Ambedkar’s faith in the dignity of the weak, the poor and the lowly, both in their individual capacity and collectively developed in him keenness for the democratic way of life. To Ambedkar, “Democracy is a mode of associated living. The roots of democracy are to be searched in social relationship, in terms of the associated life between the people who form the society.”\(^1\) Besides the thinkers, writers and institutions discussed in the previous chapter, the study of Indian society also shaped his conception of the democratic system, and he repeatedly specified the link between ancient India’s world view on life and democratic living style and basic democracy. In ancient times, democracy prevailed but later, the caste system swallowed it and established the rule of social authoritarianism. In his book, ‘What Congress and Gandhi have done to the Untouchables’, Ambedkar criticized the western writers who failed to recognize the social and economic contradictions in the Indian society. “Western writers on democracy believe that what is necessary for the realization of the ideal of democracy, namely, government by the people, of the people and for the people, is the establishment of universal adult suffrage.”\(^2\)

Ambedkar believed that adult suffrage could produce government of the people in the logical sense of the phrase, i.e., in contrast to the government of a king. But it cannot itself be said to bring about a democratic government, in the sense of government by the people and for the people.\(^3\)

---

Ambedkar scrutinized the views of western writers on politics regarding democracy and self government, which are reflected in his following comments:

(1) They omit to take into account the incontrovertible fact that in every country, there is a governing class.

(2) They fail to realize that the existence of a governing class is inconsistent with democracy and self-government.

(3) They do not seem to be aware that self-government and democracy become real when the governing class loses its means of capturing power to govern.

(4) They seem to over-look the fact that the governing class may be so well entrenched that the servile classes will need other safeguards besides adult suffrage to achieve the same end.

(5) They seem to pay no heed to the fact that what matters most in the considerations of any scheme of democracy and self-government is the social outlook and social philosophy of the governing class.4

Thus, for Ambedkar, so long as ‘governing class’ retains its means to capture power to govern, the freedom and well-being of the servile classes must depend upon the social outlook, the social conscience of the governing class and its philosophy of life. In India, “the cardinal principles of the philosophy of Brahmanism are five: -

(i) Graded inequality between the different classes;

(ii) complete disarmament of the shudras and the untouchables;

(iii) complete prohibition of the education of the shudras and the untouchables;

4. Ibid, pp. 203-204.
(iv) ban on the shudras and the untouchables occupying places of power and authority;
(v) ban on the shudras and the untouchables acquiring property;
(vi) complete subjugation and suppression of women.\(^5\)

He denounced the fact that inequality is the official doctrine of Brahmanism and the suppression of the lower classes aspiring to equality has been looked down upon by them and perpetuated by them, without remorse as their bounded duty.\(^6\) But, for Ambedkar, equality is the substance of democracy. It must be established through social revolution. If society is to become democratic, the spirit of democracy should be slowly and peacefully introduced in social customs / traditions and institutions. The primary task for Ambedkar was to discover how equality, the prime need of time, could constitute a social system based on basic democracy. 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.

To Ambedkar's mind, democracy based on associated living will give due weight and influence to all the different segments of society. It will, thus, obviate the undue preponderance of any individual or group. The supreme concern of his life was to make democracy safe for the common man thus for the nation. In a democratic society, every one should enjoy liberty and undertake the pursuit of happiness. He, however, felt that the hierarchical, inequitous, society torn into conflicting loyalties, completely governed by caste system and its rigid code of behaviour, needs to be done away with.

---

\(^5\) Ibid, p. 205.
\(^6\) Ibid, p. 215.
Rational Attitude towards Democracy

It is desirable to mention the preliminary observation made by him before explaining his definition of democracy:

1. The concept of democracy is dynamic one, in the sense that it has undergone change in its ‘form’ and ‘purpose’. To quote him: ‘democracy is always changing its form’.7

The contemporary concept of democracy is different from the Athenian democracy. Athenian democracy was practised in a small city-state, where the citizens themselves or a large sample of them could and did actually make many of the political decisions directly. Athenian model thus provides a working model of something close to the pure or extreme case of democracy…”8 But it was limited in character because it had 50% slaves who were deprived of all rights, only fifty- percent people were free. The 50% who were slaves had no place in the government at all whereas in the present democracy, it is not so. Every adult citizen can take part in the democratic process. H.B. Mayo also pointed out a big difference between the Athenian democracy and present democratic states; “It lies in the Athenian mingling of the political, the cultural, the religious; and especially the fact that in the Athenian democracy, the moral and the legal standards of the community were mingled together that they appeared as one, whereas we have divided the two.”9

2. Ambedkar observed that even the form and content of democracy might differ from time to time in the same country. “Nobody can say that the English

---

democracy before the English Revolution of 1688 was the same as the English democracy which came after the revolution of 1688.\textsuperscript{10}

It further changed its form after passing of First Reform Bill 1832. Thus its form changes from country to country and from time to time depending upon the given situation.

3. Democracy undergoes changes in its purpose also. The purpose of ancient English democracy was merely to curb the autocratic rule of the king who ‘even went to the extent of saying that although the parliament may be there, as an enactment making body, I, as a king, have got the prerogative to make the law and my law shall prevail.’\textsuperscript{11}

The purpose of democracy in recent times has undergone a distinct change, which is obviously to look after the welfare of the people, through the concept of Welfare State. It is the natural culmination of positive liberalism, which seeks to secure liberty and equality for the citizens on substantive basis. It claims to reduce economic inequalities by a system of progressive taxation for the provision of common services, not only for common use, such as, roads, railways, posts and telegraphs, bridges, but especially for the poorer sections of the community, such as, schools, hospitals, libraries, flood relief, rehabilitation of refugees, food rationing and so on. In this way, Welfare State assures help to the needy at every step.

**Definition**

The democracy, which Dr. Ambedkar contemplated is not merely an idea but a powerful concept, which respects the feelings of everyone to share in one’s own rule. Democracy aims to provide a mobile society and a free political process

\textsuperscript{10} Bhagwan Dass, op.cit., Vol.1, p. 59.

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid, p. 60.
that gives the individual the opportunity to participate in the management of affairs of one's country. Only in democratic society, virtues like rationality, integrity, liberty and freedom of conscience and thought are preferred to ignorance, fear, discrimination and superstitions. It is also presumed that democratic form of government is meant for the welfare of the people. It makes the state authority a trust. People choose those who exercise authority and they ultimately are responsible towards people.

In this backdrop, he defines democracy as, "a form and method of government whereby revolutionary changes in the economic and social life of the people are brought about without bloodshed."12 In democracy, the people's representatives try to introduce changes in the social and economic life of the people so that the welfare of the people could be possible. People also accept and respond positively to those changes without resorting to bloodshed. It implies recognition of the duties of the government and the rights of the people.

Lord Bryce defines democracy as a "government in which the ruling power of the state is legally vested not in any particular class or classes, but in the members of the community as a whole."13 According to Prof. Seeley, democracy is a form of "government in which every one has a share."14

J.S. Mill also considered democracy superior to other forms of government because the rights and interests of the individual can be safeguarded only in democracy and there is a great degree of general prosperity.

Accordingly, it emerges that democracy is superior to other forms, and achievement of democracy should be the goal of statesmanship in every country. "The modern long-time trend," wrote Charles E. Merriam in 1939, "is in the

---

direction of democracy." The reason for this trend, according to Merriam, is capable of proof:

(1) That a non-democratic society does not ensure the rule of the best, the most competent, the most conscientious, because in the long run, non-democratic society is dominated by status rather than ability; whereas in democratic society, the influence of status is kept at the minimum.

(2) It can also be proved, he states, that government by consent even with electoral processes at their worst is superior to government by force, which is the only alternative. Consent makes possible wiser public decisions, broader and sounder planning, and better public administration.

(3) It is likewise possible to prove further that democracy, in the long run, makes for greater social justice, because it inevitably tends to distribute the gains of community life more widely among the masses than any other system.

(4) Peaceful and constructive social change can be shown to be more readily attainable in a democracy, said Merriam, because of the greater confidence of the masses in the integrity and responsiveness of their government.

Ambedkar also prefers democracy because of its emphasis on virtues of tolerance and peaceful methods. He considered democracy as the best form of government to bring about revolutionary changes in the economic and social life of the people without any bloodshed.

The leading American exponent of pragmatism and also Ambedkar's teacher in USA, John Dewey, was convinced that democracy possesses virtues

which cannot be found in any other system. The reason why democracy is so necessary is that men are by nature unequal in physical and mental endowment. Without equality of treatment under law and its administration, only the favoured few got the opportunity to develop their talents and abilities. The society can reach its full possibilities, only when every one has equal opportunities to develop his potentialities. The supreme merit of democracy in Dewey’s opinion is that it sets free the human minds, thus fostering the experimentalism, without which men cannot be successful and adapt to a changing world. It gives chance to all and changes itself as human needs dictate. Democracy thus embodies the principles of change and continuity, to which Ambedkar attaches greater importance. To him, only the spirit of the people can help democracy to function well. “The foundation of democracy”, states Dewey “is faith in the capacities of human nature, faith in human intelligence and in the power of pooled and cooperative experience.”

Democracy, as reinterpreted in the twentieth century is seen to be more than a political formula, more than a system of government, more than a social order. It is a search for a way of life in which the voluntary free intelligence and activity of men can be harmonized and coordinated with the least possible coercion; it is the belief that such a way of life is the best way for all mankind, the way most in keeping with the nature of man and the nature of the universe.

James Bryce, in his ‘Modern Democracies’, gave perhaps the best descriptive appraisal of the actual working of recent democracy. He analyzed the structure and activities of the formal institutions of government in the leading democracies (excluding England) of 19th and early 20th centuries, described the working of political parties, public opinion, the press etc. and concluded that modern experiment in popular government had justified itself. Although no form

---

of government could revolutionize or perfect human nature, which has its characteristic defects; however, the working of democracy had been, in recent times, showing fewer defects than those of other forms. Modern popular government had proved to be a political expedient for the elimination of suffering, fear, inequality and injustice and an agency for the positive stimulation and cultivation of the cultural life of individual. If democracy “has not brought all the blessings that were expected, it has, in some countries, destroyed, in others materially diminished, many of the cruelties and terrors, injustices and oppressions ....” of former times. 17 And added “However grave the indictment that may be brought against democracy, its friends can answer, ‘what better ‘alternative do you offer?’”18

The Form of Government:

The Constitution of India provides for parliamentary form of government on the British model with a few modifications of it, in preference to the presidential form of the American model. But there was a considerable degree of difference of opinions in the Constituent Assembly for adopting the parliamentary system. A section of the house led by Prof. K.T. Shah pleaded for the adoption of the presidential system of government. They argued that due to political, religious and cultural diversities in India, such a form of government was needed which would be able to give stability, strength and power to control all these fissiparous tendencies whereas parliamentary system, can work only in a political society with a high degree of political maturity and constitutional discipline. The parliamentary system in view of its removable character of the executive might lead to political chaos, political instability and constitutional crisis. Ambedkar offered the

explanation of their charges and tried to justify the decision in draft constitution to envisage a removable parliamentary system of executive. He personally was of the view that a democratic executive must fulfill two conditions:

(i) It must be a stable executive; and
(ii) It must be a responsible executive.

Unfortunately, in reality, as he realized, no system of government can ensure both the above-mentioned conditions in equal degree. A non-parliamentary executive being independent of parliament tends to be less responsible than parliamentary executive, who depend upon a majority in parliament. Moreover, “the parliamentary system differs from a non-parliamentary system in as much as the former is more responsible than the latter but they also differs as to the timing and agency for assessment of their responsibility....” That’s why, “the draft constitution, in recommending the parliamentary system of executive, has preferred more responsibility to more stability.” Indeed, the accountability and answerability of the Parliamentary system in democracy is more desirable and important than mere stability of tenure of the executive.

Parliamentary system of government works on the well-accepted principle that ministers are responsible to the legislature for all their official acts and they remain in office as long as they retain its confidence. This is called ministerial responsibility and it is this responsibility that gives to the parliamentary system the name of a responsible government as well. It seems, for Ambedkar, ministerial responsibility is the essence of parliamentary government, i.e., so long as the policies and official conduct of ministers command the support of the majority of the members of the legislature, they continue to hold the reins of office and govern

the country. But as soon as they lose the confidence of the Parliament, they must resign from the office.

Before the adoption of constitution for the world’s largest democracy to be, there were different opinions regarding the nature and form of constitution. There were some that preferred the British system and some that wanted to adopt American form of government as has already been mentioned in the previous pages. There were also some people who did not want either of these two types of government. Communists wanted the Russian type of government. Even the socialists were against the parliamentary government and declared that if they come to power, they would modify it.

Despite these opposing voices, Ambedkar was strong enough and personally appealed to all to maintain parliamentary democracy. “Personally speaking, I am very greatly attached to the parliamentary system of government. We must understand what it means and we must preserve it in the constitution”.

What attracted Ambedkar to parliamentary democracy is its long run results viz. it assigns great significance to virtues like ability and co-operation, mutual respect and self-help, discipline and devotion to work, for the happiness of the millions of the people. In parliamentary democracy, a man feels that he counts in society and is not merely a play thing. It gives chances to all and changes itself as the human needs dictate. The system of parliamentary democracy, thus, embodies the principles of change and continuity to which Ambedkar attaches great importance. Walter Begot highly eulogised this aspect and pointed out that people can, under this system of government, choose a ruler who may be especially qualified to successfully pilot the ship of the state in a national crisis. In England,

---

Churchill replaced Chamberlain as Prime Minister because national emergency demanded it and this change was brought about without any political upheaval in the country. But such a smooth change is not possible under a presidential type of government. The office of the President goes by calendar. Come what may, presidential elections must be held after every four years. Begot held that, “The American government calls itself a government of the supreme people; but at a sudden crisis, the time when the sovereign power is most needed, you can not find the supreme people.... All the arrangements are for stated times. There is no elastic element; everything is rigid, specified and stated. Come what may, you quicken nothing and can retard nothing. You have to choose and assess your government in advance and whether it suits you or not, whether it works well or works ill, whether it is what you want or not, by law you must keep it” 24

Further, Parliamentary system is the only form so far devised in any representative democracy, which ensures harmonious cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of government. Ministers are the heads of the various administrative departments and at the same time, they are members of the majority party in the legislature; thus they lead the parliament with the policy on the basis of which decisions are to be made.

Referring to one of the amendments moved by Prof. K.T. Shah to provide for the separation of the executive from the legislature, Ambedkar said, “There is not the slightest doubt in my mind... the work of parliament is so complicated, so vast that unless and until the members of the executive sit in parliament, it would be very difficult for member of parliament to carry on the work of the legislature. The functioning of the members of the executive along with members of parliament in a debate on legislative measures has undoubtedly this advantage that

the members of the legislature can receive the necessary guidance on the complicated matters….”

Thus in a parliamentary system, there is no overlapping or waste of time since the executive and the legislative departments do not cross purposes, as may be found in the United States where the President may belong to one party and the majority in Congress to another. There are few chances of conflict of authority and jurisdiction in parliamentary system.

James Bryce adds two more advantages of the presence of ministers in the legislature;

1. Being in constant touch with the opposition as well as in still closer contact with the members of their own party, the ministers can feel the pulse of the assembly and through it the pulse of the public opinion and can thereby obtain useful criticism in a friendly way for their measures. The members of the legislature can also call the attention of the government to any grievance felt by their constituents and secure quick redress.

2. The system secures “swiftness in decision, vigour in action, and enables the cabinet to press through such legislation as it thinks it is needed, and to conduct both domestic and foreign policy with the confidence that its majority will support it against the attacks of the opposition”

Further, there was a model of parliamentary system already provided for in 1892 Councils Act, Minto-Morely reforms of 1909, the Montague-Chelmsford reforms 1919 and the Government of India Ac 1935, though in a limited way; and also Indians had developed familiarity with parliamentary institutions a little bit during the period of British rule. Even in India, the Indians, from time to time,

formulated proposals about the future political constitution. In 1925, some Indians led by Annie Besant formulated the Common - Wealth of India Bill that envisaged the introduction of a Parliamentary government and in fact, this bill was introduced in the British Parliament by George Lansbury and was supported by certain labour members. The Motilal Nehru Report of 1928 also envisaged a parliamentary democracy for India. The Sapru Report of 1948 did like wise. Furthermore, year after year, since the thirties, the congress had repeated its demand for setting up of a Constituent Assembly to be created on the basis of adult franchise for framing the future Constitution of India.

India did not turn back on this experience in representative government and the Constituent Assembly finally committed India to parliamentary democracy. The support for adopting this system also came from an important section of the assembly consisting of Shri K.M.Munshi, Sir Alladi Krishna Swami Iyer and others.

K.M.Munshi, for instance, said, “…. between the two executives, one on the American model and the other on the British model, there can be no question of preference … during the last 100 years, the Indian public life has largely drawn upon the traditions of the British Constitutional Law. Most of us … have looked up to the British model as the best. For the last thirty or forty years, some kind of responsibility has been introduced in the governance of this country. Our constitutional traditions have become parliamentary and we have now all our provinces functioning more or less on the British model. After this experience why should we go back upon the tradition that has been built for over 100 years, and try a novel experiment…”

—

Sir Alladi Krishna Swami Iyar also expressed his preference for the parliamentary system so that the Union Executive will have real relationship with those of the Indian states. Secondly, he thought “... An infant democracy cannot afford, under modern conditions, to take the risk of a perpetual cleavage, feud or conflict between the legislature and the executive. The object of the present constitutional structure is to prevent a conflict between the legislature and the executive and to promote harmony between the different parts of the governmental system... These, then, are the reasons which influenced this Assembly as well as the various committees in adopting the Cabinet System of Government in preference to the Presidential type...”

Nehru’s Concept of Democracy

Further, Jawaharlal Nehru had already expressed his preference for the parliamentary system in his speech earlier in the assembly. Speaking in the Indian parliament in March 1957, Nehru said, “We chose this system of parliamentary democracy deliberately; we chose it not only because, to some extent, we had always thought on these lines previously, but because we thought it was in keeping with our own old traditions as they were but adjusted to the new conditions and new surroundings ....”

Nehru’s faith in the dignity of the individual and in the importance of the people led him to have faith in democracy as a way of life and as basis of the social structure. “Democracy is not only political, not only economic but something of the mind... It involves equality of opportunity to all people, as far as possible in the political and economic domain. It involves the freedom of the individual to grow and to make the best of his capacities and the ability. It

---

involves a certain tolerance of others and even of other's opinion when they differ from yours ... it is a dynamic not a static thing.... Ultimately, it is a mental approach applied to our political and economic problems." It is clear that for Nehru, democracy was not for only for the material well being of the individual but also it was meant for his multi-dimensional development.

The general atmosphere in the world since the end of the 18th century had been more in favour of realizing the concept of justice, equality and liberty expounded by the earlier American and French revolutions. Absolute Monarchy was becoming an outdated system of government. The political trend had been to give due regard to individual's rights and his independent existence. Could it be possible that India would have remained immune to these revolutionary political trends? Moreover, it was not the British rule that brought the ideas of liberty to the Indian people, but education in the English language, which enlightened the educated Indians on the value of freedom and self-government.

Of course, it cannot be denied that the spread of education and improved means of communication brought the people of India close to the western concept of the government, a government by the people. Nehru, while moving the resolutions on the aims and objects of the Constitution in Constituent Assembly, stated that democracy was the only form of government, which we had to choose. To quote Nehru, “We say that it is our firm and solemn resolve to have an independent sovereign republic, India is bound to be sovereign, it is bound to be independent and it is bound to be republic. I will not go into the arguments about monarchy and the rest, but obviously, we cannot produce monarchy out of nothing. It is not there. If it is to be an independent and sovereign state, we are not going to have an external monarchy and we cannot have search for local

---

monarchies; it must inevitably be republic. We are aiming at democracy and nothing less than democracy." 31

**Democratic Traditions in Ancient India**

The most important point to be noted here is that Ambedkar accepted parliamentary system not because he wanted to imitate the western systems, but because he found the parliamentary traditions in India’s past. He took a great pride in the cultural traditions of his land. “Parliamentary democracy is unknown to us at present. But India, at one time, had parliamentary institutions. India was far more advanced in ancient times.... There are innumerable references in our literature to prove that parliamentary system of government was not unknown to us.”32

The history of India is replete with instances of democratic institutions. K.P. Jayaswal, in his book, ‘Hindu Polity’ has dealt with this matter at great length and has given a list of 81 Republics in ancient India. In the early Vedic times, there were Popular Assemblies, such as the ‘Sabha’ and ‘Samiti,’ that had a share in the management of the state. The earliest Buddhist records reveal that alongside powerful monarchies, there existed Republics possessing varying degrees of independence. “The administrative and the judicial business of the Clan (Sakyas) was carried out in public assembly, at which young and old were alike present, in their common Mote Hall...”33 and a single chief was elected to preside over the session.

Like the Sakyas, the Vrijjkas also had a republic. When the Chancellor of Magdha sought Buddha’s advice about invading the land of Vrijjkas, Buddha is

---

31 Constituent Assembly Debates Vol 1 pp. 59-60.
reported to have said that so long as the Vrijjyans held full and frequent assemblies, they were expected not to decline but to prosper.\textsuperscript{34}

Buddha accepted the principle of the Republic in the ordering of his ‘Sangha’. Beni Prasad, in his book, ‘The Theory of Government in Ancient India’, 1927, (p.324), stated that the Buddhist Sangha, “developed a regular parliamentary procedure and jargon which, at several points, were startling in their coincidence with modern practices.”\textsuperscript{35} The ‘Ganapuraka,’ the whip, secured the quorum and every motion had to be passed through two or four meetings. In case of the division of opinion, there was voting for which voting tickets were used and the matter finally decided by majority opinion. It has been claimed that these democratic traditions of the Buddhist religious order were borrowed from the Constitution of the Political Republics, such as that of the ‘Sakyas’, ‘Vrijjikas’ and ‘Mallas’, which existed during Buddha’s time.\textsuperscript{36}

According to Ambedkar, one can find ample evidence in the ‘Suktas’ of Mahaprinibbana that while Bhagwan Buddha was dying at Kusinara (Kusinagara) a message to the effect was sent to the Mallas who were sitting in the session at that time. They were devoted to parliamentary institutions. When they received the message about Buddha, they decided that they shall not close the session but would carry on with their work and will go to Kusinara after finishing of the business of the parliament.\textsuperscript{37} The importance of free discussion and consent is an essential requirement of popular government. A right to vote gives a man no real part on controlling government unless he is free to form his own opinions about the emerging issues, to hear what others say, to adapt his opinions.

\textsuperscript{35} Quoted by Sankar Ghose, op.cit., p.224.
\textsuperscript{36} K.P. Jayaswal, op.cit., p.539.
\textsuperscript{37} Bhagwan Dass, op.cit., Vol.1, pp. 50-51.
Democracy is inseparable from the belief in the methods of peaceful persuasion, in the ultimate reasonableness of man, and his response to rational argument. A democratic society is not susceptible to revolutions. The people know and feel that they are both sovereign and subjects. If they have any grievances, the redress is easy and can be had by peaceful and constitutional means. The political life of the community is based on complete freedom of discussion out of which emerges public opinion, which is the guiding source of political authority. Political decision makers should also follow the same attitude. But in some western countries, democracy was established after the occurrence of violent changes and revolutions. Look at the French politics where decisions are arrived at more often than not by what is known as “Knocking, knock-out blows.” This system of blows to a democrat like Ambedkar is the negation of parliamentary tradition. He likes the British type of parliamentary tradition where the members hardly ever resort to fisticuffs while taking any decision. The decision is taken almost after due discussion among the respective members. This system is hardly adequate to those not born in that system. The people of India “must learn, understand and make it a success.”

Parliamentary democracy, thus, does not involve violent methods of action, but peaceful ways of discussion and acceptance of decisions with faith and dignity. In Ambedkar’s scheme of political thoughts, this is not enough. There are three other important features inherent in the parliamentary system of government.

1. “Parliamentary government means negation of hereditary rule” No person can claim to be hereditary ruler; who-so-ever wants to rule must be elected by the people from time to time. He must obtain the approval of the people.

---

38 Ibid, p. 50.
39 Ibid, p. 52.
2. "... any law, any measure applicable to the public life of the people must be based on the advice of the people chosen by the people."\textsuperscript{40}

In a parliamentary democracy, a clear distinction is made between the head of the state and the head of the government. The head of the state is the titular head and is not the directing and deciding authority responsible before the nation for the measures taken. The elected representatives of the people actually carry out the government of the country though under his name.

3. "... that at a stated period, those who want to advise the head of the state must have confidence of the people in themselves renewed."\textsuperscript{41}

Ambedkar proposes that after every five years, the legislators, the ministers, should go back to the people and obtain the fresh renewal of their confidence. Democracy is thus institutionalized peaceful settlement of conflicts (ballots for bullets); a settlement arrived pro tem with the widest possible participation because of the adult suffrage and the political freedoms. It not only presides over social conflict and changes but also at the same time solves even older political problems that of finding peacefully the legitimate successors to the present rulers. Thomas Hobbes, for instance, thought that the problem of succession was the chief difficulty with a monarchical system. Democracy is preeminently an answer to the question, which no alternative system can answer convincingly in the modern climate of opinion how to find and change the rulers peacefully and legitimately. The methods of self-appointment of hereditary succession, of the coup d’etat are a bit contemporaneously plausible. That is why, for Ambedkar, the parliamentary system of government is much more than the

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid, p. 53.
government by succession. There are two other pillars, on which the parliamentary system rests i.e. an opposition and free and fair election.\textsuperscript{42}

In July 1942, at the All India Depressed Classes Conference at Nagpur, Ambedkar declared, “It seems to me that there lies on us a very important duty that democracy does not vanish from the earth as a governing principle of human relationship. If we believe in it, we must be both true and loyal to it. We must not only be 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 principles of liberty, equality and fraternity.”\textsuperscript{43}

\textbf{Drawbacks of Parliamentary Democracy}

Although parliamentary democracy has all the features of a popular government; a government of the people, by the people and for the people yet countries such as Italy, Germany, and Russia rejected it after brief experiments. There was wide discontent and dissatisfaction against this system of government and the standard arguments against democracy, as indicated by the concurrence of opinion throughout the centuries are that -

1. Democratic government is prone to indecision, feebleness, instability and stupidity because of the volatility, irrationality and inaptitude of the masses;

2. Democratic society exalts mediocrity and inferiority, the masses being resentful of persons above their level of intelligence and ability and preferring leaders of their own kind;

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid, p. 53.
Democracy easily falls prey to demagogism, bossism, and vicious pressure politics; the shortsightedness and narrow selfishness of the people themselves being the cause of these things;

Majority rule tends always to become majority tyranny, since the intolerance and bigotry of the multitude can be subject to no effective restraints; and

Democratic government cannot be carried out without political parties and that this invariably results in government by an invisible oligarchy.\textsuperscript{44}

Ambedkar, points out the causes leading to the failure of a parliamentary democracy as follows;

Firstly, "the movements are very slow" in a parliamentary democracy, which becomes the main cause of failure of democracy, in the countries of dictators. It delays swift actions. In a parliamentary democracy, the executive may be held up by the legislature, which may refuse to pass the laws which the executive wants and if it is not held by legislature, it may be held up by the judiciary which may declare the laws as illegal. "Parliamentary democracy gives no free hand to dictatorship and that is why it became a discredited institution in countries like Italy, Spain and Germany, which readily welcomed dictatorships."\textsuperscript{45}

The democratic system is inevitably slow, taking too long to act, to hammer out a policy in the endless debates, electioneering, and politicking. This slow method is quite unsuited for dealing with emergencies requiring quick decisions. Charges of the critics are focused around the allegation that, "...democracy is incompetent and inefficient in dealing with serious economic problems, in its unstable domestic and foreign policies, and in its inability to prepare for war. The

\textsuperscript{44} Maxey, op.cit., p. 679.
\textsuperscript{45} Bhagwan Dass, op.cit., Vol. I p 44.
breakdown of democracy in Germany and Italy, and its relative economic failure everywhere in the depression of the 1930’s was usually adduced as supporting evidence of incompetence." 46

Ambedkar, however, is not happy with dictatorship as an alternative to democracy. He is against dictatorship, but much worried about another most regrettable fact that there is a great deal of discontent against parliamentary democracy even in the countries where people are opposed to dictatorship. Democracy, almost in all countries, begins with some purposes and promises. It gives assurance for equality of political rights in the form of equal adult suffrage. It also extends the notion of equality of political rights to equality of social and economic opportunity.

There should be adequate provision of opportunities for the individual to develop his personality and enrich his life. This can be realized when everyone has free access to knowledge, security against unemployment, fair conditions of work and leisure, a fellow feeling and fair and open field for all.

Democracy promises that corporations of social groups cannot hold the State at bay, which are anti-social in their attitude. Thus democracy seeks to give assurance to all people inhabiting the State that all have equal opportunity of achieving their goals as they come to envisage them and to provide positive means for this purpose.

In fact, in spite of all such noble promises, people feel immense discontent against parliamentary democracy even in countries pledged to democratic faith. It can be said in general terms that “the discontent against parliamentary democracy

is due to the realization that it has failed to assure masses the right to liberty, property or pursuit of happiness.”47

Ambedkar felt that there was a misperception about the idea of freedom of contract, which has brought dissatisfaction against parliamentary democracy. “The idea became sanctified and was upheld in the name of liberty. Parliamentary democracy took no notice of economic inequalities and did not care to examine the result of freedom of contract of the parties to the contract, in spite of the fact that they were unequal in their bargaining power. It did not mind if the freedom of contract gave the strong the opportunities to defraud the weak. The result is that parliamentary democracy, in standing out as the protagonist of liberty, has continuously added to the economic wrongs perpetuated on the poor, the down trodden and the disinherited class.”48 Here, Ambedkar comes very close to C.B. McPherson’s analysis of democracy: “The liberal democracies that we know were liberal first and democratic later …… before democracy came in the western world, there was the society and the politics of choice, the political society and politics of competitions, the society and politics of the market. This was the liberal society and state.”49 The dimensions of democracy have changed because “democracy has not been at stand still” 50 and has been evolving. The claims of democracy would never have been admitted in the liberal societies until the socio-political institutions had a solid base of liberalism. The society as a whole and the system of government, in particular, were organized on the principle of freedom of choice. “Previously, people had thought of themselves as not individuals but members of ranks or orders or communities. Their fixed place in a customary
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society had given them some security but little freedom. Now, people begin with
delight or without fear, to think of themselves as individuals free to choose.”

Individuals were free to choose their religion, their pattern of life, their
occupations; they freely made choices as to how much of their income they may
spend, how much to save, what to spend on and what to invest in, and their
decisions, in turn, determined the prices, particularly during 17th and 19th centuries
in the industrialised countries, which claimed to have an enormously liberalizing
force. This was the market economy in which State was considered a laissez-faire
State, “when most individuals offered their labour in the market to those who
possessed accumulated capital on which they could employ other peoples labour,
and it is known as the capitalist market economy.”

This type of system has changed not only economic arrangements but also
the whole society. Earlier the society, which was based on custom, on status and
on authoritarian allocation of work and rewards is now based on individual
mobility, on contract, and on impersonal market allocation of work and rewards in
response to individual choices. Ambedkar held that this idea of freedom of
contract became sanctified and “was upheld in the name of liberty.” But the
society, which is based on individual choices, had, of course, drawbacks. There
were necessarily greater inequalities, for in a capitalist market society only some
people have got accumulated capital and a great many others have none or have so
little that they cannot work on their own but have to offer their labour to others. It
boils down to the reality: this involves inequality in freedom of choice; all are free
but some are freer than others.
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“Parliamentary democracy took no notice of economic inequalities and did not care to examine the result of freedom of contract of the parties to contract, in spite of the fact that they were unequal in their bargaining power. It did not mind if the freedom of contract gave the strong the opportunity to defraud the weak.”

Secondly, Ambedkar held the view that there is ‘another wrong which has vitiated the institution of parliamentary democracy,’ viz., the failure to realize and feel that, “Political democracy cannot succeed where there is no social and economic democracy.”

Parliamentary democracy easily collapsed in Italy, Germany and Russia because there was a lesser degree of social and economic democracy. But it worked successfully in U.S.A. and U.K., as there was a greater degree of social and economic democracy. This shows that political democracy does not strike roots and become abiding unless it enables the society to move towards economic and social democracy. In England and America, democracy developed over a couple of hundred years broadening from precedent to precedent. As democracy broadened, larger and larger numbers of people began to take part in politics and it became necessary to pay attention to their economic and political demands.

In England, through the right to vote which workers obtained progressively from 1867 onwards and which made them a strong political force, pressurized the state to give them their economic and social rights such as decent wages, full employment, social insurance, healthy conditions of work etc. They are trying to secure these by the use of democratic political processes. Political democracy enjoys the support of these large masses of workers because they find that it
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enables them to move in the direction of economic and social equality, for it is not rigid and is willing to change along with the changes of time.

The lesson to be learnt is that if democracy cannot solve the problems of social justice, discriminations, and economic development and of hunger, misery and unemployment, it is bound to be subverted, sooner or later, and replaced by dictatorship or anarchy.

Ambedkar was actually aware of the 'contradiction' between political equality and social and economic equality. In his last speech in the Constituent Assembly before the draft of constitution was adopted, he warned that on 26th January 1950, we would enter, "a life of contradictions as in politics we will have equality and in social and economic life we will have inequality." He questioned, "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 Constituent Assembly built up."56

The contradictions to which Ambedkar drew pointed attention have not only continued but proliferated in the years after independence. All these raise enormous difficulties in the way of the emergence of a homogeneous society that is essential for the growth of political democracy. Political equality becomes unreal in the face of social inequality and economic distress and insecurity. The equality that prevails in the political field, viz. one man, one value should extend to other fields as well. People value political equality only in proportion to the opportunity that it affords them to work for equality in other spheres as well.

Thirdly, apart from these drawbacks, which, according to Ambedkar, have been responsible for the failure of parliamentary democracy, there is ‘bad organization.’ Ambedkar argued that all ‘political societies’ get divided into two classes, the ‘Ruler’ and the ‘Ruled’. This is an evil that perpetually dominates the trends in the society. But the unfortunate part of it is that the division becomes so stereotyped and stratified that rulers are always drawn from the ruling classes.

C.B. McPherson has called it ‘Equilibrium Democracy’ or more specifically ‘Pluralist Elitist Equilibrium Model of Democracy’ in which ‘democracy is simply a mechanism for choosing and authorizing government, not a kind of society nor a set of moral ends; and second, that the mechanism consists of a competition between two or more self chosen sets of politicians (Elites). He further remarked that the voters’ role is not to decide political issues but they choose representatives who will carry out those decisions: it is rather to choose the men who will do the deciding.57

Thus the electorate can decide which elite shall rule but cannot change the fact that power is always exercised by an elite. As Joseph Schumpeter put it ‘democracy is the rule of the politician’. Schumpeter, in his famous book, ‘Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy’ tries to investigate how voters in western democracies actually behave and find out that “the role of the people is to produce a government … the democratic method is that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide the means of competitive struggle for the people’s vote.”58

Ambedkar believed that generally people are keen on political participation, much less on self-governance. They are content to establish a government and
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leave to it to govern them. That’s why parliamentary democracy cannot become a ‘government of the people or by the people.’ It has been in reality a government of a hereditary subject class by a hereditary ruling class. “It is because of this that parliamentary democracy has not fulfilled the hope it held out to the common man of ensuring to him liberty, prosperity and pursuit of happiness.”

In a speech delivered on the 17th September, 1943 at the All India Trade Union Workers Study Camp held in Delhi, Ambedkar expressed why there is a great deal of discontent and dissatisfaction against parliamentary democracy in the countries where people were opposed to dictatorship. Discontent against the parliamentary democracy is due to the realization that it has failed to assure the masses the right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Politicians have neglected the social and economic emancipation of the needy and poor and have failed to check anti-social and corrupt practices. Democracy in India, it seems, is unable to provide the basic necessities of life to millions of people. The success of democracy in India depends upon the satisfaction of these mighty millions.

Though reiterated over and over again, these postulates are sheer guesses. 20th century champions of democracy endeavoured to make an affirmative case for democracy. They argued that democracy was workable and preferable form of government for the people who are properly prepared by education and experience. The drawbacks discussed in the preceding pages, he held, are not inevitable. The people themselves, by proper education, reflection and experience can remove them. Ambedkar is quite aware that the spirit to work for the development of such a noble idea and the creative urge of human mind, particularly among the students can make democracy a success. Ambedkar warns
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the harbingers of democracy that if parliamentary democracy fails in this land, “the result will be rebellion, anarchy and communism.”61

While delivering a lecture to the students of D.A.V. College, Jalandhar on 28th October, 1951, he advised, “If you wish that parliamentary system of government and parliamentary democracy should 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 specific system of government in its true spirit and work for it.”62

**Essential Conditions for the successful working of Democracy**

Ambedkar analyses not only the defects in democracy but also gives some positive suggestions and delineates some conditions necessary for the successful working of democracy. Under right conditions and favourable circumstances, democracy is undoubtedly the best form of government and secures the most satisfactory and unending results. The purpose of modern democracy to him “is not so much to put a curb on an autocratic king but to bring about the welfare of people.”63

This is possible only when democracy works on right lines and improves the modus opreandii of the people. That’s why Ambedkar had very explicitly stated some of the necessary conditions for the successful working of democracy which are enumerated below:
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(I) Absence of glaring inequalities

“There must be no glaring inequalities in the society.”\textsuperscript{64} There should not be an ‘oppressed class’ and there should not be ‘suppressed class.’ He refers to what Abraham Lincoln once said “a house divided against itself cannot stand”\textsuperscript{65} and endorses the latter’s statement which has a much deeper meaning. He said that, “the deep cleavages between class and class are going to be one of the greatest hindrances in the success of democracy.”\textsuperscript{66}

His commitment to principles of liberty, equality and fraternity, which he says he derived from his preceptor, the Buddha, the precept of equality, is the prior most in his mind. He said in unequivocal terms that: “Fraternity and liberty are really derivative notions. The basic and fundamental conceptions are equality and respect for human personality. Fraternity and liberty take their roots in these two fundamental conceptions. Digging further down, it may be said that equality is the original notion and respect for human personality is a reflection of it, so that where equality is denied, everything else may be taken to be denied.”\textsuperscript{67}

(II) Existence of opposition

“The second thing which a successful working of democracy requires is the existence of opposition.”\textsuperscript{68} Opposition means that government is always on the anvil.”\textsuperscript{69}

The government must justify the act that it does to those people who do not belong to its party. He held that there must be an effective veto power against the authority of those who are ruling the country. There cannot be veto against the
king, but in democracy, it must be exercised against the party in power. Unless there are two parties - one to rule and other to oppose, there cannot be democracy.

"The dogmatic totalitarian viewpoint holds that there is only one truth and from that position, there is only one party in the 'State' that holds the direct line. The democratic view holds that different men perceive different aspects of truth mainly in the light of their lives and experiences and that there will be at least two sides of any major question."\(^{70}\)

Ambedkar valued the democratic viewpoint, i.e., the right to differ or difference of opinion, because it also gives respect to opposition party. As he had seen in Britain that not only is the opposition recognized, but also the leader of opposition is paid a salary by the government. He gets a secretary, with small secretarial staff. He has a room in the House of Commons from where he carries his business. Similarly, the leader of opposition in Canada gets a salary as does the Prime Minister. This is because in both these countries, as observed by Ambedkar, "democracy feels that there must be some one to show whether the government is going wrong. And this must be done incessantly and perpetually and that is why they do not mind spending money on the leader of the opposition."\(^{71}\)

Thus an effective opposition is a *sine qua non* for democracy. Democracy provides a veto power to the electors, as every five years, those who are in authority must be subjected to scrutiny of the people who will decide their continuance in power. There are two aspects of veto power, one is the long-term veto of five years and the other an immediate one. There must be people in the parliament "immediately ready there and then to challenge the government."\(^{72}\)
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(III) Equality in law and administration

There should also be “equality in law and administration,” 73 if democracy is to function well. This view of democracy puts emphasis on the basic equality of all human beings. “Equality may be a fiction but nonetheless, one must accept it as the governing principle.”74 All persons should have equal rights. There should be a guarantee of equality of opportunity, though complete equality in all respects is not possible.

Ambedkar does not dilate too much on equality before law, ‘equality of treatment in administration is certainty’. There are many cases where “the party government is carrying on the administration for the benefit of the members of the party.”75

Ambedkar wrote, “administration must not be interfered by the government and that the function of the government was to lay down policy but not to interfere and not to make discrimination.”76

The personnel in administration should be permanent, uncorrupt and efficient so that every body would be able to get justice. Distinction should be made between what is called ‘political offices’ and ‘civil offices.’

In this connection, he observed, “in England, in order that administration remains pure and impartial, away from politics and policy, they have made a distinction between what is called political offices and civil offices.”77

In U.S.A., the ‘spoils system’* is no more in existence. He thinks that in
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* What spoils system in USA is when one party comes in office, it removed all the employees employed by their predecessor including even the clerks and the peons and they filled their vacancies by those gentlemen who helped the new party into power.
India also, the administration should be above politics and should not allow at any rate any interference and injustice in the administration.

The administration shall be responsive, responsible and impartial; and it must be determined, command obedience: “we must have a government in which the men in power will give their undivided allegiance to the best interest of the country. We must have a government in which men in power, knowing where obedience will end and resistance will begin, will not be afraid to amend the social and economic code of life which dictates justice and expediency so urgently called for.”

He, however, observed that the administration in India is completely in the hands of the Hindus. Discriminating against untouchables, denying and depriving not only of the benefits of law but also of the protection of the law against tyranny and oppression. The result is that the untouchables are placed between the Hindu population and the Hindu ridden administration, the one committing wrongs against them and the other protecting the wrong doer, instead of helping the victims. That’s why he demanded reservation for the depressed classes in the services in order to change the composition and complexion of the administration.

(IV) Constitutional morality

The observance of ‘Constitutional morality’ for the successful working of democracy is another condition. Ambedkar agreed with Grate, the Greek historian that the constitutional morality meant, “a paramount reverence for the forms of constitution, enforcing obedience to authority acting under and with these forms yet combined with the habit of open speech or action subject only to definite legal control and unrestrained censure of those very authorities for all their public acts

combined too with perfect confidence in the bosom of every citizen amidst bitterness of party contest that the framers of the constitution will not be less scared in the eyes of their opponents than in their own."80

Everybody should recognize the necessity of diffusion of the constitutional morality for the peaceful working of a democratic constitution. Ambedkar appreciated Grate’s view that, “the diffusion of constitutional morality, not merely among the majority of any community but throughout the whole is the indispensable condition of the government being at once free and peaceable; since even any powerful and obstinate minority may render the working of a free institution impracticable without being strong enough to conquer ascendancy for themselves.”81

Thus there is an inherent connection between constitutional morality and peaceful working of the Constitution primarily because the form of an administration has a close connection with the form of the Constitution. The form of the administration must be appropriate to the form of the Constitution. The other postulate is that it is perfectly possible to preserve the Constitution, without changing its form by merely changing the form of the administration. If people are saturated with constitutional morality, then there is no need to include every detail of administration in the constitution; it can be left for the legislature to prescribe them. Ambedkar has rightly observed that a constitution, which contains legal provisions, is nothing but only a skeleton. The flesh of the skeleton is to be found in constitutional morality.

Constitutional morality means some conventions, some moral obligations that the people must observe. Although one cannot challenge in the court of law those who breach them but one can do so in the court of conscience. In England,

---

there are such conventions which are called “the conventions of the constitution and people must be ready to observe the rules of the game.”82

(V) Significance and sanctity of constitutional conventions

Ambedkar wrote,

“If you read English history, you will find many such illustrations where the party leaders have had before them many temptations to do wrong to their opponents in office or in opposition by clutching at an issue which gave them temporary power, but they refused to fall a prey to them, because they knew that they would damage the constitution, damage democracy.”83

In order to illustrate his argument, Ambedkar refers with admiration to the convention laid down by President Washington when he declined to contest for the post of President for the third consecutive tenure on the ground of constitutional morality. He also refers to the convention laid down by King Windsor Edward VIII who had to abdicate the throne as he married a common woman against the wishes of the Parliament. Thus the Parliament claimed and successfully secured the right to restrain even the personal life of the king to save democracy. To strengthen the roots of democracy in India, the people, therefore, must establish conventions and follow principles of constitutional morality.

(VI) Status of Minorities eventually was a crucial issue for Ambedkar

He held, “In the name of democracy, there must be no tyranny of the majority over the minority.”84 It is true that there is no country in the world without minority communities who are at the same time represented in different
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organizations and their rights are protected. They are given ample facilities for their self-improvement.

Ambedkar clearly states:

"The minority must always feel 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."85

He thinks that there should be free and fair discussion in the parliament on any problem. Every member of a minority party should be treated with due respect and dignity and he should be heard irrespective of his view. Every motion of adjournment should be allowed and discussed.

However, there should not be constant agitation, continuous adjournments motions and violent speeches only for the sake of opposition by the minority communities; such a spirit in democratic set up is harmful to democracy. But at the same time, the people in authority should not regard minorities as the natural people to be ruled. If this mentality persists, small minorities can never get a chance to vindicate their grievances. In democracy, it is absolutely necessary to provide opportunity rather right to the minority to ventilate their grievances.

"What happens is that these minorities develop a revolutionary spirit, something unconstitutional. It is, therefore, necessary that when democracy is working, the minority on which it is based, must not act in tyrannical manner."86

The majority party may ensure an atmosphere on the floor of parliament and even outside the parliament under which unconstitutional behaviour will not be resorted to.
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(VII) Public Morality

Ambedkar held that:

“democracy does require the functioning of moral order in society if the people wish to make it an act of success. But the political thinkers have neglected this aspect of democracy. “Ethics is something separate from politics.”

In this respect, he seems to accept Laski’s insistence on the moral order as a pre-requisite for democracy. In one of his books, he has very categorically stated that” …if there is no moral order, democracy will go to pieces.” In Ambedkar’s concept of democracy, there is mention of free government. What does free government mean? To quote him:

“It 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.”

Thus the government may pass the laws and implement them but unless there is morality in the society, law cannot achieve any success. “A politician does not merely trade in politics, but he also represents particular faith covering both-the method as well as the metaphysics of politics.” Therefore, Ambedkar indicates the need for religious, theological and spiritual foundations of politics. Politics without ethics is empty and a constant peril to the prospects of democracy.
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(VIII) Public Conscience

The last but not the least is the condition of 'public conscience' that is essential for the successful working of democracy. "Public conscience means conscience which becomes agitated at every wrong, no matter who the sufferer is and it means that everybody whether he suffers that particular wrong or not is prepared to join him in order to get him relieved."91

He cites an important example of Reverend Scott, a white man, who tried his best to liberate the Blacks from the White racial supremacy and racial discrimination in South Africa. Ambedkar thinks that it is an example to be emulated by others, especially the Indian high castes because there is South Africa everywhere in India and he laments why non-scheduled caste people do not take up the cause of the dalits. He attributed this indifference to lack of public conscience in our society. He feels there could not be any non-scheduled caste that could take up the cause of the oppressed people in India because of the lack of 'public conscience.' Ambedkar is well aware that there is injustice in every country but injustice is not equally spread in India. "The minority 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."92

Public conscience is an essential quality for preserving democratic tradition in a society. What Ambedkar has said are not dogmas that have been worked out by some political scientists, but essence of his own experience and reflections. His faith in democracy adheres to the principles of continuity and change. Having studied doctrinaire approaches, Ambedkar’s view of democracy developed along
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non-political lines, on the bases of which he wanted to discover avenues for its improvement.

It emerges that Ambedkar’s commitment to Democracy as the mode of governance was unwavering but he argued that democracy needed to become a way of life as he had observed in U.K. and USA. “The keynote of his concept of democracy as a way of life was the necessity for the participation of every human being in the formation of social, economic and political values that regulated the living men and kept them together....”93 The success of democracy depended upon the satisfaction of the millions of people who are denied/ deprived of civil, political, economic, religious and legal rights for a long period of time due to caste taboos. According to Ambedkar, it was the American pattern that suited India but, of course, tempered with the well established conventions of the British Constitution. He stressed on the moral conscience of the people, which the people of India must imbibe to establish society with equality, justice, liberty, fraternity at its core. He equally emphasized upon the economic aspect in the political freedom to emancipate and bring up the Dalits to the equality level with the upper classes. He developed some interesting arguments on why Parliamentary Democracy was the most suitable form of government for India with adequate safeguards; these have been discussed in detail in the foregoing pages.