

# ELITE

The Strength of Knowing...



Volume: September 2014





Power of Knowledge

---

# COSMOS

---

Power of Knowledge

The COSMOS (Business Quiz) Club of IBA, Bangalore, encourages the spirit of quizzing and creates a thirst for knowledge. It prepares teams for participation in various competitions. Along with these, COSMOS creates awareness on various issues and current updates. COSMOS conducts several sessions which creates a spark in their minds and encourages them to develop their knowledge further.

The Logo of the club shows a man deep in thought. The posture of the thinking man signifies that he is neither stressing too hard nor is he too relaxed in thought. He is in a state of trance and focused on the point of thought. In short, the logo signifies focus, depth and thirst for knowledge.

**Cosmos (koz?m?s, -mos) n.**

The world or universe considered as an orderly system.

Any orderly and complete system. [Syn. Universe, World]

# ECO-FRIENDLY: GOING GREEN A PRIORITY FOR INDIAN COMPANIES



**By: George Wyeth**

Spending four months in India as an American scholar concerned about global environmental issues, it was enlightening to see what Indian companies are doing to put themselves on path toward sustainable growth. Based in Prune, conversations with people in large and small companies yielded surprising results. To be honest, India's global image on environmental issues is not a great one.

It ranks low on Yale's Environmental Performance Index, and enforcement of environmental laws is generally thought to be uneven. So, it could be assumed that sophisticated sustainability efforts would be found in the local operations of multinationals (MNCs), and possibly suppliers to them under pressure to be "green".

The presumption is that most Indian firms would be focused on short-term growth rather than sustainability. However, a significant number of India-based businesses do have sophisticated sustainability efforts.

These initiatives are designed by the companies' own experts and driven by each company's local needs and opportunities, not by pressure from MNCs. The MNCs had sustainability efforts of their own, but there was little evidence that they were influencing their local suppliers.

The greenest company was [Godrej](#) and Boyce. Its programmed Good and Green includes (a) greening company operations, (b) developing greener or socially-beneficial products, and (c) supporting educational programmers to train more skilled shop floor workers. Godrej makes energy-efficient air-conditioners, and is one of the first makers in the world to market products with extremely-low-GHG refrigerants.

It has "greened" its operations to make maximum reuse of discarded materials, minimize energy and water use, and cut GHG emissions by switching from diesel to biomass fuel. A visit to Godrej's factory in Shirwal revealed that its sustainability targets were displayed in the factory's conference room. That showed sustainability is a serious priority. Some other companies are also making a mark in this arena.

Hindustan Unilever, for example, has set aggressive goals for its own operations, aiming to cut carbon emissions by 22%, water use by 29% and waste by 77% per product manufactured.

ITC has received global recognition for its efforts to keep small farmers economically viable. Kirloskar Brothers is marketing a line of highly-energy efficient pumps, significant because pumping water is one of the major drivers of energy demand. The Tata Group has embedded sustainability into its organizational DNA.

When Tata scores each of its component companies on measures ranging from leadership to business results, it looks for evidence of action being taken to combat climate change, reduce waste and use sustainability strategically as part of their business planning. So, sustainability is part of the main corporate strategy. Ash tosh Pandey, CEO of Delhi-based investment firm Emergent Ventures, estimates that between 50 and 100 companies are addressing sustainability in a comprehensive way (that is, addressing issues beyond energy and climate).

Nitti Kalothia, with consulting firm Frost and Sullivan, offered similar numbers but says that awareness has risen dramatically in the last 2-3 years among many firms. Industry associations such as the CII actively encourage their members to be more sustainable. India, unlike the US, has an official Action Plan on Climate Change and has launched an innovative energy efficiency programme called Perform, Achieve and Trade.

Efforts to create a carbon cap in the US failed several years ago. The larger economic picture is a sobering one at the moment for Indian businesses and manufacturers. A big question will be whether sustainability efforts survive this period. However, companies are unlikely to scale back efforts for which there is a true business case.

The bigger challenge will be in the public sector, as voluntary efforts alone will not solve the country's environmental problems. The efforts of leading businesses need to be complemented with enforcement to improve laggards, and a firm commitment to the rule of law. In future, it is hoped that progress can be reported in those areas as well.



# OUTSTANDING HOMEMAKER



HDFC's managing director Renu Sud Karnad recalls her two most breakthrough moments. I joined HDFC Ltd in 1978, when I was 26. It was my first job and I rightly feel that I **grew with the organization**. (HDFC was formed in 1977). Having said that, I can point to two breakthrough moments in my career which charted a new course for HDFC as well. They were changes in the way we did business. They led to a change in the mindset of all of us at HDFC. We took time to make these decisions, but now they contribute substantially to our business.

Today, housing loans are a commodity. With just one click of a mouse, a customer can avail a housing loan. When we started, customers used to come to us with great expectations and anxiety. The big question was: would they get the loan or not? The amount used to be a maximum of Rs 70,000. But it meant a world to them. If they were granted the loan, they would come to us with invitations to be part of their house warming. The effect was phenomenal. Customers from towns such as Agra, Meerut and Kanpur would come to Delhi for loans.

In the mid-1980s, when I was in middle management, we conceptualized the idea of delivering loans at a point of contact by creating spokes. The need to spread out, and be present where our customer was, steadily grew. The only way to expand was by setting up branches. But a conventional branch would entail a staff strength of 25 to 30 people. This was not viable in a small town, as the business matrix was different and evolving. Thus we introduced the hub-and-spoke model.

The first spoke was just a customer-facing office operating with two to three staff members. The customer would come to the office in his town and he would deal only with that office, but all the work would be done out of Delhi. Our first out-of-city spoke was in Kanpur and the first in-city spoke was at the India Habitat Centre, Delhi. The job at the HDFC spoke was to make sure the **customer felt he was wanted** and was being heard. The spoke collected the papers and sent them to the main office. This was well before technology advancements hap-



The files would be sent from the spoke via couriers to the hub and, after processing, hubs would send the files back to the spokes.

Gradually, a spoke became a branch depending on the business it could generate. As a result, we could open multiple offices. This method of expanding and reaching out to the remotest corners where our customer was, in the most cost-effective manner, has proven to be an asset for us. Tier-II cities today contribute 40 per cent of our business. These cities started giving us more business and more satisfied customers. Our reputation spread by word of mouth and more people started coming to us. Today, we have 25 hubs and close to 250 spokes.

The second change was more out of a necessity. It entailed changing HDFC's mindset. We never believed in using an intermediary between us and the customer. Having a connect with the customer was always cardinal for us. However, 10 years ago, with growing competition, we were confronted with a situation where other banks started sending their representatives to sell home loans at customer's homes and offices at their convenient time. It started impacting our business.

We resisted having agents initially. That resistance did not work well for us. It took us two years to come around. However, we decided to do things a bit differently. We decided the agent would not be us. He would remain an agent, he would represent us, collect the papers, help with the formalities but the decision to give the loan and the loan amount would remain with us. We still insist on meeting the customer when we are giving the loan.

We started with a couple of agents in Delhi. But we soon realized that we needed a set of people who felt a sense of affiliation with us. That led us to start our sales company, HDFC Sales, a 100 per cent subsidiary of HDFC, seven-eight years ago. The idea was to make these people feel a part of the company. Now they have a career path well laid out. As a result, we had our own people, who saw a career with us. Therefore, the chances of their overselling were fewer. Today, 49 per cent of our business comes from HDFC Sales.

Looking back, I can say with satisfaction that I was part of the core team that conceptualized and implemented these ground-breaking ideas for the organization.



The primary reasons why MNCs are flocking to the country are stable local governments and their policies, an educated young workforce and a huge market

## OUR CORRESPONDENT

Employees walk in front of a pyramid-shaped building at the Infosys campus in Electronic City, Bangalore. Private companies and MNCs have played a major part in the country's growth. REUTERS

The availability of strong technical as well as managerial talent has promoted India as a very attractive R&D destination, with the country being home to about 200 wholly-owned Centre's of MNCs that deliver pure-play Information Technology services. Innovation from India has moved on from Ayurveda and yoga to cool internet products and apps.

Management consulting company Zinnov says India is home to about 200 wholly-owned Centre's of multinationals that deliver pure-play IT and ITeS services. Ten new centres have been set up over the last two years and by 2015, the market research firm estimates that close to 50% of the Fortune 500 companies will have their facilities in India. **Connectivity**

India's GDP has consistently grown at 8% in the last few years due to a robust infrastructure. The sector also provides immense potential to private companies under the public private partnership and has attracted several MNCs in the recent past. A PwC report titled Infrastructure in India says that "foreign companies who do not acknowledge the opportunity in good time may miss out on a critical opportunity to establish a long-term presence in one of the world's largest growth markets".

Riding high on industrialisation, the annual growth in road connectivity is projected at over 12% for passenger traffic and over 15% for cargo traffic, providing an opportunity in the sector. To strengthen the rail connectivity, which is among the highest in the world, the government is expecting over 40% participation by private players. The Dedicated Freight Corridor project





As a result, several foreign companies such as Boeing, which has been in India for the last 70 years, are playing a pivotal role in providing world-class airplanes and infrastructure expecting over 40% participation by private players. The Dedicated Freight Corridor project is designed to alleviate congestion on the rail routes between Delhi and Mumbai and Delhi and Kolkata by building long-distance, cargo-only rail lines, at an estimated cost of \$6-7 billion.

While Siemens and IL&FS Rail Limited (Infrastructure Leasing and Financial Services) are constructing the Gorgon rapid Metro, a consortium of Hyundai Rotem, Mitsubishi Corporation and Mitsubishi Electric Corporation are responsible for the first wave of rolling stock for the Delhi Metro.

Other proposed initiatives include the development of manufacturing plants for rolling stock with long-term committed procurement for several years, and the setting up of logistics parks. After the successful setting up of Delhi Metro, several other cities including Mumbai are building metro rail. Indian Railways is also looking for private partners to help modernize railway stations to world-class levels, and for projects focused on increasing connectivity with ports.

several foreign companies such as Boeing, which has been in India for the last 70 years, are playing a pivotal role in providing world-class airplanes and infrastructure.

In the field of energy, GE India has been regularly innovating cleaner technologies for sustainable harnessing of energy. Alston is one of the many private players that are involved in mega power projects across the country.

Similarly, in the field of infrastructure development, companies like Larsen & Turbo and Punj Lloyd Group are working on several major projects.

### **Industrial output:**

India is tenth in the world in factory output. The manufacturing sector, in addition to mining, quarrying, electricity and gas, account for 27.6% of the GDP and employ 17% of the total workforce. Economic reforms introduced after 1991 brought foreign competition, which led to privatization of certain public sector industries, opened up sectors hitherto reserved for the public sector and led to an expansion in the production of fast-moving consumer goods. In recent years, Indian cities have continued to liberalize, which has attracted MNCs and encouraged local entrepreneurs.

### **Services:**

India is fifteenth in services output. The service industry employs English-speaking Indian workers on the supply side and on the demand side, has increased demand from foreign consumers interested in India's service exports or those looking to outsource their operations.





India's IT industry contributes significantly to its balance of payments

India also has an extensive network of undersea fibre-optic cables, which has resulted in India becoming, almost overnight, the centre for outsourcing of business process. Within this sector and events, the ITES-BPO sector has become a big employment generator especially amongst young graduates.

India has witnessed sustained economic development as envisioned by our founding fathers, and offers great opportunities to the private companies to feature in the development story of the country.

India has come a long way since its independence in 1947. Set to be a super power in the next decade, the Indian growth pattern has been based on the government policies and the participation of companies — both Indian and abroad.

Our first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru had put the country on the path of economic development through the setting up of mega companies called the *maharanis*. He believed that economic growth would ensure the true development of the country.

During the first few decades, India grew consistently on the back of the *maharatnas*. The second phase of the development started in 1990s with the relaxation of the license raj. From there on, Indian entrepreneurs and multinational companies have together brokered the growth of the country.

Private players have played a pivotal role since independence. The World Investment Report of the UN Conference on Trade and Development (Unctad) in 2012 found India as the third-best destination for foreign direct investment (FDI), after China and America, till 2014. PricewaterhouseCoopers estimates that India will become the world's third largest economy by 2050.

The primary reasons behind why multinational companies (MNC) are coming down to India are a huge market, stable governments and their policies and the educated young workforce.

## The Case for Berlin: Bringing Germany Back to the West



I recall a small, private Berlin dinner at which a senior official of the government of Chancellor Gerhard Schröder chastised me, the American guest, over Guantánamo. It showed an egregious disregard for international law among other things, the cabinet minister advised me. During the course of the evening, that same official also volunteered that, were the Guantánamo detainees on German soil, the Federal Republic would not know exactly what to do with them. This reminds me of the undiplomatic remark of a Berlin-based British diplomat from around the same time who quipped to me: “When Germans face a dilemma, they stare it in the face—then proceed to walk away, leaving the hardest choices for others.” How did we allow Russia to assume such dominance? It started in the 1990s, when we told ourselves Russia was on the path to becoming “a normal country.” In 1994, Russia joined the Partnership for Peace program. In 2002, the NATO-Russia Council was established. In those days there was even talk in some Western circles of Russia eventually joining NATO.

That was then. Dmitri Rogozin, the Russian deputy prime minister who has served as his country’s envoy to NATO, recently underscored how much has changed. Displeased that Romania had closed off its airspace to him—the Russia official is on a sanctions list after Russian aggression in Ukraine—Rogozin tweeted to the Romanians that he would be back, but next time aboard a Russian strategic bomber.





**A**gainst this backdrop of aggression and truculence one question dominates all others: What's stopping Germany today from helping us to push back against Russia's play for hegemony?

It's surely in the German national interest that accountable government and rule of law sink deep roots across Central and Eastern Europe. Eleven countries of the region have now joined the European Union; a dozen belong to NATO. What would it mean if serious backsliding were to take place and democracies became wobbly?

Germany should be taking the lead in opposing the forces now attempting to undermine the vision of comity and cooperation that lies at the heart of "Europe." But there are three principal reasons why Germany has hesitated.

The first one is perhaps obvious—the role of business and a narrowly geo-economics approach to foreign policy.

Commercial interests shape Berlin's considerations to an exceptional degree. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, united Germany was no longer "constrained by security dependence on the US," writes Germany scholar Stephen Szabo, and "markets in Eastern Europe were no longer off-limits to German companies." In Russia there are even larger stakes. When the crisis over Crimea erupted in March, the CEO of Siemens was off to Moscow before the first diplomatic envoy could be dispatched. In fact, the relatively new chief executive, Joe Kaeser, visited Russia three times during his first hundred days on the job. German foreign policy "cedes overall grand strategy to business interests," says Szabo, adding that Russo-German relations are "ninety percent economics." Talking big and carrying a small stick is no longer possible for Germany if it hopes to adopt a more mature, responsible foreign policy.



From the crisis in Ukraine we now know three important things: that Russia has a strategy toward Eastern Europe, that we don't, and that the European Union is not yet close to existing as a serious strategic actor, not even in its own backyard. But facing a rising China in Asia and the looming threat of a nuclear Iran in the Middle East, Washington will need help in Eastern Europe in defending, advancing, and maintaining a liberal order. Germany is essential to the task of containing Russian influence and aims. Continuing to avoid the hard choices in Berlin will have serious consequences for the West and the world.

It's not just in Ukraine that Vladimir Putin's regime has been advancing its agenda. There were the 2007 cyber attacks on Estonia. There was the 2008 invasion of Georgia. There's diplomatic and economic pressure today on Moldova, Macedonia, and Montenegro to discourage these (and other countries) from further Western integration. While the US was concentrating on Iraq, Afghanistan, and the Arab Spring, and while the EU has been largely preoccupied with its sovereign debt crisis, a Putin Doctrine toward Eastern Europe has emerged.

The Putin Doctrine is straightforward. If you're not in the EU and NATO by now—Georgia, Ukraine, Moldova top the current list—forget it. You belong to the Russian sphere of influence. If you are already a member of these Western organizations, Moscow will work to make you weak, divided, and dependent. To this end, Russia has been supporting extremist parties in a number of countries across the region, including in Bulgaria, Serbia, Slovakia, and Hungary. It provides financial assistance to separatists in Moldova and Georgia. The Kremlin pursues an aggressive media strategy, stirring up anti-Americanism and distrust of the West generally wherever it can. Putin also has been extraordinarily adept at using energy as an instrument of Russian foreign policy. Most nations of Central and Eastern Europe now depend heavily on Moscow for natural gas necessary for heating. Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Slovakia rely on nuclear reactors for most of their domestic electricity—the fuel being supplied exclusively by Russia.





Commercial interests shape Berlin's considerations to an exceptional degree. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, united Germany was no longer "constrained by security dependence on the US," writes Germany scholar Stephen Szabo, and "markets in Eastern Europe were no longer off-limits to German companies." In Russia there are even larger stakes. When the crisis over Crimea erupted in March, the CEO of Siemens was off to Moscow before the first diplomatic envoy could be dispatched. In fact, the relatively new chief executive, Joe Kaeser, visited Russia three times during his first hundred days on the job. German foreign policy "cedes overall grand strategy to business interests," says Szabo, adding that Russo-German relations are "ninety percent economics."

There's a broader political context to this as well. A top Berlin diplomat argued to me in the 1990s, in the context of the Balkan wars, that large-scale military conflict would become increasingly obsolete as a new era of geoeconomics replaced the old world of geopolitics. It was a theory taking hold in a number of international relations circles in those days. Just a year after the fall of the Berlin Wall, for instance, the analyst Edward Luttwak observed:

Everyone, it appears, now agrees that the methods of commerce are displacing military methods—with disposable capital in lieu of firepower, civilian innovation in lieu of military-technical advancement, and market penetration in lieu of garrisons and bases. States, as spatial entities structured to jealously delimit their own territories, will not disappear but reorient themselves toward geoeconomics in order to compensate for their decaying geopolitical roles.

The presumed future primacy of geoeconomics resonated strongly in Germany. West Germany, as result of its history, had developed its identity as a largely "civilian power," prizing multilateral diplomacy. The fact that the export-driven nation was also Europe's biggest economy has also shaped German thinking about international order and committed it to the exclusive development of soft-power tools. In his forthcoming book, *Germany, Russia, and the Rise of Geo-Economics*, Szabo details many of these factors.

As a result, when the realities of hard power rear their ugly head in Germany policy, wishful thinking pushes back. It is sometimes a problem of public opinion even more than of government caution. In the wake of the Ukraine crisis, for instance, when German Defense Minister Ursula von der Leyen sensibly proposed additional NATO support for alliance members on the front line with Russia, she quickly had to drop the idea in the face of considerable public and political opposition.



Commercial interests shape Berlin's considerations to an exceptional degree. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, united Germany was no longer "constrained by security dependence on the US," writes Germany scholar Stephen Szabo, and "markets in Eastern Europe were no longer off-limits to German companies." In Russia there are even larger stakes. When the crisis over Crimea erupted in March, the CEO of Siemens was off to Moscow before the first diplomatic envoy could be dispatched. In fact, the relatively new chief executive, Joe Kaeser, visited Russia three times during his first hundred days on the job. German foreign policy "cedes overall grand strategy to business interests," says Szabo, adding that Russo-German relations are "ninety percent economics."

There's a broader political context to this as well. A top Berlin diplomat argued to me in the 1990s, in the context of the Balkan wars, that large-scale military conflict would become increasingly obsolete as a new era of geoeconomics replaced the old world of geopolitics. It was a theory taking hold in a number of international relations circles in those days. Just a year after the fall of the Berlin Wall, for instance, the analyst Edward Luttwak observed:

Everyone, it appears, now agrees that the methods of commerce are displacing military methods—with disposable capital in lieu of firepower, civilian innovation in lieu of military-technical advancement, and market penetration in lieu of garrisons and bases. States, as spatial entities structured to jealously delimit their own territories, will not disappear but reorient themselves toward geoeconomics in order to compensate for their decaying geopolitical roles.

The presumed future primacy of geoeconomics resonated strongly in Germany. West Germany, as result of its history, had developed its identity as a largely "civilian power," prizing multilateral diplomacy. The fact that the export-driven nation was also Europe's biggest economy has also shaped German thinking about international order and committed it to the exclusive development of soft-power tools. In his forthcoming book, *Germany, Russia, and the Rise of Geo-Economics*, Szabo details many of these factors.

As a result, when the realities of hard power rear their ugly head in Germany policy, wishful thinking pushes back. It is sometimes a problem of public opinion even more than of government caution. In the wake of the Ukraine crisis, for instance, when German Defense Minister Ursula von der Leyen sensibly proposed additional NATO support for alliance members on the front line with Russia, she quickly had to drop the idea in the face of considerable public and political opposition.





There's a second important obstacle standing in the way of Germany truly coming of age in terms of its dealings with Putin, and that's the country's unique relationship with Russia itself. Germany accounts for roughly a third of EU exports to Russia. More than six thousand German-owned companies are active in Russia, including prominent blue chip companies like Daimler AG, BMW, and Volkswagen. Add to this the fact that Germany relies on Russia for approximately a third of its energy needs, and you begin to appreciate why the anti-sanctions lobby in Germany is so strong.

And that's not all. There are a number of other reasons why Germany has trouble pursuing a more multifaceted, comprehensive policy toward Russia. The country has a fragmented but not at all insignificant coalition of unlikely bedfellows who make up the pro-Russia camp.

There's the residual and still vibrant West German left, which has never given up its anti-Americanism. If the US opposes Russian action in Ukraine, goes the reflex, there must be some validity to the Russian side of things. This sort of thinking is exemplified by columnist Jakob Augstein (adopted son of Rudolf Augstein, the late, legendary publisher of *Der Spiegel*), whose reaction to events in Ukraine was to propose a new European security architecture, with Russia and without the US.

There's the East German left, the post-communists who still play a role in united Germany. Charismatic former East German lawyer Gregor Gysi, the leading member of the largest lower-house opposition party in Germany, the Left Party, blames America and NATO for the crisis in Ukraine, and berates Kyiv as a government now run by "fascists," echoing the Moscow line.

The apologetics for Russia go farther than the left, however. There's the populist right that sees in Putin—much like Pat Buchanan and some social conservative allies in the US—a valiant protector of traditional values. Such a posture is seen clearly in the new anti-euro "Alternative für Deutschland" party. According to Clemens Wergin, an editor and leading foreign policy writer with the daily *Die Welt*: "They take up a conservative strain of German thinking dating back to the nineteenth century, which harbors a resentment toward Western civilization and romanticizes a Russia seemingly uncorrupted by Western values and free-market capitalism."

War guilt may still play some role. Twenty million Soviet soldiers and civilians died in the war against Nazi Germany. And there is admiration for Russian "high" culture that has given the world Tolstoy and Pushkin, Tchaikovsky, Mussorgsky, and Chagall. Respect for Russian culture in Germany runs through the life and work of icon literary figures such as Rainer Maria Rilke and Thomas Mann (Rilke thanked Russia for "making me who I am"). Kremlin—advanced the case for deepening Russian-German rapprochement based not only on the two countries' close historical, cultural, and economic ties, but also on Putin's particular gifts as a "Deutschlandkenner" (an authority on Germany).

Authority or not, Putin has certainly been masterful at weaving together all the sometimes barely visible strands of German Russophiles. In an address to the parliament in Berlin in September in 2001, he spoke of history, reconciliation, common security, and the “unity of European culture”—in fluent German, no less, the “language of Goethe, of Schiller, and of Kant,” as he cannily put it to his audience. Never mind that Putin’s German came from his time as a KGB agent in East Germany.

This past never seemed to bother former leader Gerhard Schroder. The former Social Democratic chancellor embodies virtually every problematic instinct that modern Germany has toward Russia, defending Russian actions in Ukraine and blaming the European Union for provoking Moscow by inviting Ukraine to sign an “associate agreement.” Schroder is the chairman of the investors committee for the Gasport-dominated German energy company Nord Stream. He made headlines in April when, just after the annexation of Crimea, he celebrated his birthday in St. Petersburg with Putin.

There’s ample evidence to suggest that unlike Schroder, Angela Merkel grasps the challenge posed by Pugilism. Nor is the chancellor from the center-right CDU party alone. A letter sent in August to German lawmakers by Social Democratic Vice Chancellor Sigma Gabriel, Finance Minister Wolfgang Schnabel, and Food and Agriculture Minister Christian Schmidt laid the blame for turmoil in Ukraine entirely on Russia. The three German officials argued the need to sacrifice their country’s short-term economic interests on behalf of principle and longer-term security concerns.

So, a serious debate—not only about Ukraine but Russia generally—may just now be starting. It will involve a lengthy education process and debate with the German public—as well as with businesses and banks—to assure that Schroder's does not define the country’s future. In one recent poll, half the German public (forty-nine percent) said they wanted their country to take a middle position between Russia and the West over the Ukraine crisis. Historian Heinrich Winkler warns of the danger, seeing now a significant minority questioning the country’s anchoring in Western institutions like NATO and the European Union.

The third major obstacle to Germany developing a more balanced, realistic approach toward Russia has to do with the country’s lack of a mature, self-confident strategic class. This deficit should come as no surprise. For its first forty years, West Germany developed under the protective umbrella of Western and US security. Imagine military officers promoted through the years to the rank of general, without ever having seen combat.



A strategic class fosters a strategic culture of discussion and debate, something taken for granted in Washington, London, and Paris. While German strategic muscles were in a sense atrophying during the Cold War, for instance, France maintained a nuclear arsenal, a seat on the UN Security Council, and an independent foreign policy. Complain about the French as you like, but France understands grand strategy and the exercise of power in all its dimensions and is thus a factor around the world. (See “Hollande the Hawk?,” May/June 2014.)

Since unification, Germany has debated numerous times the subject of sending troops abroad. Anyone who follows these debates can easily get the feeling that many Germans see such commitments distastefully as a kind of compulsory fee for their membership in the security club of NATO. They do what they must, but there’s often little in the way of strategic context or larger purpose offered for these deployments. Is there a German role within a European context in maintaining a liberal world order? Does Berlin have a special responsibility to encourage and protect the young democracies of Central and Eastern Europe? Is it prepared, as a key member of NATO and the European Union, to make hard decisions in its relationship with Russia that may involve considerable economic loss and even, under some circumstances, the deployment of German troops to the region?

There are fine strategic thinkers in Germany, to be sure. Historian Michael Stürmer, *Die Zeit*-publisher Josef Joffre, and think tank leader and leading commentator Christophe Bertram come to mind. Among younger voices, Clemens Wergin, Stefan Kornelius of the *Süddeutschen* newspaper, and writer Ulrich Speck, of the Carnegie Endowment, Europe, do important work. There are intelligent voices in government and the parties as well. But the bench is very weak, and the culture of strategic thought is not only underdeveloped but has “actually all grown weaker since the end of the Cold War,” claims Wergin. This lack of a realistic strategic vision allows those numerous disparate voices in Germany’s foreign policy debate to pull the country, sometimes quite forcefully, in different directions.

What can the US do? First, lead by example. The Iraq War damaged our credibility. We need to accept this fact and seek ways to restore trust and confidence in American leadership. Unfortunately, six years of vacillation and indifference from the Osama administration have made matters even worse. The US needs to get its get its foreign policy house in order, with some clarity and consistency about our own foreign policy objectives and priorities.





Third, promote a reinvigorated transatlantic partnership that includes Central and East Europeans—and Russians, however scarce at the moment—who share our liberal, Atlanticist view of Second, reinvigorate transatlantic ties. Augment professional exchange programs with journalists, think tank scholars, and younger policymakers and parliamentarians. There is a new class of think tankers, Hill staffers, and members of Congress who know something about China, Central Asia, and the Middle East. That's a good thing. But in the meantime our own ties and knowledge of Germany and of Europe have been withering. (Disclosure: the author is working with the World Affairs Institute, publisher of *World Affairs*, on an initiative, the Transatlantic Renewal Project, aimed at tackling these problems.)

Third, promote a reinvigorated transatlantic partnership that includes Central and East Europeans—and Russians, however scarce at the moment—who share our liberal, Atlanticist view of Europe's future. And support the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, a free trade agreement that is as important politically and strategically as it is economically. On this score, Germany has been prodding us. It's time that we respond.

Finally, we should reinvest in information policies. Doubling down on the efforts of Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty would be a good start. The West has a narrative to advance. Germany, with its experience in political party foundation work and Goethe Institutes, can help us think through current challenges in valuable ways. We need to continually and persuasively make the case for accountable government, rule of law, pluralism, and tolerance. It is precisely these things that are under assault today in that part of Europe that not so long ago held the promise of a renewed and reenergized Atlantic Alliance.

## **FIND THE BRAND**

**An Animated character named “Freddie” is used to promote**

**An Animated character named “The Noid” is used to promote which brand.**

**An Animated character named “buddy lee doll” is used to promote which brand.**

# Sudoku

	5			6			8	
7		8			3	6	1	
		9	1			7		
3					6	5		9
				4				
9		4	2					6
		5			1	4		
	6	3	5			2		1
	1			9			3	





## Challenge 4 U. [All reading COSMOS]

This will definitely make your right/left brain work better!!!

These 8 things most people see in daily life.

Rearrange the spelling.

1. Kwolacld
2. Cbeofoka
3. Gilencafin
4. Cemrsenlboei
5. Rlrgsmaorsi
6. Etdbehes
7. Hpastawp
8. Hulgsint

Challenge your brain and see if you can answer these!!

Not so easy

All the best



# **ELITE TEAM**

**Editor : JYOTHIRMAI**

**Sub Editors :**

**K. Sai Manogna**

**T. Raga Divya**

**D. Naga Maheswari**

**K. Mohit.**

**P. Balla Krishna**

**Follow us on : <https://www.facebook.com/cosmosclub.iba>**

**To download Softcopy of Newsletter — [www.clubcosmos.weebly.com](http://www.clubcosmos.weebly.com)**

**For Feedback and Suggestions - [cosmos.iba.blore@gmail.com](mailto:cosmos.iba.blore@gmail.com)**

© Indus Business Academy, Lakshmipura, Thataguni Post, Kanakapura Main Road, Bengaluru, Karnataka, 560062