

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkars Ideology of Democracy

**Dr.Sandesh Wagh ,
Associate Professor,
Department of History,
University of Mumbai,
Mumbai ,
Contact no: 970 275 6655
Email : sandeshwagh7@gmail.com**

The Concept of Democracy

The term 'Democracy' is very popular one. The concept of Democracy is, however, very complex one. It has no universal definition as such. Its meaning has been undergoing constant change ever since the ancient Greek city-states in the fifth century BCE, where the origin of the concept and practice of 'Democracy' can be traced. The term 'Democracy' itself is derived from the Greek word 'demos' and 'kratos' meaning 'the people' and 'power or rule' respectively.¹⁹ Thus the original meaning of the term 'Democracy' is 'the power or rule of the people'.²⁰ It is a form of a Government in which the people rule themselves either directly or indirectly or through their elected representatives. In Democracy sovereignty vests with the people in general.

According to, Lord Bryce, Democracy is, “*A Government in which the will of the majority of qualified citizens rules*”.²¹ This definition clearly points out that Democracy is a rule of common man.

According to J.R. Lewis, “*Democracy is basically as a form of Government, but a form which exists to supply and maintain a better society, and to provide the maximum amount of liberty for the individual consistent with the attainment of order and security within the State.*”²² Definition of Democracy put forth by J.R. Lewis is nearer to the concept of State Socialism, where for the betterment of State maximum amount of liberty is prescribed for individual.

According to Dewey, *“The foundations of Democracy is faith in the capacities of human nature; faith in human intelligence and in the power of pooled and co-operative experience.”*²³ Dewey rightly points out the human nature of Democracy.

“Democracy” according to J.A. Schumpeter *“Democracy means only that the people have the opportunity of accepting or refusing the men who are to rule them...by free competition among would-be leaders for the vote of the electorate.”*²⁴ According to this definition it is pointed out that in a Democracy the real power of State is in the hands of common man who holds the right to choose his representative by the power of vote.

According to Walter Bagehot, Democracy is a “*Government by discussion*”.²⁵ According to Prof. Seeley Democracy is a form of “Government in which everyone has a share”.²⁶ After analyzing these two definitions one understands that in a democratic form of a Government every one has a share to put forth their demands.

The definition of ‘Democracy’ by Abraham Lincoln is a popular one. He defines ‘*Democracy*’ as *government—of the people, by the people and for the people*.²⁷ Thus, according to him ‘Democracy’ is a form of government. In this form the ultimate power rests with the people that means government of the people, that government is run by the people through representatives, hence it is the government by the people and lastly it is run for promoting the welfare of the people, hence it is a government for the people.

However, the term 'Democracy' has stood for many ideas and principles, and has many facets since its origin. Thus, the term 'Democracy' means different things to different people. It has so many different connotations.

In such situation, what should be understood by the word 'Democracy' is a very pertinent question. However, fortunately, there are some standard definitions which are widely accepted. And, there is no disagreement as to the basic meaning 'Democracy'.

However, there are some thinkers and philosophers who go beyond this merely mechanical concept of a form of a Government and who seek to extend its scope to social and economic spheres of human life. They define Democracy in terms of a way of life emphasizing the dignity of man.

Democracy in fact, is not merely a form of Government it is a complex of social, economic and political factors, affecting the relationship of the State to the individual, guaranteeing essential freedoms, personal liberty, freedom of expression, or organization and of governing activities.

From above definitions it is evident that broadly speaking there are two broad perspectives on 'Democracy'. The one is purely political which defines 'Democracy' in terms of a form of government and the other is socio-economic which extends the scope of 'Democracy' to social, economic and even a philosophical aspects of human life.

Though there is multiplicity of definitions, it is noticed that the foundation and centre of concern is the people only. And for the people to use power wisely for their own welfare. There must have real access to the power. As it is unconceivable that without a social and economic order which is conducive to this object the very Democracy is sure to fail.

Essential conditions for the success of Democracy

Dr. Ambedkar has clearly stated the conditions which are necessary for the successful working of Democracy. They can be illustrated in brief as under.

1. Equality:

For the success of Democracy the first and foremost essential element is equality Dr. Ambedkar states that there must be no glaring inequalities in the society. There should not be an “oppressed class” and there should not be a “Suppressed Class”. He refers to Abraham Lincoln, who once said that “a house divided against itself cannot stand”, and endorses the latter’s statement. The divided society has within itself the “germs” of a bloody revolution.⁵³

His ideal society is, based on liberty, equality and fraternity, which he derived from his preceptor the Buddha. However, he gives primary importance to equality in that trinity.

He said in unequivocal terms that, *“Fraternity and liberty are really derivative notions. The basic and fundamental conceptions are equality and respect for human personality. Fraternity and liberty take their roots in these two fundamental conceptions. Digging further down it may be said that equality is the original notion and respect for human personality is a reflexion of it. So that where equality is denied, every thing else may be taken to be denied”*.⁵⁴

Dr. Ambedkar was of the opinion that equality should prevail in human society, there should not be any discrimination under the pretext of religion, culture, norms in the society. In India his concept of equality referred to social equality in the society. Due to *Chaturvarnya* system in India, the Indian society was divided into many fractions of castes. The social norms and the legal norms of the Indian society were based on inequality. Dr. Ambedkar opposed this inequality in order to establish Democracy in India. Therefore he gave equality as the one of the necessary condition for the success of Democracy in India.

2. Two party system:

The second important condition for the successful working of Democracy is the existence of strong opposition to the ruling majority. He thinks that there must be an effective veto power against the authority of those who are ruling the country. There can not be veto against the king, but in Democracy it must be exercised against the party in power. Unless there are two parties, one is to rule and other is to oppose, there can not be Democracy. At every five years those who are in power must to the people and seek a fresh mandate from the people. If the people do not trust them, they should make a room for others. In Democracy nobody has any perpetual authority to rule and perpetual subjection to other. He said categorically that, *“as a king has no Divine Right to rule, so also a majority has no Divine Right to rule. Majority rule is tolerated only because it is for a limited period and subject to the right to have it changed, and secondly because it is a rule of a political majority, i.e. majority which has submitted itself to the suffrage of a minority and not a communal majority.”*⁵⁵

He thinks that there should be a political majority and a political minority rather than a communal majority and a communal minority. He had rightly observed that in India, *“the majority is not a political majority. In India the majority is born. It is not made. That is the difference between a communal majority and a political majority. A political majority is not a fixed or a permanent majority. It is a majority which is always made, unmade and remade. A communal majority is a permanent majority fixed in its attitude. One can destroy it, but one cannot transform it”*.⁵⁶ In his words, *“two parties are necessary to keep Government from being a despotism”*.⁵⁷

3. Equality in law and administration:

There was no equality in law and administration in India due to the *Vedic* culture in India. In Hindu system law and administration treated the person according to their castes. There was no uniform civil code in law in *Vedic* culture. The Hindu judicial system was based on injustice. There must be not only equality before law, but there must be equality of treatment in administration.

The personnel in administration need to be most sincere and efficient. There should not be discrimination in administration. Whenever necessary action is taken by the administration against any culprit the higher officer should not interfere in the matter of justice. The members of the ruling party should not interfere if any action is taken against any offender. In other words, the personnel in administration should be permanent, uncorrupt and efficient so that everybody would be able to get justice. There ought to be distinction between what is called 'Political offices' and 'Civil offices'. The British government maintained distinction between the political offices and civil offices. In U.S.A. the 'spoils system' is no more in existence. He thinks that in India also the administration should be above politics and should not allow at any rate any interference in the administration.⁵⁸

The administration must be well responsive, responsible and impartial; and it must be well determined. It should command obedience to authority.

“We must have a Government”, he said, “in which the men in power will give their undivided allegiance to the best interest of the country. We must have a Government in which men in power, knowing where obedience will end and resistance will begin, will not be afraid to amend the social and economic code of life which the dictates of justice and expediency so urgently call for”.⁵⁹

Dr. Ambedkar however observed that “the administration in India is completely in the hands of the Hindus. It is their monopoly. From top to bottom it is controlled by them Their one aim is to discriminate against the Untouchables and to deny and deprive them not only of the benefits of law, but also of the protection of the law against tyranny and oppression. The result is that the Untouchables are placed between the Hindu population and Hindu ridden administration, the one committing wrongs against them and the other protecting the wrong-doer, instead of helping the victims”.⁶⁰

It is because of this reason that he demanded reservation for the Depressed Classes in the services in order to change the composition of the administration and to fill in with their own brethren to help them and to boost up their morale.

Constitutional Morality:

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar had rightly observed that, “*a Constitution which contains legal provisions, is only a skeleton. The flesh of the skeleton is to be found in what we call Constitutional morality*”.⁶¹ However, in England it is called the usages and conventions of the Constitution. Political actors in England are invariably bound to those conventions.

Constitution needs to be observed in its letter and spirit. Each and every rule of public life can not be provided in the Constitution. The Constitution, however provide a mere skeleton or some basic principles and not every details. The details in the legal skeleton could be filled in by healthy principles or conventions which are always based on justice and which evolve in the course of history.

Though one can not challenge in the court of law against those who are in breach of them but one can do so in the court of public conscience.

He refers to with admiration the conservation laid down by President Washington who of his own declined to contest for Presidentship of U.S.A. for the third consecutive tenure on the ground of Constitutional morality. He refers to the convention laid down by King Windsor Edward III who had to abnegate the throne as he married an ordinary woman against the wishes of the Parliament. Thus the Parliament claimed and successfully secured the right to restrain even the personal life of the King.⁶²

No Tyranny of Majority:

In Democracy there are always two rival parties striving to complete against each other for getting political power. The party proving its majority forms the government and the party in minority forms the opposition. However, it is not expected from in majority to impose its tyranny over the minority.

*“The minority”, he states, “must always feel safe that although the majority is carrying on the government, the minority is not being hurt”.*⁶³ He thinks that there should be free and fair discussion in the parliament on any problem. Every member of a minority party should be treated with due respect and dignity and he should be heard; irrespective of his view. Every motion of adjournment should be allowed and discussed. The opposition party is also expected to co-operate with the ruling party by constructive criticism and fruitful suggestions in the matter of governance of the state. They should be so wise and liberal to agree or at least agree to disagree with each other. It however necessary to have political majority or minority and not communal majority or minority. The majority party should try to see such an atmosphere on the floor of parliament and even outside of parliament, in which a revolutionary spirit or an unConstitutional spirit would not develop.

4. Moral order:

According to Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Democracy requires the existence of a moral order in the society. He contemplates that politics can not be devoid of ethics. The Government may pass the laws and implement them but unless there is morality in the society law can not achieve any success. *“A politician”, he said, “does not merely trade in politics, but he also represents a particular faith covering both the method as well as the metaphysics of politics”*⁶⁴ He further said that, *“Politics has become a kind of sewage system intolerably unsavory and in sanitary. To become a politician is like going to work in the drain”*.⁶⁵ Therefore he has no faith in value-free politics. Once he reportedly said that, *“politics has become a game of scoundrel but for me it is a mission”*.⁶⁶ He however puts before the people an ideal as to how politics could be mission.

5. Public conscience:

The last but not the least is the condition of public conscience which is essential for the successful working of the democratic Constitution. According to him public conscience means *“conscience which becomes agitated at every wrong, no matter who is the sufferer, and it means that everybody whether he suffers that particular wrong or not, is prepared to join him in order to get him relieved.”*⁶⁷ He cites an important example of Reverend Scott a white man, who tried his best to liberate the Blacks from White racial supremacy and racial discrimination in South Africa. Though he was a white man, he served the cause of the blacks, irrespective of the feelings of his white community people. He thinks that it is an example to be emulated by others especially the Indian high castes. He states very categorically that is South Africa every where in India. However, he feels strange as to why there could not be any non-scheduled caste who could take up the cause of the oppressed people in India. He rightly observes that it was because of lack of “public conscience”.

He thinks that the non-Dalits should come forward to liberate the Dalits. If they failed to do so, the oppressed people would develop revolutionary mentality which could prove to be grievously dangerous to Democracy.⁶⁸

His thoughts on the conditions precedent for the successful working of Democracy in India are really worth. India has adopted a new Constitution in 1950 through which we have pledged to constitute India into a sovereign socialistic secular democratic republic and to secure to all its citizens' justice, liberty, equality and fraternity. Whether it would be possible to bring into reality the high ideals provided in the Constitution is a question which could be sincerely answered by every Indian.

However, it is difficult to say that the Indian society is able bring into reality those high ideals unless, it is prepared to remove all the inherent evils in the body politic. Therefore it could be safely concluded that the thoughts of Babasaheb Ambedkar for the success of Democracy are most significant and relevant to the Indian society in the present scenario.

Future of Parliamentary Democracy

Dr. Ambedkar delivered a lecture at D.A.V. College, Jullundur City (Punjab) on 28th October 1951. In his speech he submitted his observations on future of parliamentary Democracy. Dr. Ambedkar stated that there was variety of opinion about to which systems of Democracy to be applied in India. After long discussion parliamentary form of Democracy was accepted in India to which he was greatly attached.⁶⁹

Dr. Ambedkar explained, parliamentary Democracy is not unknown to India. He refers to the parliamentary system of Government prevailing from Buddha's time as follows:

Parliamentary Democracy is unknown to us at present. But India, at one time, had parliamentary institutions. India was far more advanced in ancient times. . If you go through the 'Suktas' of Mahaparinibbana, you will find ample evidence in support of my point. In these 'Suktas' it is stated that while Bhagwan Buddha was dying at Kusinara (Kushinagar) a message to that effect was sent to the Mallas who were sitting in session at that time.

They were devoted to Parliamentary institutions. When they received the message about Buddha, they decided that they shall not close the session but would carry on with their work and will go to Kusinara after finishing of the business of the Parliament. There are innumerable references in our literature to prove that Parliamentary system of Government was not unknown to us.⁷⁰

Regarding the rules of Parliamentary procedure Dr. Ambedkar refers to Buddhist Sanghas where secret ballot system was also prevailing. Along with intellectual freedom to all as follows:

There are many rules about Parliamentary procedure. May's Parliamentary practice is generally followed. One rule that is invariably followed everywhere is that there can be no discussion without a motion. That is why there is no discussion on a question. This rule was also practiced in our land in ancient times. The system of secret ballot now in vogue is also not new to us. It was followed in Buddhist Sanghas. They had the ballot papers which they called 'Salapatraka Grahakas'.

. Unfortunately, we have lost this entire past heritage that was good. Historians of India must tackle this question as to why these Parliamentary institutions disappeared from our land. But I find that they cannot or do not want to find out the reasons for it. Ancient India was the master of the world. There was such intellectual freedom in ancient India as was nowhere else to be found.⁷¹

Dr. Ambedkar further said that due to the decline of Buddhism in India, the Parliamentary system of Government was not observed. And in the modern times Indian people might feel that this system of Parliamentary Democracy is new to them. For the success of Parliamentary Democracy and Parliamentary system of Government Dr. Ambedkar advised to educate the Indian masses about the meaning, benefits and purpose of Parliamentary Democracy as follows:

Then why this ancient civilization went to dogs? Why was India subjected to autocratic monarchies? We were familiar with parliamentary institutions.

. We know about votes, voting, committees and other things related to parliamentary institutions. Today parliamentary system of government is alien to us. If we go to a village, we will find that the villagers do not understand what is vote, what is party? They find it something strange, something alien. It is, therefore, a great problem as to how to preserve this institution. We will have to educate the public; we will have to tell them the benefits of Parliamentary Democracy and of Parliamentary System of Government.⁷²

Dr. Ambedkar further elaborated the three main things inherent in the Parliamentary system of Government as follows:

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

Secondly, any law, any measure applicable to the public life of the people must be based on the advice of the people chosen by the people. No single individual can presume the authority that he knows everything, that he can make the laws and carry the government. The laws are to be made by the representatives of the people in the Parliament. They are the people who can advise the men in whose name the law is proclaimed. That is the differences between the monarchical system of Government and the democratic system of Government. In monarchy, the affairs of the people are carried on in the name of a monarch and under the authority of a monarch. In Democracy the affairs of the public are carried on in the name of the head of the state; but the laws and the executive measures are the authority on which the Government is carried on. The head of the state is the titular Head; he is merely a symbol. He is a concentrated 'Murti'. He can be worshipped but he is not allowed to carry out the Government of the country. The Government of the country is carried out, though in his name, by the elected representatives of the people.

Thirdly and lastly, Parliamentary system of the Government means that at a stated period those who want to advise the head of the state must have the confidence of the people in themselves renewed. In Britain, formerly, the elections to the Parliament were held every seven years. The Chartists agitated against this. They wanted annual elections. The motive behind this agitation was very praiseworthy, indeed. It would have been best in the interests of the people if annual elections were held, had it been possible, of course. But Parliamentary elections are very costly affairs. So some sort of compromise was arrived at and five years period was supposed to be a responsible period at which the Legislators and the Ministers were to go back to the people and obtain the fresh renewal of their confidence.⁷³

After analyzing the three main things inherent in the Parliamentary system of Government given by Dr. Ambedkar one understands the important role of the people in the Parliamentary system of Democratic Government.

Dr. Ambedkar clearly points out that in the Parliamentary Government people have the right to elect their representatives. There is no place for hereditary rule in the Parliamentary system of Government. He further clarified the difference between the monarchical system of Government and the Democratic system of Government. He makes it very clear that in Democratic system of Government the head of the Government is elected by the representatives of the people, and cannot act as dictator. Lastly Dr. Ambedkar points out that in the Parliamentary system of Government the Government is elected by the people for a time period. And the people have the power to change the Government.

Dr. Ambedkar further explained important features of Parliamentary system of Government as follows:

This is also not enough. Parliamentary system of Government is much more than Government by discussion. There are two pillars on which the Parliamentary system of Government rests. These are the fulcrums on which the mechanism works.

. These two pillars are (1) an opposition and (2) free and fair elections.⁷⁴

Regarding the importance of opposition in the Parliamentary system of Democratic Government, Dr. Ambedkar said that opposition is important for the fair working of Parliamentary Democracy. He explained it as follows:

One important thing in the Parliamentary Democracy is that people should know the other side, if there are two sides to a question. Hence a functional opposition is required. Opposition is the key to a free political life. No Democracy can do without it.⁷⁵

Dr. Ambedkar said that the free and fair elections are one of the pillars of Parliamentary Democracy. He explained it as follows:

Free and fair elections are the other pillar on which Parliamentary Democracy rests. Free and fair elections are necessary for the transfer of power from one section of the community to the other in peaceful manner and without any bloodshed. In olden times, if a king died, there was at least one murder in the palace.

. Revolution used to take place in palace resulting in murders before the new king used to take the reigns of his country into his authority. This has been the history of India. Election must be completely free and fair. People must be left to themselves to choose those whom they want to send to the Legislature.⁷⁵

Dr. Ambedkar was not in favour of single party system according to him in Democracy the opposition plays the very important role. He criticized Congress Party in this concern, as follows:

Now the question arises as to whether there is any desire on the part of the party in power to permit any opposition to be created. Congress does not want any 'opposition'. Congress is attempting to gather people of sundry views under one canopy. I ask you whether this is a desirable trend in the political life of this country.⁷⁶

Dr. Ambedkar advised the people to preserve Parliamentary Democracy in India, because its failure may result to anarchy in India.

He further advised the people to preserve independence of individual for realisation of Parliamentary system of Government in India as follows:

If Parliamentary Democracy fails in this country and it is bound to fail for the reasons mentioned by me the only result will be rebellion, anarchy and communism. If the people in power do not realize that people will not tolerate hereditary authority, then this country is doomed. Either communism will come, Russia having the sovereignty over our country, destroying individual liberty and our independence or the section of the people who are disgruntled for the failure of the party in power will start rebellion and anarchy will prevail. Gentlemen, I want you to take note of these eventual certainties and if you wish that Parliamentary system of Government and Parliamentary Democracy prevail in this country, if you are satisfied that we will be assured of our liberty of thought, speech and action, if we should preserve our independence, if we cherish the inherent right of individual liberty, then it is your duty as students, as intelligent community of our country, to strive your utmost to cherish this Parliamentary system of Government in its true spirit and work for it.⁷⁷

Dr. Ambedkar's views for building Democratic India

Dr. Ambedkar propagated the Social Democracy in India to remove the disabilities of Depressed and Suppressed Classes of India, in order to create a new social order based on humanity. Dr. Ambedkar's concept of Social Democracy is based on the principle of humanism. The Hindu *Chaturvarnya* system is based on inhuman principles. Dr. Ambedkar strongly opposed *Chaturvarnya* system in order to establish society based on humanism. For him Democracy is a way to establish human conditions for Depressed and Suppressed Classes. He was against hero-worship and dictatorship, he explained it as follows:

“No country can remain democratic and no people can preserve a Constitutional government, if the generality of the people are imbued with an immoderate of hero-worship... For, in India, Bhakti or what may be called the path of devotion or hero-worship, plays a part in its politics unequalled in magnitude by the part it plays in the politics of any other country in the world. Bhakti in religion may be a road to the salvation of the soul.

. But in politics, Bhakti or hero-worship is a sure road to degradation and eventual dictatorship.”⁷⁸

Dr. Ambedkar in Constituent Assembly, about Social Democracy said as follows:

“The third thing we must do is not to be content with mere Political Democracy. We must make our Political Democracy a Social Democracy as well. Political Democracy cannot last unless there lies at the base of it Social Democracy. What does Social Democracy mean? It means a way of life which recognizes liberty, equality and fraternity as the principles of life. These principles of liberty, equality and fraternity are not to be treated as separate items in a trinity. They form a union of trinity in the sense that to divorce one from the other is to defeat the very purpose of Democracy. Liberty cannot be divorced from equality, equality cannot be divorced from liberty. Nor can liberty and equality be divorced from fraternity. Without equality, liberty would produce the supremacy of the few over the many. Equality without liberty would kill individual initiative.

. Without fraternity, liberty and equality could not become a natural course of things. It would require a constable to enforce them. We must begin by acknowledging the fact that there is complete absence of two things of Indian Society. One of these is equality. On the social plane, we have in India a society based on the principle of graded inequality which means elevation for some and degradation for others. On the economic plane, we have a society in which there are some who have immense wealth as against many who live in abject poverty.”⁷⁹

After analyzing Dr. Ambedkar’s above statement on Democracy it can be safely concluded that Dr. Ambedkar propagated Social Democracy along with Economic Democracy for the true realization of Political Democracy. Traditional Hindu society was based on political, economical and social inequality. Dr. Ambedkar vehemently opposed political, economical and social inequality in India, in the interest of realisation of Political Democracy. Dr. Ambedkar’s contribution to the Democracy in India is of immense importance.

Since it gave a new dimension of Social and Economic Democracy to the Political Democracy.

Dr. Ambedkar propagated Constitutional methods for the realisation of social and economic objectives of the Democracy as follows:

If we wish to maintain Democracy not merely in the form, but also in fact, what must do? The first thing in my judgment we must do is to hold fast to Constitutional methods of achieving our social and economic objectives. It means we must abandon the bloody methods of revolution. When there was no way left for Constitutional methods for achieving economic and social objectives, there was a great deal of justification for unConstitutional methods. But where Constitutional methods are open, there can be no justification for these unConstitutional methods. These methods are nothing but the Grammar of Anarchy and the sooner they are abandoned, the better for us.

“A democratic system can endure only when citizens as a whole hold fast to Constitutional methods for achieving their social and economic objectives. Now that Constitutional methods are open and available, they must abandon the bloody or coercive methods of revolution, of civil disobedience, of non-cooperation. For achieving social and economic objectives, these methods have no place in the country. Democracy cannot long survive among any people with whom the loudest voice counts as the voice of wisdom, or when coercive pressures take the place of reason and persuasion.”⁸⁰

Dr. Ambedkar’s economic dimensions to Democracy.

Dr. Ambedkar gave economic dimensions to the Parliamentary Democracy he delivered a speech at the concluding session of the all India Trade Union Workers Study Camp held in Delhi from 8th to 17th September, 1943, under the auspices of the Indian Federation of Labour. After analyzing his speech his economic dimensions to Democracy becomes very clear.

Some of the important paragraph of his speech related to Labour and Parliamentary Democracy is as follows:

“The Government of human society has undergone some very significant changes. There was a time when the government of human society had taken the form of autocracy by Despotic Sovereigns. This was replaced after a long and bloody struggle by a system of government known as Parliamentary Democracy. It was felt that this was the last word in the frame work of government. It was believed to bring about the millennium in which every human being will have the right to liberty, property and pursuit of happiness. And there were good grounds for such high hopes. In Parliamentary Democracy there is the Legislature to express the voice of the people; there is the Executive which is subordinate to the Legislature and bound to obey the Legislature. Over and above the Legislature and the Executive there is the Judiciary to control both and keep them both within prescribed bounds. Parliamentary Democracy has all the marks of a popular Government, a government of the people, by the people and for the people.”⁸¹

From the above paragraph Dr. Ambedkar has put forth that Parliamentary Democracy has all the marks of popular Government and it is Government of the people, by the people and for the people. It can be safely concluded that this form of Government has human principles.

Dr. Ambedkar further said about the failure of Parliamentary Democracy as follows:

Why has Parliamentary Democracy failed? In the country of the dictators it has failed because it is a machine whose movements are very slow. It delays swift action. In a Parliamentary Democracy the Executive may be held up by the Legislature which may refuse to pass the laws which the Executive wants, and if it is not held up by the Legislature it may be held up by the Judiciary which may declare the laws as illegal. Parliamentary Democracy gives no free hand to Dictatorship, and that is why it is a discredited institution in countries like Italy, Spain and Germany, which are ruled by Dictators. If Dictators alone were against Parliamentary Democracy it would not have mattered at all.

. Their testimony against Parliamentary Democracy would be no testimony at all. Indeed Parliamentary Democracy would be welcomed for the reason that it can be an effective check upon Dictatorship. But unfortunately there is a great deal of discontent against Parliamentary Democracy even in countries where people are opposed to Dictatorship. That is the most regrettable fact about Parliamentary Democracy. This is all the more regrettable because Parliamentary Democracy has not been at a standstill. It has progressed in three directions. It has progressed by expanding the notion of Equality of Political rights. There are very few countries having Parliamentary Democracy, which have not adult suffrage. It has recognized the principle of Equality of Social and Economic opportunity. And thirdly it has recognized that the state cannot be held at bay by corporations, which are anti-social in their purpose. With all this, there is immense discontent against Parliamentary Democracy even in countries pledged to Democracy. The reasons for discontent in such countries must obviously be different from those assigned by the dictator countries.

. There is no time to go into details. But it can be said in general terms that the discontent against Parliamentary Democracy is due to the realization that it has failed to assure to the masses the right to liberty, property or the pursuit of happiness. If this is true, it is important to know the causes, which have brought about this failure. The causes for this failure may be found either in wrong ideology or wrong organization, or in both. I think the causes are to be found in both. As an illustration of wrong ideology which has vitiated Parliamentary Democracy I can only deal with two. I have no doubt that what has ruined Parliamentary Democracy is the idea of freedom of contract. The idea become sanctified and was upheld in the name of liberty. Parliamentary Democracy took no notice of economic inequalities and did not care to examine the result of freedom of contract on the parties to the contract, should they happen to be unequal. It did no mind if the freedom of contract gave the strong the opportunity to defraud the weak.

. The result is that Parliamentary Democracy in standing out as protagonist of liberty as continuously added to the economic wrongs of the poor, the downtrodden and the disinherited class. The second wrong ideology which has vitiated Parliamentary Democracy is the failure to realize that political democracy cannot succeed where there is no social and economic democracy. Some may question this proposition. To those who are disposed to question it, I will ask a counter question. Why Parliamentary Democracy collapsed so easily in Italy, Germany and Russia? Why did it not collapse so easily in England and the U.S.A.? To my mind there is only one answer-namely, there was a greater degree of economic and social democracy in the latter countries than it existed in the former. Social and economic democracies are the tissues and the fibre of a political Democracy. The tougher the tissue and the fibre, the greater the strength of the body. Democracy is another name for equality. Parliamentary Democracy developed a passion for liberty. It never made even a nodding acquaintance with equality.

. The result is that Parliamentary Democracy in standing out as protagonist of liberty as continuously added to the economic wrongs of the poor, the downtrodden and the disinherited class. The second wrong ideology which has vitiated Parliamentary Democracy is the failure to realize that political democracy cannot succeed where there is no social and economic democracy. Some may question this proposition. To those who are disposed to question it, I will ask a counter question. Why Parliamentary Democracy collapsed so easily in Italy, Germany and Russia? Why did it not collapse so easily in England and the U.S.A.? To my mind there is only one answer-namely, there was a greater degree of economic and social democracy in the latter countries than it existed in the former. Social and economic democracies are the tissues and the fibre of a political Democracy. The tougher the tissue and the fibre, the greater the strength of the body. Democracy is another name for equality. Parliamentary Democracy developed a passion for liberty. It never made even a nodding acquaintance with equality.

. It failed to realize the significance of equality, and did not even endeavor to strike a balance between liberty and equality, with the result that swallowed equality and has left a progeny of inequities. I have referred to the wrong ideologies, which in my judgment have been responsible for the failure of Parliamentary Democracy. But I am equally certain that more than bad ideology it has bad organization, which has been responsible for the failure of Democracy. All political societies get divided into to classes-the Rules and the Ruled. This is an evil. If the evil stopped here it would not matter much. But the unfortunate part of it is that the division becomes stereotyped and stratified so much so that the Rulers are always drawn from the Ruling Class and the class of the Ruled never becomes the Ruling class. People do not govern themselves; they established a government and leave it to govern them, forgetting that is not their government. That being the situation, Parliamentary Democracy has never been a government of the people or by the people, and that is why it has never been a government for the people.

. Parliamentary Democracy, notwithstanding the paraphernalia of a popular government, is in reality a government of a hereditary subject class by a hereditary ruling class. It is this vicious organization of political life which has made Parliamentary Democracy such a dismal failure. It is because of this that Parliamentary Democracy has not fulfilled the hope it held out for the common man of ensuring to him liberty, property and pursuit of happiness.

The question is who is responsible for this? There is no doubt that that if Parliamentary Democracy has failed to benefit the poor, the laboring and the downtrodden classes, it is these classes who are primarily responsible for it. In the first place, they have shown a most appalling indifference to the effect of the economic factor in the making of men's life. Someone very recently wrote a book called the 'End of the Economic Man'. We cannot really talk of 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 can not be merely to fatten men as we do pigs. But we are far off from that stage. The labouring class far from being fat like pigs are starving, and one wishes that they thought of bread first and everything else afterwards.⁸²

From the above paragraph it can be concluded that political societies get divided into two classes- the Rulers and the Ruled. If the Rulers fail to satisfy the just demands of poor and Depressed Classes then it is a threat to Parliamentary Democracy.

Dr. Ambedkar even critically analyzed Marx doctrine of economic interpretation of history. According to Dr. Ambedkar doctrine of economic interpretation of history can be successful if the labouring class understands the social references of life in terms of associated living.

Dr. Ambedkar analyzed Marx doctrine of economic interpretation of history as follows:

life of Depressed and Suppressed Classes of India without bloodshed by contributing egalitarian principles in Constitution of India.

Dr. Ambedkar advocated equality, liberty and fraternity for the success of Democracy. Social Democracy recognizes liberty, equality and fraternity as the principles of the life. His idea of Democracy is based on Social Democracy. His idea of Social Democracy is with the reference of Indian social situation. The basic democratic situation could be obtained only when we search for rational set of human relations. Dr. Ambedkar's specific analysis of Democracy represents an effort to define the common social situation created by political equality, through which we must subscribe to the development of other kinds of democracies, if we want to maintain the basic democratic character of Indian society. He was the opinion that political Democracy must rest on social Democracy for its true realisation. He vehemently opposed the undemocratic systems in India.

He opposed the system of *Chaturvarnya*, Caste and Untouchability, prevailing in Indian society under the pretext of religion. According to him, these systems were the main barriers in success of Democracy, as these systems denied the human franchise. Without fraternity, liberty and equality of individuals the social relationship in society becomes unhealthy and undemocratic. Dr. Ambedkar made a clear distinction between the old conditions under *Chaturvarnya* and new conditions under the Democracy in India, in his writings and speeches through out the life. According to him, Democracy is mode of associated living, where the social relationship must be based on human franchise.

Dr. Ambedkar does not confine democracy to only theory; he tried to extend democracy to its social utility. He was very practical in nature. He tried to civilize Indian society on the principles of democracy. Dr. Ambedkar through his civil right movement tried to educate the masses about the Democratic system of government.

In Dr. Ambedkar's scheme of political thought of Democracy is based on associated living, which influenced on all the different elements of society. The supreme concern of his life was to make Democracy safe for the common man and for the good of this country. This will automatically help to other countries of the world, who aspire for the preserving this great human tradition. Democracy is not a gift of nature. It is habit of social living and can be acquired by the people themselves for their emancipation and well-being.

The social and political conditions of India on the eve of 19th Century were undemocratic. The main stream political leaders of Congress and Muslim League were neglecting issues of Untouchables in their political agenda. The Depressed Classes of India were out of political order of India due to the religious norms. With the emergence of Dr. Ambedkar Depressed Classes of India got Democratic representation.

This Democratic representation of Depressed Classes radically changed their life styles. Their political participation in Democratic setup of India is because of arrival of Dr. Ambedkar's era in India. His role in the building of Democratic India can be understood by his contribution to social, political, economical and religious fields. Dr. Ambedkar gave new dimensions to democracy which were based on social, political, and economical principles.

Reference and Notes:

1. Parkash, Prem., *Ambedkar Politics and Scheduled Caste*, Ashish publishing House, New Delhi, 2002, p.53.
2. Ibid., p.53.
3. Ibid., p.52.
4. Ibid., p.52.
5. Ibid., p.1.
6. Ibid., p.2.
7. Ibid., p.2.
8. Ibid., p.2.
9. Ibid., p.3.
10. Moon, Vasant. (Ed.), *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Volume-9*, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, 1991, p.278.
11. Parkash, Prem., *Ambedkar Politics and Scheduled Caste*, op. cit, p.21.
12. Moon, Vasant. (Ed.), *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Volume-9*, op. cit, p.275.

13. Ibid., p.276.
14. Ibid., p.286.
15. Ibid., p.284.
16. Keer, Dhananjay., *Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission*, Popular prakashan, Mumbai, reprinted:2003, p.166.
17. Ibid., p.166.
18. Moon, Vasant. (Ed.), *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Volume-1*, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, 1979, pp.86-87.
19. M. Mahmood., *An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Politics*, Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi, First Published: 2006, p.106.
20. Kshirsagar, Ramachandra Kamaji., *Political Thought of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar*, Intellectual Publishing House, New Delhi, First Edition: 1992, p.53
21. Lewis, J.R., *Democracy the theory and practice*, Allman and Sons, London, 1966, p.13.
22. Ibid., p.14.

23. Saha, Tushar Kanti., *Democracy in Danger Criminality and Corruptions in Lok Sabha Elections*, Kanishka Publishers, Distributors, New Delhi, First Published: 2000, p. 1.
24. Ibid., p.2.
25. Kshirsagar, Ramachandra Kamaji., *Political Thought of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar*, op. cit, p.53.
26. Ibid., p.53.
27. Ibid., p.53.
28. Parkash, Prem., *Ambedkar Politics and Scheduled Caste*, op. cit, p.18.
29. Kshirsagar, Ramachandra Kamaji., *Political Thought of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar*, op. cit, pp.53-54.
30. Ibid., p.54.
31. Ibid., p.54.
32. Parkash, Prem., *Ambedkar Politics and Scheduled Caste*, op. cit, p.61.
33. Ibid., p.61.
34. Ibid., p.62.

35. Kshirsagar, Ramachandra Kamaji., *Political Thought of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar*, op. cit, p.54.
36. Moon, Vasant. (Ed.), *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Volume-1*, op. cit, p.229.
37. Jatava, D.R., *Political philosophy of B.R. Ambedkar*, National Publishing House, New Delhi, 2001, p.77.
38. Ibid., p.77.
39. Parkash, Prem., *Ambedkar Politics and Scheduled Caste*, op. cit, pp.64-65.
40. Moon, Vasant. (Ed.), *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Volume-1*, op. cit, p.415.
41. Parkash, Prem., *Ambedkar Politics and Scheduled Caste*, op. cit, p.65.
42. Ibid., pp.65-66.
43. Ibid., p.66.
44. Ibid., p.66.
45. Ibid., p.66.
46. Ibid., p.66.

47. Moon, Vasant. (Ed.), *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Volume-1*, op. cit, p.409.
48. Kshirsagar, Ramachandra Kamaji., *Political Thought of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar*, op. cit, p.55.
49. Ibid., p.55.
Parkash, Prem., *Ambedkar Politics and Scheduled Caste*, op. cit, pp.67- 68.
51. Ibid., p.68.
52. Moon, Vasant. (Ed.), *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Volume-13*, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, 1994, p.1216.
53. Kshirsagar, Ramachandra Kamaji., *Political Thought of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar*, op. cit, pp.56-57.
54. Ibid., p.56.
55. Ibid., p.58.
56. Moon, Vasant. (Ed.), *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Volume-1*, op. cit, p.377.
57. Ibid., p.237.

58. Kshirsagar, Ramachandra Kamaji., *Political Thought of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar*, op. cit, p.58.
59. Ibid., pp.58-59.
60. Ibid., p.59.
61. Ibid., p.60.
62. Ibid., p.60.
63. Ibid., p.60.
64. Moon, Vasant. (Ed.), *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Volume-1*, op. cit, pp.225-226.
65. Ibid., p.227.
66. Kshirsagar, Ramachandra Kamaji., *Political Thought of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar*, op. cit, p.61.
67. Ibid., p.61.
68. Ibid., p.61.
69. Jatava, D.R., *B.R. Ambedkar study in society and politics*, National publishing house, New Delhi, First Edition: 1998, p.74.

70. Ibid., pp.74-75.
71. Ibid., p.75.
72. Ibid., p.75.
73. Ibid., p.76.
74. Ibid., p.77.
75. Ibid., p.78.
76. Ibid., p.78.
77. Ibid., p.79.
78. Ibid., p.98.
79. Moon, Vasant. (Ed.), *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Volume-13*, op. cit, p.1216.
80. Ibid., p.1215.
81. Moon, Vasant. (Ed.), *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Volume-10*, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, 1991, pp.106-107.
82. Ibid., pp.107-109.
83. Ibid., p.110.

84. Ibid., p.110.
85. Ibid., pp.111-112.
86. Jatava, D.R., *B.R. Ambedkar study in society and politics*, op. cit, p.99.
87. Mathew, Thomas, *Ambedkar reform or revolution*, Segment books, New Delhi, First Edition: 1991, p.160.
88. Ibid., p.160.
89. Jatava, D.R., *Political philosophy of B.R. Ambedkar*, op. cit., p.73.
90. Ibid., p.105.
91. Ibid., p.106.
92. Ibid., p.106.
93. Ibid., pp.106-107.
94. Ibid., p.107.
95. Ibid., p.74.
96. Parkash, Prem., *Ambedkar Politics and Scheduled Caste*, op. cit, p.15.
97. Ibid., pp.15-16.

98. Moon, Vasant. (Ed.), *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Volume-7*, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, 1990, pp.55-56.
99. Parkash, Prem., *Ambedkar Politics and Scheduled Caste*, op. cit, p.18.
100. Ibid., p.18.
101. Vibhute K.I. (Ed.), *Dr. Ambedkar and empowerment: Constitutional vicissitudes*, University of Poona, Pune, First Edition: 1993, Article by Vibhute K.I., *Social justice, Constitutional scheme and spirit*, p.122.
102. Ibid., p.124.
103. Ibid., p.124.
104. Moon, Vasant. (Ed.), *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Volume-11*, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, 1992, p.242.
105. Jatava, D.R., *Political philosophy of B.R. Ambedkar*, op. cit., p.104.
106. Ibid., p.105.

107. Ibid., p.105.
108. Parkash, Prem., *Ambedkar Politics and Scheduled Caste*, op. cit, p.4.
109. Ibid., p.5.
110. Ibid., p.5.
111. Ibid., p.5.
112. Ibid., p.1.
113. Jatava, D.R., *Political philosophy of B.R. Ambedkar*, op. cit., p.98.
114. Ibid., p.114.
115. Ibid., p.99.
116. Ibid., p.99.

THANK YOU!

Dr. Sandesh M. Wagh
Associate Professor,
Department of History ,
University of Mumbai

What's apps no. 9702756655
E-mail: sandeshwagh7@gmail.com