
| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Ambedkar's Approach to International Relations and India's Foreign Policy

Ajay Kumar

Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Ramanujan College, University of Delhi, Delhi, India

Corresponding Author: Ajay Kumar, **E-mail:** ajayshweta.ak@gmail.com; ajay.kumar@ramanujan.du.ac.in

| ABSTRACT

B. R. Ambedkar has been a towering personality of modern India who was instrumental in igniting the minds of the current and next generations of citizens. However, his views on various social, economic, and political aspects have been discovered and analyzed by several scholars, but his approach to studying and analyzing international relations and Indian foreign policy has remained in a shadow. However, he used a pragmatic approach to India's foreign policy and international relations which could be more beneficial for a new India, or it could contribute to creating a powerful image of India in the world as a great and independent power. This paper tries to examine the role of Ambedkar in India's Foreign Policy and approach to International Relations. Analytical and descriptive method has been adopted for the examination of his approach and a way to handle the same. As a result, it has been found that sometimes he adopted a liberal and realist approach, and sometimes he adopted a socialist or rationalist approach, which was, in total a pragmatic approach in itself. Thus, he was a doctor who knew the treatment according to the disease.

| KEYWORDS

China, Dalits, Foreign policy, Goa, Human Rights, International Relations, Jammu and Kashmir, Pakistan

| ARTICLE DOI: INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 10 June 2023

PUBLISHED: 16 June 2023

DOI: 10.32996/pjpsh.2023.3.1.4

1. Introduction

After independence, India faced the problems such as matters of Kashmir, Pakistan, and relations with China, Sri Lanka, and Burma. An important and influential element in this regard is foreign policy, which affects not only the political but also the economic development of the country. However, less known and often ignored are B.R. Ambedkar's role regarding international relations and the way to be adopted by India's foreign policy. However, today, following his path, the present Indian government is solving domestic and international problems. This was the time when the first prime minister of India had an initial inclination towards socialism and the needs of the nation were bound to be met by the United States of America. Ambedkar was not in favor of this type of imposed economic communism which was established by abandoning morality and non-violence. He believed that morality, character, and Dhamma are the heritage of humanity, by abandoning them; no economy is helpful in the all-around development of men or citizen of the country. Many contemporary thinkers such as Gandhi, Nehru, Patel, and Rajendra Prasad differed from Ambedkar regarding international economic relations and aspects related to foreign policy. Ambedkar was always aware of the reconstruction of the social structure, whether it was a matter of maintenance of international relations or determination of foreign policy. Ambedkar was a humanist as well as a nurturer of national interests. Therefore, in Ambedkar's thoughts and literature, economic development, relation with global economic powers, and analysis of world politics are also found. Rising above the prejudices of class, group, and narrow political ideology-communism, capitalism, totalitarianism, etc., Ambedkar served India's national interest, where he has done justice to humanity; he kept in mind what is best for India as a nation. It is due to Ambedkar that he links freedom, equality, and brotherhood with morality, in his view, living without morality is crippled. Communist and totalitarian forces can confuse the world's greatness by breaking the land of religion and morality in the world. That's why he believed that our foreign policy should be in favor of world peace and international relations should be against the

eradication of any kind of exploitation against the values of enjoyment sometimes it is called democratic peace. Therefore, this paper is just an attempt to analyze and understand Ambedkar's approach to the foreign policy of India and international relations.

2. Objective of the Study

To Trace Ambedkar's Approach to India's Foreign Policy and International Relations

3. Methodology

Bhim Rao Ramji Ambedkar, popularly known as Babasaheb (a revered personality) by a significant section of the Indian population, is widely respected and remembered for his role in drafting the Constitution of India as well as his life-long crusade for human rights and dignity of the marginalized sections such as lower castes, untouchables, and women and children through his leading movements. However, less known and often ignored are Ambedkar's ideas in respect of international relations and the path to be followed by India's foreign policy. There is a difference of opinions among the scholars as to which approach he adopted to study international relations and to govern Indian foreign policy. This research article is aimed at examining Ambedkar's views on India's international affairs and their relevance in contemporary times. Therefore, the descriptive and analytical method has been used to examine the approach of Ambedkar to the same.

4. India's Situation as Newly Independent Nation and Ambedkar's Concern

International relations are about how two or more nations interact with each other and regard each other to maintain political, economic, and cultural affairs. Through international relations, most nations expect their political stability, economic progress, and cultural dominance to secure their national interests. India has been a great player in acknowledging the mode of international relations from the time of Chandragupta Maurya (350-295 BCE), but in modern times, given the rise of capitalism, international economic relations have been a driving force for the whole world. The International economic relations of any country are economic dealings with other nations of that country whether it be foreign trade, credit and finance relations, scientific and technical relations, or international tourism. However, several important factors determine the economic dealings of one nation with another.

Being a student of political economy, Ambedkar admitted that international economic relations have become an integral part of the political administration of the nation in the era of intense competition and open international trade. Two of the qualities which can be marked regarding Ambedkar's life and career are optimism and pragmatism (Zelliot, 1991). He believed that the nature and character of any country have an impact on the economic, political, and security aspects of that nation in International Relations. That's why national development, policy, planning, industry, and trade policy depend a lot on a nation's international economic and political behavior. Since his father Ramoji Sakpal had been employed in the British Indian military, he was well aware of the importance of the nation's security. Moreover, he also felt the attitude of liberal countries towards Nazism when he went to study in Germany. He realized that nations in the world had become very realistic in their nature during two major World Wars which also affected his personality after the independence of India.

He observed that the complexities of international economic relations increased after World War II with the formation of the IMF and World Bank (formed in 1944). International organizations had started to influence the system of exchange of the world market and transactions between nations. Ambedkar had experienced how liberalism emerged as an alternative to realism which considered that war can be prevented by changing the behavioral pattern of states which appears further in his proposal to make India's relations with its neighboring countries.

He confirmed that economic relations are, in fact, the energy of the national economy. The prosperity is the main goal of the national economy. He believed that the ambiguity of international relations will remain until India properly determines its economic policy (Laxman, 2019). At that time India was an economically backward and poor country. Foreign exploitation and subjugation for centuries had broken the economic backbone of India (Metcalf & Metcalf, 2006). The country was surrounded by the specter of poverty, exploitation, casteism, untouchability, famine and dreadful diseases. After the partition of India, fierce communal riots took place, due to which there was a huge loss of life and wealth happened. The economic structure of the country was shattered due to partition. Due to the communal riots in western and eastern Pakistan, and the inhuman behavior of Pakistan's Muslims, thousands of people were coming to India from Pakistan as refugees. That's why the problem of settling the refugees had arisen in front of the Indian government (Robinson, 2012).

Only a few days after attaining independence, in 1947, India had to get caught in the war over the issue of Kashmir. This war reached its end by 1 January 1949 (Nawaz, 2008). On the other hand, the economic situation of the country was badly affected by the effects of World War II (Schofield, 2021). The problems of lack of goods, a huge increase in prices and unemployment had arisen in a big way. There was a scarcity of food. Due to all these things, the economic life of the country was getting completely

disintegrated. There was a wave of discontent all around. All these complex problems were a challenge for independent India which Ambedkar was realizing at that time.

5. Faith in Democratic World Government and Global Treasury

The decade of the 1930s brought a recession in the markets around the world. To maintain the hold of the colonial government, the British government also faced serious challenges, especially in the colonies like India where the demand for political independence was gaining momentum. Therefore it was too necessary to solve local problems because the condition of the world's economies was very bad since the World War-I. However, Britain was aware of this recession (Gwiazdowski, & Chouliarakis, 2021). Therefore, In August 1925, the British Government constituted the Hilton Young Commission (also known as the Royal Commission on Indian Currency and Finance) to study the currency system of India. Ambedkar was also present in the meeting of this commission. When he appeared before the commission, every member present there had copies of his book '*The Problem of the Rupee: Its Origin and Its Solution*' in their hands. Based on the recommendations of that commission's report and Ambedkar's text guidelines, a few years later, British Government conceptualized the idea of the 'Reserve Bank of India (RBI)' and it was established in 1935 (Srinivasa, 2019). Thus, he contributed to the creation of the Reserve Bank for India for solving the economic problems of India. It implies that Ambedkar had full faith in national or international organizations for economic and political problems since he was one of the first generations of professionally trained economists in India (Rajadhyaksha, 2015).

This shows that as a liberal theorist, he believed in peace and prosperity. Ambedkar, like Immanuel Kant, believed that peace is the key concept of liberal theory, but how can it be achieved or how it could be cultivated? The solution to this problem is that core ideas of liberalism—individual freedom, political participation, private property, and equality of opportunity—should be protected and they can be protected by enshrining them in institutions. Ambedkar's thoughts about peace could be observed in his speech as a Union Law Minister when he told that "I will take first the principle of peace. We want peace, nobody wants war" (TIME, 1954), for instance, when W.E.B. Du Bois and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) delivered their 'Appeal to the World' to the United Nations in relation to racial discrimination and violence against African-Americans in 1947. Ambedkar was deeply influenced by Du Bois, so he considered the United Nations (International Organization) could be a platform for a global appeal against injustice. Ambedkar was more optimistic about the United Nations (Cabrera, 2019). Because of the negligence of the Indian government in 1946 Ambedkar had prepared a report on the condition of the Scheduled Castes for submission to the United Nations but he did not send it because he realized that it would be better to take a break until the constituent assembly and the future parliament was given a chance to deal with the matter (Ambedkar, 1951).

Therefore, when the United Nations and the World Bank were formed to maintain world security and peace and, to reconstruct the colonized states during the de-colonization process, Ambedkar put his faith in these institutions. He believed that the one World Government or United Nations Organization and the World Bank were the only solutions to the problems of global marginalization. Not only this, but Ambedkar also expressed his desire that India should also take permanent membership in the United Nations (Prasad, 2022). Ambedkar was always against Jawaharlal Nehru's trend regarding permanent membership in the Security Council of the United Nations. Ambedkar's wish for permanent membership in the Security Council for India in 1951 made him the first statesman in the country who considered that India had a legitimate and rightful place in international politics. However, Nehru himself declared that India had become the fourth or fifth most important country in the United Nation. Nehru remained only a member of the lobby to get China permanent membership in United Nations (Ayoob, 2019). When Western and Eastern blocs kept asking Nehru to take permanent membership of India in the Security Council of the United Nations, Nehru kept rejecting it. He went on to say that some people in the United States America had offered him that India may replace China (Taiwan) in Security Council. Rather, instead of giving India a permanent seat in the Security Council of the United Nations, he was bent on making Communist China a permanent member because he was suspecting that the Western bloc was leading him to enmity between India and China which are two good friends (Gowtham Devarapalli, 2022). Whereas at that time if India had gotten permanent membership in the Security Council of the United Nations, then perhaps India would have had its own existence in the international order as a superpower. Today it does not have to ask for a permanent seat in the Security Council of the United Nations and maybe China would have been India's good friend, which it is not now.

On the basis of Ambedkar's farsightedness and British initiative only, in 1945, while still under colonial rule, therefore, India became a founding member of the World Bank. For the first time, India suggested the formation of a special group to help developing countries, on the basis of which the International Development Association was later established. Shortly in post-independence, in 1949 India took the first loan from the World Bank for the development of the Indian Railways and it is one of the longest rail networks in the world. This was the first loan given by the World Bank to an Asian country, and also the first time it was signed by a woman—Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit (The World Bank Brief, 2021).

6. Economic Independency

From 1947 to 1954, increasing the production of the most important food grains and making efforts for industrial progress was very necessary to solve the problems of independent India. During this period, India had to import a lot of for the supply of wheat grain. The United States of America helped India in this regard. Therefore, India had to build its foreign trade relations with the vision of maintaining trade relations with America. The United Nations took action against North Korea in the Korean War of 1950. In this matter, India had to support America because America was solving the problem of the wheat grain supply in India. Therefore, when the whole world was divided into two blocs during the cold war, then it became necessary for India to maintain its inclination towards the Western bloc. That's why India's trade relations were mostly with the western bloc, especially with Britain and Common Wealth (McMahon, 1987). Therefore, Ambedkar realized that India's foreign policy should be independent. Ambedkar also felt that if India was economically independent, it could take the right decision. Thus, at that time, Ambedkar found the national interest of India linked to her economic policy. Analyzing the increasing dependence on foreign countries' support, it was necessary to reduce this dependency. Ambedkar suggested that in this way, the burden of foreign loans will increase, which is against the national interest. He commented that India has become independent after a long time and freedom is a valuable treasure for India. That's why agriculture should be a state industry so that India does not have to depend on any other country (Singariya, 2013).

Along with this, Ambedkar believes that such a policy for other nations should be made so that the strength of our independence remains. He suggested that we cannot sacrifice our independence and self-respect just by depending on other countries for our needs. Thus, we should handle our food crisis in such a way that the ancient pride and honor of India maintains. Not only this, the Indian economy has been greatly affected due to the arrival of refugees. That's why India was in great need of money to improve its economic condition. It is very difficult to run huge five-year plans without foreign aid. According to Ambedkar, foreign aid is inevitable due to insufficient internal resources. Therefore, technology and capital investment should be given more priority in the transfer of foreign aid. Thus, Ambedkar was of the views of "Atta Deepo Bhav" propounded by Buddha which simply means that "self-help is the best help" (Kalva, 2022). Ambedkar's view is close to that of the neo-realist Kenneth Waltz (1979) that "States do not willingly place themselves in situations of increased dependence. In a self-help system, considerations of security subordinate economic gain to political interest" (Waltz ,2014 ;Mitchell, 2015).

7. Ambedkar as Proponent of a Strong Nation in the World

Ambedkar believed that India should have a unique place in the establishment of world peace. For this, India must have an independent existence in the world. India should move away from the policy of colonialism, imperialism and, apartheid, and exploitation, in relation to fraternity, equality, and social justice at the international level should establish itself in this regard. India has achieved its independence after a long political and social struggle, so the work does not end here. India should guide many Asian and African countries in achieving independence (Mehta, 2013). In the maintenance of India's international relations, if there is a violation of freedom, killing of justice, or if there is an attack, then India must have replied immediately. Inaction and cowardice cannot give a firm place to the Indian nation in the world. Such peace and non-violence protests will make India's international relations disrespectful and nonexistent. Therefore, the path of development in the world should be taken forward in such a way that India should be considered an embodiment of equality and power, as he said that "war cannot be abolished by merely refusing to fight when attacked, to abolish war you must win the war and establish a just peace" (Khare, 2005, 192).

Along with this, Ambedkar wanted India to behave like a completely sovereign state. Therefore, in 1948, about the relationship with Commonwealth Ambedkar prepared an important dossier of the kind of relationship India should have in the British Commonwealth and handed it privately to the finance minister of India. The finance minister informed Ambedkar, "I read it with great pleasure, an easy and simple analysis of a very tough problem". In the dossier, Ambedkar argues that the need for cooperation, between India and Commonwealth, is mutual. The Commonwealth can provide the help we need for technical progress and defence quicker than any other country and that is why it will not be wise for India to snap the ties with the Commonwealth. Ambedkar described the pattern of colonial status and argued, "We cannot be loyal to the King; our president will not represent the King. Another reason is more emotional. Even if we leave the British out, the Commonwealth will be dominated by white people. We can be citizens of the Commonwealth but the common citizen is dangerous." He thrashes it out further concluding "Commonwealth citizenship is an empty concept. This kind of citizenship implies loyalty to the King. India being a federal state cannot be loyal to the King. De Valero, the Irish independence fighter, accepted the membership as a colleague state on certain conditions in 1921. We should ask for the same status. Our membership should always depend on what India wishes to do." Suggesting a way out, he said, "instead of being a member of the Commonwealth on conditions, we should add the above provision to the Constitution of the Commonwealth"(Moon, 2002). That's why five things were involved in Ambedkar's maintenance of international relations: (1) harmonized relations with neighbor countries, (2) independence with the concept of affirmative economics, (3) reduction in dependence on foreign aid, (4) self-sufficiency in food grains, and (5) Self-reliance in agriculture and industrial development.

8. Relations To The Neighboring Countries

8.1. Relation with Pakistan

Ever since India became independent, the issue of Pakistan has remained a burning issue for India. As mentioned earlier, Ambedkar was very concerned about the issue of Pakistan. The issue of Kashmir has been very complicated in this regard. He suggested a way to deal with this issue prudently. On 10th October 1951, Ambedkar suggested that "our quarrel with Pakistan is a part of our foreign policy about which I feel deeply dissatisfied. There are two grounds that have disturbed our relations with Pakistan—one is Kashmir and the other is the condition of our people in East Bengal" (Kotwal, 2022).

Taking that to be the main question, Ambedkar's view has always been that the right solution is to partition Kashmir. The Buddhist and Hindu portion should be given to India and the Muslim portion should be given to Pakistan as we did in the case of India. He told that it is a matter between the Muslims of Kashmir and Pakistan for which India is really not concerned. To this problem, the Muslim majority part of Kashmir should be left to decide their future on their own or split it into three parts; the Cease-fire zone, the Valley, and the Jammu-Ladakh Region, and a plebiscite should have only the Valley. Ambedkar was afraid of the proposed plebiscite, which was to be an overall plebiscite, he realized that the Hindus and Buddhists of Kashmir are likely to be dragged into Pakistan against their choices and we may have to confront the same problems as we are facing today in East Bengal" (Ambedkar, 2016, 129 & 849).

In Ambedkar's opinion, the problem which has been decided on the basis of religion has to be solved on the same basis. When communal hatred has divided Kashmir, then political unity and constitutional bonds cannot be helpful in uniting Kashmir. Sects are also one of the established values of foreign policy. The solution to the Kashmir problem is also in this. Ambedkar, therefore, repeated the statement of Bismark and Bernard Shah. According to the former, "politics is not a game of realizing the ideal. Politics is the game of the possible" (Team Ambedkar Today, 2019). And in the wording of Bernard Shaw, "good ideals are good but one must not forget that it is often dangerous to be too good. Our foreign policy is in complete opposition to these words of wisdom uttered by two of the world's greatest men" (Team Dharma Dispatch, 2022). But alas the Indian government did not give importance to his plan for Kashmir problem.

Ambedkar resigned from the position of Union law minister and told five causes for doing so. The third cause highlights his disappointment with India's policy on Kashmir. Mentioned statement in the explanation of his resignation from the Cabinet is available in Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches (BAWS), Vol. 14 (2), page 1317. During the General Discussion on the budget in 1952-53, while denouncing the expenditure on the Indian Army due to engagement in Kashmir, Ambedkar replied it was a needless burden on India's depository: "The question of the plebiscite is in no way new in the history of the world... After the First World War, I certainly remember there were two questions to be settled by plebiscite... which we can usefully carry into the Kashmir dispute and have the matter settled quickly so that we can release Rs. 50 crores from the Defence Budget and utilize it for the benefit of our people"(Beg, 2020).

Moreover, Ambedkar asserted that out of 350 crores of rupees of revenue India raises annually, it spends about Rs. 180 crores of rupees on the Army. It is a massive expenditure which has hardly any parallel (Paranjpe, 2009). During the debate on budget in Rajya Sabha he attacked the Indian Government, "the amount of money needed for the development in the country is being spent on the military defence which should be reduced" (Moon, 2002). Ambedkar reiterated his support for a plebiscite in Kashmir, stressing that India could learn from "the line of action taken by the League of Nations with regard to the plebiscite in Upper Silesia and Alsace-Lorraine" (Beg, 2020). His resentment was due to his foresightedness which he showed in his speech. He said "On the Kashmir issue, the policy adopted by the Congress Government is not acceptable... This policy if continued will lead to a perpetual enmity between India and Pakistan, and the possibility of war between the two countries...while they should be good and friendly neighbors" (Telegraph India.com, 2019). Today this thing proved worthwhile.

Along with this argument, he refused to draft Article 370 for Jammu and Kashmir because he was firmly opposed to it. Ambedkar expected that by including the Article and making limited application of laws made by Parliament for this state, it would create lots of problems rather than solving them. He was not interested to give special powers to Jammu and Kashmir. Instead of drafting the article, he said to Mr. Sheikh Abdullah, you want that India should defend Kashmir. "You wish India should protect your borders, she should build roads in your area, should supply you with food grains, and Kashmir should get equal status as India, but you don't want India and any citizen of India to have any rights in Kashmir and the Government of India should have only limited powers. To give consent to this proposal would be a treacherous thing against the interests of India, and I, as the Law Minister of India, will never do that. I cannot betray the interests of my country" (Telegraph India.com, 2019), since he considered Kashmir as a part of India like other states of India.

8.2. Relation with China

Ambedkar was too pragmatic and realistic in nature therefore he demanded a realistic foreign policy for China but he was too critical of Nehru's friendly approach to Communist China and taking a non-alignment position preventing India to develop close ties with the democratic United States of America. Given the track record of China and its expansionist approach, Ambedkar pointed out that India's first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's policy of engagement with Communist China was a mistake, instead, India could have better allied its foreign policy with the United State of America as both the countries are democratic. In retrospect, especially after the 1962 war and the usurpation of Aksai-Chin by China, Ambedkar's prophecy was proven right.

In 1951, to address Lucknow University's students, Ambedkar said about China that India must choose between parliamentary democracy and Communist way of dictatorship and come to a conclusion. He was opposed to Nehru's approach of '*Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai*' (India and China are brothers) and disagreed with India's Tibet policy (Tajamul, Usha, & Nasreena, 2015). He took a pragmatic approach to realize the strategic goals of the country and solving the forthcoming problems rather than endeavoring to realize an ideal geo-political order. He was not even against using power and wit for intensifying the strategic gains of the country and condemned Nehru's patience in waiting for the evolution of a just global political order on the hypothesis that good sense would prevail among the world powers. As a great expert on political science, theorist to international politics and Constitution, he believed that there is no place for *Panchsheel* (five-fold ideals) in international politics. In his opinion, India would have tried hard to win a permanent seat in the United Nations Security Council and a pragmatic Tibet policy. Instead of believing in China, Ambedkar felt that close Indo-US relations premised on a natural affinity of democracies would lead to foreign assistance to India and lighten the national burden. Ambedkar did not just stop at that but also introduced the idea of forming a league of democracies in Asia and beyond to counter the expansionism of Communist and other autocratic regimes (Sentinel Digital Desk, 2022). Later on, this idea became famous in International Relations by the name of *Democratic Peace Theory*.

Regarding the *Non-alignment policy*, Ambedkar also criticized the foreign policy of India towards China as being too idealistic. He called for foreign policy to be specific by outlining clear lines of association either with democratic countries such as the US or communist nations such as China. It is necessary to mention here the fact that he resented not being a part of the defense committee or foreign committee in India's cabinet and was only vested with joint responsibility without any active privileges for policy making. His attitude regarding China was also accompanied by his regret for not being able to afford the substantial time to attend to the foreign affairs of the country because he was involved in drafting India's constitution.

One of the prominent events that could be observed as clear evidence of Ambedkar's attitude on China is the international acclaim that he got for criticizing Nehru's 'fractured' foreign policy and its relevance for China. *Time* magazine stated that Ambedkar was the first significant Indian leader to openly criticize the foreign policy of Nehru on the grounds of being distant towards the United States of America and securing too much friendliness with China (Sentinel Digital Desk, 2022).

On 26th August 1954 Ambedkar censured Nehru on his foreign policy. He disapproved the policies of power hungry Russia. "Communism is like a flaming fire which will devour everything, even capitalism." He scrutinized the American and European policies and warned the nation of possible Chinese invasion, "India will be invaded by those who are habitual invaders" (Moon, 2002).

The Tibet policy was also a major point of consideration in the views that Ambedkar had on China. He felt that India should be given priority in solving the problem and not China. He condemned the intervention of China in Tibet and thus he relied on the most basic paradigm to approach this issue. According to him, to ensure stability in the nation, a pragmatic approach should be adopted in foreign policy. This can be observed in his recommendations for making the foreign policy of India on the grounds of strategic and developmental alternatives as well as solving national problems rather than regional and global problems (Khare, 2013).

Ambedkar said India has not succeeded to develop a strong foreign policy. Tibet has been occupied by China; it will have a long-term threat to India. This statement by Ambedkar is still relevant. In fact, he wanted Tibet must be an independent region. In a speech in Kathmandu in 1955, he warned about the aggressive and expansionist approach of China to the Himalayan states. After the war of 1962 Indian foreign policy synchronized itself under the coercive measures of China from a major power to a humble entity. Keeping the words of Ambedkar, Tibet and Tibetans' dignity needs to be protected. It is not only for the interests of Tibetans but for India (Kumar, 2017).

Ambedkar also realized the strategic value of Tibet as a buffer zone between India and China and the close link between Tibet's independence and Indian security while stating that "by letting China take control over Lhasa (Tibetan Capital) the Prime Minister Nehru has in a way helped the Chinese to bring their armies on the Indian borders. Further he said, any victor who annexes Kashmir can directly reach Pathankot, and I know for sure that he can reach the Prime Minister's House also." Not happened only this, but

the recent clashes in Galwan since 2020 have made foreign policy thinkers and the Indian strategic community realized that understanding the value of an independent or de-militarized Tibetan plateau is critical for peaceful borders (Rashid & Khaund, 2022).

8.3. Ambedkar's Views on Goa

On the issue of Goa Ambedkar rejected Nehru's policy too. He criticized Nehru, by commenting that "as far as I remember, immediately after independence Prime Minister was reminded of the abandonment and transfer of Goa by the Portuguese. A delegation was sent to Prime Minister, but he did not show any interest in it. I believe that if he actively participated in Goa's matter from the beginning, then with a small police action of the Government of India, we could take possession of Goa. But he kept raising his voice for Goa. He did nothing. The result was that the Portuguese garrisoned Goa" (Moon, 2002).

Furthermore, Ambedkar estimated that if we consider that Goa is not protected from military power and it's not an army or weapons brought by the Portuguese there as the Prime Minister ensures us. That's why it is futile to argue about the situation, it will not yield any result. Suppose the Portuguese behave well with the people of Goa, then will we give up our claim on Goa? Portuguese might give Goa the status of an independent colony and full citizenship status to its people. Still, we will not give up our claim on Goa as it is a part of India. Unfortunately, even the most enlightened countries are supporting the Portuguese.

Ambedkar expected that India would have to bear the brunt of the non-alignment policy, so in the case of Goa, he observed the international community. He asserted that "I am feeling regretted to know that Mr. Churchill is also supporting the Portuguese. The Prime Minister is repeating Mr. Churchill's words that the Portuguese will not use force. Brazil has a similar attitude, while America has no clear stand on it. Perhaps his sympathies are also with the Portuguese. I wonder why this is happening. Why is England, who voluntarily gave us independence, giving hostile opinions to other countries in this situation? It's impossible to know this. I do not know whether Prime Minister Nehru would accept my suggestion or not, but I think the international community wants to teach him a lesson to follow the path of non-alignment" (Khairmode, 1979).

Therefore, Ambedkar has given some suggestions to the Indian government regarding Goa: "I have a suggestion for Prime Minister Nehru If the Portuguese has the support of other members of the United Nations; India should not enter into a military conflict with them. But I have two proposals. You would remember the case of Louisiana in America where it was French dominated. America dominated on both sides of that state. Americans wanted the French to give up their hegemony over the state so that it can be incorporated into the United States of America. The United States of America paid a high price to get it. I have proof of that too. That price is not high for such a large area and Goa is nothing compared to that. Goa will have an area equal to a city in Louisiana if Prime Minister Nehru wants to adopt this proposal" (Khairmode, 1979). The second proposal he gave to Nehru was to take Goa on lease. He said that Berar was leased. Berar was the property of Nizam, he was the ruler there but in 1853 the British government took it on a permanent lease, I think the Nizam must have been given a very nominal amount. We want complete authority over Goa and want to establish our rule there. There is an example in our country in which the king's property was taken on lease and later became part of the country permanently. I think his son was made Prince of Berar. This is another option that can be implemented by Prime Minister Nehru. There is no reason why either of these methods should not be successful in convincing the Portuguese. In this way, the Nehru government did not pay attention to both the options (suggested by Ambedkar) of purchasing Goa or taking it on lease (Parvathaneni, 2009).

But even here Nehru did neither adopt Ambedkar's policy nor appreciate it in the case of Goa. The result was that Nehru delayed Goa's liberation until 1949 and from 1949 to 1954 Indian government began to negotiate with French Government, all the French enclaves merged with India peacefully but the Portuguese had given a dissent over it. In the end, only armed action worked in Goa, and was liberated from 450 years of Portuguese rule but by 1961 there had been a lot of loss of life and property. In this sense, the Indian government made a big mistake by not adopting the peaceful methods suggested by Ambedkar.

9. Realistic and Pragmatic Approach to Foreign Policy

Ambedkar was writing the Indian Constitution at a time when realism was being introduced to international politics. Political scientist and historian Hans J. Morgenthau was the leading post-war scholar who had tried to provide a shape to realism in international relations through his classical text *"Politics among the Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace"*, (1948). For Morgenthau, politics is governed by laws rooted in human nature. He believed that power is the dominant goal in international politics, and it defines the national interest in terms of power. His state-centered approach rejects the moral ground of the state aspirations with the objective moral laws employed to govern the universe and maintained that all state actions seek to keep, demonstrate and increase power. Morgenthau interpolated an approach that emphasized power over morality. In this way Morgenthau could be considered the pioneer of realism (Cristol, 2009), but Ambedkar gave a new progressive theory by combining morality with realism.

Ambedkar was also one of those realists who believed that the struggle always remains even after the war. The struggle is constant for the powerless but powerful always dominates by the constructed social structure. This idea has been propounded in his text "*Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Ancient India*"; he has accepted in this text that Indian history is none other than the struggle between Brahmanism and Buddhism. A struggle always remains between egalitarian Buddhist ideology and dominant Brahmanic ideology which can be observed in ancient Indian history.

According to Ambedkar, one thing has an important place in making morality sacred and comprehensive. He argued that the one who is the best in society should be given security from the point of view of social interest. The background of this thing is related to the situation in which we imagine the 'struggle of life' and the 'survival of the fittest' in it as is given in Darwinism. This question is directly related to the theory of evolution. Everyone knows that the development that has happened in human society is due to the struggle of life. Because food was available in very limited quantities in early life, in the distribution of which, there was a fierce struggle. It was a condition when nature's claws and teeth were soaked in blood. In such a fierce and bloody struggle for life, only the fittest survived because it was physically strong. The basic condition of human society has been like this. Nevertheless, in very ancient times, someone or the other must have raised the question of whether only the fittest should be considered the best. If the weakest one is also saved by giving protection, then this wish will not be fulfilled from the point of view of society. Couldn't the weakest people be superior or best from the point of view of society? It must have got an affirmative answer. Then the question would also have arisen what is the solution for the protection of the weakest? The only solution for this was that some restrictions should be imposed on the fittest so that it would allow the weakest to live as well. Even the weakest one can be a great citizen of society, even if he is not physically fit. In this situation, the utility and root of morality are hidden (Tilgodia, 2003). That's why it was necessary to make moral ideals sacred and comprehensive. Moral restrictions were necessary not only for the fittest but for all the citizens of the society. By doing this, not only the physically strong will be disciplined, but also be protected the weakest, who might otherwise have been best (Ambedkar, 2017).

With this Social Darwinism theory, Ambedkar praised realism at one way and Buddhist idealism at the other way, which is also applicable to international relations. In this way, in the condition of post-Darwinism, how to maintain the international order is described by Ambedkar. Thus he provides the idea of following a realistic as well as a progressive/pragmatic approach in the international arena or society. In this way, Ambedkar gives importance to the "societal concept" of Hadley Bull. The idea of international society believes in the assumption of the "societal" nature of inter-state relations. This concept is usually got to mean that order in international politics is maintained because of social bonds between states. Hedley Bull provided the most compact definition, according to which international society "exists when a group of states, conscious of certain common interests and common values, form a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another, and share in the working of common institutions" (Bull, 2002, p. 13; Hoffman, 1986).). But still, Ambedkar does not appear to be sticking to any one ideology, he always wanted to implement a dynamic, pragmatic or progressive approach in International Society via conducting with social justice. That thing is different, in the campaign to save the weakest state; the United Nations adopted the principle of "Collective Security" so that no country can show its aggression on the newly independent and weakest nations or any nation of the international community (or society). A collective security system guarantees the security of each state of the world against any aggressive activity which may be committed by any state against any other state. It was based on the principle of "one for all, and all for one" (Ebegbulem, 2011) which could be matched to Ambedkar's social justice in International Relations.

Therefore, Ambedkar also rejected the policy of *coexistence*. He believed that the principle of co-existence is very surprising. The question is—could communism and democracy co-exist? Could it be expected that there will be no conflict between the two? That's why Ambedkar considered this belief absurd. He believed that communism is a forest fire that burns and destroys whatever comes in its way. Countries that are far from the center of communism think that by the time the forest fire reaches them, they will destroy it. But what will happen to the countries which are very close to this fire? He has thoroughly analyzed articles by politicians from Canada and Europe in which they have supported coexistence. He was not impressed at all by their praise. He said that Canadian politicians could safely say that coexistence was possible because Canada was thousands of miles from China and Russia. Thus, England barely survived the world war. Now England has realized that it was tired, it could no longer do anything, so it could support coexistence. But it's also a question of, as Ambedkar believed, geographical distance. He said that we should not forget that in the foreign policy of any country, its geographical location has great importance. That's why India should decide in this regard, keeping in view its geographical location. What might be in the interest of Canada might not be in India's interest. What might be good for England might be bad for India. We have to think about it. Therefore, in Ambedkar's view, the policy of coexistence was such that Nehru adopted it without any thought and farsightedness (Gaikwad, 1999).

Today we can observe Ambedkar's pragmatic foreign policy prophecies which have proven right. Ambedkar had already warned against China's expansionist approach. Recently, China is using its military might for territorial expansionism in the neighborhood, it is also using its "deep pockets" to non-militarily expand its strategic reach, even if it means violating

international laws and there should be a debt trap for the associates (Paul, 2019). It was prophetic on Ambedkar's part to doubt communist China's intention to cooperate for development and strategic partnership. The Communist ideology of his times had an underlying component of military expansionism and it has not shifted even today, especially in the matter of China. Chinese expansionism continues in its neighborhood persisted since it occupied Tibet in the early 1950s and it has not expanded to even smaller countries in South and Central Asian neighborhood. It is error-free fact that China went along with its expansionist policy in Tibet, Southern Mongolia, East Turkmenistan, and also Hong Kong, and Taiwan in one way or the other. While the whole world is observing with great concern China's recent and explicit expansionist policy in the South China Sea in infringement of international laws or norms, its incursions in South Asian smaller neighboring countries remain less noticed. Nepal and Bhutan are examples of it. Notwithstanding its claim about friendship with Nepal, China has captured some parts of Nepal successfully, using what is described as "salami slicing strategy"(divide and conquer). In seven border districts of Nepal, including Dolakha, Gorkha, Darchula, Humla, Sindhupalchowk, Sanbhuwasabha, and Rasuwa China has penetrated and occupied territory. China has also not left Bhutan. A Chinese map that was published in 1951 showed territories in Bhutan, Nepal, and Sikkim in China. Incursions by the Chinese military in the Tibetan plateau have enhanced tensions in Bhutan. China even tried to encroach on the territories around India's border, the latest military's forward movement in the Galwan Valley it's an example that violated the 1996 agreement with India to maintain peace till border disputes are settled (Shivamurthy et al., 2022). India has opposed Chinese threats for an incursion in its Ladakh region. That's why Ambedkar narrated that the foreign policy of the country has given him "cause, not merely for dissatisfaction but for actual anxiety and even worry"; further he said in 1951 "On 15th of August 1947 when we began our life as an independent country the world was our friend. Today, after four years, all our friends have deserted us... How dangerous it has been to us this policy of doing the impossible and of being too good" (The Indian Express, 2009). Ambedkar had said this because the Constitutional Assembly was not unanimous about his views on the issue of *Panchsheel*, so he decided to debate the issue. In this debate, to put Panchsheel in National Policy, K.T. Shah, Mahavir Tyagi, B.H. Khardekar, Damodar Swaroop Seth and Anantasayanilyengar participated to come on the conclusion (Verma, 1989).

Ambedkar claimed the fallacy of the *Panchsheel* Agreement of 1954 between India and China by describing that "I am indeed surprised that our Honorable Prime Minister is taking this 'Panchsheel' seriously... If Mr. Mao had even an iota of faith in Panchsheel (both the agreement as well as the Buddhist code) he would have treated the Buddhists in his country in a different manner" (Mehrotra, 2000). Related to this criticism was the realization by Ambedkar of the realist maxim of power succession over morality when he uttered that "Panchsheel (The Buddhist code of five principles) has no place in politics. The truth inherent in Panchsheel is that morality is forever changing. There is nothing called morality. You can abide by your promises in accordance with today's morality and by the same propriety you may violate your own promise simply because tomorrow's morality will have different demands" (Parvathaneni, 2009).

Here, Ambedkar compared the Nehruvian idealistic policy to Mao's realpolitik in the sense that while India felt that China would carry out the Panchsheel or the morality of respecting India's brotherly sentiments, the latter's realist and power-driven and aggressive goals were made explicit by the fact of China's strike on Tibetan Buddhist culture which contravened a main tenet of the Panchsheel Agreement and earlier promises of autonomy made to Tibetans as well as to India of respecting Tibet's special character and not openly militarizing it (this can also be observed as contravened of two principles of the Panchsheel Buddhist code– not telling lie and abstaining from destruction and stealing). At the same, Ambedkar's warnings regarding the fragility of morality and agreements in international politics subject to realist and pragmatic calculations have proven right during the subsequent border skirmishes and the recent impasse in Ladakh since 2020 which were in contravention to earlier border agreements and confidence-building measures of 1993, 1996, 2003 and 2013 respectively (Rashid & Khaund, 2022). Therefore, he rightly said that Panchsheel is of no use in politics, at least not in the communist countries. The whole of Asia is a battlefield and India needs to align itself with other democratic countries." (Moon, 2002).

Aniruddha Babar (2021) rightly said about Ambedkar that "He was an expert in International Relations and Defence affairs as well. India is now finally realizing the value of his thoughts on Foreign as well as Defence policies. Everything that Ambedkar predicted about China and the world has proved to be a reality" (Babar, 2021).

9.1. Determinants of India's Foreign Policy

In this way, Ambedkar used to have very different views from Nehru in relation to foreign policy by observing neighboring and international conditions. But the conduct of foreign policy is based on some fundamental principles. By which a nation in foreign affairs, while dealing with other nations politically, economically, and socially, follows these principles. Each nation, according to its purpose and ideals, establishes adequate coordination in the national interest and international interest and conducts the foreign policy of its country. India also has to establish a balance between national and international interests. According to Ambedkar, The basic objective of India's foreign policy is—protection of national interest, in reference to opposition to war,

imperialism, colonialism, and racial discrimination, and trying to remove the economic disparity between developed and developing countries through the United Nations and promoting international peace and co-operation, etc.

Ever since Ambedkar joined Indian politics, he has been involved indirectly or directly in Indian foreign policy. Even when the country was not independent, Ambedkar continued to give his suggestions in deciding India's foreign policy. For example, Ambedkar also gave his suggestions to the British Government regarding India's involvement in the Second World War. As he said in 1939 while debating in the Bombay Legislative Assembly—"In so far as the resolution says that India has been made a participant in the war between Great Britain and Germany without the consent of the people of India...The British Cabinet controls the foreign policy of the Empire. In the making of foreign policy, this country (India) has no voice. In the declaration of war, this country has no voice. In the settling of peace terms, this country has no voice...India has a greater right to participate in the foreign policy of Great Britain, a far greater right than the Dominions have..."(Ambedkar, 1990). Here Ambedkar wanted to say that India has full right to remain neutral in this war because the consent of the people of India has not been taken about this. At the outbreak of the Second World War, he called upon Indians to join the Army in large numbers to defeat Nazism, which he said, was another name for Fascism (Khare, 2005, 192). He said that the Nazi ideology is a direct menace to the liberty and freedom of Indians. He further stated that the fury with which the British Government had been denounced by Hitler in his *Mein Kampf* for having given Indians education and political liberty, is quite well known. Given this fact, there is the strongest reason why Indians should come forward to fight Nazism...this war is full of potential for good. It promises to give birth to a new order...by fighting this war and establishing the New Order the world can be made safe for democracy."(Lokhande, 1982).

Ambedkar believes that determining foreign policy is too complex. This is a reflection of nations' behavior. With more subtle and sharper vision, nations' character could be examined. If any state has flawed insight into the changing nature of states, its predictions are bound to be flawed. State politics quickly slips on the ground of mercy and morality. Deception, deceit, and selfishness emerge with the relation to others in foreign affairs. Compulsion is of no use in foreign affairs. Ambedkar believes that whether it is a matter of partition of India, Pakistan's intention to snatch Kashmir, whether it is the matter of keeping Goa under control by the Portuguese, or the matter of possession of Lhasa by China, in all these cases, India's defeat has come from considering the foreign policy as simple, peaceful and coexistence. Thus, it seems that Mergenthu's views and Ambedkar's views were similar in a way that national interest is paramount; states do not follow any moral rules or laws. Ambedkar believes that peace, coexistence, and Panchsheel can be principles for foreign policy but the face of politics keeps on changing with the change of states, change of governments, and change of government bases. Ambedkar believes that no one can end the existence of moral and humanistic values. But Buddhism makes us aware of the worldview. Only our internal and external approach will keep us alert, which should be the foundation of our foreign policy. Only then can these moral principles of ours be protected. Because without power and influence in world politics, it is very easy to violate principles, it has no control system. Therefore, in the absence of power and influence, the spirit of peaceful coexistence and world brotherhood is likely to fall down. That's why Ambedkar's foreign policy is practical or pragmatic and dynamic in this sense. Moreover, he believes that in world politics, now the time for pedantry has gone, preserving independence and sovereignty has remained important, and it seems easy to be lost in peaceful cowardice. It is not adequate that you are following the rules of the road, it is enough to protect you, but the co-traveler should also follow the rules of the road, foreign policy is based on the same. Our protection and rights will be achieved only when our vision is ambivalent in following the principles. Unprincipled foreign policy is the path of distraction, but in the shadow of ideals in world politics, power and influence can be used to protect sovereignty. That's why compulsion, cowardice, passivity, immobility, and inattention are not synonymous with Panchsheel and Co-existence. These principles are impressive with their eternal values but India has to accept their dynamic form. Only this role of India will be in its own interest and the interest of world peace.

10. Ambedkar as a Future Realistic thinker of International Relations

Ambedkar used this quote from Thucydides on the first page of his classical text *"What Gandhi and Congress have done for untouchables?"* which proclaims as –*"It may be your interest to be our masters, but how can it be ours to be your slaves?"* (Ambedkar, 1945). This shows that Ambedkar had studied Thucydides (a famous Greek Realist), Ambedkar must have been aware of Classical Realism. Moving forward in the path of Realism, he also went ahead of Kenneth N. Waltz, a neo-realist thinker who gave *"levels of analysis"* formula to run the foreign policy of a country (Elman, 1996). The levels of analysis constitute a framework or perspective on International Relations that suggests a multiplicity of influences, actors, structures, and processes to explain international outcomes and events. That's why Ambedkar tried to see India's condition at the individual level, state level, and international level to decide India's foreign policy (Onuf, 1995).

Ambedkar gave a lot of importance to the geographical location of India (Khare, 2005, 220) at the *individual level*. He observed that the northern boundary of India is bounded by the Himalayan Mountains which is considered the Indian border. China, Nepal, and Bhutan in its north; several mountain ranges separate India from Burma in the east. In the east, Pakistan, which is today called Bangladesh, is surrounded by the Indian states of West Bengal, Assam, Meghalaya, Tripura, and Mizoram. Pakistan and Afghanistan are in the northwest. The Andaman and Nicobar Islands in the Bay of Bengal and the Lakshadweep Islands in the Arabian Sea are

part of Indian Territory. The mainland of India is divided into four distinct divisions—The extensive mountainous region, the plains of the Indus and the Ganges, the desert region, and the southern peninsula—all these facts together are important for establishing India's economic and security relations (Khimesara, 1995).

India cannot ignore its marine border at any cost in the establishment of international economic relations. The events of Indian history show that the powers that dominate the Indian Ocean may easily establish their authority over India. Once upon a time, it was said that the one who ruled the Mediterranean Sea would do business in the world. Today this is the condition of the Indian Ocean. In the 18th century, European tribes also entered through sea routes. When the Indian seas were ruled by the British, the way to establish British trade in India became easy. Almost all the foreign trade in India was done through this route. Therefore, by making good trade relations with neighboring countries, the whole economy can be benefited. It may be convenient to maintain cordial economic relations among the coastal areas.

As far as the northern border is concerned, India's northern border is shared by many neighboring countries. India's land border is shared with Pakistan, China, Nepal, Bhutan, Afghanistan, and Burma. North Kashmir is connected to Afghanistan and it is only a few kilometers away from the border of the Soviet Union (now Russia). The mountain range of the Himalayas exists between China and India. In ancient times it was an invincible sentinel. Scientific progress and the invention of strategic weapons have ended this security of India. His idea has paid off; today India is a nuclear power.

According to Ambedkar, therefore, it has become necessary for the development of India to maintain good relations with its neighboring countries. That's why it can always take care of geographical conditions through economic relations with its neighboring countries. Because trade relations keep changing, breaking, and forming, but the geographical location remains the same. But the mountain ranges of the Himalayas and the Indian Ocean lead India to conflict with the neighboring countries. Therefore, the following benefits can be obtained from trade relations with neighboring countries:

1. Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, Sri Lanka, Malaya, China, Siam (the former name of Thailand), Dutch, and East Indies can become good markets for India.
2. Traders and investors in these states will be able to get opportunities for security and business development only when there is harmony with the neighboring states.
3. Trade security is possible only on the security of sea and air routes.
4. Due to good relationships with neighboring countries, there remains a sense of security among investors and expatriates towards international trade (Khimesara, 1995).

In the maintenance of international economic relations, *at the group level*, India's relations with neighboring countries are important. For this, India has a vast sea coast, which has good connectivity (Khimesara, 1995).

Ambedkar was more concerned about security because he was having a sense the process of nation-building in India at the *state level*. Then India was one of the few independent countries. Ambedkar felt that India was divided into thousands of castes in which untouchability was at its peak due to the ideology of Hinduism. Due to this, there was a lack of brotherhood or fraternity in India. He believed that if India was not divided into castes, India would not have been ruled by aggressive powers or foreign invaders again and again. He also observed a common area where people live together and are connected through common descent, history, culture, and language. Therefore, he said that "feeling of oneness, the consciousness of a common heritage, consent desire and desire to live together, as the most important element of a nation" (Mathew, 1991). Therefore, only by eradicating social evils, untouchability will be destroyed and the feeling of brotherhood will be born among the countrymen, only then India will be able to become a strong and powerful nation.

Ambedkar was observing India's situation even at the *international level*. He asserted that the world is broken into two big blocs after World War II. Many countries are merging into the Russian bloc. What is the American policy now, Ambedkar understands that their point of view is that Russia has got ten countries; it should be satisfied with them. In Ambedkar's opinion, it is the duty of America and Britain to make free these countries from Russia and make them independent. But neither country has the moral capacity nor the will to take on such a huge task on its hands. That's why they are adopting another way of security; the other way of security is that no country can come under the control of China or Russia. He thinks all freedom lovers or liberals will agree with this view. Now they are planning that Russia should not adopt aggressive methods anymore. SEATO has not been formed to attack any country, but its purpose is to prevent the invasion of independent countries. That's why Ambedkar was against the opinion of Prime Minister Nehru who is against the SEATO. Ambedkar believed that while there is no guarantee that India cannot be invaded. Therefore, the issue of India's security is very important. That's why joining the International Organization will be more important for the purpose of security. In fact, Ambedkar wanted India as a democratic country to join SEATO (South-East Asian Treaty Organization) rather than join the Soviet bloc (Aravindan, 2012). It was an astute analysis by Ambedkar as Pakistan would later join

SEATO as well as the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) in 1954 and 1955 respectively (Gaikwad, 1999). In 1952 he observed it carefully, after returning from America he talking to the press in India on 14 June 1952 that "Americans are sympathetic towards Pakistan, I have noticed when sending their representatives to foreign countries, Pakistan selects them very carefully. Indian representatives in foreign countries are inexperienced. Their education is of a lower standard"(Moon, 2002).

Apart from this, Ambedkar criticized the Nehru government and his leadership. He asserted that Nehru's foreign policy had formed India as a friendless country that Nehru had messed up on the Kashmir issue—protected dishonest men and that India was encircled by a kind of United States of Islam (Pakistan and another Muslim countries) on one hand and Russia/China on the other hand, for the conquest of Asia to bring it under communism. Therefore, he said that 'If you want to be effective, then you must have guns & not mere soft speech' (Sanjeev, 2003). Further, he said that the Indian government should not depend upon the *Panchsheel* accepted by Mao and documented in the Tibet treaty of non-aggression. If Mao had any faith in *Panchsheel*, which was considered a crucial part of Buddhism he definitely would treat the Buddhists in his country in a very different way. 'The keynote of our foreign policy', he bitterly remarked, 'is to solve the problems of other countries and not to solve the problems of our own country'(Sanjeev, 2003).

India did not join SEATO after Ambedkar's warning but Nehru had to explain that India needed an international organization, as Ambedkar said, for its security, so he converted the policy of non-alignment into a world movement and participated in the Bandung Conference in 1955. Daniel Snyder has called Nehru the father of the Non-Alignment Movement (Sneider, 1983). The NAM conference was organized by Indonesia, Burma, Pakistan, Ceylon (Sri Lanka), and India. Its purposes were to oppose colonialism by any nation and to promote Afro-Asian economic and cultural cooperation (Haque, 2017).

11. International Human Rights and Ambedkar

Human rights are above all rights and these are inseparable rights of every human being. The codification of these rights has been begun after the United Nations Charter in 1945. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 is the first codified document. Ambedkar's role in the protection of human rights is generally avoided or not a much-explored area of study. He was considered only a Dalit icon or messiah by his ideology for searching safe heavens for Dalits but in fact, his human rights perspective was for all and it needs in-depth study. He was a strong advocate of human rights for all and the emancipation of Dalits is one of his aims. The concept of universal human rights and the role of Ambedkar in the protection of human rights are closely related. His work for human rights and the emancipation of the underprivileged is remarkable in Indian human history. He was born in an underprivileged community but his work suggests that he has worked for humanity in general and that has to be appreciated by all. He is a national figure and is considered a symbol of knowledge across the world (Sahiti, & Srinivas, 2019).

To understand Ambedkar's role in human rights, it is necessary to understand the concept of human rights in India. India has a very long history of discrimination against women, lower castes, weaker sections and class struggles, etc. It has emerged many social problems like gender inequality, caste, and class-based injustice and discrimination. The development of human rights from 1948 to till date has a place for equality, liberty, fraternity, and social-economic and political justice and it can be observed in the Constitution of India. Therefore, it is important to observe the performance of Ambedkar in the protection of human rights in India. The study of human rights is very important because they are considered essential for human existence. After the decline of the League of Nations, the world community became aware of the protection of human rights for the newly independent countries in the post-World War II period. Forming the United Nations Charter on June 26, 1945, was the first step in the protection of human rights. Shortly afterward, on December 10, 1948, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) came into existence which provides a concrete form for human rights for all.

As evidence, we can observe it that in 1946 and 1947 Ambedkar approached the United Nation and Winston Churchill for the cause of Dalits before the independence of India. Ambedkar has always kept a sharpen eye on international affairs. Ambedkar had prepared a report to the United Nations on the rights of Dalits in India (Khobragade & Singh, 2020). He had sent Shri N. Shivraj, Shri R. R. Bhole and Shri D. G. Jadhav on various occasions to represent the cause of the downtrodden community in the United Nations Organization. He was rightly of the opinion that the slavery of the untouchables was not only a blot on the Indian society but also on the world as a whole. According to him, the world owed a duty to the untouchables as it owed to all suppressed people to break the shackles, and set them free, because the problem of untouchability was grater than the problems of slaves, the Negroes, and the Jews. When in December 1942 he was invited by the Chairman of the Indian Section of the Institution of Pacific Relations, he prepared a document for submission to the conference. Later on, this document was published in 1943 by Thacker & Company, Bombay under the caption, "Mr. Gandhi and the Emancipation of the Untouchables"(Lokhande, 1982).

On 10 December 1948, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to protect humanity from all kinds of injustice. The Declaration was drafted over two years on the initiative of the United Nations commission on human rights. Its chairperson was Eleanor Roosevelt – wife of Franklin Roosevelt. Thus India played its role as a nation which

loves the spirit of universal brotherhood, in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UNUDHR), designed its constitutional preamble to materialize the same. The Indian constitution's preamble promises "to secure to all its citizens' justice –social, economic and political; liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship; equality of status and opportunity; and promote among them all; Fraternity assuring the dignity of the people and the unity of the nation" (ASIRVADAM, 2014). Looking at this preamble, it seems that India has contributed a lot to the development of Universal Human Rights because it reflects the imperatives of social democracy given by Ambedkar. Apart from this, Ambedkar kept trying for the rights of laborers, Dalits and women from the beginning. For example, he did Satyagarh for Dalits, formed BahishkritHitkarini Sabha for them, formed an Independent Labor Party for laborers, and prepared a Hindu Code Bill for women. M Asirvadam asserted that at the time when our constitution was being made, at the same time, some people from India were members of the Committee of Universal Human Rights Commissions (ASIRVADAM, 2014). Apart from it Vivek Kumar Yadav, Shomik Dasgupta and Bharath Kumar claim that focusing on caste-based oppression, Ambedkar made a universal claim for human equality and dignity which appeared long before the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. They claim that Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) declared and asserted that "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights". It appears similar to the Mahad movement's unanimous resolution on human equality, stating that "All human beings are of equal status since birth and they are of equal status until they die", which was stating of about two decades before the Human Rights Universal Declaration (Yadav, Dasgupta, & Kumar, 2020). Moreover, article 2 of the Human Right Declaration—everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms outlined in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status—is quietly matched with article 15 of the Indian constitution.

12. Conclusion

The ideas propounded by Ambedkar show that he was a leading scholar who wanted to establish social justice in India but in external affairs, he wants to adopt a realistic approach with dynamic idealism. The ideals which he asked to be added to the foreign policy are still visible in India's foreign policy. For instance, after the conflict of 1962; Nehru changed the foreign and security policy and adopted the dynamic Panchsheel policy after Ambedkar. Most importantly, India initiated a substantial program of military modernization. It committed itself to build a million-strong army, with ten new mountain divisions equipped and trained for high-altitude warfare, a 45-squadron air force with supersonic aircraft, and a modest program of naval expansion. India's foreign policy behavior, however, increasingly assumed a more realistic orientation. Similarly, as an international theorist, Ambedkar saw India as a strong nation that can leave its influence on other countries. For example, influenced by his ideas, Nehru created the NAM (Non-Alignment Movement) which included several Asian countries. Not only this, Ambedkar turned out to be a neo-realist of the future, who tried to examine international relations at the unit, state, and international levels. Moreover, no matter how many controversies have happened over his thoughts, the contribution of his thoughts be seen even today in the universal declaration of Human Rights. After getting independence, what kind of behavior should have been done with the neighboring countries, it would also have been verified from his thoughts that no country can progress without harmony with its neighboring countries. Thus, he was a global icon who completely thought of the national interest of India and humanity in the world as a whole. Ambedkar rightly said that he was firstly and lastly Indian but people didn't understand him. But those who are trying to understand him have assumed that he is a symbol of knowledge with pragmatic understanding.

The conclusion of the study is based on all the references available for the current study because the scholars have taken no great care in this regard. They either did not touch this dimension of Ambedkar or they even did not get literature for review. On this issue, the limitations of the study have also been similar. But still, this dimension will be very significant for the readers regarding this study. However, this research does not end there, still now, through this study, those aspects related to International Relations and Ambedkar are yet to be discovered which have not yet come to the limelight such as national security, strategic planning, peace and conflict studies, geopolitics, and nationalism ,etc. Hence, it can be said that this research study will prove to be very important for students of International Relations with its wider scope.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9831-1373

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

- [1] Ambedkar, B. R. (1990). Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: Writings and Speeches, Vol. 7. *Government of Maharashtra, Bombay*.(p.243).
- [2] Ambedkar, B. R. (2016). *Ambedkar: Writings and Speeches*. Vol. 15, pp.129 & 849.
- [3] Ambedkar, B. R. (2017). Annihilation of Caste: The Annotated Critical Edition. And Rodrigues, V. (2011). Justice as the lens: Interrogating Rawls through Sen and Ambedkar. *Indian Journal of Human Development*, 5(1), 153-174.
- [4] Ambedkar, B. R. (1945). What Congress And Gandhi Have Done To The Untouchables. Thacker & Co. Ltd. Bombay.
- [5] Aravindan, N. (27 April, 2012). Bodhi Sattva's Hindutva: Part 5. #SWARAJYA. Available at <https://swarajyamag.com/featured/bodhi-sattvas-hindutva-part-5>
- [6] ASIRVADAM, M. (2014) A CRITICAL REVIEW OF DALITS AND HUMAN RIGHTS.
- [7] Ayooob, M.(18 March 2019).Nehru, China and the Security Council seat. The Hindu. Available at <https://www.thehindu.com/opinion/op-ed/nehru-china-and-the-security-council-seat/article26561751.ece>. Retrived on 21 January 2023.
- [8] Babar, A. (2021). Against All Odds-Bhimrao Ambedkar: The Prophet Who Warned India Against Communist China.
- [9] Beg, M.S. (22 April 2020). Kashmir: Integration Through Distortion of Ambedkar's Stand on Article 370. The WIRE. Available at <https://thewire.in/politics/jammu-kashmir-ambedkar-article-370>.Retrived on 7 January 2023.
- [10] Bull, H. (2002). *The Anarchical Society—a study of order in world politics*, 3rd edn, Basingstoke and New York.
- [11] Cabrera, L. (2019). Ambedkar and Du Bois on Pursuing Rights Protections Globally. In *On Public Imagination* (pp. 56-58). Routledge.
- [12] Cristol, J. (2009). Morgenthau vs. Morgenthau?"The Six Principles of Political Realism" in Context. *American Foreign Policy Interests*, 31(4), 238-244.
- [13] Dr. B.R. AMbedkar Speech on 10 October 1951. Avalable at <https://www.dharmadispatch.in/history/how-prime-minister-jawaharlal-nehru-ousted-dr-b-r-ambedkar-from-the-cabinet-the-full-story>
- [14] Ebegbulem, J. C. (2011). The failure of collective security in the Post World Wars I and II international system.
- [15] Elman, C. (1996). Horses for courses: Why nor neorealist theories of foreign policy?. *Security studies*, 6(1), 7-53.
- [16] Gaikwad, Vijay B.,(1999) Dr. Ambedkar's foreign policy and its relevance, Vaibhav Prakashan, Raipur, p. 231
- [17] Gowtham Devarapalli, D. V. (2022). BR Ambedkar's Perspective Of Indian Foreign Policy: A Critique Of Nehruvian Model. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(7), 4232-4238.
- [18] Gwiazdowski, T., &Chouliarakis, G. (2021). Regime change and recovery in 1930s Britain. *Leeds University Business School Working Paper*.
- [19] Haque, A. (20 May 2017). Jawaharlal Nehru – The architect of India's foreign policy. The Times of India. Available at <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/jawaharlal-nehru-the-architect-of-indias-foreign-policy/articleshow/58767014.cms>. Retrieved on 10 January 2023.
- [20] Hoffman, S. (1986). Hedley Bull and his contribution to international relations. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*, 62(2), 179-195.<https://www.ambedkaritoday.com/2019/09/resignation-of-dr-ambedkar-from-cabinet.html>
- [21] Kalva, S. (2022). Anand Teltumbde on Globalization and Ambedkar: A Left Perspective. *Contemporary Voice of Dalit*, 2455328X211067591.
- [22] Khairmode, C.B. (1979) Dr. Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar Charitra Khand, Vol.11.
- [23] Khare, V. (2005) . *Dr. BR Ambedkar and India's national security*. Kilaso Books.
- [24] Khare, V. S.(2013). Strategic and Security Thought of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar.Scholar Press.
- [25] Khimesara, G. (1995). Economic Thoughts of Dr. Ambedkar. (Hindi Version). Madhya Pradesh Hindi Granth Academy. Bhopal
- [26] Khobragade, J., & Singh, P. P.(2020) Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar and Human Rights.
- [27] Kotwal, A. (2022). Ideological edifice of Article 370. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 8898-8904.
- [28] Kumar S. (15 April,2017). Ambedkar's Tibet concerns and Chinese threat. The Pioneer. Available at <https://www.dailypioneer.com/2017/columnists/ambedkars-tibet-concerns-and-chinese-threat.html>. Retrieved on 9 January 2023.
- [29] Laxman, M. (2019). Contribution of Ambedkar in India's Federal Finance System. *Contemporary Voice of Dalit*, 11(1), 8-16.
- [30] Lokhande, G. S. (1982). *Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar, a Study in Social Democracy*. Intellectual Publishing House.
- [31] Mathew, T. (1991). *Ambedkar, Reform or Revolution*. Segment Books.
- [32] McMahan, R. J. (1987). Food as a diplomatic weapon: the India wheat loan of 1951. *Pacific Historical Review*, 56(3), 349-377.
- [33] Mehrotra, L. L. (2000). India's Tibet Policy. *An appraisal and options*. New-Delhi.
- [34] Mehta, P. (2013). *Recasting Caste: Histories of Dalit Transnationalism and the Internationalization of Caste Discrimination* (Doctoral dissertation).
- [35] Metcalf, B. D., & Metcalf, T. R. (2006). *A concise history of modern India*. Cambridge University Press.
- [36] Mitchell, R. (2015). Redefining Pragmatic Engagement: The'NewModel'of US-China Relations and the Opportunity of Shared Consequences. *International Affairs Review*, 23(3).
- [37] Moon, V. (2002). *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, translated by Asha Damle*National Book Trust of India.
- [38] Nawaz, S. (2008). The first Kashmir war revisited. *India Review*, 7(2), 115-154.
- [39] Onuf, N. (1995). Levels. *European Journal of International Relations*, 1(1), 35-58.
- [40] Paranjpe, S.(2009) India's Internal Security.
- [41] Parvathaneni, H. (14 March 2009). What if Ambedkar had shaped India's foreign policy?. The Indian Express Archive. Available at <http://archive.indianexpress.com/news/what-if-ambedkar-had-shaped-india-s-foreign-policy-/434288/2>
- [42] Paul, T. V. (2019). When balance of power meets globalization: China, India and the small states of South Asia. *Politics*, 39(1), 50-63.
- [43] Prasad, C.B. (2022). From the archives: B. R. Ambedkar, the man who saw modernity. *India Today*. Available at <https://www.indiatoday.in/india-today-insight/story/from-the-archives-b-r-ambedkar-the-man-who-saw-modernity-1911448-2022-02-10>
- [44] Rajadhyaksha, N. (14 April 2015). Ambedkar, Rupee and our current troubles. MINT. Availbale at <https://www.livemint.com/Opinion/rMImvbuYNDk4RvWGfMtQO/Ambedkar-rupee-and-our-current-troubles.html>. Retrieved on 21 January 2023.
- [45] Rashid H. & Khaund, A. (16 April 2022).Prophetic Ambedkar and India's Current Foreign Policy. Kashmir Observer. Available at <https://kashmirobsver.net/2022/04/16/prophetic-ambedkar-and-indias-current-foreign-policy/>. Retrived on 7 January, 2023.

- [46] Robinson, C. D. (2012). Too much nationality: Kashmiri refugees, the south Asian refugee regime, and a refugee state, 1947–1974. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 25(3), 344–365.
- [47] Sahiti, M. S., & Srinivas, T. (2019). Relevance of Educational Philosophy of Dr. Br Ambedkar in Contemporary Scenario—An Overview. *New Horizons Of Dalit Culture And Literature*.
- [48] Sanjeev, N (2003). Life and Mission of Dr. Ambedkar. eSamskriti. Available at <https://www.esamskriti.com/e/History/Great-Indian-Leaders/Life-and-Mission-of-Dr-Ambedkar-24.aspx>
- [49] Schofield, V. (2021). *Kashmir in conflict: India, Pakistan and the unending war*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- [50] Sentinel Digital Desk. (28 May, 2022). Ambedkar's prophecies about China's mindset are proving right. Availbale at <https://www.sentinelassam.com/editorial/ambedkars-prophecies-about-chinas-mindset-are-proving-right-593951>
- [51] Shivamurthy, A. G., Fazli, Z., Hossain, D., Bhandari, A., Bhattarai, D., Naseem, A., &Attanayake, C. (2022). India-China Competition: Perspectives from the Neighbourhood.
- [52] Singariya, M. R. (2013). Dr. BR Ambedkar: As an Economist. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 2(3), 24-27.
- [53] Sneider, D. (1983). The origins of the Non-Aligned movement in the A American independence tradition. *EIR (Executive Intelligence Review) Journal*, 6(33).
- [54] Srinivasa, D. (2019) CONTRIBUTION OF DR. BR AMBEDKAR FOR INDIAN SOCIETY: AN OVERVIEW. *NEW HORIZONS OF DALIT CULTURE AND LITERATURE*, 94.
- [55] Tajamul, R., Usha, S., & Nasreena, A. (2015). India's Foreign Policy-Retrospect and prospect. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 9(6), 212-216.
- [56] Team Ambedkar Today. (2019) Resignation of Dr. Ambedkar from the cabinet (Law Minister) in 1951
- [57] Team Dharma Dispatch.(2022). How Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru Ousted Dr. B.R. Ambedkar from the Cabinet: The Full Story. The Dharma Dispatch. Availbale at <https://www.dharmadispatch.in/history/how-prime-minister-jawaharlal-nehru-ousted-dr-b-r-ambedkar-from-the-cabinet-the-full-story>. Retrived on 21 January 2023.
- [58] Telegraph India.com (6 September 2019).BJP says Ambedkar opposed Article 370, proof shows the opposite. The Telegraph online.New Delhi. Availbale at <https://www.telegraphindia.com/india/bjp-says-ambedkar-opposed-article-370-proof-shows-the-opposite/cid/1702839>. Retrived at January 7, 2023.
- [59] Telegraph India.com (6 September 2019).BJP says Ambedkar opposed Article 370, proof shows the opposite. The Telegraph online.New Delhi. Availbale at <https://www.telegraphindia.com/india/bjp-says-ambedkar-opposed-article-370-proof-shows-the-opposite/cid/1702839>. Retrived at January 7, 2023.
- [60] The Indian Express (16 April, 2009).Ambedkar's views on foreign policy.The Indian Express. Available at <https://www.newindianexpress.com/opinions/2009/apr/16/ambedkars-views-on-foreign-policy-41489.html>Retrieved on 8 January 2023.
- [61] The World Bank Brief. (19 October, 2021). Celebrating 75 Years of World Bank-India Partnership. The World Bank. Available at <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/india/brief/75-years-of-world-bank-in-india>. Retrived on 9 January 2023.
- [62] Tilgodia, J. (2003). Bharat Ratna Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar. Ravi Publication.
- [63] TIME (6 Sep. 1954). Foreign News: Untouchable's Warning. TIME. USA. Available at <https://content.time.com/time/subscriber/article/0,33009,820086,00.html>
- [64] Verma, D. P. (1989). Jawaharlal Nehru: Panchsheel and India's Constitutional Vision of International Order. *India Quarterly*, 45(4), 301-323.
- [65] Yadav, V. K., Dasgupta, S., & Kumar, B. (2020). "All Human Beings are of Equal Status Since Birth": Caste, Inequality and BR Ambedkar's Universal Claim for Human Equality. *Indian Journal of Human Development*, 14(3), 481-492.
- [66] Waltz, K. N. (2014). Anarchic orders and balances of power. In *Realism Reader* (pp. 113-123). Routledge.
- [67] Zelliott. E. (1991). Dr. Ambedkar and America. A talk at the Columbia University Ambedkar Centenary. Available at http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealc/pritchett/00ambedkar/timeline/graphics/txt_zelliott1991.html