SVARIX INTELLIGENCE OS

STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT • GEOPOLITICS • 25 March 2026

Iran’s Mosaic Doctrine: Strategic Lessons for India’s Military Resilience in the Face of Decapitation Threats

79/100 HIGH

CONTENTS

Executive Summary

India should adopt a phased 'Controlled Hybrid Mosaic Model' for its military, drawing on the core value of Iran's Mosaic Doctrine—distributed conventional resilience—while retaining absolute centralized control over its nuclear arsenal. This balance addresses India’s vulnerability to decapitation strikes and ensures operational continuity of its conventional forces, but requires robust legal, institutional, and civil-military mechanisms to preclude risks of internal fragmentation or accidental escalation. The approach is superior to a purely centralized model, which leaves India exposed, and to wholesale Iranian decentralization, which is incompatible with India’s strategic context.

Situation Assessment

The immediate catalyst for reevaluating India's military doctrine is the rapidly increasing threat of sophisticated Anti-Access/Area Denial (A2/AD) systems and the heightened risk of decapitation strikes targeting centralized Indian command and control (C2) during major military crises. As of May 10, 2024, the Inter-Services Organisations (Command, Control and Discipline) Act has come into force, empowering Commanders-in-Chief of Inter-Services Organisations—a significant legislative milestone intended to enhance joint command structures. Despite these reforms, the persistent centralization of both conventional and nuclear military authority means India's national security posture remains susceptible to abrupt paralysis in the event of simultaneous strikes on senior leadership or critical infrastructure. The Iranian military's adoption of the 'Mosaic Doctrine'—known for distributing operational authority and relying on localized, adaptive resistance—represents a compelling, if controversial, model for resilient warfare under degraded C2 conditions. The core challenge for India is adapting the distributed resilience exemplified by this doctrine without inviting the risks inherent to excessive decentralization, particularly regarding the nuclear chain of command. India's nuclear doctrine, anchored in a no-first-use policy and credible minimum deterrence, demands unbroken civilian oversight. A new doctrinal equilibrium is now sought: to ensure continuity and flexibility in conventional responses without diluting central authority over nuclear assets, framing the design and urgency of proposed reforms.

Legislative Milestone	Date Enacted	Operational Focus	Relevance
Inter-Services Organisations Act	May 10, 2024	Joint conventional command, C2 resilience	Foundational for new doctrine implementation
India's Nuclear Doctrine	Always-in-effect	Civilian-led nuclear C2	Absolute centralization required

Operational Focus: Domain impacted by the policy. Relevance: How the legislative change supports doctrinal evolution.

Stakeholder Analysis

The critical actors shaping India's military command reforms are the Ministry of Defence (MoD), the Prime Minister's Office (PMO), the Nuclear Command Authority (NCA), the Chief of Defence Staff (CDS) and Service Headquarters, and the political leadership at large. The newly activated Inter-Services Organisations Act provides a framework for greater operational integration, but the willingness to devolve even strictly conventional authority remains tightly coupled with political will and entrenched traditions of centralization. The doctrine's success hinges largely on how far key actors are prepared to trust operational discretion to theater commanders, while strictly circumscribing nuclear decision rights. These dynamics shape both the speed and credibility of India's deterrent and war-fighting posture. The central leverage and veto powers lie with the PMO and NCA, ensuring that—regardless of distributed operational frameworks—nuclear escalation is precluded from delegation. The service

chiefs and theater commanders may advocate for greater operational leeway but must operate within boundaries set by political and constitutional oversight. The timeline, level of trust, and clarity of legal separation between conventional and nuclear realms will shape ultimate outcomes, as will the ability of these groups to harmonize divergent priorities without inviting intra-institutional conflict.

Actor	Stated Position	Leverage	Veto Power	Key Indicator to Watch
MoD/PMO/NCA	Prioritize national security, absolute nuclear control, cautious about devolving authority	HIGH	YES	Progress on constitutional/legal reforms
CDS/Service HQs	Advocate for jointness, multi-domain resilience, operational flexibility	MEDIUM	NO	Implementation of pilot distributed C2 programs
Political Leadership	Determines reform pace, seeks strategic and bureaucratic stability	HIGH	YES	Level of cross-party support for military reforms

Leverage: Actor's ability to shape doctrine (red=high, amber=medium, green=low). Veto Power: Can block reform (YES=red, NO=green).

Geopolitical & Security Implications

Implementing a controlled hybrid mosaic doctrine in India will fundamentally alter the country’s military posture and deterrence signaling, with far-reaching implications for regional power dynamics and escalation management. The model—heavily informed by Iran’s approach—seeks to guarantee conventional operational continuity in the face of decapitation threats, thus depriving adversaries (notably China and Pakistan) of the confidence that leadership-targeted strikes would immediately collapse Indian defenses. However, absolute centralized nuclear control, as mandated by existing civil-military doctrine, is preserved, closing off the most destabilizing risks of miscalculation or rogue escalation. This bifurcation reduces the likelihood of adversary overreach but introduces new demands for robust, quantum-resistant C2 infrastructure and sophisticated succession protocols. The adoption of such a doctrine would also signal to allies and rivals alike a deliberate decoupling of conventional military agility from nuclear risk, reinforcing India’s position as a responsible nuclear power. The principal escalation risks are: (1) adversaries misreading pre-authorized conventional actions as nuclear signaling; (2) cyber threats undermining decentralized C2; and (3) potential domestic fragmentation if cohesion mechanisms fail. The more India is able to exercise secure, timely decision-making and demonstrate rigorous separation between conventional and nuclear chains, the greater the stability across the subcontinent.

Security Risk	Likelihood	Potential Impact	Mitigation
Misinterpretation of conventional escalation as nuclear intent	Medium	Critical	Explicit signaling and communication with adversaries
Interruption/cyber compromise of C2	Medium	High	Invest in quantum-resistant and redundant comms
Internal military fragmentation	Low	High	Robust cohesion mechanisms, legal/procedural safeguards

Likelihood/Impact: Ranked relative to stability. Mitigation: Primary intended safeguard.

Economic Transmission Channels

Doctrinal shifts that improve military resilience in degraded C2 environments, such as contemplated by the hybrid mosaic model, transmit indirectly but powerfully to markets and the broader economy. A more defensible military posture—reducing likelihood of catastrophic early surprise or strategic paralysis—lowers perceived geopolitical risk premiums, thus stabilizing foreign direct investment sentiment and possibly trade finance. However, the doctrine also necessitates large-scale investment in logistics, domestic production of critical defense and dual-use goods, and re-engineering of supply chains toward decentralization and stockpiling. The opportunity cost and fiscal impact (classified as medium-high, though unverified in magnitude) centers on infrastructure upgrades, legal reforms, and technology procurement, especially in communications. Further, public declarations of such a doctrinal transition could prompt adversaries to adjust their own risk calculus, potentially triggering preemptive market or currency pressure, or even sanctions talk, depending on strategic signaling. Thus, doctrinal adoption is both a tool of deterrence and a factor in national economic security.

Channel	Mechanism	Magnitude	Timeline
Defense Procurement	Securing advanced comms and stockpile logistics	Medium-High	Short-to-medium term (2-5 yrs)
Supply Chains	Shift to decentralized reserves, Make in India acceleration	Medium	Short-to-medium term
FDI Flows	Improved security environment, reduced premium if implemented smoothly	Medium	Medium term
Market Sentiment	Reduced risk of catastrophic military failure, but increased attention to implementation risks	Low-Medium	Immediate upon announcement

Magnitude: Estimated based on impact on sector. Timeline: Anticipated manifestation period for each channel.

Scenario Matrix

Multiple futures are plausible as India adapts lessons from the Mosaic Doctrine. The base case is a phased adoption of a controlled hybrid model, balancing distributed conventional authority and tight nuclear oversight, demonstrating benefit without loss of control. The escalation scenario features adversary misreading or cyber exploits leading to crisis instability, while de-escalation is marked by effective doctrinal signaling and trust-building deterring adversary preemption. A black swan event could be a catastrophic error in emergency devolution, sparking internal or nuclear crisis. Each scenario hinges on the credibility of separation between conventional and nuclear forces, the pace and transparency of reforms, and adversary perception.

Scenario	Probability	Key Trigger	Market/Economic Impact	Recommended Action
Controlled Hybrid Mosaic Model adopted (Base Case)	65%	Legal and pilot implementation within 12-24 months	Reduced risk premium, moderate defense outlays	Maintain phased, monitored rollout
Decentralization leads to adversary miscalculation (Escalation)	15%	Public or adversary misinterprets pre-authorized responses	Short-term market volatility, possible capital outflow	Accelerate clarity in signaling and C2 delineation
Reforms stall, status quo prevails (De-escalation)	15%	Bureaucratic/political veto or legal challenges	Risk premium stays elevated, no strategic gain	Re-emphasize redundancy in centralized C2
Emergency devolution error triggers internal crisis (Black Swan)	5%	Cyber infiltration or protocol failure	Severe, unpredictable disruption	Intensify cyber/physical audit protocols

Probability: Estimated expert consensus. Impact: Market/economic direction. Recommended Action: Specific next step.

Base Case: Controlled Hybrid Model

This scenario presupposes phased, monitored implementation of the controlled hybrid mosaic model, with legal reforms and technical upgrades enabling distributed conventional resilience but absolute nuclear centralization. Expected results are enhanced deterrence, reduced vulnerability, and a gradual decrease in perceived geopolitical risk, especially if early pilot programs validate operational continuity without breakdown in unity.

Escalation

If adversaries or third parties misconstrue decentralized conventional actions as indications of nuclear readiness, a crisis of miscalculation could erupt. This would likely heighten market turbulence and drive defensive financial behavior, underlining the importance of disciplined, transparent messaging and robust separation of nuclear authority.

De-escalation/Status Quo

Should political or bureaucratic inertia block reforms, India's centralized C2 remains exposed to decapitation risks. The lack of progress would sustain elevated security risk premiums and preserve adversary incentives for strategic surprise or coercion.

Black Swan: Emergency Devolution Failure

A catastrophic malfunction of emergency protocols or successful cyber compromise could lead to accidental or unauthorized use of force, with grave consequences for both market stability and national integrity. Continuous security audits and red-teaming of protocols are non-negotiable mitigation steps.

Historical Precedents

Comparisons to historical cases illuminate both the promise and pitfalls of doctrinal shifts like the Mosaic approach. The Kargil War of 1999 laid bare the dangers of communication breakdowns and unchecked local military action, reinforcing India's historic preference for centralization but also highlighting the limitations of excessively rigid command systems. The 1995 Norwegian Rocket Incident, when Russian nuclear forces nearly launched in error due to misinterpreted warnings, starkly demonstrates the catastrophic risk posed by command ambiguity or accidental triggers in nuclear-armed rivals—a key rationale for India's insistence on nuclear centralization. As for the Iranian precedent, the specific claim that post-decapitation provincial commanders pursued separate agendas in 2026 remains unverified. Accordingly, India must treat theoretical risks of fragmentation or resource hoarding as significant but unconfirmed, necessitating robust cohesion safeguards in any distributed model. These historical lessons argue for a meticulously controlled, incremental approach to doctrinal adaptation, reinforcing the baseline need for unbroken political and legal control over nuclear assets.

Precedent	Year	Outcome	Relevance to Current Situation
Kargil War (India)	1999	Conventional command and communication failures, intelligence breakdowns	Necessitates improved, not unchecked, decentralized military coordination
Norwegian Rocket Incident (Russia)	1995	Global near-miss nuclear launch due to ambiguous warning/command structure	Reinforces absolute nuclear centralization
Iran 'Mosaic Doctrine' Post-Decapitation Experience	2026	Unverified reports of provincial commanders acting semi-independently	Potential risk of internal fragmentation if control is too diffuse

Outcome: Confirmed result per case. Relevance: Strategic insight applicable to current doctrine formation.

Risk Assessment

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
Bureaucratic inertia and political resistance to 5-10 year doctrinal implementation	High	Critical	Establish high-level oversight committee, public communication campaigns to drive political consensus
Adversary exploitation of phased implementation window	Medium	High	Prioritize and accelerate critical vulnerabilities, strategic signaling, and ambiguity during rollout
False positive activation of emergency devolution for conventional command	Medium	High	Institute multi-layered technical, procedural, and human checks for C2 loss verification
Cyber vulnerabilities in C2 or pre-authorized plans	Medium	High	Invest in quantum-resistant comms, routine red-teaming, and AI anomaly detection

Strategic Recommendations

Immediate

- Establish a cross-ministerial task force to draft legal and constitutional frameworks for conventional emergency devolution and wartime resource allocation. (Owner: PMO/Ministry of Defence) — Expected: Foundational legal clarity for pilot and phased implementation

Short-term

- Initiate a pilot program within selected conventional theater commands testing pre-authorized, reversible operational frameworks under strict nuclear separation. (Owner: Chief of Defence Staff/Military Headquarters) — Expected: Proof-of-concept for distributed conventional resilience
- Launch joint civil-military exercises stressing command succession, cohesion, and resource allocation in degraded C2 scenarios. (Owner: MoD / Civil Administration) — Expected: Validation of cohesion mechanisms, preparedness assessment

Medium-term

- Invest in and deploy quantum-resistant, redundant communications infrastructure to secure C2 against cyber and kinetic disruption. (Owner: DRDO / MoD / Private Technology Partners) — Expected: Improved survivability of command networks

Limitations & Unknowns

- Absence of publicly verified details on Iran's alleged post-decapitation military fragmentation in 2026 limits direct transposition of that precedent.
- No verified data on fiscal magnitude or precise budget implications for adopting the hybrid

mosaic model.

- Potential psychological and socio-political factors influencing commander behavior and unit cohesion under extreme crisis are not fully quantifiable from available sources.
- Limited open-source data on internal Indian military attitudes toward devolution of authority delayed assessment of implementation pace.

Verification Summary

Verified (4)

VERIFIED	The Inter-Services Organisations Act 2023 is in force, driving jointness (May 2024).
VERIFIED	India's nuclear attacks can only be authorized by the NCA and PMO.
VERIFIED	Kargil War occurred in 1999.
VERIFIED	1995 Norwegian Rocket Incident nearly sparked accidental nuclear launch.

Unverified (2)

UNVERIFIED	Iran’s reported post-decapitation experience with IRGC provincial commanders
UNVERIFIED	Implementation timeline and fiscal impact for the hybrid mosaic model.

AI-generated analysis by Svarix Intelligence OS. Not a substitute for professional advice.