Chapter - 2

-Dr. Ambedkar and Classical & Modern Thinkers-

"The means of living of man is Artha; (wealth), the earth on which humanity abides is Artha (wealth). The scripture which tells remedies to the acquisition of such land and its keeping is Arthashastra (Economics)" - Kautilliya Arthashastra

Dr. Ambedkar studied extensive courses in economics, sociology, history, politics, philosophy and anthropology. The chief courses he completed during his stay in America from 1913 to 1916 were the classical economics and modern economic theories, money and backing science, finance, history of economic science, Adam Smith’s economic theory, history of socialism, principles of socialism, social statistics, Marx, pre and post Marxian socialism, commerce and commercial policy, labour problems, political economics and finance, moral and political philosophy etc. This reference is enough to reveal that he had core touch with the science of economics and political science. His writing reveals he had been disciplined enough in the classical thinking, but tended towards sociological aspects of economics. Though he seem to be a socialist but he had not forsaken the rope of classical thinking, chiefly: of Adam Smith, Marshall, Ricardo, Johan Stuart Mill, and Nationalist Friedrich List. Hence to analyze his economic thoughts, under the classical thinking, as correlating thoughts in to the mainstream history of economic thoughts, shall not be out place. Nay it would be more consistent and it is a crucial need to observe the rainbow exposure of his blues of economic thoughts to compare among the various colors of classical and modern thinkers.

Dr. Ambedkar’s stay in London and U.S.A. brought him in contact with number of titanic personalities of modern thinkers. Prof. R. A. Seligman, Prof. John Dewey, Prof. Edwin Cannon, J.M. Keynes, Harold Laski etc, happened to come in contact with him in person. And he closely studied number of scholars who shaped life of European countries. Liberal economist like John Stuart Mill, The French satirist Voltaire, the

* Kautilliya: Arthashastra P.533
constitutionalist Edmund Burke, Jefferson, Carlyle and great Negro leader Booker T. Washington, Martin Luther, the Irish Patriot Daniel O'Connell the great philosopher Bertrand Russell, the great writer Max Muller, and many other like Erasums, John Calvin Hegel, Abraham Lincoln, Ignatius Loyola, Prof. Dicey Walter, Beghot, John Adams, Walter Bazzot, Toyan bee Birrel, T. H. Green, Hobbes, Bosanquet and many other's thoughts are his means of references in writing or speeches. The way he cites quotations of these scholars and thinkers that makes obvious the fact of his deep and perusal study of their thinking.

i) The Classical economists and Dr. Ambedkar-

This notion is now established that, the classical thinkers developed the science of economics, though it had been contributed many fragments of economic thinking of Physiocrats and Mercantilists. In this aspect the development of classical theory of economics can be narrated in short, but it is difficult to reach the prime cause and founders of the economic science. The development of classical theory, which is filed with, “An Inequity in to the nature and causes of Wealth of Nations,” of Adam Smith, but it, is not the major event to have to have such a conclusion. History of its development which can show, we have writings of Espinas and Souchon of medieval and post medieval period, and right up to 18th century Dubois, Rambaud, Ashley Ingramm Hector, Denis, Brants and Cossa, Supported in the form of seeds of economic thinking.

As per M. Deschamps, “As far as the history of the science is concerned there is no need to farther back than the physioicrats.” Physiocratic view is laid in natural order, “the science of natural order,” as defines Dupont de Nemours.1. Antoine de Montchretien the Physiocrats, who first employed the term, “Political economy” as a special name for the science of economics, in the beginning of seventeenth century. Quesnay the second most important figure, a doctor by his profession, turned his attention towards rural economy, in the concluding years of his age. Quesnay and his descendants must be given a credit of grasping the conception of unified science of society, that all social facts are linked together in the bonds of inevitable laws which individuals and governments would obey, if they were once made known to them. Later on Adam Smith and all others followed the track, which was primarily

1. Gide & Rist, History of Economic Doctrines, P.10
constructed by the all above physiocrats. After the death of Quinsy in 1774, the ‘Wealth of nations’ of Adam Smith was published in 1776. Smith is called the father of economics; no doubt, he had greater power of observation. With the publication of Wealth of Nations, economics became the science of ‘political economy.’

The Concept of Classicest -

The Classical economists developed theories upon the subjects of human, social and national, needs at the consumption level of ‘wants’, and their means of satisfaction. The scope of society and nationality expanded the regime of the study in to four divisions of economics, production, consumption, distribution and exchange. Public Finance the fifth division that it was given less attention, to which Dr. Ambedkar remained attached with interest. It is interesting to remind that ‘economics’ is a short of name of political economy, necessarily should have the chief consideration of the subject of public finance, but classical placed it on second place instead of the first. Political economy, which basically means to the economy of state and must depend its policy upon the theory and analysis of public finance. But classical abandoning the same, built theories over the subject of marketing by making it a centrifugal one.

The classical economists assigned individuals the main role of stressing free unhindered competition. Individual is motivated by the personal gain, consideration and love for their own selves. However they believed that such a free competition helped by the unseen power benefitted the common man as a whole. In Smith’s words, “It is not from benevolence of the butcher that we expect our dinner, but from regard (his) own interest”1, so because of their faith in free competition and the divine hand, they wanted the governmental no interference, or at its absolute minimum.

In the community of classical few figures like Adam Smith, T.P. Mathus, Alfred Marshall, David Ricardo, A.C. Pigou, John Stuart Mills, are important, others and neo-classical repeated the same idea. All of them continued to exercise a good deal of influence in U.K. and other countries, even today. The most vital specification regarding the classical is that they gave very little importance to the macro economic theory and public finance. This gap was fulfilled at a very late stage during the thirties of the twentieth century. Dr. Ambedkar was one of the most

important figures that stressed the Macro economic theory. Public finance was his favorite subject. Dr. Ambedkar nowhere specially discussed micro economic theory, being a pragmatic and a practical problem solving personality, he worked upon applied economics, at many junctures he differed with renowned thinkers like Edwin Cannon on the subject of currency. But this does not mean that he had no interest of classical theory and micro economic analysis. His writing reveals that he used classical and modern micro analytical concepts. There is much room to have his fragmented thinking over the classical analysis and that can be synthesized with the proper assimilation of the fragmented points of thought. But these fragments though over charged by classical theory, regarded with many social and political and also macro economic theories. His statements can be referred for many subjects, but it will be useful to refer them for the classical analysis, as presently thought of. Where to refer Dr. Ambedkar’s thought with classical thinking is also a big question. Among the many sub-divisions of the classical subjects and its contents, it will be more interesting to discuss over the ‘subject matter’ of the economics. So that it will meet the objective of Dr. Ambedkar’s view on, ‘the Definition of Economics’. Once if his definition is referred with its interpretation and finally postulated in to a thesis, the entire critique on classical thinking can be achieved.

The classical individualism-

Apart from individual motivation and personal gain, under the free unhindered competition, the soul of classical thinking, as almost all classical economist treated economics a science of common man, but the common man relates to a middle standard, it hardly keeps any concern to a man of low standards and below standards which is deemed to be under poverty line. And since poverty is another source of all kinds of social evils, it becomes difficult task to talk of welfare of them, even to the father of economist. But Dr. Ambedkar’s economic thinking in unique in its nature, because it considers all the facts which were neglected by the late all contemporary thinkers in the science of economics, the former thinking directs and discusses certain economic facts which are of common sense and of natural course. It is a science of positive feelings as

Dr. Ambedkar studied extensive courses in Economics, specially: Economics of Adam Smith, and J.S. Mill, Ricardo, Karl Marx, and many others like; J.M. Keynes, the modern economists of his time.

*It is specific to note that; Dr. Ambedkar is in cross with all of them on the basic few aspects of their theses.*
it justifies curve of satisfaction from bread, it nowhere thought of any justification regarding the destitution of bread at least on the level of morality. In fact any kind of destitution or unjust deprivation from bread or means of bread must lead to the misappropriation of the national wealth and thus create maladies in the society, which is going to destroy the total welfare of society. This is the fundamental juncture of Dr. Ambedkar’s economic thinking; under this deduction inferences of his economic thoughts can be proposed with regard to the science of economics.

ii) The Science of Economics and Dr. Ambedkar-

The sciences physical or social, all of them were made for the human being, for his well being. But man himself due to his faculty of learning things in a specific way, tried to classify them and it is easy for him to operate in this particular way, otherwise all the gamut bulk of the informative facts of life would have made a jungle itself, where in it may put him in a state of stigma; what to learn and from where to start? But whatever the case may be, the classification itself created certain kind of system to follow, different kind of styles of languages to use and distinct conditions to adopt, all that in to which and without taking it to be granted as difficult to make all those thesis and theories in to the domain of ruling.

The science of economics is no exception to this, but it seems, man felt the need of economic science, and it has certain motivational factors those are behind it, can be said as the founder intelligence agency that comprises of founder economists. Those have ultimately produced the most important social science, which is essential, to learn and understand all the aspects, that governed his life of feeding, comforts, which is vital for his physical and mental as well as social and natural existence.

Defining Economics:

The global races differ their physique due to their geological specifications. But when races under certain conditions go on to abide at indifferent geological regions they naturally form classes. The classes may differ due to their interactive political status, and thereby produce abilities and disabilities. They bear either certain privileges or sustain losses. At this juncture if all sciences will only fold hands and close eyes
without any proposition of moves for disables, and to remove, the
disabilities, it will not prove to be a true science. And if there were a
king, who is not to take cognizance of such baseness of conduct among
the classes, should necessarily loose his divinely folklore that king is the
form of God. That means, it presupposes the move of king and view of
intellectuals. From both the sides their thoughts must sustain endeavor to
turn up the picture of destitution, for the sake of their heavenly kingdom.
But for that, micro economics must turn its dimension of thinking in to
normative and generalized, in true sense, instead of as it goes on declaring
science of economics is a positive science, as it remains one sided positive.
But it should rather than that, be a completely positive not one-sided
science, otherwise men, like Ruskin, will ever attack the thesis business
of economists.

Micro economics, which deals the discussion on the economic
phenomenon of man is primarily related to ‘satisfaction’ only. It hardly
does count, perhaps does not consider the opposite of satisfaction or
pleasure, that is ‘suffering’ and sorrow. Thus it is meant economic science
of positive human feelings. It has no place to consider the opposite
feelings. This proves that there is no place for economic deprivation, or
perhaps only by placing scarcity of means, instead of economic
deprivation which gives effect to human suffering and sorrow. Notably it
is obvious that, science which cannot consider the sorrow and suffering of
human being and which is the prime source of his ‘ambitions and desires’,
without the consideration of the later how can perfectly be said the
economics a science of human welfare and well-being? The human
sorrow and suffering start with his birth, in this context it is obvious that
man cannot live his life without caring things, happing all about him.
This is what why obligation of state rests in principle to take care of its
subjects.

The growth of economics shows different interpretation in this
regard though things are so obvious. The customary use of word,
‘Economics’ without the reference for ‘political economy’ lost the real
growth of science of economics, which consequently, since Dr. Quessnay
to Dr. Ambedkar would must have resulted into Ambedkarian view. The
divisions of economics reveal this fact, in the beginning it has only four
divisions: i.e. consumption, production, distribution and exchange. The
national economy in due course created to the fifth division, ‘public
finance’, which has prime motive to provide economic welfare to the
common wealth of a country. As Jathar and Beri says, “in the complex
economic organization of modern society the activities of man in relation to wealth have to be studied from various points of view, namely consumption, production, exchange and distribution of wealth. These give us the traditional four principal divisions of economic. In view however of the important role played by modern states in the economic life of the community, state economics or the economics of government, of which the subject, public finance is the most vital aspects may be added as the fifth division of economics.¹ However it is interesting to note how Jathar and Beri is posing and using public finance as vital, and may be somewhat dodging and slippery to the prime notion ‘political economy’ of Antoine de Montchretien, who says ‘political economy’ as a name of the special science. A perusal over the article by Jean Rousseau disclosed the essence of this prime concepts, but for Guide and Rist, it felt medley and strange. But both never forgot to mention, “But this article clearly proves that it was not always devoid of significance. It also reveals and interesting fact that the science has always been chiefly concerned with the business side of the state especially with the material welfare of the to citizens.”² Performance of material welfare to the citizens and increasing riches and powers of a nation seem to be a single object, but the beneficiary is lost in the later, among those it was the view of Adam Smith who was called the father of economics, saved the science but lost the children of the nation. Guide and Rist rightly noted, “even Smith never succeeded in getting quite beyond this point of view, for he declares that ‘the object of political economy of every nation is to increase the riches and the power of that country.”³

Dr. Marshall’s note that “there is waste when anyone consumes less than is necessary” is quite remarkable to the essence of economics but he left no ward regarding what are the waste’s relation and its responsibility. Instead he went on, “It should however be noticed that many things which are rightly described as superfluous luxuries, do yet, to some extent, take the place of necessaries, and to that extend their consumption is productive when they are consumed by producers,” which has become the prominent notion of modern economics, no doubt. But this is an escape from the root beginning point of interpretation, which meant olden times, and he is talking about the ends only, i.e. the fruit base point. It is a sense less miracle to think only a functioning at

---

¹ Jathar and Beri – Elementary principles of economics, Oxford university press, page.09
² Guide and Rist: History of Economic Doctrines, page.1
³ Ibid page.1
the fruit point, escaping rather from the root point, and with that it can become hardly a science of utilitarianism.

**Foundation of Classical Economics**

There is no doubt that physiocrats from Antoine de Montchretien to Quesnay and their followers, besides the classical community from Adam Smith to John Stuart Mills and their followers are the founders of science of economics. Apart from the fact of individualism detected by classical, mercantilist believed that state like an individual must secure the maximum of silver and gold before it could become wealthy,¹. where socialist thinking believed that, ‘happiness could only be found in a more equal distribution of wealth, in the abolition or limitation of the rights of private property or in the creation of a new society on the basis of a new social contract in short in the foundation of the Utopian common wealth.”². These facts were more precisely detected by physiocrats.

The rationalized concepts of economics:

With the walk of physiocrats and mercantilists the succeeding classical and modern economic community shoots up the chief concepts in the economics: 1) Economic Motives. 2) Economic Efforts. 3) Economic Man. 4) Economic welfare. These four can be said of makers of substance of economics. As per Marshall’s view human economic motives are studies in economics. The motives are to be proved with the economic efforts. The efforts constitute economic man and the aim of economic man is to gain economic welfare.

As per Marshall’s interpretation that man’s move, ‘But it concerns itself chiefly with those motives which affect, his conduct in the business part, that is what, ‘motive’ which mostly based upon the Hedonism and Utilitarianism, the school of psychology, finally transformed the acceptance of the concept of economic man. But before making it the same, man must go through the economic efforts. The debate on the substance of economic led it to the acceptance of the only those efforts that are economic that makes a sense of economic returns. If a mother is serving her child or a boy playing on the ground does not mean to ‘economic-man’ or economic effort. The efforts should gain returns in

¹ Guide and Rist: *History of Economic Doctrines*, page 21
² Ibid – page 21
exchange. The ideal utility of the gain and maximization of satisfaction gave rise to the concept of economic welfare.

The goal of economics is said to be economic welfare but it is not an easy task, the concept ‘economic man’ and ‘economic efforts’ diffused their conceptual meaning because economic welfare is the ultimate goal, but it is necessarily to be based upon the ethics of morality. The question remained intact that what about the efforts of a thief and dacoits, are they economic men having economic efforts or should them be left unstudied saying unsocial, what? The social sanctity never says a thief to be a rich and satisfied.

The classical thinking could not solve this problem of unsocial misappropriation of wealth. But there is room and hope for it in Ambedkar’s economics. British government labeled many tribal races as criminal castes. And it was true that they lived on the business of dacoits and thefts. Under the British government this tribe was charge sheeted from very beginning, as soon as British police got information of the criminal tribe,s birth, they used to file criminal sections. Dr. Ambedkar analysis finally relieved them with the caste classification of ‘Vimukta Jati’ that meant relieved from criminal caste and not only that, he made many constitutional provisions for them to be assisted by, the state aided facilities. Ambedkar’s view rightly gave meaning to the concepts of economic welfare of man and welfare state.

For those who believe that economic welfare can be achieved only with the morality in society, and its success is depend upon the peaceful atmosphere and healthy individuals, though they seem to be in right place, still miss and ignore the fact of their responsibility through state. The rehabilitation of such people those are victims of the neglect of state or society, it is thus the welfare state concept gets its true meaning and marches the economic welfare towards the social welfare and national well-being.

Economic welfare of Man -

In 18th century after industrial revolution intellectual community and philosophers began to realize that, human moral, social needs and all other activities have economic foundation. And thus the nucleus of comprehensive welfare of man built upon the wealth. Dr. Mark Abraham stressed upon the ‘Equal distribution of Wealth’ 1. Now a days socialistic vies is coming forth and that also declares ‘distribution of wealth’ on the basis of equal rights.’ While interpreting the meaning of correlation

1. Quoted by Prabharkar Deshmukh: Arthashastrachi Multatwe.
between the human welfare and wealth the maximum utility of wealth for the welfare of man, a welfare state is deemed to be essential.

Human welfare and morality:

In economics though wealth and human welfare is placed relatively, still human welfare must need morality. Of course this morality depends upon the economic abundance in society. Wealth is a means to the ends. A society where wealth is treated as an end, there morality is bound to come to an end. But where people get satisfied their primary needs and good opportunities of education and services are made available to them, their rights and property are protected; therein only the morality can prevail.

iii) The Definitions of Economics and Dr. Ambedkar-

During the history of last three hundred years, every economist defines the science of Economics, either directly or indirectly. The unwanted volume of definitions is not less, but the definitions solved two problems, 'the subject matter' of economics, and ideological stand of economist. Many economists defined economics directly, while some like Adam Smith indirectly, without defining went on into the interpretation of the substance and content of economics. Adam Smith first book titled, "An Inquiry into the nature and causes of wealth of nations", was finalized as his definition of economics. Dr. Ambedkar also though not defined economics directly but there are ample occasions where he placed the substance of economics as a definition. Without the study of his definition of economics correlative with all other classical and modern economists the ideological stand of Dr. Ambedkar can not be made evident, for which he deserved.

Rational Substance of Economics:

The substance and occasion of economics is so vital hence Dr. Ambedkar from the beginning of his college education he studied economics. "The study of economic ways of getting a living will ever remain important." For him 'economic motive' is the strongest one, as it was to other classical economists. Under this condition only the substance of economics can be determined. How the science of economics gets importance in human life, different economists cited varied opinions. 'According to Adam Smith, the acquisition of wealth is the main
objective of human activity therefore it is necessary to study how wealth is produced.'

Samuelson rightly calls, economics the “Queen of the social sciences.” Lionel Robbins is one step ahead, numerically remarks regarding the science of economics as he is, “fully convinced that, if a man tried to talk much about the ultimate questions of polities without a knowledge of economics, it was some thing of miracle if he talked sense.”

Dr. Marshall’s belief that, “the two great forming agencies of the world’s history have been the religious and the economics—and economic influences have no where been displaced from the front rank even for a time and they have nearly always been more important than all others put together.” All these assertions make evident that the science of economics is the most important, but this is talking of economics rather than about. The significance of economics acquire rationalization even from a critique, but when economist enter the content of microanalysis he and his theory both can become the target of criticism. Ruskin, Harold and Ricardo, were in forefront to exert blasting criticism over the traditional view of the science of economics. David Ricardo who rigorously ascribed deductive method set his own view upon the study of economics, he says, “I think it should rather be called an inquiry into the laws which determine the division (distribution) of the produce of industry among the classes, who concur in its formation.”

Ricardo’s discussion from an angel of novelty placed him, “No dweller in ethereal regions. He was in the thickest of the fight – the butt of every shaft”, writes Guide and Rist. John Ruskin is next to none in hard naming, dispelling the direction of subject matter of economics, he called ‘bastard science of darkness’, and a ‘dismal science of “illth” rather than wealth’. Harold J. Lasky who is deadly against capitalism held that, “If democracy is to work without being in constant danger of being destroyed, the only way is that

4. Quoted by R.M.Gokhale: Arthashastriya Vicharacha Itihas; Continental Prakashan Pune. Page.114
capitalism should be destroyed, when this has been done, there will be no
class of vested interests which would like to destroy democracy to save it
self”1; and had belief that a state, “It is supreme coercive power used to
protect the consequences inherent in the postulate of any given society”.
2.

While explaining the classical feature of economics Karl Marx
beats that, “It is not a theory of value but a theory of capitalistic
exploitation”3. John M. Keynes earlier professional of classiest, in his
concluding years of thinking finds that, “Classicism was not a realistic
explanation of depression and unemployment.” He remarks that, “the
characteristics of the special case assumed by the classical theory happen
to be those of economic society in which we actually live, with the result
that its teaching is misleading and disastrous if we attempt to apply it to
the facts of experience.”4. Keynes who toiled for General theory and
many other theses, in the concluding thinking could not affirm his own
thesis. What was the use of his entire labour wasted in former thinking?

Karl Marx the great socialist who had belief that his is the only
scientific socialism; where upon Dr. Ambedkar called it, ‘a mere
enthusiastic term and misplaced notion; Marx squint – eyed affirmatively
a comment at the classical theory of economics that, “Dr. Quesnay made
a science out of political economy, he summarized it in his famous
Tableau Economique. Beside the thousand and one commentaries on this
table which have appeared, we posses one by one the doctor him self.”5.
Classical theory is a contagious product of apolitical economy formulated
metaphysically. He was very harsh and hard to criticize capitalistic
theories. Still he had to give consent in favour of free trade. On the
question of free trade, while, “To sum up what is free trade under the
present conditions of society? Freedom of capital.... Gentlemen! Do not
be deluded by the abstract word freedom! Whose freedom? Not the
freedom of one individual in relation to another but freedom of capital to

1. Quoted by Suresh chandra Pant: History of Western Political thought. Page 284
3. R.M. Gokhle; Arthashastriya Vicharacha Itihas; Continental Prakashan Pune.
Page.253
4. Quoted by Dr. M.L. Seth: An Introduction to Keynesian Economics. Page. 37
5. Karl Marx - The poverty of philosophy, page. 96
worker-- why should you desire farther to sanction unlimited competition with this idea of freedom when the idea of freedom itself is only the product of a social condition based upon free competition?” 1. But he concludes, “In a word the free trade system hastens the social Revolution. In this revolutionary sense alone, gentlemen, I am in favour of free trade.”

The foregoing confrontations with each other, and jugglery of own theses, quake the science of economics in quandary and fading its face into inscrutable and insensate. In this way for our research purpose, the only area where we have to work is to give more strong foundation to the science economics is to confirm the definition of economics. That will not only make the definer’s stand and his ideology evident but also provide a fertile to the growth of economics.

Definition of Economics-
Defining the science of economics was always been a dilemma before the economists, all classical as well as modern. And perhaps it is mostly because of the complex nature of economics. It is the most relative science, which has to have its facts produced from various motives sprang from a number of other related subjects of different sciences. Therefore the nature to define the subject matter, the course as well as source of action and also scope of substance found to be difficult. Defining economics has been going on down the centuries and there by the economic science seem to be suffocated somewhat under its huge number of definitions says Keynes. But this does not mean that defining economics is unnecessary. On the contrary it has exposed varied aspects of economics and proved its importance.

It is, in fact, the stream of defining economics helped it to reach unto the modern stage, with the concepts of developmental welfare economics. On this juncture varied definitions of classical and modern thinkers and also a definition of Dr. Ambedkar on the science of economics will make evident Dr. Ambedkar’s stand and his ideology, as it has been proved with the late all others.

Definers and Definitions:
Among the huge pile of definitions of economics which are normally categorized in; - as wealth definitions, welfare definitions, and scarcity

1. Marx; Ibid, p.205-6
definitions and growth definitions, out of them very few are considerable for the sake of study and only those can be critically interrelated with the definition of Dr. Ambedkar.

The case of defining the science of economics had a certain kind of illogical tendencies in the beginning, but still there were good enough to prove foolproof. Gradual exploration of the concept shaped the development of economics. The consequence of defining the science of economics was not so easy with these considerations, which were very easily formulated into definite clauses. From Antoine to Samuelson and even Kautiliya constructed definition of economics. The laying down a definition of economics, in some definite words or clauses, was also a matter of much thrash out among the economists. Though with the use of on line words of previous thinkers, framed but their own novel definition, they were never behind in proposing a particular definition.

There had been always a growing controversy among the economic thinkers with regard to the definition of economics. The substance of controversy was what should be the ‘subject matter of economics’, before Admin Smith since 1776 and after smith’s interpretation of economics, in terms of national wealth, though many economist agreed the central idea of the study of economics, still there are modern economists those were defining economics with an advance idea regarding the subject matter of economics.

The selected definitions and definers can be interpreted as under: -

1) Antoine de Montchretien, the foremost person whom economics is ‘Political Economy’ though now a days we use it without the adjective ‘Political’, but it reveals the chief object and substance of economics. Gide and Rist rightly observes that, “It also reveals the interesting fact that the science has always been chiefly concerned with the business side of the state, especially with the material welfare of the citizens – ‘with the fowl in the pot’, as Henry IVth put it. Even Smith never succeeded in getting quite beyond this point of view.” 1, at this Marx has rightly caught up the point that Dr. Quesnay made science out of the terms of Antoine de Montchretien. But Gide and Rist, putting Antoine’s sight aside and thought of science of economics a matter of process of beginning and end said, “It is not too much to say that this makes the beginning of a new science – the science of political economy.”

1. Gide and Rist: History of Economics Doctrines, page.21
2) Dr. Quesnay, who attributed his work only with ‘Rural Economy’ and ‘Animal Economy’ having belief in social and natural economy. He believed in natural laws. “For Quesnay declared that a knowledge of its laws must be enforced upon men, and this afforded a raison d' etre for an educational system which was to be under the direct control of the Government.” It seems that Quesnay accepted the term, ‘political economy’ but he formulated the content merging into a different course of abstraction of ideas as Marx marks to him.

3) Adam Smith, inspite of not defined in a particular clause of definition, his definition of economics is postulated with the many views like as of Haney. He says, “An inquiry in to the nature and causes of the wealth of nations,” was the full title of the book, and this title was considered by Smith to be an adequate definition of the scope of political economy.” ‘Wealth of nations’ published in 1776 entitled, “An Inquiry in to the nature and causes of wealth of nations” shot up many meanings that:

Economics is the science wealth.

It teaches how to accumulate the wealth of nations.

The most important term he used is ‘Nations’. Though his entire work is built-up under the concept of nationalism it caused abstraction of the vital term nation. His definition is called ‘wealth definition’, “Adam Smith defined economics as, ‘a science which studies the nature and causes of the wealth of nations.” This definition is postulated from the title of Smith’s treatise. One thing is clear that for Adam Smith the subject matter of Economics is ‘production of wealth’. As per his view productive labour and classification of labour is primarily responsible for the ‘production of wealth’. Classification of labour generates the exchange and medium of exchange. Value is decided due to labour exchange; hence money gets its value.

The laws regarding satisfaction or marginal utility presuppose the plus condition of consumer that he is already having a state above than sorrow and suffering. He is not deprived or is of imposed destitution of wealth. If economics has to be called a science it must be made a perfect science of human welfare and well being. Adam Smith who wrote division of labour in his ‘wealth of nation’ believes division of

1. Gide and Rist Ibid. page.29
2. Quoted Gokhale: Arthashastriya Vicharacha Itihas, Page.89
labour as a natural occasion, the prime factor for the production of wealth, he explains dissimilarities, on the fact of talent he explains, "the difference of natural talents in different men is, in reality, much less than we are aware of, and the very different genius which appears to distinguish men of different professions, when grow up to maturity, is not upon many occasions so much the cause, as the effect of the division of labour. The difference between the most dissimilar characters, between a philosopher and a common street porter for example, as from habit, custom, and education. When they came into the world, and for the first six or eight years of their existence, they were perhaps, very much alike, and neither their parent nor playfellows could perceive any remarkable difference. About that age, or soon after they come to be employed in very different occupations. The difference of talents comes then to be taken notice of, and widens by degrees, till at last the verity of the philosopher is willing to acknowledge scares any resemblance. But without the dispositions to truck, barter, and exchange, every man must have procured to himself, every necessary and convenience of life, which he wanted. All must have had the same duties to perform and the same work to do, and there could have been no such difference of employment as could alone give occasion to any great difference of talents." 5.

Adam Smith’s contention may contend Hindus’ belief of ‘Chaturvarna’ because it is not deemed to be a man made phenomenon. All the four varnas and therein involved all castes, are separate human entities. They do not correlate any humanly interest among them. Their comfort and joy, sorrow and suffering is not men made coherence, it is but all operated by God. As per Adam Smith this type of non-obligation of each other is seen only in animals. “Each animal is still obliged to support and defend itself separately and independently, and derives no sort of advantage from that variety of talents with which nature has distinguished its fellows.”1. But he believes human co-existence and feel the requisite exchange of geniuses among men, “Among men, on the contrary, the most dissimilar geniuses are of use of one another, the different products of their respective talents, by the general disposition to truck, barter, and exchange being brought, as it were in to a common stock, where every men may purchase what ever part of the produce of other men’s talents he has occasion for.”2. Adam Smith not only believes co-existence of human being, but he also shows the requisite faith of dignity in each

other as, "Over and above the expense necessary for enabling the sovereign to perform his several duties, a certain expense is requisite for the support of his dignity." 1

Adam Smith who laid down the foundation of micro economics he still could not thrust in or even not thought of an ‘untouchable’ man of Indian condition. Adam Smith had not been in occasion to think why a philosopher’s son becomes philosopher and a potter’s, a potter, when he shows the difference of ability between the philosopher and a potter, his ‘animal angle’ to observe the economic behaviour of man, no doubt is good enough to discharge certain economic instincts, but humanity cannot let man remain long an animal only. When a philosopher tries to make his son a philosopher and while making, so when he uses tactics to snatch the opportunities from potter’s children, that leads to Dr. Ambedkar analysis of caste that is ‘endogamy’ which becomes curse to the nation, causing social welfare in to detriment and national development in to home-war. The division of labour of Adam Smith in the same above fashion much contended to the Hindus who believed in Chaturavarna-ism, because Adam Smith shows its natural utility and essentiality of diversity.

Under the impact of physiocrats and naturalism, J. B. Say and N.W. Senior denoted definition of economics as science of wealth, "Thus all the classical economist worked upon economics as a science of wealth to them, only think important was the wealth. The term ‘wealth’ wealth interpreted in a very narrow sense to mean riches and abundance of money, and the economist as such was expected to suggest wags and means of increasing the wealth of society," 2. categorized as wealth definitions wherein Adam Smiths definition is enough to represent the present discussion.

Under the light of humanity as a whole, the natural latency and legal morality both are lost in the discussion of Adam Smith. His advocacy of naturalism breathed to part in to the neglect of man when bound by rigidity, and his theory void of legal – morality delimited him from appliance to monument when remain unspoken of.

1 Adam Smith: Ibid, page.465
2. Dhingra & Garg: Foundations of Economics, Sultan Chand & Sons, page.8
-A Postulated Dr. Ambedkar’s View Over the Definition Of Adam Smith

‘An Inquiry into the nature and causes of wealth of nations.’ This definition has certain postulated implications when viewed from the discussion of Dr. Ambedkar they are as under:

# It is an inquiry and establishment of laws of common observance.
# The inquiry focuses the target of nature and causes of wealth.
# The wealth is targeted because it deserves the vital power of satisfying human needs.
# The wealth is not to be observed into its natural substance but it is to be accepted in terms of ownership of some concerned. Without the phenomenon of ownership the wealth cannot be a subject to economic science.
# The ownership of wealth and its benefits varies according to powers and strength of the owners. Which must give rise to inequalities that is a curse, which must be eliminated otherwise it perverts the entire wealth and nation.
# The legacy of ownership always remain in question because there can not laid down any measure of benefiting from trading or services with the help of wealth, hence benefits must be shared by the society in terms of reservation and public expenditure.
# There exists a nation and its state, which is a permanent entity that owns wealth; the wealth is divided into its common wealth.
# Human being who has diverse aptitudes, to own the wealth, represents the direct wealth-owner, the commonwealth and he needs the wealth to satisfy his wants.
# The nation and state is a neutral agency, which is only to the guaranty of political supervision, without the guaranty of benefiting from wealth of nation to its common wealth, they are at liberty to consume it at their capabilities.
# Wealth of nation has certain characteristics and transitions that are to be inquired so as to make progress of nation as far as possible. It may be in the form of gold or a new production.
# Wealth ultimately is to be owned by the nation only so far as society cannot be extinct at all, therefore the nation cannot extinct.
Critical Propositions of Dr. Ambedkar's View -

Apart from the above positive consideration an Ambedkarian view from critical sight on the definition of Adam Smith can be shade under the following critical Analysis:~

Definition of Adam Smith regards the wealth of 'Wealth of Nations'; it fundamentally refers to the wealth of common wealth which necessary means to the generalization of the common tendency towards the wealth. The wealth employed ownership of common wealth. But what will happen to the economic science when a particular class, and others to be deprived of own wealth of commonwealth? Since the escape from the above subject matter turns in to devoid of the scientific nature of economics.

The subject matter of the economic science must be referred in its minutes of class and its wealth, if it is to refer 'man and his wealth'. Without that, the science of economics is to loose it's very purpose. When we refer society or nation to rationalize the principles of economic science, then the logic must permit us to see the structure of society. Without a general consideration of society we remain at a loss to lay down any of principles regarding economics.

Human being as a natural phenomenon must necessarily differ his very physical appearance and conditions of living standards and this standers of ownership that may also beget specific skills as Smith refers. But this does not mean that the man is entirely responsible for that condition which is prevailing around him. There are many such basic social and natural moves, which bind man into that condition, and the national entity is on the obligation to make him free from the bondage, to enforce the economic liberty if bondages are contagious.

With the above critical summary there remains the task of Adam Smith's definition. The chief criticism can be narrated as under:~

It does not refer to a man who does not own property. The exploration of wealth off shoots its nature, as it lies in its possession. But the possession is bi-dimensional, the possessor has to own the possession; he is to look after the protection of the possessed. A slave can probably be possessed by the master, he can be said a wealth of the master. But a shudra or untouchable was nothing of the above, and protection of the both is left out of the thesis of Adam Smith. The untouchable had no right to property, he had no means of livelihood, that was not left upon his own rights, it is left to the contention of the individuals of a particular class of society presumed as a higher class.
The above class who is discarded from the wealth of society as a whole and counted in a number as the negative correlation to whole of the society but a few individuals subjected and are kept upon to benefiting the entire power of wealth, with services of slaves and untouchables, leaving their life in to detriment.

Even slave of Europe and untouchables of India have a significant difference between them. As services of a labour hired so as of the slaves, in the full sense, it is no wrong in it, he was allowed to rest in a state of total exertion, as the master realizes that there is no use beating the slave to drive him to work. But the master realized slave’s utility. Apart from this the state of the Indian shudra and untouchable has no place in it, and his existence is considered to be unwanted, and they had no humanly rights of wealth. Even in a progressed 21st century of today can witness a great means selling human beings for the private exploitation purposes. The thing is too radical to accept to be legal in term of economic fact, as it is hard to accept an act of a thief or a smuggler.

The positive number of individuals or the correlation figure of the whole of society is neglected from the guaranty of state; hence state remained void of the legacy of its economy. And the voice versa proposition must be applied in the consideration of legacy of economy as if wealth as an economic phenomenon has its own certain natural laws, depicted by Quesnay to Marshall, the laws should be applied to man also, if laws are applied to society’s or nation’s wealth. If economic laws are natural, man is also a natural being and deserves certain rights as soon as he takes birth on this earth, hence laws and legacy must be applied to man and his wealth. If wealth is a means of welfare, man himself is also may be an organic means to the welfare. If wealth has possibility of perversion in absence of economic laws, the same can be possible with the man in absence of his rights properly guarded by the protection of state, and both wealth and man should be guarded at any cost to achieve the welfare and well being of society and the nation as a whole. And it is duty of economics to comprise and enforce them to suit the former title, ‘The political Economy’, if political science is not to do it.

To distinguish and classify the natural skills of labour under the head of division of labour, cannot be the only work of economics, but it should place desirable room to develop the quality of labour. Adam Smith’s porter son must be able to become a philosopher as he discussed in his wealth of nations, if economics is the business of the state.
The only accumulation of gold and wealth is not the sole object of a nation but rather than that it is chief business of state to entrust economic rights to make men able and to develop institutions, to produce wealth and accumulate gold. In absence of the above vital obligation wealth and the people both must turn to be incorporated into a black economy and a society Dr. Ambedkar says, needs ‘there should be good money rather than black money’.

4) David Ricardo: had been in different conditions as compared with Adam Smith, when they built their separate theses they have a difference of one generation. Ricardo in his book, ‘principles of political economy and taxation’, published in 1817 and his economic thoughts have got finally shaped into this logical thesis. His thoughts are more socialistic than capitalistic. Dr. Ambedkar called him, ‘the great economist’ while discussing ‘the problem of rupee as, he was on the right side of thesis of currency standards. Ricardo denotes, ‘wealth which is product with the help of labour, machinery and capital, it is divided among the landlords, capitalists and labours’, his proposing question is that, “to determine the laws which regulate this distribution is the principal problem in the political economy”.

Adam Smith has not defined economics in a definite clause as Ricardo did, hence is not under charge of dodging the tradition, but the fore runners like Marshall and Robbins did not follow the path of Ricardo who formed his definition of economics as with reference to Smith.

While defining economics Ricardo goes one step ahead of Adam Smith. Rejecting Smith’s definition, he says, ‘you think economics is an inquiry into the nature and causes of wealth of nations’, but definition of economics is, he says, “I think it should be rather be called an inquiry into the laws which determine the division (distribution) of the produce of industry among the classes who concur in its formation.” Ricardo using Smith’s term of ‘inquiry’ entered the relevant subject matter of wealth of nations, ‘the real cause and the real nature,’ as it is expected to Ambedkar’s economic thought. Even it can be stated that Ricardo defined economics, only after reading Adam Smith’s wealth of nations, to

1. Quated by Gokhale: Arthashastra Vicharacha Itihas, page. 114
2. Quated by Gokhale: Ibid page. 114
determine the substance of economics in his own view. He was a mathematician previously and became an economist afterwards.

Ricardo proposes the substance of economics that is to equate the wealth of nation among the countrymen, which is one of the most important aspects of Dr. Ambedkar for which he called, ‘economic liberty’ and ‘economic equality’. The greatness of Ricardian economic thought might be allured Dr. Ambedkar because of socialistic view, but, “yet despite all efforts, deliberate or otherwise to dislodge it, Ricardian economics proved to have great staying properties” as says Bell, 1 the very unique an essential nature of Ricardo’s thinking.

5) Dr. Alfred Marshall, whose definition is regarded as welfare definition. He defines economics as, “Political Economy or Economics, is a study of mankind in the ordinary business of life, it examines that part of individuals and social action which is most closely connected with the attainment and with the use of material requisites of well-being. Thus, it is, on the one side, a study of wealth, and on the other and more important side, the part of study of man”. 2.

The followers of Dr. Marshall like A.C. Pigou, J.M. Keynes also defined economics, and it is also regarded as welfare definition. Dr. Marshall explained the substance of Economics. He says, “Economics is a study of men as they live and move and think in the ordinary business life. But concerns it self chiefly with those motives which affect most powerfully and most steadily, man’s conduct in the business part of his life --- But for all that the steadiest motive to ordinary business work is the desire for the pay which is the material reward of work. --- But the motive is supplied by a definite amount of money, and it is this definite and exact money measurement of the steadiest motives in business life. - - - It (Economics) concerns it self chiefly with those desires, aspirations and other affections of human nature, the outward manifestations of which appear as incentives to action in such a from that the force or quantity of the incentives can be estimated and measured with some approach to accuracy and which therefore are in some degree amenable to treatment by scientific machinery. An opening is made for the methods and the tests of science as soon as the force of a person’s motives - not the

---

1 Quoted by Gokhale: Ibid, page.135
2. Quoted by I. C. Dhingra & Garg: Foundation of Economics, Sultan Chand & Sons. Page 9
motives themselves - can be approximately measured by the sum of money, which he will just give up in order to secure a desired satisfaction, or again by the sum which is just required to induce him to undergo a certain fatigue” 1.

The merit of Marshall’s definition is that he openly introduced the ‘welfare’ concept and he shifted the foregone thinkers form the attention of ‘wealth’ centered to ‘man’ centered as substance of economics. If Marshall had not been there to introduce the welfare concept in economics, perhaps there might not be given due importance to the human welfare. The division of consumption therefore had been developed with many consumption theories. Dr. Marshall had given meaning to the division of consumption and consequently to the satisfaction of man and thus the welfare of human being.

Welfare definition of Marshall is also criticized under the heads of minutes of welfare. Social and individual, or personal, relatively concerns with scarcity of money and means, and social groups with monopolistic exploitation and also war economy, which does not constitute the aid to the term of welfare. The chief criticizer Lionel Robbins believes that, ‘economic concerns are not with the causes of material welfare as such’. 2.

Criticism under Ambedkar’s view: -

Apart from the above criticism Ambedkar view focuses certain drawbacks of welfare definition. As per Marshall consideration substance of economics lies in the study of men, having strong motives and aspirations that chase up for material reward of his work. Dr. Ambedkar view can analyze this proposition that it presupposes the healthy social condition and ignores the class and caste structure of a nation. As the social structure in India, it is to think in terms of various castes and the most affected were Shudras and untouchables and in Rome and America particularly the slaves and Negroes. A perfect science as a whole this definition is void of imparting the common rationalism though thinking with the vital term ‘welfare’. Where Dr. Marshall says economics studies ‘wealth’ on one side, and other, ‘man’, a more important side, “For man’s character has been molded by his every day work and the material

resources, which he there by procures”. Marshall’s definition is ignorant of the condition of cast and class structure, where means of livelihood and means of resources were absolutely denied to them on the ground of sectarian and mythological concepts. Dr. Marshall’s ‘economic man’ is not the last man. The science of economics must consider ultimately ‘unto this last’; otherwise it will loose its scientific nature. As per Ambedkar’s view a destituted person who is banned of to be motivated for his own satisfaction; he is a real man of economic consideration, if economics has to become a perfect science of welfare. Economics must be able to study the ways of the welfare for this last person. If economics has to be called a science, it must be made perfect science of human welfare in the society in which men have to live. The classical thinking considers the pleasures and consequently causes of wealth, it hardly considers causes of pains and poverty. Even providence and fulfilling of human needs cannot achieve the desire goal of satisfaction and welfare. Otherwise there would not be found the fact of men, seeking and staying in the particular type of professions, and it proposes that without the proper social, political, and economic status, man cannot enjoy the desired satisfaction. Basically man is having a peace seeking nature. In spite of getting ample money, man does not want to be a thief and dacoit because mere money cannot give him the desired peaceful satisfaction. Under this consideration the case of Shudras and slaves is more considerable where upon Marshall has not placed any kind of view.

Dr. Marshall’s definition is no doubt a more progressive and modern pointing towards man, comparatively to the previous thinkers. Where Adam Smith lays emphasis on ‘wealth’ he also ignores the fact; wealth for whom and who to possess? But Marshall’s definition at least presupposes the place of a common and average man, though could not think of a destitute or discarded poor man who is not allowed even means of livelihood or wealth to possess kept deliberately below poverty line. Marshall’s theory presupposes only positive feelings and not about pain and suffering, his thinking has taken economics away from its essential objectives, which is the obligation of state and truly saying, the duty of political economy.

While defining economics Dr. Marshall pointed out two things of human behavior. First is regarding his move in the ordinary business of

life, and secondly the motives which are backed up by his thinking and desires. On both the aspects he formed his theses, which he made the principle proposition of his study of man. Ambedkar's view is that it does not start from these aspects of man, but it enquires the why of man's moves and motives. Dr. Ambedkar views, why man moves and why has he to keep motives, these are the primary consideration of his enquiry. As per Marshall's explanation chiefly concerns with, "those motives" affecting business part of his life for his specific, "love of money", the desire for the material reward of his work, and motive is supplied by a definite amount of money which is a definite and exact measurement of the motive and his satisfaction.

But still economics cannot be compared with the physical sciences, for it deals with the ever changing and subtle forces of human nature. The outward manifestation of desires, aspirations and affections through a particular motive they are to appear. Dr. Marshall noted substance of the economic science as satisfaction of motives and fatigue of dissatisfaction. Dr. Ambedkar's view rests in the why that, where Marshall is to prove curve of satisfaction why has he not attempted to prove the curve of fatigue and pain. Because Marshall says that they can be measures directly with the exchange value of a particular goods. In fact no economist had ever taken pains to measure the pains of human being. How much losses and frustation are sustained to a destitute or affected man is also a function to be measured by society or state to compensate. It is the obligation of state and that is why Antonie the first man who beheld the distinct nature of economics and therefore gave true name the political economy to his first article on economics in the beginning of eighteenth century.

Dr. Marshall uses another term of chief concern of Economics that is, "the ultimate aim of man" and that is the 'welfare and well being.' But the welfare varies in its nature due to personal attitude towards consumption nature and education. Even it varies as per the riches of a person. "The significance of a given price is greater for the poor than the rich" Dr. Marshall's expanding explanations in his thesis many times concludes in to antithesis, and there by proves its bluntness for operation. How a Science can be supported by such measures and means of study that only can derive mistaken products to which we call theories. Because

1, Ibid, P 16
where Dr. Marshall says, “... it is this definite and exact money measurement of the steadiest motives”\textsuperscript{1}, concludes, “the same price measures different satisfactions even to persons with equal incomes.”\textsuperscript{2}, rationalizes that “but there differences, man generally be neglected when we consider the average of large members of people”\textsuperscript{3} But his rationalization also diminishes. Dr. Marshall concludes on the substance that, “To conclude provisionally economists study the actions of individuals but study them in relation to social rather than individual life and therefore concerns themselves but little with personal peculiarities of temper and character. They watch carefully the conduct of a whole class of people some time whole of a nation”.\textsuperscript{4} is a spontaneous conclusion but still unaware of the complexities of society. Ambedkar’s view is that Economics in its role can never be an individual only, but its creation is only for society. Therefore he cannot accept definitions based on the study of individual human being. For him Economics is the social science it should benefit entire society without any discrimination of classes. Where economics fails to operate its measures and means to study with the indifferent results, the social aspect should be given the mount. Marshall were to accept this view because he himself admits that, “... it will also be found to be true that there is a fundamental unity of form underlying all the chief of them, and that in consequence, by studying them together the same kind of economy is gained as by sending a single postman to deliver all the letters in a certain street instead of each one entrusting his letters to a separates messenger”\textsuperscript{5} But again there remains a little difference.

For study point of view, this simile is not bad, but Marshall could not have seen the parcels and letters delivered in to the streets, are always borne the indifferent values; in one street a message of life and in other of a death. Dr. Marshall rationalizes an ignored fact of the condition like slaves of Rome or Shudras and untouchables of India. On the various economic problems of individuals under the influence of motives and facts, Though Dr. Marshall is thinking in a fool-proof idea, he is not aware of the knave-proof tricks of the Indian traditional social groups,

\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid P.12
\item Ibid short note P12
\item Ibid p. 16
\item Ibid p.21
\item Ibidp.23
\end{enumerate}
who guide to separate streets, areas away for certain castes and abstained them from all beneficial deliveries. Ambedkar’s view is that, it should be rational to common path and middle path rationalism. Dr. Ambedkar accepted the ‘Poona Pact’, as a middle path to solves social and economic problem of the backward community. In this view how Marshall miss holds, can be seen in his last sentence to his simple, “ For the analysis and organized processes of reasoning that are wanted for any one group of them will be found generally useful for other group”.1 By the Poona pact, it was made useful to few rather than put many on the detriment. All these things are seen to be not in control of economic thinking hence in Dr. Ambedkar’s view; it must consult to the Political economy. As else it would be a gospel of imbalanced mind of a destitute man. Which would be neither worthy of society nor for a madman. But only found of those handing power and wealth are to enjoy the every thing of society and knowing all others many by soft fun making. That's why writers like Ruskin have given many hard names to economics, calling it, “bastard science of darkness”.2 Dr. Marshall without refuting the allegation tried to pacify his own concept, “if the older economists had made this clear, they would have escaped many grievous misrepresentations, and the splendid teachings of a Carlyle and Ruskin as to the right aims of human endeavor and the right uses of wealth, would not then have been marred by bitter attacks on economics” Marshall started at Rights of Human but he could not shape it more.

The writers like Carlyle and Ruskin who attacked economics in a perennial conflict deemed to be a ethical difference But of distinct where for few who look it as a difference of socialism, where Dr. Ambedkar find it to be the Legacy of Economy.

6) Karl Marx : being an analyst of ‘scientific’ socialism, and pleader of dialectical Materialism, and Materialistic interpreter of history, he is on the side of Dr. Ambedka’s acclaim of ‘social oppression’ thought Dr. Ambedkar has an objection to his socialism as a scientific. But in defining economics perhaps Marx must get Dr. Ambedkar’s positive assent to his definition. Marx defines economics, “political Economy is the study of the anatomy of the society.”

---

1 Ibid P. 23
2 Jathar and Beri Page 15
From the above definition Marx is odd with all classical thought Ricardo is another to the rest of all. Marx is unique to say that, 'in the development of society how matrix of stages and classes of society is occurred. And by what principles are the social changes and different classes formed in the society? This should be explained by the economics. He was of the opinion that methods of production determine the social relations and social relation in the foundation of social structure. In short economics is the study of social structure based upon the modes of production.\(^1\)

An Ambedkar view; can be shade upon this definition, as in India the case of Marxian definition remain different from the opinion of Dr. Ambedkar because in olden Hindu society classes determined the modes of production rather than the vice versa said by the Marx. As per the Hindu mythology classes are forced, first, to render certain services and provide certain production useful for the society, chiefly the upper caste. Excluding India, Marx is right to say, 'modes of production determine the social relations and structure of society'. But Marx's definition seems more a definition of sociology than of economics, 'Anatomy of society' is a vast and big concern, to locate the economic concern, the lost key is to the definition as it is expected. Again Marx, when explained definition he placed the entire emphasis upon the division of production only. Man's economic concern relates to many other functions like consumption, exchange, distribution and public finance. The only plus point of Marxian definition, the 'study of social anatomy' is that which aims to trace out the disease of 'society' that is the why is the down full of society.

5) Lionel Robbins; An economist of Landon School of economics, in his famous book, “An Essay on the Nature and significance of Economics”, defines, “Economics is the science which studies human behavior as a relationship between ends and scarce means which have alternative uses”.\(^2\)

Ambedkar’s Critique on Robbins’ definition: the merriest of Robbins definitions is that it broke out the reality of human ends and relative strategy of a means again he gave a new definition instead of

---

1 Gokhale: Arthashastriy Vicharacha Itihas, P. 234
2 Qtd: Dhirgra and Garg, Foundations of Economics, Sultanchad and Sons P. 10
traditional concept of wealth definition. But Robbins dodged the welfare concept of classical and also. Perhaps he may not be aware of that he extinguished the concept of moral did from the desired study of Economics. As per Dr. Ambedkar, ' Ends and means are concomitants'. 1. Therefore extreme polarization of to phenomenon of ends and means con not is said of ultimate reality as depicted by Robbins. His showing the medley of human efforts between the two ends. ' Only ends can justify means', says Dr. Ambedkar, emphasized upon why we attach article 'THE' to a particular 'END': we simple ignore the simultaneously liberated many ends, and that is the essentiality and legacy of 'need', to be maintained. But this does not due to scarcity of means, But rather human in capabilities to consume all means and to approach all means at a time.

Scarcity of means is not ultimate nature of means, or may it be that there is no need to say scarcity because it blockades the vital research activity to increase the means rather than going in to the alternatives, or sacrifices of the other ends. Because for Dr. Ambedkar, “ Of course for the exigencies of an eminently practical life we must set an absolute value on some one end. But in doing this we must take precaution that the other end involved are not scarified". 2. And as per Robbins definition he implies that man has to alter his ends and means because both have opposite realities, i.e. unlimited ends and limited means having alternative uses. But

Dr. Ambedkar’s view shades light upon the most of nature of scarcity of means is perceived due to the in capabilities and inequalities of human organic means, personal and social organizational means of life. Where legacy of economy prevails there will not be scarcity like thing perceived by Robbins. Dr. Ambedkar never commented any where over the term of scarcity. The scarcity is only a prima-facie observation and it can be annihilated with the help of other means of technology and intellect of human brain a man who has no food to eat can dream and long for a lunch, for him scarcity of money and means to have lunch is real, but for man who is owner of many hotels, has no scarcity of lunch or dinner, but he is in the problem of using all the hotels at a time to have his lunch. Hence it becomes the problem of management rather than tasting the various hotels and better have money source the single thirst to content. As per Ambedkar’s view, in fact the

---

1  Dr. Ambedkar Vol. 1, P.485
2  Dr. Ambedkar: Vol. 1. P. 485
assimilation of centralized means of ends assembled on the basis of power and wealth and abstaining others from knowledge of their sources, and technology is prime cause of having perceived the nature scarcity of means, which is the core of capitalistic economy. Again under employment is not caused by the scarcity of resources it self But by their abundance and concentration only. The country like India where resources are ample is not facing problems due to scarcity of resources but due to mal-utilization and under utilization of resources. The nature of ends is also not unlimited but they are limited in their verge of needs and needless at their satisfaction and tend to liberate many ends.

Dr. Ambedkar's postulated proposition on the scarcity of means -

The means of ends perceive scarce because they are indirectly related to: -

1) The conditions of Society interlinked with the tendency of exploitation based upon discriminatorily measures among the various races, religion caste and class.

2) The resources of means remain unapproachable, due to the violation of fundamental rights or monopoly of resources resulting deprivation of some classes.

3) The state may function in a way resulting negligence towards its obligation and to protect the fundamental rights of the people.

People may have conspicuous consumption tendencies, in a state of negligence and exerting behavior of exploitation tendencies.

People or state may be in a state of negligence towards the research and inventions.

4) The scarcity is not the absolute nature of means if it were so there could not be 'pain economy' in the ancient and 'pleasure economy' in the modern age as Dr. Ambedkar says. The suffering of 'pain economy' was faced by man not because of 'scarcity' of means, but due to absence of transformed means, belonging to the existing fool-proof means. And the transformation of scarcity is related to the scarcity of intelligence, and application of technology. In the modern world man is cloning the most unique rareness of biological existence of man, the farming of poultries and goats is no case to wonder today.

The case of Indian province Orissa is remarkable in this regard it was facing draught and disease inflicted contingencies of scarcity of means of better livelihood before the project of water policy undertaken by Dr. Ambedkar. Its production was low and people were caught by
health deficiencies. Today Orissa is the highest state of growth in per capita income, which is recorded by RBI 5.66 percent S.D.P. (State Domestic Product.) where total national average is 4.80 percent.

7) Paula. Samuelson: while defining says, “To the real interpretation of any subject in few sentence and make it different from that of other subjects and to show that what is the theme of economics this is all but a difficult job.” Samuelson defined, “Economics is the study of how man and society choose, with or without the use of money, to employ scarce productive resources which could have alternative uses, to produce various commodities over time and distribute them for consumption now and in future, among various people and groups of society.”

Critique: Samuelson’s definition is called growth definition it indicates constant process of production distribution and consumption. Of finished products, which are the result of selected alternative resources embayed by man and people and groups of society like Robbins Samuelson gave definition in new dimension, but he held the Robbins Scarcity of resources As Dr. Ambedkar say’s Ends and Means are concomitants hence the scarcity of means can not be said specifically or common phenomenon. Both are conditional realities.

8) Channakya Kautilliya: The pen name of Vishnu Gupta, the man of Indian Economics wrote ‘Arthashastra,’ (Political Economy) “Chronologically Kautilliya’s period, fall during the period of Chandragupta Maurya, who was crowned in the year 321 Before Christ; then for Kautilliya’s Arthashastra probably is written during the end of the forth century” 2. If may be the middle of political economy for the use of Chandragupta Maurya before more than two thousand and three hundred years that is important. Kautilliya says, “This Arthashastra (Economics) empowers the human nature upon the Dhamma (Religion) Artha (wealth) and Kaam (Reverence) and also protects.....them. And this scripture, Arathashatra destroys the Adharma (ill practices) and wealth opposing things” 3.

2. Durga Bhagawat: Kautilliya Arthashastra P. 5
3. Kautilliya: Arthashastra P.533
In the fifteenth part of *Arthashatra* Kautilliya defines economics, “The means of living of man is *Artha*; (wealth) the earth on which humanity abides is *Artha* (wealth). The scripture which tells remedies to the acquisition of such land and its keeping is *Arthashastra* (Economics)”

*Kautilliya Arthashastra*, edited rewritten by H. A. Bhave first Edition 1981. Kautilliya’s economics refers to land - economy rather than farm or agro Rural. He wrote *Arthashastra* for ‘the State King’ chandragupta Mauraya of India. Though Kautilliya is the oldest one among the present and past economist of classical. His definition is also important for the purpose of Dr. Ambedkar studied Kautilliya on the subject of who were *Shudras*, he refers the condition of *Shudras* in the period of Kautilliya.

Kautilliya’s definition lays emphasis on land as the core factor of wealth of any nation, where Adam Smith and other economist believe in gold and Silver, which is in fact a produce of land. Land is the most rare thing than gold or diamond. Because if man, got victory over any other planet other than earth, he may not get the quality of land which is available on this earth planet. Dr. Ambedkar in his State socialism proposal held up the grip of the same core factor of wealth, which would make possible the essential resources of wealth of land, be distributed under the principle of equality. Any other economist than Kautilliya has not brought the core factor of wealth into notice; it is enough to note the core economic thinking of Vishnu Gupta *the Chanakya Kautilliya*.

The above volume of definitions of selected economists is enough to compare the postulated definition of Dr. Ambedkar.

iv) Dr. Ambedkar’s Definition of Economics-

Dr. Ambedkar did not discussed economic principles in a particular relatively written book. But since he has been a philosopher of economics and tremendously his writings and speeches on the subject of economics are available, reveals the basic analysis of the science of economics in the most advance thinking and towards the modern concept of human development and welfare. There is a tremendous potentiality in his available sources to formulate a particular theory, or to probe a research in the field of economics, there could be, possibly may not available a relative discussion on a micro theory, but definitely available

1. Ibid, P. 530
in the fragments. So far as this research is concerned, the single aspect of postulating his definition of economics, will be a central axis which not only make centrifugal foundation to his stand of the thesis over the economic thinking but a guiding barometer for the future enquiries.

The postulation of Dr. Ambedkar’s definition of Economics is the need of time, and to postulate a definition of Dr. Ambedkar means, with precaution to nothing more than his defined definition. But again this case is not going to happen first time in the history of economic doctrines. The most important case is of the ‘Father of Economics’: Adam Smith, who himself never defined economics in a definite clauses of sentence. Complete title of his book, ‘The Wealth of Nations’ termed as a definition of economics. With Dr. Ambedkar the case is not so weak as it seems with Adam Smith.

Dr. Ambedkar has placed ample connotations with regard to the substance of economics. And if a very little gap, which may be felt elsewhere, for that also Dr. Ambedkar himself left modality up to certain extend. He was of the opinion that, ‘where missing limbs of history, one traced, they should be connected with a permissible imagination on the basis of facts available. He says, “I believe that in such cases it is permissible for him to bridge the intuition to abridge the gap left in the chain of facts by links not yet discoursed and to propound a working hypothesis suggesting how facts which cannot be connected by known facts might have been inter- connected, I must admit that rather than hold up the work, I have preferred to resort to this means to get over the difficulty created, by the missing links which have come in my way” 1

In support of the definition ample number of explanations can be given, all with the views that Dr. Ambedkar has expressed in his writing and speeches, and also though they are enough in number. In his words, “It is a well-known principle of the law of evidence that witness must be weighed and not numbered. The number of witnesses is a less important consideration than the weight to be attached to the individual testimony of each, or to the some of the testimonies of all taken together”. Also the evidence both direct and circumstantial in support, ‘Defined’ definition all of them are not the least worthy of weight age.

1 Dr. Ambedkar 243 Vol. 7
Dr. Ambedkar and Economics -

To work in to the field of philosophy means to analyze and raise a designed subject matter with a little analytical intellect, and to define a subject is not a hard case job with a diverse consideration of references, and thereby we can gain a substance of knowledge. But to define knowledge of a particular subject, substance of philosophy, having consideration of utilitarianism and pragmatism is not an easy jab. And if be it may perhaps a defined by some one, it remains always above the faculty of difficulty to understand, and also to make it understand truly to others, is another corollary of the some matter. The matrix of philosophy will remain ever lasting. It can be said that philosophy has a quality that goes on contravenes with all the sciences. The conflict shoots up progress of the both. Science is both theory and practice, and Philosophy is interpreting of wit over the abstracted aspect involved in the theory. The great philosopher Bertrand Russell once said, “Organic life, we are told, has developed gradually from the protozoan to the philosopher, and this development, we are assured, is indubitably an advance. Unfortunately it is the philosopher not the protozoan, who gives this assurance”.

It happens with the philosopher that his assurance is unfortunate. The why of it hardly perceived by the common people, that is why they follow philosopher and suffer the losses, even a philosopher also remains at a loss to perceive the why of it. Because the property of proteins has a price and that cannot be ascertain by philosopher. It is the economist who can make protozoan to talk into the figures of development. Will Durant is right when he says, “economics has a certain kind of characteristics of being able to drag the philosopher from his metaphysical thoughts of pleasure as well lure and bear the coarse strife of necessities and maintain economic gain to sustain the existence of his life”.

why this difference is found between the philosopher and an economist, Dr. Ambedkar is ultimate to upheld the view that the economic life and the philosophic outlook of a society are more intimately connected than is commonly supposed.”

1Russell: Why men fight, New York 19)
2Will Durant: Story of Philosophy P. XXVII
3 Quoted by Dr. Ambedkar of J. Bonar: in Vol. I P. 489
The economic life is substance of economics, which makes a social science. Philosophy is synthetic interpretation of social outlook. Both have different dimensions. But to reach the welfare state from the development, may it be protozoan to ameba and ameba to animal, and without any obstacles as accepted by Russell from animal to philosopher, rather than making it in to dinosaur. But to make philosopher is not an easy thing even before and after the animal making. There remains vital juncture of science of economics, which is to be, crossed a head over. Because great many times ‘when we drag a philosopher in the economic transaction, his philosophy seem to be trembled down’ the task as said by Will Durant. But, if a philosopher becomes victim of economic complexity, still man has to resolve it at any cost, “Philosophical proposition must be a priori Propositions will refer not to things but to relations” also, as suggested by, Russell.

Under the above considerations, on the juncture of vital science of economics and over the means of Philosophical propositions’ there are certain realities of human existence and human behavior. If we accept a central system of economy we would nothing but cerate a farm of pigs or oxen in absence of private profit motive. And if we leave it unaccounted with private property rights we create black groups if we don’t have government and if we have, white groups of thieves and dacoits. Bertrand Russell demands philosophical propositions of man which have to be relative not only things but as well as to behavior also.

But if the task is to be resolved anyhow and man is to be made philosopher rather than making him pig and dinosaur, or thieves and dacoits. The consolidated feature of the science of economics must be reviewed, which has maximum age of 300 years, inter related every thing what ever it would be in the name of market economy and controlled state economy.

But in the both case we create curse of pigs and dacoits, some thing vital aspect, which economics is missing while interpreting and which must be an overlooked essence of economics. This is a fundamental dart, under the light of economic thoughts of Dr. Ambedkar are concerned. The present study is to seek the vital aspect and there upon all foregoing under the consideration how to determine the philosophic propositions, and if they are made and in true conditions of

---

1 Will Durant: Story of Philosophy P. 256
social strength towards the thinking of political social and economic liberty, all three constitute the substance of political Economy. The foregone economist used all three concepts, each in its theory and hence the juncture of economics is the most important.

Therefore it is an occasion to postulate the definition of Dr. Ambedkar. His thoughts are pragmatic because for him, economic facts and philosophy are closely connected with each other, men tends to look out economic gain in to philological grandeur and tries to engross about the economic resources. But the philosophic out look always remained a matter of controversy with the utilitarianism. Dr. Ambedkar also seeks practical fruitfulness of philosophically interpreted theory, he says, "Philosophy is no purely theoretic matter. It has practical potentialities. Philosophy has its roots in the problems of life and whatever theories philosophy propounds must return to society as an instrument of re-constructing society. It is not enough to know, those who know must endeavor to fulfill." 1.

Philosophy, which is enrooted in the problems of life, its ripe fruits and seeds must return to the ground of society for the reconstruction ultimately, and this should be done on the level of endeavor. Dr. Ambedkar with his proposition must contravene with the Nassu Willam Senior and John Eliot Carines. Senior believes that the subject matter of economics is wealth. Happiness or welfare thought can not be involved in economics, things those can be exchanged, or those things have values, all of them can be involved in the wealth.' 21(21. Translated: R M Gokhale- Arthashastriya Vicharacha Itihas P.156) Senior is given an honour of correcting the definition of Adam Smith. On the question of Role of economics, Economist like senior and Cairnes insisted that, "What ever be their generality and their truth, don’t not authriosed him in adding a single syllable of advice," 32. to guide about how to solve day-to-day problems of economy. It should not teach morals or values. It is an objective science not an ideal or value seeker. That is the work of politicians, and social reformers. With reference to this view Robbins however thinks that, 'without proper knowledge of economics anyone tries to speak on the problems of social and political, it was something of miracle if he

21. P. 286 Vol. 4
32. Quoted by R M Gokhale Arthashastriya Vicharacha Itihas P.157
talked a sense.’ In fact some one is needed to talk to society to save it from many evils, but the talking personality needs to be of a righteous foresight. Senior and Cairns seem to be talking like an open minded, but their thinking pattern must be probed into an analysis of judgment of whether is it righteous line of thinking?

To this Dr. Ambedkar’s barometer is, “A person with an open mind is always the subject of congratulations. While this may be so it must at the same time be realized that an open mind may also be an empty mind, and that such an open mind, if it is a happy condition is also a very dangerous condition for a man to be in. A disaster may easily overtake a man with an empty mind. Such person is like a ship without ballast and without a rudder. It can have no direction. It may float but may also suffer a shipwreck against a rock for want of direction.”

A mind in a happy condition talking with a open mindedly can easily be overtaken by empty mindedness, which is going to suffer the losses for want of direction.

Dr. Ambedkar presupposes that a happy condition also can mislead easily to the losses in absence of proper direction and strong foundation. Senior is afraid of the possible destruction of the scientific nature of the economics. But Dr. Ambedkar is of the opinion that, ‘Science is made for human and not human for science.’ The classical view that economics should not guide regarding the values, does not seem to fit with Dr. Ambedkar, because he through out his life, not only built, interpreted theories, but he guided people and solved economic and social problems, though he is termed as a politician or a reformer, in spite of his original creed of economist.

**-Dr. Ambedkar and the substance of economics-**

Most of the economist believes that economics is a science of wealth or of production and distribution. But to Dr. Ambedkar the subject matter of science is different from traditional thought of. The vital essence that is an urge to be investigated, during the course of development from protozoan to philosopher, as said by Russell. The same is proclaimed everywhere in the discourse of Dr. Ambedkar.

---

1. Dr. Ambedkar: *Partition of India* Vol 8 p. 18
To Dr. Ambedkar, 'the study of economic ways of getting a living will remain ever important.' He believes in the essential economic activity of man which is itself a reaction of the natural bounties, he says, "given the materials man can hardly be expected to remain inactive, for the economic motive is the strongest and the most dynamic of all. He tries at once to exploit the environment for his well being." It is perhaps, prima-facie, naturalism as propounded by him and as we perceive it. But Dr. Ambedkar rises a fundamental question, 'who is responsible for this activity of man', he places both the propositions, 'whether it is a spring of his psychology or the external circumstances?'

Dr. Ambedkar finds that external circumstances are responsible for man's activity, as an established doctrine. Because if he is not so quiescent being, presupposed to the springing psychic, and that would be a biological untruth.

The spring of man inculcated previously by the external circumstances moved him to hold the means of survival. But Dr. Ambedkar says, "Granting of fact of survival. I mean to make a statement yet more important. It is this, there are many modes of survival and not all are equally commendable."

Dr. Ambedkar believes that, because man's impulses cannot be divided into any classes. And the people of certain caste and race or class and religion condition that man is with his birth, and as it is a fact of social life and there cannot be any excuse to any country, therefore the means of survival must be revalued and they should be righteous and justifiable to the condition of a society. The 'love of money', a labeled view to classicism, of Carlyle and Ruskin, criticizing on the classical economists, which is the chief term, Dr. Ambedkar reiterated the same, to answer Russell as, 'It is wrong to object it after the fulfillment of basic needs of life.' 'Love of money' is only a part of their general complaint against the goods of the world and finds its justification in the economic circumstances which give rise to this particular belief.

Dr. Ambedkar's argument in support of his defense over the criticism on the 'Love of money' is economically circumstantial.

1. Dr. Ambedkar, Vol.12 p.6
2. Dr. Ambedkar, Vol.1 p. 487
3. Dr. Ambedkar, Vol.1 p. 489
It is the same thing, as when a man was living in a “Pain economy”, the philosophy of sour grapes, is propounded in the same way. He, “believes that a thing must be nasty if it is cheap”, criticism over the love of money has no philosophic weight age. It is a misconception without inquiring the “dead uniformity of character” and the purpose of money. Property or wealth is not the prime embodiment of the possessive instinct of man, “The trouble therefore one might say, is not with property but with the unequal distribution of wealth.”

Production-
The entrepreneur by his out lay of variety of investments in to the process of production by tradition confirmed to labour, land, capital and profit. But as per Dr. Ambedkar there are many other factors which share in the distributive (system) process; must be part of production process. Dr. Ambedkar also assents to the Law of proportion in the production process and the principal of substitution affects it though it is not strong enough to invalidate the Law of production. Thus the process of production comprises and many modes of investment of resources hence the function of distribution is complex and vital. “According to Adam Smith it is the adoption of the Law of primogeniture chief by due to the exogenous of a military life that needs to the creation and preservation of large holdings.” Dr. Ambedkar reiterated that “Thomas Arnold once said, ‘a faulty political economy is the fruitful parent of crime.’

Human wants (ends) and its satisfaction
The economist believes that economics chiefly concerned with human wants and his efforts to satisfy the wants. Even Dr. Ambedkar’s teacher E.R.A. Seligman says, “The starting point of economics is the existence of human wants. To satisfy hunger and thirst, to secure shelter and to provide clothes were the chief aims of primitive man and constitute even today the more force of all society.”

---

1Dr. Ambedkar, Vol.1 p. 489
2Dr. Ambedkar, Vol. 1 p. 467
3Dr. Ambedkar, p.475
4Dr. Ambedkar Vol.1 p. 475
5Seligman: Principles of Economics Qtd by Dr. Ambedkar, vol.12 p.3
But to Emerson, human efforts his success and satisfaction will be futile if not backed up by plus condition. He says, "Success is constitutional depends upon a plus condition of mind and body, on power of work on courage. Success goes invariably with certain plus or positive power must balance an ounce of weight." Dr. Ambedkar, one step ahead, of Emerson, who presupposes that it is not matter of a human desire to get or to arrange the plus condition of society for success of man. The fundamental success depends upon the plus condition of society Dr. Ambedkar says, "This plus condition of body and mind is also the result of social environment, if the environment is propitious. In a society where there is exemption from restraint, a secured release from obstruction in a society where every man is entitled not only to the means of being but also of well-being, where no man is forced to labour so that another may abound in luxuries, where no man is derived of his right to cultivate his faculties and powers so that there may be no competition with the favoured, where there is emphasis of reward by mento, where there is good will towards all."

If social environment is void of plus condition and adversely full of minus condition, where maximum number of groups of society pouring the social environment full of unpropitious to a particular or for some social groups. If it is full of restrain and obstruction to get the means of ends, where certain class is forced to labour in spite of its demise and sorrow, where means of luxuries are completely vanished as indiscernible dreams, where man is deprived of rights and privileges, where no word of condolence for his death in servile, and where only ill wills prevail for each others, what can do a 'wealth of nation', where there is no consideration of it regarding, for which it is produced, and, who to possess it? And if it is a privilege of few and detriment of others, it is not the science of wealth it may be science of 'illth', as said by Carlyle.

The plus condition is, "Given the material" to the man, it may make him an economic man, as economist thinks. But to Dr. Ambedkar, "the end of economic man", we can not really talk the end of the economic man for the simple reason that the economic man was never born. The common retort to Marx that man does not live by bread alone is unfortunately a fact. I agree with Carlyle that the aim of civilization cannot be merely to fatten man as we do (to) pigs. But we are far off from that stage. The laboring class far from being fat like pigs, is starving and

1. Dr. Ambedkar, Vol., 12, p. 735.
one wishes that they thought of bread first and everything else after wards.”1, hereby Dr. Ambedkar points out the fundamentals of human motives and desires. It is Dr. Ambedkar’s exact grip over the basic nature of human. It is true that man does economic ways of living but it is not all for bread and butter. It is something more than that of having a being of some position. And therefore Dr. Ambedkar proposes, ‘It is the strategy of human nature that he pays no heed to the ends simultaneously liberated while we cherish a particular end, “But in doing this we must take precaution that the other ends involved are not sacrificed. Thus, the problems that if we are to use force as we must, achieve something we must see that while working for one end, We do not destroy in the process the other ends equally worthy of maintenance.”2 The preservation of the ‘other ends’ is the vital human force of his motives, if it is sacrificed; it is the loss and misfortune of a being that could not attain to a being. Even Marshall could not explain this view, though he placed a progressive thinking that, ‘not concerned with man as he is, not with an abstract or economic man, but a man of flesh and blood,” where Dr. Ambedkar believe that human aspirations are not merely economic. Hence to think man is merely economic is a misleading to his essential struggle of becoming a Goodman or a philosopher.

Satisfaction of wants:

Dr. Ambedkar expresses his view over the human nature, which was thought to mutilate; itself by excessive feeding as it is applied to some one’s appetite, but he says it is not a comprehensive proposition. And void of scientific thinking, Dr. Ambedkar terms the laws of consumption as a reaction to the classical theory. He says, “The laws of consumption it may be noted, are simple certain deductions from the economic doctrines of the utility theory of value. Formulated as a reaction to the classical theory by Cournot, Gossen, Walres, Menger and Jevons, it no longer thinks of utility as a quality as a quality inherent in the objection thing or condition but as dependent upon the capacity it possesses to satisfy human wants. This being so, the utility of an object varies according to the varying condition of the organism needing satisfaction. Even an object of strongest desire like food may please or disgust, according as we

1Dr. Ambedkar, Vol. 10 p. 109.
2Dr. Ambedkar, Vol. 1 p. 485.
are hungry or have over indulged the appetite, thus utility diminishes as satisfaction increases. In other words as satisfaction is the pleasurable activity of particular organ or a group of them, the curve representing the relation of the organ to the object of its satisfaction varies inversely with the condition of the organ."1 Dr. Marshall who places, “consumption may be regarding as negative production. Just as man can provide only utilities, so he can consume nothing more.” And that utility is the prime cause of value in exchange it is accessible, “the excess of price which he would be willing to pay rather than go without the thing over that which he actually does paying, is the economic measure of this surplus satisfaction, it may be called consumers surplus,”2 with certain deductions, the mathematical school and Austrian School of subjective economists developed the laws of consumption. Jevons says, “ Utility though a quality of things is no inherent quality but a circumstance of things arising out of man’s requirements.”3 Human requirements depends upon his capacity to possess things to satisfy his wants, where Mitra still concludes, “Utility may not be identical with satisfaction but there is a close correspondence behaving the two. So maximization of utility can be regarded as a close approximation to maximization of satisfaction.”4

Dr. Ambedkar brings our attention towards the most important factor, regarding the law of satisfaction. He explains that the organisms of man needing satisfaction must possess utilization capacity of the thing which is to be consumed for him consumed utility means a particular individual a utility tended to be zero and increased to maximum of the satisfaction. His vital observation that, the varying condition of the organism, primarily responsible for the increment of satisfaction for them it is the condition of one or more organs, he explain, “In other worlds as satisfaction is the pleasurable activity of a particular organ or a group of them, the curve respecting the reaction of the organ to the object of its satisfaction varies inversely with the consolation of the organ.”5 Dr. Ambedkar agrees with Prof. Giddings, that the position of human consumers is taken by our neglected parts, Dr. Ambedkar proposes the consequesical two reasons first: “because at some point in the process of satisfaction the particular organ irritated, ceases to deserve may further

1 Dr. Ambedkar, Vol.I. p.490
2 Dr. Alfred Marshall: Principle of Eco. P.103
3 R M Gokhale: Arthashastiya Vicharachit Ithias P. 306
5 Dr. Ambedkar, Vol.I. p. 490
satisfaction by feeding itself on the object of its craving," and second: "because other organs needing a different kind of satisfaction, clamor against the over indulgence of some one organ at their expense."1 Prof. Gidding’s view holding subsidization effect marginal utility as per this second proposition is correct but Dr. Ambedkar does not accept the view that over indulgence of one single organ can not mutilate the whole organism. He reveals the vital aspect of satisfaction that the laws of consumption must be destination to penalize that by the laws man is not contend single or some organs but, “On the other hand, through one at a time, all the appetites have their turn. Human nature is, thus fortunately provided by its vary makeup against a one sided development leaving no doubt as to its promise for an all round development in a congenial environment. Whether it will be able to obtain the miscellaneous food material, intellectual or spiritual is craves for, is a matter beyond its control if it is mutilated by the lack of variety of food, it will be through society default and not its own.”2

The rationalization of the law of substitution effect of marginal utility is to makeup man’s all-round development that is his natural urge and it is beyond control. Any antithesis to this proposition will result in detriment of satisfaction and welfare of man. In this way it can be postulated that Dr. Ambedkar proposes by stressing the condition of human organism will decide its satisfaction or dissatisfaction, hence providence of a: “plus condition” is essential and it is the obligation of state or society. Mere human being itself is at lost to maintain the plus condition without the aids of nation.3

-Dr. Ambedkar’s Definition –

Dr. Ambedkar affirms the foundation of human sciences for the ultimate well being. He divided all human exigencies with their relative sciences, hence for him to define economic science in to a single book has become meaning less and also it was out of time available to him. And it is true that a proclaimant of different sciences, looks to mingle in such a

1Dr. Ambedkar, Vol. 1 p. 490
2Dr. Ambedkar: Vol.1 p. 490-91
3Dr. Ambedkar, Vol. 12 p. 735
thing is a time wasting. What ever the case may be, but for the sake of
research and for future generations to understand him in a better way,
present research work thinks this is a better instrument. That will entice
the thesis to concentrate on the gist of Dr. Ambedkar’s economics.

To postulate Dr. Ambedkar’s Definition of economics means not
only to assemble his fragmented views, but also to rationalize his claim
regarding the subject matter of economics. As per the foregoing
discussion over the definition of economics, where Adam Smith’s wealth
definition, Dr. Marshall’s and his follower’s welfare definition and also
Robbin’s Scarcity definition, Ricardion and Marxian distribution definition,
and Samulson’s Growth definition, all are enough to generalize the existing
definitions of economics. The definition of Dr. Ambedkar is also to be
termed like the above, in a specific category, either in the former specified
terms or a special category.

Before making any category we must examine his way of
illustration, the terminology he uses and the aspects he touches to aim the
goals, all of these what does it comprises into a subject matter of
economics. All the components of definition can be probed for an
explanation. Dr. Ambedkar wrote many books and gave many speeches,
and there are thousand of his documents where in economic thoughts are
expressed. The subject matter of economics he expresses is found in his
few books. Though present research attempted to postulate Dr.
Ambedkar’s definition of economics that does not mean that Dr.
Ambedkar’s explanations and views are ambiguous or scanty or blunt,
but they are voluminous and overcharged with sharp wisdom, even
coherent enough and sequential to the development of the history of
economic thoughts.

From Adam Smith’s ‘Title Definition’, Marshall’s ‘Substance
discussing definition’, Robbin’s, ‘Technical Scarcity definition’, and
Samuelson’s, ‘Growth definition’, Dr. Ambedkar’s definition of
economics can also be postulated in the light of his pretensions, with
regard to his own explanations on the economic problems.

Definition: -

‘Economics is, ‘a science of intelligent efforts, “to justify and
control the operation of force over the means employed to achieve the
ends,” for the welfare of nations’.’

1 Dr. Ambedkar, vol. 1 p. 485
The above clause of sentences seems to be a matrix sentence, but it is a dictum sentence of Dr. Ambedkar, having enough reference of defining the science of economics in relation to its substance and subject matter. The various aspects of the definition can be explained as under:

**Explanation of Dr. Abmedkar’s Definition: -**

As Lionel Robbins, after laying definition of economics gives explanatory notations to expound his definition, in the same way the above definition of Dr. Ambedkar is also logged by his own fragmented explanations summarized in a series of postulations.

The postulations are the views of Dr. Ambedkar expressed on varies subjects and on different occasions. It expects a criticism, but Dr. Ambedkar’s all propositions seem to concern economic thinking. And if we classify the ultimate reality and welfare of man and his society, it is nothing more than his mental emancipation, with healthy and wealthy life, and in consequence, the same to his society as a nation. All other things are not more than supporting only. Hence his spakes scattered all over in his writings and speeches, though assembled here to explain his definition of economics, it is done for the sake of economic analysis, as this is a need of time and the words are there only to find a proper pace to make people understand it in a more efficient way.

For the purpose of proper explanation and to find out the corresponding aspect implied by the definition, it is better to analyze it in to sections for the provision of thorough exemplification.

**-Dissection of the Definition-**

The definition of Dr. Ambedkar is classified in to following four parts -

(a) A Science of Intelligent efforts, i.e. *Intelligent Efforts*.

(b) To justify and control the operation of force, i.e. *Justification, and Controlling*,

(c) Operation of force over the means employed to achieve the ends. i.e. *The means and their Ends, Employment of the means, Achievement of the Ends*.

(d) For the Welfare of Nations, i.e. *Welfare of Individuals, Welfare of the Societies of Nations*. 

The above dissection thresholds the definition of Dr. Ambedkar, pointing out the list of aspects to which explanations exemplified:

The Aspects involved in the definition of Dr. Ambedkar are:

1) A science of intelligent efforts
2) A science of justification and control
3) A science of operation of force over the means
4) A science of employment of means to achieve the ends
5) A science of welfare of nations

v) Explanation of the definition of Dr. Ambedkar-

The postulated definition of economics of Dr. Ambedkar can be explained under the above aspects:

1) A science of intelligent efforts: -

Since Dr. Ambedkar, not only pointed out the economic activities and economic policies regulated by intellectuals but also how are they primarily responsible for the welfare of society. They may either be in ruling government or merely in the society, what ever they play a role, is responsible for the welfare of the nation. And above all the economic activity makes man to think intelligently.

"It must be recognized that the selfish interests of a person of the class to which he belongs always acts as an internal limitation which regulates the direction of his intellect". The intelligence is the central point of justification, control and force. And perhaps therefore Dr. Ambedkar had deliberation of ample occasion over the subject of intelligence and intellectual class both of which play a vital role in the cultivation economic growth.

The airconditioned clean offices and posh and fresh hotels are though seem to be outcome of economic activity but they are in fact monuments of human economic intelligence. Purity and freshness is the first condition of intelligence. Hence, the term 'intelligent' brought in the definition is not without the nature of economics. In reality only intelligence can bring economic growth, that is why Dr. Ambedkar says it was, 'pain economy' in olden timed and 'pleasure economy' in modern

1 Dr. Ambedkar vol. 7 p. 240
2 Dr. Ambedkar vol. 1 p. 485
times. Therefore a man without intelligence must sustain ‘pain’ and it is due to lack of means, which he cannot use or produce and preserve.

Society is made of the both laymen and philosophers. It is not astonishing that every science has its creator behind, without his any corresponding reference. As any physical science is the creation of the physiologist. A common man can evade becoming a physiologist but he cannot dodge the economic efforts of his life, because of, for his own subsistence. In short every body has to be rational intellectual while performing the living activity. Even an illiterate man is also naturally forced to think on his economic transactions in a way of some wise ness, else he might be put on the helpless state of losses.

Will Durant has left the illiterate man while indicating the helplessness of a philosopher. Economics has a certain kind of characteristic, not only, dragging philosopher but even an illiterate man also from his any other thoughts of metaphysics and force him to the coarse strife of necessities and sustain the existence of life. Every economic activity is an intellectual activity. It is only economic activity, which forced humanity to invent various sciences to meet his needs.

Dr. Ambedkar while making distinction between rule and principle says, “Rules are practical. But principles are intellectual...Rules like cooking recipes do tell just what to do and how to do it. A principle, such as that of justice, supplies a main head by reference to which he is to consider the bearings of his desires and purposes, it guards him in thinking by suggesting to him the important consideration which he should bear in mind.”1 Dr. Ambedkar exhibits the virtues of the principle, “The principle may be wrong the but the act is conscious and responsible, the rule may be right but the act is mechanical.”2 which doing good by virtue of rule in the light of principle. But the essence of man is that he is not a machine but still he needs a system hence he bears rationality and there by intelligence. This makes obvious that why Dr. Ambedkar repeatedly tress upon the element of intelligence of man and always referred regarding the intellectual class. Even he pointed the prime cause of classes that are found in the society for him, “there is a world of difference between one who is learned and one who is an intellectual, the former is class- conscious and is alive to the interests of his class.
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The later is an emancipated being who is free to act without being swayed by class considerations”. The fact of intelligence, thus, bears the class consideration in its voidness or as per its level. Marx who talks of social anatomy, Ricardo as ‘distribution among classes’ Marshall and Robbins, of ‘man’s behavior’ and Samuelson; of people and groups of society; hardly made this diagnostic reference that it is human intelligence which work behind its class and group consideration. To Dr. Ambedkar, intellectual class also bears certain characteristics though liberated from class consideration.

‘In every country the intellectual class is the most influential class, if not the governing class. The intellectual class is the class which can foresee, it is the class which can advise and give lead. In no country does the mass of the people live the life of intelligent thought and action. It is largely limitative and follows the intellectual class. There is no exaggeration in saying that the entire destiny of a country depends upon its intellectual class. If the intellectual class is honest independent and disinterested it can be trusted to take the initiative and give a proper lead when a crisis arises.’

‘It is true that intellect by itself is not virtue. It is only a means, and the use of means depends upon the ends, which an intellectual person pursues. An intellectual man can be a good man but he can easily be rogue. Similarly an intellectual class may be a band of high-soled persons, ready to help, ready to emancipate erring humanity or it may easily be a gang of crooks or a body of advocates of a narrow clique from which it draws its support.’

Thus the welfare of man, which perceived him in the form of “Happiness notoriously varies with conditions and circumstances of a person, as well as which conditions of different and epochs.” But there is a role of principles. The principles, which given certain value and living by them man varies his own acts of living growing, “The principle which makes little of the present act living and growing naturally looks upon the present as empty and upon the future as remote. Such principle is inimical to progress and is an hindrance to a strong and a steady current life”. Hence revaluation of values and ideals rests upon the intellectual class. “Ideals as norms are good and are necessary. Neither a

1 Dr. Ambedkar Vol. 7 p. 240
2 Dr. Ambedkar Vol. 3 p. 71
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society nor an individual can do without a norm. But a norm must change with changes in time and circumstances. No norm can be permanently fixed. There must always be a room for revaluation of the values of our norm. The possibility of revaluing values remains open only when the institution is not invested with sacredness. Sacredness prevents revaluation of its values, once sacred, always sacred”.

This, revaluation only can be made by the intellectuals. To idealize certain reality for the purpose of revaluation on the basis of a personal or classial advantage and is not good of morality, “Only when a person finds a personal advantage in things as they are, that he tries of idealize the real. To proceed to make such an ideal real is nothing short of criminal. It means perpetuating inequity on the ground that what ever is once settled is settled for all times. Such a view is opposed to all morality. No society with a social conscience has ever accepted it. On the contrary, what ever progress in improving the terms of associated life between individuals and classes has been made in the course of history is due entirely to the recognition of the ethical doctrine that what is wrongly settled is never settled and must be resettled.”

In this way man can proceed to settle his transaction in the filed of economic bargains. It is largely depends upon, how intellectual class is working in a nation whether it is under the band of traditional values or as emancipatory and free from any class consideration.

2) A science of Justification and control:

Justification: The work of justification of ends and means with its force for the achievement of end is nothing but the work of intelligence. If a philosopher is not going to do this work, it is bound to happen the work rests upon the intellectual class. Because for Dr. Ambedkar, ‘the economic life and philosophic out look of society are more intimately connected than commonly supposed.’

The Doctrine of Justification:

The doctrine of justification is concomitant to the doctrine of control, that is why Dr. Ambedkar says, ‘to justify and control’ as in copulative term. The ‘Control’ is useless if it has no link with

1. Who were the Shudras. Vol. 7 p. 31
2. Dr. Ambedkar, Vol. 7 p. 32
'Justification'. The justification only can give impulse as to the manner in which the reaction of the control is going to exercise, and at what degree would be the control. In other word it determines the exercise of control with context to time, location , in what manner and by what means.

The doctrine of Justification has two more elements, which Dr. Ambedkar laid down. First, Justification under a principle and Secondly justification under a rule, Dr. Ambedkar explained both of them in an extensive wit for him, ‘principles acts as intellectuals for justification Rules are habitual to their practical aspects of course. Principles remain silent and do not part in course of action. Man needs both of them.’

All the economic laws refer to the specific assumptions of condition. In spite of these condition economic laws never proves to be exact to the measures of the laws. That is why there seem to be cited certain limitation by the economist. Habits, demonstration effects, ‘Duesenberry’, man made and natural calamities affect all economic transactions. The above three because not in the control of man, and remain always out of human governance. There fore economists rationalized these factors in a different way of assumptions and habits. This is a run out from the rational thinking Dr. Ambedkar’s view, which denotes these things to be brought in to the regime of justifications. Being without any consideration of these facts left to their growth into the nuisance of various cults. Because when man always wants maximum, and expends minimum, he wants maximum not because the means are limited but his inherent tendency to posses maximum, and which sprang in him from the cycle of life. Lord Buddha says, ‘desires are unprovidable’ hence they are to be controlled appropriately as per justification.

Few economist like Senior abstained economist from ethical preaching to people or his involvement in the day-to-day problem solving indulgence. It is perhaps only because, justification, being the vital spirit of economics. Justification for the common welfare is the essence of common wealth. If political economy is not going to keep enough justification, means and ends, and force applied over, what will happen to the morality and wealth of society? Certainly ending both into detriment. Justification is necessary. “For a means when once employed liberates many ends - a fact scarcely recognized” For Dr. Ambedkar says,
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1 Dr. Ambedkar Vol. 3,P.75
“The justification must satisfy the world that ends given prominence to by one or other of the combatants could not be achieved otherwise than by violence i.e. without involving the sacrifice of other ends equally valuable for the stability of the world.”

Dr. Ambedkar proposes the ultimate instrumentality of justification as, “But the responsibility for an intelligent control of force rests on us all.”

Control:

The economics deserves the first work of justification of force over the means and ends, because the end at the ultimate consumption-margin, mutilates itself by feeding and shifting the desire to another end. And it is a natural process of organism. But it is the only phenomenon, which increases human intelligence upon the justification of over-indulgences and there by with controlled force, addition, deduction, or shifting what ever it may be needed, through its utility and value to another end. This process only can restore the contented and total welfare of life.

In the words of Dr. Marshall, as showed in the work of Malthus that, “Malthus showed by a careful investigation of history what ever the forces which had as a matter of fact controlled the growth of population in different country and different times.”

Dr. Ambedkar’s definition does not only lay stress upon the justification of force but as Malthus thus observed the natural forces which controlled population, Dr. Ambedkar’s definition lays stress upon the control of the force. They should be sought and employed to bring out a peaceful result and not resulting in to destruction. Man should develop his own forces and should efficiently be able to control them for his own and national goodness.

Doctrine of Control:

The factor of control, which Dr. Ambedkar noted in his definition, is the soul of economics. The control relates to the ability to stop proceeding further in an expected adverse final result and also plan in
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further for better opportunities if available in a favorable conditions for
drawing maximum benefits in a particular time, labour, and means in a
consistent ratio of returns.

As there cannot be any means without a system of control, then it
is but natural the economics cannot be without the concept of control in
the respective doctrines. The element of control has not been given
importance in former thinking, but it was not default of economic
science. The consumption control theory was built in the recent 19th
century, but the correspondingly implied thinking was on going at the
every time even in the age of physiocrats and Mercantilists. Thus Dr.
Ambedkar's defining is seem to be abnormal but because his implication
is a care thrusting, it looks, so in fact in this reference, and it is obvious
that it cannot be without Para defining.

Again control of means should not be going to result in the entirely
controlled economy. For Dr. Ambedkar says, 'There should not be harm
to private motivation of activity.' But as in modern world all countries'
economies a little or greater part are controlled economy. But they
should not result in complete control of economy. For the controlled
must be imparted by intellectuality. And the intelligent control of force
does not signify the control over the desires though it implies. For desires
can not be controlled but rather than that they can control the needs and
there by the economic theories. The over indulgence diminishes the
utility of needs and that is only because of human organism and behavior
operates under the imperatives of desires. But it is human intellect,
which does not act as animals, he learns and uses justification and control
and operation of force over the means employed to achieve the end.

Human efforts to employ means in its intelligent form, only can
desire the value-based life of many modes, but for that process
revaluation of present values of life is necessary. In absence of the same,
ends may lead to vicarious results, which may destroy humanity. There
fore intellectual revaluation of values is only way to justify and control
which can maximize the welfare of the people, of the world.

3) A science of Operation of force over the means.

Lionel Robbins said means are scarce and the ends are unlimited and man
behaves corresponding to the both of them in between with the
alternative uses of means. But Robins does not explain the details of
human economic behavior. Means and resources are meaning less, if not
desired by man or remained needless to humanity. Dr. Ambedkar's implied proposition is more extensive to expound the reality of trinity of means, man and ends. They are futile if man is unable to apply any kind of force over the means even at the stage of desired and in the condition of need. Without the essential force, which is an operation, over the means, means cannot be employed to achieve some end. To Dr. Ambedkar, 'Force is necessary for the achievement of an end and that which ought to be in constructive form'. "In short the point is that to achieve any thing we must use force, only we must use it constructively as energy and not destructively as violence"1. For Dr. Ambedkar this consideration is an ultimate, in absence of it economics will not be able to, 'study the human behavior' as Robbins says or 'study the society's mode of choices to employ the means' as said by the Samuelson. The farthest fact-reaching proposition is needed to explode the problem of the study of man and to conclude the final finding with net achievement.

Force is as necessary and is to function under the impulses of desires of needs, and it varies according to the prominence of needs. In absence of force, means employed will be fruitless, for it loses its very essence and thereby the substance of the science of economics. Even Burke who believes force as only destructive means, says, 'Force can not be a lasting means.'2. But to Dr. Ambedkar, "...a distinction between use of force as energy and use of force as a violence needs to be made."3 Achievements of the ends are most important aspect of human economic activity. Man live for his ends bearing certain motives and impulses. But as per Russell, "Man's impulses are not fixed from beginning by his native disposition. Within certain limits, they are profoundly modifies by his circumstances and his way of life. The nature of these modifications ought to be studied, and the result of his study ought to be taken account of, in judging the good or harm that is doe by political and social institute."4

4) A Science of employment of means to achieve the ends: -

Society of every country consists of various classes. The structure of society remains always complex. Any law and rule of the state policy find it difficult to analyze a rule over the peoples' customs and practices. Again the society consists of certain classes and certain classes dominate the other classes. Their means of domination are their power of physical
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and mental, and possession of means of ends. The legislation is compelled to enact the means of ends as per the actual existence of classes and possession of means and end.

Man as a living being need feeding and comports he may even take a risk of death, even for these needs because it is a question of his life. Man for his needs apply his forces and courses himself into the movements that may either be called economic activity or non economic activity, but the motive behind it is nothing but economic. To Dr. Ambedkar the achievement of some end with the use of force over the means is not a foolproof activity it involves the operation as well as regulation of force, so as to save as many ends as possible. Still for his destruction of some evil-one is no exception if required. It, “needs to the justified is the destructive violence.”

Though he says, “... no justification, I think, is needed for the use of force, what needs to the justified is the destructive violence.” 2 Regarding the achievement of end the most important aspect has been brought the notice by Lionel Robbins in his definition that ‘things are scarce’ hence it is the economic problem of human behavior. This concept is not novelty; it is derived from the classification of wants, and their sequence of exigencies. No economist has been so emphatic as Robbins regarding the scarcity of means. But it made man as if helpless. Dr. Ambedkar believes that the olden economies were ‘pain-economy’ when man had his productivity remarkably low and bearing very few inventory means of production. Dr. Ambedkar talks about the exigencies but it does not mean the means are scares. The exigency is not due to scarcity of means but because of inability of man due to various reasons to pose the available resources. There are many countries those have ample resources but their government is unable to reach the resources.

If the, “Extract from the physical world useful material which become the original source of man’s subsistence,” 3 If we consider Robbins definition then the question arises, that whether physical world is limited or unlimited. If we accept this contention that it is limited to global earth, then why man is going beyond the earth for energy i.e. as solar energy and ultimately space energy. It is the only thing that man must learn, is how to use the ‘means’ available to create the desired ‘means’ of
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ends. The reference of scarcity is just as beginner's plea often faced by in a language learner, but researchers invent new concepts and form new worlds with their inventions and study.

It is inability of a man who is not put in a plus condition to avail the exiting resources under the guard of fundamental rights. The report of World Bank observed that only those countries are having topmost wealth production those are imparting and guarding the fundamental rights of their people. The recent American expedition over the mars and Saturn is enough to judge the matter of scarcity. The land of moon is patented to Australia for the further research and development and the space about it is planned to build up a space mottle, has become a state story. To think in the modern economic theories 'the scarcity of means' has become a thesis like a heavy steam-engine which is useful and operable but no body wants to use it, for it can not be intelligent to its output of utilities.

Robbins thinks 'means are scare and ends are unlimited' but to Dr. Ambedkar 'ends and means are concomitants'. He is even extensive to think that man himself is an end,' of course being a means in himself. Thus it reserves the place of question that how can one to be unlimited and other to be limited with alternative uses. It is the human intelligence, which deserves probability of abundance of means and resources, causing 'pain economy' in its absence in the world of antiquity and 'pleasure economy' in its scientific growth, in the present modern world.

Dr. Ambedkar's explanation regarding inequity and rights shows the unreal supposition that means is scarce. But this does not mean that Dr. Ambedkar is of the opinion that means are absolutely scarce. As the case it might be in any such implication. But the scarcity of means is not absolute; it is only a primary condition, which can be changed by technology and with the advancement of knowledge. Hence to place the means of ends are scare seems to be a misguiding term. A scientific view is that which converts scarcity in to abundance. The scarcity felt before a hundred year ago is not as it is felt to day even at the explosion of population. The scarcity is diminishing. The scarcity felt a hundred years ago was not due to the absolute nature of means of end which Robbin's talks of, but because man's intellect was not advanced to be able to avail the existing resources. The technological advancement proved that scarcity of means is not ultimate but human nature is neggardious to develop inventions his intelct and also because of the prevailing
inequality of wealth in all the corners of world on the basis of class, caste, race and religion, on the basis of the favourism to certain persons or class and disfavor to another. The means of ends were retained at some people and maximum people on different customs were left on the condition of their miss fate of destitution, which was not at their fault. Hence Dr. Ambedkar miss approves the story of sour grapes. “Bearing this in mind, it becomes easy to understand why the philosophy of sour grapes of the have-nots is the most human of all beliefs and why it so largely pervades our values about things which we can and thing which we can not posses in spite of our efforts to have them. When we cannot have a thing we argue that it is not worth having. There is thus genuine difference between the out looks of the “haves” and the “have-nots” towards worldly goods as there is, between the religions of the down cast and successful. Each one in obedience to its profoundly moral nature: moral even in its immorality, in that is seeks justification for every thing for every thing it does-idealizes its own attitude.”

To over come the problem scarcity man must learn to expound the resources and intellectual use of utilities. The theory of consumption explains the human wants. What are the wants means? Wants are of three types: ‘Essential’, ‘of comforts’ and ‘luxurious’. In facts ends may be unlimited but the essential needs can easily be delimited. The means needed to satisfy human basic needs are not so much unachievable; as they are posed to the minimum means of ends, and can be achieved with a sizable labour if there is a plus condition in the society and all the rights are protected by the state. But the world conflicts over the racial, class caste, and religion and vanishes the plus condition of society. The way out is here that, it is the obligation of state to be aloof and apart from these ‘looks’ of inequities, that which causes mankind the scarcity of means. Both form a certain ‘beliefs’ of established customs that make life of mankind into a suffering. In the mal-force of ambitions things are not left as for all to work upon, but they are misappropriated in a biased tendencies, which cause not only to an individual but later on to all another classes and thus establishing the custom of denial of opportunity to certain classes.

Activity of man, whether it is a spring of his psyche, to Mr. Bertrand Russell, “man springs his impulses into action”. But to Dr.
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Ambedkar external circumstances are responsible for his economic activity, where Dr. Marshall believes, "if a man is steadfast and thoughtful, even his impulses are products of his habits which he has adopted more or less deliberately."\(^1\) It seems that Marshall is evident of support to Russell. But in fact Marshall supports to Dr. Ambedkar, while saying, "And whether these impulses are an expression of his higher nature or not whether they spring from mandates of his conscience, the pressure of social connection, or the claims of his bodily wants, he yields a certain relative precedence to them without reflection now, because on previous occasions he has decided deliberately to yield that relative precedence."\(^2\)

Bertrand Russell assumes, "men's impulses and desire may be divided in to those that are creative and those that are possessive. Some of our activities are directed to creating what would not otherwise exists, others towards acquiring or retraining what exists already." He proposes a selection of "the best life is that in which creative impulses play the largest part and possessive impulses the smallest."\(^3\)

Dr. Ambedkar rejects the proposition, for him "Every impulse if uninhibited, will lead some creative act. Whether the product will be appropriated or not is a matter wholly different from any act of impulse or instinct, it depends, I submit, upon the method of its production — whether individualistic or otherwise — and upon the nature of its use — whether communal or otherwise. No one sets up a right of appropriation neither to any thing that is produced by common efforts nor to anything that is of joint use. Of the former one may cite the game of communal hunt of the primitive folks. For an example of the later, the situation just as nobody will ever setup a right of exclusive ownership regarding public monuments . . ." It is just a question of production and use of the produced. It is not a matter of having a more or less of the impulses of creative or loss of the possessive. Russell's view is a socialistic more than classical. But to Dr. Ambedkar the question of making a distinction in the impulses of man, is not important but the creation should be as "Communal hunt" and possession as, "Joint use" . . . "Just as nobody will ever set up a right or exclusive ownership regarding public monument."\(^4\)

\(^1\)Alfred Marshall: *Principles of Economics*, Footnote, P. 17, 8\(^{th}\) Edn.
\(^2\) Marshall, : Ibid P. 17
\(^3\)Russell, quoted by Dr. Ambedkar, Vol. 1, P. 491
\(^4\)Ibid
to create and posses the means of ends, either by exchange or provision of assistance, by credit or by grants. Because 'Boulding also points out that economics is not merely a study of scarce means but also of human welfare, for welfare is an end itself.'1 The helpless situation of good government is there when, “In a society where classes clash and are charged with anti-social feeling and spirit of aggressiveness, the Government can hardly discharge its task of governing with justice and fair play.”2 Therefore the achievement of the ends is possible only when there will not be any class or caste consideration and if it is not extinguished completely, the economic social and political rights are protected on an independent line of laws. With that people may achieve only few ends, but ultimately man needs welfare and well-being through achievement of ends which is only possible in a plus condition of society governed by the law of the state.

5) A science of Welfare of Nations :

The concept of welfare has two aspects that are: social welfare and individual welfare, but the both are not in co-operation with each other though man lives in the society. The things or the acts which can constitute the sum total of the welfare of a man, need not comprise the sum total of a social welfare. And the necessities that makeup the some total of social welfare can necessarily not be supposed of the same value to an individual to increase his welfare. This is the traditional analysis of classical.

Dr. Ambedkar’s definition, because it is not only observes the behavior of man but, it is at an observation which is the natural course of action. Under the traditional analysis of classical, such proposition, which would be beneficial to the welfare of one aspect and non-beneficial to another, this is some what story damning the intelligence of man. Dr. Ambedkar’s definition presupposes that the way by which welfare of society can be brought up, must be the best way for an individual to accomplish his welfare too. There cannot be any contradiction. If the conspicuous intake of drugs is a liking of some individual with his pleasure of drowsiness, it is not the welfare of the man. It is only titillating intoxicative which

1. Mitra : Economics Micro and Macro, P. 2
2. Dr. Ambedkar, Vol. 4 P. 283,
make man an artificial provocation of satisfaction. It is only result of artificial intake and the intake is injurious to health is well known by the intaker. It may also become a matter of welfare when an addicted began to justify and control the intoxicative intake.

Even the taxpaying liability, though *prima fascia* seems to reduce the welfare of an individual. But the fact remained out of the consideration of the classical, that what these paid taxes are doing for him. A little tax can make his life of cities and metropolitans honored and secured, in absence of which it is uncanny for an individual if he would live in a wood and face the problems of roads, rains dark and dacoits animals and enemies. The sum total of tax paid constitutes a more welfare in comparison to the losses of money i.e. the loss by way of taxes.

The science which studies the intelligent efforts of man, to justify and control the force employed over the means to achieve the ends, it is purposeful, not only on the part of the science, but on the part of the course of function of a nation as well with an individual also. As 'means justifies ends' so the study of economics and course of economic activity of humanity must justify its destination, which is the welfare. The existence may be without it, but man, because more than an animal in the existence of life, is to conquer the existence of life. As Adam Smith seeks welfare of nation in their richness of gold and silver, as Marshall in man's accomplishment of economic gain and satisfaction, Recardian and Samuelsons' having care of distribution of the production among the society, thus aiming the economic welfare.

The Doctrine of Welfare:-

The concept of welfare is not new, it is used by various economists Dr. Marshall used it in more significant way and succeeding to extensive interpretation by Prof. Pigue. But Dr. Ambedkar pretends to imply it in a different way. Marshall wants to make welfare of man through his own earnings and expects under a wealth of private property for his wants. But Dr. Ambedkar is desirous to make welfare of people, Dr. Ambedkar expounds the essential quality of the science of economics, that not only refer to the optimal utility consumption but it also refers to the optimal conditioning to the life of people. Dr. Ambedkar's definition guides us to this optimal utility and conditioning on the both the side, individual as well as society. Justification and control maintains the force employed over the means. Thus we can have the best results of achieving our ends.
Adams Smith’s definition only inquires the nature and causes of wealth of nations, Marshall’s, Robbins’ only studies through human behavior passively, though desirous of human welfare. But Dr. Ambedkar by way of definition of economics exhibits the complex nature of the economic activity. It propounds the demonstration of using optimal utility and optimal conditioning to human life of a nation. Thus Dr. Ambedkar’s definition covers all the five divisions of economics, it teaches the optimal consumption, production, distribution and exchange, and also guides the state for its public finance and public expenditure. It not only exhibits the nature and courses of wealth, it not only studies human relationship between ends and scarce means, it not only controls the means of production but it justifies all economic components for the welfare of nations, i.e. the welfare of all the peoples of the nations.

The Doctrine of The legacy of Economy :

The Welfare of man and nation is above all and supreme. Mere achievements of ends are not enough, nor saving all the ends is important while achieving and end. The achievement of an end should be fruitful in to welfare, hence no wrong in destroying evil ends to accomplish the welfare, “The achievement of an end involves the destruction of many other ends which are integral with the one that is sought to be destroyed. Use of force must be, so regulated that it should save as many ends as possible in destroying the evil one.” Only by destructing evil ends the equilibrium of welfare can be maintained. This justification gives an occasion to the legacy of economy. Since as per Ambedkar’s view social welfare and individual welfare is not opposite of each other but they are supportive, hence destruction of the corresponding evil end is justifiable. But it is being both parts, individual and social, as a representative of the State. They are not only to destroy the evil ends but they are at obligation to support the common ends to save themselves.

The press of every nation reveals many such facts that prove the legacy of economy and it is to justifying the social welfare with the individual one. A man from Britain conducted brothel for his daughter’s higher education, and a man from Venezuela who kept his grandmother’s dead body inside fridge in his home only for the reason that he had no money to sustain the expenses of funeral rites. In both the cases there is a loss of individual as well as social welfare. If state as a representative of society is not at the obligation to support the desired common ends, the

(1Dr. Ambedkar Vol. 3,p.451)
society must sustain such practices of ills, the brothel and the foul environment even by good people. Constant practices of such odds are seen in every nation. This certainly demands the attention of society or state but not only up to the extend that the above both persons arrested due to public police reported for immoral and foul environment, but more also of the state's assistance in such public interested works. It is of justification and control that matters under the state policy, which directly increases social welfare and also individual welfare also. If would the justified proviso be there, neither the public had been there to report the matter to police nor, the individuals be arrested and nor would be there an environment of foul and brothel.

The classical fetched the distinction between social and individual welfare, this happened due to their artificially turning economics, the social science into its extreme exactness upon the ground of physical sciences. With this wrong presumption classical demarked tobacco a means to individual's welfare and society's anti welfare matter, forgetting that the Economic Laws are generalized laws which never can constitute the exactness of human feelings. Because any point of pleasure, feeling cannot last long to confirm his welfare. Man is lived by only average pleasure feelings. He cannot go extremely into the domain of feelings to have a pleasure because any kind of extreme extend must result in anti feelings and subject to the distraction of pleasure and happiness. The generalization of economic laws is it self an out come of the justification and control of force over the means employed to achieve the ends.

Dr. Ambedkar being a statesman while aiming the welfare of nation thought of this legacy of economy in the nation. The economic structure of the nation must be embodied within the legal structure of the country. The state must provide the legacy of economy. The operation of the resources and means can be justified and controlled by the principles incorporated in the political economy and ruled by the law. For him 'Principles are like intellectuals useful for justification', 'Rules are practical and habitual, pursues only course of action while principle remain silent, even do not prescribe the course of action', 'Principles stand by purposeful and desirous of consideration like a justice. Man must bear, some principle and act by the rules', I accepted under the wisdom of the principle, so as to justify and control the operation of force

1. Dr. Ambedkar Vol.3, P.75
over the means employed to achieve the ends'.

By way of principles and Rules Dr. Ambedkar proposes to restructure the economy of the nation. Legacy of economy is not to go abridged, "the privileges or immunities of citizens, nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty and property without due process of law."  

Dr. Ambedkar is emphatic on the legacy of economy, the main purpose behind this is, "to put and obligation on the state to plan the economic life of the people on the lives 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." Marx and Samuelson are very common to use the words like society or class and people, but they hardly explained about the complex structure of society. For Dr. Ambedkar " Every society left class to find its place vis a vis other classes, according to its importance in society, as may be determined by the forces operating from time to time. There was no official gradation fixed and permanent." But where such classes course into confrontation with each other with anti social feelings the prevailing government of that country can hardly discharge the qualities of a good government. The ruling, "Government even though it may in form be a government of the people. It will be a Government by class for a class".

In such a situation the welfare of a nation is ruined badly without any sympathy. In some degree of a low or high notion is made of classes on the various bases, legacy of economy protects every body's interest, in such a situation. In such a confrontation of classes clashes with each other like two different nations. Legacy of economy guarantees every person to pertain his economic and social welfare, by having a status of one man-one value. In the problems of class conflicts, to Dr. Ambedkar for the preservation of economic and social life of a nation, legacy of economy must be adopted in the light of the equation of: 'One man -One Value'. To him welfare of a man or welfare of a nation lays in the equation of, 'One man -One Value'. He is of the strong contention that without the adoption of this equation there cannot be a total welfare of
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man and society. For a complete welfare, the State should be able, "to remove social, political and economical inequalities." He looks a picture of total welfare of man and his nation. In his view the subjects of a state are," to be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodation, advantages, facilities: educational institutions, privileges of inns, rivers streams, wells, tanks, roads, paths, streets, public conveyance on land, air and water theaters and other places and public resorts or amusement except for such condition and limitations applicable alike to all subjects of every race, class, caste, color or creed." Dr. Ambedkar strongly believes that men clash not due to the possession of wealth, 'property may be aggressive but have compensating effects,' "the trouble therefore one might say, is not with property but with the unequal distribution of it." For him equal distribution of property lies in legacy of economy in terms of the key industries shall be run by the state and basic industries either by state or public undertaking corporations. Insurance should be a monopoly of the State and agriculture should be a State industry run by the collective farming.

Dr. Ambedkar's above propositions are based upon certain confirmation of the principles of political economy. He believes, "... The individual is an end in himself," because for him, 'ends and means are concomitants.' What ever may be the condition but for survival of man means is essential, whether it is to be in abundance or scarcity, but does it make any difference is a question? Dr. Ambedkar makes a difference he says, "Granting the fact of survival I mean to make a Statement yet more important. It is this; there are many modes of survival and not all are equally commendable. For instance, mobility to beat a timely retreat may allow weaker varieties of people to survive. So the capacity to grovel or lie low may equally as the power of rising to the occasion be the condition of the survival of a people. Consequently, it cannot be granted as is usually supposed that because a people have survived through ages that therefore they have been growing and improving through ages. Thus it is not survival, but the quality, the plane of survival that is important. It the Indian readers ... probe in to the quality of their survival.
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and not remain contented merely with having survived ... I feel confident that they will be convinced of the necessity of a revaluation of their values of life."1.

Thus how countrymen keep their values of life in existence constitute the operation of economic life. Not only that for a better life, revaluation of values is required, it is the natural need of economic law for the welfare of nations.

A mere political equality of voting power cannot secure life of a countryman. Even a beggar or helpless poor must have a room in a nation to survive and to develop the quality of his survival; the possibilities to increase his faculties' economic and social barriers should not be a cause of his victims. The oppressed and the poor class should have adequate provisions for their survival. They should be given representation in every sector of the nation. If a nation is of a poor countrymen it is better to have a centrally controlled economy for the nation, but still politicians adopt market economy, it should be treated a sacrifice of the poor people for the socialistic state, they deserve adequate provisions for their survival in absence of the socialistic state.

Market economy is a progressive form but needs enough and careful protection towards the interest of the backward classes labour class and poor people. In a centrally controlled economy of a socialistic state rich class is already protected by their big assets entrusted at the state, because they get a secured regular income from their assets. On the contrary poor labour class strive for their living needs, but at least it is assured up to a standard living. Whatever maybe the system but after all welfare of man and his nation is the ultimatum of it's political economy. It is this Legacy of Economy propounded by Dr. Ambedkar, which is an essence of economic life of man that only can constitute the economy and enforced through the constitution of a nation.
Analysis of  
Dr. Ambedkar’s Definition of Economics –

Dr. Ambedkar’s definition of economics has a distinct and special occasion. He expressed the substance of economics in his review written on the war book, ‘Principles of social Reconstruction’ by Mr. Bertrand Russell. The main subject of the book is ‘wealth’ and ‘war’. It was a fortunate event for the present generation that Dr. Ambedkar’s view regarding the subject matter of economics could happen to emerge as a critical reaction to the book of Mr. Russell.

The appropriation of Dr. Ambedkar’s views expressed over the war book, whether they are justifiable for the proposition to the interpretation made upon the subject matter of economics in the interest of research, is in fact can be made a matter of criticism by the readers. But in reality it is not important that on what subject Mr. Russell wrote his book, as a matter of philosophy. As a philosopher he had wide range to discourse with the world, therefore he wrote on the vital subject of ‘war and wealth’. The subject matter of the book is not important here. The important thing is that an economist as Dr. Ambedkar is reacting to the subject matter of the philosopher Mr. Russell, who may not be an economist. But Dr. Ambedkar has written critique upon the book, of course in his own language of economist and that is the most important aspects, other things are negligible.

Hence it can never be a matter of criticism, but it may perhaps need further research on this subject.

The defense that, without leaving the subject matter in to unanswerable and in void of question mark this definition can be accepted or might be regarded as if having a loose foundation though

(1Dr. Ambedkar Vol.1, P.487)
it is acceptable. Therefore without going into indulgence of rejection, it is better to have a critique of analysis of pros and cons of the definition of economics of Dr. Ambedkar.

In the foregoing study we have seen total eight definers with their definitions of economics for the reference of Dr. Ambedkar's definition. The most important thing is that among the eight definitions of: Ricardo bears a socialistic nature, while of Marx, is communistic definition, and rest of all other's bear capitalistic nature in their definition. Even Kautilliya's definition is of capitalistic nature. Dr. Ambedkar's definition is not merely observational to the behavior of man, but it points out the basic nature of his activity and expounds the natural way of maximization of his welfare.

Dr. Ambedkar's definition penetrates the minutes defined by the Robbins and Samuelson. Robbins believes, 'Scarcity of means and in between of the ends and means, economics studies human behavior.' To Samuelson, 'how man chooses to employ means of production, and distribution of the produced? Dr. Ambedkar without loosing both the propositions exhibits the vital core of both: Robbins and Samuelson's definitions. Robbins' observation of man, as a behavior between ends and means made economics a passive science and the man a helpless.

Dr. Ambedkar proposes that if a man choosing to particular means and a particular end is a matter of his intelligent choice and efforts. He is not a mere victim of the condition of means and ends he works with his intelligent efforts. Where for Robbins, 'it is human behavior between ends and means'. But for Samuelson, 'it is man's choice of employing means of production and distribution.' Dr. Ambedkar points out and exhibits the three essential factors in addition to the aspects denoted by Robbins and Samuelson that:

First, that it is not a choice, it is an intelligence of man working behind it, and,

Secondly, more than that the vital factor is that means or resources do not move themselves, but it is human intelligence which applies force over the means to meet the desired ends, and

Thirdly, Dr. Ambedkar brings out to our notice the key factor to meet the desired end that is justification and control of force. And in his equation every thing is done for the welfare interest of nations, and it is because 'Economics' is a social-welfare Science of humanity.
The Classical believed in individual's economic activity. But welfare of nations cannot afford complete liberty in the resources of means. Thus Individual welfare and social welfare constitute indifferent poses. It is very easy to use words like, 'society', 'class', 'groups' and 'nation' but it is very difficult to cite their complexities and problems arising out of them. The classical and the modern thinkers used the terms but rarely explained a proposition of remedial aspect in their definition. Dr. Ambedkar explained the matrix of its complex structure of society and classes also interpreted the problems arising out of them. Ruskin and Carlyle, 'abused' economics it was not due to the science is so, but at even their having been socialist they could not explain the corresponding drawbacks, perceived in the economics, interpreted by classical economist.

As Antoine said, economics a science of 'political economy', Smith, of wealth, and for Marshall, it is for welfare of man'. To Dr. Ambedkar it is for welfare of societies of nations, so as to mean the 'political economy'.

To Marx who believes economics is 'a study of social anatomy,' looses the essential force of society, which is primarily responsible for the evolution and development of society. Marx lays economics a 'study of social anatomy', but is it of a dead or of model-room anatomy. It looks more of the same than a study of live society though his doctrine is more aggressive even to a blood-revolution. It seems that, Dr. Ambedkar exhibited what Marx pretends to say regarding the 'study of social anatomy'. Dr. Ambedkar puts forth both mind and anatomy of live society.

Dr. Ambedkar's State socialism, which, summarized as 'Legacy of Economy,' is the vital point of justification for the classical and modern scholarship. It propounds to propose that key industries and basic industries with agriculture must be under State monopoly. Where classical, believe extinction of State monopoly and non-intervention of government in economic transactions. But it is to be noted that he proposes to take care of private incentives and keep open all the avenues for them. This seems to be too contradictory, being socialistic and still open to a room for capitalist. What ever it may be,
but in the light of Dr. Ambedkar's definition his basic proposition regarding the means operating under the force justified and controlled either by individual or State remains outstanding and worthy to follow.

**The Category of Dr. Ambedkar's Definition**

What can be the category of Dr. Ambedkar's definition? Is it 'Wealth', 'Welfare', 'Scarcity or 'growth' definition. To look this matter in a different way, the wealth definition can not be called a 'welfare' definition and a growth definition can not be a welfare definition so far as its contents and reference is concerned. Dr. Ambedkar's definition seems to be comprises of all the contents required to become a welfare definition, but this does not mean that contents of Dr. Ambedkar's definition comprise in the existing definitions. And this is enough to analyze it to be a distinct. His definition is not as Samuelson defined with taking considerations of the former economists.

The task of categorization of Dr. Ambedkar's definition rests upon us is true but since it's distinct nature does not permit us to put it in the existing categories. Hence it should be categorized into a different term and the term can be denoted as cosmic or universal definition. For this purpose we can probe in to his definition to realize the category of 'Universal Definition'.

The complexity of Dr. Ambedkar's definition is unspeakable in all its corresponding circuits to various aspects of economic and political life of man. He observes the means and ends in their original form but he knows the means are void of utilities if not operated with force and the force is also needed to be in a constructive form instead of destructive.

Dr. Ambedkar definition is not scanty of words or terminology, used to acclaim its content. It is not using words like distribution of means and commodities, production and money and exchange, i.e. these are words denoting the division of economics, used by Samuelson and formers. His definition is full of pure wisdom of cosmic interpretation of economic activity of human being. Dr. Ambedkar uses only few new words in his definition as:

'Justification and control, operation of force'. Because these words constitute, 'intellect', and also because he makes mention at various occasions regarding, intellectual class, and intellect, which exercises important impact on the people and government, hence the term
‘intelligent efforts’, is extended. And also he being a nationalist looking always the national interest in every activity with welfare of societies of the nations, therefore definition extended, for the welfare of nations.’ It implies no adverse meaning if the definition were kept barely as, the main clause of definition, “to justify and control the operation of force over the means employed to achieve the ends.” The extended clause for the welfare nations just exhibits the implied meaning of the definition. The explanation given by the Dr. Ambedkar while defining the substance of economics can be arranged into sequential off shoots. It can exhibit the essential nature of Dr. Ambedkar’s universal definition of economics. The words Dr. Ambedkar used in his definition are not new in a way but they referred a new meaning. The definition is autonomous to signify its own meaning. It can be nothing but of a cosmic nature in its meaning.

The Classical economics built economics on abstract ideas. Their apprehension was that slavery may result due to interference of government in economic field hence they proposed ‘Laissez faire’, but after rise of a strong capitalism, bad monopolistic tendencies crippled along with it, poverty among plenty was faced by the economic man the ‘Laissez faire’ gradually turned in to the ‘Statism’. Dr. Ambedkar as a developmental thinker proposed ‘Legacy of Economy’, i.e. that is to rest upon the State as an obligation.

The explanation of the terminology used in the definition of Dr. Ambedkar -
It is often happened with the terminology used to denote some thing, when sought the meaning of the them and after explanation the original meaning is lost. To avoid the same the meaning of the terminology is tried to seek in the terms of the definition autonomously as follows-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Terms</th>
<th>= Meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Intelligent efforts</td>
<td>= is intelligent ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Intelligent ends</td>
<td>= is justification and control of means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Justification and</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Control of means</td>
<td>= is the welfare of nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Welfare of nations</td>
<td>= is the achievement of ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Achievement of ends</td>
<td>= is employment of means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Employment of means</td>
<td>= is the operation of force (over the means)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Operation of force</td>
<td>= is intelligent efforts. (Over the means)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Analysis of -
The Definition of Dr. Ambedkar -

Dr. Ambedkar pays emphasis on the justification and control of force over the means employed to achieve the ends, this is quite critical for human being. Because man is not a machine neither universe, things happened at their distant alien factors giving effects to man and man remains helpless to control the force. More over man hardy behaves intellectually to words a fact of habitual movement in spite of having him intellect in routine course. He takes pains of intellect thinking at initial stage but latter on goes on mechanically under his habits.

The most important thing is that justification needs proper logics and analysis else it remains untouched or unjust justification. To justify means man must maintain the purity of his instruments of justification other wise every thing of justification and control go on towards obstruction and destruction. And to keep purity intact is impossible for man. Down the ages man did it try to pop up its purity under various social religious and psychological tactics but surprisingly the substance of purpose escaped from it, making things more worse. Dr. Ambedkar's definition fails to give proper means of justification. The above interpreted definition says intelligent effort and intelligent ends are justification and control of means these things are beyond human barriers.

For those who may object this ‘defined,’ definition of economics of Dr. Ambedkar, which is a preponderance of probability, cannot be resisted. Dr. Ambedkar had been to point out that, "It would be nothing but pedantry to say that a preponderance of probability is not a sufficient basis for a valid decision". On this defined definition of economics, presently researcher insists that if this is not to accept as final definition, then again insist upon their efforts to postulate the same in their own way and expects its revaluation on this postulated definition after testing my all-direct and indirect evidences, because “the case of notion of pollution is universal”. excepting own human intelligence, for if it got into it, it is of no more intellect.