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CHAPTER VII

CONSEQUENCES OF NON-IMPLEMENTATION OF SECURITY POLICIES OF DR. BABASAHEB AMBEDKAR

The international system has undergone fundamental change since the end of the cold war. At the same time former notions of military security has been replaced with internal threats of militant, nationalistic movements and the social costs of economic globalization. There are some fundamental contradictions in the strategic interest of India. This has particularly made the non-military dimensions of security the major factor affecting the security problems in India. The fundamental shift in security perceptions that has been observe in recent decades is the transition from Military threats to non military threats include ethnic cleansing, violation of human right, religious fanaticism secessionist, activities etc.

Today our nation is so engrossed with terrorism, separatism, communalism, provincialism, nepotism, poverty, corruption, unemployment, dearness and inequality that very stream of development has been hindered. It was been effecting the thinking of citizens so much so that the anti-national forces are becoming more active than loyal forces. That is why there is great danger to the India’s national security. For unity and security of India Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar propounded various policies/ideas and suggest various policies to the government of India, but government of India not adopted his policies that point of view we
must analyzed what are consequences of non-implementation of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar’s policies. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar is remembered in India with great pride and honour. His progressive and influential personality was multifaceted. He played a vital role in building a strong nation state. His life and philosophy are a document of his struggle for human right. He laid great stress on the three principles of equality, liberty and fraternity. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar wanted to change and revolutionize the society with his ideals.

According to model taken for this research work following are three major policies which are directly related to contemporary problems of India’s national security. But government of India did not adopt following policies:

1) Defence policy:

2) Policies for external security and foreign relation:

3) Policies for regional integration:

7.1 Non-implemented Defence Policy:

As suggested by Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, Indian Prime Minister did not took seriously the cautious stand with the communist China, the consequences were very losty that India had to face China debacle in December 1962. Secondly, as advocated by Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, India’s foreign policy and defence policy never in consonant with the Western Democratic countries on the name of Non-Allignment. The result was that, the western dominant power, i.e. USA never considered India a safe partner in the strategic planning; and India could not able
to gain much from the USA. On the contrary, USA always been very indifferent with India on many crucial occasions.

1) Compulsory military education.

2) India need the second capital

7.1.1 Compulsory Military Education: Consequences of Non-implementation

The constitutional commitments to the universalization of primary school education and to equality of opportunities for education are motivated by the conviction the schooling is a basic human right. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar advocated that compulsory education for all children’s up to the age of 14 and he also advocated compulsory military education for youth within certain age group.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar had vision if we made compulsory military education for youth then it would create new work culture with awareness of security issues among youth generation and they would attract towards military aspects contemporary problems of National and International security.

7.1.2 India Need the Second Capital :A Neglected Security Policy

Since the departure of the British, India had only one capital and that is New Delhi before the British, India has always had two capitals. During the Moghal period, India had Delhi as one capital and Shrinagar in Kashmir as another
capital. When the British came they too had two capitals, one was Calcutta and another was Simla. Even when they left Calcutta for Delhi they retained Simla as their summer capital. According to Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar strategic thoughts Delhi is vulnerable place. It is within bombing distance of the neighbouring countries. Although India is trying to live in peace with its neighbors it cannot be assumed that Indian will not have to face war sometime or other and if war comes, the government of India will have to leave Delhi and find another place for its location. Which the place to which the government of India can migrate? A place that one can think of is Calcutta. But Calcutta is also within bombing distance from Tibet or China. Although India and China today are friends, how long the friendship would last no one can definitely say? The possibility of conflict between India and China remains. In that point of view Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar rejected Calcutta as another capital. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar also rejected Bombay as second capital because our Indian Navy is too poor to protect the country. If it comes down to Bombay Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar suggested south preferably in the city of Hyderabad. Hyderabad fulfills all the requirements of a capital for India, Hyderabad is equidistant to all states. From the Defence point of view it would give safety to the central government. It would give satisfaction to the south Indian people that their government is some times with them. The government may remain in Delhi during winter months and during other months it can stay in Hyderabad.
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar also gave the following table for proving relevance and strategic aspects from given table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>FROM DELHI</th>
<th>FROM HYDRABAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Bombay</td>
<td>798 miles</td>
<td>440 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Calcutta</td>
<td>868 miles</td>
<td>715 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Madras</td>
<td>1198 miles</td>
<td>330 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Patiala</td>
<td>124 miles</td>
<td>990 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Chandigarh</td>
<td>180 miles</td>
<td>1045 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Lucknow</td>
<td>275 miles</td>
<td>770 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source- Govt. of Maharashtra 1979 vol. I P-171)

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar provided prudent thoughts / policy/ideas about Defence matter but government of India not adopted his ideas/policy. Following are some consequences, which are directly related to contemporary problems of India’s national security.

1) India is the only country which shares disputed land borders with two-nuclear armed neighbours that have a long record of close strategic collaboration.

2) If India would have second caspital at Hyderabad than strategic or administrative result would be different.

3) Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar was an interested militarization programme for youth and to make military education compulsory for become strong nation state. But government of India not adopted his thoughts / ideas/ policy

Today lacks of compulsory military education, among Indian Youth, they are not aware about security or strategic issue. When Kargil episode had happened than nation aware about nationalism and Defence forces. If government adopted
compulsory military education after the independence may be result would be different.

4) Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar propounded policies there is need to interaction between bureaucrats and Defence personals.

Have clear and precisely Defence and security doctrine but unfortunately, after 55 years of independence there is no clear doctrine aim and objectives of Defence policy.

5) It is need to understand Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar thought in the area of national security

7.2 External Security and Foreign Relations: A Neglected Policy Option

The principal objective of India's foreign policy has been the establishment of friendly relations, co-operation in economic, socio-cultural and other areas, building common security consensus among neighbours and prevention of interference from extra regional powers. Yet the quality of her relationship varies in a background of highly complex and variables bilateral relationships. A country's change according to the needs of the changing world situation and the country's own requirements. This applies equally to India's foreign policy. With the end of the cold war and the consolidation of a new era of globalization Indian foreign policy has entered a period of deep uncertainty. From Independence Indian foreign policy shaped by six persons i.e. soldiers, diplomats bureaucrats politicians, policy oriented academics and journalists. This six persons everywhere talk about with their traditional preoccupations with external threats and their
emphases on strong military power and skilful diplomacy to which will be added strong concern with greater economic strength for the country. The new goals emerged after collapse of former Soviet Union i.e. Social cohesion, sustainable development, ecological problem the maintenance and strengthening of political liberty, the continuous movements towards a more egalitarian democratization elimination of external threats. The rise and growing strength of transnational economic agents, mechanism and Institution i.e. WTO, IMF, WB and international money markets with their astronomical levels of financial capital floes in central to the consolidation of neo-liberal economic system. The Indian state in it’s foreign policy will have to pay more attention than ever before to how it will intervene in the developing institutions of this global neo-liberal regime.

However, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar advocated idea’s/policies for India’s foreign policy with broad dimensions but government of India not adopted his policies which are relevant to global neo-liberal regime and contemporary problems of India’s national security. Following are suggestions by Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar for India’s foreign policy:

   a) Geographical factor

   b) Co-existence

   c) SEATO

   d) Panchsheel

   e) Kashmir
7.2.1 Geographical Factor:

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar had highlighted that “one must not forget that in the foreign policy of a country the geographical factor is the one of important factors. Each country foreign policy must vary with its geographical location in relation to the factor with which its dealing”. (Parliament Debate, P. 954)

7.2.2 Co-existence:

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar considered the adoption of the principle of co-existence is not quite proper for India, especially in view of our close geographical proximity to the communist countries. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar explain co-existence, “can communism and free democracy work together? Can they live together them? (Govt. Maharashtra 1997, P.878)

7.2.3 SEATO:

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar explaining his view on the strategic positions of the country. He stated that India had been completely encircled on one side by Pakistan and on the other by the Muslim countries. The barrier between Egypt and England had been removed by the handing over of the Suez Canal. “There might be very little difficulty in the Muslim countries joining with Pakistan and forming a block. On this side by allowing the Chinese to take possession of Lhasa, the Prime Minister had practically helped the Chinese to bring China close to the Indian border” Ambedkar complained. (Bharill Chandra, 1977, P.111).
7.2.4 Panchsheel:

Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar was Totally disagreeing with the Tibet treaty and the principles of PANCHSHEEL by the Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. He said that, “I am somewhat surprised that the Prime Minister should take this Panchsheel seriously, the Panchsheel, as you sir know it well, is the essential part of the Buddhist religion and if Mr. Mao had any faith in the Panchsheel he certainly would treat the Buddhist in his own country in a very different way. There is no room for Panchsheel in politics and secondly, not in the politics of communist country”. The communist countries have to well-known principles on which they always act on is that morality is always in a flux. There is no morality. Today morality is not tomorrow’s morality you can keep your word in accordance with the morality of today and you can break your word with equal justification tomorrows because tomorrows morality will be different. (Govt. of Maharashtra, 1997, P.882)

7.2.5 Kashmir:

The state of Jammu and Kashmir comprised province, the small state of Poonch, the gilgit agency in North West, including Hunza and Nagar, and Ladakh and Balistan down of Kashmir, comprising the above constituent units, covered an area of 83,25,859 miles. The area of the state and its longitude and latitude vary, though in a minor way in old records and documents. It was inhabited by Buddhists, Hindu, Muslims and Sikhs. It was predominantly a Muslim inhabitant area (Nath Birbal, 1998, P.9). Kashmir has an ancient history which shows that Kashmir came under the rule of Ashoka the great who founded the city of Srinagar
the discovery of Buddhist relics and edicts has led historians to conclude that Ashoka was the original founder of Srinagar.

As per the Indian Independence act, the state of Jammu and Kashmir had acceded to India voluntarily because of ideological convergence between the freedom fighters of India and those of Jammu and Kashmir. Top Pakistani leaders tried to do their best to woo the people of Kashmir but, represented by eminent leadership, they decided to link their destiny with India. We have fought a war in 1947 because Pakistan aggressed and wanted to grab Kashmir by force. However their efforts were frustrated. But, before we could clear the aggressor from the entire territory of Jammu and Kashmir a cease-fire had come in and about 1/3^rd of the territory or so remained in the hands of Pakistan. (Rao Krishna K.V., 1996, P.194). Concurrently, when, we took up the issue with United Nations, after protracted discussion, two resolutions were passed which were accepted by both sides. And these envisaged certain vacate the aggression after the fulfilling this precondition, India was to reduce her forces and after that was achieved, a plebiscite was to be held under the auspices of the United Nations. However, since Pakistan did not vacate aggression till this day and has built up forces main-fold, compared with what she had on 1^st January 1949 at the time of the cease fire the other two steps could not be implemented i.e. India reducing her forced and a plebiscite under the auspicious of the United Nations. But despite that, Pakistan keeps harping on the issue of self-determination or plebiscite. Although the UN resolutions were
not implemented. India took steps to hold elections to a constituent assembly. Then the assembly drew up a constitution and based on the rest of country. The state of Jammu and Kashmir is the only state, which has a constitution of its own, and this derived from a special dispensation made in the National constitution under Article 370. Pakistan was not reconciled to this situation and therefore, aggressed twice more in 1965 and 1971, and again on both these occasions, her efforts were totally frustrated by India and the people of the state. At the end of each of these wars, we had agreements. Now once Pakistan got back her territories and provinces, she forget all about these agreements from 1971 to till date Pakistan started proxy war with India in May 1998 India and Pakistan became Nuclear weapons state.

In February 1999 Lahore declaration signed by the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan (Akbar M. K., 1999, P.61). After few months Kargil took place. Kargil did not happen overnight. It was a result of Pakistan’s increasing audacity over the years which largely flowed from India’s unwillingness to take the bull by its horns and give a befitting military response. (Sharma Rajeev, 1999, P.15)

However, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar had his own vision regarding Kashmir problem. When he given statement for his resignation he had explain various issues which was retaliated to security matter he did not agree with India’s foreign policy and stand taken by government of India regarding Kashmir issues.

He said, “Our quarrel with Pakistan is a part of our foreign policy about which I feels deeply dissatisfied. There are two grounds which have disturbed our
relation with Pakistan— one is Kashmir and the other is the condition of our people in west Bengal. I felt that we should be more deeply concerned with East Bengal where the condition of our people seems from all the newspapers intolerable than with Kashmir. Not withstanding this we have been staking our all on the Kashmir issue. Even then I feel that we have been fighting on an unreal issue. The issue on which we are fighting most of the time is who is right and who is wrong. The real issue to my mind is not who is right but what is right. Taking that to be the main question, my view has always been that the right solution is partition of Kashmir. Give the Hindu and Buddhist part to India and the Muslim part to Pakistan as we did in the case of India. We are really not concerned with the Muslim part of Kashmir. It is a matter between the Muslims of Kashmir and Pakistan. They may decide the issue as they like or if you like dividing it into three parts, the cease fire zone, the valley and the Jammu-Ladhak region and have a plebiscite only in the valley. What I am afraid of is that in the proposed plebiscite, which is to be an overall plebiscite, the Hindu 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 Maharastra, 1995, P.1332)

After evaluation of India’s foreign policy we can learn what are drawbacks in foreign policy. How government of India adopted foreign policy and what policies were suggested by Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar but adopted by government there are followings are consequences on India’s national security
1) India’s foreign policy has been facing continuous adverse criticism, because without well defined a geographical factor and national interest, India humiliated by China in 1962. Today China claims 90,000 sq. kms. Of territory in India’s eastern sector in Arunachal Pradesh.

In addition, it is in occupation of 38,000 sq.kms.of territory in Ladakh including Aksai chin 1000 sq.kms of Pok west of Karakoram pass given by Pakistan 30 Sq.kms. Wong Dong in Arunachal Pradesh and 40 Sq.kms. of Barahati grazing grounds in Uttar pradesh (Madhok V.K.1998.P.11)

2) According to Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, the Chinese possession of Tibet he accused the government of helping the Chinese to bring their border down to the Indian border, because government allowed the Chinese to take possession of Lhasa. Due to this mistake Chinese took possession of Tibet in 1950 which removed the buffer state between the two giants. The 1998 Indian nuclear tests calling China a bigger potential threats than Pakistan.

3) Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar said that, “If you want Parliamentary government, you must be friendly with the countries which are trying to defend this form of rule against attack”. We took distance from U.S.A. from independence. But today changes in geo-economic position to geostrategies and geopolitics we are trying to maintain well relation with U.S.A.

4) According to Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar he wanted to protect his country and make her prepared for war He argued that there is no place for ‘Panchsheel’ in
international politics only remain national interest due to lack of vision India’s defense expenditure were only 2% of GNP from 1947 to 1962.

4) Due to Kashmir problem we had three war with Pakistan and arm race have been increased in South Asia.

5) Due to Kashmir problem thousands of jawan and officers were killed in Kashmir

6) Due to Kashmir problem today Kashmir peoples demanding greater autonomy although Jammu and Kashmir already has sufficient autonomy.

7) Due to Kashmir problem Pakistan considers that Kashmir is the unfinished business of partition and is the core dispute between the countries

8) Due to Kashmir problem burden on Indian economy has been increasing.

9) South Asia becomes nuclear flashpoint.

Recently, some sections of society are demanding trifurcations of Jammu and Kashmir where as Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar had given solution on Jammu and Kashmir by partition of Jammu and Kashmir. But unfortunately Government of India did not adopt Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar’s policies related to security matter. Some of the leaders consider as he was only leader of depressed class and chief architect of Indian constitution although he was great strategic thinker, Security experts and he propounded prudent policies for external security and foreign relation but government of India not adopted his policies from independence it is right time to think and analyzed

Suggested policies of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar and adopt his policies for overall development, unity and security of India.
7.3 Policies for the Regional Integration: A Neglected Option

India is land of many diversities. Its population has crossed almost one billion. People speak different languages, each has its distinctive script and literary traditions and is spoken in dozens of dialects. In addition, there are seven major religions practiced. Each has several sects. Besides this, there are several tribal belief systems. The majority of the Indian population is Hindu (82%) but the populations following the other faiths are large enough to be politically and culturally significant.

Geographically, the country consists of three natural regions: the north, the Deccan, and the south, demarcated by a major river that flows from west to east across the peninsula. Within each of this region, history and geography have combined to create smaller linguistically, and politically defined domains with district identities. Over time, these identities have crystallized as boundaries of language and dialect, distinctive patterns of behavior, dress, craft, folklore, and traditions in literature, music, architecture and often traceable to the first centuries after Christ.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar had suggested policy for regional integration. He had vision as how to integrate such vast diverse population. He suggested smaller states for administrative purpose and official language of every province shall be the same as the official language of the central government. He argued that the main advantages of the scheme of linguistic provinces would make democracy work better than it would mix provinces. A linguistic provinces produces what
democracy needs, namely social homogeneity now the homogeneity of people depends there having belief in a common origin. In the possession of a common language and literature in their pride in a common historic tradition, community of social customs etc.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar statement on the formation of linguistic states that came as a critique of the report of the states Reorganization Commission. What the commission has created, according to him, is not a mere disparity between the states by leading U.P. and Bihar as they are but adding to them a new bigger Madhya Pradesh with Ragasthan. It creates a new political problem of the consolidated Hindi speaking North versus the Balkanized south. Considering the vast cultural differences between the two sectors and the apprehensions of dominance of the north articulated by the leaders of India’s of the south. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar predicts the threats to India’s unity and security. He observes that the commission should have followed the principle of One State One Language and not One language One State but unfortunately government of India not adopted his suggested policies.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar favours formation of unilingual states as against multilingual states for the very sound reasons that the former fosters the fellow felling which is the foundation of a stable and democratic state, while the latter with its enforced juxtaposition of two different linguistic groups leads to faction fights for leadership and discrimination in administration factors which are incompatible with democracy. His support for unilingual states is however
qualified by the condition that its official language shall be Hindi and until India becomes fit for this purpose, English shall continue. He foresees the danger of a unilingual state developing an independent nationality in its regional language is raised to the status of official language. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar remedy is to equal representation of the state in the central legislature irrespective of their area and population. In smaller state the proportion of majority to minority which in India is not political but communal and unchangeable decreases and the danger of the majority practicing tyranny over the minority is also minimized. The Indian state has successfully managed cultural diversity over a period of 50 years in which the country’s population crossed one billion many group, identities were strengthened through electoral process, Political awareness, increased with economic development. Today some section of society argued the larger Indian states needs to be divided into smaller, more culturally homogeneous units, Which will be more responsive to popular needs to provide better administration. India represents a plural society in which a variety of ethnic linguistic and religious groups co-exist in terms of varying co-operation and competition. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, while moving the draft constitution in the constituent assembly said that the form of constitution was federal. His concept of federalism meant that the state was a federation in peacetime, but unitary in emergency. He remarked that the constitution establishes a dual policy with the union at the Center and the states at the periphery. Each endowed with sovereign powers to be exercised in the fields assigned to them by the constitution. (Rao Shiva, 1968, P.422)
Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar suggested various policies for regional integration but government of India did not adopt his suggested policies therefore following are consequences, which are directly related to contemporary problem of India’s national security. Such as misuse of Article 356, Regional disparity, regionalism, etc.

7.3.1 Article 356: Unwisely Used

Impositions of President rule in the political party in the Centre try to pressurize the state government. Some political parties have political interest for using Article 356. From 1950 to 2002 near about 100 times central government used Article 356 for the political interest. Some extent there was such situation to used article 356 but when we critical analyzed the presidential rule imposed on the state we can find out that there was a political interest to used article 356 in a particular state. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar suggested article 356 is a “a dead letter”, (Constituent Assembly Debates, Vol. IX, P.177) he said: “if at all they are brought into operation, I hope the president who is endowed with those powers will take proper precautions before actually suspending the administration of the provinces. I hope the first thing he will do would be to issue a mere warning to a province that has erred that things were not happening in the way in which they were intended to happen in the constitution. If that warning fails, the second thing for him to do will be order an election allowing the people of the province to settle matters by themselves. It is only when these two remedies fail that he would resort to this article” (CAD, Vol. IX, P.177). The purpose of article 356, thus expounded
so clearly in the constituent assembly by Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar must be surely in mind before exercising such power. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar was always of the view that the President as a constitutional head acts on the advice of the council of ministers.

From 1950 to 2002 there were mass dissolution of State Assemblies following to the Lok Sabha election in 1977 and 1980. In 13 cases the State Ministries were dismissed even though they commanded the majority in the assembly. The Supreme Court had invalidated the dismissal of the Bommai Ministry on April 21, 1989. When the chief minister claiming majority support from the assembly, was ready to face the assembly. In short suggested policies of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar not adopted by government of India. Today each state fears from centre and does not have any guarantee about there stability. According to Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Article 356 Ambedkar is provision for regional integration and unity of India. Whenever emergency situation occurred President act and use Article 356 is last option. But it is unfortunate thing our politician used Article 356 for political purpose.

7.3.2 Regional Disparity : A Policy Option in Waiting

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar thought on linguistic states certainly helps us to understand the cause behind the growing regional aspiration in various states and among the leaders from the south. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar rightly pointed out that reorganization commission would create a new political problem of the consolidated Hindi speaking North versus the balkanized south. Further he prefer
to small states which will meet the efficient administration and special needs of the different area. It will also satisfy their sentiments.

Today India is facing serious internal challenges to national security. Emergence of regional parties at center government are good sign for national integration but at the same time it would create problem for development. Due to regional disparity in industrial and agricultural field regional political party also take regional bias view for development. For example Cavery water dispute, Maharashtra-Karnataka Border dispute, Economic and Technology disparity among states, Language differences, North Vs. South etc.

However, the experience of the constitution in the last five decades has given themselves the constitution, in the area of Centre-state relation and consequently led some political parties and leaders to agitate and re-agitate to consider and reconsider the existing constitutional scheme in the area of Centre state relation. Recently various demands came from regional party like, National conference from Kashmir and Alkali Dal (Badal) president for declaring India a commonwealth of autonomous states with full right to the constituent units to pursue and promote their regional, ethnic, and religious identities. (Times of India, December 1991) The threat of late chief minister of Orissa Mr. Biju Patnaik that he would not hesitate to follow the suit of Assam and Punjab, if the state financial autonomy is not going to be re-considered (Indian express, January 11, 1992) and the statement of Ms. Jayalalitha, the chief minister of Tamilnadu, over the Cavery water dispute, that unless the central government discharges its responsibility in
the best interest of federation, the fabric of the constitution and unity of our nation could be destroyed (Times of India, August 6, 1992) clearly shows that emerging febrile symptoms that are being developed on the fabric of the Indian constitution beyond doubt.

Hence, it is right time to ask ourselves where have we gone wrong. Is it with the constitution? Answer to this question may be given in the context of some important issues like imposition of President’s rule in the state, demand for more fiscal autonomy, and regional disparities discussed in the from time to time. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar suggested strong Centre and autonomous state form unity integrity and security of the nation state, his policies may help us to steer through the present contemporary problems of India’s national security and guide us for the regional integration.

* * * *