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3.1 Introduction

The Indian Constitution was conceived and drafted in the mid-twentieth century when the concept of social welfare state was the rule of the day. The Constitution is thus pervaded with the modern outlook regarding the objectives and functions of the state. It embodies a distinct philosophy of government, and explicitly declares that India will be organized as a social welfare state, i.e., a state which renders social services to the people and promotes their general welfare. In the formulations and declarations of the social objectives contained in the Preamble, one can clearly discern the impact of the modern political philosophy, which regards the state as an organ to secure the good and welfare of the people.¹

This concept of a welfare state is further strengthened by the Directive Principles of State Policy, which set out the economic, social and political goals of the Indian Constitutional system. These directives confer certain non-justiciable rights on the people, and place the government under an obligation to achieve and maximize social welfare and basic social values like education, employment and health etc. The Constitution is thus an instrument to achieve the goal of economic democracy along with political and social democracy.²

² Ibid, pp.16 -17.
This aspect was also emphasized by Dr. Ambedkar in his concluding speech in the Constituent Assembly: “Political democracy cannot last unless there lies at the base of it, social democracy.”

India, being a welfare State, has taken upon itself the responsibilities of extending various benefits of Social Security and Social Assistance to its citizens. The social security legislations in India derive their strength and spirit from the Directive Principles of the State Policy as contained in the Constitution of India. Although the Constitution of India is yet to recognize Social Security as a fundamental right it does require that the State should strive to promote the welfare of the people by securing and protecting, as effectively as it may, a social order in which justice social, economic and political shall inform all the institutions of national life. Further the state shall in particular, strive to minimize the inequalities in income and endeavour to eliminate inequalities in status, facilities and opportunities amongst different categories of people.

The Directive Principles of State Policy in the Constitution of India (Part IV) mandates that it is the State’s responsibility to ensure a social order for the promotion of welfare of the people and securing adequate means of livelihood through the right to work; safeguard the health; and strength of workers; and ensure the provision of social assistance in certain cases such as unemployment, old age, sickness and

---

3 M.P. Jain, supra note 1, p.15.
5 Article 38, Constitution of India.
6 Ibid, Article 39 (a).
disablement. Provision of just and humane conditions of work and maternity relief is also within the ambit of the Directive Principles as is free and compulsory education.

3.2 Constitutional Philosophy and Social Security

The mark of all civilizations is the respect they accord to human dignity and freedom. Human development is a process of enhancing human capabilities – to expand choices and opportunities so that each person can lead a life of respect and value. The three essential capabilities for people are –

(i) to lead a long and healthy life (life expectancy at birth);
(ii) to be knowledgeable (educational attainment reflected in adult literacy which is reflected by the combined gross primary, secondary and tertiary enrolment ratio); and
(iii) to have access to resources needed for a decent standard of living. Human development is essential for realizing human rights, and human rights are essential for full human development. Human Rights and human development share a common vision and common purpose – to secure the freedom, well-being and dignity of all people everywhere. To secure: Freedom from discrimination – by gender, race ethnicity, national origin or religion; Freedom from want – to enjoy a decent standard of living; Freedom to develop and realize one’s human potential; Freedom from fear – to threats to personal security, from torture, arbitrary arrest and other violent acts; Freedom from injustice and violations of the rule of law; Freedom of thought and

---

7 Id., Article 41.
8 Id., Article 42.
speech and to participate in decision making and form associations; Freedom for
decent work – without exploitation.

A decent standard of living, adequate nutrition, health care, education, decent
work, and protection against calamities are not just development goals, they are also
human rights. Poverty eradication is only a development goal – it is a central
challenge to human rights. But the realm of human development extends further; they
include the following needed for being creative and productive and for enjoying self-
respect, empowerment and a sense of belonging to a community, i.e. security,
sustainability, and guaranteed human rights.\textsuperscript{10}

The term “social security” is all encompassing and has wide connotation. Its
dimensions are largely subjective, though in some cases objective criteria can be
defined. It includes:

(1) Alleviation of Poverty including Elimination of hunger and deprivation;
(2) Economic and Income Security;
(3) Food and Nutritional Security;
(4) Social equity including gender dimensions;
(5) Reaching the un reached;
(6) Empowerment of people at various levels including the individual and
Community, and elimination of voice less ness.\textsuperscript{11}

The Constitution of India, through the various articles of Fundamental Rights
and Directive Principles of State Policy, has provided for ‘social security’ both
directly and through implied provisions.

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid, p.2.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.
3.2.1 Preamble

The grand objectives and socio-economic goals to achieve, which the Indian Polity has been established, are stated in the Preamble. These are: to secure to all its citizens social, economic and political justice; liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship; equality of status and opportunity, and to promote among them fraternity so as to secure the dignity of the individual and the unity and integrity of the nation.\(^\text{12}\)

The Supreme Court has observed in *Samatha v. State of Andhra Pradesh*,\(^\text{13}\) "The Constitution envisions to establish an egalitarian social order rendering to every citizen, social, economic and political justice in a social and economic democracy of the Bharat Republic". The Constitution thus ensures economic democracy along with political democracy.

The goals and objectives of the Indian Polity as stated in the Preamble are sought to be further clarified strengthened and concretised through the Directive Principles of State Policy. Therefore it is essential that the Preamble be read along with the Directive Principles, which lay down certain goals for the government to achieve so as to maximize social welfare to the people.\(^\text{14}\) The Directive Principles have been used as interpretative tools in the interpretation of various fundamentals rights by the Supreme Court and they have been given expansive meaning.

\(^{13}\) AIR 1997 SC at 3326.
\(^{14}\) See Chapter XXXIV M.P. Jain, *supra* note 1, p.1595.
3.2.2 Fundamental Rights

(1) Right to life

The Constitution of India provides that ‘No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law’. The Supreme Court has interpreted the expression ‘life’, in Art.21, rather liberally and broadly. Over time, the Court has been giving an expansive interpretation to ‘life’. The Court has often quoted the following observation of Field, J.; in *Munn v. Illinois*, 16 “by the term ‘life’ as here used something more is meant to mere animal existence. The inhibition against its deprivation extends to all those limbs and faculties by which life is enjoyed. The provision equally prohibits the mutilation of the body by the amputation of an arm or leg...”. Similarly in *Fracis Coralie v. Delhi* Bhagwati, J., has observed, “we think that the right to life includes the right to live with human dignity and all that goes along with it, namely, the bare necessaries of life such as adequate nutrition, clothing and shelter over the head and facilities for reading, writing and expressing oneself in diverse forms, freely moving about and mixing and commingling with fellow human beings”. Thus, the inhibition against deprivation of ‘life’ would extend to all those faculties by which life is enjoyed. The essence of social security can be seen in the mature words of the Apex Court.

Again in *Shantisar Builders v. Narayanan Khimalal Totame*, 18 the Supreme Court has observed: “The right to life under Art.21 would include the right of food, clothing, decent environment and reasonable accommodation to live in.

---

15 See Chapter XXVI on Article 21 M.P. Jain, supra note 1, p.1259.
16 94 U.S.113 (1877).
17 AIR 1981 SC 746, 753.
18 AIR 1990 SC 630.
The difference between the need of an animal and a human being for shelter
has to be kept in view. For the animal, it is the bare protection of the body, for a
human being, it has to be suitable accommodation which allows him to grow in all
aspects—physical, mental and intellectual”.

From non-deprivation of life to its preservation, from negative to positive
content, Art. 21 has been fundamentally transformed as a result of judicial creativity.
During the last fifty years, Art. 21 has had quite an eventful journey. A most
remarkable feature of expansion of Art. 21 has been that many of the non-justiciable
Directive Principles have been converted into enforceable Fundamental Rights by
the magical wand of judicial creativity. In the process of expanding the ambit of
Art. 21, the Supreme Court has integrated many Directive Principles with Art. 21.
The result of this judicial activism has been that not only many Directive Principles
have been activated but also many new Fundamental Rights have been implied by
the Supreme Court from Art. 21.19

Another broad formulation of the theme of life with dignity is to be found in
Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India,20 characterizing Art. 21 as the heart of
fundamental rights, the Court reiterated that “to live with human dignity, free from
exploitation.

It includes protection of health and strength of workers, men and women and
of the tender age of the children against abuse, opportunities and facilities for children
to develop in a healthy manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity, educational
facilities, just and human conditions of work and maternity relief. These are the

19 M.P. Jain, supra note 1, p. 1310.
20 AIR 1984 SC 802.
minimum conditions, which must exist in order to enable a person to live with human dignity. No government can take any action to deprive a person of the enjoyment of these basic rights".

In *Chameli Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh*, the Supreme Court while dealing with Art.21 has held that the need for a decent and civilized life includes the right to food, water and decent environment. The Court has observed in this connection: "In any organized society, right to live as a human being is not ensured by meeting only the animal needs of man. It is secured only when he is assured of all facilities to develop himself and is freed from restrictions, which inhibit his growth. All human rights designed to achieve this object. Right to live guarantee in any civilized society implies the right to food, water, decent environment, education, medical care and shelter. These are basic human rights known to any civilized society".

Again in *CERC v. Union of India*, The Supreme Court has observed: "The right to life with human dignity encompasses within its fold, some of the finer facets of human civilization which makes life worth living.

The expanded connotation of life would mean the tradition and cultural heritage of the persons concerned. Thus, the Supreme Court has introduced a qualitative concept into Art.21. Whatever promotes quality of life falls within the parameters of Art. 21. The right to life connotes not merely animal existence but includes finer graces of human dignity, culture and civilization. A provision for social

---

21 AIR 1996 SC 1051.
22 Ibid, at 1053.
security is similarly meant to ensure human dignity and can be considered to be implicit in Art. 21

(2) **Right to Livelihood**

Conceptually, livelihoods connote the activities, entitlements and assets by which people make a living. Assets are not only natural/biological *i.e.*, land, water, common property resources, flora and fauna but also social and political *i.e.*, community, family, social networks, participation, empowerment, human knowledge and creation of skills and physical material infrastructure.

In *Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corp.*, the Supreme Court has observed, "the question which we have to consider is whether the right to life includes the right to livelihood. We see only one answer to that question, namely, that it does. The sweep of the right to life conferred by Art. 21 is wide and far-reaching. An important facet of that right is the right to livelihood because, no person can live without the means of living, that is, the means of livelihood".

If the right to livelihood is not treated as a part and parcel of the constitutional right to life, the easiest way of depriving a person of his right to life would be to deprive him of his means of livelihood to the point of abrogation.

The Court has observed on this point: Deprivation of livelihood would not only denude the life of its effective content and meaningfulness but it would make life impossible to live. And yet such deprivation of life would not be in accordance with the procedure established by law, if the right to livelihood is not regarded as a part of the right to life.

---

24 AIR 1986 SC 180.
Emphasizing upon the close relationship between ‘life’ and ‘livelihood’, the Court stated: “that which alone makes it possible to live”, leave aside what makes life livable, must be deemed to be an integral component of the right to life.

Referring to the Directive Principles of State Policy, e.g. Arts 39(a), 37, 41, the Court has pointed out that, if these Directive Principles obligate the State to secure to the citizens an adequate means of livelihood and the right to work, “it would be sheer pedantry to exclude the right to livelihood from the content of the right to life. Thus, right to livelihood is accorded the status of fundamental right.

In D.T.C. v. D.T.C. Mazdoor Congress, the Court has observed, “the right to life includes right to livelihood. The right to livelihood therefore cannot hang on to fancies of individuals in authority. The employment is not a bounty from them nor can its survival beat their mercy.

Income is the foundation of many fundamental rights and when work is the sole source of income, the right to work becomes as much fundamental.

By reading Art.21, along with the Preamble to the Constitution and Directive Principles, the Supreme Court has ruled that social justice; right to economic justice, right to economic equality, and economic empowerment of the weaker sections of the society constitute Fundamental Rights. The aim of social justice is to attain substantial degree of social, economic and political equality. Social justice and equality are complementary to each other.

The march of Art.21 still continues. The frontiers of Art.21 are still expanding and the courts are still exploring its new dimension.

(3) Right to food:

The right to food has not been guaranteed as fundamental right but the right to life under Article 21 of the Constitution of India has been interpreted as including the right to food. In *People's Union of Civil Liberties (PUCL), v. Union of India*[^26] the Supreme Court of India said: “in our opinion, what is of utmost importance is to see that food is provided to the aged, infirm, disabled, destitute women, destitute men who are in danger of starvation, pregnant and lactating women and destitute children, especially in cases where they or members of their family do not have sufficient funds to provide food for them”.

The Right to Food is linked to several—if not all—other human rights, namely right to life, right to health, right to livelihood, freedom of association, expression and information, right to private property, and right to education.[^27] More recent developments establish its links with right to water.[^28]

Acknowledging the interrelations between right to life and other rights, in the first ever case on Right to Food, *Kishen Pattnayak & another v. State of Orissa,*[^29] the Supreme Court affirmed the individual’s Right to Food as a necessary corollary of the fundamental Right to life guaranteed under Article 21 and thus, acknowledged the close nexus between the right to life and the Right to Food. Further, the Right to Food may be seen in conjunction with the right to assemble which enables people to participate in shaping policies and obligations designed to protect themselves from the

[^26]: AIR 1997 SC 568.
[^29]: AIR 1989 SC 677.
ravages of hunger and starvation. Also through such public action inappropriate policies and inadequate actions could be challenged and criticized which would consequently ensure more responsive and accountable government.

Hunger is such a gross violation of human right that “To die of hunger is equivalent to being murdered, while chronic and serious under nourishment and persistent hunger are a violation of the fundamental right to life”. Every human being has a right to be free from hunger and to have access to safe and nutritious food. As a matter of law, the Right to Food has, at least in formal terms, been accorded universal recognition as a human right.

It is articulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (hereafter UDHR), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (hereafter ICESCR), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (hereafter CRC), and several other international instruments. States and the governments that are parties to these instruments have obligations and commitments to assure the realization of the right. Under the Rome Declaration of World Food Security 1996, the Heads of the States reaffirmed the right of everyone to have access to safe and nutritious food, consistent with the right to adequate food and the fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger.
Being a signatory of these instruments India is bound both by the provisions and the corresponding obligations arising under the Covenants.  

(4) Right to Work

Employment is a human right, an entitlement that is in tune with the dignity and worth of human personality. Work is essential for so many reasons: for economic reasons; for personal reasons; for dignity; for income; for social integration.

The United Nations Hot Springs Conference, as far back as 1943, proclaimed: “The first cause of hunger and malnutrition is poverty; and the first cause of poverty is lack of work”. Hence the statement of Mahatma Gandhi is pertinent in this regard, who said; “To the poor and hungry, God is bread and appears in the promise of work.” No discussion on livelihood opportunities will, therefore, be complete without an analysis of productive employment opportunities. The problem of eliminating hunger, reducing poverty, enhancing livelihood opportunities and improving the quality of life requires the understanding, inventiveness, and interaction of farmers, industrialists, agricultural scientists, educators, environmentalists, health care workers, and policy makers, who share a commitment to development and change.

(5) Right to work as a Fundamental Right

The National Commission has proposed a constitutional obligation on the State to provide to the citizens “Rural Wage Labour” as a means of livelihood for a minimum of 80 days in a year as a Fundamental Right and has proposed the introduction of a new Article 21B, in the Constitution.

33 Article 26 Pacta Sunt Servanda (Every treaty in force is binding upon the parties to it and must be performed in good faith) UN Convention on Law of Treaties, 1969 Vienna.
34 Constitutional Review Commission, supra note 9, p. 42.
In regard to the provision of employment and social security, the most significant provision of the Constitution of India is Article 41 which obligates the state to make within the limits of its economic capacity and development, make effective provision for securing the right to work, to education and public assistance in cases of unemployment, old age and sickness and disablement, and in other cases of undeserved want".

Despite the commitment of the State to develop it into a Welfare State, this concern was not reflected in the plan strategies during the first, Second and Third Five Year Plans, when employment *per se* did not receive much attention. ‘Right to Work’ caught the imagination of the national government only in 1988 when it proposed to make ‘right to work’ a fundamental right.

A national debate on ‘right to work’ was set and consummated at the meeting of the National Development Council (NDC) at the national capital which was attended by all the Chief Ministers (and Governors) of the country. The NDC discussed the proposal to make the ‘the right to work’ a Fundamental Right.35

A natural extension of the Right to Food is “the right to work” which provides the best protection against hunger and poverty.36 The human right to food does not require that everybody shall produce their own food.

The Right to Food requires an access to food in a dignified manner.37 Access to gainful employment will generally be a condition precedent to enabling individuals to command access to food they require.38

---

35 National Development Council (NDC) on 11th October 1990, in Delhi.
The States must pro-active engage in activities intended to strengthen people’s access to and utilization of resources and means to ensure their livelihood. Consequently the Right to Food is not only a question of production but economic accessibility is also one of its key components.

3.2.3 Directive Principles of State Policy

Various provisions of Part IV of the Indian Constitution, which provide for directive principles, have direct bearing on social security measures and legislation. They impose obligation on the state to take positive measures to secure welfare of the people.

Thus, “the state shall, in particular strive to minimize the inequalities in income and endeavour to eliminate inequalities of state’s facilities and opportunities, not only among individuals but also among people residing in different areas or engaged in different vocation”.39

Article 39 (e): provides “the state shall in particular direct its policy towards securing that the heath and strength of workers, men and women, and the tender age of children are not abused and that citizens are not forced by economic necessity to enter avocations unsuited to their age and strength”. For the protection of children Article 39 (f) provides: “the state shall, in particular direct its policy towards securing that children are given opportunities and facilities to developed in a healthy manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity and that childhood and youth are protected

---

39 Article 38 (2) of the Indian Constitution.
against exploitation and against moral and material abandonment”. More specifically, Article 41 provides: “the state shall within the limits of its economic activity and development, make effective provisions for securing the right to work, to education and to public assistance in cases of unemployment, old age, sickness and disablement and in other cases of undeserved want” the state has to make provision for securing just and human conditions of work and for their maternity relief”.

Further, “that the state shall strive to secure living wage, a decent standard of life and full employment of leisure and social and cultural opportunities to all the workers, agricultural or otherwise”. And Article 47: “imposes a duty on the state to raise the level of nutrition and the standard of living and to improve public health”.

The directive principles referred above are intended to secure, besides social security measures, a new social order in which the citizens should be assured socio-economic justice. In fact, these Articles ensure social security, notwithstanding the fact that the most Articles mix social security with a more broad objective, i.e., public welfare. To implement the ideals in the Directive Principles of State Policy both the Central as well as State Governments are empowered to enact legislation on ‘labour’ as embodied in List III (the concurrent list) of Seventh Schedule of Indian Constitution. Entry 23 of this list deals with “Social Security and Insurance”, employment and unemployment.

Today we are living in an era of welfare state, which seeks to promote the prosperity and well being of the people. The Directive Principles strengthen and promote this concept by seeking to lay down some socio-economic goals, which the

40 Id., Article 42.
41 Id., Article 43.
various governments in India have to strive to achieve. These principles have been characterized as ‘basic to our social order’ as they seek to build a social justice society. In *Minerva Mills Ltd. v. United of India*, the Supreme Court considered the meaning of “socialism” as to crystallize a socialistic state securing to its people socio-economic justice by interplay of the Fundamental Rights and the Directive Principles. In *G. B. Pant University of Agriculture of Technology v. State of Uttar Pradesh*, the Supreme Court has stated that democratic socialism achieve socio-economic revolution to end poverty, ignorance, disease and inequality of opportunity.

The basic framework of socialism provides a decent standard of life to the working people. Further, in, *State of Karnataka v. Ranganatha Reddy*, the Supreme Court has stated that the aim of socialism is the distribution of the material resources of the community in such a way as to subserve the common good.

In *Sanjeev Coke Mfg. Co. Bharath Coal Ltd.*, the Supreme Court has held that the broad egalitarian principle is implicit in every Directive Principle. The law ought to be designed so as to promote broader egalitarian social goals to do economic justice for all. Again in *Air India Statutory Corporation v. United Labour Union*, in course of time, the Courts have raised social and economic justice to the high level of a Fundamental Right. In *LIC of India v. Consumer Education and Research Center*, the Supreme Court held, that in short, all state action should be such as to make socio-economic democracy with liberty, equality and fraternity a reality to all the people.

---

42 AIR 1980 SC 1789.
43 AIR 2000 SC 2695.
45 AIR 1983 SC 239.
46 AIR 1997 SC 645 at 667.
47 AIR 1995 SC 811.
through democratic socialism under the rule of law. Right to Social and economic justice has now been held to be a Fundamental Right.

In *Dalmia Cement (Bharat) Ltd. v. Union of India*,$^{48}$ the Supreme Court has emphasized that the core of the commitment of the Constitution to the social revolution through rule of law lies in effectuation of the Fundamental Rights and directive principles as supplementary and complementary to each other. The Preamble to the Constitution, Fundamental Right and Directive Principles—the trinity—are the conscience of the Constitution.

Chandrachud, C.J., in *Minerva Mills*,$^{49}$ said that the Fundamental Rights “are not an end in themselves but are the means to an end”. The end is specified in the Directive Principles. It was further observed in the same case that the Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles together “constitute the core of commitment to social revolution and they, together, are the conscience of the Constitution”.

The Indian Constitution is founded on the bedrock of “the balance” between the two. “to give absolute primacy to one over the other is to disturb the harmony of the Constitution. This harmony and balance between Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles is an essential feature of the basic structure of the Constitution”.$^{50}$

### 3.3 Social Security: A Fundamental Right

The provisions that define Fundamental Rights and formulate the Directive Principles of State Policy (and Governance) leave no doubt about the concern and commitment of the Constitution to the right of citizens to enjoy social security: that

---

$^{48}$ 1996 19 SCC 104.
$^{49}$ AIR 1980 SC 1789.
$^{50}$ Ibid, pp 1806-1807.
the security that is envisaged is not only against aggression and violation of sovereignty by other countries, but also security against deprivation. The concept of social security and the commitment to social security are thus well established under the Constitution.

The judgments of the Supreme Court clearly declare that the right to life includes the right to livelihood should remove any doubt about the commitment to social security. The right to livelihood includes the right to work, and the right to education that equips us with the skills that we need for employment as well as the ability to fulfill one's civic and social responsibilities.

There are international and inter Governmental declarations like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Covenant on Social Economic and Cultural Rights which define social security as a human right or a fundamental right of the human being. Our Government is a signatory to many of these Conventions or Declarations.

Because a country's constitution is its supreme law, the recognition of the right to social security in the constitution of a country will usually mean that the right enjoys a greater level of protection than if it were simply incorporated in ordinary legislation.

Already many countries have express provisions in their Constitutions relating to social security as fundamental right, for example: Italy (art. 38), Portugal (art. 63), Spain (arts. 41 and 50), the Netherlands (art. 20), Ireland (art. 45), Islamic Republic of Iran (art. 29), Hungary (art. 70E), Japan (art. 25), India (arts. 38, 39 and 47), South Africa (art. 27), Ghana (art 36), Chile (art. 19[18]), and Columbia (arts. 46 and 48).
India also a similar provision can be inserted in the Constitution making the social security as a fundamental right.

3.4 Conclusion

The Constitution of India was drafted to uphold and paraphrase the ideals that inspired the struggle for freedom. The paramount and declared goal of the struggle was not mere independence from imperialist rule but the achievement of human freedom in all its majesty. This meant evolving and protecting a social and political order that guaranteed freedom. It also meant creating the material conditions (including the material requisites) that the citizen needed to enjoy the richness of freedom. Those who drafted the Constitution were aware of their duty to reaffirm the ideals in terms of rights and duties, and the need to match ends and means, goals and resources, and to provide practical guidelines for graded progress towards ideals were imperative and unabandonable.

The Fundamental Rights in the Indian Constitution guaranteed to every citizen include the right to life, and as the Supreme Court has pointed out, the right to livelihood is inherent in the right to life. The ultimate object of social security is to ensure that every one has the means of livelihood, food, shelter, health, and care. It follows, therefore, that the right to social security is also inherent in the right to life without which a dignified life is impossible. India is constitutionally a socialist state and the principal aim of socialism is to eliminate inequality of income and status and to provide a decent standard of living to the people. Thus, commitment to provide social security to the needy is inherent in the Indian Constitution, deservedly claiming the status of fundamental right.