



A Vision Document

S.N. Balagangadhara

Universiteit Gent
Belgium

E-mail: Balu@UGent.be
Tel.: 092649371
Fax: 092649483

Introduction

As the title makes clear, this is a vision document. Intended as a first step in developing a workable policy, this note is long on perspectives but short on concrete strategies and steps that both India and Europe have to follow. This is deliberate because the goal of this document is to generate a discussion among the partner institutions about (a) the need for a vision; (b) the different strategies that we could fruitfully pursue; (c) the short and long-term benefits that could accrue to all involved in this endeavor. Once a vision is underwritten, we can subsequently work on implementing concrete strategies and tactics as it suits the strengths of the individual partners.

There are four major sections in this document. The first outlines the reasons why Europe has to develop an India policy; the second shows why India needs a policy towards Europe. What emerges by combining both policies together is a vision, which undergirds India Platform, as one group and one institution sees it today, which constitutes the third part. The fourth part is a 'vision behind the India Platform vision', added here in order to answer some concerns. It is my hope to see this vision undergo modification, improvement and elaboration as Indians and Europeans begin their work together.

1. Why Europe Needs India

Setting the Context

When we talk of India (or China) today, or about their role in the world of tomorrow, we must never forget where they are coming from: during the 1960s and 70s, both belonged to the poorest nations on earth with more than half their population living below the absolute poverty line as defined by the United Nations and with little or no middle-class to speak of. In India, at that stage, less than 1% of the population owned more than 80% of the disposable income. During the last two decades (three decades for China), they have set upon a road of rapid industrialization. Thus, India suffers not only from the ills of the past (massive poverty, illiteracy, etc. induced by centuries of colonization) but also from the diseases of the present (massive social disruption arising from rapid industrialization). When we look at India today, then, we must look at her neither as a European Nation nor as an industrialized 'modern' country but as one that is doing the best she can to cope with problems that are every bit as gigantic as the country itself. We have to look at her with compassionate and understanding eyes and not with eyes either tinged green with jealousy or made yellow by prejudice. The economic and social inequity in India is not a proof of the failure of her economic and social policies any more than her IT and engineering industry is a proof of her strength. India is an emerging world power in the complex combination that she is now because of which she will pursue a road of her own for tomorrow. In other words, we need an 'India policy' (and a 'China policy') today. We cannot develop such a policy by merely 'applying' or modifying an existing policy for dealing with an advanced industrial country (say, the US or Japan) or for a developing country (say, Malawi or Bangladesh).

Universities and Societies

European universities are the results of organic processes in the European culture. Not only do these institutions have their own history but they are also (and above all) embedded in the history and developments of the western culture. Even where people make fun of the Humboldtian notion of 'higher education', there these notions continue to have a common, European currency. Such ideas belong to the heritage of the communities of which the universities are a part. When, therefore, European universities enter into collaboration with each other today, they are merely extending the multiple forms of interactions that have prevailed for centuries among the European nations. Almost all the researchers

and intellectuals of the European universities have emerged from the native populations and that too in an organic fashion. To this day, Europe has hardly had the need to recruit intellectuals and researchers from elsewhere in order to develop its universities.

In stark contrast to this stand the universities in the US. Almost from their beginnings, its university structures have survived through a recruitment of intellectuals from elsewhere: first mainly from Europe and now, since the Second World War, increasingly from Asia and Latin America. Intellectual immigrants have driven the universities in the US. A continuous inflow of immigrants *masks* the lack of an organic connection between the universities in the US and their own society. In many of the domains I know, most intellectual breakthroughs have come from first or second generation émigrés. Without a continuous influx of immigrants, the universities in the US would perhaps become second-rate institutions at best. This has to do with the social and cultural history of the US itself, and the relationship between the universities and American society at large.

Consequently, these two nations (the American and the European) have hitherto understood the universities in entirely different ways. In Europe, the university is not seen as an institution external to society; universities are *how* the society maintains continuities between generations and solves the problem of transmission of culture (some sets of knowledge and skills). This is illustrated by how the universities are seen to relate to society. In the US, one speaks of “outreach programmes” when one talks about the relationship between the University and the broader society. In Europe, by contrast, both the mission of the university and the duties of the individual professors include the rendering of services to society. With respect to teachers in universities too, the problem formulation is different between the US and Europe. In the US, one is perturbed by the role of ‘public’ intellectuals (university professors) in social life; in Europe, by contrast, almost all intellectuals were (and still are, to a great extent) professors at universities. What is nonsense in Europe makes sense in the US: in Europe, it is nonsensical to identify university professors as ‘private’ intellectuals, whereas in the US, one has deontological problems when such professors become ‘public’ intellectuals.

These differences in the relationship between universities and societies are of great importance for their future need for intellectuals and researchers and the fulfilment of this need. Let me focus only on Europe in this note to explore the options it has.

For various reasons that include the changing demographic pattern of European societies, Europe is facing a partially paradoxical situation. While, on the one hand, there is a growth of structural unemployment including a growth in youth unemployment, on the other hand, the countries of Europe are also facing an increasing shortage in schooled and skilled professionals. If Europe has to sustain its level of welfare, it *needs a dramatic increase* in its skilled ‘workforce’. But its indigenous pool for recruitment has shrunk enormously in the course of the last decades. Given, furthermore, the huge budgetary cuts in public expenditure that European governments are blindly pursuing, the chances of increasing this pool are very unlikely for the next few decades. However, the need will also be very high precisely during this period. One alternative option is to look elsewhere to meet this need, which will become acute in the course of the next decade and more.

Here, India is an obvious choice for many reasons. However, to be successful in this venture means that Europe has to build a relationship with India – a relationship that is different from what existed previously or even what exists now. It must build a *new* relationship between itself and Indian universities, which is beneficial to both concerned parties. Before I spell out what should be ‘new’ in this relationship, let me look at the current model of cooperation and explore its drawbacks.

The Current ‘Business Model’

The current model (namely, establishing institution to institution contacts) works best when either European universities are at issue or when US universities are involved. It works in the first case be-

cause of the common heritage and history that European institutions share. It works too when we talk about establishing contacts between the US and Europe because an institution to institution contact is the only way to relate to US universities, given their external nature to society. *It will fail in all other cases. Why?*

Both India and China have reached the place where they are today through a combination of two processes. There is, first, their own history: (a) both countries have an internal reservoir of indigenous intellectuals; they also have a native *cultural history* of research and education that is every bit as rich as Europe's own cultural history. Further, they have also created indigenous institutions of learning. The second process is the result of their recent history: (b) they have a western educational system, which has mainly accrued to them through colonization (in the case of China, we need to qualify this point more carefully). Their institutions reflect the *combination* of these two processes in a lopsided way: the way, that is, how and why some universities have reached the 'top' whereas the majority is languishing behind. However, unlike in the US, these top universities are fed by the *general indigenous population* and not by immigration. Here, they are very much like the European universities. Furthermore, in contradistinction to the US and Europe, India and China have begun to expand their higher education system. They possess a very great reservoir to draw intellectuals from. As such, the number of 'top' universities can only increase. More important for our present purposes is the following trend: many of the 'top' universities of today will very soon *lose their pre-eminent position*.

Why? In India, the reason is not far to seek. *The so-called top institutions of today were the only institutions available yesterday*. The Indian Institutes of Technology, the Indian Institutes of Management, the Indian Institute of Science, etc. were mostly set up as elite institutions many decades ago. *They were the only institutions available to those who wanted to do research*. Therefore, those who were bright and rich went to these institutions and many from them emigrated to the UK and the US later. Today, there is an explosion of colleges and universities; both the rich and the bright, and the poor and the bright, have more choices than even three decades ago. As a consequence, some of these so-called 'top' universities have already started sliding downwards: JNU, set up as an elite institution in Delhi, is one such. Today, it has already become a second-rate university. Thus, what we see today is a snapshot of the situation that prevailed decades ago; it is not a current photo.

This is evidenced in the prominence that some *geographical regions* in India enjoy today. Bangalore, the so-called silicon valley of India and the state capital of Karnataka, housed just one ordinary university and two engineering colleges less than three decades ago. Yet, this city created the ICT revolution in India two decades ago. It was not the so-called 'top' university in Chennai, or Hyderabad that led the technological revolution in India. Neither Delhi nor Calcutta, which housed the elite colleges and universities, nor the top technological institutes delivered the economic or research impetus in India. All they did was develop westernized elites that left the shores of India as soon as they could. The Indian growth is fuelled by indigenous intellectuals, the way it happened in Europe.

Consequently, when people establish links with such 'top' universities using the current model, they have to deal with a westernized elite that has been doing 'business' with Europe for decades on end. These Indians are receiving homages from a queue comprising of multiple donors all eager to do them a favour. Why should they get excited about another second-rate university from Europe, when the Ivy-League universities in the US are clamouring for their attention? However, this is not the only problem. Because one seeks merely an institution-to-institution contact, the only available 'business model' we have is the kind of contact that one industry establishes with another. What has a small to medium-sized university from Europe to offer that makes it 'irreplaceable'? Not very much. Of course, being good businessmen, the Indians are not averse to entering into contracts with other universities. After all, these institutions too feel proud that they have many 'international' agreements. Besides, their faculty would not mind a trip to Europe, all expenses paid and they would not mind hosting foreigners in India either. But it is of no great consequence to these 'top' universities, whether these contracts are sustained or not.

In this model, building 'institutional contacts' takes the form of the kind of 'networking' that business people engage in: to collect as many visiting cards from as many important and high-placed people as possible. This *'LinkedIn'* network model is inadequate for an institution of 'higher learning' that should put the pursuit of truth and knowledge above any such networking. While it might be useful and impressive to mention the number of international contracts signed in the annual report of a university, it is not (in and of itself) of any great significance to the institution itself. Furthermore, such a model ignores the fact that European universities are embedded in the common history of *peoples* and do not just possess an institutional history.

The only route to success (measured in medium and long-term perspective) for European universities, if they intend to be successful, is to establish a *people-to-people* relationship between India and Europe. We have to keep in mind that we are relating to Indian institutions that not only have their own history but are also *embedded* in a people with a *different cultural history*. That is, initiating a fruitful institutional contact requires relating one people to another. In that case, creation of institutional contacts occurs through the establishment of links between people. Because the latter takes place in multiple ways and at different levels, the India Platform cannot see itself as an attempt by one European university merely to establish contact with other Indian universities. India Platform must become both European and multi-dimensional from the very outset, if it has to succeed.

However, this does not imply that we should forget what the universities need (and, by extension, what Europe needs) for their continued successful existence. One such is unrestrained access to natural resources. In the case of universities, it is easy to specify those resources: the European universities need *direct access* to the top researchers of tomorrow; this is the 'natural' resource of any university. In other words, we need to have direct access to that *reservoir which will feed the top universities with researchers in the India of tomorrow*. We should make these future Indian researchers *want to relate to us*, make them *want to do research for us and with us*. And this relationship can only be built over a period of time and in multiple ways. How is this to be achieved?

Rethinking the Strategy

In the course of what follows, I will identify the three *dimensions* that any such successful strategy has to follow. These three alone are not enough, but they are necessary. They merely outline the nature of the strategy we have to follow, while adding other dimensions or parameters as we go along.

1. India is a huge country not only in terms of population but also in terms of size. It is as varied as Europe in terms of its languages and cultures. Therefore, we need to identify a region in India and focus on that area first. Once we have done that, what should our next step be? Let me use a military metaphor here: *we need to lockdown that area or region*. (The 'why' and the 'how' of this step will become clearer later on.)

Locking down a region implies at least three things: (a) we must become the 'preferred' partner, if not the dominant force there; (b) because we function as 'partners' we must not only have native counterparts but also those who help us in this venture; (c) for this to occur, we must have something to offer. Let me look at each of these separately but briefly.

Regarding *condition (a)*: On its own, no single medium-sized European university is big enough to become a preferred partner in a region. The needs in any region in India far outstrip the capacities of any single university. The same consideration applies to the needs of the universities in that particular region. Consequently, we need to create a European consortium of universities to begin with. While creating such a consortium we have to carefully choose our

partners: we need dynamic middle-sized universities which are ambitious. Mostly, we will find them not among established universities who think they have a reputation to protect but among those young universities who want to build themselves a reputation. Therefore, here is where we have to look.

Regarding *condition (b)*: Because we are entering India as a consortium, our indigenous counterpart should also be a consortium of universities. It does not make sense for us to focus on any one university because there are multiple universities operating in any one region in India. Besides, one cannot become a preferred partner in a region simply by working with a single university. However, when we talk about the consortium of universities in a region, we have to work at two levels. One that involves relating to the universities in the region; the second that involves working with multiple science and engineering colleges, medical and nursing colleges, dental and agricultural colleges, law and management colleges, research institutes and so on. Here, some choice becomes necessary – a choice defined in terms of the capacities of the European consortium.

Regarding *condition (c)*: We must offer something that demonstrates our good faith and our intrinsic commitment to the welfare of our Indian partners. In one sense, for the next decade at least, European universities have much to offer in terms of knowledge, expertise and skill. Here, we have to keep in mind that we are following a long-term strategy. That is, we should remember that we are not aiming only at short-term benefits for us in the first instance. So, we need to work with a *forked* strategy here: one branch of the fork should keep its options open regarding collaborations and seek opportunities to enter into contracts with premier research facilities, where and when possible. The second branch of the fork should explicitly seek to offer what these universities badly need today: *capacity building*. This need refers to something that European universities have very great expertise in, namely, *in doing research*. Most universities in India need help in building research teams, in learning how to do research and in building capacity groups within their universities. The India Platform offers this help that demonstrates its *good faith*: we help these universities *in building research centres and research groups* in multiple domains.

2. Having used a military metaphor, let me use an economic one now. We *create a market for ourselves*, a market that does not exist today. This implies that we do not seek a 'niche' for specialized products or sell 'niche products', which works well in a well-developed market but not so well in a developing market. The thought behind it is this: *as India and her markets grow, so should we*. (This is the business strategy used by companies that have been successful in India so far.) Our welfare must be *seen to depend* on the welfare of the Indian clients. However, creation of a market requires that we actively seek an area that is not yet taken over both in terms of products and in terms of 'competitors'. This consideration applies (a) geographically; (b) in terms of the 'potentiality' of that geographical area to function as a market; (c) in terms of the goods we intend selling, and (d) in terms of the 'natural resources' available in that area. I shall look at these conditions separately but briefly.

Regarding *condition (a)*: Because of the size of the regions and their populations, we need to identify a *focus* for a region. Most big cities in India have populations that outstrip the size of Belgium as a nation. (Bangalore, one of the smaller but major capital cities, has nearly 10 million people and has hundreds of colleges and hundreds of thousands of students.) Given the size and capacity of the European consortium, we need to expend our limited resources carefully. Here, in some senses, the decision is easy: all the well-known institutions in the major capital cities are already taken. Most European nations and the US (and their universities) have already established bases here and, as such, there is no possibility for India Platform to directly lock down any cosmopolitan centre. This means that we have to shift our focus *to rural and semi-urban areas* to begin with.

Regarding *condition (b)*: Even where we turn to semi-urban and rural areas, we must still be able to tap into interesting hubs in Indian social life. Such hubs must possess active researchers and industries in the ICT, biotechnology and bio-engineering, and house multiple research institutes. There cannot be only one hub; nor can it be a hub which is specialized in only one small segment. We need to have potential access to multiple hubs. Only if these rural and semi-urban areas have organic links with such hubs would they function as a potentially interesting market.

Regarding *condition (c)*: There must be some awareness ('felt need') for the goods that we are able to offer immediately. As I said before, we should not try to sell one product (a 'niche' product) in a pre-existing market; we must create a market for ourselves where none exists today. In other words, we have to sell multiple products, the 'necessities of life' so to speak, all of which are needed (and felt needed by the people) in these regions. That is, we must grow (as an institution) as our partner institutions grow: *we grow as India grows*.

Regarding *condition (d)*: Such must be our strategy that, by implementing it, we get direct access to the 'natural resources' we need, namely the bright and young researchers. Such an access should enable us to plan and execute joint research ventures that yield fruits in the middle- and long-term.

3. If we need direct access to young researchers, we will have to relate directly to the current educational system, which we can because the consortium consists of educational institutions. However, we can do this only if we have something to offer in this regard. That is, we need to *introduce novelty* into the Indian education system itself. This requires that (a) these 'novelties' are known to us at least partially; (b) they must be genuinely new in the Indian context; (c) there should not be any resistance to such an introduction. Moreover, such an introduction demonstrates our good faith to them in the sense that no immediate and tangible benefits accrue to us as a result. It is only thus that we win their trust and loyalty. Because all these are self-evident conditions, I shall not elaborate them separately here.

Summarizing, we need to use these three parameters simultaneously. Let me now formulate the India Platform strategy in one single sentence: *we lock down a region in such a way that we can create a market by introducing novelty into the education and social system*. This approach must also enable us to create a *people-to-people* contact. These thoughts contain the rudiments of an 'India policy', which we need to pursue. Thus, we see how different this is from the typical approaches to 'internationalization'.

Outline of an Educational Proposal

With these constraints in mind, here is my proposal: build the India Platform at Ghent University with the help of a consortium of European universities. Let us choose young and dynamic universities that want to expand and grow. In choosing such universities, we can use two criteria: (a) in Western Europe, we should not focus on 'prestigious' universities from Germany, France, UK, etc. In fact, it might be even advisable not to explore the possibilities in these countries. (b) It would be more interesting to focus also on dynamic regions: East and Central Europe. For historical reasons, they have been isolated from developments in Western Europe and the US for a long period of time. Consequently, their universities are more likely to be open to bigger visions and newer vistas than institutions in Western Europe.

Let this European consortium enter into an agreement with a consortium of universities and colleges in Karnataka. Bangalore, its capital city, is one of the biggest and the most important technological hubs in India. Karnataka also contains multiple hubs: Mysore, Mangalore, Hubli and Dharwad and so on.

Let us focus primarily on rural and semi-urban colleges and universities with whom most other European institutions would never enter into an agreement.

What can we offer them immediately? There are two things: (a) As I said before, we can offer them help in capacity building. Helping them build research potential through the process of setting up research centres, training the young faculty in doing research, etc. are crucial in this regard. (b) We also need to introduce 'novelties' into their educational system. Here too, we can offer them something that is not novel here in Europe but very new in Karnataka. Let me elaborate very briefly on these two points.

One of the characteristics of the European education system is the close organic connection it has established between research and education. Equally characteristic of the Indian education system is the quasi-total absence of precisely this link in most universities and colleges. If the Indian education system is to have a future, it must establish a link which is quasi non-existent between these two aspects. European universities can be of immense help in this regard by introducing a research culture within the institutions we collaborate with. Mutual exchange of faculty and research students, isolation of domains where it is possible to build such a research culture without massive investments in infrastructure, the scalability (and hence the effectiveness) of research training, etc. would be the initial parameters in the development of such research culture. This capacity building is pivotal to the future of our collaboration. This is the first novelty that we are going to introduce in the education system in Karnataka.

Further, two of the banes of the current Indian educational system are (i) the monochromatic syllabi and (ii) the emphasis on rote learning. Science and Engineering students, for instance, are not exposed to any domain of knowledge except those *narrowly relevant* to their future profession. One of the interesting aspects of European education is its broader orientation to education and forming. Regarding the second, we also need to note that Europeans have been experimenting for decades with *problem-oriented approaches to education*. We can offer and transmit our experiences in this regard by helping our Indian partners to restructure their educational content. In India, it is almost unknown in most colleges and universities (outside of premier institutions) that the teaching faculty *also engages in research*. Within the European university culture, it is difficult to imagine such a radical dissociation between education and research. Through the setting up of teacher-training modules, we can help bridge the huge gap that exists today in these universities. Finally, we can also introduce social science and humanities modules in the engineering and science curricula and train their faculty. That is, we can develop a 'faculty training programme' in the course of the next 4 to 5 years. This too can be done in a novel fashion: there is no need to give 'A Short Introduction to Sociology', 'A Primer in Political Science' and such like. There is no interest for such courses. We can introduce them to a problem-oriented approach in the social sciences and humanities as well. This approach should allow us to address the problems that Indian society is facing today, such as the unbalanced economic growth, the fast changes at the societal level, the increasing violence between groups, etc. As it is, a number of Karnataka universities are very interested in introducing courses in the '*comparative science of cultures*', as it was developed at Ghent University. We can introduce such programmes in these universities and help train the faculty to teach this programme as well.

Simultaneously, we begin a test-phase of training the faculty from engineering and science colleges to teach modules in humanities and social sciences in their colleges and universities. This initiative has already found seed-money from both the Karnataka State Government and the Engineering University that groups all the engineering colleges from Karnataka (VTU). We can leverage this support to elicit more internal funding but also, more importantly, to involve the dominant industries (including Infosys founders) in this initiative. All these groups can become our partners and stakeholders in our attempts to introduce much-needed change and novelty in the Karnataka educational landscape.

Even though no immediate (tangible) benefits might accrue to us (apart, perhaps, from some institutional contracts), such an initiative will provide immense rewards in the middle- and long-term. Through the faculty-training programme, we will have direct access to all colleges and universities. Through the introduction of teaching modules, we will have immediate and lasting impact on faculty. We obtain direct access to the best of the bright and promising students and it will be up to us to attract them to our universities or to Europe. Then it is up to us to decide how many researchers we want to train, how we train them, and in which areas; these are all decisions that will be taken within the framework of trust and loyalty that our first few years will have earned us. We will have the good will and active support of the government, the private sector, and it will be up to us, again, to make of it what we will. Above all, we will have established a profile for ourselves in the entire region in about 5 years. Thus, we will not only lock down the area but do so on our terms. All the conditions outlined above are satisfied in this proposal.

However, that is not all. The situation that I outline for Karnataka is more or less fully applicable for the rest of India as well. If we manage to pull-off this task in Karnataka, then this experiment *is repeatable in the rest of India*. Because most of our work will be carried out by generating internal resources and because, in a few years' time, we will also have trained enough personnel, any requests for extending this 'model' to the neighbouring states (in South India, like Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh, two growing engineering giants in India) can be easily honoured. I foresee many more states appealing to our expertise in creating such a programme in their regions. If this happens, our range and impact would be limited purely by our abilities and willingness. This is one of the additional reasons for choosing Karnataka, where the needs are currently the most acute.

Because I have been working with some such goal for the last 10 years, most of the preliminary work in Karnataka is already carried out. We have the support of the government, of the Inter-University Board (IUB) in Karnataka, the foundations of a consortium and so on.

Such a long-term strategy does not prevent us from seizing initiatives and being pragmatic: sign contracts where and when opportunity visits us; seek contacts with industries; look for R&D partnerships; promote educational exchanges; and so on. In fact, one of the earliest realizations of the India platform would be to create such a *dual-track policy*: one track that consistently works on creating organizational structures that would enable us to build for the middle- and long-term; the other track which opens up new windows for capitalizing on available opportunities. It is a matter of 5 to 10 more years to achieve the major goals that I outline.

2. Why India Needs Europe

Setting the Context

Today, in the 21st-century world, the relationship between India and Europe is more complicated than their mutually intertwined history would indicate. Despite the fact of colonization by European powers, India is oriented more towards the US than it is towards Europe. This does not have so much to do with a resentment bred by colonization as much as it has to do with the history of India under colonization and the perception of Europe by others (including Indians). Let me briefly sketch both, beginning with a thumbnail description of India as it evolved through the process of colonization.

Unlike the earlier generations of Indian intellectuals, the present-day Indians are not confronted by what they (the former) had to cope with viz., a dynamic western society. We know only too well today, what choices the earlier generations had and what they made of those yesterday: either they retreated into obscurantist revivalism touting the indigenous culture as the only or the best form of life, or took to an aggressive hawking in the street bazaars of India those goods and products bought at bargain-

basement prices from giant warehouses elsewhere. The first group went into bankruptcy in its country of origin while some entrepreneurial elements amongst them shifted their shops from the banks of the Ganges and the Kaveri to that of a Thames and a Hudson. The second has made fortunes by selling remainders at retail prices. Either way, the Indian culture stagnated: the Indian intellectuals had lost a world they never had and grew up in one they never knew. And their heirs and legatees have to struggle to make an alien world their own whilst their world becomes alien to them. All of this was yesterday.

Today? Today, according to perceptions in India and the US, Europe has turned in on itself. Her culture has developed agoraphobia. Her leaders are parochial and provincial, her intellectuals amnesic, her body-politic anaemic and her citizenry cynical. Europe is a world grown old beyond its age, her vision myopic and bi-dimensional, and her perspective short and shallow. This enables one to relate to Europe without being overawed by its dynamism; the static nature of the European society today throws its limitations up in sharp relief.

This, however, is only one perception of the European world. Of course, it is also the most popular description available in the market place. For our purposes, and in truth, this description does not suffice: we need to realize that no culture or society is ever 'static', no matter what Indians or Americans think; no matter what the American pundits say, Europe is not the tired 'old world' they claim it has become. In fact, it continues to be the rich storehouse that it once was and that is why Indians should relate to this part of the world with a greater urgency than ever before. That, at least, is the message in this part of the note.

Why Europe?

The answer to this question is really very simple: *Europe is both a reality and a dream.*

Europe as a reality: What were European intellectuals engaged in during the last two thousand years? It is almost impossible to answer this question without relating the history of Europe; still, we can say that they produced theologies, philosophies, fine arts, and natural and social sciences. The list is so varied, so diverse and so long, that one does not know where to begin or how to end. Perhaps the most interesting theories about human beings, their cultures and societies, which we use today, are products of European intellectuals. So, too, are the institutions and practices that we find desirable: democratic institutions and courts of law, for instance. Though it colonized the globe, Europe also industrialized the colonies, established courts of law, laid railroads, and introduced scientific education, modern medicine and parliamentary democracy. The sheer scope, variety, and quality of European contribution to humanity are overwhelming. When Indians debate about secularism and religious fundamentalism, when they deliberate and introduce legislations about abortion or educational institutions, when they do scientific research and publish papers in learned journals, they are walking in the footprints of the Europe of both yesterday and today. Europe is present as *a reality*, something we can neither forget nor ignore.

Europe as a dream: Europe is indeed a dream, both for Europeans and for Indians, but in two entirely different senses. Europe is a dream for Europeans because of what they are attempting to achieve today. When the European constitution was drafted, they took the first step (even though that was not crowned with success) never seen hitherto in the history of humankind: a partial *transfer* of national sovereignty by more than 25 nation-states achieved *only and solely* through a process of peaceful negotiation. Until then, we knew of only one way of surrendering national sovereignty: *through war and conquest*. The dream of European integration has shown that war is superfluous for this purpose. This is why Europe is a dream for Europeans; if they succeed, then it will also become a dream for the rest of us to pursue.

However, today, Europe is a dream for Indians for an entirely different reason. Let me raise a question by way of an explication: What has India to learn from Europe? Here are the familiar answers: science and technology; democracy and the rule of law; respect for human rights and ecological awareness; becoming modern and cosmopolitan. When such answers are given, it does not mean that we have to learn from Europe this or that scientific theory; or, a solution to this or that mathematical problem. What is meant is something like this: Indians have to learn from European culture a *particular way of going about in the world*. That, one believes, is the unique contribution of European culture, something that is absent elsewhere. And what is this 'particular' way? Here too, a simple answer should suffice: *it is the scientific way*. Europe is a dream for Indians in this sense.

The Scientific Way

To understand what precisely I am talking about, we need to look at the Asian continent as a whole because India is a relative latecomer as a major player here. Even though many countries in Asia were poor and underdeveloped for quite some time, the picture has changed radically and drastically in the last three or so decades. Today, Asia is spending massive amounts of money in building up scientific and educational institutions, in training its research personnel, in entering into collaborations with institutions from outside the continent. Yet, one development is striking: relative to Europe (or even America), their contributions to the field of fundamental scientific research and technology is extremely minimal. Even where we boast of some individual Noble Prize winners (Sir C.V. Raman, for instance), there, these individuals hardly developed any native research culture. That is to say, there is a *conspicuous absence of scientific research culture in Indian institutions*. This, then, is what one has to learn from Europe: to *develop an indigenous research culture* among the intellectuals from both natural and social sciences. If that does not happen, India will rapidly become obsolete in the world of tomorrow.

To appreciate the previous sentence adequately, let us notice the status of Indian engineering and medical colleges and their 'products' very briefly. The staff in these colleges are hardly doing any scientific research but spend their time in teaching courses they learnt when they were themselves students. As a result, most students who emerge out of these colleges are not kept abreast of the latest developments in science and technology. Perhaps, what is even worse is that they are not capable of assimilating these advances on their own either. Consequently, as recent studies have shown, a substantial percentage of the engineering students is not only unemployed but also unemployable. If we look at the so-called IT prowess of India, the picture is even more disheartening. Most of the much renowned IT companies (Infosys, Wipro, TCS, etc) rely on *back-office* revenues for their growth and hardly spend any money on research and development. The R&D budget of one company, say Microsoft, outstrips by ten times or more the whole of the research and training budget of all these companies put together. With the shift to cloud computing, for instance, the face of IT is going to change radically in the course of the next decade or so. When it does, the revenues that these IT companies count upon is going to be reduced drastically because the nature of outsourcing that is occurring now will change dramatically in the future. How is India prepared to face these developments? The answer is painfully simple: *it is not*. What will then happen to the engineering colleges and their students, if things do not begin to change here and now? Here too, the answer is simple: they will go the way the dinosaurs went.

The only way Indians can face up to tomorrow is by transforming their educational and scientific institutions in a radical way by *introducing the culture of scientific research*. Currently, they do not have the *human resources* required for this job: the expertise, the skill and the experience to build the research culture needed to survive the tomorrow is absent. Consequently, despite the huge amounts of money the government of India is spending on research, the results are dismal: the research efforts either produce trivia (in social sciences) or tertiary research in science and technology. It tells us much when the premier institution of research, the Indian Institute of Science, does not even make it to the top 100 institutions in the Shanghai ranking. Surely, that is not because India lacks intelligence or money to

achieve this banal goal. They do not have the most vital ingredient needed to flourish, namely, *the culture of doing scientific research*.

At the level of social upheavals, Asia has experienced everything the West has without having had an intellectual upheaval, which even remotely resembles those that have occurred in the West. They have had revolutions, palace coups, dictatorships, capitalisms, democracies and what-have-you. They have even had colonisations and independence movements. But where are the renaissances or the enlightenments? Where are the Galileos, Newtons, Einsteins, Bohrs and Hawkings of India? Why not a Vienna Circle or, at least, a Frankfurt School? Surely, the Indian culture has had its share of brilliant men and women. Where, then, are their Marxes, Webers or Freuds? They can at least produce a John Maynard Keynes or an Émile Durkheim. They can afford a Popper, surely, if not a Russell or a Wittgenstein. Where are they?

That is why India *needs Europe today*.

Why Not America?

This question is important today because, increasingly, in the course of the last two decades at least, Indians have been looking towards America. By the end of the last decade, Indians had become the third biggest immigrant group in the USA, displacing the Chinese. The more than two million Indian immigrants to America represent the biggest peaceful migration (in the shortest time) the world has ever known. The Indian government (especially the Ministry of Human Resource and Development) appears to take policy decisions while eagerly awaiting approving nods from Washington or New York. Given this, the obvious question is: why Europe and not America?

In a way, I have already answered this question at the beginning of this note, when I spoke about the relationship between universities and society. Perhaps, a repetition will do no harm here. As I have noted, the universities in the US are heavily dependent on immigrants to keep their educational and research institutions at the top. These institutions are artificial islands in American society and they have no experience in relating to the population in any organic fashion. The research culture in the US is sustained mostly by a continuous influx from all parts of the world and is not a part of American intellectual culture. The dominance of the US in many areas of research (especially in the social sciences) is a result of the massive funding occasioned mostly by Cold War ideology. As this ideology begins to die, so does the research funding: increasingly, there is a growing pressure to downsize research funding for all fundamental research especially in the social sciences.

What India needs for its future is not a series of intellectual and institutional collaborations between the so-called 'elite' institutions in India and the US. Where such collaborations occur, there they will be completely determined by what has defined the US ever since the World War, whether it is at the level of foreign relations or at the level of academic collaborations: *its national interests*. In some senses, a kind of *rabid nationalism* is the defining characteristic of all American institutions, whether industrial or commercial firms, or the military or the administration, or educational institutions. In this sense, American institutions will work with India only in so far such collaboration *serves their interests*, however that gets defined. Each educational institution (say a Harvard or a Yale) thinks only in terms of its individual interest, if and when it undertakes collaborations. Furthermore, such institutions have *neither the conception nor the experience* of developing a scientific research culture in a people or a nation. This is evidenced by the fact that such institutions continue to remain 'foreign' in their own country and culture.

In stark contrast to this kind of nationalism and isolationism stands European culture. Forced from the very beginning to think in terms of the "interests of the Empire", European colonial powers could not project their 'national interests' as overriding priorities. Because of the organic relationship between its culture and its intellectuals, universities in Europe faced the need to educate and form the population at large. The meeting of these needs has expressed itself as the renaissances, enlightenments and

scientific revolutions. What India needs is not so much academic agreements between some institutions as much as it needs the growth of a scientific research culture among its intelligentsia. Here, only Europe has the wherewithal to be of help and not the USA. Hence Europe.

However, this is not meant to imply that America is 'selfish' or that it has not been 'generous' enough for those hundreds of thousands of Indian students, whose education it has financed. My point is narrower: I am talking about the interests that guide the US institutions when they enter into *collaborations* with partners elsewhere. Even here, I am speaking about the dominant tendency and not making a law-like generalization. I merely want to suggest that international collaboration should enable India to tap into its own potential.

3. Problems and Solutions

In one sense, we could say that there are no constraints but only opportunities. Better said, perhaps: what look like constraints in the eyes of one are merely opportunities in the eyes of the other. That is how I shall look at the relationship between Europe and India in what follows. Let me begin by outlining what is described as a 'constraint' to the future of Europe.

Globalization

In the early phase of selling globalization to the European public, the following story was popularized in the media by both politicians and policy makers. Given the relatively cheap skilled labour and lower costs of production of goods and commodities in Asia, it is profitable for the western industries to shift their loci of production there. It also makes macroeconomic sense to do this, despite the resultant loss of jobs in Europe and America, because the cheaply produced goods allow western consumers to benefit. Asian societies and economies will also benefit from this relocation because of its obvious impact on their local economies.

This story has changed in the course of the last three years or so, beginning with the financial mortgage crisis that America unleashed upon the world. It now transpires that western nations (both consumers and governments) were living above their means and that their massive consumption of cheap goods produced in Asia and elsewhere has substantially contributed to this crisis. Consequently, the story is now one of huge austerity measures and slashing of budgetary deficits across all sectors.

If we put the two stories together, it appears as though 'globalization' is the root cause of economic crisis and that austerity is the only answer that our national economies can afford. Even though much more can be said about this issue, I have said enough to summarize the slogan of today: European consumers should become poorer if the Asians have to prosper. I do not believe that this story is true, despite its popularity. The capitalist economies generate new wealth and do not merely reproduce and divide a fixed amount of wealth; the prosperity of one section of a people does not require the impoverishment of another section.

Further, compounding this problem as it were, a phenomenal development is going to take place in Europe: a massive retirement of baby-boomers (that is, people born during the 1950's, after the war) from active profession in the course of the next 5 years or so. Known also as 'the problem of the ageing population', this phenomenon confronts Europe with many issues: (a) at the level of institutions of higher education, European universities and colleges will confront a sudden shortage of qualified teachers and researchers; (b) at the level of social policy, the welfare state will confront a huge surge in demands for pension; (c) at the level of health policies, there will be an uninterruptedly increasing demand on health care for old-age diseases; (d) at the level of the economy, there arises the skew in the ratio between the active and inactive segments of the population. These four issues are enough (even though more problems will emerge due to the changing demography in Europe) to suggest that

this huge number of retirees are going to become 'the' problem for Europe in the course of this decade and it is likely to remain that for many more decades to come.

Of course, European policy makers have been aware of this problem for a decade or more. Many countries are trying to address this issue, even though the discussion has been mainly at the level of economics: how is Europe going to sustain its pension-scheme? How is it going to generate enough finances to take care of its ageing population? While each political party has its own solution, ranging from privatizing pensions to immigration of skilled labour from elsewhere, none appears to appreciate the huge social and cultural problem that is going to explode during this decade: *how is Europe going to 'deal with' its preponderantly aged population?*

To understand the *magnitude* and the *socio-cultural* nature of this problem, we need to realize that (nearly) the majority of the population will consist of retirees. Hitherto, Europe had developed many institutional forms to deal with its aged: travel to exotic destinations, rest houses, civil and cultural associations, and so on. However, these are meant to deal with a *minority*, where the majority is active in some profession or another. It is this situation that is going to change radically: now it will be the majority that requires *social outlets* and ways of utilizing 'free-time'. Put in a simple way and in the starkest of terms: Europe is going to confront *a massive social problem of boredom and meaninglessness* experienced by a majority of its population. It cannot simply *extend* its currently existing facilities to keep the aged 'occupied' because the budgetary demands of any such scheme cannot be met by any national economy. Europe is simply not equipped to deal with this huge problem also because it foresees no meaningful *institutional role* for its aged and retirees. It cannot remain indifferent and hope that individuals will 'somehow' solve their problems because it is not going to be limited to some individuals but will, instead, manifest itself as a huge *social phenomenon*. This problem will be more acute than maintaining pension-schemes and financing them. If left unaddressed, it is going to create a *massive* social and cultural *dislocation* in the fabric of European society. Yet, strangely enough, there is hardly any discussion about this aspect of 'the problem of the ageing population', one of the biggest constraints on European growth and its future prosperity.

Globalization and Education

Reconsider the requirements of Indian society and its institutions of higher learning: (a) there is a need for the infusion of scientific research culture among their intelligentsia; (b) given the size and the nature of the task, this need cannot be met by signing some MoUs between a few institutions; (c) it requires a sustained and massive *training* stretching over a decade or more; (d) it can only be provided by those who have the time, patience, and experience to do this.

Consider now what Europe will be producing in the course of this decade itself: (a) a huge number of retirees, who will be leaving institutions of higher learning; (b) a gigantic group of people with tremendous experience in both doing research and teaching it; (c) an inexhaustible pool of experience, skill and time; (d) a population that can be meaningfully 'employed' in society without being 'professionally active'.

The answer begins to stare in our face now: *if we look at 'the problem' of Europe in global terms, it becomes 'the solution' for India* (and, indeed, for the whole of Asia). When looked at in isolation, each country confronts an unsolvable problem; however, when brought together, *each is a solution for the other*. Is not this what 'globalization' is about?

This solution, where we involve retired academics and researchers to help the Indian intelligentsia, will also automatically address the problem of sustainability of the existing pension structures. For instance, these academics could be paid their pension-benefits (stretching from 1 to 6 months) by the host country or the host institution, during which time the European economy is relieved of paying these benefits to these people. In that case, its social budget will be reduced by a considerable amount, which might enable the pension-scheme to survive without draconian austerity measures.

Because it will not be limited to a few individuals from some or another institution, the talk of 'people-to-people contact' begins to make sense. In short: it is a pure *win-win situation* for both Europe and India.

Needless to say, this solution is capable of straight-forward extension. Aiming at retirees during the first decade of their retirement, when they are still fit and active, this proposal can draw teachers from primary and secondary education into its net. The impact of the transfer of this vast experience cannot but enrich education in India: a massive training of primary- and secondary-school Indian teachers, undertaken by European teachers with decades of experience, can only make the Indian teachers better. The fruits of this labour will be plucked by India two or three decades later. In fact, one can extend the idea even further: one can look at other professionals possessing a variety of skills which can be productively made use of. How far one could extend this depends only on the willingness of Europe and the needs of India.

On the Right Strategy

This consideration suggests that this strategy will work only in the middle and long term. One should not aim for immediate benefits accruing from signing institutional agreements right away. Educational institutions and policy makers should aim at long-term benefits and not blindly look for short-term gains alone. Of course, as must be obvious, a successful implementation of such a policy requires multiple actors: from educational institutions to policy makers and politicians. While working towards reaching that goal, we need not be disheartened by the limited nature of our individual impact. On the contrary, we should look at this as a pilot project.

Towards this end, the suggestion is this: *while signing institutional arrangements today, we already begin exploring the retiree pool of the university academics.* Alumni of our universities would be as important as partners in this venture as would be current teachers and researchers. We enter into a contract with the present in order to tap their past so that we may have a future. This is the only right strategy to pursue. Here, as elsewhere, experience will guide us in developing the right ways of pursuing common goals.

Universal Health Care or Health Tourism?

In India, the following broad changes can be observed in the health-care 'system'. Due to the lower standards of living and highly skilled personnel, it makes good economic sense to seek sophisticated health care there at costs much lower than what they are in either America or Europe. As a result, there is an increasing amount of 'health tourism' initiated by American private insurance companies. Amongst other things, this is resulting in the creation of elite hospitals in India catering increasingly to native wealthy clients and the American patients.

One hugely negative impact of this development is to be seen in India. Its growing middle class is squeezed between the increasingly unaffordable treatment in elite hospitals and the very low level of health care provided by government hospitals. The growing small nursing clinics and hospitals are woefully inadequate to meet the demands of this huge middle class.

In contrast to America, there is the European model of universal health care which is under severe budgetary pressure from the current economic and budgetary crisis. The financial need of Europe dictates a reduction in state subsidies for its health care system; the increasingly older population, by contrast, is exerting a greater pressure to increase the outlay on its health-care system.

The solution is obvious: *we help introduce the European model of universal health care system in India (beginning with one region, namely Karnataka), which also caters for the European citizens.* Implementing this solution can only be the result of the collaborative effort of multiple actors and organizations: from governments through insurance companies to hospitals and medical colleges in both parts of the globe. However enormous this task might be, this enormity is the challenge that the India

Platform wants to address itself to in the course of the next 5 years or so. It intends to meet this challenge by developing consortia of hospitals, medical colleges and insurance companies in both India and Belgium (to begin with).

University and private hospitals will also play a pivotal role in the development of both short and long term policies, which benefit all the concerned parties.

In the *short term*, such hospitals can enter into active collaborations with the existing hospitals, clinics and nursing homes in the region of Karnataka. This would enable a time-bound exchange of staff (surgeons, doctors, interns, etc.) with their Indian counterparts. The clinical experience accruing from treating many diseases (which most in Europe read only in text-books or rarely come across) will be of incalculable value in adding to the expertise of the hospital. In the same move, they can also enter into agreements with many new medical colleges in the region and influence their further growth.

In the *long term*, this will allow them to play a pioneering role in helping Belgium (and Europe) to re-think and reorient the federal health policies. Instead of standing on the side-lines and impoverishing our much-envied health-care system or blindly reproducing mindless slogans borrowed from America, *we save our health-care system by generalizing it*: we can promote the idea of a “global health care” by outlining policies and projects for collaboration with India that is beneficial both to Belgium (and Europe) and to India. This vision note is not the place to outline all the mutual benefits that accrue from such collaboration. However, it requires trust and cooperation at all levels: between health-care professionals, health insurance companies, governments and, of course, patients. The long-term policy would pursue this route through pilot projects, social experimentations within the existing legal and medical frameworks by setting up bridges between India and Belgium.

How do we address the problem of ‘motivating’ European patients to go elsewhere in this proposal? The answer is obvious: the pensioned population that helps India build its academia is also likely to become the early beneficiary of the proposed universal health-care system. They will not require an additional motivation in this case.

Conclusion

By now, the basic conclusion must be clear: *we, the people, can make globalization work for us*. There is no need to meekly accept the stories spewed out by the popular press and the pundits that globalization implies competition, which merely helps low-wage countries and the ‘rich’ consumers. Globalization, in essence, brings people together; *each becomes a solution for the problems of the other*. If translated in a *socially responsible way*, globalization brings about a greater collaboration between peoples, drawing them together in a web of mutually beneficial dependencies. We can make globalization work for us, if only we have the will to do so. The only question that we need to ask in the 21st century, *our time*, is this: *do we have that will?*

4. Why Europe and India Need Each Other

The vision note raises three concerns: (a) Is not the envisaged people-to-people contact purely instrumental? (b) Is not there a continued asymmetry in the relation between Europe and India? (c) Is not this a form of ‘neo-colonialism’?

Europe Reconsidered

Today, we are all familiar with what Europe has visited on the humankind during the course of the twentieth century and before: brought slavery to Africa and colonialism to most parts of the globe; inflicted the two World Wars, the horrors of fascism, Nazism and concentration camps, etc. Mankind, it

seems, has paid a very high price for the 'development' of Europe as a culture, as a civilization and as a continent.

All of this is undoubtedly true. But, we must take note of the fact that Europe has also paid a very, very high price for these developments. The world wars decimated her population; the concentration camps opened up a wound in the innards of this culture that is not yet healed; the post-world-war developments, including the Cold War, ripped her nations and cultures apart. In fact, such is this rupture which the twentieth century has inflicted on the unity of this culture and continent that it can only be described this way: the price that Europe has paid lies in its *inability to experience itself as a culture*, all current attempts notwithstanding. Europe, in very simple terms, is suffering from *massive amnesia*, which is both cultural and social in nature. Europe and the Europeans of today do not know anymore who they were, where they are coming from, where they should be heading. *Europe does not anymore know who or what she is*. This is witnessed at different levels: from functioning as an American lapdog to the lack of an effective presence on an international diplomatic and political level. Therefore, the question that faces Europe today can be formulated as the most urgent of her tasks: to *recover her memory*. So far, it has been unable to do this.

India Revisited

While it is true to say that colonialism in India 'modernized' the country in multiple ways, the very process inflicted massive damages on her culture. Apart from tearing the daily lives of Indians apart, it also inflicted other ills: *inducing colonial consciousness*, which expresses itself in the lack of creativity in thinking about society, culture and experience; the passive reproduction of European stories about India as truths about her culture; the assumption that the West is culturally superior; the resultant tacit acceptance that the future of India is to become 'western'; and so on. The massive migration to the US has not improved this state of affairs. In conformity with its culture of 'ethnicizing' peoples (Chinese-American, Vietnamese-American, Mexican-American, etc.), the Indians lead 'ghettoized' lives there, even where their ghettos are more affluent than, say, those of African-Americans. In this sense, 'globalization' has not led to an intimate contact between Indians and western culture. Instead, it has given birth to a view from shopping malls and television channels.

If we realize that we have to go back many centuries to discover the creativity of Indian culture by looking at its intellectual and material products, it is clear that colonialism destroyed some kinds of dynamism in Indian culture. Though India is by no means static, her future lies in recovering the dynamism that she lost due to colonial conquest and rule. This dynamism will not come back until she loses the colonial consciousness imposed by colonialism and currently sustained by the kind of modernizing path India is pursuing. Further, it is not only education and research that need to come together (at the level of institutions of higher learning) but also thinking and experience (at the level of the daily life of people). Therefore, it is also clear what the challenge of Indian culture is: to *rediscover its intrinsic dynamism*. Let us note here too that India has so far failed in this attempt to rejuvenate her own culture.

India and Europe Reconnected

Now, one can also see the outlines of 'a vision behind the vision': *by reconnecting these two peoples, we shall enable both to complete their urgent tasks*.

Amnesia, whether cultural, social or individual, can be lifted if the entity in question repeats some old tasks in the environment where such tasks are embedded in. Through colonialisms, Europe created an asymmetry for which it paid the price of losing its memory. Today, we partially recreate this asymmetry but in a non-colonial way, where Europe 'teaches' and India 'learns'. Thus Europe reproduces some of its old tasks in such a way that she can recollect and remember what it was before. Here, India voluntarily gives Europe the 'resource' she needs. At the same time, India will also provide

Europe with the resources that she needs to ask and satisfactorily answer a very old question: what has Europe to learn from India?

The same powers which imposed colonial consciousness on a people are also capable of removing it. Through daily contacts with thousands of Europeans (in a single region and in a concentrated manner) Indians will, once again, confront the challenge of relating to another culture, European culture, but this time without problems or complexes. Discovering that Europe is another culture, whose way of being lends legitimacy to her own way of living without discrediting it, India will rediscover her lost dynamism by losing colonial consciousness. Here, Europe lends her 'services' to the Indian people in their attempts at self-discovery.

Colonialism, which was a direct rule of one power on another and an indirect rule of one people over another, is neatly reversed: it is now two peoples who get into a daily and direct contact with each other and enter into a people-to-people relationship. The way of living of one people will have to adapt itself to the daily lives of another people. The myriad of contact points and interfaces that emerge as a result is the only kind of people-to-people contact that can heal both.

Meeting the Concerns

Thus, if we imagine the kind of contact that India Platform envisages, under the assumption that it proves possible to bring this about, we can see how the concerns are answered.

The intrinsic worth of this renewed cultural contact can be put in a very simple form: *While India gifts Europe with her memory, Europe gifts India the autonomy and dynamism she needs.* Europe gives back to India the unity of her culture; India gives back to Europe her identity. As a result, both not only heal but also become whole. What more intrinsic worth can there be than this gift and act of friendship?

A new asymmetry is created but in such a way that it sets the old asymmetry right: the only way to level an asymmetrical situation is to bend it back, which, seen on its own, is also an asymmetrical act. We have to keep the mutual history of the relation between Europe and India in mind in order to appreciate that this asymmetry restores balance between two peoples.

In doing so, this process neatly *reverses* the old process of colonization. This too, looked on its own and with common sense prejudice, appears as a form of neo-colonialism. However, it is not: it brings peoples into contact with each other directly and as equals, something which colonialism simply cannot. Further, through this people-to-people contact, it will be left to the Indian culture and to the people of India how they make use of (and, indeed, what use they make of) the unity of their daily lives. Consequently, the suggestion is not that India becomes 'western': it will, for the first time, enable India to draw from the West what it needs and make use of it the way it suits her own culture.

Generalizing the Issue

In the way the issue has been formulated, it is obvious that it can be generalized to include (minimally) the whole of Asia and Africa into its scope. This should be the case as well: we are talking about 'globalization' and this phenomenon is not limited to India. However, elaborating on this aspect is left to other people and places. For now, all we need to note is that we are in a position to face the challenges that the twenty-first century has thrown up, if only we are willing to think the way the world is compelling us to think today, namely, globally and creatively.