

Dissonance Of Strategic Culture In Defense Policy

Pityas Datwurina¹, Aries Sudiarso², I Wayan Warka³, Lukman Yudho Prakoso⁴

Naval Strategy Program

Faculty of Defense Strategy, Republic of Indonesia Defense University

Jakarta, Indonesia

tyassdatwurinaa@gmail.com



Abstract – Dissonance is a concept that comes from the study of psychology or something commonly called cognitive dissonance, which means a state of discomfort or dilemma which is the result of conflict between two beliefs. This thought arose because of what has been known to humans so far trying to stick to one thought. But at certain times, it happened clashes of beliefs that make a person no longer consistent on one particular thought and pattern of behavior, that is what is referred to later as dissonance. The use of the term 'consonance' refers to consistency, while 'dissonance' describes inconsistency. Strategic decisions are generated not only by such structural conditions international system, but most importantly by domestic political factors others, such as their imperial heritage and perception of the state. They plays important role in interpreting historical memory, national symbols, constructing myths, including the national identity of a country thereby forming a belief system which is a manifestation of how does the political elite understand who they are and how ideal the state is behave through defense policy. The role of the political elite is important because it is the owner of power in framing historical narratives, and creating political discourse, they are also capable producing norms, including redefining and adopting an idea from a variety of kinds of ideas that exist, in accordance with what is believed by the elite as the best in in order to achieve their interests.

Keywords – Dissonance; Strategic Culture; Defense Policy; Elite Beliefs; State

I. INTRODUCTION

Dissonance is a concept that comes from the study of psychology or something commonly called cognitive dissonance, which means a state of discomfort or dilemma which is the result of conflict between two beliefs (Metin, 2011). This thought arose because of what has been known to humans so far trying to stick to one thought. But at certain times, it happened clashes of beliefs that make a person no longer consistent on one particular thought and pattern of behavior, that is what is referred to later as dissonance. The use of the term 'consonance' refers to consistency, while 'dissonance' describes inconsistency (Metin, 2011). Cognitive dissonance has a major effect on many aspects of life, for example judgments, decisions, and evaluations. This conflict of beliefs is very influential in the decision-making process, so that when a dilemma occurs because of the mismatch between beliefs and behavior, a change must be carried out in order to eliminate and reduce the dissonance. Festinger states "cognitive dissonance proposes that when people experience psychological discomfort (dissonance), they strive to reduce it through either changing behaviors and cognitions or adding new cognitive elements" (Metin, 2011).

The magnitude of the level of dissonance depends on the importance of the value of a elements that can be knowledge, beliefs, or attitudes that make someone has this dilemma. If someone gives the important priority of an element as mentioned above, the magnitude of the level the dissonance can be enormous. Dissonance will give effect in the form of pressure to reduce or eliminate the feeling of dilemma, and this pressure can increase increases so as to make a person try more and more to adjust between thought and behavior to be taken. Festinger (1957) explained that individuals may change behavioral cognitive elements, environmental cognitive elements or add new cognitive elements to reduce dissonance (Metin, 2011).

In a strategic culture, dissonance is defined as a situation in which it arises conflict that occurs between two beliefs or a clash of strategic cultural values (Lantis, 2002). These clashes occur because of differences in orientation behavior and goals to be achieved. This dissonance then pushes change in the strategic culture of a country. Dissonance is a situation where elites feel that strategic culture is as long as it is used it starts to be irrelevant in achieving the goal because it faces series of international changes. Dissonance then it can also be called a "strategic cultural dilemma", which later define new directions for foreign policy and reconstruct narratives history (Lantis&Charlton, 2011).

According to the leaving poststructuralist strategic culture from constructivism, this change can be seen as an elite attempt to use culture in order to gain influence and goals. With In other words, a changing strategic culture is the path to formation new cognitive boundaries and then promote new pathways within context of policy choice (Lantis&Charlton, 2011).

In addition, strategic culture experiences dissonance when it is influenced by two the following factors, namely the first is that there is an external shock that makes challenges to beliefs and historical narratives that have been understood so far. This external shock is in the form of a dramatic or traumatic event (Lantis, 2009). The conditions where there is a radical change that undermines legitimacy of existing norms, changes in power in society, and enable actors who produce cultural norms to construct a consensus around alternative norms. Radical change what happened next resulted in extreme psychological stress, and requires a process of socialization by bringing up the participation of certain groups in creating a new political cultural orientation. This strategic cultural dissonance then influences a country's defense policy, and can be seen when there is a significant change in their defense policy.

II. METHODS

This research is a type of explanatory research. Explanative research is research involving two or more variables through the use of theory and concepts in explaining a phenomenon, and accompanied by research hypotheses in the research.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

National defense is how to use the potential national resources that are owned to be used as a national power in times of peace, used in times of war, and during times after war, to face threats from outside and from in the country, both in the form of military and non-military threats to territorial integrity, state sovereignty, and the safety of the entire nation and state in the framework of realizing national security (Supriyatno, 2014). The study of national defense itself is an evolution in security studies, defense studies, and military studies.

Defense axiologically explains how to create defense policies, laws, strategies, tactics, define threats contained in the defense white paper, defense doctrine, defense posture, to a country's defense strategy. In addition, the purpose of a country's defense is to maintain its existence, both by expansion and defense, in order to achieve national security and is useful for dealing with military and non-military threats, real and potential, as well as anarchic national and global political dynamics.

Management of the national defense system is one of the functions of the state government aimed at protecting national interests and supporting national policies in the defense sector. In managing the national defense system, the President determines the general national defense policy which then becomes a guide in the implementation of national defense efforts by related actors.

Hays Peter explains defense policy as a plan or series of actions made by the government, political parties or business actors that aim to influence and produce a decision, action and anything related to the armed forces or military force starting from recruitment, training, organization, development and deployment of a country's military power (Hays, et al., 1997).

Theoretically, Hays mapped out three stages in policy making which consisted of (1) setting goals/ends by state leaders; (2) establishment of appropriate means by authorized institutions to achieve these objectives; and (3) allocation of resources by regulatory agencies and congress (Sadeh and Vallance, 2009).

In the book it is explained that when talking about defense policy, we can't separate it from domestic environment, which is discusses about strategic culture (Hays, et al, 1997). Strategic culture was the first manifestation of World War II that studied the styles of state behavior. Strategic culture claims that strategic choices and behavioral tendencies related to state security are influenced by culture, in which the culture in question is formed through shared historical experience memories, state geostrategy conditions, political elite articulation of national identity, and also myths and traditions (Lantis, 2009). Lantis see strategic culture

as a set of shared beliefs, assumptions and modes of behavior, derived from common experiences and accepted narratives (both oral and written), that shape collective identity and relationships to other groups, and which determine appropriate ends and means for achieving security objectives (Lantis, 2009).

The history and experience of a country is very important for understand the birth and evolution of the country, and also how the identity and strategic cultural characteristics (Lantis, 2009). Historical chapters in theory international relations starts from the phase of a country during the colonial era and after colonial, but it also starts from pre-modern, modern, and post-modern. History that the country has gone through varies and then forms their experience and understanding.

This is what then makes the country have different responses to an event even if confronted with it in the same situation. Therefore, history cannot be simply ignored because history simultaneously forms the collective memory of a nation, which in fact it is no longer objective because the state in general has already selected and emphasizes more on historical memories that are glorious, triumphant, as well as the country's golden age to remember.

In addition, political elite also becomes a source of forming a strategic culture because There the political elite also becomes a source of forming a strategic culture because this collection of individuals plays a role in interpreting historical memory, national symbols, constructing myths, including the national identity of a country thereby forming a belief system which is a manifestation of how does the political elite understand who they are and how ideal the state is behave. The role of the political elite is important because it is the owner of power in framing historical narratives, and creating political discourse, they are also capable producing norms, including redefining and adopting an idea from a variety of kinds of ideas that exist, in accordance with what is believed by the elite as the best in in order to achieve their interests. They plays important role in interpreting historical memory, national symbols, constructing myths, including the national identity of a country thereby forming a belief system which is a manifestation of how does the political elite understand who they are and how ideal the state is behave through defense policy. The role of the political elite is important because it is the owner of power in framing historical narratives, and creating political discourse, they are also capable producing norms, including redefining and adopting an idea from a variety of kinds of ideas that exist, in accordance with what is believed by the elite as the best in in order to achieve their interests.

Myths are believed to be part of all cultural groups, and play a role in the evolution of strategic cultural identity. Myth can have a different meaning than traditional understanding that actually happened, so the myth is considered as something that didn't really happen, or an ideal, or a fictional stor (Lantis, 2009). Myth is a manifestation of that belief express basic political values, most of which are unconscious or assumed a society, in short, as a dramatic expression of a ideology. This myth was formed and built by the elite, based on events heroic or the heyday of a group, which is then doctrinized so that people also understand that the myth is real and become a source of shared beliefs and certain patterns of behavior.

Strategic decisions are generated not only by such structural conditions international system, but most importantly by domestic political factors others, such as their imperial heritage and perception of the state.

IV. CONCLUSION

The first, the strategic culture of a country can change or experience dissonance, aside from the semi-permanent nature of strategic culture, too because of external shocks and clashes of thoughts between thoughts traditional and strategic thinking brought by certain political elites, and this influences the country's defense policy. The main thing is, Political elites here have an important role as agents of change because of them become a party to continuously interpret history and culture, and then framing historical narratives, including reconstructing strategic culture which has been firmly rooted before. And secondly, because of strategic culture can change, as well as the behavior of the state through a foreign policy that issued. The country will experience a change in the trend of its political behavior when Strategic culture undergoes changes either due to external shocks or clash of strategic thinking and traditional thinking.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hays, et al. 1997. American Defense Policy 7th Edition. London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- [2] Hays, P. L. 2002. United States Military Space: Into the Twenty-First Century. Alabama: USAF Institute for National Security Studies and Air University Press.

- [3] Lantis, Jeffrey. 2002. Strategic Culture and National Security Policy. International Studies Association, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- [4] Lantis, Jeffrey. 2009. Strategic Culture and Tailorred Deterence: Bridging the Gap between Theory and Practice. Contemporary Security Policy, Vol.30, No.3 (December 2009). Taylor and Francis Published.
- [5] Lantis, Jeffrey dan Charlton, Andrew. 2011. Continuity or Change? The Strategic Culture of Australia. New York: The Collage of Wooster.Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Indonesia. (2008). Indonesia Defense White Paper. Jakarta: Kemhan RI.
- [6] Metin, Erim. 2011. The Advance in the History of Cognitive Dissonance Theory. International Journal of Humanities and Social science, Vol.1, No.6, Juni 2011. Ankara: Centre for Promoting Ideas, USA.
- [7] Sadeh and Vallance. 2009. The policy process. In C. a. Pilch, Space and Defense Policy (pp. 125-149). London: Routledge.
- [8] Supriyatno, M. 2014. Tentang Ilmu Pertahanan. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.