CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSIONS & FINDINGS

One of major concerns of this thesis is to engage with the broad theoretical suppositions regarding socio-economic development and their relationship with today’s economic scenario and, more particularly, with respect to relevancy of these thoughts on justified grounds. For this reason, literature that deals with theoretical debates on thoughts of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar has been the main focus in this work. To understand the social and economic perspective as a important destination to reach the growth and development of the nation, the thesis argues, the researcher needs to look in to one of the best articulations of this dimension; and this articulation is found in the work of B.R. Ambedkar.

Ambedkar was a practical person. Though, he came from an academic background, with a certain expertise in Economics and the British Constitution, Ambedkar did not engage in abstract theoretical writing in relation to politics. In this sense, he is not a systemic writer. His ideas regarding politics and political values are scattered in various writings. Mostly, these writings engage in concrete, contemporary issues of prime importance in his day. Therefore, all published writings and speeches of Ambedkar have been referred to. This would include his debates in the constituent assembly. And to understand Ambedkar himself, additional secondary literature on Ambedkar has been referred to, though selectively. Since this is a work which attempts to locate Ambedkar’s work within the broad theoretical debates related to Social, Economic, Culture, Minorities, Justice and Rights, these debates have been discussed and a sound background reading of these debates has gone into the work. References to these works have been given only when it was considered necessary.
Apart from this, works related to modern Indian history, particularly works related to the thoughts of Ambedkar and examined its relevancy in this competitive have also be considered. Last, but equally importantly, a background reading of sociological and anthropological works related to Dalits and Dalit situation has been an important part of this work.

Following hypotheses were framed and tested through the secondary data sources from National & International Journals, Books authored by Dr. B. R. Ambedkar and other Eminent writers and critics.

$H_01$: An analysis of the economic conditions prevailing in our country has a relevancy in lieu of the Ambedkar’s thoughts on economic spectrum.

From the findings and the results of previous studies on Ambedkar’s thoughts and views it has been argued that Ambedkar emphasised on the nationalisation of economy. He was of the view that state should manage the economy that the production might reach the optimum level and the benefits must not be taken away by the capitalist. The benefits must be distributed equally. He stood for the progressive transformation of society, removing glaring social and economic inequalities that were due to the capitalist system. B.R. Ambedkar was a firm believer of socialism. According to him, “state socialism is essential; for India’s industrialisation. Private economy cannot do so and if it makes an attempt it would give way to economic disparities, as it can be visualised in the case of Europe. His view on nationalisation of industries and life insurance showed his great concern for the economic problems faced by India. The formation of the public sector and the establishment of Life Insurance Corporation showed that he was in agreement with other leading economists. He remarked that industrialisation of India was a necessary thing. But side by side the principle of state management and state ownership of industry must
be adopted. Amenities like social insurance and control over employment, dismissal were vital to the progress of industry. About these measures the lower middle class must be protected. He firmly believed that by eliminating exploitation, the industrial harmony can be established through labour welfare and congenial industrial relation. He remarked “we have attained political freedom and equality but without economic and social equality this is quite insufficient”. Ambedkar emphasised more on economic and social freedom and equality. His concept of society and socialism aimed for the welfare of the poor classes, ending inequality based on birth eliminating discriminatory practises in social behaviour patterns reorganising the political economy for the benefit of all maintaining full employment and education, providing social security for the weak and the sick. Further this study has found that the economic thoughts propounded by him is still considered today by the political leaders while framing the economic policies, rules and provisions.

The hypothesis ‘an analysis of the economic conditions prevailing in our country has a relevancy in lieu of the Ambedkar’s thoughts on economic spectrum’ is accepted and found relevant and gained momentum in this competitive environment.

H02: There is a significant impact of Ambedkar’s foresighted vision on the economy of today.

Today economy is affected by the vision of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar and his thoughts can be seen in the minds of the leaders which led their country towards the path of progress and development. As Dr. Ambedkar was an economist by his basic training. His career was characterized by two distinct phases: the first one up to 1921 as a professional economist contributing scholarly books and the second one as a political
leader thereafter until his demise in 1956, during which he made path breaking contributions as a champion of human rights for the untouchables.

According to Ambedkar the caste system in India was a major obstacle to economic growth and development. The caste system didn’t allow people to teach their professional skills to any person belonging to other caste. Only the members of their own caste were allowed to learn the profession. Thus if a person had the skill necessary for a particular job he would not accept the profession of a caste lower than his own. In a dynamic industrial set up the individual must be free to choose his occupation. But due to social religious restriction on inter occupational mobility has following consequences: Firstly, by not permitting readjustment of occupation, caste become a direct cause of much of the unemployment in various groups, as a religious Hindu would prefer to be unemployed rather than getting employed in profession not assigned to his caste. Second, individual justice and economic efficiency demand that competition exists in factor market. Due to the restriction on inter-occupational mobility of labour, capital and entrepreneurship across caste groups the caste system creates segregation in each of these markets. Labour and capital thus does not flow from one occupation to another even if the wage rate or rates of return on investments are higher in the alternative occupations. This brings about a high level of inefficiency in resource allocation.

H₀₃: Changes in the development of Nation are positively correlated with the Ambedkar’s economic policies.

This hypothesis found that the changes in the development is positively correlated with the economic policies of Ambedkar. He was one of the greatest leaders of modern India. He was an eminent scholar and a brilliant intellectual. He was a great
humanist and a revolutionary. Although he is merely known as the greatest saviour of the suppressed community but his greatness goes far beyond this fact. He was not only concerned with grievances the untouchables, the most vulnerable community of the world, but he touched every aspect of human life viz. social, political, cultural, anthropological, religious, historical, gender etc. Of course, there is no other person in India who can have an analogy with Dr. Ambedkar in terms of knowledge with humanistic thoughts. Really, he was an ocean of knowledge on different faculties. In spite of this fact, it is unfortunate that very few people in India have come to know about Dr. Ambedkar's philosophy and the endeavor he did for the elevation of humanity. If he is described in one word, it would be humanist and if in two words then he, definitely must be known as social humanist.

As he was on the greatest social humanist of the world, it is therefore natural that he should have adopted such a political that could be conducive to the people who have been with no fundamental rights and lived a life worse than the beasts. In a completely undemocratic society i.e. the Hindu society, he could not serve his purpose of elevating the lower castes of India. And of course, in order to make his dream true - to bring the untouchables and other lower castes at par with other sections of society, he adopted the democratic political system.

The genesis of Democracy in the world Democracy is a form of government in which a substantial proportion of citizenry directly or indirectly participates in ruling the state. It is thus distinct form of government controlled by a particular social class or group or by a single person. In a direct democracy citizens vote on laws in an assembly, as they did ancient Greek city states and do today in New England towns. In an indirect democracy citizens elect officials to represent them in Government; representation is typical in most modern democracies. Today the essential features of
democracy as understood in the western world, are the citizens be sufficiently free in speech and assembly, for example to form competing political parties in regularly held elections.

The study further discusses that the first democratic form of Government developed in the Greek city states during the sixth century B.C. Aristotle's constitution of Athens shows that in Athens all citizens rich and poor, participated fully in governments; miners, women, slaves and foreigners however perhaps ninety percent of the population were not citizens. Greek democratic Institutions were collapsed under the imperial onslaught first of Macedonia and later Rome. Republican Rome had popular assemblies (comitia), in which the citizens met to elect officials and make laws. The comitia last their power, however, first to the aristocratic senate and ultimately to the Roman Emperors. Democratic ideas did not reappear on a significant scale until the 17th century.

The Barbarian invasions and the fall of Rome in the 5th century A.D. produced a European society that was primarily concerned with security rather than democratic institutions. This gave rise to the rigidly hierarchical system feudalism and monorialism. Political attitude were moreover shaped by the powerful Christian church, which taught, in effect, that existing institutions had divine sanction. Nonetheless, the middle ages saw the establishment of rudimentary representative bodies for the development of democratic institutions. The medieval kings claimed divine authority to rule, but they relied on their principal baronial vassals for practical advice, rendered in council. Gradually the councils claimed more than advisory powers, and their membership was expanded to include elected representatives from the knightly and burgher classes. This was the genesis of the modern India.
Dr. Ambedkar discussing about the essential conditions precedent for the successful working of democracy he argued that –Essential conditions precedent for successful working of democracy As we know that the government who in power goes after every five years to the people to ask whether those who have been in power are well qualified to be entrusted with power and authority to look after their interests, to mould their destiny and to defend them. But Dr. Ambedkar is not satisfied with this long duration to check the loyalty of government to the people and nation rather he is of the view that there should be a veto to raise the question policies and working pattern of the government.

He says," Democracy requires that not only the Government should be subject to the veto- long term of five years - at the hands of people, but there must be an immediate veto in the parliament; immediately ready there and then to challenge the Government." Further making his view more clear he advocates that if the Government is not concerning with the cause of people and nation the opposition should challenge the authority of Government. Dr. Ambedkar stood firmly for a strong opposition and considered it as a precedent for democracy. But if we retrospect the Indian scenario, there has never been an opposition since the independence.

Today there is an opposition but it is not as effective as it must be. It is because both the Government and opposition are travelling on the same track i.e. both are performing in the same manner. There has no left morality to raise the finger at other because all the political parties taking full bath in pond of corruption, bribery, nepotism, casteism and immorality. Therefore, the opposition in spite of adequate number in the house has been ineffective to harm the Government. The one political parties leave no stone unturned when at the wrong activities of the Government and raise the related issues both outside and inside the house but when these parties
capture the power repeat the same with full of their potential. Another condition that he told precedent for the success of democracy is the equality before in law and administration. Moving our eyes Indian social and political arena, we find that in spite of a strong constitutional guarantee before law and in administration, caste, political party, religion and ideology playing their role everywhere. The political parties and leaders are interfering in the matters of administration, moulding the destiny of administration in favor of their caste or party fellows.

The political parties and leaders have been using the administrative power for their own causes and making the money from every opportunity they get. Caste, religion and creed are still being observed in administration. It is personally observed many offices and found portraits, Paintings, statues and hymns/ shlokas from a particular religion. Besides, the festivals and other parallel activities of a particular religion are often being observed to have celebrated in the government offices and educational institutions. This cannot be the sign of impartial administration. In a democratic state there should be a free and fair administration. The ministers and legislators do not hesitate even to say that they will take care the matters of those who have given vote to them. It has become a common phenomenon that when one party government goes and other party grab power, it change all the previously existing staff that does not suit to their interests and appoint all new office bearers who can strive for completing their order without making comments or hurdles or right or wrong. One of the most important condition precedents for the successful democracy.

According to him, is the observance of constitutional morality. The democracy pleads for the removal of hereditary ruler or monarch. But what is happening in our country all are acquainted with it. The hereditary system of ruling is being observed in all the political parties. The leaders of many political parties have been sticking to the seats
and not only this but they are taking their sons, wives and other relatives in politics and presenting them as their predecessors and the people are accepting them. The leaders do not want to quit from the politics even they are not able to walk and talk.

In our country, an huge army of sadhus, Swamies, Yogies, Bapus, Mahatmas and Yogies are preaching about renunciation, devotion, human service, abstention and morality but not a small impact of this is seen nowhere. As the preachers increase, the volume of corruption, immorality, black marketing also increase. Even the so called Sadhus and Mahatmas do not spare of such charges. If these religious men are not free from greed and lust how can they establish morality in the society and politics. Our leaders are showing no concern to the causes of people but running after money and power for them and their family. Ours is said is a religious country but if we compare our leaders to the leaders of other countries, we find a great difference.

Dr. Ambedkar, citing the example of George Washington, the president of America proved that how constitutional morality works. Washington was like God to the American people and became the first of America after the constitution was drafted. Washington refused to be elected again and said to his people, "My dear people, you have forgotten the purpose for which we have made our constitution. We made this because we did not want a hereditary monarchy and we did not want a hereditary ruler or dictator. ...If you stick to worship me year after year and term after term what happen to your principles? Can you say that you have rightly rebelled against the authority of the English King when you are substituting me in this place?" Washington due to the loyalty and fidelity stood second time and when the people third time approached him he spurned them away. He said that the principle not to have hereditary rule. You should not fall to prey. But in the Indian scenario, what it is found that our leaders do not want to quit even unto their death. The Goons, criminals
are observed enjoying the power with the leaders and ministers and some of our leaders and ministers are themselves come from criminal background with many cognizable offences. This can be justified with the data available about the members of Parliament elected in the 2004 and 2009 parliamentary elections.

Dr. Ambedkar among the enumerated essential conditions required for the successful working of political democracy, more importantly emphasized on economic and social democracy without which political democracy would be in jeopardy. Unfortunately, even after the six decade of independence, the Indian society as well as political democracy has been unable to generate the ideal conditions essential for the smooth functioning of democracy as per Dr. Ambedkar's perspective.

The social effort of Dr. Ambedkar. A distinctive feature of Dr. Ambedkar's scholarly contribution is his perceptive analysis of economic dimension of social maladies, such as, the caste system and untouchability. While Gandhi had defended the caste system on the basis of division of labor, Dr. Ambedkar came out with a hard-hitting critique in his book ‘Annihilation of Castes’ (1936), pointing out that what was implicit in the caste system was not merely division of labor but also a division of labors. Dr. Ambedkar's attack on the caste system was not merely aimed at challenging the hegemony of the upper castes but had broader connotation of economic growth and development. He argued that the caste system had reduced the mobility of labor and capital which in turn, impeded economic growth and development in India. Dr. Ambedkar was able to understand the role of caste as barrier in the socio economic development. Hence he has crushed both Varna and caste system which were responsible for social disparity and inequality. Amartya Sen has opined that quota system helps empowering communities.
Based on the discussion it is observed that liberty gains its importance for Ambedkar. In that case, how can one achieve progress in society without sacrificing liberty? This commitment to liberty obliges Ambedkar in defending a democratic rather than a dictatorial form of government. However, he quickly, realizes that a formal conception of democracy is replete with many problems. He questions the accepted wisdom of political theory. A formal conception of democracy believes in a regime of equal rights to all members of a society; taking them as individuals. In a society that abounds in social inequality, a regime of equal rights is bound to undermine the interests of minorities. At the same time, a society in which members act as a caste or a group rather than as individuals creates a system of a permanent majority and a permanent minority.

Ambedkar has made an interesting comment in this regard. He argued that it did not matter whether power was held permanently in the hands of a single person, single class, or a communal majority group, it still amounts to dictatorship. Therefore, tyranny of the majority is as bad as that of any individual tyrant. He also makes another normative claim by saying that the communal minority is equal to the communal majority in a Democracy. This means a minority's rights cannot be sacrificed for the greater interest of the majority. This principle echoes the Kantian dictum, that every one shall be treated as an end in himself and none shall be treated as a means to another's ends. In this sense, a minority shall be treated as an end in itself. In such a case, how can minorities be protected in a democratic form of government? Particularly, when the minority is a distinct cultural group? Ambedkar goes on to ask: how to protect minorities who are distinctively marked but do not posses a unique culture? Since the essence of democracy is that those who rule represent the interests of the people; to ensure effective representation, instead of
arguing for equality of rights and taking individuals as the prime units, we need to
deviate a bit by recognizing groups and give some group rights, without completely
compromising on individual rights. In other words, a proper balance of group rights
and individual rights is needed.
The next thing, Ambedkar argues is that in a hierarchical and differentiated setup, we
need to move beyond an equality of rights argument and replace it with an argument
supporting differential rights. Differential rights can also facilitate in breaking the
cultural domination of some groups. They can assist in bringing about a culture that is
conducive to minorities. This would be one of the important hypotheses of this work.
Ambedkar provides sound theoretical arguments in defense of differential rights. He
argues in order to ensure liberty to individuals, it is imperative to have equality; otherwise some will enjoy liberty at the cost of others. In order to ensure Equality, when there is so much of diversity in human nature and social inequality, there is a need to understand Equality in a more substantiate sense. Ambedkar concentrates, in particular on social inequality; while, supporting formal equality in case of differences in human capabilities that are natural. Human capabilities largely are affected by social circumstances; and these circumstances have strong sociological reasons. They do not just affect individuals, they also affect groups and differently. These groups can be classified along class, gender and caste lines. A system that is insensitive to their differences can turn out to be unjust. Different groups also have different social standing in society; a group with a high social standing has more access to resources (social, economic and cultural) and political power, which can be used to manipulate the system for its own advantages. Moreover, these advantages can be used for maintaining their domination over others. A large portion of Ambedkar's writing is addressed to this particular problem with a formal conception of Democracy.
Democracy, in order to be true to its name and philosophy, must avoid unjust domination of any kind: a class over another; a group over another; majority over minority. In order to achieve this, it must recognize the social standing of groups in society; understand the kind of power relations that exist between groups; their history; and then take measures to protect groups who are in an underprivileged position. Ambedkar makes minority rights central to Democracy. By arguing that the weaker a minority the more its need for safeguards and positive measures to promote its interests, he adopts a "Max-min" principle of social justice; which is familiar to us in the form of the more recent difference principle of John Rawls. In the Rawlsian formulation, a just distribution should adopt a principle where the greatest advantage goes to the least advantaged. In this sense, Democracy can be a vehicle for bringing about social change and furthering justice in society.

Ambedkar was strongly against British colonialism in India- his early academic writings concentrated on this aspect; but he was equally critical of internal colonialism by the Hindu majority. To some extent, he blames the British for their unprincipled paternalist approach in addressing the problems of minorities. After the Poona Pact and his experience with reservations in elections, he was completely convinced that separate electorates were the only solution to the problem of Dalits as a minority. His last engagement with the British, in the form of requests and petitions, ended frustratingly with them not conceding to his request of declaring Dalits as a separate minority in Indian society and thereby granting them separate electorates. In this context we need to point out Ambedkar' s persistent claim that Dalits are not part of Hindu society, and therefore are a minority in Indian society. Here, Anbbedkar, apart from social and economic aspects, adds another important criterion for designating Dalits as a minority.
Ambedkar thinks that nationalism can provide the necessary solidarity that is needed to advance social justice. We can here notice a communitarian strain in Ambedkar's thought. It is communitarian because fraternity holds an important place, along with liberty and equality, in Ambedkar's thought. A society in order to progress towards achieving a socially just society needs a great amount of solidarity among the members of society. It needs a common sense of belonging to a community. For this purpose, Ambedkar would like some amount of homogeneity between members of society.

5.1 GLIMPSES OF SCHOLARLY WORKS

Dr. Ambedkar wrote three scholarly books on economics: (i) Administration and Finance of the East India Company, (ii) The Evolution of Provincial Finance in British India, and (iii) The Problem of the Rupee: Its Origin and Its Solution The first two represent his contribution to the field of public finance: the first one evaluating finances of the East India Company during the period, 1792 through 1858 and the second one analyzing the evolution of the Centre State financial relations in British India during the period, 1833 through 1921. The third book, his magnum opus in economics, represents a seminal contribution to the field of monetary economics. In this book Dr. Ambedkar examined the evolution of the Indian currency as a medium of exchange covering the period, 1800 to 1893 and discussed the problem of the choice of an appropriate currency system for India in the early 1920s. On his return to 2 India, his contributions during that period carry a distinctive imprint of the economist in him. The sole effort of Dr. Ambedkar was to provide a social abase to political economy. His approach was in tune with strengthening social justice. The RBI was established in 1934 was based on the ideas of Dr. Ambedkar presented
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before the Hilton Young Commission. His economic ideas have directed to bring economic reforms in India.

Various books written by Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar and different books on economics have been reviewed i.e. Administration and finance of the east India company, Ancient Indian Commerce, Annihilation Of Caste, Buddha Or Karl Marx, Castes In India, Commercial Relations of India in the Middle Ages, Communal Deadlock And a Way to Solve it, Essays on Untouchables and Untouchability 1, Essays on Untouchables and Untouchability 2, Essays on Untouchables and Untouchability 3, Evidence Before The Royal Commission On Indian Currency And Finance, Federation versus Freedom, Lectures on the English Constitution, Maharashtra as a Linguistic Province, Need for Checks and Balances, etc. Dr. Ambedkar was able to enlighten Indian people through his writings.

5.2 SUMMATION

Dr. Ambedkar had an integral approach in developing his social philosophy. Ambedkar was thus providing economic sociology in a critical manner. It has been noted that Dr. Ambedkar’s keen observation can be seen in the following statement: There have been social revolutions in other countries of the world. Why have there not been social revolutions in India is a question which has increasingly troubled me. After deep thinking he argued that the only answer to it “is that the lower classes of Hindus have been completely disabled for direct action.” Through his state socialism Ambedkar tried to strengthen the weaker sections of the society for such change.

Ambedkar was one of the pioneers of social justice in India. It was Ambedkar who provided new dimensions to the concept of justice. We regard him as the ‘Champion
of Social justice. He was himself a victim of social injustice, faced its difficulties; and he not tolerated the injustice, but boldly fought against them. Ambedkar had a liberal concept of justice. Like Gandhi, for Ambedkar, justice is simply another name of liberty, equality and fraternity. In this sense, the core value of Ambedkar concept of justice is human equality, equal distribution of the welfare materials and discrimination less society. Thus, the spirit of social justice, according to Ambedkar, gives a significant place to mutual sympathy and respect. Whatever he achieved, that would have been possible for his strength of character which manifested his individual charisma. As a statesman, scholar, crusader of downtrodden and above all a spiritual guide, Ambedkar has left an indelible impression on the Indian History.

His contribution to uplift the downtrodden made him a cult figure among the depressed classes. He now lives in the heart and mind of the million of the suffering people. They now look at him as immortal soul whose memory will even guide the nation on the path of social justice, liberty and equality. Thus, Ambedkarism is of great relevance to Indian society even today in achieving social justice, removal of untouchability, in establishing equality and freedom and true democracy. Democratic socialism is the key note of his political thought and constitutionalism is the only way to achieve it. In conclusion, it can be said that this research gives closer and analytical insight into the thoughts of Ambedkar on equality and freedom and provides an answer to the question of whether we achieve religious tolerance, human equality and freedom, true democracy in the society, justice and peace in the light of political philosophy of Ambedkar whose memory will ever guide the nation on the path of justice, liberty and equality.