

CHAPTER-6

**Ambedkar's thought on democracy and
distributive justice:**

**A rational approach to the fulfillment of
Ambedkar's vision of India**

Chapter-6

Ambedkar's thought on democracy and distributive justice: A rational approach to the fulfillment of Ambedkar's vision of India

There are various forms of government known to history- Monarchy, Aristocracy and Democracy to which may be added Dictatorship. But the most prevalent form of Government at the present time is 'Democracy'. In the West, the Greeks claim to have invented the Democracy. The term 'democracy' has derived from the Greek term 'demos' and 'kratos', means people and government. In the Greek City-State, the Athens was the best known type of the Democratic Constitutions. In Athens there was Assembly or Council of people, where people were widely participated in the governance process. Any way, the European political thinkers hardly recognized that there had been any democratic traditions before twentieth century in India. It is out rightly wrong. If we look at the Ancient Indian history it would be clear that India had a long tradition of Democracy. In Dr. Ambedkar's views the concept of Democracy, Panchsheel, and majority has their roots in Buddhist thought. During the time of Buddha democratic practice was prevalent in India. Lord Buddha was a great supporter of the tribal democratic states. In no other part of the ancient world were the relations of man and man and of man, and of man and the state so fair and humane as it was in India. There was government by discussion. In ancient India the Tribal Councils –*Sabhas and Samits*- had a big say in governance system, people were gathered in large numbers in open air platform to discuss matter of public importance and that was contained the elements of a modern Parliament. The king was primarily seen as protector and defender of public opinion. The Buddha Jatakas cite stories of kings ousted by mass revolts. Lord Buddha was born in a 'Sakya Clan' which was belonged to Republics. He was born a democrat and died as a democrat. At the time he lived there were 14 Monarchical states and 4 Republics. He belongs to the clan of Sakya and the Sakya kingdom was a Republic. He was extremely loved with Vaisali which was his second home just because it was Republic.¹ The Buddhist texts reveals that after the death of Lord Buddha, the 1st Buddhist Council was held at Raja-giha, the 2nd Buddhist Council was held at Vaishali, the 3rd Buddhist Council was

summoned by king Ashoka at Pataliputra, and the 4th Council was held under king Kaniska; and all the four Councils were large public Assemblies based on democratic pattern.

In the Sakya Parliament the young and the old assembled-father, son, and younger brother all were possessing franchise. They had the right to speech and vote and each one could aspire guarded. Siddhartha Gautam was initiated into the Sakya Parliament at the age of twenty. Most of the modern Parliament procedures were adopted by the Sakya Parliament. It was the rule of procedure in the Sakya Parliament that there could be no debate without a motion and no motion could be declared carried unless it was passed three times. The Republican society functioned in an atmosphere of equality and mutual respect. Moreover, the social organization was free from sectional barriers. The Republican Constitutions were really laying the foundation of “social democracy”. The Buddhist Sangha was fashioned on the secular and democratic procedures of the political Sangha.²

Supporting the historical evidence of the past, Dr. Ambedkar, viewed that ancient India was the master of the World. There was such intellectual freedom in Ancient India as was nowhere else to be found. There was a time when India was studded within Republics and where there were Monarchies, they were either elected or limited. But they were not absolute. Parliamentary democracy is unknown to us at present. But India, at one time had Parliamentary institutions. If one go through the ‘*Suktas*’ of *Mahaprinibbana*, one can find ample evidence of democratic method in Buddhism. The Buddhist Bhikshu Sanghas were nothing but Parliament and the Sanghas knew and observed all the rules of Parliamentary procedures known to modern times. It is stated that the system of secret ballot paper was followed in the Buddhist Sanghas. The ballot paper is called, ‘*Salapatraka Grahakas*’. Unfortunately, we have lost all this past heritages.³ Addressing to the Constituent Assembly, he said:

It is not that India did not know Parliaments or Parliamentary procedures. The Buddhist Sangha had rules of seat arrangements, rules regarding motions, voting by ballot, Resolutions, Quorum, Whip, Censure motion, counting of votes, committees, regularization, adjudication and other things related to Parliamentary institutions. Although these rules of Parliamentary procedures were applied by Buddha to the meetings of the Bhikkhu Sanghas, the essence of Buddhism lies in working practically for one’s freedom-

economic, social and political. Buddha was the torchbearer of democracy and an ardent exponent of liberty, equality and fraternity.⁴

Every individual in a Sangha was equal by birth and every family was equal for political purpose. These Republican principles of Buddha's Constitutional pattern of Sanghas had a tremendous impact on Ambedkar. He strived hard for the establishment of democracy in post-independence India. He expressed his anguish over the loss of the entire past heritage. To him, the Hindu Social System divided the society into Varnas and Castes and also denied the existence of liberty, equality and fraternity which are the deepest concern of democracy. If in democracy liberty does not destroy equality and equality does not destroy liberty, it is because at the base of both there is fraternity. Fraternity is, therefore, the root of democracy.⁵ The Hindu social system raised all barricades against democracy. It did not teach fraternity. Instead it teaches divisions of society into classes and also creates separate class-consciousness. Democracy was lost in Brahminic India. Dr. Ambedkar interpreted the concept of democracy in Indian context. In his opinion, democracy is not as a fixed dogma, it always changes its form, it is not always the same in the same country and that it always undergoes changes in purpose. Indian democracy was quite different from the Western democracy of Athens, England and America. Hence, it is pertinent to understand the meaning of democracy known to the West.

Aristotle, father of Political Science, defined democracy in terms of the roots of the Word; 'demos' means people, 'Kratein' means rule. To him, democracy is a form of government in which supreme power is in the hands of freemen. Aristotle's definition was that democracy was a Constitution for those who are free and owners of property- that is, all citizens except the serfs. The people form a majority in an elected sovereign government and exercise some role in decision-making and in judging in disputes. This classical definition of democracy found echoes in John Stuart Mill and Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson preferred that form of democracy which provided a "government by its citizen in mass, acting directly and personally, according to rules established by the majority".⁶ J.S. Mill, democracy was the "ideally best form of government" in which every citizen is "at least occasionally called on to take an actual part in the government by the personal discharge of some public function, local or general".⁷ To Walter Bagehot democracy as "Government by discussion". Abraham Lincoln defined democracy as a government of the people, by

the people, and for the people. In the views of Anthony Arblaster, “for democracy is a concept before it is a fact, because it is a concept it has no single precise and agreed meaning”.⁸ It shows his deep insight into the real problems of democracy. Because as it is argued in recent times, democracy cannot be used as a plain and simple, uncomplicated term of description at all. In fact, Dr. Ambedkar understood it very well that the Western pattern of democracy is not applicable to Indian scenario. Dr. Ambedkar’s thought in democracy is not limited to what he thought about political democracy, and the machinery for its implementation, -like franchises, election, political power and electorates, but is reflected in all his writings, lectures, speeches, conferences, and above all, in his lifetime struggle against the Hindu caste-system, his knowledge of the western political literature on democracy was astounding and by his thorough research in this field, he could see very well that the enlightened citizenship of western democracies was based on the pillars of equality and fraternity which could not even be conceived of in the caste-ridden Indian socio-political context. Even the early western aversion to the rule of the multitude that goes by the name of “people” was carefully studied by him when he contemplated on the possibility of a post-independence democratic government in India. Remembering Edmund Burke, he warned against the tyranny of the majority. Nowadays, it has become a well-known problematic of democracy what a majority of votes can be questioned on many grounds and can, sometimes, place one before very uncomfortable questions. That is to say, the democratic process of adult franchise, elections of electorate can be very undemocratic because of a number of wrong rhetorics linked with it that usually go unquestioned.⁹

Ambedkar realized that a mere distinction between state and society, state and government and the state and nation are not enough to serve the purpose. The views of J.S. Mill, Harold J. Laski and MacIver on democracy were not appropriate in Indian social system because it failed to focus on the social relationship between the people who form a society. Indian society, to Ambedkar, is based on Castes and every thing is organized on the basis of caste. The Indian society does not consist of individuals; it consists of collection of castes with utter lack of bond of sympathy or co-operation. The existence of the Caste is a standing denial to the ideals of democracy.¹⁰ He viewed “Democracy in this country is like a summer sapling. Without social unity, the roots of sapling cannot be strengthened. If social unity is not achieved this summer

sapling of democracy, will be rooted out with gust of summer wind".¹¹ He said that there are certain fundamental considerations which go to the roots of democracy and which cannot be ignored without putting democracy in peril. Criticizing the views of Western writers on politics regarding democracy and the self-government he said:

(1) They ignored the hard fact of history that in every country there exist two classes, the governing class and the servile class between whom there is continuous struggle for power. (2) By reason of its power and prestige the governing class finds it easy to maintain its supremacy over the service class. (3) The adult suffrage and frequent elections is no bar against governing class reaching places of power and authority. (4) On account of their inferiority complex the servile classes regarded the governing classes as their natural leaders and the servile classes volunteer themselves to elect the governing classes as their rulers. (5) They fail to realise that the resistance of a governing class is inconsistent with democracy and self-government. (6) Self-government and democracy become real when the governing class loses its power to capture the power to govern. (7) In some countries the servile classes may succeed in ousting the governing class from the seat of authority with nothing more than adult suffrage, in other countries the governing class may be so deeply entrenched that the servile classes will need other safeguards besides adult suffrage to achieve the same end.¹²

Dr. Ambedkar considered democracy as a historical movement. And the government of human society underwent some very significant changes over time. There was a time, he said, when the government of human society had taken the form of rule by the despotic sovereigns. This was replaced after long, bloody struggle by a system of government known as Parliamentary democracy. This democracy was believed to bring about the millennium, in which every human being will have the right to liberty, equality and fraternity.¹³

Ambedkar's Concept on democracy:

According to Dr. Ambedkar the most accepted form of government of the world is democracy. There is, however, no unanimity as to what constitutes democracy. When one examines the question one finds that there are two views regarding the democracy. One view is that democracy is a form of government where the government is chosen by the people-where government is a representative

government. According to this view democracy is just synonymous with representative government which means adult suffrage and periodical elections. According to another view a democracy is more than a form of government –a form of organisation of society. There are two essential conditions which characterises a democratically constituted society. (a) absence of stratification of society into classes, (b) a social habit on the part of the of individuals and group which is ready for continuous readjustment or recognition or reciprocity of interests.¹⁴ Of the two views about democracy there is no doubt that the first one is very superficial if not erroneous. There cannot be democratic government unless the society for which it functions is democratic in its form and structure. Those who hold that democracy need to be no more than a mere matter of elections seems make three mistakes:

The first mistake is to believe that government is some thing which is quite distinct and separate from society. As a matter of fact government is not something which is distinct and separate from society. Government is one of the many institutions, which society rears and to which; it assigns the function of carrying out some of the duties, which are necessary for collective social life.

The second mistake lies in their failure to realise that a government is to reflect the ultimate purposes, aims, objects, and wishes of society and this can happen only where the society in which the government is rooted is democratic. If society is not democratic, government can never be. Where the society is divided into two classes governing and the governed the government; is bound to be the government of the governing class.

The third mistake is that whether government would be good or bad, democratic or undemocratic depends largely on the instrumentalities particularly the civil service on which every where government has to depend for administering the law. It all depends upon the social milieu in which civil servants are nurtured. If the social milieu is undemocratic then the government is bound; to be undemocratic.¹⁵

In the views of Ambedkar, there is another mistake, that is, for democracy to function it is enough to have a democratic form of government. To realise this mistake it is necessary to have some ideas on good government. And Good government means good laws and good administration. This is the essence of good government and nothing else. He thought that there cannot be good government in

this sense if those who are invested with ruling power seek the advantage of their own class instead of those of the whole people or the down-trodden. Whether the democratic form of government will result in good will depend upon the disposition of the individuals composing the society. If the mental disposition of the individuals is democratic then the democratic form of government would produce good government. If not, democratic form of government may easily become a dangerous form of government. If the individuals in a society are separated into classes and isolated from one another and each individual feels that his loyalty to his class must come before his loyalty to everything else or he bound to place the interests of his class above the interests of others and practiced discrimination against those who do not belong to his own caste in every sphere of life what can a democratic government do. In such a society, government may be a government of the people and by the people; it can never be a government for the people. It will be a government by a class for a class. A government for the people is only possible when the attitude of each individual is democratic that means each individual is prepared to treat every other individual as his equal and is supposed to give him same liberty which he claims for himself. This democratic attitude of mind is the result of socialisation of the individual in a democratic society. Democratic society is therefore a prerequisite of a democratic government. Unfortunately, the task of good government depends upon the mental and moral disposition of its subjects has seldom been realised. Democracy is more than a political machine. It is even more than a social system. It is an attitude of mind or a philosophy of life.¹⁶ Ambedkar thought that can social divisions permit the working of a democratic government? There have been differences of opinion in that. There were views in the West, as early as the 16th and 17th century that only propertied classes are able to elect a representative government. To them democracy meant only a representative government elected by a community of like-minded people, with property of power. Ambedkar did not like this as democracy.

Dr. Ambedkar analyzed the concept of democracy keeping in mind the prevailing social situation in India. The study of Indian society shaped his conception of the democratic system, and persistently he specified the link between ancient India and basic democracy not as some thing casual, but exactly as the relationship between two friends. He points out that India had democracy in ancient times, but the caste system swallowed it and established the rule of social authoritarianism. He hopes that

India could reveal the true image of basic democracy, if it follows the path of social revolution. Generally, Democracy has been defined, as you know, by various people, writers of political science and philosophers, sociologists and so on. The definitions of democracy given by Walter Bagehot or Abraham Lincoln were also not satisfactory to Ambedkar. But Dr. Ambedkar defined democracy in a different and in a much more concrete way. By “Democracy” Ambedkar mean, “A form and method of government whereby revolutionary changes in the economic and social life of the people are brought about without bloodshed”.¹⁷ The principle of self-government expresses the desire of the people to rule itself rather than be ruled by others whether the rulers are absolute monarchs, dictators or privileged classes. It is called “democracy”.¹⁸ He further said that “Democracy was a state of policy where, the governing class failed to capture powers to govern others and where the majority takes the reign of the instrumentalities of the state”.¹⁹ For Ambedkar, “Democracy is not merely a form of government. It is primarily a mode of associated living of conjoint communicated experience and to be searched in the social relationship. It is essentially an attitude of respect and reverence towards fellowmen”.²⁰ He believed democracy means no slavery, no caste, and no coercion. Freedom of thoughts, choice and capacity to live and let other live, which according to his conscience, would be the right path to democracy. Democracy is not a gift of nature. It is a habit of social living and can be acquired by the people themselves for their emancipation and well being. Ambedkar said:

It is necessary to remember that in a democracy, the ultimate principle is after all self-government and that means that final decision on all matters must be made by popularly elected persons and not by experts.²¹

Unless the people become able to exercise the franchise in an intelligent manner after understanding the political parties and their programmes in a rational and empirical way the democracy won't be safe in India. However, Dr. Ambedkar was an ardent follower of democratic system, and a scheme of democracy reforms every part of his brilliant literature. His idea of democracy as a type of social system, with necessary tendencies and limit, may be said to be enshrined in the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity, which form the concept of basic democracy. The basic democratic situation could be obtained only when there would be rational set of human relations. Ambedkar's specific analysis of democracy represents an effort to

define the common social situation created by political equality, through which we must subscribe to the development of other kind of democracies, if we want to maintain the basic democratic character of Indian society.

Ambedkar's conception of democracy does not focus any class structure in society, because in class structure breeds tyranny, vanity, pride, arrogance, greed, selfishness, insecurity, poverty, degradation, loss of liberty, self-reliance, independence, dignity and self-respect. He was a political realist; therefore, he regarded democracy in its practical aspect as the social organisation of the people in the sense that the people included all members of society. Thus he remarked, "A democratic society must assure a life of leisure and culture to each one of its citizens". Man occupies the highest place in the scheme of animal existence because of his cultivated mind and it is culture that divides the brute from man. Therefore the aim of a democratic society must be to enable every person to lead a life of culture which means the cultivation of mind as distinguished from the satisfaction of mere physical wants. A life of culture can be made possible where there is sufficient leisure for a man to devote himself to a life of culture. Leisure is quite impossible unless some means are found whereby the toil needs is less lessened. That can happen only when machine takes the place of man, thereby lessening the hours of work he is engaged in. thus, the concern of democracy should be to provide such conditions in society s all could lead a life of culture and religion otherwise people may lose faith in it.²² The main concern of his life was to make democracy safe for the common man and for the good of his country. He regarded that the democratic principles of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness were essentials in human life. He also had given importance on human rights.²³ He was keen that every member of society must share in exercising them. He was of the opinion that there should not be any kind of discrimination in the exercise of human rights, because it would be a negation of social and political democracy. He attached more importance to the freedom to form associations in various fields of life. For that he sought help of a Constitutional system, because he regarded that there was no freedom without Constitutional government. According to him, such institutions were the very soul of freedom and democracy.²⁴ Thus he wrote:

That to support democracy because we are all children of God is a very weak foundation for democracy to rest on. That is why democracy is so shaky whether it made to rest on such a foundation. But to recognize and realise that

you are parts of the same cosmic principle leaves room for no other theory of associated life except democracy. It does not merely preach democracy. It makes democracy an obligation of one and all .²⁵

Dr.Ambedkar realised that the democracy in India was a product of the historical situation and a unique national experience. The course of democratic development must protect the values of individual liberty, fraternal relationship, and morality grounded in humanistic religious belief. He supported the ideas of Constitutional separation of religion and state, the provision of fundamental rights, and the assignment of important functions to the Judiciary for strengthening the roots of democracy in India. Through legal and institutional reforms and by changing the habits of the hearts and mind, the creative use of political resources like election, well-wishers and friends must usher in a new life for the weaker sections of our society. For him, the purpose of modern democracy was to being about the welfare of the people. Though whatever efforts a people may make, they will never succeed in reducing all the conditions of a society to perfect equality, yet the democratic order must minimize the inequalities of wealth and income and protect the oppressed classes from the exploiter class. This is the true test of a democracy, and other tests being the existence of an opposition to show whether government was going wrong, equality before law and in administration, the observance of constitutional morality, the functioning of moral order in society, and the perseverance of public conscience. In other words, the perpetual rule of one class or a political party, the monopoly of the means of production in a few hands, the curtailment of civil liberties, the blind faith in democratic leaders, the atmosphere of fear and oppression, the misuse of political authority, the negative use of political recourses, etc., are some of the vices that can invariably damage the basic structure of democracy.²⁶ The existence of anything as undemocratic as caste was, Ambedkar felt, enough to kill the concept of democratic way of life. The division of India's population into castes and creeds, he thought, made the country unfit for representative government. The fact is that Hindus in India divided into touchable Hindus and the untouchable Hindus surely made the concept of 'government by the people' meaningless. In such a government, every role cannot be assumed by all. He said, such a government:

Tends to develop the personality of the few at the cost of the many-a result scrupulously to be avoided in the interest of democracy. To be specific, it is

not enough to be electors only. It is necessary to be law-makers, otherwise who can be law-makers will be masters of those who can only be electors.²⁷

In his speech in Bombay Legislative Council he further said:

I shall the house to note the relative position that we shall occupy under this democracy. Under this democracy which the Prime minister wishes to be established in this country are thing, as I said, will be unalterable, namely, that there will be Hindu majority, and scattered all throughout this land, scattered all throughout every village there will be a small appendix, if I may use that expression, a few clusters of hurts, a few mud houses of peoples who are called untouchables. In every village you will have in juxtaposition a colony constituting of Hindus, and a Maharwada or a Chamawada or a Bhangiwad or whatever you like to call it attached to that colony. That would be the unalterable fact.²⁸

Generally, we marked that the keynote of Ambedkar's concept of democracy as a way of life, which was the necessity for the participation of every human beings in the formation of the social, economic and political values that regulated men's lives and bound them together. The fundamental elements of his concept of democracy were, in short, liberty, equality, fraternity, natural rights and justice. He believes that these are essential for complete development of personality and capacities of every person. He believed that democracy offers every individual to achieve social equality, economic justice and political justice guaranteed in the Preamble of the Constitution. Therefore, in the Constituent Assembly he had stated that mere securing political democracy is not sufficient. It should be followed by establishing social democracy and economic equality. His vision was the foundation of social democracy in India.

Classification of Democracy:

Dr.Ambedkar focused on three categories of democracy in India that are (1) Political Democracy (2) Social Democracy and (3) Economic Democracy. For him, Social and Economic democracy are the tissues and fiber of a political democracy. The details are as follows:

Political Democracy: Dr.Ambedkar located the political power in the people thinking of that it is the key to all social progress. According to him, the soul of democracy is the doctrine of, "One man, one vote" and "one vote, one value". What

he means each and every man to count for one. No man for more than one. It means every government should be on the anvil both in its daily affairs and also at the end of a certain period when the voter and electorate would be given an opportunity to assess the work done by the government. We have established political democracy just because we do not want to install by any means whatsoever a perpetual dictatorship of any body of people.²⁹ Democracy is unrealizable without freedom of political discussion. A right to vote gives a man no real part in controlling government unless he is free to form his own opinions about his vote, to hear what others have to say about the issues; and to persuade others to adopt his opinions. He further said that “Parliamentary system of government is much more than government by discussion. It is negation to hereditary rule. Whosoever wants to rule must be elected by the people from time to time. He must obtain approval of the people. There are two pillars on which the Parliamentary system of government rests and works. Those are (1) an opposition and (11) free and fair elections. In this system of government people should know the other side if there are two sides to a question. Hence a functional opposition is required. Opposition is the key to a free political life. No democracy can do without it”.³⁰ While visualizing high political objects, he said that democracy must in harmony with social aims. He regarded democracy as both a social way of life and political method. Dr.Ambedkar pointed out that there are four premises upon which political democracy rests:

- (1) The individual is an end in himself.
- (2) The individual has cetin inalienable rights which must be guaranteed to him by the Constitution.
- (3) The individual shall not be required to relinquish any of his Constitutional rights as a condition precedent to the receipt of a privilege and.
- (4) The state shall not delegate power to private persons to govern others.³¹

In democracy every party has the right to criticize and capture political power. The party in power tries to keep the power in its hands. According to him, the real test of the party system would come when the governmental power might shift from the ruling party to some other political party or parties. Understandably, Dr.Ambedkar

realised that political democracy cannot succeed where there is no social and economic democracy because these are the tissues and fiber of a political democracy.

Social Democracy: Dr. Ambedkar viewed that social democracy means a way of life which recognises liberty, equality and fraternity as principle of life. They are not separate, they are union of trinity. Democracy, to him is more than a form of government. It is a form of the organisation of society. There are two essential conditions, which characterise a democratically constituted society. First is the absence of stratification of society into four classes. The second is a social habit on the part of individuals and groups, which is ready for continuous readjustment of recognition of reciprocity of interests.³² He regarded a favorable social setting as a pre-requisite for the success of democracy: without this democracy would not last long. The formal framework of democracy was of no value in itself and would not be appropriate if there was no social democracy. Ambedkar regarded democracy as a way of life. It involved rational empiricism, emphasis on individual, the instrumental nature of the state, voluntarism, and the law behind the law, nobility of means, discussion and consent, absence of perpetual rule and basic equality in all human relations. But he said:

An ideal society should be mobile, should be full of channels for conveying a change taking place in one part to other part. In an ideal society there should be many interests consciously communicated and shared. There should be varied and free points of contact with other modes of association. In other words, there must be social end-osmosis. This is fraternity, which is only other name for democracy. Democracy is not merely a form of government. It is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience. It is a respect and reverence towards fellowmen.³³

He outlined that equality is the principle and the substance of democracy which must be sought through social revolution. If our society is to become democratic, the spirit of democracy should be slowly and peacefully introduced into our customs and institutions. In searching out the social design of democracy, he suggested the possibility that equality in one aspect, should be extended to other aspects of life, too. He expressed that the politicians wanted good government and their aim was to establish a democratic form of government. But they never stopped to consider whether a democratic form of government was possible. Their contention was found

on series of fallacies. A democratic form of government presupposes a democratic form of society. The formal framework of democracy is of no value and would indeed be a misfit if there was no social democracy. The politicians never realised that there was not a form of government; it was essentially a form of society. It may not be necessary to form a democratic society to be marked by unity, by community of purpose, by loyalty to public ends and mutuality of sympathy. But it does unmistakably involve two things. The first is an attitude of mind, an attitude of respect and equality towards their fellows. The second is a social organisation free from rigid social barriers. Democracy is incompatible and inconsistent with isolation and exclusiveness, resulting in the distinction between the privileged and the unprivileged. He regarded democracy as both a social and a political method.³⁴ To end the social barriers, the inequality of caste system, Ambedkar stressed the need of making political democracy a social and economic democracy. For him, political democracy could not last unless these lay at the base of it. Social democracy recognized liberty, equality and fraternity as the principles of life. They formed an inseparable trinity in a democratic social structure. Without equality, liberty would produce the supremacy of the few over the many. Equality, without liberty, would kill individual initiative. Without fraternity, liberty and equality could not become a natural course of social relationship. If the fact is recognized that there was complete absence of two things in Indian society: equality in social and economic life, then political democracy, the political authority, must strive for removing this contradiction at the earliest moment, or else those who suffer from inequality will blow up the structure of political democracy. Thus, Dr. Ambedkar made a clear distinction between the old condition and new need of social order as a basic democracy.³⁵ Dr. Ambedkar further said:

Democracy is more than a political machine. It is even more than a social system. It is an attitude of mind or a philosophy of life. Equality and liberty are no doubt the deepest concern of democracy. But the equality and liberty are not sustained by the law of the state. It is the fellow feeling that sustains the democracy. What the French Revolutionists called fraternity. The word fraternity is not an adequate expression. The proper term is what the Buddha called, Maitree. Without fraternity, liberty would destroy equality and equality would destroy liberty. If in democracy liberty does not destroy equality and equality does not destroy liberty, it is because at the basis of both there is fraternity. Fraternity is, therefore, the root of democracy.³⁶

Thus, he laid emphasis on equality and fraternity in all spheres of life. As he realises the isolation and exclusiveness following upon the class structure creates an anti-social spirit in the minds of the privileged classes. The recognition of the class structure of society and the income structure of society as sacrosanct were utterly undemocratic and unrealistic. It set in motion influences which were harmful to rational human relationships. Hence, he denounced the sanctity of the class structure of society which was a positive danger to democracy.

Economic Democracy: Economic democracy means that the economic needs of the people are to be satisfied. No person should die in want of food, clothing and housing, if democracy is to live up to its principle of one man, one value. He points out that the principle of graded inequality has been carried into the economic field. From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs has no meaning in Hinduism. Rather the Hindu Social Order advocates the principle “from each according to his need, to each according to his nobility...its motto is that in regard to the distribution of good things of life to those who are reckoned as the highest must get the most and the best and those who are classed as the lowest must accept the least and the worst”.³⁷ The Hindu social order is founded on the fixity of occupations for each class and continues thereof by hereditary. He viewed that the democratic order must minimize the glaring inequalities in society. In democratic society there must be neither an oppressed class nor an oppressor class. It is the duty of the state to prevent the monopoly of the means of production in few hands. To empower both the Dalits and non-Dalits economically, he proposed that the state should be given political power for the regulation and control of both key industries and agriculture; to this end he proposed that economic powers should be incorporated into the body of the Constitution itself without abrogating Parliamentary democracy and without leaving its establishment to the will of democracy.

He was ware of the fact that capitalism makes democracy meaningless as it cannot protect the individual freedom and rights from the invasion of others rights. He, therefore, advocated for establishment of State Socialism to retain Parliamentary democracy and avoided dictatorship to safeguard individual liberty and to make it sure that the law of the Constitution prevailed to save both democracy and socialism. In one of his books, ‘States and Minorities’, he proposed for the adaptation of an economic political system as a new venture to benefit the poor masses of our society.

He, therefore, suggested the following proposals such as (a) Insurance shall be a monopoly of the state. (b) Agriculture shall be a state industry. (c) Land will belong to the state and shall be let out to villagers without distinction of caste or creed. (d) There will be no landlord, no tenant and landless labourer. (e) Rapid industrialisation of economy under the complete supervision and control of the state should be initiated.³⁸ While we have established political democracy, it is also the desire that we should lay down as our ideal economic democracy. We do not want merely to lay down a mechanism to enable people to come and capture power. The Constitution also wishes to lay down an ideal before those who would be forming the government. That ideal is economic democracy, whereby, one man, one vote is meant. While elaborating upon his theme of state socialism he wrote:

The soul of democracy is the doctrine of one man, one vote. Unfortunately, democracy has attempted to give effect to this doctrine only so far as the political structure is concerned by adopting the rules of one man, one vote...It has left the economic structure to take the shape given by those who are in a position to mould it. This has happen because Constitutional lawyers...never realised that it was equally essential to prescribe the shape and form of the economic structure of society, if democracy is to live up to its principle of one man, one value. Time has come to take bold step and define both the economic structure as well as political structure of society by the law of the Constitution.³⁹

Ambedkar denied that his scheme of state socialism should be incorporated in the Constitution of India so that the ruling party would be bound by it and the whims of the majority would not alter it. It is only by this that one can achieve the triple object: namely, to establish state socialism, retain Parliamentary democracy and avoid dictatorship. To protect the citizen against economic exploitation he proposed to include certain provisions on fundamental rights. He stated:

The main purpose behind the clause is to put an obligation on the state to plan the economic life of the people on lines which would lead to the highest point of productivity without closing every avenue to private enterprise and also provide for the equitable distribution of wealth.⁴⁰

While framing the Constitution of India as the Chairman of the Drafting Committee, he introduced the Directive Principles of State Policy with the object to

establish economic democracy in India. The Directive principles, as laid down in the Constitution, directs the state to secure an adequate means of livelihood, that the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are also distributed as best to sub serve the common good; that the operation of economic system does not result in concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment; that there is equal pay for equal work; that the health and strength of anyone is not abused and nobody is forced to enter avocation unsuited to their age; that children are given opportunity to develop their personality and are protected against exploitation or forced labour. Along with these provisions, another directive principle imposes obligation on the state to promote with special care the educational and economic interests of the weaker sections of our society and also protect them from social injustice and all forms of economic exploitation.⁴¹ Dr.Ambedkar viewed that the directive principles have a great value and it laid down the ideals of economic democracy and it shall be the duty of the government to implements it.

Now, having regard to the fact that there are various ways by which economic democracy may be brought about. We have deliberately introduced in the language that we have used, in the Directive Principles, something which is not fixed. We have left enough room for people of different ways of thinking, with regard to the reaching of the idea of economic democracy, to strive in their way to pursue the electorate that it is the best way of reaching economic democracy, the fullest opportunity to act in the way in which they want to act.

Challenges to Democracy in India:

Democracy is understood to be a political instrument and where this political instrument exists, there is democracy. Democracy, as Ambedkar, points out is quite different from a Republic as well from Parliamentary Government. The roots of democracy lie not in the form of Government, Parliament or otherwise. A democracy is more than a form of government. It is primarily a mode of associated living. The roots of democracy are to be searched in the social relationship, in the terms of associated life between the people who form a society. And the word 'Society' connotes one by its very nature. The qualities which accompany this unity are praiseworthy community of purpose and desire for welfare, loyalty to public ends and mutuality of sympathy and co-operation. To him all these ideals not to be found in

Indian society because there are several factors that pose challenges to the democracy. And the challenges are as follows:

(1) The Indian Society does not consist of individuals. It consists of an innumerable collection of castes with no bond of sympathy and having no common experience to share. The existence of the Caste system is a standing denial to the existence of ideal society and to the democracy. In his view, Indian Society is so imbedded in the Caste system that every thing is organized on the basis of caste. An Indian cannot eat or marry with an Indian simply because he or she does not belong to his or her caste. An Indian cannot touch an Indian because he or she does not belong to his or her caste. In politics and you can see caste reflected therein. In the field of industry. You will find that all the topmost men drawing the highest salary belong to the caste of the particular industrialist who owns the industry. The rest hang on for life on the lowest rungs of the ladder on a pittance. In the commercial sectors you will also find the same picture. The whole commercial house is one camp of one caste, with no entry board on the door for others. In case of charity, except one or two all charity in India is communal. If a Jain dies, he leaves his money for Jains. If a Marwadi dies, he leaves his money for Marwadis. If a Brahmin dies, he leaves his money for Brahmins. Thus, there is no room for the down-trodden and the outcasts in politics, industry, commerce, and in education.

(2) The Caste system accompanied by the principle of 'Graded Inequality' also poses a great threat to democracy. Castes are not equal in their status. They are standing one above another. They are jealous of one another. It is an ascending scale of hatred and descending scale of contempt. It destroys willing and helpful co-operation. Ambedkar views that Caste and Class system are different and in Class System there is no complete isolation as there is in the Caste System. The stimulus and response between two castes is only one-sided. The higher caste act in one recognized way and the lower caste must respond in one established way. It means that when there is no equitable opportunity to receive the stimulus from and to return the response from different castes, the result is that the influences, which educate some into masters, while educate others into slaves. It results into a separation of society, into a privileged and a subject class. Such a separation prevents social endosmosis.

(3) The fixation of occupation in caste system also cuts the very roots of democracy. That means one caste is bound to one occupation. Society is no doubt

stable organized when each individual is doing that for which he has been aptitude by nature in such a way as to be useful to others; and that it is the business of society to discover these aptitudes and progressively to train them for social use. But a society to be democratic should open a way to use all the capacities of the individual. Stratification is stunting of growth of the individual and deliberate stunting is a deliberate denial of democracy.⁴²

Conditions for successful working of democracy:

Dr.Ambedkar while speaking on the subject of democracy in Poona gave importance on the “Conditions Precedent for the Successful Working of Democracy”.

First Condition: According to Ambedkar the first condition precedent for the successful working of democracy is that there must be no glaring inequality in the society. There must not be an oppressed class. There must not be a suppressed class. There must not be a class, which has got all the privileges, and a class, which has got all the burdens to carry. Such a thing, such a division, such an organisation of a society has within itself the germ of a bloody revolution, and perhaps it would be impossible for the democracy to cure them. As I understand it, that the deep cleavages between class and class are going to be one of the greatest hindrances in the success of democracy. Because in democracy what happens? In democracy, everybody, even the oppressed, the suppressed, those who are deprived of their rights and those who carry the burden, they have the right to vote in the same way as those who have all the privileges, and probably those who are privileged are fewer than those who are unprivileged and since we adopt a majority rule as the rule of decision, it is quite possible that if the privileged few will not willingly and voluntarily surrender their privileges, then the distance between them and the lower orders will destroy democracy and bring into existence some quite different. Therefore, there is no doubt in my mind that if you examine the history of democracy in various part of the World, you will find that one of the cause for the breakdown of democracy is the existence of these social cleavage.

Second Condition: The second thing which a successful working of democracy requires is the existence of opposition. Democracy means a veto power. Democracy is a contradiction of hereditary authority or autocratic authority. Democracy means that at some stages somewhere there must be a veto on the

authority of those who are ruling the country. In autocracy there is no veto. But in democracy we have provided, that at every five years those who are in authority must go to the people and ask whether in the opinion of the people they are well qualified to be entrusted with power and authority to look after their interest, and mould their destiny, to defend them. That is what I called veto. Now, a democracy is not satisfied with a quinquennial veto that the Government should go at the end of five years only to the people and in the meantime there should be nobody to question the authority of the Government. Democracy requires that not only that the Government should be subject to the veto, long-term veto of five years, at the hands of the people, but there must be an immediate veto. Here must be people in the Parliament immediately ready there and then to challenge the Government. Now, if you understand what I am saying, democracy means that nobody has any perceptual authority to rule, but that rule is subject to sanction by the people and can be challenged in the House itself. You will see how important it is to have an opposition. Opposition means that the Government is always on the anvil. The Government must justify every act that it does to those of the people who don't belong to its party. Unfortunately, in our country all news papers, for one reason or other, I believe, it is the revenue from advertisements, have given far more publicity to the Government than to the opposition, because you cannot get any revenue from the opposition. They get revenue from the Government and you find columns after columns of speeches reeled out by members of the ruling party in daily news papers and the speeches made by the opposition are probably put somewhere on the last page in the last column. I am not criticizing what is democracy. I am talking about the condition precedent for a democracy. "The opposition is a condition precedent for democracy". But do you know that in England not only is the opposition recognized, but the leader of the opposition is paid a salary by the Government in order to run the opposition. He gets a secretary, he gets a small staff of stenographers and writers, and he has a room in the House where he does his business.

Third Condition: The third condition precedent for the success of democracy is equality in law and administration. One need not at this stage delight too much on equality before the law, although there might be cases here and there when there is equality before the law. But what is important is equality of treatment in administration. It is quite possible for good many of you to imagine or recall cases

where a party Government is carrying on the administration for the benefit of the members of the party. At any rate, I can recall great many instances of this sort. Suppose there is a law which says that nobody shall deal in a particular commodity without a license. Nobody can quarrel with that law because it is universal. There is no discrimination in that particular piece of legislation. But when a man goes to a particular officer or to the Minister with an application for licence in trading in a particular commodity, the Minister concerned may first look at his hat that means in which political party the person belongs and if it appeals to him he will deal the case and if not he refused him. You can just imagine what chaos and injustice would result in administration. The sort of a thing which used to happen in the USA is called a 'Spoil System', that is to say, when one party came in office, it removed all the employees that were employed by their predecessor including even the clerks and the peons and they filled their vacancies by those gentlemen who helped the new party to go in power. This was not helpful to democracy hence, they abolished this system. For efficient functioning of democracy, there is need of a permanent Civil Service for implementing the policy of the Government without fear of the executive.

Fourth Condition: According to Dr.Ambedkar the fourth condition precedent for the successful working of democracy is the observance of Constitutional Morality. Many people seem to be very enthusiastic about the Constitution. Well, I am afraid, I am not. I am quite prepared to join that body of people who want to abolish the Constitution, at any rate to redraft it. But what we forget is that we have a Constitution which contains legal provisions, only a Skelton. The flesh of that Skelton is to be found in what we call Constitutional morality. In England it is called the conventions of the Constitution and people must be ready to observe the rules. Dr.Ambedkar cited the example of George Washington, the first President of America. When he was requested by the people to stand for the second time for the Presidentship of America, Washington said, "My dear people, you have forgotten the purpose for which we made this Constitution. We made this Constitution because we did not want a hereditary monarchy and we did not want a hereditary ruler or a dictator". Even, Dr. Ambedkar supported Prof.Laski's writings on Conventions of the Constitution that the king must accept the advice of the Prime minister and if he does not accept the advice, the Prime minister shall force his ejection. Ambedkar believed

violation of Constitutional morality would damage the Constitution and the democracy as well.

Fifth Condition: To Dr.Ambedkar there is another factor which is very necessary in the working of democracy and it is this that in the name of democracy there must be no tyranny of the majority over the minority. The minority must feel always safe that although the majority is carrying on the Government, the minority is not being hurt, or the minority is not being hit below the belt. You take our own Parliament where the members of the opposition are doing by constantly bringing in motions of censure or adjournment motions. It is not a very happy thing to work in Parliament to be constantly dunning these adjournment motions. If Government were constantly to oppose adjournment motions of the minority community which is represented in the House by a group of few members in such case the minority communities will not get a chance to ventilate their grievances.What happens is that these minorities develop contempt for Parliamentary people and develop a revolutionary spirit something unconstitutional. It is, therefore, necessary that when democracy is working, the majority on which it is based must not act in a tyrannical manner.

Sixth Condition: Dr.Ambedkar thinks that democracy does require the functioning of moral order in society. Somehow, our political scientists have never considered this aspect of democracy. Ethics is something separate from politics. You may learn politics and you may know nothing about ethics as though politics can work without ethics. To my mind it is an astounding proposition. After all, in democracy what happens? Democracy is spoken of as a free Government. And what do we mean by free Government? Free Government means that in vast aspects of social life people are left free to carry on without interference of law, or if law has to be made, then the law maker expects that society will have enough morality in it to make the law a success. Dr.Ambedkar appreciated Harold .J. Laski for his insistence on the moral order as a requirement of democracy. In one of his book he has categorically stated that the moral order is always taken for granted in democracy. If there is no moral order, democracy will go to pieces as it is going now probably in our own country.

Lastly, Dr.Ambedkar viewed democracy requires ‘public conscience’. There is no doubt about it that although there is injustice in every country, the injustice is not equally spread. There are some where the impact of injustice is very small. There are

small against whom the impact is very great. And there are some who are absolutely crushed under the burden of injustice. Dr. Ambedkar cited the examples of South Africa where those people who are suffering are Indians. Even a large number of young boys' and girls belonging to the White race are joining hand in the struggle of the Indians in South Africa. This is called "public conscience". Public conscience means conscience which becomes agitated at every wrong; no matter who is the sufferer and it means that everybody whether he suffers that particular wrong or not, is prepared to join him in order to get him relieved. We are talking much about South Africa but it is strange that almost every village of India has similar incidents like South Africa and yet I have very seldom found anybody not belonging to the Scheduled Class taking up the cause of the Scheduled Class and fighting, and why? Because there is no "public conscience". I and my India is the only World within which I am found. If these sorts of things happen, the majority which is suffering from injustice gets no help from others for the purpose of getting rid of this injustice. It again develops a revolutionary mentality which puts democracy in danger. Now, as I said, what I have said is not a series of dogmas which have been worked out by many political scientists, but the result of what is impressed upon me as a result of reading the political history of different countries, and I believe that these are the most essential conditions for the purpose of preserving democracy.⁴³

Dr. Ambedkar after going through the political histories of various countries of the World proposed that these are the most essential conditions for the purpose of preserving democracy.

Things necessary for maintenance of democracy:

By the time Dr. Ambedkar completed his observation on the Constitution of free India, his inner emotion arose to the extent that he came up with some of his reflections on the future of India. He reminded the House on 26 January 1950 that India would be an independent democratic country, according to which 'India from that day would have a government of the people, by the people and for the people'. But question again coming to his mind was: 'what would happen to her democratic Constitution? Will she be able to maintain it or will she lose it again? And the second thought that came to his mind is that India did not know what Democracy is? In his opinion there was a time when India was studded with Republics and where there were monarchies, they were either elected or limited. They were never absolute. It is

not that India did not know Parliaments or Parliamentary procedures. A study of the Buddhist Bhikshu Sanghas disclose that not only there were Parliaments-for the Sanghas were nothing but Parliaments-but the Sanghas knew and observed all the rules of Parliamentary procedures known to modern times. This democratic system India lost. Will she lose it a second time? I don't know. But it is quite possible in a country like India- where democracy from its long disuse must be regarded as something quite new- there is danger of democracy giving place to dictatorship. It is quite possible for this new born democracy to retain its form but give place to dictatorship in act. If there is a landslide, the danger of the second possibility becoming actually is much greater. He said to the House that we must maintain our democracy not merely in form but also in fact. For maintaining it, he suggested three things or devices. The following things were:

(1) Constitutional methods: The first thing, he suggested was to achieve social and economic objectives, we must only use Constitutional methods. It means, according to him 'we must abandon the bloody methods of revolution. It means that we must abandon the method of civil-disobedience, non-cooperation and Satyagrahs. When there was no way left for Constitutional methods for achieving economic and social objective there was a great deal of justification for unconstitutional methods. But where Constitutional methods are open there can be no justification for these unconstitutional methods. These methods are nothing but the grammar of anarchy and sooner they are abandoned the better for us.

(2) Not to lay liberties at the feet of a great man: the second thing Dr.Ambedkar suggested and also by referring to John Stuart Mill, gave a caution, who once said, not 'to lay their liberties at the feet of a great man, or to trust him with powers, which enables him to subvert their institutions. He further added that there is nothing wrong in being grateful to such great persons who have rendered greatest service to the country and there is no harm to offer them our thanks, but there are limits to gratefulness. But at all cost, hero-worship must be avoided. Dr.Ambedkar pointed out that this caution was very necessary for India, because we are already having some traditions established in this regard. He said, in India, 'Bhakti' or what may be called the path of devotion or hero-worship, plays a part in its politics unequalled in magnitude by the part it plays in the politics of any other part of the

World. 'Bhakti' in religion may be a road to the salvation of the soul. But in politics, 'Bhakti' or hero-worship is a sure road to degradation and to eventual dictatorship.

(3) Make a political democracy a social democracy: The third thing, Dr. Ambedkar suggested that we must not content with mere political democracy. We must make our political democracy a social democracy as well. Political democracy cannot last unless there lies at the base of it social democracy. What does social democracy mean? It means a way of life which recognizes liberty, equality and fraternity as the principles of life. These principles of liberty, equality and fraternity are not to be treated as separate items in a trinity. They form a union of trinity in the sense that to divorce one from the other is to defeat the very purpose of democracy. Liberty cannot be divorced from equality; equality cannot be divorced from liberty. Nor can liberty and equality be divorced from fraternity. Without equality, liberty would produce the supremacy of the few over the many. Equality without liberty would kill individual initiative. Without fraternity, liberty and equality could not become a natural course of things. It would require a constable to enforce them. We must begin by acknowledging the fact that there is complete absence of two things in Indian society. One of these is equality. On the social plane we have in India a society based on the principle of graded inequality which means elevation for some and degradation for others. On the economic plane, we have a society in which there are some who have immense wealth as against many who live in abject poverty. He very powerfully put across his conviction about the future of democracy in these words:

On the 26th January 1950, we are going to enter into a life of contradictions. In politics we will have equality and in social and economic life we will have inequality. In politics we will be recognizing the principle of one man, one vote and one value. In our social and economic life, we shall, by reason of our social and economic structure, continue to deny the principle of one man one value. How long shall we continue to live this life of contradiction? How long shall we continue to deny equality in our social and economic life? If we continue to deny it for long we will do so only by putting our political democracy in peril. We must remove this contradiction at the earliest possible moment or else those who suffer from inequality will blow up the structure of political democracy which this Assembly has so laboriously built up.⁴⁴

Moreover, for social democracy recognition of the principle of fraternity is essential. Fraternity means a sense of common brotherhood of all Indians, all Indians being one people. It is the principle which gives unity and solidarity to social life. It is difficult thing to achieve because Indian society is based on castes. But we must overcome all these difficulties if we wish to become a nation in reality. For fraternity can be a fact only when there is a nation. Without fraternity, equality and liberty will be no deeper than coats of paints. These are my reflections about the tasks lie ahead of us. The monopoly of political power in the hands of a few to be removed very soon. The down-trodden classes which are tired of being governed are impatient to govern themselves. This urge for self-realisation in the down-trodden classes must not be allowed to devolve into a class struggle or class war. Therefore, the sooner room is made for the realisation of their aspiration, the better for the few, the better for the country, the better for the maintenance of its independence and the better for the continuance of its democratic structure.⁴⁵

Parliamentary Democracy:

Addressing a special session of students Parliament in a college of Jullandhar, Ambedkar reiterated Parliamentary Democracy in India. He said that during the discussion in the Constituent Assembly there was a variety of opinions regards the nature of the Constitution that we should have. Some preferred British system; some American system. There were others who did no want either of these two types of Government. But after a long discussion, a large majority of members came to a conclusion that the system of the Parliamentary Government as it is in Britain is best suited to our country. There are some sections of people who do not like Parliamentary Government. Communists want the Russian type of Government. The Socialists are also against the present Constitution of India. They are agitating against it. They have declared that if they come to power, they will modify it. Yet Ambedkar had strong support to the Parliamentary System of Government. He says Parliamentary democracy is unknown to us at present. During the time of Lord Buddha Parliamentary system was prevalent in India. Generally, the Buddhist Sanghas followed this practice. Unfortunately, we have lost this entire past heritage. Historians of India must unearth this question why these Parliamentary institutions disappeared from our land. Why this ancient civilization went to dogs? Why was India subjected to autocratic monarchies? We were familiar with Parliamentary

institutions. We know about votes, voting, committees and other things related to parliamentary institutions. Today parliamentary system of government is alien to us. We will have to educate the public; we will have to tell them the benefit of Parliamentary Democracy and Parliamentary system of government as well. There are three main things in the Parliamentary system of Government.

Firstly, Parliamentary Government means negation of hereditary rule. No person can claim to be a hereditary ruler. Whoever wants to rule must be elected by the people from time to time. He must obtain the approval of the people. Hereditary rule has no sanction in the Parliamentary system of Government.

Secondly, any law, any measure applicable to the people must be based on the advice of the people chosen by the people. No single individual can presume the authority that he knows everything, that he can make the laws and carry the government. The laws are to be made by the representatives of the people in the Parliament. They bare the people who can advices the men in whose name the law is proclaimed. That is the difference between the monarchical system of government and the democratic system of government. In monarchy, the affairs of the people are carried on in the name of a monarch and under the authority of a monarch. In democracy, the affairs of the public are carried on in the name of the head of the state; but the laws and the executive measures are the authority on which the government is carried on. The head of the state is the titular Head; and the government of the country is carried out, though in his name, by the elected representatives of the people.

Thirdly and lastly, Parliamentary system of government means that at a stated period those who want to advise the head of the state must have the confidence of the people in themselves renewed. After five years a legislator and the ministers were to go back to the people and obtain the fresh renewal of their confidence.⁴⁶

To Ambedkar this is not enough. Parliamentary system of government is much more than Government by discussion. There are two pillars on which the Parliamentary system of government rests. These are the fulcrums on which the mechanism works. These two pillars are (a) an opposition and (b) free and fair elections. For the last twenty or thirty years we acclimatized to one single political party. We have nearly forgotten the necessity and importance of 'opposition' for fair working of Parliamentary Democracy. We are continuously told that opposition is an

evil. Here again we are forgetting what the past history has to teach us. Moreover, one important thing in the Parliamentary Democracy is that people should know the other side, if there are two sides to a question. Hence a functional opposition is required because opposition is the key to a free political life. No democracy can do without it. Britain and Canada, the two exponents of Parliamentary systems of governments recognize this important fact and in both countries the leader of the opposition is paid salary by the Government.

In Ambedkar's views, free and fair elections are the other pillar on which Parliamentary Democracy rests. Free and fair elections are necessary for the transfer of power from one section of the community to the other in peaceful manner and without any bloodshed. Hence elections must be completely free and fair. People must be left to themselves to choose those whom they want to send to the Legislatures. Now the question arises to as to whether there is any desire on the part of the party in power to permit any opposition to be created. Congress does not want any 'opposition'. Congress is attempting to gather people of sundry views under one canopy. Congress is accepting help of multi-millionaires and taking the side of 'Big Businesses' at all crucial times. Under these circumstances, do you, gentlemen, think that there is any hope for the Parliamentary Democracy to succeed.

If Parliamentary Democracy fails in this country and it is bound to fail for the reasons mentioned by me the only result will be rebellion, anarchy and communism. If people in power do not realise that people will not tolerate hereditary authority, then this country is doomed. Either communism will come or Communist country may control over our sovereignty, destroying individual liberty and our independence or the section of the people who are disgruntled for the failure of the party in power will start rebellion and anarchy will prevailed. Gentlemen, I want you to take note of these eventual certainties and if you wish that Parliamentary system of Government and Parliamentary Democracy prevail in this country, if you are satisfied that we will be assured of our liberty of thought, speech and action, if we should preserve our independence, if we cherish the inherent right of individual liberty, then it is your duty as students, as intelligent community of our country, to strive your utmost to cherish this Parliamentary system of Government in its true sprit and work for it.⁴⁷

Working of Parliamentary Democracy:

While addressing to the Sholapur Municipality Conference he expressed his view on the working of Parliamentary Democracy in India and the political situation that has grown up in the country has developed the habit among the people to pay homage to one political party, the Congress. Observing the present- day democratic situation in India, he said:

I am no believer in democracy as in ideal to be pursued in all circumstances and in all claims; and having regard to the present-day situation in India, democracy is a most unsuitable system of government. At any rate, for some time in India needs the strongest hand of an enlightened autocrat.⁴⁸

On the workability of Parliamentary Democracy in India Ambedkar was skeptical. Thus, he observed:

In this country we have democracy, but it is a democracy which has ceased to exercise its intelligence. It has bound itself hand and foot to one organization. It is the greatest malaise, a disease and a sickness. It has affected all our people. Unfortunately, the Indian people are by tradition men who have more faith and less wit. Any one who does anything out of the ordinary, does something so eccentric as to be called in other countries as insane person, acquires in this country the status of a Mahatma or Yogi. And people follow him as the sheep follow the shepherd... Democracy must learn that its safety lies in having more than one opinion regarding the solution of any particular problem; and in order that people may be ready to advice with their opinions, democracy must learn to give a respectful hearing to all who are worth listening.⁴⁹

Dr.Ambedkar believed that Parliamentary system of Democracy is beneficial for the individual and for the society as a whole. He also supported the good self-government which would be a representative government and would be more efficient and good as well. During the freedom movement, he urged for a good self-government which can efficiently and effectively perform its duties of service and sacrifices. He, therefore, viewed that a good government largely depend upon the harmony of the people in power and the people not in power. He remarked:

Efficiency combined with selfish class interests instead of producing good government is far more likely to become a mere engine of suppression of the servile classes.⁵⁰

He was of the opinion that the rule of a single political party is detrimental to popular government. Thus, he quoted:

To have popular government run by single party is to let democracy become a mere form for despotism to play its part from behind it.⁵¹

One party government leads to totalitarianism that robbed man of his basic liberty and individuality. He said, “in anarchy and dictatorship liberty is lost and social unity among the people consisted in the social need for protecting the best and having common rules of morality and safeguarding the growth of the individual”.⁵² For majority rule, Ambedkar, like J.J.Rousseau, was also conscious of the fact that the majority rule might not necessarily be, as it was not always, in the interest of the whole community. His main concern was to safeguard the individual against the tyranny of the majority. Thus he wanted to achieve this by formulating a scheme of ‘checks and balances’ on the lines of American Constitution. He maintains that the will of the majority was essential for good as well as responsible government, but it should necessarily be provide concessions and considerations to the will of the minorities. With such passionate devotion to democracy, Ambedkar said, “We must strive along with democratic countries to maintain the basis of democratic civilization”, and if “we believe in it, we must both be true and loyal to it. We must not staunch in our faith in democracy but we must resolve to see that in whatever we do, we do not help the enemies of democracy to uproot the principle of liberty, equality and fraternity. If democracy lives, we are sure to reap the fruits of it. If democracy dies, it will be no doubt our doom”.⁵³

Failure of Parliamentary Democracy in India:

Dr.Ambedkar started, and also adhered to the struggle for a Democratic Republican System for the salvation of the Shudras and the Untouchables. But the form of democracy which he visualized was the picture of a polity in which there would be no slave and there would be participation of all in the governance system of the country. There would be no landlords or tenant, no master no salve. For him, democracy is the political system in which the governing class fails to capture power.

Democracy (*Ganatantra*), according to him was *Bahujantantra*, a rule of Bahujan (rule of common people). He, therefore, vehemently criticized the Parliamentary system of Government which fails to provide adequate strength to the untouchables and Shudras so that they could capture power. The structure of Parliamentary democracy and its paraphernalia on the contrary has paved the way for the privileged and governing classes, the micro minority to capture power easily through the ballot, rather than a system of universal franchise. As a result the elected representatives of the people, in the name of the people, rule with a ruthless motive of exploitation like the tyrants. Political parties play dubious role to further their interests and deprive voters during elections. People are helpless before the manipulative power of money, muscle, mafia, and media.

Ambedkar on 17th September, 1943 at the concluding session of the All India Trade Union Worker's Study Camp, under the auspices of the Indian Federation of Labour thundered:

Despotic sovereigns were replaced after a long and bloody struggle by a system of government known as Parliamentary Democracy. It was felt that this was the last word in the framework of government.... India is negotiating to have Parliamentary Democracy. There is a great need of someone with sufficient courage to tell Indians, "Beware of Parliamentary Democracy, it is not the best product, as it appeared to be."⁵⁴

He opposed Parliamentary Democracy because it was not favorable to give liberation or salvation to the Indian divine slaves. He explained:

Labour wants liberty..... Labour' concept of liberty is positive. It involves the idea of Government by the people. Government by the people, in the opinion of labour, does not mean Parliamentary Democracy.⁵⁵

He believes, Parliamentary Democracy is a form of Government in which the function of the people has come to be to vote for their masters and leave them to rule. Such a scheme of Government, in the opinion of labour is a travesty of government by the people. That is why even at the final stage, he once again, on 25th November 1947 demanded on the floor of the Constituent Assembly:

These are my reflections about the tasks that lie ahead of us. They may not be very pleasant to some. But there can be no gainsaying that political power

in this country has too long been the monopoly of a few and the many are not only beasts of burden, but also beasts of pray. This monopoly has not merely deprived them of their chances of betterment; it has sapped them of what may be called the significance of life. These down-trodden classes are tired of being governed. They are impatient to govern themselves. This urge for self-realisation in the down-trodden classes must not be allowed to develop into a class struggle or class war. It would to a division of the House. That would indeed be a day of disaster. For, as has been well said by Abraham Lincoln, a House divided against it can not stand very long. Therefore, the sooner room is made for the realisation of their aspiration the better for the maintenance for its independence and the better for the continuance of its democratic structure. This can only be done by the establishment of equality and fraternity in all spheres of life. That is why I have laid so much stress on them.⁵⁶

This is what he reasoned on the 17th September 1943: “Why did it (Parliamentary Democracy) not collapse so easily in England or in USA? To my mind there is only one answer- namely, there was a greater degree of economic and social democracy in the latter countries[England and USA] than it existed in the former[Italy and Germany]. Social and economic democracies are the tissues and the fibers of a Political Democracy..... All political societies get divided into two classes- the Rulers and the Ruled. This is an evil. If the evil stopped here it would not matter much. But the unfortunate part of it is that the division becomes stereotyped and stratified so much so that the Rulers are always drawn from the Ruling class and the class of the Ruled never becomes the Ruling class. People do not govern themselves, they establish a Government and leave it to govern them, forgetting that it is not their Government. That being the situation, Parliamentary Democracy has never been a Government of the people or by the people, and that is why it has never a government for the people”.⁵⁷ Democracy is the growth of the polity of a country with the development of its socio-economic structure. Democratisation of the society and its political structure began in England in the 12th Century A.D, in the shape of the *Magna Carta*, the First charter of Liberty in 1215 A.D. Thereafter, Parliamentary Democracy grew into its present form through the path of ceaseless civil wars. Indian society never witnessed any civil war, an inevitable precondition for attaining liberty and freedom from the hand of slavery. The Parliamentary Democracy that we have

has gone into the hand Ruling castes of India. It can not bring forth the day of deliverance for the Dalitbahujans. Ambedkar apprehended that Parliamentary Democracy would not be beneficial and it would not be effective to liberate the depressed classes. The drawbacks of Parliamentary Democracy, as Dr.Ambedkar visualized during the decade of 40's or 50's have become a reality palpable before our eyes today. The characteristics have demonstrated themselves in the present day political arena. In elections, the candidates are not the representative of the people. They are the nominee of the political parties. The political parties are formed by the ruling castes; hence they have to obey the whip of the political bosses. Even Constituencies consisting of 90% of Dalits, tribal, backward castes and minorities, are posed by a candidate of upper caste. When all political parties set candidates from the upper caste in a constituency, the untouchables, tribal and backward caste voters are absolutely helpless. Members of Parliament and State Assemblies are sold and purchase for corers of rupees to support the Government. During the election time 'booth capturing', 'rigging'; capturing of counting station, 'looting ballot boxes' and 'false counting' are common phenomenon.⁵⁸All most all Political Parties are giving tickets to person with criminal records to gain votes. Criminalization of politics has gone into deep. There is no consensus among major political parties to debarred candidates with criminal records. Money, mafia and muscle power are the order of the day. The political atmosphere in the country is in a bad shape infected by corruption. The root cause of this corruption is to remain in power through money power. Ambedkar realised the alarming rise of corruption in India. He, therefore, appealed to Jawaharlal Nehru to check the corruption heavy handedly but unfortunately Nehru rejected his proposal saying that it was not a matter of grave concern.

Indian politics lacks ethics and morality. Politicians had forgotten their moral responsibility. Hardly, we seen politician with moral character. Dr.Ambedkar had given importance on ethics and morality. He pointed out Politics without ethics are empty and a constant peril to the prospect of democracy. That the moral order is always taken for granted in democracy. If there is no moral order, democracy will go to pieces as it is going now in our own country. He was very much aware that although the elected candidates may have knowledge and character, but still they need to posses training of parliamentary legislative procedures. With this thought in his mind, he proposed a compulsory training for those who wanted to enter into politics.

In order to invigorate the democratic forces in India, Ambedkar established “the training school for entrance to politics” in July, 1956 at Nagpur.⁵⁹ A visible gap has been marked in Indian democracy as defined in the Constitution and as practised in the political process. Over the year an undesired and inevitable situation has developed where the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. The monopolization of all resources like natural, social, economic and political by the hands of the upper-caste elites has pushed the historically disadvantaged or the marginalized Backward Castes and Dalits into poverty and deprivation. Displacement of Tribals from their land and forest, encroachment of lands, control and ownership of land in the name of development created economic disparities which is the blatant manifestation of social inequality. The few champion democracy’s representative virtues at the cost of many really threaten the essence (justice, liberty, equality and fraternity) of Parliamentary democracy as envisaged by Dr. Ambedkar.

The Parliamentary democracy has not yet been able to fulfill the hopes it held out to the common man of ensuring to him, liberty, equality, prosperity and pursuit of happiness. The people called upon to deliver justice are not sincere in implementing the Constitutional provisions of the Constitution. The people in power have greater responsibility to think over the drawbacks of present trends of political life. If they do not, the prospects of democratic tradition in India may be dark and dismal. The masses, so far suffering oppressed and tyrannized, will start rebellion and anarchy will prevail.

However, we are proud for our democracy which is largest functional democracy of the world. The first general election which was held in 1952, under the newly adopted Constitution give chances to huge numbers of Indian citizens to exercise their voting power which was more than the total population of Europe. Never before in human history was such a large scale democratic practice seen. It is Ambedkar who strived hard to empower the common citizens of India with voting rights. Though we have no two-party systems which are essential for Parliamentary democracy, but due to our pluralistic culture the Indian political system has given birth to multi-party system. It is the political party who ruled for long period of time did not pay proper attention to the interests of different sections, castes, groups and regions of India over long period of time which created the breeding grounds for the growth of large numbers of political parties. Owing to the existence of large numbers

of political parties no political party is in a position to get absolute majority to form the government, hence coalition and alliance politics is marked by political instability. Despite of the political instability the coalition practice would retain the spirit of Parliamentary democracy. Parliamentary regimes have built-in mechanisms for power-sharing in such circumstances. Coalitions can offer effective and continuous representation to a variety of interests. Moreover, Parliamentary democracy is known for its healthy opposition. But the role of the opposition party in Parliament is not up to mark and in several cases they have supported the government instead of bringing them to the right path. Certain drawback of Parliamentary democracy does not undermine its importance. And any debate in favour of Presidential form of government in India is not the perfect answer because Parliamentary democracy can be more stable in a society like India. The founding fathers of our Constitution were not in favour of Presidential form of government. The Draft Constitution also proposes Parliamentary system. They realised that the American and Swiss systems give more stability but less responsibility. The Prime minister is first among equal; the President has no equal. Dr.Ambedkar, as the Chairman of the Drafting Committee gave legal shape to the Parliamentary system with a removable executive. To justify it he argued:

The Parliamentary system differs from a Non-Parliamentary system in as much as the former is more responsible than the latter, but they also differ to the time and agency for assessment of their responsibility. The Draft Constitution in recommending Parliamentary system of executive has preferred responsibility in stead of more stability.⁶⁰

For the better functioning of Parliamentary democracy the politician should be more transparent and accountable. The electoral system should be reformed and make it more representative. Strict action to be taken to make it free from criminals, money and muscle power. Floor crossing by the elected members for power, money and loyalty should be stopped. All the three organs of the state are to be more active; the Judiciary must be more accountable and free from corruption. Executive should more accountable and transparent as well as dutiful towards the general public, and the Legislature should reaffirm the hope and aspiration of the people.

Ambedkar and Distributive Justice:

Justice may be regarded on the one hand as a concept concerned with the order of society as a whole, and on the other hand as an expression of the rights of individuals in contrast to the claims of general social order. Justice, to Aristotle as to Plato, means that every member of a community should fulfill his moral obligation towards the fellow-members of his community. Aristotle views, 'distributive justice' assigns to every man his due according to his contributions to the society. It is the principle of distribution of goods, services, honour and offices among the citizens of the state. He regarded distributive justice is giving equal shares to equal persons and unequal shares to unequal persons. What he mean is that benefits or responsibilities should be proportionate to the worth (the merit or ability) of those who receive them. As Aristotle puts it, "if flutes are to be distributed they should go only to those who have a capacity for flute-playing; and similarly, a share in ruling should be given only to those who are capable of rule".⁶¹ For him, Justice distributed, not equally, but in proportion to some quality, character or achievement of the persons concerned.⁶² Thus, Aristotle allocated advantages according to desert or merit which was rejected by liberal theorist like John Rawls and libertarian theorists like F.Hayek and R.Nozick. Aristotle's distributive justice is absolutely different from the modern democratic concept of justice. The distributive justice in democracy insists on absolute equality. Thus, the modern interpretation of distributive justice is different and it establishes an organic relationship of a juristic norm with a particular system of economy. Simply, distributive justice means equal distribution of income, values and services among the equals only. However, Aristotle's notion of distributive justice based on merit or desert was not acceptable to Ambedkar as it depicted capability or ability which was undemocratic in nature.

British political philosopher Jeremy Bentham propounded the principle of 'utility'. To him, justice means utility and welfare. The hallmark of his thought was 'greatest happiness of the greatest number'. But Ambedkar puts: the real test of the progress of India will be: what have you (rulers) done for these people (untouchables)? Both J.Bentham's 'utility' and Ambedkar's 'justice' express the idea of 'equality' through 'inequality'.⁶³ Ambedkar was not agree with Bentham's principle of utility of greatest happiness of greatest number as it ignored the interest of the less advantaged, while Ambedkar's justice focused on the welfare of

untouchables. The Marxian concept of 'distributive justice' in the post-revolutionary socialist society is 'from each according to his ability and to each according to his work'. A worker will receive back in the form of goods and services what he has contributed in production. That means the distribution of burdens should depend on abilities, while the distribution of benefits should depend on needs: 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs'. Ability does not come into the picture. Benefits are not to be the reward of contribution to the common good. In a communist society, it is presupposed that men will work for the common good as hard as they can, in the way that their different abilities allow, and that they will be content to receive what they need, not what they have earned. Their needs differ to some extent, and therefore, they will not receive identical benefits. Thus, the communist notion of distributive justice is idealist in nature, where equality of income is a high sounding phrase but practice is highly unequal. It is appropriate to quote George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, 'where all animals are equal but some are more equal than others'.⁶⁴ He also rejected Marxian concept of distributive justice on the ground of need or ability where one awarded with his needs not by his contribution.

The idea of distributive justice has become more important in twentieth century writings of Neo-Liberal political thinkers like J.W Chapman and John Rawls. J.W Chapman tried to integrate the idea of justice with his principles of 'economic rationality of man' and 'consumers sovereignty' coupled with individual's claim of 'moral freedom'. To Chapman, the first principle of justice appears to be the distribution of benefits which maximizes benefits in accordance with the principle of 'consumers' sovereignty'. The second principle is that a system is unjust if the material wellbeing of the few is purchased at the expense of many. It implies that justice requires that no one shall gain at the expense of another.⁶⁵ John Rawls in his famous work, *A theory of justice* (1971) puts forward fairness as the criterion by which to distinguish the just policy from unjust. He proposed that all primary social goods-liberty and opportunity, income and wealth and the bases of self-respect- *are to be distributed equally unless* (emphasis added) an unequal distribution of any or all these good is to be of advantage to the least favoured.⁶⁶ It is plain that Rawls's analysis of distributive justice is a version of the equality-needs concept. It makes equality basic and then emphasizes the needs of the poor when justifying departures from equality. J.Rawls calls his criterion 'maximum', the maximum welfare for those

who have the least, the minimum, in society. There is, of course, no doubt that a decent compassion (incorporated into one intuitive notion of justice) approves of maximum, giving special emphasis to the needs of the poor.⁶⁷ Hence, Rawls sets up a social system, in which 'no one gains or loses from his arbitrary place in the distribution of natural assets or his own initial position in society without giving or receiving compensatory advantages in return.

In the Indian social context the idea of justice or distributive justice bear much more importance to Ambedkar. In his views, '*Distributive justice*' is a procedural rule which requires that law should follow in allocating and distributing rights among the members of the state. The state, through its law and policies, plays an important role in the distribution of these values and give it legitimacy. In Ambedkar's view, distributive justice means distribution of benefits equally among the every members of the society through the constitutional democratic framework. This can be possible in a society of free social order in which the individual is an end in himself and the aim and object of the society is to follow and encourage the highest possible development of personality of all its members. Society is not above the individual and if the individual has to subordinate himself to society, it is because such subordination is for his betterment and only to the extent necessary.⁶⁸ He regarded the principle of justice as a compendious which included most of the principle of what has become the foundation of a moral order. To him, justice means a just society based on the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity. In fact Justice has always evoked ideas of equality, of proportion, of 'compensation'. Equity signifies equality. If all men are equal, then they are of the same essence and their common essence entitles them to the same fundamental Rights and equal liberty. He argued if all communities are to be brought to the level of equality, then favoured treatments are to be given those who are below the level. Due to social inequality in India, Ambedkar opted for comprehensive set of socio-economic and political preferential and supportive policy measures to uplift the condition of depressed classes. To him, political justice would not be sufficient criteria unless and until it followed by socio-economic justice. To him, distributive justice is proportional equality and it is the duty of the state to promote the economic status and the living standards of the disadvantage groups. However, the state will remove socio-economic inequality by ensuring employment opportunity, right to livelihood and quality of life to poor weaker sections of the

society. Thus, Justice is of primary socio-economic and political values, while the procedural rules are the secondary values. To him, first Justice then the rules of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity which follow up. For Ambedkar, justice could be understood in relation to liberty, equality and fraternity which he recognizes as a way of life. Liberty gives opportunity for development of human personality and even shapes one's destiny. To restrain absolute liberty, equality comes in picture. Equality binds man with man and it gives effect to the consciousness of mutual obligation of right that brings the members of a society together. Fraternity is the in-depth feeling to provide an atmosphere wherein people could enjoy the values of liberty and equality. Fraternity is only another name for democracy. Democracy is not merely a form of government. It is primary mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience. Fraternity, to Ambedkar, is the name for the disposition of an individual to treat men as object of reverence and love and desire to be in unity with his fellow beings.⁶⁹

Roughly speaking, Ambedkar's theory of 'distributive justice' corresponds to John Rawls theory of distributive justice with practical utility. Much before John Rawls, Dr. Ambedkar has incorporated the provisions of equality and distributive social justice in the Constitution of India. India has a long history of Caste-ridden society. The society is a gradation of Castes forming an ascending scale of reverence and a descending scale of contempt- a system which gives no scope for the growth of that sentiment of equality and fraternity which is very essential for a democratic form of government. Before the advent of the Constitution, there was an unjust social order. Under the system of Varna-Jati, the Brahminical upper castes have undue, and unjust privileges, where as, the Shudras and Panchamas suffered from suppression, neglect and discrimination. The Hindu social structure stamped the vast majority of people as *Shudras* and *Panchamas* fit for nothing but only for manual labour. Dr. Ambedkar realised this problem, he, therefore, enshrined classless egalitarian socio-economic provisions like equality before law and equal protection of law (Article .14), equality of opportunity, abolition of Untouchability (Art.17), right to freedoms (Art.19), freedom of religion, protection of interests of minorities (Art.29-30), promotion of welfare of the people (Art.38), equal justice and free legal aid(Art.39), right to work, education and to public assistance in certain cases(Art.41); a host of welfare schemes for women and children along with special protection for SCs, STs and OBCs in the

form of 'reservation'. Reservation is a measure to correct the prevailing inequality. It is a means to peaceful revolution- and it operates as an evolutionary process. The Constitutional redistribution provisions are based on the moral concept or social justice that recognizes the rights of the individuals to obtain the basic social and welfare service irrespective of their eligibility, economic criteria, education and caste status. He suggested a formula for the removal of 'inequality' of different communities in respect of 'their status and progress'. In a speech before the Bombay Legislative Council on 12th March, 1927, Dr.Ambedkar suggested a formula for the removal of 'inequality' of different communities in respect of 'their status and progress'. He said, "If they are to be brought to 'the level of equality', then the only remedy is to adopt the principle of inequality and to give 'favoured treatment' to those who are below the level".⁷⁰ It should be noticed that Ambedkar has used the expression 'the level of equality'. His formulas may be stated thus: $L = I + F$, where L= level of equality, I= inequality and F= favoured treatment (reservation) to Scheduled castes and Scheduled Tribes. And the level of equality is called 'justice'.⁷¹

As the Chief Architect of India's Constitution, he got it shaped clearly on the values of justice, liberty, equality fraternity and dignity of man. The Preamble of the Constitution of India, since its inception on 26th January, 1950, has been invoking the spirit of India's people of all castes, creeds and communities 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 to promote among them all and Fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity of the Nation.

The Preamble to our Constitution stresses the need of a '*just social order*' in India. The Constitution has well authorized the State and its three organs: Legislature, Executive and Judiciary, to effect and maintain a social order in which all citizens could get all kinds of justice without any discrimination based on caste, creed and community. Dr.Ambedkar, as the champion of the downtrodden classes incorporated sets of Constitutional provisions in the nature of both protective and promotional measures in order to ameliorate the Socio-economic conditions of the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other socio-economically and educationally backward classes citizens of India. The Constitutional safeguards for Scheduled castes, and Scheduled tribes and other backward classes are found in Articles 15(4), 16(4) and

29(2) of the Fundamental Rights (Part-III) and Part XVI of the Constitution, which deals with special provisions for the Scheduled castes and Scheduled tribes.

Article 15 (1) of the Constitution provides that the State shall not discriminate against any citizen on grounds of religion, race, caste, Sex, place of birth or any of them.

Article 15(4) Nothing in this article or in clause (2) of Article 29 shall prevent the State from making any special provision for the advancement of any socially and educationally backward classes of citizens or for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes.⁷²

Article 16(1) expresses that there shall be equality of opportunity for all citizens in matters relating to employment or appointment to any office under the state.

Article 16(4) lays down that nothing in this article shall prevent the State from making any provision for the reservation of appointments or posts in favour of any backward class citizens which, in the opinion of the State, is not adequately represented in the service under the State. Articles 15(4) and 16(4) of the Constitution enable both the State and Central Governments to reserve seats in educational institutions and reserve posts for appointment in Public Services for socially and educationally backward class citizens and for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The main objectives of Articles 15(4) and 16(4) is to foster equality by adopting a technique of adjusting socially and educationally weaker sections of society and to bring them par with the advanced sections. The only of implementing social justice is by promoting the policy of reservation provided under Articles 15(4) and 16(4) of the Constitution.⁷³

Articles 330 and 332 make provisions for reservation of seats in Lok Sabha and the State Legislative Assembly of almost every State for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

Article 330 holds: “(1) Seat shall be reserved in the House of the people for

- (a) the Scheduled Castes;
- (b) the Scheduled Tribes (except for Scheduled Tribes in the Tribal areas of Assam and in Nagaland) and
- (c) The Scheduled Tribes in the autonomous district of Assam”.⁷⁴

Article 332 states that, “(1) Seats shall be reserved for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, (except the Scheduled Tribes in the Tribal areas of Assam and in Nagaland), in the Legislative Assembly of every States. (2) Seats shall be reserved also for the autonomous districts in the Legislative Assemblies of the state of Assam”.⁷⁵

The Directive Principle of State Policy embodied in Part IV of the Constitution ensures economic justice. Economic empowerment to Dalits and Tribes is one of the principles of economic justice which assured by Article 46 says “The State shall promote with special care the educational and economic interests of the weaker sections of the people, and, in particular, of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled tribes, and shall protect them from social injustice and all forms of exploitation”.⁷⁶ This Article further takes care that the State shall protect these classes of people from social injustice and all forms of exploitation. As the word ‘promotion’ connote advancement, the word advancement in Article 15(4) would include advancement in social, economic and educational fields. The framers of the Indian Constitution wanted to bring into existence a new social order where social justice and economic justice are assured to all.

Dr. Ambedkar in ‘*Sates and Minorities*’, a memorandum prepared and submitted to the Indian Constituent Assembly, on behalf of the All India Scheduled Caste Federation, presented a blue print of his own model of economic development and State Socialism. He proposed: (1) The key and basic industries shall be owned by the state and shall be run by the state or by corporation established by the state. (2) The insurance shall be the monopoly of the state and the state shall compel every adult citizens to take out a life insurance policy commensurate with his wages as may be prescribed by the Legislature. (3) The agriculture industry shall be State Industry. (4) Agriculture industry shall be organized on the following basis:

- (i) The State shall divide the land acquired into farms of standard size and let it out the farm for cultivation to residents of the village as tenants (made up of group of families) to cultivate as a collective farm and the farm shall be cultivated in accordance with rules and directions issued by Government.

- (ii) The land shall be let out to villagers without distinction of Caste or creed and in such manner that there will be no landlord, no tenants and no landless labour.
- (iii) It shall be the obligation of the state to finance the cultivation of the collective of the collective farms by the supply of water, drought animals, implements, manure, seeds etc.

(5) The scheme shall be brought into operation as early as possible but in no case shall be the period expended beyond the tenth year from the date of the Constitution coming into operation.⁷⁷

Thus, Dr.Ambedkar proposed state ownership of agriculture with a collectivized method of cultivation and a modified form of state socialism in the field of industry. State socialism is essential for rapid industrialization. Private enterprises cannot do it and if it did, it would produce those inequalities of Wealth which Private Capitalism has produced in Europe and which should be warning to Indians. Dr.Ambedkar also proposed that the above scheme of state socialism should not be left to the Will of the legislature and it should be established by the law of the Constitution so that it will be beyond the reach of a Parliamentary majority to suspend, amend or abrogate it. This guarantees the State Socialism while retaining Parliamentary democracy. Dr.Ambedkar also believed that his plan of State Socialism was essential for increasing productivity without closing every avenue to Private Sector and also distributing wealth equitably. Thus he observed:

The main purpose behind the clause is to put an obligation on the state to plan the economic life of people on lines which would lead to highest point of productivity without closing every avenue to the private enterprises and also provide for the equitable distribution of wealth.⁷⁸

Thus it follows from the above analysis of Dr Ambedkar strategy of development that the state has to play very active and crucial role in accelerating the growth with justice through democratic methods. The foundation of democracy would be feeble and shaky if the contradictions between political democracy, enshrined in the constitution, and social and economic inequalities, existing in our society, are not resolved. Further Ambedkar also argued that if democracy was to live up to its principle of 'one man one value', it was essential to define both the economic

structure as well as the political structure of the society by the law of Constitution.⁷⁹ But due to strong opposition in the Constituent Assembly, Dr. Ambedkar could not incorporate his scheme of 'State Socialism' under Fundamental rights as a part of the Constitution.

Dr. Ambedkar devised special preferential treatment in the form of reservation to bring equality among unequal. The accumulated disabilities resulting from past deprivation of educational advantages and opportunities for the advancement to Backward Classes, Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes can be removed by providing them special treatments like reservation in Government services and educational institutions. Dr. Ambedkar pointed out that the reason for the demand of reservations by the servile classes is to put a limit on the power of the governing classes to have control over the instrumentalities of government.⁸⁰ He was of the opinion that the principle of '*reservation*', will give perfect meaning to democracy in India. Normally most people fail to understand the implications of democracy and reservation. Since India has various communities, races, castes, and tribes. Due to its multi-racial, multi-lingual, multi-cultural and diversity of community, each community wants representation in Government. And to make democracy meaningful each of these communities should get their representatives in the three organs of government, Executive, Legislature and the Judiciary.

The Indian social system urged the historically disadvantaged section of people to demand reservation as their legitimate rights. The culture and its effect still continue to make them socially and educationally backward. The socio-cultural (educational) disabilities perpetuate inequalities and injustice. How can there be free, fair and equal competition among unequals? Reservation is demanded as rights to set right the wrongs and disabilities arising out of the unequal caste structure. The wrongs and the consequent disabilities are not things of the past, but are realities even today! The Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Other backward Castes are a traditionally deprived lot denied of equal rights and opportunities. Now having become aware of the prevalence of justice, they want to undo it and move towards an egalitarian social order. So, they demand the implementation of policies based on the principles of social justice to eradicate the continuing social injustice.⁸¹ It is a fact that India is a caste society and caste is reality here. The state policy of protective discrimination gave a great impetus to the process of politicization of caste as well as

de-reutilization of inter-caste relation.⁸² If affirmative measures are not taken in the fields of education, jobs and politics the upper caste monopoly will perpetuate itself and the lower castes will continue to have strong resentment against it. This is bound to express itself through our democratic political institutions. But if there are protective measures, justice to the Dalit-backwards will be ensured to some extent and “caste feeling will be muted to some extent also”. It is, therefore, “not reservation, but non-reservations will perpetuate caste divisiveness in our society”.⁸³ Reservation in fact, is an effective means to remove social injustice. Backwardness or social injustice can be eradicated by providing a helping hand and special facilities to the deprived. Thus, reservation is an inadequate but essential means to achieve the desired goal.⁸⁴ Thus, “reservation, in fact, is one of the instruments of annihilation of caste. This is an economical and educational means to destroy case bit by bit”.⁸⁵

Dr.Ambedkar realized that reservations for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Backward Classes would provide the incentive, opportunities and resources to utilise their neglected talents. It enhances their capacity to develop their talents and efficiency. It also promotes pride, self-respects and a sense of achievement that help them to contribute to the Nation building. A sense of inspiration created that they are participants to the Nation’s progress and achievement.

Ambedkar’s vision of true Democracy:

Dr.Ambedkar was the pioneer of democracy in India. He convinced that is not merely a form of government, but quite essentially a form of society. Thus he wanted a society based on democratic values. Democracy, as envisaged by Dr.Ambedkar, was revolutionary in the context of hierarchical society that India was, and still is. He thought of it as a weapon to attack casteism, in which caste dominance was often congruent with economic dominance, and the resulting oppression, both socially and economically. His concept of democracy was an attack on feudal society with the most striking manifestation of social inequality called caste. Political participation in the form of elections thus became his utmost priority because by this, he believed, the traditional feudal structure will be crumbled under other ascriptive identities. In fact, the political assertions of the lower castes which are historically disadvantaged extended the favourites of Indian democracy.⁸⁶ To Ambedkar, universal adult suffrage or the right to vote is an associated life and he demanded that the elected franchise to be extended to all untouchables. In 1928, he argued before the Simon Commission

that “associated life is shared by every individual, and as every individual is affected by its consequences, every individual must have the right to settle its terms”.⁸⁷ He further argued that democracy needs not only efficient government but also good government and it required representation of various groups in the administration. To Ambedkar, the freedom and independence of our country have to come with the freedom of the individual that is to say democracy has to be inclusive by extending its range “with democracy steadily chipping away at the hierarchy and moving downwards”.⁸⁸ Seen in another way, Ambedkar foresaw democracy as a reconstruction of the low-caste poor man, a reconstruction that would give him a much needed political identity. Conceptually Ambedkar’s ideal of a democratic citizen was one who was politically equal in spite of the other institutional inequalities that surrounded him and which, he believed would have the capacity to reduce the social privileges of the uppermost part of the caste hierarchy.

However, the discourse of power for the Dalits became very important in Ambedkar’s thought on democracy as this evident in his statement “We must become a ruling community. What I want is power- political power for my people-if we have power we have social status”.⁸⁹ One of the reason why Ambedkar’s vision of democracy could no be fulfilled in modern India is the fact that a very important strategy to this end that he foresaw has been neglected government after government in independence India. This is the problem of the slow development of the mass education. Dr. Ambedkar ended his concluding address with the following challenge not only to the members of the Constituent Assembly, but also to the people of India:

In the first place, the (castes) bring about separation in social life. They are anti-national because they generate jealousy and antipathy between caste and caste. But we must overcome all these difficulties if we wish to become a nation in reality.... By independence, we have lost the excuses of blaming the British for anything going wrong. If hereafter things go wrong, we will have nobody to blame except ourselves. There is greater danger of things going wrong, times are fast changing. People including our own are being moved by new ideologies. They are getting tired of Government by the people. They are prepares to a Government for the people and are indifferent whether it is Government of the people and by the people. If we wish to preserve the Constitution in which we have sought to enshrine the principle of the Government of the people for the people and by the people, let us resolve not

to be tardy in the recognition of the evils that lie across our path and which induce people to prefer government for the people to Government by the people, not to be weak in our initiative to remove them. That is the only way to serve the country.⁹⁰

Dr.Ambedkar was of the opinion that free India should be made safe for democracy. Due to the peculiar social formation in India there are Minority communities pitted against a Hindu Communal Majority, that if no provisions are made in the Constitution to cut the fangs of the Hindu Communal Majority, India will not be safe for democracy. The untouchables, therefore, insist on devising a Constitution which will take note of the special circumstances of India and contain safeguards which will prevent this Hindu Communal Majority in society from getting possession of political power to suppress and oppress the untouchables. With at least a modicum of political power in the hands of Minority communities will prevent their suppression and exploitation, and to enable them at least to hold their own in their struggle for existence against the Communal Majority.⁹¹ Dr.Ambedkar was aware that ‘jealousy and antipathy between Caste and Caste would harm nation-building’. Calling upon the Indians, he said:

Their destiny is bound up with the victory of democracy and if democracy wins, no one can stand in the way of India’s freedom. The chief task of Indians at the moment is to see that democracy wins. It is our country’s future that requires us to do it as our duty.⁹²

Dr.Ambedkar’s vision was to bring a social transformation by breaking down the system of Varnas and Castes so that everybody gets the opportunity of self-development. For this he adopted a democratic and Constitutional means. His thinking was predominately occupied by Constitutional and democratic ideologies. His philosophy was based on humanism of a democratic and pragmatic type. Throughout of his life he was fully pre-occupied with human problems, and also raised a movement against the cruelty of humanity, indignity and untouchability and injustice against man and women. For him, everything must be judged by the standards of utility and justice, that is, by fruits or by its consequences, in the interest of the many. He opposed Gandhi and other Congress leaders those who had given utmost importance only on the political freedom of the country. He was not against the political freedom but along with political freedom, he, laid stresses on social

freedom, democracy and dignity of the depressed classes those who are crippled for centuries by the Hindu society. Since Ambedkar belonged to the down-trodden people, he organized them for a united action to win the battle of social freedom and human rights on the peaceful and Constitutional lines. He encouraged the untouchables to rise and face the challenges of exploiters and oppressors in order to march forward on the road to a free society based on Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. He wished India to become a true nation embracing all castes and creeds in fraternity. To him there could be no nation without fraternity. Moreover, Ambedkar stressed the need of democratic liberalism and humanism for establishing right relations purely on the basis of reason and justice. No society of Ambedkar's vision can find its fulfillment without uplifting those poor, illiterate and downtrodden, who have been dumped in the black whole of ignorance, superstition and bigotry for century long. Hence, the main object of Ambedkar's life was to bring about a social revolution in the interest of such people who get the equal opportunities of self-development through education.⁹³

Moreover, his vision of India is the happiest blending of the past with the present, i.e., the Buddhist cultural ethos and ideals, which contains in the Preamble of India's Constitution. He wished India to establish a society wherein all citizens could enjoy the fruits of freedom and live with self-respect and dignity as a man. He never focused on the welfare of a single community. His heart felt deep anguish for all those who suffered from injustice and exploitation. The universal message of India was love, peace and harmony; and Ambedkar was a harbinger of that great message. Peace with equality and dignity was the goal of human progress. Dr. Ambedkar told his people to live in peace, love and liberty, instead of running after material abundance. He gave a clarion call to all people to herald the dawn of a new social order based on the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity and the integrity of the nation.⁹⁴ As the main Architect of the Constitution, Dr. Ambedkar strived hard to get rid of the anti-democratic forces. He emphasized on the Constitutional morality to maintain democracy. Constitutional morality can save our democratic institutions and values; even the administration cannot work honestly without adhering to the laws of the Constitution and the norms of Constitutional morality as established from time to time by the healthy functioning of both, the administration as well as the political leaders.⁹⁵ Thus, according to Dr. Ambedkar, a mere façade of democracy would not achieve the

purpose of democracy, which should be the welfare of the whole people. Ambedkar as a liberal political thinker did not accept the classical notion of parliamentary democracy for efficient, stable and good government because he believed that, 'efficiency combined with selfish class interests instead of producing good government is far more likely to become a mere engine of suppression of the servile classes'.⁹⁶ Thus, his aim was to get justice and freedom for all people. Moreover, he argued that poverty, illiteracy and caste distinctions were the sure threat to democracy. This should be removed from earliest possible time. His basic concern was to liberate and emancipate the untouchables of India from the yoke of Hindu social slavery. In his radio talk he said:

Indians today are governed by two different ideologies. Their political ideal set out in the preamble of the Constitution affirms a life of liberty, equality and fraternity. Their social ideal embodied in their religion denies them.⁹⁷

Ambedkar, while contemplating on the plight of his country plagued by inequality, and burdened body and soul by the heavy demands of its Brahmin and the Banik masters, said that it was difficult to conceive of an India free from her slavery to poverty, starvation and illiteracy even after independence if the outlook of her rulers does not change. The tradition and social philosophy of India had such a negative impact on the downtrodden masses that these internal limitations of democracy in India were enough to block all progress that a democracy assures to its people.⁹⁸ He hoped that his countrymen will someday learn that the country is greater than the man. He emphasized on social unity for strengthening the roots of democracy in this country. He cautioned Indians:

Democracy in this country is like a summer sapling. Without social unity, the roots of sapling cannot be strengthened. If social unity is not achieved this summer sapling of democracy, will be root out with gust of summer wind. Further he gave clarion call to the Indians to learn that, the democracy is a top dress on Indian soil, which is essentially undemocratic. We have to cultivate good relations between man and man based on fraternity, which is the corner stone of our Constitution.⁹⁹

Babasaheb Ambedkar had come to fulfill a mission. His vision was to free millions of downtrodden people from the shackles of social slavery and serfdom. And also he devoted all his energies to achieve the desired goals. It was his glorious fight

for ushering in India a social economic democracy. He envisaged the cohesive social order based on equality and justice i.e. social, economic and political. His aim was to realise the ideal of one man one value in all walks of life i.e. Social, Economic, and Political. His vision was not to establish a mere political democracy but social democracy, what he calls a way of life which recognises liberty, equality and fraternity as the principle of life. In his views, these principles of liberty, equality and fraternity are not to be treated as separate items in trinity. They form a union of trinity in the sense that to divorce one from the other is to defeat the very purpose of democracy. Therefore, Equality, liberty and fraternity cannot be divorced from each other. He had argued that, without equality liberty would produce the supremacy of the few over many. Equality without liberty would kill individual initiative. Without fraternity, liberty and equality could not become a natural course of things. Thus, he had envisaged that social justice could be brought when political democracy is extended in social and economic sphere of life as well. Furthermore, he was a great advocate of the spirit of social brotherhood. For, Ambedkar, justice, liberty, equality and fraternity prescribe the minimum that all men and women should be entitled to claim in a State. He emphasizes that democracy is a tool in the hand of ordinary people to further their interests and safeguard human values and dignity. It is the Constitutional democratic set up that can guarantee social justice to the subjugated and exploited sections and development to the nation as well.

References

1. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, Vol-3, p.451.
2. Jayaswal, K.P. Hindu Polity: A Constitutional History of India in Hindu Times, the Bangalore printing and publishing house, Bangalore, 1978.pp.90-91.
3. Narake Hari, ed, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Higher Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Mumbai, vol-17,part-3,2003, p.424.
4. Constitutional Assembly Debate, Vol-11, Speech on 26.11.1949.
5. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, Vol-4, 1987,pp.283-284.
6. Jefferson Maurice Wiltse, Jeffersonian Tradition in American Democracy, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1935, p.83.
7. Mill J. S, Considerations of Representative Governments, Indianapolis, Bobbs Merills, 1953, p.42.
8. Arblaster, Anthony, Democracy, Second edition, World View Publications, First Indian Reprint, Delhi, 1997, pp.3.
9. Ibid., pp.2-10.
10. Narake Hari, ed, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol-17. Part-3, op. cit., pp.519-521.
11. Ibid., Vol.-17.Part-1. op. cit.-xxiii, Editorial.
12. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, Vol-9, 1991,pp.447-48.
13. Ambedkar B.R, State and Minorities, Thacker and Co Ltd, Bombay, 1947,p.38.
14. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-4, op. cit., p.281.
15. Ibid., pp.281-282.

16. Ibid., pp.282-3.
17. Narake Hari, ed, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, vol.17. Part-3, op. cit.,p.475.
18. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, Vol.10, 1991,p.39.
19. Ibid., Vol-9, op. cit.,p.448.
20. Ambedkar B.R, Annihilation of Castes, Bheem Patrika Publications, Jalandhar, 1995,p.55.
21. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, vol-2, 1982,p.347.
22. Ambedkar B.R, What Congress and Gandhi Have Done to the Untouchables? Thacker and Co Ltd, Bombay, 1945, pp.295-296.
23. Ambedkar B.R, State and Minorities, op. cit.,p.3.
24. Ambedkar B.R, Ranade, Gandhi and Jinnah, Bheem Patrika Publications, Jalandhar, 1943, p.36.
25. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-4, op. cit., p.286.
26. Jatava D.R, B.R.Ambedkar, Study in Society and Politics, National Publishing House, Jaipur, 1998, pp.94-95.
27. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, Vol-1, 1979,p.251.
28. Ibid.,Vol-2, 1982, p.246.
29. Constituent Assembly Debate, Vol.vii, p.535.
30. Rattu N.C, Last Few Years of Dr.Ambedkar, Amrit Publishing House, New Delhi, 1997, p.32.
31. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, vol-1, op. cit., p.409.
32. Ibid., vol-4, op. cit., p.281.
33. Ambedkar B.R, Annihilation of Caste, op. cit., p.38.

34. Ambedkar B.R, Ranade, Gandhi and Jinnah, op. cit., pp.26-27.
35. Jatava D.R, B.R.Ambedkar, Study in Society and Politics, op. cit., p.93.
36. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-4, op cit., pp.283-284.
37. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-3, op cit., p.111.
38. Keer Dhananjay, Dr.Ambedkar, Life and Mission, Popular Prakashan, Mumbai, 2003, p.391.
39. Ambedkar B.R, State and Minorities, op. cit.,p.44.
40. Ibid., pp.44.
41. Jatava D.R, B.R.Ambedkar, Unique and Versatile, Blumoon Books, New Delhi,1998, p.111.
42. Narake Hari, ed, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches,Vol-17, Part-3, op. cit., pp.519-521.
43. ibid.,pp.475-485/ Narake Hari ed, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol-18, Part-3, pp-328-339. Narake Hari, ed, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol-20, pp.445-55.
44. Ibid, p-979, / Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, vol-13, 1994, p.1216.
45. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-13, op. cit., pp.1215-18.
46. Das Bhagwan, ed, Thus spoke Ambedkar, Vol-1, Buddhist Publishing House, Jalandhar, 1963. A lecture delivered at D.A.V College, Jullundur City Punjab on 28 October, 1951. Narake Hari ed, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches,Vol-17, Part-3, pp.426.
47. Ibid., pp.426-428.
48. Keer Dhananjay, Dr.Ambedkar, Life and Mission, op. cit., p.298.
49. Ibid., pp. 298-299.

50. Ambedkar B.R, What Congress and Gandhi Have Done to the Untouchables? op. cit., p.240.
51. Ambedkar B.R, Ranade, Gandhi and Jinnah, op. cit.,pp.74-75.
52. Ambedkar B.R,Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, Vol-11, 1992,pp.323-25.
53. Keer Dhananjay, Dr.Ambedkar, Life and Mission, op. cit., p.349.
54. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, vol-10, 1991,pp.106-7.
55. ibid., p.37.
56. Moon Vasant ed, Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, vol-13, 1994, p.1217.
57. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, vol-10, op. cit., and pp.108-9.
58. Biswas S.K, Goods, False- Goods and the Untouchables, Orions Books, Delhi, 1998, pp.306-6
59. Narake Hari, ed, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, vol-17, Part-2, op. cit., pp.161-162.
60. Constituent Assembly Debate, Vol.vii,p.32.
61. Politics, Book III, 12 / Raphael, D.D. Problems of Political Philosophy, Macmillan Press Ltd, London, 1990, p.120.
62. Hobhouse L.T, The Elements of Social Justice, George Allen& Unwin ltd, Londn,1958, p.97.
63. Biswas Oneil, A Phenomenon named Ambedkar, Blumoon Books, New Delhi, 1998, pp.94-95.
64. Raphael D.D, Problems of Political Philosophy, Macmillan Press Ltd, London, 1990, pp.136-137.
65. Chapman, Justice and Fairness in Friedrich and Chapman ed, Justice in Nomos VI, New York, 1963, pp.30-34.
66. J.Rawls, A theory of Justice, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1972, p.62.

67. Raphael D.D, Problems of Political Philosophy, op. cit., pp.147-148.
68. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-3, p.95.
69. ibid., op.cit, p.97; Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-1, p.57.
70. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-2, op. cit., p.42.
71. Biswas Oneil, A Phenomenon named Ambedkar, op. cit., p.96.
72. Article, 15, and Added by the Constitution First Amendment Act, 1951, section2.
73. Article16.
74. Article 330.
75. Article 332.
76. Article 46.
77. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, vol-1, op. cit., pp.396-397.
78. Ibid, pp.408-412.
79. Ibid, p.412.
80. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Vol-9, op. cit.,p.482.
81. Thorat Sukhadeo, and Negi Prasant.Aryama, Reservation and Private Sector, Quest for Equal opportunity and Growth, Rawat Publications, New Delhi, 2007,pp.313-14.
82. Seth, D.L, Economic and Political Weekly, p.2508.
83. Engineer, Asgar Ali, pp.xx.XXI.86.
84. Seth, D.L, Economic and Political Weekly, p.137.
85. Illaih, Kancha, Economic and Political Weekly, p.2309.

86. Gopal Jayal Niraja, ed, Democracy in India Themes in Politics, Oxford University press, New Delhi, 2001, p.26.
87. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-2, op. cit.,pp.338-400.
88. Gopal Jayal Niraja, ed, Democracy in India themes in Politics, op. cit., p.28.
89. Keer Dhananjay, Dr.Ambedkar, Life and Mission, op. cit., p.405
90. Moon Vasant ed, Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, vol-13, op. cit., p.1218.
91. Ibid., vol-9, op. cit., p.477.
92. Narake Hari, ed, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, vol-17, Part-2, op. cit., p.332.
93. Jatava D.R, B.R. Ambedkar, Unique and Versatile, op. cit., p.172
94. Ibid, pp.47-48.
95. Ibid., p.83.
96. Ambedkar B.R, What Congress and Gandhi Have Done to the Untouchables? op. cit., p.245.
97. Narake Hari, ed, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, vol-17, part-1, Editorial-XXIII, XXIV.
98. Rodrigues Valerane, ed, The Essential Writings of B.R.Ambedkar, Oxford University press, New Delhi, 2004, pp.145-148.
99. Narake Hari, ed, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, vol-17, part-1, Editorial-XXIII, XXIV.