2.1 The Political Inequality

“If” wrote the ‘time’ on July 1940, “we speak of Democracy, we do not mean a Democracy which maintains the right to vote but forgets the right to live and work. If we speak of freedom, we do not mean a rugged individualism which excludes social organisation and economic planning. If we speak of Equality, we do not mean a political equality nullified by Social and Economic Privilege.¹

Equality and inequality are widely used concepts in philosophical debates and ideological writings. They provide a representation of society’s belief and demonstrate how certain goals and values become dominant. Like other related concepts such as liberty, or democracy equality and inequality express and reflect a range of attitudes and aspirations held by individuals and social groups. Interpretation of the meaning of such concepts has become primarily the task of philosophy which must attempt to identify the principles inherent in them.

We already had a extensive discussion on the meaning, nature and different dimensions of inequality in the previous chapter. Here we are primarily concerned with one of the dimensions of inequality, namely political inequality.

Today the whole global community is faced with the problem of inequality. Actually while studying this problem, our primary concern is with certain basic structural phenomena such as class, status, and

power which exist in all societies. Class, power and status are three principal aspects of social stratification in the broad sense of the term. This approach to the problem of inequality, which was first formulated by Max Weber, has been widely used by sociologists.\(^2\) This classification or stratification is not a new one. Sometimes, it is phrased as the distinction between ‘economic’, ‘social’ and ‘political’ inequality. Alternatively it can be phrased as the distinction between inequality of ‘class’, ‘status’ and ‘power’. It is, perhaps, self-evident that inequalities of class, status, and power need not always coincide.

No writer on social inequality has explicitly formulated and consistently retained the tripartite distinction. In deed, everyone of the best-known discussions of inequality, from Aristotle to Rousseau, Tocqueville to Tawney, has been confused by the neglect of it.\(^3\)

Thus, all systems of stratification are constructed in the same basic way no matter in which society they appear. They all display such characteristics as (i) differentiation (people identity with different social groups), (ii) ranking (people are ranked in hierarchical order, from the bottom to the top), (iii) institutionalization (people come to accept the system as the normal pattern of behaviour); and (iv) influence on individual personalities (people’s personalities reflect their positions in the system). Moreover, social stratification systems are all based on the possession of things that are sacred, and therefore, prized which are popularly categorized as wealth, prestige, and power. Sociologists prefer to speak of these categories, or dimensions of the stratification system as earlier stated - class, status, and power. It is according to these categories that people are assigned a rank in

---

\(^{10}\)


society and relegated to a stratum or level with others who are similarly ranked.  

Thus, this kind of stratification is primarily based on social inequalities. Different scholars have emphasized different aspects of social inequality. Many of them give importance to the economic factor. Others have emphasized on the inequality inherent in the distribution of power and authority.

Though political power can not be equally distributed, that can only be shared proportionately in democratic hierarchical order. Thus, it is the political rights (Right to vote and right to participate etc.) that can be equally distributed. The latter is a situation available in a ideal democratic set up, while the former is impossible to achieve. Ibn Khaldun, the fourteenth century Arab Historian, said: “The possession of power is the source of riches”. The so-called elite theorists who wrote mainly at the beginning of the present century also assigned primary significance to the political factor. For them the basic cleavage was not between the rich and the poor or the propertied and the propertyless; it was between the elites and the masses or the rulers and the ruled. Rousseau maintained that natural or physical inequalities among men were small and unimportant, and he turned his attention to what he called moral or political inequalities such as those of wealth, honour, and power. These, he believed, to be based on convention and to be established, or at least authorised by the consent of men'.

---

Associated with the economic changes, there have been number of important changes in legal and political system in order to achieve equality. T.H. Marshall has described in detail the growth in England first of legal equality, then of political equality and finally civil equality. With reference to Indian situation, two developments have been particularly important in regard to political equality. There has been first of all after independence an extension of democracy in the widest sense of the term. Secondly, there are the mechanisms of (PR) which has been created in the Indian Constitution, specifically for the benefit of politically the under-privileged strata (SCs & ST) through proper representation in legislatures. This special treatment of PR has been provided under Articles 330 and 332 of the Constitution in order to provide equitable distribution of political representation in Indian Legislatures. But more closely we look at the political system, the more difficult we find it to decide whether the decline of inequality in the modern world is real. On the one hand there is increase in “participation” in the electoral and civic activities particularly in the Anglo-American political system; in fact many American political scientists would regard participation as a crucial indicator of modernization. And on the other hand, there is the increasing concentration of the means of violation and persuasion not only in Soviet type of political system, but also in the American; this is an aspect of modern political system which following C. Wright Mills, many scholars have begun to view with apprehension. It now appears that if we define participation in a certain way, an increase in political

---

10 For other Economic and Educational benefit, See Article 16(4), 15(4), 17, 46 ... etc.
participation can be made to appear perfectly compatible with rising inequality in the distribution of power.\textsuperscript{13}

So far as India is concerned, we virtually achieved political equality by the adoption of the constitution on 26 January 1950. Indeed Dr. Ambedkar voiced it in the CA when he said that political democracy has been secured by the adoption of the principle of “one man, one vote”, and the task that remained was the securing of economic democracy.\textsuperscript{14} Though, we have achieved political equality, which may be termed as \textit{de-jure} political equality, however, we have not in fact achieved \textit{de-facto} political equality as such. Justice Mathew, while delivering Dr. Rajendra Prasad memorial Lecture on “Equality” observed that, “a commonplace objection to the principle of political equality is that men are not, in fact equal”.\textsuperscript{15}

‘All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights\textsuperscript{16} and, ‘everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country’.\textsuperscript{17} These are universally accepted political rights.\textsuperscript{18} Nevertheless, men are in fact politically unequal in many respect. There are certain factors which are solely responsible for it and precisely, contributes political inequality; To mention a few of them, Poverty, Status, Illiteracy, Money-Power, Political coercion, Electoral Malpractices, Unequal Electoral Constituencies, Political skill (quality of representation) and Castes etc. Thus, there are two main factors i.e., economic resources, and political resources which are interrelated and contributes political inequality.\textsuperscript{19} Let us examine some of these factors in detail.

\textsuperscript{13} Andre Beteille, \textit{Inequality and Social Change}, (1977), pp. 128.
\textsuperscript{16} Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article, 1.
\textsuperscript{17} Id., Article 21.1.
\textsuperscript{19} For detailed discussion on political resources, see infra, No. 44, pp. 62-82.
It was initially believed that the adoption of the principle of adult franchise i.e., ‘arithmetic’ equality – ‘one men, one vote’ secured political justice to the people. However, it was soon realised, borne out by experience in the political process, that economic inequality and inequalities in status affect adversely the participation in a democracy, and even the objective of attaining social and economic justice. Economic inequality (poverty) generates unequal capacities among classes, particularly weaker sections of our society, to influence the policies of governments, which in turn are reflected in the institutions and programmes.\textsuperscript{20} It is clear that political and economic equality are deeply interrelated. The gravamen of the socialist criticism of bourgeois democracy has always been that equality in political rights is of little importance, so long as there remain gross inequalities in economic power. The criticism was put in its sharpest form by Lenin. Political democracy, he argued, can be defined as a system by which the working class choose, at given intervals which members of the governing class was to rule over them.\textsuperscript{21} Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, during the CA debates said, that socio-economic justice is qualitatively higher than political justice. Nehru further made it clear:

There will be no full freedom in this country or in the world as long as a single human being is un-free. There will be no complete freedom as long as there is starvation, lack of clothing, hunger, lack of necessaries of life and lack of opportunity of growth for every single human being, man, women and child in the country. We aim at that.\textsuperscript{22}

Nehru used of the expression “complete freedom” indicates that he regarded freedom from want as the basis of liberty and that the

\textsuperscript{20} Sivaramayya, \textit{op.cit.}, No. 4, p. 566.
\textsuperscript{21} Hiusberg, \textit{op.cit.}, No. 18, p. 140.
\textsuperscript{22} CAD, (July 22, (1947), Vol. IV, p. 739.
essence of justice in free India would be valued in terms of substantive benefits to the poor, the hungry, the wretched. Thus, in an empty stomach adult franchise or political justice would soon become a mockery. Political justice too, would soon lose its meaning if socio-economic justice is not forthcoming. “The next danger arises from the staggering economic structure country .... Independence will be weighed in the scales of the essentials of life. If they are not forthcoming, the political structure is sure to collapse”. This apprehension can be discerned from K.M. Munshi’s diary, written a few days after August 15, 1947. Similarly Dr. Ambedkar, while addressing the CA observed:

On January 26, 1950, we will have equality in politics and inequality in social and economic life. We must remove this contradiction at the earliest moment, or else those who suffer from inequality will blow up the structure of political democracy which this Assembly have so laboriously built up.

Thus, the framers of our Constitution were well aware of the fact that political freedom without socio-economic justice is meaningless. Therefore, they wished to secure triology of justice. “Social Justice demands the evadication of social inequalities based on Caste, Colour, Race, and Creed, etc. Economic Justice rules out distinction from man to man from the point of view of economic values .... Political Justice refers to the absence of arbitrary treatment of citizens

25 Dr. Ambedkar’s Address to the CA, 25 November 1949.
in the political sphere”. The triple justice ensure “something which is not only right to do, and wrong not to do but which individual persons can claim from us as their moral right”. Social Justice is all inclusive of all the triple justice.

So, every political leader, political thinker and social reformer give more importance to socio-economic equality, than to political equality; without the former, the latter is impossible to achieve. Thus, it is economic inequality which further perpetuates other dimensions of inequalities, of which political inequality is one. All the above mentioned factors are interrelated and based on economic power which can be conveniently summed up in a single term i.e., economic inequality.

In a democratic political system, participation in the democratic process is of two kind such as (i) participation of an individual as a voter and (ii) as a representative of the people. These, economic inequality (poverty) and other factors like caste and religion etc. can affect both types of participation particularly in Indian political system.

The simplest definition of democracy, rule by the people implies participation. To rule carries the unstated condition: to take part; yet the role of participation in democracy has never been agreed up on. To conclude from its etymology that democracy implies participation by the people in activity of ruling begins, rather than ends the controversy. What is to be achieved by participation? What is its function? If

27 It is implied in Concept of Justice as defined by Mr. J.S. Mill.
28 The expression “Social Justice” popularly seeks to provide everyone what is due to him. It has double meaning. In limited sense, it means rectification of injustice in the personal relation of the people. In the wide sense, it seeks to remove all imbalances in social, economic and political life of the people. See, K. Subba Rao, Law and Social Justice.
understanding were reached in area, it would be relatively easy to
describe the forms participation might assume.\textsuperscript{30}

Now, let us examine the effects of economic or social inequality
(poverty, caste, status, and religions etc.) on the process of
participation in politics.

Berman and Loeb point out that individual participation in
political activity is partly a function of leisure. “Poor people are simply
too burdened with the problem of sheer economic survival to have any
time to spare. In addition, it is the poor who have come to feel
alienated from the society”.\textsuperscript{31} Sometimes money is not enough to win
elections, however, it can considerably affect its out-come. There are
certain other means to influence the voters. The illegitimate use of
money for bribing the voters is fairly common in our society. For
instance, in the Fourth General Elections in Bihar “Caste, money and
students played a very important role during the election campaign”\textsuperscript{32}
Distribution of certain essential commodities among the poor is
another means to influence the voters. In Mysore, “payment in kind-
clothes, food, drinks-was said to be employed to influence voters”\textsuperscript{33}

Elections are supposed to be the life blood of democracy. They
provide an opportunity to the electorate to rid the system of corrupt
elements and to choose between the programme and performance of
rival political parties. These are among the essential assumptions of
parliamentary democracy.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{30} For detailed discussion on ‘Participation in politics’, See, J. Roland Pennock and John W.
Champman (ed.) Participation in Politics, Nomos XVI, (1915).
\textsuperscript{33} Id., No. 14, p. 340.
\textsuperscript{34} See, Ajit Bhattacharjea, ‘Saving the Electoral System’, Indian Express, June 12, 1982.
The absolutely free elections are a dream in the developing countries, even under colonial conditions. In an atmosphere charged with so much heat and passion, with party thugs intimidating and beating up opponents, and an electorate ready to sell their votes to the highest bidder, free elections are largely an illusion.\textsuperscript{35} Thus, there is no freedom of expression and selection of representative through elections voluntarily in Indian political system. Unfortunately, the right to vote, which is the basic feature of representative democracy, could not find place in part III (Fundamental rights) of the Indian Constitution. However, under the U.S. Constitution, this rigid has been specifically provided by the Fifteenth Constitution, Amendment (1870).\textsuperscript{36} Nevertheless, this right is more than a fundamental right and can conveniently be deduced from freedom of expression\textsuperscript{37} and personal liberty,\textsuperscript{38} provided in part III i.e., ‘Fundamental Rights’ of our Constitution. Similar views has been expressed by Justice K.K. Mathew in one of the most celebrated case -Kesavananda Bharati.\textsuperscript{39} He observed that personal liberty also includes right to vote.

The main factor for electoral malpractices is economic and social inequalities, particularly in India. Mr. Sen Verma, a former Election Commissioner of India, referring to the evil of bribery of voters expressed the view\textsuperscript{40} that the remedy lies in the amelioration of the socio-economic conditions of the masses or electorate who are steeped in brutalizing poverty.

Economic dependency and status (social) plays an important role in preventing the downtrodden from voluntarily exercising their right to vote. Inequality of status particularly, the inferior social status

\textsuperscript{36} Section 1, See William Cohen & John Kaplan, \textit{‘Bill of Right’}, (1976), p. 811.
\textsuperscript{37} Article 19.
\textsuperscript{38} Article 21.
\textsuperscript{39} Kesavanand Bharati v. State of Kerala, (1973) 4 SCC.
of women and Harijan resulted in unequal participation of women and Harijan in political process. Till 1971 votes were counted according to the booths. This system of counting enabled the agents to know how certain groups voted in a particular village or in an area covered by a polling booth. The weaker sections complained that if they did not vote according to the wishes of the dominant cast of the village, they took revenge by burning their houses or by imposing social and economic boycotts.\textsuperscript{41} There are number of instances of massacre, of poor Harijan particularly in U.P., Bihar, and other parts of the country, in order to terrorise them and compel them to obey the dictates of the dominant section. The recent killings in U.P. in which the Chief Minister, V.N. Pratap Singh had to resigned from the Chief Ministership on 29.6.1982 is recent burning example of political coercion.\textsuperscript{42}

Thus in order to avoid this type of incidents, and political coercion, as a remedial step, from 1971 the practice of mixing ballots of different booths has been adopted.

This change in the election procedure adopted by the Election Commission was badly criticised by K.L. Advani a prominent BJP Leader.\textsuperscript{43} An echo of the same criticism is found in the Report of the Tarkunde Committee. The Report states:

\begin{quote}
The argument that the new system of mixing votes prevents intimidation and harassment is not altogether convincing. Most of the intimidation that takes place is pre-election, and not post-election. Besides, as the Election Commission (in its report on the Fourth General Election) has rightly stated, for persons and parties so
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{41} See, Sivaramayya, \textit{op.cit.}, No. 14, pp. 566-567.
\textsuperscript{42} See also Political Coercion in Nwabuez, \textit{op.cit.}, No. 30, pp. 140-148.
minded it is not difficult to find how a particular area voted.44

Dr. B. Sivaramayya,45 in his brilliant exegesis on inequality in electoral process, very rightly pointed out the above view of the committee is unconvincing. He assert that normally, revenge and reprisals will be taken after the announcement of the results and not before, when the candidate and their supporters are in the midst of their election campaigns. If the 1971 procedure is not adequate to check the evil of political coercion and bribery, then the remedy is not to revert to the old procedure as suggested by the Committee but to devise a more stringent method of mixing the ballots. Dr. Sivaramayya further observed that, the committee also ignored an important point made by the Election Commissioner in the Fifth Report that the procedure of mixing the ballots is in vogue in England since 1872, under the Ballot Act of 1872. The criticism has its root in the doubts which the political parties entertained about the impartiality of election machinery, generated by the politics of the then times, and the objection is clearly misplaced.

The Election Commission, in its report however, pointed out that after the introduction of this method there were very few complaints relating to intimidation, coercion or victimization. The effect of economic (poverty) and social (caste) inequalities is more rigorous on the SCs and STs than on others. These inequalities effects the total personality of a man of these communities. It affects their abilities, political skill and knowledge, political awakening, leadership, and political mobility and so on, and it results in political inequality in comparison with the other communities.

In modern democracies the costs of compaigning prove a great obstacle for a poor but competent person with abilities to contest the elections. We are told, that David Davis, a close adviser of Lincoln and subsequently a judge of the U.S. Supreme Court said: “Men work better with money in hand .... I believe in God’s Providence in this Election but at the same time we should keep our power dry”.46 The Costs of an election compaign mounted because of inflatiór modern mass media and the need to contact voters personally by means of door to door compaign which in turn increased the dependence of poor Harijan candidates on political parties and wealthy caste Hindus financiers. This ultimately results in political slavery. The dependence on wealthy people and on political parties for support and finances give more power to manipulate and exploit the Harijan leaders.47 This economic dependency on political elite of weaker sections consequently, leads to ineffective representation in the legislatures.48 Thus, the whole PR according to the RPI is nothing but a “political charity”. According to Dr. Ambedkar the political power conferred by reservation, was a strange kind of power which – “is lame, dumb, and deaf”.49 This was the main argument against PR put forward Ambedkar, who himself fought for the political power through representation. Dr. Ambedkar as well as their followers particularly from RPI demanded for effective political representation in order to get the effective political power. And that is why Dr. Ambedkar after some time abandon the idea of PR. However, Dr. Ambedkar and his followers could not get enough seats in legislatures in elections fought independently. Even Dr. Ambedkar lost his election against a congress

47 See, for more discussion, Sivaramayya, op.cit., No. 14, p. 570.
48 For participation in debate and parliamentary activeness of SCs and STs members of Lok Sabha, See, Appendix, Tables 12 and 13.
candidate Kajorolkar in 1952 from Bombay.\textsuperscript{50} Similarly, independent Harijan candidates from the general constituencies of Lok Sabha and States Assemblies could not be elected independently in previous general election.\textsuperscript{51}

Thus, the trend of the ruling party, particularly the congress, in selection of their Harijan candidates has been very surprising and shocking. Congress prefers only loyal and less qualified candidates, and this is why the performance of this type of representatives has been very poor during the debates in Lok Sabha and States Assemblies.\textsuperscript{52}

The other factors which affects the political capacity for competition, as earlier stated, are, qualification, political mobilization and economic resources etc., according to Dr. Joshi, which ultimately leads to Political inequality.\textsuperscript{53}

The other factor remain to elaborate is the social inequality (caste). In Indian hierarchical society, caste plays an important role in elections. There are many states in which electoral posts in rural Panchayats and Municipal Councils are also reserved in proportion to their population, though in many case these persons may simply be nominated by elected higher caste person if no SC member is directly elected. Thus, many seats reserved for the SCs in rural Panchayat bodies are never filled, in contravention of state laws requiring their representation, a particularly serious problem since the SCs are even more heavily rural than the nation as a whole.\textsuperscript{54} Because of lack of

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{50} Baxi, \textit{op.cit.}, No. 41, pp. 10-11.
\bibitem{53} See, ‘Public Policy and Scheduled Castes Political Resources’, Joshi, \textit{op.cit.}, No. 150, pp. 62-82.
\bibitem{54} Id., p. 62.
\end{thebibliography}
effective means of communication and politicization ‘the rural population of SCs and STs is not much conscious, in respect of their political rights. Typically, only those castes which have participated in village politics find it possible to step into the larger arena.\textsuperscript{55} Few SC persons were politically’ experienced as candidates or representatives at the time of the first general elections in independent India, and of these few, most were the product of pre-independence beginnings of the reservation policy. The SCs were over-represented in the ranks of the poor and ill educated to whom the franchise and voter experience were extended only a few years before independence. Only in a few areas is there any evidence of widespread political awakening among SCs prior to independence; Maharastra, where Ambedkar’s influence was most closely felt, is one of the few exceptions.

The other important factor is that the populations of the SC voter in reserved constituencies (RCs) are very less as compared to the other higher caste voters. This large quantity of high-caste voters in a RC results in caste domination on the SCs members, thus SC candidate represents the higher caste voters instead of SC voters. This trend also lead to in affective representation in legislatures.\textsuperscript{56}

The Constitutional provision of reserved seats is complemented by statutory provision to enhance political participation by SCs and STs. Generally, RCs are formed on the basis of contiguity communications, absence of natural barriers, cultural and ethnic homogeneity. The object of the forming of the RCs is to provide equal opportunity of participation in political process to those who due to social and economic disabilities could not otherwise get this opportunity. But unfortunately, we could not achieve this objective too.


\textsuperscript{56} See, Galanter, \textit{op.cit.}, No. 51.
Because, the RCs are so badly formed that there is no uniformity of voters, particularly of SC voters in each constituencies.

In the case of STs seats, there is a single standard for selection – concentration of the ST population.\textsuperscript{57} Since typically the tribal population lives in areas of concentration, the constituencies reserved for them contain a high proportion of STs. In 1962, the STs comprised more than 50 per cent of the population in 18 of the 31 Lok Sabha constituencies reserved for them.\textsuperscript{58} Conversely, most of the major concentrations of STs population are located in RCs. Of the 29 constituencies in which STs comprise over 40 per cent of the population, 23 are reserved. Thus the reserved seats encompass the bulk of the STs population perhaps close to 70 per cent.\textsuperscript{59}

In case of seats reserved for SCs, the Commission is instructed to apply two standards (i) concentration of SC population and (ii) dispersal of reservations. The Delimitation Act instructs the Commission to locate seats reserved for SCs “in different parts of the state and …. as far as practicable, in those areas where the proportion of their population to the total is comparatively large”.\textsuperscript{60} The Delimitation Commission achieves this by first reserving the constituencies with the highest concentration of SCs - usually not much more than 20 per cent - and then selecting the others by the dispersal criterion. Since the SC population, unlike the Tribes, is rather evenly dispersed, the constituencies reserved for them contain far fewer SC members. Among the 75 Lok Sabha constituencies reserved for SCs in the 1972 elections, there was none in which they comprised a majority of the population and only 13 in which they comprised as

\textsuperscript{57} Section 9(1)(d), (Delimitation Act, 1972).
\textsuperscript{59} See Appendix, Table 1.
\textsuperscript{60} Section 9(1) (c) (Delimitation Act, 1972).
much as thirty per cent.\textsuperscript{61} The bulk of SCs constituencies contain between 10 and 30 Per cent of SCs. Thus, the vast majority of SCs perhaps 75 per cent - live outside the constituencies reserved for SCs.\textsuperscript{62} Of the 111 Lok Sabha constituencies where SCs comprised more than 20 per cent of the population, in 1961 only 46 are reserved, while 29 constituencies with less than 20 per cent are reserved. Thus, the pattern of concentration of STs and dispersion of SCs reappears in the reserved seats in the state legislatures as well.

The present mechanism of RCs results in un-equal participation of SCs voters in electoral process in order to elect their SCs representative of their own choice. This amount to negation of the basic right on which participatory democracy stands.

The last, but not the least, factor equally important is inequality of Status. In Our political system, women have been denied equal participation of women in the political process: Razia Ismail rightly questions:

\textit{But what have our women voters won for themselves in the years since Independence? Have they won real independence for themselves … How many women are still denied the right to decide whether they would like to work even at the lowest rung of the humblest trade-instead of bearing children from their teenage years?\textsuperscript{63}}

Due to the inferior social status of women, particularly from the weaker sections of our society, this inequality of status resulted in

\textsuperscript{61} See, Appendix, Table 2.
\textsuperscript{62} For Comparison of Concentration of SCs and STs in Lok Sabha Constituencies Reserved for Them, See, Appendix, Table 3.
unequal participation of women in the political process. This, in turn, has resulted in the neglect of measures to ameliorate injustices towards Women in many directions.

The Committee on the status of Women has also pointed out that though women do not constitute a majority, they are beginning to acquire the recognized dimensions of a minority. These are: (1) inequality of class, (ii) inequality of status, and (iii) inequality of political power.\(^{64}\)

The picture is more dismal when we turn to representative participation. The number of women elected to the Lok Sabha has declined from 33 in 1962 to 28 in 1967, and to 21 in 1971. Thus, the number of SCs and STs women elected to the Lok Sabha and States Assemblies has been negligible since independence. This trend of unequal participation of women, in political process precisely contributes political inequality.

Our constitution nowhere speaks of political equality, however, it speaks of political justice as such.\(^{65}\) But our constitution indirectly through certain Articles\(^ {66}\) intended only political equality. Nevertheless, we still remain politically unequal due to certain serious deprivations, like the necessary economic and political resources, mentioned earlier.

---


\(^{65}\) See Preamble.

\(^{66}\) Articles, 14, 330, 332, 333, 325 and 326 etc.