

B.R.Ambedkar and his Philosophy on Indian Democracy: An Appraisal

Ishita Aditya Ray (Corresponding Author)

Assistant Professor, Bejoy Narayan Mahavidyalaya, Burdwan University, India.

E-mail:ishitaaditya@gmail.com

Sarbapriya Ray,

Assistant Professor, Shyampur Siddheswari Mahavidyalaya, University of Calcutta, India.

E-mail:sarbapriyaray@yahoo.com

Abstract:

The main goal of the study is to analyze and evaluate critically the idea of B.R.Ambedkar, the great Indian constitution maker, regarding Indian democracy and to capture the position of Ambedkar on issues whose relevance is even felt at present. Analyzing the idea of democracy of Ambedkar in details, it can be found out that Ambedkar had unshakeable faith in democracy. In his conception of exploitation less society, democracy has an extra-ordinary role which he defined as 'one person, one vote'; and 'one vote, one value'. Democracy means empowerment of any person for participating in the process of decision-making relating to her/him, democracy means liberty, equality and fraternity - Ambedkar's definition of democracy had such a tone. This research gives closer and analytical insight into the thoughts of Ambedkar and provides an answer to the question of whether we, the Indian, achieve religious tolerance, human equality and freedom, true democracy, gender respect 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.

1. Introduction:

Dr. Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar (1891-1956), 'a symbol of revolt' (as mentioned by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of independent India), was one of the front-ranking nation-builders of modern India. He is popularly known as the 'pioneer' who initiated the 'liberation movement' of roughly sixty-five million untouchables of India. Yet, Dr. Ambedkar, the chief architect of Indian Constitution, notwithstanding all handicaps of birth, has made, by pursuit of knowledge in the humanities, social sciences, politics and law, an indelible imprint on the body politic of the country. A glance of his copious writings would evidently show that despite his preoccupations with the problems of the *dalits* (Untouchables), Ambedkar has in his own way, made significant contributions to the contemporary political ideas.

B.R.Ambedkar stood apart from his well-known famous contemporaries of India in three respects. First, being a great scholar, social revolutionary and statesman, he had in himself a combination of these attributes that one rarely possesses which made him distinguished from other intellectual personalities of that time. As an intellectual, gigantic personality and creative writer, he had imbibed knowledge that was truly encyclopedic. The range of topics, width of vision, depth and sophistication of analysis, rationality of outlook and essential humanity of the arguments that he came-up with made him different from his illustrious contemporaries.

Secondly, Ambedkar never wrote merely for literary purpose. In his scholarly pursuit as in his political activities, he was driven by a desire to comprehend the vital issues of his time and to find solutions to the problems of Indian society. With this motivation, he intervened, at times decisively in shaping the social, economic and political development of the nation during its formative stage. There was hardly any issue that arose between the early 1920s and the mid-1950s in India to which Ambedkar did not apply his razor-sharp analysis, whether it was the question of minorities, reorganization of states, partition, constitution or the political and economic framework for an independent India.

The third unique aspect of Ambedkar lies with the nature and kind of questions he delved into. What is probably most important in a thinker and intellectual is not so much the answer they provide but the question they raised. Ambedkar raised the questions that were simultaneously relevant and uncomfortable. Relevant as they were critical for the nation-in the making and uncomfortable as very few were willing to acknowledge the existence of those issues. Ambedkar raised certain pressing issues in his characteristic style that no one was willing to take up or deal with.

In course of his public life over three decades, Ambedkar was fully convinced that politics should be the instrument to fight for justice in adorning all sections of the Indian people with freedom. As such, he tirelessly worked towards the goal of justice for the untouchables in an unjust society, mainly through political means. In the course of these activities, Ambedkar developed his own ideas about society and politics of the contemporary India. Viewed from the subject of political science, those ideas obviously merit attention. But, scholars who have worked on Ambedkar's different ideas fail to bestow due importance on these aspects of his thinking. As a background to this article, it has been considered appropriate to present the position of Ambedkar on the central issues with which Ambedkar was preoccupied and the issues, which continue to confront the Indian society and its polity and economy. The present study is a humble attempt to make a comprehensive and objective analysis of philosophy of B.R. Ambedkar regarding Indian democracy keeping in minds the gaps and lapses in the existing literature on Ambedkar.

In this article, an attempt has been made to provide an insight into B.R. Ambedkar's idea on democracy. He was a true democrat and advocated a democratic society based on the principles of natural justice, equity and classification according to aptitude, ability and profession. The roots of democracy lie not in the form of Government but in the social relationships. He considered caste system in India as a serious obstacle in the path of democracy. He said "The first condition precedent for the successful working of democracy is that there must be no glaring inequalities in the society. Secondly, there must be statutory provisions to mitigate the sufferings and to safeguard the interest of the suppressed and oppressed people. The society must be based on the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity in order to ensure social endosmosis". According to him, economic inequalities are inherent in the capitalist economy which makes political equality assured by democracy worthless. Thus, according to Ambedkar, the failure to recognize that political democracy cannot succeed where there is no social and economic democracy has vitiated parliamentary democracy. Ambedkar maintained therefore that though "parliament democracy developed a passion for liberty, it never made 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 liberty swallowed equality and left a progeny of inequalities"

2. General connotation of Democracy:

Democracy is the most valued and also the indistinct political terms in the modern world. The ancient Greek word 'democracy' means rule by the *demos*, which can be translated as either 'the people; or 'the mole' depending on one's ideological preference. By itself, democracy means little more than that, in some undefined sense, political power is ultimately in the hands of the whole adult population and that no smaller group has the right to rule. Democracy can only take on a more useful meaning when qualified by one of the other word with which it is associated, for example, liberal democracy, representative democracy, participatory democracy or direct democracy. Although all free societies are democratic, democracies can fail to protect individual freedom. Countries are generally considered democratic to the extent that they have fair and frequent elections in which nearly all adults have the right to vote, citizens have the right to vote, citizens have the right to form and join organizations and to express themselves in alternative sources of information existed. Architects of democracy must determine the constitutional structure that best suits the needs of a particular country, alternative forms of constitutional democracy include parliamentary versus presidential forms of government, plurality versus proportional representation system and federal versus unitary systems.

In a Parliamentary system, the Prime Minister is elected by the parliamentary process and can be removed from office by a vote of no confidence from the Parliament. Executive and legislative powers are fused in a Parliamentary System. In a Presidential system, the President is elected directly by the people and there is a formal separation of powers.

Plurality voting tends to produce a two-party system and greater governmental stability, but it offers voters fewer choices. Proportional representation, on the other hand, encourages the formation of small or splinter parties, which can make governments unstable.

A third constitutional choice is whether to set up a federal or unitary form of government. In a federal system, authority is divided between central and state governments. In a federal system, each state has its own legislative and executive and state exercise broad powers.

In the late 20th Century, a democratic revolution spread around the world as more countries sought to establish democratic governments. These democratic transitions raised hopes for a better and more peaceful world. Francis Fukuyama asserted that democracy had triumphed over communism and other competing ideologies. He suggested that democracy would in time become universal.

Samuel Huntington examines the history of democracy since its emergence in America. He concluded that there have been three waves of democratization and two reverse waves since democracy first washed up on America's shore.

During the first democratic wave (1828 – 1926), more than thirty countries became democratic. A reverse wave began when Benito Mussolini came to power in Italy in 1922. Between 1922 – 1942 reversals occurred in many new democratic countries succumbed to communist, fascist and militaristic ideologies. By 1942, only twelve countries were democracies.

A second wave of democratization followed World War II (1943 – 1962) when the United States and Allied occupation promoted democracy in West Germany, Italy, Austria, Japan and South Korea. The second reverse wave occurred from 1958 to 1975, marked by military coups in Latin America and Asia and the birth of a number of African Countries. By 1975, a third of the world's democracies had reverted to authoritarian rule. Reversal occurred in Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Greece, Turkey, India, Pakistan, South Korea, the Philippines and elsewhere. Virtually all newly independent African countries were authoritarian. Many social scientists began to think that democracy was not applicable to developing countries.

In the mid 1970's the third wave of democratization began in southern Europe – Portugal, Greece and Spain. It spread throughout Latin America, as the military returned to the barracks. It moved into Asia, with India, Pakistan, Turkey, the Philippines and South Korea restoring democracy. Finally, the spread to the communist countries of Eastern Europe. Between 1974 and 1990, some thirty countries made transitions from authoritarianism to democracy, approximately doubling the world's number of democracies. The third wave of democratization occurred, in most cases, through negotiations, elections and nonviolence.

An important factor that influences the consolidation of democracy is the country's level of economic development. It produces a more highly educated society and attitudes, such as trust and tolerance that are conducive to a democratic political culture. Greater economic wealth facilitates compromise and accommodation among different groups. Democracy follows, to use Samuel Huntington's phrase, "a two step-forward, one-step-backward pattern." The consolidation of democracy is influenced by prior experience with democracy, the political institutions that are established and the level of economic development among other factors. In a democracy, the government and opposition leaders must work together, which often requires basing from the previous experience of others.

3. B.R. Ambedkar's idea of Democracy in Indian context:

According to Ambedkar, democracy means fundamental changes in the social and economic life of the people and the acceptance of those changes by the people without resorting to disputes and bloodshed. He wanted to establish the principle of one man, one vote and one value not only in the political life of India but also in social and economic life. He wanted political democracy to be accompanied by social democracy. He gave central importance to social aspects of democracy over political aspects, unlike many others whose discourse on democracy is confined to the political and institutional aspects. Ambedkar paid greater attention to social linkage among people than separation of powers and constitutional safeguards for democracy. The concept of power contained in his thinking has a direct relationship between social power

and political power. He was conscious of the social and economic inequalities which corrode the national consciousness of the Indian people. Ambedkar said, "We must make our political democracy a social democracy as well. Political democracy cannot last unless there lies at the lease of it social democracy".

Ambedkar paid serious attention to religious notions that promote democracy. Ambedkar viewed the religious foundation of caste as the fundamental obstacle to democracy in India on the one hand and the Buddhist doctrine of liberally, equality and fraternity as the foundations for democracy on the other hand. He writes, "It is common experience that certain names become associated with certain notions and sentiments, which determine a person's attitude toward men and things. The names, *Brahmin*, *Kshatriya*, *Vaisha* and *Shudra* are hierarchical divisions of high and low caste, based on birth and act accordingly".

Ambedkar thinks of democracy from the viewpoint of practical life. He belongs to the realistic school of political scientists. He is not bothered about the principles and theories of political science. During the national improvement, his aim has to have justice and freedom for the people in the real sense. He aspired for having a government of the people, for the people and by the people. According to Ambedkar, democracy means no slavery, no caste, no coercion. He wants free thoughts that choice and capacity to live and let live, which his conscience, would be the right path to democracy. Ambedkar says "Democracy is a mode of associated living. The roots of democracy are to be searched in social relationship, in terms of the associated life between the people who form the society".

Ambedkar is the greatest political thinker. Outwardly this may see strange that in India, life was the monopoly of the *Brahmin* caste and was completely denied to other castes for thousands of years. However, here no contradiction is involved. It was the very privileged position assigned to the *Brahmin* that became the cause of the retardation. In Indian society, property, illiteracy, caste distinctions as the positive dangers to democracy. In these situations, educational facilities and economic help should be provided for those who are illiterate and backward on one hand and on the other, who want to wipe on the roots of caste system in order to safeguard the interest of democracy. Ambedkar says, "If you give education to the lower strata of the Indian society which is interested in blowing up the caste systems, the caste system will be blown up". At the moment, the indiscriminate help given to education by the Indian Government and American foundation is going to strengthen the caste system. Giving education to those who want to blow up caste system will improve prospect of democracy in India and put democracy in safer hands.

In Indian society, class structure is a positive danger to democracy. This class structure made a distinction of rich and poor, high and low, owners and workers, an permanent and sacrosanct parts of social organization. "Practically speaking in a class structure there is, on the other hand, tyranny, vanity pride, arrogance, greed, selfishness and on the other, insecurity, poverty, degradation, loss of liberty, self reliance, independence, dignity and self respect."

According to Ambedkar, the aim of democracy is essentially need for the interest of society as a whole, and not for any class, group or community. Therefore, Dr. Ambedkar, while speaking on "conditions precedent for the successful working of Democracy", in Poona, emphasized that, "The first condition which I think is a condition precedent for the successful working of democracy is that there must be no glaring inequities in the society. There must not be an oppressed class. There must not be a suppressed class. There must not be a class which has got the entire privileges ad a class which has got all the burdens to carry. Such a thing, such a division, such an organization of society has within itself the germs of a bloody revolution and perhaps it would be impossible for democracy to cure them." To him, real democracy is opposed to the suppression of minorities. The suppression and exploitation of minorities in any form is the negation of democracy and humanism. If suppression is not stopped, then democracy degenerates into tyranny.

Ambedkar holds that the individual in society is an end in him and he has certain inalienable right in

social relationship, which must be guaranteed to him by the consumption on certain reasonable conditions and be protected by the state.

The democratic principles of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness are considered to be the essentials of human life in Ambedkar's concept of democracy. He attaches more importance to human well being and

The effective opposition is an important factor in the working of a successful democracy. Democracy means a veto power. There are two aspects of the veto power, one is the long term veto of five years and the other -an immediate one. There must be people in the parliament immediately ready there and then to challenging Government.

Secondly, there must be equality in law and administration for efficient functioning of democracy and there is need of a permanent civil service for implementing the policy of the Government. The importance of free opposition and consent is a needful requirement of popular Government, Ambedkar says "Democracy is unrealizable without freedom of political discussion. A right to vote gives a man no real part in controlling government unless is free to form his own opinions about his vote, to hear what others have to say about the issues and to persuade others to adopt his opinion."

Democracy to Ambedkar is "a form and a method of government whereby revolutionary changes in the economic and social life of the people are brought about without bloodshed." In democracy, there should be no tyranny of the majority over the minority. The minority must always feel safe that although the majority carrying on the Government, the minority will not be hurt and that the minority will not be imposed upon. Ambedkar appreciated Harold Laski for his insistence on the moral order as a basic necessity of democracy. He says that if there is no moral order, democracy will get to pieces. It requires a "Public conscience". "A political democracy without an economic and social democracy is an invitation to trouble and danger". Social democracy alone can assure to the masses the right to liberty, equality and fraternity. So, democracy is not only a form of government but a way of life through which social justice can be established. Social justice ensures that society should promote the welfare of all. Democracy is a dynamic attitude towards human life. It attaches a great importance to virtues like tolerance and peaceful methods. Thus, parliamentary democracy involves non-violent methods of action, peaceful ways of discussion and acceptance of decision with faith and dignity, There are two other pillars on the which parliament system rests. This system needs an opposition and free and fair elections. Ambedkar says, "In a Parliamentary democracy, there should be at least two sides. Both should know each other well. Hence a 'financial opposition', is needed opposition which is the key to a free political life. No democracy can be without it." In modern times, Dr. Ambedkar appears to educate and enlighten people to adopt the fair means for a change of government. "Election must be completely free and fair. People must be left themselves to choose whom they want to send to the legislatures."

The consequences of the caste system on politics and election are quite obvious. Caste are so distributed that in any area there are major castes carrying the seats of Assemblies and Parliament by sheer communal majority voting is always communal, because the minority communities are coerced and tyrannized for casting their vote in favour of a particular candidate.

The democratic principles of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness are considered to be the essentials of human life in Ambedkar's concept of democracy. He attaches importance to human well being and human rights. The essence of democracy, to Ambedkar, is that as many members of a society as far as possible should share in the exercise of human rights. It means that there should be equal opportunities for all citizens and harmony among the claims of each person. Discrimination in human rights is the very negation of social and political democracy. Thus, Ambedkar puts emphasis on equality, and liberty of human rights.

According to Ambedkar, parliamentary democracy has all the marks of a popular Government, a government of the people, by the people and for the people. In parliamentary democracy, there is the executive who is subordinate to the legislative and bound to obey the legislative. The Judiciary can control both the executive and legislative and keep them both within prescribed bounds. Ambedkar says,

parliamentary democracy has not been at a standstill. It has progressed in three directions. It began with equality of political rights by expanding in the form of equal suffrage. Secondly, it has recognized the principle of equality of social and economic opportunities. Thirdly, it has recognized that the state cannot be held at bay by corporation which is anti-social in their purpose. Parliamentary democracy produces the

best result in the long run, because it assigns great significance to virtues like ability and cooperation, mutual respect and self help, discipline and devotion to work, for the happiness of the millions of people. The system of parliamentary democracy, thus, embodies the principle of change and continuity to which Ambedkar attaches great importance. To him, only the spirit of the people can help parliamentary democracy to function well. People and democracy are closely related to each other. Ambedkar says, democracy is another name for equality. It is, therefore, a matter of some surprise that there has been a revolt against parliamentary democracy although not even a century has elapsed since its universal acceptance and inauguration. There is revolt against it in Italy, in Germany, in Russia and in Spain, and there are very few countries in which there has not been discontent against parliamentary democracy. Why should be this discontent and dissatisfaction against parliamentary democracy ? There is no country in which the urgency of considering this question is greater than it is in India. India is negotiating to have parliamentary democracy of the erroneous ideologies which have been responsible for the failure of parliamentary democracy. I have no doubt that the idea of freedom of contract is one of them. The idea became sanctioned 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, in spite of the fact that they were unequal in their bargaining power. It did not mind if the freedom of contract gave the strong opportunity to defraud the weak. The result is the parliamentary democracy in standing out as a protagonist of liberty has continuously out as a protagonist of liberty has continuously added to the economic wrongs of the poor, the downtrodden and the disinherited class.

Ambedkar says, the second wrong ideology which has initiated parliamentary democracy is the failure to realize that political democracy cannot succeed where there is no social and economic democracy. Some way 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 any 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. 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.

Ambedkar says, ‘I have referred to the wrong ideologies which in my judgment have been responsible for the failure of parliamentary democracy. All political societies get divided into two classes – the rulers and the ruled. 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 classes 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, forgotten 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 those vicious organization of political life which has made parliamentary democracy has not fulfilled the hope it held out the common man of ensuring to him liberty property and pursuit of happiness.’

Dr. Ambedkar was one of the admirers of freedom and self-government of India. And he stood for a democratic system of administration. Dr. Ambedkar preferred the elected rulers or the government to hereditary rulers for a good and democratic administration. He emphasizes that the administration must be free of corruption and dishonest ways of administering things. He says, everyone must share the responsibilities for the successful working of the democratic institutions in the land, otherwise; the feelings of public welfare and co-operation would not be strengthened.

He says, “Democracy cannot function in the absence of basic civil liberties – which enables the community to vindicate itself against the state furthermore, the right to criticize, if it is to be effective, must include the right to organize opposition through political parties. Representative democracy is essentially procedural. It is characterized by free expression, free parties and free election.” To Ambedkar, “Political parties are

indispensable in parliamentary democracy, for democracy without a party system is unconceivable. There should be a regular party system.” Ambedkar preferred that at least two parties are essential in democracy for its fructification. “A party is necessary to run government. But two parties are necessary to keep government from being a despotic. A democratic government can remain democratic only if it is worked by two parties – a party in power and a party in opposition.”

Ambedkar fought against caste and injustice because he found that there were no human rights for a large majority of the people. He rebelled against such a social organization. He wanted to vitalize the masses in India, for equal human rights. For removing the social, economic, political and religious disabilities of the untouchables, it was necessary to establish Government of the people, for the people and by the people. Only under a democratic system of government could social economic, political and religious freedom be ensured equally to every man and woman. His ultimate aim of life was to create a “real social democracy”.

The concept of his social democracy included human treatment and human rights to all, without which it can be no sure and stable political life anywhere. The 19th century meaning of democracy is that each individual should have a vote, does not stand up to full test of social and political democracy. Without social democracy, neither political liberty, nor the unity of the nation can be maintained. According to him, political democracy rests on four premises: - these are –

- i) “The individual is an end in himself.
- ii) The individual has certain inalienable rights which must be guaranteed to him by the constitution.
- iii) The individual shall not be required to relinquish any of his constitutional rights as a condition precedent to the receipt of a privilege.
- iv) The state shall not delegate powers to private persons to govern others.”

The dignity of the individual, political liberty, social progress and human rights are necessary constitutional safeguards which form Ambedkar’s basic decent democratic ideals in the political democracy. To him, the ground plan means the social structure of a community to which the political plan is sought to be applied. Political democracy and liberty are nothing if not beaked and bucked up by equal social patterns, because the political structure rests on the social structure. “Indeed, the social structure,” he says “has a profound effect on the political structure. It may modify it in its working. It may nullify it or it may even make a mockery of it.” It is therefore, essential that before passing any Judgment on any scheme of political relationship even making plans for economic reforms, the people must consider the ground plan that means social relations, Democracy should be regarded as both a social and a political method.

“The soul of Democracy”, he says, “is the doctrine of one man, one value”. This principle finds intrinsic worth in the individual personality of each man in political and social relation. This stands for the economic well being of the people, without which democracy, to him, has no value.” The sum of democracy, according to him, essentially consists in the economic welfare of all men living in a particular society, besides its realization in political relation. Otherwise, democracy would kill its own soul and democracy without soul would be useless, unrelated to human aspirations.

In India, to Ambedkar, the people have not realized that it is equally essential to prescribe the shape and form of the economic structure of society for the benefit of the majorities of men. They have not escaped hopes for economic democracy and emancipation, one vote after the long five years, has no meaning to the starving man. It has no significance to the man who is always exploited, rebuked and repressed. It has no value to him for whom there is no sympathy, no love and no give and take of life’s hopes.

4.Summary&Conclusion:

The main goal of the study is to analyze and evaluate critically the idea of Ambedkar regarding Indian democracy and to capture the position of Ambedkar on issues whose relevance is even felt at present.

A detailed analysis of his life and mission reveals that Ambedkar held the basic and fundamental norm, to be equality- social, economic and political, from which he proceeded to lay down a collection of 'ought' propositions; in this hierarchy of 'ought', the initial fundamental 'ought' on which the validity of all the other ultimately rests, the fundamental norm seems to be the social equality, the justification for the rest of the legal reforms and changes he persistently fought for. It was a society full of social inequalities in which Ambedkar was born. The humiliation he experienced in such an in egalitarian society bore on imprint in all thought his life.

Analyzing the idea of democracy of Ambedkar in details, it can be found out that Ambedkar had unshakeable faith in democracy. In his conception of exploitation less society, democracy has an extra-ordinary role which he defined as 'one person, one vote'; and 'one vote, one value'. Democracy means empowerment of any person for participating in the process of decision-making relating to her/him, democracy means liberty, equality and fraternity - Ambedkar's definition of democracy had such a tone. Because he presided over making of the Constitution and is being projected as its chief architect, there is a misunderstanding that parliamentary democracy is what he wanted. But nothing could be farther from the truth than this. He himself spoke against parliamentary democracy. He defined parliamentary democracy as "voting by the people in favour of their owners and handing over the rights of ruling over themselves" . This provides a glimpse of the span of his ideal, which certainly was much beyond the Indian Constitution or any common place understanding about him. His conception of democracy appears to be purely people oriented. He showed that the bookish concepts of equality are detrimental to the disabled sections of society in the prevailing social setting and proposed a fundamental change in the concept of equality. It envisaged complete abolition of inequality. His principle of positive discrimination is based on this very concept of equality. But the operational aspects of this concept involved the need for some kind of autonomous institution, which was met by 'State' and 'religion'. Ambedkar firmly believed that political democracy cannot succeed without social and economic democracy. In his concept of democracy, he opined that political democracy is not an end in itself, but the most powerful means to achieve the social and economic ideals in society. State socialism within the framework of parliamentary democracy can defeat dictatorship. Fundamental rights without economic security are of no use to the have-nots. He was against coercive centralized institutional authority that Hobbesian Philosophy maintains. Associated life is consensual expression of shared experience, aspirations and values. If a small section of the society is allowed to manipulate the cultured symbols of the society that process becomes undemocratic and destructive. It is necessary to stress that his greatness lies in the radicalism of his conceptions, his vision of a human society sans any kind of exploitation; not in the remedies or apparatus he proposed in the circumstances prevailing in his time.

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 and provides an answer to the question of whether we, the Indians, achieve religious tolerance, human equality and freedom, true democracy, gender respect 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.

References:

1. B.R.Ambedkar: Writing and Speeches, vol-9 ,p-168.
2. B.R.Ambedkar: Writing and Speeches, vol-1, p-41.
3. Lokhande. G. S., *B.R. Ambedkar: A study in social democracy* p-23
4. *Constituent Assembly Debates, (25-11-1949) vol. xi, p- 972*
5. Op.cit. Keer. Dhananjay, P-490

7. B.R.Ambedkar: Writing and Speeches, vol-9, p-295
 8. Ibid. p-191
 9. Ibid.p p-197-198
 10. Op.cit.Lokhande. G.S,p-24
 - 11.Ibid p-24-25
 - 12.Op.cit. BRAWS,vol-9 p-167
 13. Ibid. p-168
 14. Ibid. p-169
 - 15.Op.cit.Lokhande.G.S, p-29
 - 16.Pylee,M.V.,*Constitutional Government in India*, p-703
 17. BRAWS, vol-1 p-54
 18. Ibid, p-54-55
 - 19.see, Dr. Ambedkar, article: *Essential condition precedent for the successful working of democracy.*
 20. B.R.Ambedkar: Writing and Speeches,,vol-1,p-32-35
 21. B.R.Ambedkar: Writing and Speeches,,vol-10. p-107-109
 - 22.Ibid.p-107-109
 - 23.Ibid. p-108-109
 - 24.BRAWS. Vol-1 p-237
 25. D.R.Jatava. *Political philosophy of Dr. B.R.Ambedkar*, p-100
 26. B.R.Ambedkar: Writing and Speeches, Vol-1 .p-409
 27. Ibid.p-412.
 28. Huntington, Samuel, P: *The Third Wave: Demonstration in the late Twentieth Century*, Norman and London University of Oklahoma Press,1991.
 - 29.Fukuyama Francis, ‘The end of History?’ *The National Interest*, no.16(Summer,1989).
 - 30.Speeches delivered by Dr.B.R.Ambedkar before the Poona District Law Library on 22nd December,1952; Quoted in Ambedkar College Magazines, Mahad,1962.
 31. B.R.Ambedkar: *What Congress and Gandhi Had done to the Untouchables?*,p295.
 32. Kheer, Dhanajay, Dr.B.R.Ambedkar:Life and Mission,p495.
-

This academic article was published by The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE). The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open Access Publishing service based in the U.S. and Europe. The aim of the institute is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the publisher can be found in the IISTE's homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:**

<http://www.iiste.org/Journals/>

The IISTE editorial team promises to review and publish all the qualified submissions in a fast manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

