such as roads and canals, to produce an economic boom. The concurrent Khitan invasions along the northern frontiers of the Sung ultimately forced the capital to retreat south during the latter reign of the empire.

Paul Smith, representing the new wave in scholarship on mid-imperial Chinese social and economic history, cites this event as the starting point of what he terms the “Song-Yuan-Ming transition:”

We propose a four-century transitional period in which domestic and international processes and events favored some Tang-Song trends over others and influenced the ways those trends developed into the Ming-Qing era. The trajectory we propose is evolutionary, but it is not path-dependent: all the social, economic, and cultural trends we discuss in this volume spanned the Tang-Song to the Ming-Qing eras, but the paths they followed—and the fact that it was these trends and not some others that ultimately came to the fore—reflected a contingent sequence of processes of transformation that was fundamentally shaped by political changes, including the threat, triumph, and temporary defeat of non-Han rule.

83 Holcombe, p. 90
84 Xuanzang stayed in India from 629-645 A.D., making the journey via the thriving silk route.
87 Paul Smith and Richard von Glahn, The Song-Yuan-Ming Transition in Chinese History (Cambridge: Harvard East Asian Monographs 221, forthcoming), 1-32, p. 6. Writing the introduction for the volume, Smith provides an excellent overview of the existing scholarship on the mid-imperial period and convincingly argues that the proposed transition helps to contextualize the events of the succeeding centuries—especially the evolution of the Chinese state under the Qing.
China was enveloped in the Mongol dust storm of the 12th and 13th centuries that swept all in front of them. The study of such a transitional period helps incorporate the subsequent Mongol Yuan rule [1270-1368 C.E.] into the larger political processes shaping Chinese history, thereby lending a flavor of political continuity that is somewhat lacking in the Indian case.

However limited the ability of the Yuan state to penetrate Chinese society, it did reunify all the territories of greater China for the first time since the early Tang… and presided over a period of vigorous commercial and agrarian development.88

The Yuan dynasty was replaced by the Ming [1368-1644 C.E.], which was again ethnic Chinese. This period is often cited as China’s greatest cultural epoch. At the broad geo-political level, relative stability and the lack of external threats distinguished the Ming from the preceding two eras. This had as much to do with favorable conditions as with Ming attempts at pre-empting the rise of neighboring powers that could worry the empire in the future.89 As a consequence, the Ming was also a time when China actively extended her influence outside her borders. A striking example of this is the eunuch admiral Zheng He’s voyages to Africa, coastal India and South-east Asia between the years 1405 and 1433 during the reign of emperor Zhu Di.90

The Qing Empire [1644-1912 A.D] which saw China through to the modern era was an actively imperialist empire.91 It was during this period that China expanded to her largest territorial limits. The Qing either conquered or subjected to dominion status a number of regions and states including Manchuria, Mongolia, Xinjiang and Tibet. Smith argues that the positing of a Song-Yuan-Ming transition highlights Qing governance as the epitome of a statecraft tradition that goes back to the twelfth century, when the steppe, the state, and the local gentry emerged as equal forces shaping China’s political trajectory.92

He furthermore notes that

88 Smith, p. 23.
89 To provide an example, the Yong le emperor carried out five expeditions between the years 1410 and 1424, first against the Mongols, and then their potential successors, the Da Dan tribe. For more details see Johnston, Cultural Realism, p. 231-235.
90 Louise Levathes, When China Ruled the Seas—The Treasure Fleet of the Dragon Throne, 1405-1433. (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994). The expeditions were suddenly halted in 1433 in spite of their apparent success. One possible reason could have been the lack of tangible results, weighed against the influence and fame earned and the heavy outlay of money incurred to equip the expeditions.
91 James Millward, cited in Smith, p. 31.
92 Smith, p. 34.
The ability of the Qing to forge agrarian China and the Steppe into a unified polity far exceeded the capacity of any previous dynasty, whether Chinese ruled or alien, and eliminated any notion of the Great Wall as China’s outer frontier.  

Central to China’s approach to international relations was a Sino-centric world order: “China thought of itself as the ‘middle kingdom,’ the centre of its universe. It modeled its foreign relations on the Confucian values associated with filial piety.” Other states or kingdoms beyond the realm of imperial China were normally expected to acknowledge, and thereby validate, the superior position of the emperor in this Sino-centric world order.

In this manner was manifested a tributary system of international relations. It created a highly ritualized relationship between the Chinese emperor and a foreign ruler through which the foreign ruler symbolically demonstrated his complete submission and obedience to the emperor of China—at least that was the Chinese view of things.

It is from this context that we must address Zheng He’s voyages in the 15th century, as well as China’s interference in the affairs of kingdoms in Southeast Asia, the Steppes, and Tibet. Clearly, under the Qing were manifested the political ambitions and Confucian worldview of many of the Chinese intellectuals through several centuries. Towards the later years of the Qing, however, the state began to isolate itself from the outside world again. On the whole, the enduring discernable feature is that of a degree of political continuity—centered on the notion of the ‘middle kingdom.’ This is true even in the cases of non-Han rule as Smith has pointed out.

The main contrasting feature in each region has been the presence or lack of a clearly identifiable political unity for most of the centuries. Subcontinent wide empires have been few and far apart in India, though they have been the norm in China. While there existed a clear conception of a ‘middle kingdom’ in China, the same cannot be said for the Indian subcontinent. Only Ashoka and Akbar had a political vision of the subcontinent as a unified unit.

---

93 Smith, p. 31.
Structural Comparisons of Society

Chinese and Indian societies are characterized by unique structural developments that have had a lasting influence on their cultural practices. The defining feature of Indian society is the caste system. The origins of the system can be traced back to the approximate period of 1500-1000 B.C. when the Aryan-speaking peoples of Central Asia migrated into the subcontinent and mixed with the native population. It is likely that the caste system emerged as an outcome of the interactions and assimilation of these people with each other. Originally meant as a means of dividing society along functional lines, it has developed into a much more complicated system with somewhat pedantic boundaries demarcating different castes and sub-castes.\(^{97}\)

The original and broad view of the caste system is based on the concept of *Varna*, a Sanskrit word with manifold uses; in the present context referring in all likelihood to color. In an early period, membership in a *varna* appears to have been based mainly on personal skills rather than birth, status, or wealth. However, by the end of the *Rigvedic* period [about 500 B.C.], the hereditary principle of social rank had taken root.\(^{98}\) *Varnas* were divided into four broad categories along a descending hierarchical social scale:

— The *Brahmins* were the teachers and the priests
— The *Kshatriyas* were the warriors and rulers; the aristocrats
— the *Vaishyas* were the merchants, businessmen, and farmers
— the *Shudras* were menial workers

This classification serves as the ideological underpinning of the caste system. In reality however, what has developed through the centuries is a much more complicated and nuanced system wherein the key concept is *jati*—the small-scale perspective represented by local village societies and comprising of thousands of castes and subcastes. While the concept of *Varna* helps situate the overall caste system, it is the study of *jatis* that is normally the focus of most scholarly writing on the caste system of India.\(^{99}\) In addition to restricting social mobility, the caste system has also provided the basis for much legal

\(^{97}\) For a masterly analysis of Caste in India today, especially in its more particular and non-functional conceptualization, refer to the works of M.N. Srinivas. For an introduction to Caste in India, also see A. L. Basham, *The Wonder That Was India* (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1967).


discourse. So pervasive has been the influence of the caste [jati] system in Indian social life that even those peoples that converted to other religions, such as Islam or Christianity carry, with them the baggage of caste distinctions and politics into their new religions while at the same time also creating new sub-castes within their adopted faiths.

The entry of Islam into the subcontinent did not change this fundamental feature of Indian society. Islam too was influenced by Indian customs and traditions. For example, it too, unlike in other places, got stratified on caste lines, a subject which social anthropologists like Imtiaz Ahmed and others have done much research on. British rule did not significantly alter the underpinnings of the caste system. Instead of tackling the legal difficulties arising from governing a diverse population the British were satisfied in merely coding the prevailing Hindu customs and traditions.

China does not possess any similarly pervasive system of structuring society. Rather, its fundamental underlying notion is that of the centrality of the family and the hierarchical relationships that that implies. The omnipresent role of the family can be traced back to the earliest historical Chinese dynasty, that of the Shang (1766-1122 B.C.). Under Confucius, this basic characteristic was re-synthesized as a constituent of a much larger framework for society. Confucius envisioned society as a complex interplay of relationships and conduct—not only within the material world but also with the heavenly—that were grounded on humaneness, filiality and ritual decorum in order to provide stability and to alienate it from disorder and crises.

But not until the Neo-Confucian revival during the Song did Confucian thinking enjoy any primacy as a source of structuring society. Eric Zurcher provides a three-pyramid metaphor for understanding the composition of Chinese society during the first millennium A.D. The three peaks of the pyramid symbolize Daoism, Confucianism and Buddhism while the base represents a syncretisation of the three with the popular

---

101 The problem of a unified civil code still haunts India today where its Hindu majority and large Muslim minority do not share several legal notions or customs.
religions that were a constant feature since early on.\textsuperscript{103} Thus, Chinese society was an immense mix of various beliefs and ideologies that were only orthodox and separate at the upper levels of society, as represented by the three peaks. As a consequence the only clear structural distinction that existed was the one between commoners and elites, with the elites being composed of the aristocracy and the landed gentry.

The advent and spread of printing marked a key change in the dynamics of the commoner elite dichotomy by facilitating the rise of a meritocratic bureaucracy. Indeed, one of most significant consequences of the printing revolution was the redefinition of who constituted the elite. The bureaucracy had always been a marker of status and power, and starting from the Han times it had been dominated by the aristocracy, though some civil servants were also recruited through examinations. During the Tang, greater stress was laid on formalizing and standardizing the examinations for entry into the civil service.\textsuperscript{104} Yet on account of the expenses involved in preparing for the exams, the applicant pool remained a small and privileged one. The mass production of manuals and literary classics broadened the playing field by making education available to a much wider class of people than merely the aristocracy and rich landed gentry. Appearing for the exams became a marker of social status and learning—so much so, that anyone even preparing for the exams was worthy of that status. As a consequences of these changes a whole new literati elite was created that was not necessarily rich, but that had at least spent some time pursing studies towards civil examinations. The defining characteristic of this elite was social mobility. Indeed, Elman identifies this process as culminating around 1200 with the “transformation of the shih from men of good birth to men of culture.”\textsuperscript{105} In other words, one’s birth no longer guaranteed one’s identity as an elite, rather one’s behavior and one’s education did. On the basis of how well their members did in the exams, elite families could lose their status just as easily as non-elite families could gain them.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[104] Benjamin Elman, “Rethinking the Historical Roots of the Late Imperial Civil Examinations,” in Benjamin Elman, A Cultural History of Civil Examinations in Late Imperial China (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), p. 1-65.
\item[105] Elman, p. 14.
\end{footnotes}
The bureaucracy in China, much like its global counterparts all over the world today, played a key role in governance and the formulation and execution of policy. Their goals were structured around a common theme—that of the governance of the middle kingdom. By contrast, there was no organized bureaucracy in India where bureaucrats were military men, and administration did not penetrate everywhere. The only serious Indian attempt at bureaucratic organization was the *Arthashastra* which provided the seeds of structure for approaching India as a political unit. But the memory and knowledge of the *Arthashastra* was lost following the early medieval ages, not to be resuscitated until the 19th century. Even Akbar’s *mansabdari* system discussed earlier relied on military governors to carry out civil administration duties. It was the British who brought to India the notion of an organized and career oriented bureaucracy; though they did not permit Indian’s to sit for the civil service examinations till the turn of the 20th century.

A further broad generalization can be made regarding the dynamic nature of the society based on the mobility afforded in each. In China’s case, especially by the second millennium when printing was making its effects felt, mobility was much easier than it was in India. This feature may very well have helped engender a sense of a Chinese political identity. In India, the exact opposite was more likely—the political fragmentation, development of regional languages, and lack of social mobility contributing to the rise of regional political identities.

---

106 Elvin cites the writing of manuals and treatises on fiscal policy during the Sung. Similarly, the 7 *Military Classics* were a compilation of different approaches to warfare and military strategy.

107 For a quick overview of the political system of the *Arthashastra* see Kulke and Rothermund, p. 62-64. For an authoritative translation of the *Arthashastra* see R. Shamasstry (trans.), *Kautilya's Arthas¯astra* (Mysore: Print. and Publishing House, 1961).

108 Benedict Anderson, in his famous book *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* has discussed how the modern printing press and the consequent mass circulation of novels and literature played a tremendous role in instilling the idea of nationalism amongst their readers—common customs, common ways of life, common food, and so on—without the readers ever directly knowing one another. While tenuous, such a comparison can also be extended to mid-imperial China. We may not witness a Chinese nationalism, but can definitely see a similar argument working to create a Chinese identity. See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).
Cultural practices and norms

The two regions vary substantially in the development of their cultural practices and norms as well. However, even though each has experienced substantial change over its long history, there exist basic social and cultural patterns that are recognizable today. In spite of the regional fragmentation in the Indian subcontinent, much of Indian culture has a common central core which emerged from and is reflected in the subcontinent’s major religion—Hinduism. Hinduism, as many argue, is more a way of life than a religion in that it has no central text or scripture, no institutional basis, and no prophet. The easiest way to think of it is as “an amorphous body of beliefs resting on a few basic tenets.” 109 And this facet has allowed it to adapt and assimilate many of the features of invading foreign cultures, while at the same time penetrating the lives of the Christians, Jews, and Muslims of India. This seeming resilience and adaptability of an Indian, Hinduism-based but highly assimilated culture, is often cited as one of India’s greatnesses. 110

Rothermund and Kulke have discussed the development of Indian culture by identifying four factors of the early medieval period as key influences. 111 The first, as we have discussed above, was the emergence of regional kingdoms. The second was the transformation of ‘Brahminism’ into a new kind of popular Hinduism. 112 The evolution of regional languages and regional political centers, which in turn resulted in the growth of regional cultures or sub-cultures, comprise the third and fourth factors.

In spite of this regionalization, a common thread of Indian culture persists across the people. Tanham has noted, “the widely held perception that culture is a central feature of Indian life may be a greater force than the culture itself, which is slowly changing.” 113 But beneath the surface is a lurking sense of the whole of India as a cultural entity based on the notion of Aryavarta, the world of the Aryans encompassing undivided India. 114 The Hindu caste system, in spite of all its pitfalls in the modern

109 Tanham, p. 15.
110 I use the term Hinduism-based culture to distinguish it from any aspersions of being purely Hindu in nature. Rather, by assimilating foreign influences continuously, the culture is larger than the sum of its parts.
111 Kulke and Rothermund, p. 138. The authors engage in a detailed discussion on the growth of regional cultures in the following pages.
112 This mirrors developments in China, wherein the elite Confucian world-view of the mid-imperial era slowly spread and was adopted by the masses by the time of the Qing.
113 Tanham, p. 15.
114 Arya in the Indian context denotes a good and noble man, and does not carry any racial connotations.
context, played a significant role in maintaining the cultural unity of India because it essentially stratified society along horizontal lines unlike tribal systems which are vertically oriented. Consequently, at a supra level, a Brahmin of south India was closer to a Brahmin of north India than to his lower caste and vice versa. The location of pilgrim centers in different corners of India highlights this concept—Kailash in Tibet, Amarnath and Kedarnath in the Himalayas, Kamaksya in Assam, Kanyakumar in Tamil Nadu and Dwarka in Gujarat—and provides India’s cultural boundaries. The many references in the Mahabharata and Ramayana to far flung areas in Nagaland or Afghanistan or Tamil Nadu further underscore the same point.

Among some principal common concepts in Indian [Hindu] culture are Dharma, Karma, and transmigration. The Indian view of life is a complex mix of pragmatism and realism balancing on the precipice of fatalism and passivism. Logic is counted as being only one among many influences on life; others including emotion, tradition, fate, and intuition. A contributing factor to this view is the concept of time and of creation, which are cyclical: birth, death, and rebirth are not only man’s fate, but also represent the workings of the universe.

When looking at Chinese culture, the omnipresence and influence of Confucianism cannot be ignored. Confucianism had become the state orthodoxy during the Han period [202 B.C.-220 C.E.] and enjoyed royal patronage since then. The Great Learning, whose written form is attributed to this era, includes a catena which explains the relation between self-cultivation of the individual and how that positively impacts upon the family, the state and general peace in the world. According to Confucius every individual has his own place in society and must respect others and act in accordance with it: “let the ruler be a ruler; the minister a minister; the father a father; the son a son. Thus, society is envisioned as a complex interplay of relationships and conduct—not only within the material world but also with the heavenly—that are

---

115 Conversation with Partha S. Ghosh. 04/12/03. It is important to observe that while the endogamous nature of the system ensured this supra unity, linguistic divisions of India tended to blur the concept.
116 Conversation with Partha S. Ghosh. 04/12/03.
117 Tanham, p. 17.
119 The Analects 12:11, in de Bary and Bloom, p.56
grounded on humaneness, filiality and ritual decorum in order to provide stability and to alienate it from disorder and crises. This view was duplicated for inter-state relations as well. “China stood at the top of the pecking order, providing an intellectual and bureaucratic model of proper governance for Chinese and non-Chinese alike.”

However, Confucianism did not hold sway at the popular level. Zurcher’s three-peak metaphor has already been mentioned earlier. The advent and slow rise of the Neo-Confucian movement from the Song times laid the foundations for the spread of Confucian values and ideals across Chinese society en masse. Even though the Neo-Confucians articulated a return to the ways of the sages, they could not but help take on certain aspects of the religions they came in touch with, namely Buddhism and Daoism. The real transformation in this regard occurred during the Qing.

Recent scholarship demonstrates that the Qing state aimed for much more universal integration of state and society than had previous dynasties, by transforming the Daoxue orthodoxy of the Song-Yuan-Ming elite into the orthopraxy of Han peasants and non-Han villagers throughout the realm.

The result was a system of privileges and gender performance that began to characterize Chinese society. Thus, by the 19th century we can see a commoner lady like Ning Lao T’ai T’ai articulating the same concerns as Neo-Confucian elites of the Song era.

Whether Confucianism itself can be regarded as a religion is a tricky issue. Many see it as a “strictly secular body of moral and political reflection.” However, de Bary and Bloom contend that for Confucianism the realm of human activity itself is sacred and by identifying oneself within a community performing rituals one sacrilizes human interaction.” But religion or not, it achieved a religion-like following in the centuries that followed the Sung.

A key distinction that emerges between the two cultures is that based on practicality. In addition to being highlighted by Confucianism’s more prosaic world-view, it is best exemplified by attitudes towards history and record-keeping. The Chinese were very meticulous about their record keeping with local city and village gazettes

---

121 The very idea of transmission of knowledge which the neo-Confucians claimed had been hindered by Buddhism is essentially an argument used by Buddhists against other religions!
122 Smith, p. 33.
124 De Bary and Bloom, p. 9.
surviving to this day and providing students of Chinese history with a treasure trove of information. The Indian’s on the other hand seemed to have had a disregard for history.¹²⁵ These can be attributed to a combination of political and structural factors, as well as to philosophical approaches to life. The tendency to keep records is especially important in engendering a strategic outlook as it reflects planning and an awareness of the details of past events.

What emerges from the analysis of these four broad factors is the notion that we can find evidences of cultural as well as political unity in China, whereas in India cultural unity has been accompanied by only sporadic bouts of political unity. Indeed, as discussed, the hold of political institutions has been tenuous at best over the entire subcontinent and has broken down more often than not. Hence, while China acted like a state for much of its history, the subcontinent was composed of a multiplicity of states that acted independently. Only occasionally were they united under one umbrella. Societal and cultural factors served to magnify this dichotomy. In China’s case, societal and cultural developments were linked to political developments. A bureaucracy maintained central power whose traditions and practices slowly came to be representative of all Chinese. In India, societal and cultural developments took place in spite of, or without regard to, any concurrent political developments.

¹²⁵ This is especially the case for Hindus, though not as much for Muslims.
IV—PROPOSITIONS

Among the primary questions raised in the introduction to this paper is whether differing historical experiences could have led to different traditions of strategic thinking. This section will attempt to build on the previous section’s analysis by forwarding some propositions about Indian and Chinese traditions of strategic thinking.\textsuperscript{126} Without attempting to address what is India or China’s strategic culture in its entirety, one can contend that China has had a consistent tradition of strategic thinking aided by several contributing factors. Evidence from India seems more controvertible.

\textit{Traditions of Strategic thinking—India}

As remarked in the introduction, studies of Indian strategic thought are not plentiful. This in itself can be taken as an indicator of the lack of importance accorded to strategic thinking in the Indian mindset. Indeed, the only study to have emerged in recent years on the subject has been that by a non-Indian. George Tanham’s \textit{Indian Strategic Thought—An Interpretive Essay} is, as its title suggests, not an exhaustive analysis of Indian strategic thinking but rather an interpretive effort based as much on research and analysis as on personal impressions and observations.\textsuperscript{127} Tanham too notes that India “has produced little formal strategic thinking and planning.”\textsuperscript{128} Within the Indian intellectual arena, the most strident voice to make similar claims has been that of K. Subrahmanyam. In an interview given to Amitav Ghosh, Subrahmanyam has qualified India as a non-doctrinaire society even religion wise.\textsuperscript{129} He claims, however, that this facet also translates into a unique way of handling internal problems—insurgents are not liquidated, but won over.

A useful paradigm for approaching India is to think of her as culturally old but politically young. Our analysis in the previous section suggests that the permanent feature of Indian civilization has been a cultural unity lacking any longstanding political

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{126} Understandably, these are speculative and based on broad generalizations. Such criticism would merely reinforce the need to study this issue in much more depth—historically as well as analytically. \\
\textsuperscript{127} George K. Tanham, \textit{Indian Strategic Thought—An Interpretive} (Santa Monica: RAND, 1992) \\
\textsuperscript{128} Tanham, p. 50. Subrahmanyam claims, however, that this facet also translates into a unique way of handling internal problems—insurgents are not liquidated, but won over. \\
\end{flushright}
complement. Such a lack of political identity on a subcontinental scale effectively stunted the growth of any tradition of strategic thinking. However, it is hard to find evidence of even regional political identities surviving with vigor. Tanham argues that the principal means of identification in older Indian societies were caste, locality and language.\textsuperscript{130} As a result, strategic thinking within the subcontinent remained dominated by a regional focus with states competing with and fighting against other regional states. The Arthashastra’s Mandala (rings) approach to foreign policy provides an enduring model for such inter-state interactions. According to the Mandala concept, a state should determine its foreign policy based on concentric circles: contiguous neighbors are enemies, their outer neighbors are friends, and so on. Foreign policy instruments are expounded based on this assumption:

The Circle of States \textit{[mandala]} is the source of the six-fold policy...peace (\textit{sandhi}), war (\textit{vigraha}) observance of neutrality (\textit{āsana}), marching (\textit{yāna}), alliance (\textit{samsraya}), and making peace with one and waging war with another are the six forms of state-policy.\textsuperscript{131}

While the text itself was forgotten during the first millennium A.D., these basic tenets seem to have survived and seen application.\textsuperscript{132}

Among the key features within the realm of Indian strategizing is a non-expansionist tradition.\textsuperscript{133} This can only be done if conception of the self—in this case the political state—is first in order. Indeed, to use this to contend that Indians are a peace-loving people leaves the question begging; in truth, Indians have not had a long enough united political history to demonstrate their love for peace or territorial aggrandizement decisively.\textsuperscript{134} Indeed, when the chance presented itself—such as under the Mughals and the Mauryas—expansionism was very much in existence.\textsuperscript{135} According to Tanham

\textsuperscript{130} Tanham, p. 51.
\textsuperscript{132} An interesting parallel can be drawn with medieval and modern Europe. India is roughly the size of Europe and experienced similar inter-state conflicts and alliances through much of her history.
\textsuperscript{133} Tanham, p. 54.
\textsuperscript{134} Indian politicians often use this argument—of non-aggression being a historical trait— but its logic is convoluted since the very idea of an Indian union seems to have been foggy at best through much of Indian history. For the germ of this concept one has to go back again all the way to the Arthashastra—but that does not mean it endured with equal vigor through the ensuing centuries.
\textsuperscript{135} The Mughals expanded their control over parts of Central Asia, especially present day Afghanistan, and during the reign of Aurangzeb [1656-1707] the empire also extended southward in a bid to cover the entire subcontinent. The Mauryas also undertook major campaigns, controlling much of present day Afghanistan.
Indian (Hindu) tendencies towards fatalism-realism and Indian concepts of time, where history is revered but not recorded or studied, also contribute to a distinct aversion to planning. A non-practical approach hinges on Hinduism’s equal focus on the ephemeral and on the real. Confucianism, the dominant elite philosophy of China, is much more practical in outlook.137

As a result Indian strategic thought is reactive in nature. This is evidenced by the fact that rarely has an Indian army perceived and acted on its strategic environment: most invading armies have fought decisive battles not on the borders but well within subcontinental territory.138 Such a tendency persists even in the present. Tanham quotes former Chief of Air Staff Air Chief Marshall N.C. Suri admitting as much when he characterized the Indian Air Force as “reactive” instead of “active.”

He expressed little concern over Pakistani efforts to acquire an advanced early warning (AEW) system: “we will see how to counter it if Pakistan acquires the new capability.”

Evident here is an inherent tension as over the past 100 years leaders of the freedom struggle and independent India have struggled to shape a cohesive Indian political identity.140 But they are also straddled with a mindset that has not thought of the region as a single political unit for extended periods and which arguably has a tendency to avoid long term planning, thereby contributing to a frequently impractical approach to foreign policy.141 This is modern India’s enduring strategic challenge.

136 Tanham, p. 50.
137 This is a debatable point, as Chinese popular culture was just as seeped in superstition and wonderment. This merely magnifies the role of the bureaucracy in China; read on.
138 The first significant Muslim invasion of India was met by a substantial Indian force only once it had made its way well into the subcontinent. Similarly, Babur, the first Mughal, fought his decisive battle on the fields of Panipat, just outside Delhi. It is important to note that I am making a distinction between the historical reasons for such a situation, and its consequent result.
139 Tanham, p. 50.
140 Indian nationalism presents a much more complicated case than most other countries. It is founded on civic as well a cultural elements—the extolling of historical greatnesses is involved in a complex dance with more modern civic notions of equality and liberty in a secular context.
141 South Asia expert Stephen P. Cohen has argued that Indian diplomats have often infuriated their counterparts from other countries by constantly taking the moral high ground in discussions. See Stephen P. Cohen India—Emerging Power (Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2001, especially chapter 3, “The India That Can’t Say Yes.”
Traditions of Strategic thinking—China

The relative abundance of scholarship on Chinese strategic thinking stands in stark contrast to that on India, with both ancient as well as contemporary examples abounding. Ancient treatises can best be encapsulated by the *Seven Military Classics*, included among which is Sun Tzi’s classic *The Art of War*. The *Classics* were among principle texts studied by Chinese rulers and elites through much of Chinese history. Recent additions include two works emanating from RAND. The first is a short monograph by Mark Burles and Abram N. Shulsky in which the authors use doctrinal writings and historical events to identify future patterns in the use of force by China. Burles and Shulsky focus on primarily on post 1949 China. Ashley Tellis and Michael Swaine have conducted a more expansive and authoritative study analyzing China’s strategy making trends through history as well as in the current century. Rosita Delios has analyzed contemporary Chinese defense thinking from the point of view of its strategic culture. Alastair Johnston’s combines an excruciatingly close textual analysis of the *Seven Military Classics* of ancient China with the study of Ming foreign-policy decisions.

If we were to attempt assigning a paradigm to China along the lines attempted for India above, the obvious choice would be to think of her as politically and culturally old. Political unity ensured deliberation on the governance and future of the Chinese state. Furthermore, the fear of internal chaos, especially during times of external threat is a common theme in Chinese history.

As a result, China’s vulnerable borders and history of repeated foreign incursions have established a strong connection, in the minds of most Chinese, between internal political and social weakness and foreign aggressiveness.

The Chinese bureaucracy was trained with China’s rule in mind. It was a system based for the most part on Confucian principles. The key, as has been noted earlier, lay in the

---

142 Including Mao Zedong in the 20th century.
143 Mark Burles and Abram N. Shulsky *Patterns in China’s Use of Force—Evidence from History and Doctrinal Writings* (Santa Monica: RAND, 2000).
146 Johnston, *Cultural Realism*.
147 Swaine and Tellis, p. 13, 16.
establishment and maintenance of hierarchical patterns of behavior within society and inter-state relations. However, Tellis and Swaine have noted that this did not imply that China’s leaders were too rigid and impractical in their policymaking: “when confronted with relatively strong potential or actual foes, they at times adopted far less hierarchical practices.”

Emperors and bureaucrats both actively thought about the state and its governance:

In his work on statecraft, the Sheng Xue Xin Fa, Yong Le (a Ming emperor) cited the Tang Tai Zong emperor, “As for weapons and armor, these are the inauspicious tools of the state. Although one’s territory is great, if one is belligerent the people will become destitute. Although the state may be in peace, if one is constantly warring then the people are endangered” (Ming Chengzu 1410:538).

Closer analysis of such documentary evidence and historical events about policy decisions has led to a reassessment of views on Chinese strategic thinking. This emerging scholarship has suggested that there exist two dominant strains in traditional Chinese strategic thinking. Johnston calls the first a Confucian-Mencian paradigm, which

assumes essentially that conflict is essentially aberrant or at least avoidable through the promotion of good government and the coopting or enculturation of external threats. When force is used, it should be applied defensively, minimally, only under unavoidable conditions, and then only in the name of the righteous restoration of a moral political order.

However, when compared to the study of actual actions, a different picture emerges. Johnston calls the second strain the parabellum paradigm. It assumes

That conflict is a constant feature of human affairs, that is due largely to the rapacious or threatening nature of the adversary, and that in this zero-sum context the application of violence is highly efficacious for dealing with the enemy.

While the first indicate a largely defensive strategy, the second suggests a more proactive offensive one. Johnston further argues that his research indicates that it is the parabellum paradigm that has dominated, especially in cases where China “enjoys a superior military

---

148 Swaine and Tellis, p. 16.
150 Johnston, Cultural Realism, p. 244.
151 Johnston, Cultural Realism, p. 249. Johnston further contends that this view dominates much past scholarship on the subject.
152 Johnston, Cultural Realism, p. 249.
position and confronts minimal political or economic repercussions.”153 Tellis and Swaine have qualified Johnston’s claims by stating that their “assessment also suggests that such Chinese behavior has derived more from the material and structural conditions confronting the Chinese regime than from cultural factors.”154 Delios goes to the extent of arguing that there is “a uniquely Chinese approach to strategy,” and that it persists even in a nuclear-armed China.

By combining these observations with historical data scholars have constructed a substantive set of assumptions about Chinese strategic culture. China’s two fundamental security concerns were an intense fear of internal social chaos and threats from the periphery.155 As a result, Swaine and Tellis track the early years of Chinese empires to discover a disproportionately higher number of wars along the periphery all aimed at ironing out potentially problematic issues.156 Delois has also argued, “according to strategic tradition, including Mao’s traditional people’s war, one does not embark on a counter offensive unless one is assured of victory.”157 According to Mao himself,

Fight no battle unprepared, fight no battle you are not sure of winning; make every effort to be well prepared for each battle, make every effort to ensure victory in the given set of conditions between the enemy and ourselves.158

Thus, patience is a key element in Chinese strategic thought. The other appreciable aspect is that of clearly identifiable imperatives. Armed with these basic notions of Indian and Chinese traditions of strategic thinking we can now move forward in time to the 20th century.

153 Swaine and Tellis, p. 49.
154 Swaine and Tellis, p. 49.
155 Swaine and Tellis, p.16.
156 Swaine and Tellis, p. 46-47.
157 Delios, p. 12.
V. SITUATING INDIA AND CHINA IN THE 20TH CENTURY

At the turn of the 20th century, both India and China were emerging out of years of western domination—India, direct colonial rule, and the Chinese, indirect unfair trade treaties such as the European spheres of influence. Realizing that their countries had been left behind in a new world order the peoples of both regions were rediscovering as well as reanalyzing their histories with the aim of bringing about an internal revitalization. Each state’s nationalist/reform movement was focused as much on the need to modernize as to regain past glory. Indians and Chinese drew pride from the accomplishments of their ancestors. Past achievements helped position their identity and also influenced their views of their neighbors and the outside world at large.

The nationalist narratives of both India and China conceive of these countries as great nations that have historically exercised substantial influence [cultural and/or political] over large areas beyond their boundaries.

And this past glory played a key role in how they viewed the world outside their borders during the 1950s.

Reform movements in India can be traced to the early decades of the 19th century. In India social reform was initiated by the likes of Raja Ram Mohun Roy and Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar. Mohun Roy is credited with the abolishment of the practice of sati. Vidyasagar actively advocated widow remarriage and helped establish women’s education in India. In succeeding years reform became inextricably linked to the larger nationalist struggle.

---

159 For many Chinese intellectuals, this was confirmed when Japanese demands were given precedence over Chinese ones at the treaty of Versailles. India, being a colony of the British Crown, was not represented at Versailles, even though several million Indian soldiers fought for the British in Europe.

160 Garver, p. 11.

161 Sati (Su-thi, a.k.a. suttee) is the traditional Hindu practice of a widow immolating herself on her husband’s funeral pyre. Following the efforts of Raja Ram Mohan Roy and his Brahma Samaj, the ritual of sati was banned by the British Government in 1829. However, it took several years of further social reforms spear-headed by the likes of Dayananda Saraswati (of the Arya Samaj) and Mahatma Gandhi to actually stop the practice. Through virtually non-existent now, the practice is not entirely out of the Indian consciousness: instances were reported in the Indian states of Rajasthan (in the 1980) and Madhya Pradesh (2002), causing a great deal of controversy and social turmoil.

162 Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar (1820-1891) was a great Indian scholar and reformer who fought against the social evils of child marriage and exploitation of women.

163 One of the biggest tools that backfires on the colonizers is education. Western educated natives begin to see the state of affairs in their land and compare it with those in Europe. Subsequently, they begin to raise
At the core of India’s modern nationalist narrative is the notion that India is a great nation whose radiant influence molded a wide swath of the world beyond its boundaries. The creators of modern Indian nationalism looked in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries for a story of Indian national greatness comparable to those told by European nationalists. Indian thinkers found [as we have noted] in their national history only brief periods of great empires and far longer periods of fragmentation and internecine war. This did not discourage them, however, for they turned to the religious, linguistic, and other cultural influences that emanated from the subcontinent, flowing over and deeply influencing other lands.164

Emerging as a largely moderate movement for reform and change without demanding independence in the late 1800s, India’s freedom and nationalist movement became progressively bent upon total independence by the early decades of the 20th century.165

Reform movements emerged a little later in China as it was not until mid 19th century that the Qing’s relative weaknesses had begun to become apparent to the Chinese intelligentsia. The Opium Wars [1839-1842 C.E.] were among the first in a string of downward spiraling international encounters that began to undercut China’s prominence in the world. Additionally, many Chinese progressively also saw their culture and social structures as causal factors in the decline of their country. The Boxer rebellion finally forced the Qing state to think seriously about reforms. By 1895, with China’s defeat at the hands of the rejuvenated Japanese, things had come to a head for many Chinese intellectuals and activists. In the following decades, these intellectuals and activists strove to reform their people and their country.

In doing so, they employed varied and often conflicting methods based on a plethora of ideologies ranging from gradual moderate reformism to violent nationalism to anarchism. Western concepts and literature were widely referred and Russian strands of anarchism and nihilism too found favor among many young Chinese.166 A basic understanding of what ailed China also began to take shape through literature. The system of privileges and gender performance that had defined China through its past few centuries had eroded under threats of political and economic instability. As a result, awareness about the injustices that are committed by the colonizers. They envision a free country of their own based on western ideals of freedom, democracy and socialism.

164 Garver, p. 12.
165 The Indian National Congress was established in 1885 with the initial goal to better represent the concerns and issues of Indians to the British crown.
166 Jonathan D. Spence, The Gate of Heavenly Peace (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1982), p. 78. People like Qui Jin, Zou Rong, and many more emerged in the limelight, with their calls for revolutionary and bloody change as the only way of ridding China of her ills.
Chinese traditions and behavior failed to adapt and began to be seen as the main causes of Chinese decline.\textsuperscript{167}

China’s nationalist narrative has many similarities with that of India. It too “postulates that throughout most of its history China was a great nation and, unlike India, a powerful state whose influence extended over wide regions of Asia.”\textsuperscript{168}

\textit{Inevitable contact—unavoidable conflict?}

There is a substantial overlap between the two countries perceived traditional spheres of influence. By comparing Indian assertions made during from the March-April 1947 First Asian Relations Conference held in New Delhi with maps in Chinese school textbooks of the early 50s, John Garver has presented a map of these spheres in his new book.\textsuperscript{169}

Garver notes that the New Delhi conference

Identified Burma, Siam (Thailand), Malaya, Cambodia, Champa, Sumatra, Java, and Bali as regions of Southeast Asia which had received “strong influences from India in the domain of religion, language, art and architecture…The orbit of India’s cultural empire once embraced these distant lands for several centuries.” According to the narrative describing the display, “Burma owes to India her script, religion, and its sacred literature.” Champa, a kingdom encompassing what later became southern Vietnam nad eastern Cambodia, “was for a thousand years (ca. 3\textsuperscript{rd} to 12\textsuperscript{th} c.) a land of mixed Indo-Cham culture.”…On Java and Sumatra, Hindu and Buddhist rulers looked to India for religious instruction and political support. “Indonesian contacts with India seem to have continued right up to the 15\textsuperscript{th} century…To India’s north Nepal was shaped by interaction with India…Beyond Nepal, Tibet came within India’s sphere of influence. Tibet in the 7\textsuperscript{th} century “borrowed from India Buddhism and also the Indian script script preserved with little change since that time.”\textsuperscript{170}

In similar fashion was included present day Sri Lanka and in Central Asia, it was argued that India’s influence was considered paramount mainly because of the spread of Buddhism. In this way was the notion of a greater India put forth.

Garver has deduced the Chinese view of its spheres of influence by looking at records of its tributary states. He claims that the modern Chinese nationalist view of the situation encompassed wide portions of Inner Asia, Southeast Asia, and South Asia.

---

\textsuperscript{167} Writers such as Lu Xun, writing in the 1920s, explored these notions in stories such as “A Madman’s Diary” and “Kong Yiji.”\textsuperscript{167} In the former, Lu highlighted the prevalent Confucian practices of offering human flesh and the general apathy in society, thereby hinting at the predatory and cannibalistic nature of Chinese society. See Lu Xun, “A Madman’s Diary” and “Kong Yiji,” in  \textit{The Columbia Anthology of Modern Chinese Literature} (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), p. 7-21.

\textsuperscript{168} Garver, p.13.

\textsuperscript{169} Garver, p. 15. See Appendix C for a copy of the map.

\textsuperscript{170} Garver, p. 12-13.
A map produced in Chinese textbooks in 1954 neatly illustrated the geographic scope of China’s lost [emphasis added] tributary system. This particular map—showing China’s territorial losses at the hands of Western and Japanese imperialists during the century between the Opium war in 1839 and China’s “Liberation” in 1949 and selected for classroom use by PRC educational authorities—was intended to create a sense of bitterness, wounded pride, and thereby popular support for the PRC’s efforts to wipe out the “humiliation” of the past.\(^{171}\)

How effective the tributary system was is not entirely sure. It can be argued that it was more advantageous for the tributaries than for China though it also opened them up to the influences of a larger and more pervasive culture.\(^{172}\)

These claims merely reinforce a central notion developed thus far in this paper—India as politically young, culturally old; China as both, culturally and politically old. India’s influences over her periphery were admittedly cultural and contributed to the lack of any strategic thinking in their regard. In China’s case cultural as well as political contacts are evident.\(^{173}\) Given that each country’s perceived spheres of influence overlapped the logical question to explore is whether there also existed a substantial degree of contact between the two. This contact can again be divided into cultural and political. There is ample evidence to highlight Indian cultural influences on China, the most notable example being the spread of Buddhism. However, the lack of a comparable political center in India meant that there was little contact of this nature with China. In his voyages Zheng He’s interactions in India were with local coastal rulers of the south and not with any larger political entity.

Through their histories contact between India and China had been unavoidable. But with the creation of their modern political identities—India achieved independence on August 15 1947 and the Peoples Republic of China was declared on October 1 1949—it also appears that conflict, or at least tensions, were inevitable given each country’s nationalist narrative and traditional spheres of influence. After nearly two thousand years of intermittent cultural contact, the two behemoths of Asia found themselves eyeing each other as modern political entities. The stage had been set.

\(^{172}\) Garver, p. 13.
\(^{173}\) On more than one occasion a Chinese emperor sent down an army to fight on behalf of one of his tributaries in Southeast Asia.
VI. CONFRONTATION

The decade of the 50s saw India and China attempting to position themselves vis-à-vis the world. China’s key objective was to battle capitalism, which saw it involve itself in the Korean War in 1950 (and in Vietnam in the late 70s). India was trying to position itself as the leader of the third world. India viewed China’s support and co-leadership in that project as a key element of its foreign policy. In his book *Discovery of India*, Nehru spent several pages highlighting Sino-Indian contacts through the past 2000 years. According to him western domination had interrupted these contacts. But now with their re-emergence on the world scene as proud and independent states, India and China could again re-engage each other:

> And now the wheel of fate has turned full circle and again India and China look towards each other and past memories crowd in their minds; again pilgrims of a new kind cross or fly over the mountains that separate them, bringing their messages of cheer and goodwill and creating fresh bonds of a friendship that will endure.  

Several in the Indian intelligentsia mirrored this vision. As a consequence India backed China in the United Nations in 1950 after she entered and took over control of Tibet. As a consequence India backed China in the United Nations in 1950 after she entered and took over control of Tibet.

At a time, when to a large number of countries, Communist China appeared to be a pariah, it was India which projected China and its leader Chou En-Lai before the world community at the 29-nation Afro-Asian Conference in Bandung (Indonesia) in April 1955 and made them acceptable to the countries of Asia and Africa.

India also signed the *Panchscheel* Agreement with China in 1954, the underlying theme of which was that the two countries would solve all disputes and misunderstandings in a peaceable and friendly manner. While India’s willingness to bend over backwards in trying to please China must have become apparent to the Chinese, it is not clear how China viewed India. Mao’s collected works make no mention of India. Nor do any of Zhou Enlai’s selected published works written before the 1940s discuss Sino-Indian ties.

---

174 Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Discovery of India* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1985 [first published 1946])

175 For example, P.C. Bagchi, an academic at Rabindranath Tagore’s Visva-Bharati University, invoked lines from a letter written by Xuanzang nearly 1400 years ago in dedicating his book on Sino-Indian relations to “friends in China:” “To show that we are not forgetful. The road is long, so do not mind the smallness of the present. We wish you may accept.” See P.C. Bagchi, *India and China—A Thousand Years of Cultural Relations* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1951).

176 Sinha and Athale, p. 21.
Whether this is because of paucity of material on account of lack of openness in the Chinese government, as noted in the introduction, or because of other factors is not clear. If we go by the Athale and Sinha report, “events soon showed that while India adhered to the ‘Panch Sheel’ as a code of international behavior, China treated them merely as a temporary device of diplomacy.”\(^{177}\) This statement throws up interesting possibilities for how India and China approached each other.

Chinese annexation of Tibet in 1950 suddenly brought India and China face to face. The British had anticipated this possibility several years ago and had made substantial efforts to ensure that Tibet retained her independence from China, serving as a territorial buffer for India.\(^ {178}\) The British were only partially successful in their efforts. At the Simla Conference of 1914, the Chinese representative refused to accept the border demarcations that had been discussed by the British and the Tibetan representative, claiming that Tibet had no legal right to sign any border document as it was under the suzerainty of China.\(^ {179}\) Thus, while the Indians claimed the agreement as one among the many proofs they supplied in trying to demarcate the border, the Chinese refused to honor it claiming it was illegal.

Among the Indian leadership, only Home Minister Vallabhbhai Patel was able to comprehend the changing dynamic in Sino-Indian relations that were precipitated by the arrival of China at India’s northern borders. He addressed these concerns in a letter to Prime Minister Nehru.

Throughout its history, Patel told Nehru, India had not faced Chinese armies stationed in Tibet on India’s northern borders: “Throughout history we have seldom been worried about our northeast frontier. The Himalayns have been regarded as an impenetrable barrier against any threat from the north. We had friendly Tibet that gave us no trouble.” This was about to change with the PLA occupation of Tibet. The “disappearance of Tibet, as we know it, and the expansion of China almost up to our gates” presented India with a new and dangerous situation... “Our northern and northeastern approaches consist of Nepal, Bhutan, Sikkim, The Darjeeling (areas), and tribal areas in Assam” and “the undefined state of the frontier and the existence on our side of a population with its

\(^{177}\) Sinha and Athale, p. 23.
\(^{178}\) Neville Maxwell has deliberated at length on British efforts in this regard in *India’s China War*, using Alistair Lamb’s detailed study of the Sino-Indian border. The British Empire was similarly keen on maintaining Afghanistan as a buffer against Russian Imperialism. Lord Curzon of Keddleston, the Viceroy of India (1898-1905) was among the first thinkers to consider the importance of borders in the emerging modern world.
\(^ {179}\) For details about the Simla Conference, see Maxwell, p. 47-49 and Gupta,
affinities to the Tibetans or Chinese have all the elements of a potential trouble between China and ourselves.\textsuperscript{180}

The pragmatist that he was, Patel went on to detail that China was no longer going through internal turmoil. The fact that she claimed Tibetan suzerainty also implied that she might view all prevailing treaty negotiations between India and Tibet dubiously. But for Patel, it appears that Indians did not have any conception of the implications—strategic and political—of a new and largely unestablished Sino-Indian border. Nor did they have much of an understanding of China’s imperatives. Steve Cohen notes that this persists to this day:

> Because it is so culturally different from India, China presents a special problem for Indian negotiators and policymakers. Apart from a handful of Sinologists, Indian officials have enormous difficulty understanding Beijing. Stereotypes abound, concerning the “inscrutable,” arrogant, and self-centered Chinese. What particularly galls Indian officials is China’s contempt for India’s position in the region, in Asia, and in the world.\textsuperscript{181}

The real rift began following the signing of the Panchsheel Agreement in 1954. Arthur Stahnke has argued that in New Delhi’s view, “this accord removed all serious differences between themselves and Peking, including the boundary disagreements.”\textsuperscript{182} They took Chinese silence on the issue as confirmation of this belief. However, Zhou En-lai had an altogether different view of the proceedings. According to him, the border question had not been raised only because “conditions were not yet ripe for its settlement and the Chinese side, in its part, had not had time to study the question.”\textsuperscript{183} Starting from that year each side began to claim territorial infringements by the other.\textsuperscript{184}

In our efforts to track traditions of strategic thinking, unpacking Zhou’s statement is extremely productive. It can effectively be broken into two parts—conditions were not ripe for settlement, and the Chinese had not had time to study the issue at hand. While the second is an acceptable reason, the first carries with it an ambiguous air. According

\textsuperscript{180} Garver. p. 28-29.
\textsuperscript{181} Cohen, p. 88.
\textsuperscript{182} Stahnke, p. 96.
\textsuperscript{183} “Letter from Prime Minister of China to the Prime Minister of India, 23 January 1959,” White Paper I, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{184} In any scenario where two nations disagree about their common border, their perception of the territorial transgressions of the other will also naturally be at odds. Hence, country A might believe it is operating its troops on its own sovereign land, which however, country B might also claim, and hence, might look upon as a territorial encroachment. This is important to keep in mind when reading reports from each side about who transgressed and where.

52
to Delios, leaving something unsaid—or open to interpretation—is part of the dynamic of Chinese language and thought.\(^{185}\) Does looking at China’s possible strategic interests suggest other possible motives and planning? China’s anxiety over establishing dominance over periphery areas has already been discussed earlier. Of the two regions contested—NEFA and Aksai Chin—the latter was clearly the more important strategically. To maintain control over Tibet, China needed to establish lines of communication and of transport. The easiest option available was to build a road down from Xinjiang into Tibet—a road that would have to travel through the Aksai Chin. In fact, China had covertly begun construction of such a road. Athale and Sinha show that even though Indian authorities learnt of the construction they did not take serious note of it till its completion was announced in the Chinese press.\(^{186}\)

Thus, a possible case can be built for China acting along identifiable strategic imperatives. Indeed, waiting for the ripe moment sounds ominously familiar to Mao’s statement of fighting no battle unprepared. Additionally, the fact that the Chinese held on to Aksai Chin after the ceasefire merely serves to highlight the pursuance of a clearly defined strategic goal. For the Indian part too, it seems the pattern identified earlier fits: Indian responses were exactly that—responses. The Indian government, and Nehru in particular, were easily satisfied by Chinese non-committal utterances in the early 50s. Stahnke finds that Indian behavior often suggested “genuine ignorance or naïveté regarding Pekings intentions.”\(^{187}\) Thus, it fits the pattern of Indian strategic thinking being reactive in nature.

Indian attempts at sending troops close to the border through its Forward Policy in the later years of the dispute can be considered as pro-active. However, in the larger scheme they were reactive since China had already been active along the border for several years prior.\(^{188}\)

\(^{185}\) Delios, p. 16.
\(^{186}\) Athale and Sinha, p. 28.
\(^{187}\) Stahnke, p. 100.
\(^{188}\) Following the Chinese takeover of Tibet in 1951 the Chief of the Indian Army, General K.M. Cariappa had recommended to Prime Minster Nehru that the army should be prepared for any potential Chinese aggression since the two countries now sat facing each other. Yet Nehru dismissed this fear by stating: “It is not the business of the Commander in Chief to tell the Prime Minister who is going to attack us where. In fact, the Chinese will defend our Eastern frontier [emphasis added]. You mind only Kashmir and Pakistan.” Tanham, p. 71.
No doubt the above is an oversimplification of the issue. The purpose here is not to explain the events based purely on traditions of strategic thinking but to see if strategic thinking can further help further illumine the subject. The above deductive example is merely a case in point that highlights the need for further researching this approach to the conflict, especially from the context of relations today. Indeed, further such examples can be found but they would not serve any purpose besides speculation at this point. As stated, the aim of this paper has been to set up an initial framework from which future work can take off. But for such analyses to be successful it would require a much more detailed analysis of all the factors. Yet, basic intuition and the observations made in sections three and four indicate that this may be a potentially fruitful exercise.

The implications of the conflict for either side were quite different. China gained control of her periphery, including Tibet, and silenced a potentially noisy neighbor. Whether it had any impact on the masses is another research question of interest as the war coincides with the ending of the Great Leap Forward. For India, it was the harbinger of a period of increased defense spending and a more hard-nosed approach to international politics. Swapan Dasgupta has recently pointed out in India Today International: “In its dealings with the world, India no longer sees itself as the automatic champion of the wretched of the earth.” It seeks an honorable entry into the club of Great Powers.”

The Sino-Indian war had no small contribution to play in this transition.

---

VII. CONCLUSION

The previous section ended with some speculation about possible ways of reading what happened during the 50s and the early 60s in an effort to fit it into larger patterns of observable strategic behavior. Even though the framework has been applied to an event 40 years in the past, it is important to note that highlighting of past greatness has played a prominent role in the construction of modern nationalisms in both India and China. Indeed, the 1962 war remains a key memory in modern India’s consciousness. Hence, impact of these processes over history should not be consigned to history.

A major theme in this paper has been the distinction between the effects of experiences based on cultural unity and political unity, or both, as the case may be. In China we can find evidences of cultural as well as political unity, whereas in India cultural unity has been accompanied only sporadically by bouts of political unity. While China acted like a state for much of its history, the subcontinent was composed of a multiplicity of states that acted independently. Only occasionally were they united under one umbrella. Another key distinction that emerges between the two cultures is that based on practicality, which is best exemplified by attitudes towards history and record-keeping. Both factors seem to be evident in the Sino-Indian dealings during the 50s. The case can be made that both acted along identifiable patterns based on their historical experiences. But to establish that—one way or another—a more exhaustive study needs to be undertaken.

This has been an exploratory study, the main aim of which has been to instigate further research into strategic thinking and the Sino-Indian war. Its success can be measured by its ability to focus attention on the question of strategic culture and strategic thinking as a factor in the 1962 war and in bilateral relations in general. Indeed, the stated object has been to advocate more detailed analyses of the questions and observations raised and their possible impact on the war and its immediately preceding years. Today, with strains of fundamentalism growing across all regions and religions, the need to understand the other in fullness has taken a critical role. Studying traditions of strategic thinking, strategic culture, and their possible implications is an important
element in that larger effort. Furthermore, our notions of security and strategic thinking too need to be expanded beyond purely military aspects. K. Subrahmanyam has argued:

In today’s world the threats posed are very sophisticated and they range over a whole spectrum from direct invasion to what are known as nonmilitary threat to a nation’s security. A nation’s security is no longer defined narrowly and nowadays it is extended to include aspects like security of food, energy, access to resources, freedom to develop high cost and sophisticated technology and so on.\(^{191}\)

This merely accentuates the need for strategic studies research in the sense advocated in this paper.

VIII. APPENDIX
APPENDIX C—TRADITIONAL SPHERES OF INFLUENCE

MAP 3.1 Overlap of Perceived Indian and Chinese Historic Spheres of Influence.
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