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CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 The Concept of Security:

Historically, the paradigm of national security evolved with the emergence of the nation-state in the seventeenth century. In the interest of national survival, national security became a prominent concern of states. There is not only one concept of security; "National Security", "International Security", and "Global Security" refer to different sets of issues and have their origins in different historical and philosophical contexts. (Haftordorn Helga, 1991: P.3) Four decades ago, Arnold Wolfers in his book 'Discord and collaboration' characterized national security as an "ambiguous symbol" that "may not have any precise meaning at all". Alastair Buchan writes, "Security is a word with many meanings". Most authors limit themselves to equating security with the absence of a Military threat or with the protection of the nation from external overthrow or attack. Richard Lowenthal, from a German perspective, in addition emphasizes safeguarding political and social self-determination. Joseph Nye concurs that today most security policies are designed to insure "social autonomy as a group, and a degree of political status, not merely to insure the physical survival of individuals within national boundaries". He adds another criteria: "a certain minimal expected enjoyment of economic welfare." Like Nye, Richard ullman argues that, "defining national security merely (or even primarily) in military
terms conveys a profoundly false image of reality.” He suggest a broader
definition: “ A threat to national security is an action or sequence of events that (1)
threatens drastically and over a relatively brief span of time of degrade the quality
of life for the inhabitants of a state or (2) threatens significantly to narrow the
range of policy choices available to the government of a state or to private non-
governmental entities (persons, groups, corporation) within the state.” (Ullman
R.H.1983: p.135)

This definition takes account of a broad variety of contingencies, but it
requires further clarification and raises questions of applicability. And it must be
seen – as should the other definitions – in a specific cultural context : the highly
industrialized democracies of the West. Other countries have very different
concept of security, most developing countries emphasize the economic and social
as well as the domestic dimensions of security. The Soviet term, “besopasnost”
means freedom from fear; Moscow’s security policy has been an instrument of
system maintenance. (Haftendorn Helga, 1991, p. 5)

According to Hobbes, it did not much matter whether threats to security
came from within or outside one’s own nation. A victim is just as dead if the bullet
that kills him is fired by a neighbour attempting to seize his property as if it comes
from an invading army. A citizen looks to the state therefore, for protection
against both types of threat. Security, for Hobbes, was an absolute value. In
exchange for providing it the state can rightfully ask anything from a citizen save
that he sacrifices his own life, for preservation of life is the essence of security. In
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this respect, Hobbes was extreme. For most of us, security is not an absolute value. We balance security against other values. Taking account of these different interpretations, British political scientist Barry Buzan tries to avoid this tangle and argues that national security cannot be defined in any general sense. But only in relation to specific cases, he thus restricts himself to an ideograph treatment of the security problem. (Buzan Barry, 1983: P. 6)

The analysis of the security paradigm and the changes from National security to global security each based on different theoretical and political assumptions, are closely linked to the historical evolution of the international system and the intellectual progress in its interpretation. In each phase, we find competing interpretations on realist and other idealist based on different theoretical assumptions about the nature of man and the behavior of states.

The concept of security is extended from the security of nations to the security of groups and individuals: it is extended downwards from nations to individuals. In the second, it is extended from the security of nations to the security of the international system, or of a supranational physical environment: it is extended upwards, from the nation to the biosphere. The extension, in both cases, is in the sorts of entities whose security is to be ensured. The concept of security is extended horizontally or to the sorts of security that are in question. Different entities (such as individuals, nation and "systems") cannot be expected to be secure or insecure in the same way; the concept of security is extended
therefore, from military to political, economic, social, environmental, or “human” security. (Rothschild Emma: 1995: P.55)

The foreign policy speeches of the Clinton administration contained repeated references in 1993 and 1994 to extended on “human” security including to, “a new understanding of the meaning and nature of national security and the role of individuals and nation-states”. The International Commission on Global Governance was the exponent, in 1995, of vertically extended security: “Global security must be broadened from its traditional focus on the security of states to the security of people and the planet”. The United Nations development programme took as the principal theme of its 1994 Human Development Report the transition. “From nuclear security to human security”, or to “the basic concept of human security”, defined as safety from “such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression”, and “protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions”. The United Nations Secretary General called in 1995 for a “conceptual breakthrough” going “beyond armed territorial security”, (as in the institutions of 1945) towards enhancing or protecting “the security of people in their homes, jobs and communities”. These ideas of extended security are hardly new in the 1990s. they are a development, to take one example of the idea of common security put forward in the 1982 Report of the Palme Commission. Common security was understood, in the Report, in a quite restricted sense. It was presented as a way for nations to organize their security in the presence of nuclear weapons: “states can no longer seek security at each others expense; it can be attained only through
co-operative undertaking.” But the report also pointed towards several more conceptions that are extensive. One was that security should be thought in terms of economic and political, as well as military objectives; that military security is a mean, while the economic security of individuals, or the social security of citizens “to chart futures in a manner of their own choosing”, or the political security that follows when “the international system (is) capable of peaceful and orderly change” were ends in themselves. Olof Palme wrote in his introduction to the Report as well as governments and states. The new security ideas of the early 1980 were the reflection, in turn, of many earlier discussions. “Over the past decade or so vast arrays of public interest organization have begun to put forward alternate conceptions of national security.” The idea of security has been at the heart of European political thought since the crisis of the seventeenth century. It is also an idea whose political significance, like the senses of the word, “security”, has changed continually over time. The permissive or pluralistic understanding of security, as an objective of individuals and groups as well as of states - the understanding that has been claimed in the 1990s by the proponents of extended security-was characteristic, in general, of the period from the mid seventeenth century to the French revolution. The principally military sense of the word “security” in which security is an objective of states, to be achieved by diplomatic or military policies, was by contrast an innovation, in much of Europe, of the epoch of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. The great public uses of security in the new national sense can be dated even more precisely. Before the congress of
Vienna assembled in 1814, the study of national security grew more narrow and rigid during the cold war than it had been before. During that time, security issues have been militarized by super power and the rest of the world. (Keith Crause and Williams Michael C., 1996, p. 235)

Military power is not the only source of national security and military threats are not only dangers that state face (though they are usually the most serious). As a result, a security study also includes what is sometimes termed "statecraft"- arms control, diplomacy, crisis management, for example. These issues are clearly relevant to the main focus of the field because they bear directly on the likelihood and character of war. Because non-military phenomena can also threaten states and individuals, some writers have suggested broadening the concept of "security" to include topics such as poverty, AIDS, environmental hazards, drugs, abuse, and the like (Stephen M. Walt, 1991: P.213). Early literature in national security also employed a rather narrow definition of politics. The literature ignore or non-strategic sources of international tension and to focus solely on military issues.

2.2 Hobbes View on Security:

In the state of nature, there exists a fundamental imbalance between man’s needs and his capacity to satisfy them-with the most basic need being security from a violent and sudden death. To avoid injury from one another and from foreign invasion, men conferee all their power and strength upon one man, or upon
one Assembly of men, that man reduce all their Wills, by plurality of voices into one Will. The sovereign state provides for a domestic peace but at a price. Hobbes' solution for civil war displaces the disposition for wares of every man to the international arena. (Ronnie D. Lipschutz, 1995: P.30)

In above discussion, we can understand the search for security through sovereignty is not a political choice but the necessary reaction to anarchical conditions. In short, Hobbes advocated that for the security of nation state, we must prepare ourselves and struggle for power is permanent and universal.

2.3 Marxian View on Security:

According to Marx, the split between society and the state to spread of secularized security is the guarantee of the egoism of civil society. A struggle for power, which necessitates the security of states, whereas in Hobbes view alienation is a consequence of the struggle for power. Moreover in Marx the power struggle is not permanent condition it is historically and class specific, and once contradiction between a social production of wealth and the private exercise of power comes to in dialectical resolution the state would become absolute and with it security dilemma. For Hobbes, the struggle for power is permanent and universal. (Ronnie D. Lipschuts 1995: p.32) During the mid-1980s strategic thinkers, observers noticed that the concept of security had been subjected to little reflection in comparison with how much and how strongly it had been used only a
recent years concept of security so common there are four approach of security (a) The traditional progressive approach to accept two basic premises of the established discourse, first the security is a reality prior to language, is out those irrespective of whether the conception of objective or subjective is measured in terms of threat or fear and second the more security, the better, and (b) To argue why security should encompass more than is currently the case, including not only xx but also yy where the latter is environment, welfare, social development immigration and refugees etc. with this approach one concept the core meaning of security is uncontested (c) One approach of national security strictly focus on the security of people, either as individuals or as a global or international collectivity. (d) Concept of security based on four sets of positive goals related to human needs. Security becomes "the combined defence policy for each need category the totality of defence endeavors of the entire-human societal organization." (Ronnie D. Lipschutz 1995, p. 48). The term security has acquired a number of connotation assumptions and images derived from the International to National.

The concept of security is to broaden where as international dynamics, a number of codes, rules and understandings have been established that makes international relation an inter-subjectively defined social security possessing its own specific laws and issues. National security is similarly social in the sense of being constituted inter-subjectively in specific fields. Security is a broad concept
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and therefore many things are threatening in security terms. Western security experts thinking addressed "Non military aspects of strategy" are economy, environment, social development, migration and drugs in a search for new security problems to replace the old ones. Over the last few years, an interest in the concept of "societal security" has developed, especially in Europe. In the traditional state centric perspective, "societal security could come to mean making the state secure against society.

The security of societies is closely related to, but nonetheless distinct from political security has to do with the organizational stability of states, system of government, and the ideologies that give governments and state their legitimacy. In today's world, the boundaries of state and society are rarely coterminous. The key to society therefore, involves those ideas and practices that identify individuals as members of a social group. Society is about identity, the self-conception of communities, and those individuals who identify themselves as members of a particular community. (Ronnie D. Lipschutz, 1995: p.68)
In Fig. 2.2, I do not locate security at three levels but at the center of the hourglass images. Security in other words has to be read through the lens of national security. Of course security has an everyday meaning. Security is in historic terms the field where states threaten each other, challenge each other’s sovereignty, try to impose their will on each other, defend their Independence and so on. Security moreover has not been a constant field, it has evolved and since world war II has been transformed into a rather coherent and recognizable field.

In Fig. 1.2, I have suggested a re-conceptualization of security field in terms of a duality of state security and societal security. State security has sovereignty as its ultimate criterion, and societal security has identity. Both are important a state that loses its sovereignty does not survive as a state: a society that loses its identity fears that it will no longer be able to live itself.
2.4 Indian Perspectives on National Security:

Above analysis and various definitions of national security given by various scholars, with their own views emphasize different aspects and various connotations of national security of a nation-state. However, in respect of India, perspective on national security may have different shades, considering its social, economic and political pre-conditions. A detailed study of these pre-conditions could develop better understanding essential connotations and important dimensions to India's national security.

The national security discourse is focused on limited terms i.e. foreign policy, military power, military capabilities the articulation of social security needs have been left to the socially concerned whose voice is not heard in the security arena. In Indian perspectives the term security can be defined broadly or narrowly in both national and social context. Broader interpretations bring in the requirement of economic and social dimensions of a national security. When approached narrowly its' focuses on territorial integrity and sovereign power in the national security and the violation of political rights (Koithora Varghes, 1999: P.20). In modern India the concept of national security ought to be located in the interest of human welfare and national power. There is more to national security than territorial integrity and the preservation of state sovereignty. The improvement and development of human conditions is at least as important as achievement in the international stage. Micro-level well being of the individual ought to be of as much concern as the macro-level stature of the nation. The
security discourse in India is dominated by the aspirations of elite and the co-opted middle class. In India external and internal component of security is important. The external component has a economic and politico-military dimension. The internal component has a socio-economic and a politico enforcement dimension. (Koithara Varghes, 1999: P.22).

The concept of national security is much wider than that of defence, and the approach to national security requires comprehensive views of various political social economic, technological, and strategic aspects. (Subrahmanyam K., 1972: P. 7). There is a widespread impression of the term National Security. It is self-evident and it involves safeguarding our territorial integrity and sovereignty. Sovereignty and abridgement of it are admittedly sophisticated concepts, while defence of territorial integrity is simple enough. Those familiars with western literature will define the concept of national security as the ability of a nation to protect its internal values from external threats. Walter Lipman the noted columnist, once defined it in following terms. A nation has security when it does not have to sacrifice its legitimate interests to avoid war and is able if challenged, to maintain them by war, while these definitions adequately cover the concept as applied to stabilize nation state of the industrialized west. These are in adequate to encompass the entire area of the problem of national security faced by such a heterogeneous and developing nation state like India (Subrahmanyam K., 1972: P.1). Conventional wisdom in most parts of the world has tended to threat national security as synonymous with national defence. The reality, which is being
increasingly appreciated, is that the former covers a much broader spectrum of challenges, threats and responses as compared to the latter. Which being a sub-set of national security in its comprehensive framework, relates to military security essentially from external threats. At the same time it has to be noted that capabilities also constitutes the ultimate instrument in application of force when and where required in the pursuit of national security. (Singh Jasgit, 1987: P.845)

In India the broader concept of National security may be seen to have it roots in the struggle for Independence itself; and wells articulated and operationalised in the early years of India’s history as an Independent Nation state. Nehru’s concept of an ‘area of peace’ extending all around India the pursuit of the policy of non-alignment in a global system. The basic approach also emphasized that India’s security issues cannot be isolated from the geo-strategic environment and geopolitical realities of the international system.

In this context, therefore, it would be useful to attempt a definition of national security so as to formulate the framework of national strategy to achieve it. According to Morton Berkowitz and P.G.Bock, National security can be most fruitfully defined as the ability of a nation to protect its internal values from external threats. However this definition falls short of a comprehensive approach to national security. Views on exact definitions will no doubt differ, but we may adopt a broad concept of national security accordingly changes took place in international security environment i.e. The preservation of the core values critical
to the nation state from external and internal threats. According to this definition to identify the core values at the same time it is necessary to note that although external and internal security issues are substantially different in nature. Many issues affecting internal security may stem external, political, social, economic or military pressures. Similarly domestic insecurity and perhaps what is even more relevant, perceptions of domestic vulnerabilities may create incentive for external pressures. (Singh Jasgit, 1987: P.886). India has always approached the subject of security in its larger framework, beyond that implicit in defence and military forces. The concept of security has involved the preservation and perpetuation of the core value i.e. Democratic political set-up, secular state, socialism, nature of the state, attainment of egalitarian society, maintenance of internal peace and security and economic development and progress. These values had shaped the Indian civilization and they provide the foundation on which modern Indian can be built taking into account the historical socio-economic condition in the country. Given the pluralistic society socio-economic inequities, regional disparities at the time India became independent these core values stand enshrined in the Indian constitution since 1950.

The traditional security thinking based on military capability to cope with external military threat, therefore, needs to be re-oriented to meet the challenges and threats. The 19th century concept of a nation in arms moved on to that of a nation at war in the first half of the 20th century as witnessed during the two world wars. The additionally due to coercive strategy in the nature of external threats
requires new approaches to formulation of national security doctrines and strategy for a nation under threat of war These essentially demands greater interactive foreign, domestic and defence policies for a comprehensive national security strategy. These fundamental issues need to be taken into account in any discussion of the national security.

The core values of the Indian nation state derive their strength from its culture and civilization. In the conceptual framework for India’s national security the three main core values stands for: Democracy, secularism and egalitarian society, erosion of any or all of these values in any form for whatever reason, erodes the legitimacy of the Indian nation-state and hence poses threats to its security. It was for this reason that these values were so carefully enshrined in the constitution of India (Singh Jasgit, 1987: P.892). The term security of a state generally means the preservation of territorial integrity, political independence, sovereignty and the economic autonomy of the people. As a concept, it has long been contested, and has remained underdeveloped. However till the end of the cold war, the concept was associated with the threats or use of force, force and associated concepts or strategies like war, limited war, deterrence, alliances, arms control disarmament, and crisis management. But after the demise of Soviet Union, the end of cold war, and the diminishing chances of war or nuclear war, emphasis has been on rethinking its content and defining it more broadly and present day in the age of globalization security problems, especially for developing countries like India are result of terrorism, transborder solidarity,
malnutrition, illiteracy, poverty, social disparities, lower gross domestic product, imbalance market economy, communalism, violations of human rights etc. which were traditionally kept out of national security discourse. The fundamental challenge before us today is how to include the domestic challenges before a state for broadening the agenda of national security. Internal challenges to the state have shown its pervasiveness in different parts of the world. Traditionally it is argued that threats emanate domestically from different groups, competing for power in a political system. Where consensus is often totally absent for example, Yugoslavia, Somalia, Bosnia, Afghanistan, Congo and Sri Lanka where particularly the ethnoreligious and political rivalries have significant ramification and at several levels they have fused with international crisis. After the end of the cold war experiences at global level would suggest that inter challenges to security are rooted in problems of political identity, socio-economic grievances, lack of legitimacy of state and individuals, and the most important reason is the non-stability of political and economic institutions. (Mishra Rajesh K., 1998: P.29.)

The idea of security has undergone changes keeping pace with the changing international security environment. From the narrow definition of, Security of territory from external aggression to global implies the threat of a nuclear holocaust, security today implies among other things, protection from threats of disease, hunger unemployment, crime, social conflicts, political repression and environmental hazards. In recent years the UN’s concern for social issues and development has also be receiving considerable attention. However, UN interest in
social progress is not new, it derives directly from its character, “To promote higher standards of living full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development. (Dr. Rao B. Meena and Dr. M. Vijayalakshmi, 1998: P.7)

We emphasize more for our national security priorities, hardly considering internal security consolidation as an important matter, on the threats from Pakistan and china. Such a restricted view focused on limited issue i.e. foreign policy, military capabilities, defence planning, and defence expenditure the articulation of social security needs have been left to the socially concerned, whose voice is not heard in the security arena.

It asked, a layman would probably explain national security as the protection of territorial integrity, which for that purpose would require the adequate building up of the armed forces along with the appropriate acquisition of military hardware. This view, however, is simplistic and does not address and complexities forced by nation-state today. After all in addition to securing territorial integrity the peoples of a country would neither like its political or constitutional system to be challenged nor want its economic, technological or scientific progress and interest to be in any manner of jeopardy. A nation would like to safeguard and promote its core values, which could be, termed the nations way of life these may be those such as democracy, federalism or human rights. The term national security would, therefore have to encompass all these factors. If that were so, then it cannot be assumed that challenges to a country’s national
security emanate only from the external environment. A useful definition, which is relevant to present times, state “security is not military hardware though it may include it, security is not military force, security is development and without development there is no security”. Another analyst theories National security does not mean merely mean safeguarding territorial integrity. It also means ensuring that the country is industrialized rapidly and has a cohesive, egalitarian and technological society. Anything that comes in the way of this development internally or externally is a threat to national security.

At this stage it has to be noted that challenges to national security have to be combated by one or more or a combination of the instrumentalists available to the state, i.e. domestic capabilities, diplomatic avenues, military strength. Similarly these tools of the state are used not only in a defensive posture, but also to further national interests. These three state capabilities draw their ability or strength or the lack of it from the elements of national power which is a mix of strategic, military, economic and political strength and weakness. It is determined in part by military forces but even more by the size and location of territory, the nature of its frontiers, population, economic structure, natural resources, technological developments, social cohesiveness, institutions, stability of its political process and finally the national character and spirit. The foregoing, in a sense has already generated the need for deeper analysis of the theoretical and empirical factors which determine security for nation within itself, in the external environment and in relation to all other nations. Thus it may suggested that
basically there exist in the very core of national security three levels or three separate constituents. These are in ascending order the individual, the state and the international order or system in its entirely. The importance of these three levels of national security lies in their intrinsic security values and equally in the obvious connections between individual or personal security that of the state and the security of the international system.

Fig. 2.3: Components of National Security

2.5 Individual Security:

We start from study the component of national security i.e. Individual security, because people represent in one sense, while a vast array of dangers, doubts, opportunities and challenges loom over an individual, ranging from criminal violence to incurable disease to natural disaster the aspect that is germane
to the topic is that of social challenges. These are those arising from the fact that an individual forms part of larger human environment with its unavoidable socio-cultural economic and political consequences. In order to secure oneself against socio-cultural threats the individual is prepared to submit to a government. Thus the state becomes the mechanism by which one seeks to achieve an adequate level of security. Here in lies the rub, because the state itself can become a major source of insecurity to the individual citizen depending upon its composition. If the state is benign clashes of interest between the individual and the state are minimal on the other extreme is the dominant state where the pursuit of state interest supersedes the interest of its citizens and is unresponsive to individual security needs. Insecurity from the state, however, whether dominant, can arise from a variety of factors as part of an explicit state policy against certain groups of people from political disorder from state terrorism from inadequate process of law enforcement etc. Finally the inability is the last dimension in which the linkages can be seen.

2.6 Security of the State:

What constitute a state and what constitutes a challenge to a state are the two central concerns. A state consists of population and its associated geographical territory as its physical base and at a higher plane it comprises an idea held in common by the people a deeply rooted loyalty to the idea of state existing as a metaphysical entity. This logically leads to the concept of sovereignty which, simply put, means nothing other than total and complete self-ruled and
provides the crucial element which divides states from other forms of large units, and also from other states. It is at this stage that the concept of national security introduces, by the use of term National, the implication that the object of security is the nation thus widening the scope of examination to a quest for an understanding at what is a nation, and raises the question about links between nation and state. A nation can be defined as a large group of people with the same cultures, and possibly the same racial heritage and normally living in a given area.

Is a nation a state, are all nations also state, and vice versa? In its pure, pristine form the nation preceded the state and gives rise to it as in the case of Japan and China. At the other end of the spectrum, some nations have no state like the Palestinians, the Armenians, the Kurds and the Jews before the inception of the Jewish state in 1947 between these two extremes lie all
forms of national hood and statehood, and suffice it to say that a clear understanding of what constitutes a nation and what constitutes a state, though inextricably interwoven, is central to the study of national security and a deeper examination is worth the pursuit. Based on this challenges to the state can be identified which, broken down to their component parts, are threats to idea of the state, the physical basis of the state and to the institutions of the state. These cover a wide variety of stimuli, ranging from manipulation of ideas to widening of military power, which can be applied to any of the three components of the state separately or in columniation. Another factor, which underpins the range and intensity of vulnerabilities of a state, is the strength or weakness of the state itself. Internal peace means the existence of law and order and a state of tranquility. It signifies the state of security and protection and of the state from internal violence the steps taken against all possible internal challenges such as political agitation, strikes, riots, sabotage, espionage, armed insurgencies and separation movements. After all, the state has to be secure for the protection, preservation, maintenance growth, enhancement, development and values of interests.

State institutions: Institutions in a state such as the judiciary, the legislature, and the bureaucracy, media and the military provide to a state an organizational structure. Strength when strong and vice versa, as also checks and balances over each other. Where the state is strong, national security may be viewed primarily in terms of protecting the components of
state from external and internal interference and challenges. Where 
the state is weak the very idea of the state and its institutions are objects of 
internal conflict and confrontation to the point of violence even attracting on 
occasions heightened levels of threat to its territory and people from external 

souces.

2.7 Overview of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar on Issues of India’s National

Security:

In 21st century India will be facing numerous national security challenges 
what are these challenges? How best these can be faced? What are the weaknesses 
in the national security policy making? The main thrust of the research to redefine 
the concept of national security and highlights the thoughts of Dr. Babasaheb 
Ambedkar on India’s national security. The need for redefining the concept of 
national security has become for human kind as a whole. National security no 

longer beholds in the ability to defend ourselves. However national security 
encompasses various dimension i.e. strategic and non-strategic or internal and 
external dimension. The term national security can be defined broadly or 
narrowing in both national and social context when broader interpretations bring 
in the requirement of economic and social development. When approached 
narrowly its focus on territorial integrity and sovereign power in the national 
setting and the violation of political rights. No nation can become and remain 
strong powerful and sustainable if it ignores the internal and international 
dimensions of its security. National security is composed of national and internal.
Internal strategies include the complete spectrum of socio-political and socio-economic policies and internal security strategy. External strategies would include defence and diplomatic strategy economic-trade and aid strategies (Seth Pravin, 1996: P.13)

Today our society is engrossed in terrorism, communalism, separation, provincialism, unrest among the minorities, poverty, illiteracy and unemployment and these viruses are hindering development of the nation state. Our social and national life, unfortunately has been a victim of a number of divisive forces and internal conflicts. The need of the hour is to pull down the barriers that divide people, resolve conflicts and bring about unity and overall welfare with a view to fostering social cohesiveness and national integration, irrespective of consideration of caste, creed, religion and place of birth, sharing the postulate of secularism. Now there is a need to understand and evaluate Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar’s philosophy, mission and the relevance of his thoughts, and ideas in a proper perspective for an honest effort at removing inequality, giving practical shape of to liberty, equality, democratic values and humanistic ideas enshrined in the supreme law of the land- the constitution of India. (Shabbir Mohammed, 1992: P.14)

Bharat Ratna Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar was a savior of the suppressed classes, a noted jurist, the chief architect of India’s constitution a profound scholar, a daring leader and the greatest pioneer of Buddhism revival in India. He is not only constitutionlist and Parliamentarian, but also as scholar and active
social reformer all over the world. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar is widely known for his contribution to the making of modern India. His social and political efforts for the uplift of socially deprived classes in the making of India’s constitution and his scholarly solution to the vital issues of his times helped decisively in shaping the social, political and economic character of India at a crucial period of its history. Equally important but less known were his contributions in the making of India’s development policies. As a cabinet member during 1942-46, he has instrumental in laying the foundation of India’s water and electric policy. In the early 1940 s, which were a crucial period in the evolution and adoption of economic planning in India. He initiated and gave momentum and a definite shape to the policy and planning of its water and electrical power development. (Thorat Sukhadeo, 1993: p. 148) To research on the thoughts of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar on issues related to India’s national security is a difficult task. In the post-independence era, we have seen number of books written on great men of India. It is seem that most of the scholars or writers write on the life, and mission of this great son of India, but they have touched only half part of his personality and lauded him as the masiah of dalit in India. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar to be a nationalist leader first and than the leader of dalit in India. Dr. Ambedkar dreamt of India in which every citizen would be Indian first and Indian last. (Gautam Munshilal, 1993: P.1)

In view of this, an attempt has been made in this research work to examine Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar views on certain aspects and to indicate as how they are related to national unity and integration or national security. In the age of
globalization India withdrawing her responsibility from social development. If it continues it will be paralyzed the society and its implication occurs on India’s national security. Today our nation state is facing the grave problems of national security viz. communalism, inequality and antagonism that are hindering development of the nation. It is high time to understand and evaluate Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar’s philosophy mission and the relevance of his ideas, thoughts and ideals in a proper perspective. The present day problems of national security especially economy are very serious. Mounting unemployment, poverty, social tension, lack of proper distribution of income, labour unrest’s, gender based discrimination, failures in the land reforms sector, foreign exchange crisis, over population, lack of moral values and nationalism are some of the issue of concern in our day to day life.

His concepts of the society and socialism deserve careful attention which are aimed at the welfare of the poor classes ending inequality based on socio-economic characters, reorganizing the political economy for the benefit of all, maintaining full employment and education. Providing social security for the weak and the sick and finally rebuilding the Indian society on the foundation of cooperation, love, friendship, rather than division of men into rigid social barriers. (Lal Shyam and Saxena K. S. 1998: P.25)

Keeping this view Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar given thoughts on following some issues, which is directly or indirectly, relevance to contemporary problems of India’s national security.
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Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar had provided solutions had given policies, put forth his views on very concerned issues and problems of national security of India. His policies and views on India’s national security can be categorized such as:

A) Policies for the nation building.

B) Policies for national integration
   I) Policies for the regional integration.
   II) Policies for social integration.
      a) social justice
      b) Labour policy
      c) Women development policy
      d) Education policy
      e) Eradication of poverty

C) Policies for the political stability

D) Defence policy and

E) Policies for external security and foreign relation

2.8 Policies for the Nation Building:

The nation building has been a complex phenomenon it covers overall development of nation state i.e. economic development population growth spread of literacy development of mass media and social development and military capability. The approach of nation building in the late 20th century has of necessity to be different to be with statecraft of Machiavelli and Hobbes. (Kothari Rajani, 1976, p.7)
Before independence nation building denoted techno-economic tasks of the type performed by government agencies like the railways, public works department etc. (Ramakant and Uperti, B.C. 1991.P.143) Nation building is a continuing process. It is a quest for perfection, which remains an ever-changing phenomenon. Thus no nation can claim to have been built to perfection. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar contribution to the nation is his direct participation and role in the formulation of certain development policies and planning. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar involved in policies making once as law minister in the central cabinet of independent India during 1947-51 and earlier as a member of the viceroy’s Executive council, in charge of the labour, Irrigation and power portfolio during 1942-46. Though he made a substantial contribution to the nation’s development (Thorat Sukhadeo, 1993.PP.6-7).

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar was an eminent economist. He was the first Indian to write comprehensive economic study, which included theoretical issues as well as concrete economic problems. His ideas regarding fiscal policy, and administration, provincial autonomy and problems of Indian people, poverty, unemployment and inequalities, stagnant agriculture and distorted industrialization were outstanding. His assertions that (I) Social exploitation and injustice were prevalent in every country and (ii) political and economic phenomenon were dependent on each other are relevant even today (Nagar V.D. and Nagar, K.P.: 1995, PP.1-15). Further, what is creditable to Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar is through almost his entire economic writings related to the pre-independence period, they
reflect not only unique freshness but also his deep insights into the problem. He approached and examined the problems with such foresight that his analysis and treatment of some of them is very much relevant for nation building even today. (Patil, V.T. 1995, P.166). He has expressed his thoughts on nationalization of industries, state socialism and social equality. He has given a thought on integrated economic philosophy for Indian development and programme of action. Based on it is revealed in the manifestoes of the independent labour party and scheduled caste federation and in his speeches on the constitution of India, in the shaping of which he played a most prominent role. (Kuber, W.N.: 1991,P.248)

The present day problems of the Indian economy and nation building are very serious. Mounting unemployment, rising number of poor people, growing social tensions, brutality on oppressed groups, concentration of resources, lack of proper distribution of income, negligible access of marginalised sections to public facilities, labour unrest, gender based discriminations, pitiable levels of living of urban slum of dwellers, agriculture-industry mismatch, failures in the land reform sector, foreign exchange crisis, faster population growth and lack of moral values and nationalism are some of the issues of concern in our economy and nation building. Dr. Babasheb Ambedkar tried his best to raise these issues after the First World War. His contributions firstly as a professional economist and later on as a sound social scientist, a forceful Parliamentarian, a real social reformer and a propagator of human love and peace show a true testimony to his affection and approach for the development of the nation. He had a scientific forecasting power.
That is why his life and career was fully dedicated to key social-economic and security issues, which the nation is facing currently. Even today, Indian economy is mainly rural based where the symptoms of iniquities land distribution, semi-feudal production relations, constraints of extension of green revolution, negligible availability of service sector and disguised unemployment are observed.

The relevance of his thoughts may also be seen in his advocacy for freedom for all end of slavery, a federal structure of the country and abolition of rural evils like Khoti systems and to bring land revenue under the net of income tax. To consider agricultural income tax is a contentious issue at present. But the political interests political parties and leaders unable to take a concrete decision. As a result inequitable distribution of income is a reality in the national economic scenario particularly in states where cultivable land is unevenly possessed. As a result feudalism is existence, landholders having big size land are free from income tax and disparity among poor and rich is increasing. His contributions may enthuse one to conclude that the 20th century history of Indian economic thought has commanded ample of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar’s contributions. His approach is economic thinking is a topic of lively debate and will remain so even in the 21st century. (Shyamalal and Saxena, K.S.: 1998, P.24)

Recent years several social scientists attempted to examine Dr. Ambedkar’s ideas in the classical paradigms of economic development. Some others try to analyze the relevance of Ambedkar through Marxian framework. A need for a methodology to read analyzes and understands Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar.
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar believed that land reforms are very much needed in India from the point of stepping up agricultural production and overall nation development. As an economist, he wished emphasized the input relations that may emerge as a consequence of land reforms. He opined that, the existing holdings land are uneconomic, not however in the sense that they are small but that they are too large consequently, the remedy for the ills of agriculture in India does not lie primarily in the matter of enlarging holdings, but in the matter of increasing capital and capital goods. Thus he was able to visualize a production function which had its independent variables mainly money and real capital.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar was been on viewing agriculture as an industry. Ambedkar propagated the idea that taking over the uncultivated lands for cultivation and giving them to landless labourers could solve the urgent problem of landless labourers. He advocated collective farms, as they could help them to extent looked at from the present day point of view. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar seems to be right in his expression on land reforms. Though it has been the declared policy of the government of India that land reforms should be recognized to constitute a vital element both in terms of the anti poverty strategy and for modernization and increased productivity in agriculture. Very little achievement has been made in this regard. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar’s vision that land reform is only legal eyewash and it is also not a solution to the landless agricultural labourers has by and large been true even today. Contemporary economic thinking
is, however, more surprisingly with regard to the need for land reforms, is related to agricultural production.

**2.9 Policies for National Integration and Assimilation:**

According to Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar common language, common culture is also conductive for national unity and integration since it strengthens the social cohesion, which is the basis of national unity. In fact common language and common culture are interrelated and common culture emerges out of common language. Thus, culture is not only the part of language but geographical in nature and consists of various aspects. As such every religious community can certainly claim to have made some contribution to national culture.

**2.10 Policies for the Regional Integration:**

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar has predicted that the big north Indian states would dominate politics of India. He held that there is vast difference between north and south in terms of education and standard of living. Therefore Dr. Ambedkar wanted to correct the imbalance by dividing large north Indian State into small and administratively manageable state.

**2.11 Policies for Social Integration:**

Dr. Ambedkar suggested various policies for social integration, which are important for the unity and integration of the India.

a) Social justice

b) Labour policy

c) Women development policy
2.12 Policies for the Political Stability:

India has been passing through a critical period there have been three general election in three years several serious socio-economic issues have emerged due to political stability and lack of governance skill to handle internal problems. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar had suggested following policies for political stability.

The issue of the centre state relation has assumed great importance in changed political climate of India from the 1996 General election. Today when the states are demanding more powers and autonomy for their development than it will raise the issue of national unity and integrity.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar sought to achieve national unity and integrity through the federalism. The provision of the Indian constitution specially those relating to the federal system. Ambedkar believed would go a long way in cementing the forces of national unity and integrity. He has been argued that the Indian political system is quasi-federal, a unitary state with subsidiary federal features rather than a federal state with subsidiary unitary factors. In the Indian federal power is distributed among the states and the center. (Sankhdher M.M., 1983:134)

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar was accepting a federal framework if it ensured the unity and integrity of the country on the one hand. The protection of the depressed classes on the other.
2.13 Defence Policy:

In July 1941, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar was appointed on the Defence Advisory committee. He advocated introduction of compulsory military education for all youth within certain age group. He suggested Hyderabad as a second capital for India for defence, security and administrative purpose.

2.14 Policies for External Security and Foreign Relation:

The primary interest of our foreign policy has been to safeguard our national interests. According to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru peace, non-alignment, elimination of racial discrimination, the liberation of subject of people and the maintenance of freedom, adherence to Panchsheel for each other’s, territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in each others internal affairs equality and mutual benefits and peaceful co-existence were the main principles of our foreign policy.

India’s foreign policy, according to Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar based on peace, coexistence between communism and free democracy and opposition to SEATO. (Rajya Sabha Debates, 1954 P. 469). He said, “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, 22nd April 1954). Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar criticized Nehru’s foreign policy time to time. He analyzed the Chinese possession of Tibet. He accused the Prime Minister of helping the Chinese to bring their border down to the Indian border, because Nehru allowed the Chinese to take possession of Lhasa. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar wanted to protect this country and make her prepared military capability for war.

* * * *