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6.1 Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar’s Views on Defence and Foreign Policy:

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar inherited the military courage both from his maternal and also his paternal source. He had always taken keen interest in Defence and security affairs. As a young man he had joined the Baroda State Forces as a Lieutenant. He had to leave his job because his father was seriously ill and soon died on 2 February 1913. (Longer V. 1980.P.29) Towards the end of July 1941, the Viceroy expanded his Executive Council and set up Defence Advisory Committee. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar appointed in Defence Advisory Committee and takes active interest in the Defence matter and propounded militarisation programs in the country and attended the various session of the National Defence Council.

After the second war started on 3 September 1939 due to the invasion of Poland by Nazi Germany Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar appeal to government to take steps to prepare Indians for defending their country. He reminded the British government how they had agreed at the Round Table Conference that the Defence of India was to be treated as the responsibility of India. He advocated introduction of compulsory military training for all persons within certain age group. Recruitment of the standing army must be open to all communities. Commenting
on the second world war Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar remarked that it was not altogether a war for the division of world territories but was also a revolution which demanded a fundamental change in terms of associated life, between man and man, nation and nation. He further remarked that it was a revolution, which called for the reorientation of the values of associated life. Victory over Nazism would put an end to the nazi order. Under it liberty was lost equality denied and fraternity purged as a pernicious doctrine. It was actually an order of hatred, war and enmity. To him the victory over such evil forces was freedom and equality to other people and a new order of society to all. In this sense, he supported a war that means, Independence, liberty and equality, a good government and a just society for preserving new values of life. Nazism had greatly degraded and disparaged man. It was against this degradation that he stood for. He said “war cannot be abolished by merely refusing to fight when attacked, to abolish war you must win war and establish a just peace” (Kuber W.N. 1991. P236)

After evaluation of India’s Defence policy from independence, India does not have a Defence policy with welldefined aims and objectives, nor does it have a Defence philosophy to achieve these. Various estimates and Defence committees of the parliament have rightly been censuring India’s Defence planners for ‘adhocism’ in decision making and the absence of a Defence policy based on a national security doctrine. India does not have a system of direct military advice by professionals to their political masters. All advice does not have to filter through generalists most of whom are unfamiliar with matters concerning Defence
nor do they have the ability to scrutinize the functioning of India’s military machine. To consideration above evaluation Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar was rightly pointed out for militarization program for youth and awareness of security issues for unity and integrity of India.

6.1.1 Military Education:

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar advocated compulsory military education for Indian youth for awareness of defence and security matter to younger generation and create administrative and discipline for development and protection of country. Some of the Indian State realised the importance of military education for the purpose of discipline in the youths and to foster national fillings and values among the youths for the rest of their life. This system is already in existence in many strong and powerful nations.

6.1.2 The Need for the Second Capital:

India has always had two capitals, during the Moghal and British period. During the Moghal period India had Delhi as one capital and Srinagar in Kashmir as another capital when British came they too had two capitals one was Calcutta and another was Simla. Even they left Calcutta for Delhi they retained Simla as their summer capital. Dr. Ambedkar given strategic importance to second capital at Hyderabad to remove gap between south vs. north and Delhi is a vulnerable place. It is within bombing distance of the neighboring countries. Dr. Ambedkar suggested Hyderabad, Secunderabad and Bolarum should be constituted into a
chief commissioner's province and made a second capital of India. Hyderabad fulfills all the requirements of a capital for India and it equi-distance to all states.

6.1.3 Defence Policy:

National strategy covers all aspects of a nation’s life and living. It is composed of internal and external strategies national security strategy is a subset of national strategy, and also has internal and external dimensions. The internal elements would be defence against terrorism, subversion and insurgency; the external elements would be defence against external aggression and coping with the threats of coercive diplomacy. The internal aspects of national security strategy would need integrated planning by the Ministers of home affairs, defence and external affairs as well as some neighbouring countries use sponsored insurgency and terrorism in lieu of war for achieving their foreign policy goals. As far as external strategies are concerned, defence and foreign affairs are two sides of the same coin. The strategies would cover policy and capacity creation for the achievement of the missions assigned to security strategy by national strategy. This also involves the preparation of a whole spectrum of scenarios within the span of its scenarios. India’s defence policy, in a wider sense, would encompass the economic, industrial and technological base as capability analysis, the stability of the socio-cultural and political system as the operative dimension, and the relevance of diplomacy for the determination of national security.
6.1.3.1 Phases of Defence Policy:

In the initial years since independence, almost until 1962, India adopted the Nehruvian formula of defence through diplomacy (Thakkar Usha, 1999, P.263). The Nehruvian model of development was based on the logic of defence through development. The 1962 Indo-China war realized that the reassessment of the defence policy. Indian government concerns about military capability and attention shifted to the development of a military capability. The Indo-Pakistan war of 1971 and the success achieved in East Pakistan provided a rationale for the shift from a policy of defence through diplomacy to defence through military capability. First nuclear test at Pokharan of nuclear capability further confirmed this trend.

6.1.3.2 Defence Policy from 1971 to 1990:

The 1980s witnessed the beginning of changes in the international security environment. Several changes are identifiable in the decade a problem emerges about internal socio-politico cultural security problem, and slow shift towards new economic policy and globalization, liberalization, and growing relevance of dual use technologies. Internal security emerged as major challenges to the unity and integrity to Indian nation state. Punjab and later Kashmir brought the problem of national security to the heartland from the otherwise peripheral are of northeast India. This phase also saw a remarkable spurt in the dual use sector. The Integrated missile development program started in 1983. The nuclear field saw expansion and consolidation of facilities.
6.1.3.3 Defence Policy from 1990 to 2002:

After the collapse of Soviet Union and East European revolution of 1989 and due to advancement science and information technology changes have taken place in the understanding of the concept of power and ideology. The old pattern of logic that the military capability was the ultimate and perhaps the exclusive source of power has given way to the recognition of other imperatives like economic status and technological advancement. Today in the 21st centuries economic capability technology advancement and military capability are the sources of world to become world power.

6.1.3.4 Problems of Defence Policy:

The problem of understanding the Indian defence policy in specific terms, as raised in the context of the estimate committee report, remains unanswerable. Various estimates and defence committees of the Parliament have rightly been censuring India’s defence planners for ‘adhocism’ in decision-making and the absence of a defence policy based on a national security doctrine. (Modhak V.K.: 1998, P.117).

They have also stressed the need for reorganization of the ministry of defence. They have observed that decisions are not taken after an in depth analyses or consideration of a whole range of options. Indian defence policy has to be made by the Defence Minister and Ministry of Defence and not by the chief of staff who merely provide inputs, currently, whatever operational plans and policies are in vogue are prepared by the Chief of Staff assisted by the defence planning staff.
(DPS). This is an unsatisfactory arrangement. Besides India's defence plans are not integrated with the national planning through the planning commission. A 15 year-perspective plan for the defence forces not devoted into national planning has no meaning, with every major weapon system imported from abroad and some produced under license, and with manpower the only indigenous weapon. Further India's defence capability depends on the nation's total potential and not merely on men in uniform or what the government-run defence unit can produce. Again, with over three dozen laboratories, it does not need 30 odd directorates in the R&D to monitor with the service headquarters. This can only result in thousands of scientists remaining engaged in pushing files, meanwhile, the country is told that enough is not being spent on R & D although its budget has increased by a factor of 300 over the last 25 years.

Constitution of India gives various powers to the government of India to use the armed forces for to maintain internal or external threat from enemy and international peace keeping purpose. However, in the U.S., the President can employ the armed forces for six days under powers Act and no more, after which he must seek congressional approval. Therefore it is time that we in India too thought of similar restrictions and the need for Parliamentary endorsement by at least two-thirds majority. When the government wants to continue the employment of armed forces beyond six days, or the country would continue to have cases like the induction of the IPKF in Sri Lanka without any restraints.
Statement made by the former Prime Minister and defence minister Narasimha Rao in the parliament, Today, India does not have a document called defence policy it is not available in the Ministry of Defence or in the service headquarters either. Can the nation accept such a situation? There is much useful work to be done where defence is concerned. Obviously, foreign and defence policies should be complementary to achieve India national aim within its national doctrine formulated by the cabinet. And this should in all fairness, be debated in the parliament before finalization. In the last 55 years of our independence India has been involved in the international peacekeeping and use of force in defence her own interest. In addition, the Indian armed forces have played a significant role in the preservation of India’s internal security and unity. Today the Indian armed forces in terms of manpower are the third largest in the world.

However, those who spoke about defence policy in the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha did not always distinguish between defence policy, defence management and defence operations (Subramanyam K.: 1972, P.6). In a nutshell, the aims and objectives of India’s defence policy can be summarized as follows. The defence policy has to cope with treats both from Pakistan and China and to blunt their designs for mischief in Kashmir and the Northeast, so that Kashmir does not become another Vietnam nor does the Northeast fragment and turn into another Bosnia. Thus, India defence philosophy is modeled on the concept of prevention of war and removal of the causes of war with a strong military deterrent including a second strike nuclear capability to achieve all this besides a
major change in India's attitude from a compromising and a reactive one and restructuring of higher defence organization as well as the Ministry of Defence.

6.2 Policies for External Security and Foreign Relations:

Foreign and defence policies are inexorably inter-linked. It is difficult to say what take priority - which should be dealt with diplomatically, Military or by imposing economic sanction? All option has to support each other. Foreign and defence policy interrelated to each other.

After the independence of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru adopted the foreign policy which has various objectives i.e. peace, non-alignment, elimination of racial discrimination, respect for each other, territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in each others internal affairs, equality and mutual benefits and peaceful co-existence. India's foreign policy according to Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar was based on peace co-existence between communism and free democracy and opposition to SEATO. (Rajya Sabha Debates: 1954, P.469)

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar states that, "If you want parliamentary government, you must be friendly with the countries which are trying to defend this form of rule against attack". (The Times of India, 22 April 1954)

He argued that the foreign policy of India has not solved our problems. He remarked, "the key note of our foreign policy is to solve the problems of the other countries and not to solve the problems of our own" (Rajya Sabha Debates, 26th August 1954.). According to Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Panchsheel was an
essential part of Buddhist religion. He remarked that if Mao had any faith in the Panchsheel he certainly would treat the Buddhist in his own country in a better way. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar was not a pacifist. He wanted to protect his country and make her prepared for war if she attacked. To him the submission to wrong and surrender to evil was cowardice. It was against one’s self respect and dignity. He did not oppose peace if peace was just and honorable. Free and peaceful living of the nations was the principle underlying his concept of international relationship. It meant the creative effort of adjusting the worn machinery of democracy to the existing conditions of scientific society. According to him the vital problem in international relation particularly before the free nations of the world was the expansion of communism referring to the principle of the peace he said, “we want peace. Nobody wants war”. The only question what is the price for this? At what price we are purchasing this peace? (Kuber, W.N. 1991, P.240).

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar foreign policy, philosophy was based on Pro-Anglo American’s, anti-Soviet, Pro-SEATO and against non-alignment policy of India. The coexistence between parliamentary democracy and communism was a myth to him.

6.2.1 Thoughts on Pakistan and Kashmir:

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar was not only Dalit leaders or social worker, or economist, he was really strategic thinker, security expert he gave thought and plans to solve the problem of Kashmir issue. He stated in his book, “Pakistan or
partition in India”. The brotherhood of Islam was not the universal brotherhood of man. It was brotherhood of Muslims for Muslim only. According to him, what the Muslim were asking for was the creation of administrative areas which were ethnically, more homogeneous. The Muslims wanted these homogeneous administrative areas, which were predominantly Muslim to be constituted into separate nation and desired to have a national homeland. According to Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, nationalism in relation to a nation should to be based fundamentally on a strong feeling of social unity, and nationalism in relation to internationalism should be founded on human brotherhood. He emphasized that nationalism should not be tyranny and menace to any other community and country. Dr. Ambedkar defines nationality meant, “Consciousness of kind, awareness of the existence of that tie of kinship” and nationalism meant, “the desire for a separate national existence for those who are bound by this tie of kinship”. (Govt. of Maharashtra : 1990, P.30)

There cannot be nationalism without the feeling of nationality being in existence. Nationality did not in all cases produce nationalism.

a) It was a dynamic expression of the desire to live as a nation.

b) There must be territory which nationalism could occupy and make it a state, as well as a cultural home of the nation.

According to him, a community had a right to safeguard, but on the contrary, a nation had a right to demand separation. Muslims had developed a will to live as a nation. History showed that the theory of nationality was embedded in
the democratic theory of the sovereignty of the will of a people. Dr. Babasaheb considered the question of defence in their major factors. 1) Questions of frontiers 2) Questions of resources and 3) Questions of armed forces.

Pakistan would not have a scientific border. But he contended that no country had a scientific border. It was no use insisting that any particular boundary was the safest. He maintained that modern technique had robbed natural frontiers of much of their former importance. Artificial fortification could be created as barriers. The resources of Hindustan were far greater than the resources of Pakistan. So he concluded that the creation of Pakistan would not leave Hindustan in a weakened conditions. (Kuber. W.N.: 1991, P191)

According to Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar he gave thought on Kashmir issue which have ideological and historical base he says that, " give the Hindu and Buddhist part to India. We are really not concerned with the Muslim part of Kashmir. It is a matter between Muslims of Kashmir and Pakistan. They may decide the issue, as they like. Or if you like, divide it into three parts. The cease-fire zones the valley and Jammu-Ladakh region and has a plebiscite only in the valley. What I am afraid is that in the proposed plebiscite which is to be an overall plebiscite the Hindus and Buddhist of Kashmir are likely to be dragged into Pakistan against their wishes and we may have to face the same problems as we are facing today in East Bengal. (Govt. of Maharashtra : 1990, P.1322)

However, Dr. Babasaheb argued that the possibility of Hindu-Muslim unity was based on two premises a) General belief in the efficacy of a central
government to mould a diverse set of people into one nation and (2) The general feeling that the satisfaction of Muslim demands would be a sure means of achieving Hindu-Muslim unity. Dr. Ambedkar summarized the action and reactions of the political forces during the three decades and analyzed in three ways: a) social stagnation b) communal aggression c) National frustration of political destiny. Dr. Ambedkar regarded the social reform movement but he felt sorry that it was not seen in Muslim Community.

There was no organized movement for social reform among them. Under these circumstances the Muslim community became stagnant. The basis of the politics of Muslims politicians was rivalry and continued rivalry, which marred the social progress of the Muslim community. The Hindu-Muslim conflict as the basis of politics was an accepted fact during the thirties of the twentieth century. Though the spirit of independence was growing the communal bitterness was also growing. According to Ambedkar Pakistan rested upon the distinction between a community and a nation: a community has a right to safeguard; a nation has a right to demand separation. So the two-nation theory had the justification of demanding separation from Hindus. According to him, there was the virus of dualism in the two-nation theory. He remarked, “it is a positive disintegration of society and country”. By adopting Pakistan as the goal, the Muslims had forgotten the struggle against British. Self-determination meant right to establish a form of government in accordance with the wishes of the people. According to Ambedkar, “it has meant the right to obtain national independence from an alien race
irrespective of the form of government". The claim of Pakistan was said to be founded on the principle of self-determination.

The self-determination must be by the people. The Muslim League for the benefit of India claimed the demand of self-determination. At the same time, the league was opposed to self-determination being applied to Palestine. The principle of self-determination had not imperative character because, "self determination is not a universal principle of all". It was not absolute at all. It was to be considered in the light of many factors like language, religion, land and geographical elements. According to Ambedkar there were two methods of protecting the minorities. One was to provide safeguards for minorities and the other was to provide for the transfer of Hindu population from Pakistan. If the boundaries of the Punjab and Bengal were redrawn the question of transfer of population would come in a marked way. Dr. Ambedkar gave various example i.e. Turkey, Greece, Bulgaria. The transfer of minorities was the only lasting remedy for communal peace. The only way to make India homogenous was to arrange for exchange of population untill this is done the problem of Hindu-Muslim would remain and would continue to produce disharmony in the politic of India. He said that the question of transfer of population could be successfully tackled by a commission with equal members of both countries.

India’s future security will be determined by the way it manages the threats posed by its two closely aligned regional adversaries, China and Pakistan. Because of the close partnership between the two and their history of jointly
working against. Indian interests, the regional military equation pits India against these powerful regional adversaries not separately but jointly. No other Nation is placed in such a hostile regional environment. In fact, India is the only country, which shares disputed lands border with two nuclear-armed neighbours that has a long record of close strategic collaboration. India can only deal with this uniquely adverse situation by combining strong defence with innovative diplomacy and countervailing strategic partnerships.

As far as India’s security is concerned, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar thought of internal and external security and has given more emphasis by providing several strategies and models to keep India integrated and built into a strong nation-state. His contributions in this respect is inimitable. His ideas on nation building through economic policies, through integrating deprived section of the society including women are seems to basic key for the secure India. The hetrogenious society of India need to be integrated further to develop into a cohesive one, by his language formula/model, practising unique model of unitary-federal structure, for which he has given explicit reasoning in the Constitution.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar was very definite in his ideas onto provide necessary provisions for political stability in India, and also he was ardent advocate to make centre stronger for the long term political stability and to curtail regionalism and separatist tendencies. Therefore, while making the draft of the constitution, he has carefully and very strategically formulated the nature of
Indian federalism, which is totally different than federalism per se. His thoughts on India's foreign policy seems to be very pragmatic, as he cautioned about China's intention and advocated for friendship with the democratic governments in the West. More importantly, compulsory military education to the youths of India is a necessity to build strong India and to foster the integration were the significant thoughts of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar on India's national security.

6.2.2 India's Foreign Policy:

Security policy in a wider sense encompasses the economic, industrial and technological base, the cohesiveness of the socio-cultural structure; the resilience and stability of the political system and the efficacy of diplomacy. There is a need to add the Military capability approach to the security policy with factors like social development, diplomacy and science and technology. There is also the need to realize the linkage between domestic policy and national security policy. An important aspect of this linkage is the factor of cost. A national security policy ultimately rests on ruling political party or political decision about the role that the nation is to play in international politics. (K. Subramanyam: 1972, PP. 8-9).

The decade of the 1990's has seen a profound transformation in the international security environment today the cold war has ended. We are no longer faced with two opposing military alliances with their gigantic nuclear arsenals in a state of high alert. The threat perceptions of North Atlantic treaty organization (NATO) and Warsaw pact forces as implacable adversaries, seen through an ideological prism, are a thing of the past. As profound changes have occurred
between two former adversaries, there is no hope that multilateral institutions like the UN would be revitalized to assume the mantle of collective security. New regional organizations, such as the organization for security and cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) have emerged. Existing organization like North Atlantic treaty organization also are seeking to redefine their role in trying to tackle existing and future challenges.

It is natural that India’s immediate neighbourhood should be a major priority in India’s security considerations. A peaceful and constructive environment in our neighbourhood is important for all of us. If we are to achieve accelerated development for ourselves and for the region as a whole. The South region accounts for roughly one fourth of all humanity. If this region is to establish its rightful place in the community of all firmly established as the basis of intra south Asian- SAARC neighbourhood Central Asia world’s richest known deposits of hydrocarbon resources. We need enduring partnerships with the countries of this region by setting up mission in all these countries to promote political, economic, science and technological co-operation. Developments on the security front in central Asia too are a concern for us. We are observing the developments in Afghanistan and our earnest desire is for an end to external interference in that country followed by a return of peace.

Today in the age of globalization interdependence among all countries in the world, to tackle non-conventional and non-military threats arising out of international terrorism, narcotics, ethnic conflicts, fundamentalism, environmental, pollution, natural disasters etc. all of which impinge upon the overall security of
A redefinition of old concept requires new thinking and fresh approaches. If we are to successfully deal with the challenges posed by an uncertain future more so, there is growing realization that what is needed is a collective approach based upon co-operation rather than competition and confrontation? (Gujral I.K., 1997, PP.2-6)

Ever since India became Independent in August 1947, it has faced military conflicts, including the recent war like Kargil conflict with Pakistan and one war with China. India thus faces serious security threats from China and Pakistan. In recent years, more than posing a direct military threat, china continues to represent a challenge to India’s role in South Asia. China has also softened its stand on Kashmir issue and China helped Pakistan in developing its nuclear weapon capability is well documented. Its recent supply of M-11 missiles has disturbing implications for India. China supplied arms worth 1.6 billion dollars to Mynamar and its help in constructing of naval and electronic facilities and modernization of its naval bases are also of concern to India.

Ever since the partition in 1947, India and Pakistan have been in a state of uneasy peace conditioned by the problems between them. The problem related to properties of the minorities, canal water, controversies over projects on the Eastern Rivers, Siachin, navigation projects/water barrage and Sir creek India has to tried to solve these problems by peaceful means but Pakistan creating problems in Kashmir has basically disturb the atmosphere. Even Pakistan faces serious internal threat from large-scale ethnic clashes between Shia and Sunni sects. Pakistan fabricated Islamic identity in the international forum and encouraged ascendency
of religious fundamentalism. ISI activities in various parts of Indian states, proliferation of small arms and drug trafficking within Pakistan poses serious threats to India’s national security.

India’s relations with Bangladesh, Nepal and Sri Lanka have witnessed significant ups and downs in the past. India has invariably attempted to maintain good relation with Bangladesh and solving the mutual problems bilaterally. Some of the contentious issues bedeviling Indo-Bangladesh relations are Farrakka Barrage, migration of chakma tribals from chittagong Hill tracts, New Moore islands, demarcation of boundary, infiltration and Tin Bigha corridor. Inspite of India’s sincere intentions and best efforts to maintain the friendly relation with her neighbours, she has not been able to maintain the desired tension-free relations. The emergence of Bangladesh was an event of major importance on the sub continent. In the name of Islam or safeguarding Muslim identity, Pakistan or Bangladesh may create security-related problems for India. American President’s recent visit to Bangladesh has strategic significance and ought to be reckoned by India while contemplating threats to national security. The Buddhist kingdom of Bhutan has sought to use its geographic inaccessibility to protect its cultural heritage. India renegotiated the British-Bhutan treaty of 1910 in 1950. It would be in India’s interest to maintain cordial relations with Bhutan.

Bhutan became a member of the UN in 1971 and the NAM in 1979 with Indian support. At China’s insistence, direct negotiations were held between her and Bhutan to solve the boundary disputes. Efforts by China to draw Bhutan in her orbit have necessarily been viewed with concern by India.
Chinese interests in Mynamar also worry to India. China attempts to gain maritime rights in Mynamar would provide easier access to the Bay of Bengal which would again threaten Indian security. India’s relations with Sri Lanka have been generally marked with cordiality. She has played significant role in bringing to an end the ethnic conflict. However, continued conflict between LTTE and Sri Lankan Armed forces spills over to Indian states in the South and has security implications. In present context Sri Lanka ethnic crisis showed not totally shy off from Sri Lankan development. There is no scope for military solution to the problem of LTTE. Sri Lankan Government should take all necessary steps for eradication of nation inequalities in the field of language, education, race and culture. Sri Lanka's survival as a united entity will always be the permanent interest of India.

The South Asian region itself poses threats to various dimensions of India’s national security as perceived by the Indian strategies. These challenges could be broadly classified in two categories, military non-military with Pakistan would like to create further Kargil like situations in future for India. Apart from such military threats, we should plan for meeting a vast spectrum of non-military threats. The non-military threats to Indian national security revolves around drug trafficking, introduction of illegal arms, landmines, transnational terrorism, poverty, population, energy need, sustainable development, resource constraints, water security, food security and population security.

***
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