



**Transform the political democracy into social democracy:
DR. B.R. Ambedkar's Constitution**

Prof. S. Ambedkar Ashok., MR PG College Vizianagaram

Abstract: *Every social history in the society has background reservation has its own background when people into high and low on the basis of their birth and not on the basis of merit were divided by the law book of Brahmins. Dr. B.R. Ambedkar viewed that “we the people of Bahujans the majority should always authority but the educated and elite SC, ST & OBCs people are not pay back to their society and organized them as well as not followed the cautions, directions and path of the Dr. B.R. Ambedkar. “Political power is the master key by which we can open each and every lock.” And, not understand the “One man one vote and one value.” They may not come to the one agenda and one party can't form the Government with workers and peasants. So long as they will not get protection of their lives in the country.*

Key words: *Constitution, Bahujans, colonialism , imperialism, Untouchables*

Introduction

The post-world wars-scenario, the end of colonialism and imperialism , the transfer of Power in the World particularly in Asia, the socio-economic and cultural ethnic, racial, religious, caste, colour and linguistic diversities which led to internal disturbances and external invasion perpetuating on Bahujans. In the case of Indian sub-continent, no nation or religion is exceptional India is pleural society. According to Dr. B.R. Ambedkar's view on constitution, “However good a constitution may be it is sure to turn out to be bad because those who are called to work it happen to be a bad-lot. However bad a constitution may be it may turn out to be a good if those who are called to work it, happen to be a good-lot. The working of a constitution does not depend wholly upon the nature of the constitution”.

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar views

According to Babasaheb Dr. B.R. Ambedkar – “India is not a nation. It is a multi-nation”. Every nation has its own

identity and profession of caste: which has graded-degraded position in the Indian socio-economic and political system which was boon of god to the Indians. Everybody has their own customs, conventions, traditions and literature pertaining to the region in which some dominant and ruling castes and classes has its own unity and integrity in order to suppress and exploit the defeated Shudras and Panchamas. According to Dharma: “Might is right, and god's gift and their birth right and privilege, to rule the degraded people”. According to B.G. Tilak's slogan is “Swaraj is my Birthright – We have it” is Trivarna's right “Home Rule”. According to Pandit Motilal Nehru's Swaraj Party – Nehru Report – degraded then Minorities Muslims has no constitutional privileges. So all are opposed and Congress and Gandhi's staunch follower's Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Today's pupils are tomorrow's citizens. Even Iron Man opposed the downtrodden – vote and constitutional privileges representation and reservations at this juncture. The transfer of power from British crown to



Gandhi and Congress by chance Muslim escaped their ill treatment and hegemony.

Whereas Hindus (Savarnas) opposed Untouchables right and safeguards. In the hands of the Congress Gandhi – who are unable to protest and made the constitution at the cost of the minority will in the Constituent Assembly and adopted whether Constitution on 26th January 1950 – halfheartedly accepted, social justice and social democracy. So India became Democratic, Sovereign, Republican State. Merely so the Constitution real and genuine spirit is diluted in the name of mixed economy and election based on caste, religion, money-mafia media and education system. Now so again we the people have to start another redeeming and liberation mass movement in India on the Democratic and Representative Path What Dr. B. R. Ambedkar said that my people will only establish real socialism with the help of workers and peasants. They only the political democracy transform into socioeconomic democracy came into exist.

Ambedkar descended the Indian skies like a meteor, lighting up the freedom movement with a viable economic vision and road map, charted a constitutional democracy which, as he often said, could take us to the revolutionary goal of equality, liberty and fraternity. This assessment is accepted by a large number of people. However, his economic ideology and mission have been buried in the sands of globalization, privatization and 'reforms' by the ruling elite and even his self-proclaimed followers, who have joined hands in erecting stone and granite statues of the 'Revolutionary' whose thoughts not only sprang from the soil of the country but also its political, economic and social

realities (It was buried even earlier by those who presented a confused and diffused ideology from various political platforms, and who buried his rational and scientific thinking).

If we really, deeply study his core ideas, ideology if you like, his central mission is spelt out in his drafts to the Constitution Drafting Committee of which he was the Chairman, 1947-49. Dr. Ambedkar finally emerged as the main 'Architect' of this most vital document that lays down the framework of the Republic and its social, political and economic objectives, which is a manifesto of those who struggled for India's freedom against foreign capital, foreign rule and local dominant, economic and caste interests. The Constitution is above the Supreme Court, the Lok Sabha, the Prime Minister and the Executive and was intended to be its guiding star, its Dhruvatara. How much we have deviated from the Constitution's Directive, its soul the Directive principles which are mandatory for any Government in office is an issue which is for all of us to assess. If this is tested by the ground reality of the condition of the exploited classes, the denial of equality of opportunity, of education, of the very right to life, to work, and economic policies which have made the preamble of the Constitution a paper promise in the hands of the exploiting class who have arrogated to themselves a near total monopoly of resources, unprecedented and growing concentration of wealth that make a mockery of the direction 'for the common good'.

The Honourable Dr. B.R. Ambedkar: Sir, looking back on the work of the Constituent Assembly, it will now be two years, eleven months and seventeen days since it first met on the 9th of December 1946. During this period



Constituent Assembly has altogether held eleven sessions. Out of these eleven sessions the first six were spent in passing the Objectives Resolution and the consideration of the Reports of Committees on Fundamental Rights, on Union Constitution, on Union Powers, on Provincial Constitution, on Minorities and on the Scheduled Areas and Scheduled Tribes. The seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth and the eleventh sessions were devoted to the consideration of the Draft Constitution. These eleven sessions of the Constituent Assembly have consumed 165 days. Out of these, the Assembly spent 114 days for the consideration of the Draft Constitution.

Coming to the Drafting Committee, it was elected by the Constituent Assembly on 29th August 1947. It held its first meeting on 30th August. Since August 30th it sat for 141 days during which it was engaged in the preparation of the Draft Constitution. The Draft / Constitution as prepared by the Constitutional Adviser as a text for the Draft Committee to work upon, consisted of 243 articles and 13 schedules. The first Draft Constitution as presented by the Drafting Committee to the Constituent Assembly contained 315 articles and 8 Schedules. At the end of the consideration stage, the number of articles in the Draft Constitution increased to 386. In its final form, the Draft Constitution contains 395 articles and 8 Schedules. The total number of amendments to the Draft Constitution tabled was approximately 7,635. Of them, the total number of amendments actually moved in the House was 2,473.

I mention these facts because at one stage it was being said that the Assembly had taken too long a time to finish its work – which was going on leisurely and wasting public money. It was said to be a case of Nero fiddling,

while Rome was burning. Is there any justification for this complaint? Let us note the time consumed by Constituent Assemblies in other countries appointed for framing their Constitutions. To take a few illustrations, the American Convention met on May 25th, 1787 and completed its work on September 17, 1787 i.e., within four months. The Constitutional Convention of Canada met on the 10th October 1864 and the Constitution was passed into law in March 1867 involving a period of two years and five months. The Australian Constitutional Convention assembled in March 1891 and the Constitution became law on the 9th July 1900, consuming a period of nine years. The South African Convention met in October, 1908 and the Constitution became law on the 20th September 1909 involving one year's labour. It is true that we have taken more time than what the American or South African Conventions did. But we have not taken more time than the Canadian Convention and much less than the Australian Convention. In making comparisons on the basis of time consumed, two things must be remembered. One is that the Constitutions of America, Canada, South Africa and Australia are much smaller than ours. Our Constitution as I said contains 395 articles while the American has just seven articles, the first four of which are divided into sections which total up to 21, the Canadian has 147, Australian 128 and South African 153 sections. The second thing to be remembered is that the makers of the Constitutions of America, Canada, Australia and South Africa did not have to face the problem of amendments. They were passed as moved. On the other hand, this Constituent Assembly had to deal with as many as 2,473 amendments. Having regard to these facts, the charge



of dilatoriness seems to me quite unfounded and this Assembly may well congratulate itself for having accomplished so formidable a task in so short a time.

Turning to the quality of the work done by the Drafting Committee, Mr. Naziruddin Ahmed felt it his duty to condemn it outright. In his opinion, the work done by the Drafting Committee is not only not worthy of commendation, but is positively below par. Everybody has a right to have his opinion about the work done by the Drafting Committee and Mr. Naziruddin it welcome to have his own. Mr. Naziruddin Ahmed thinks he is a man of greater talents than any member of the Drafting Committee. The Drafting Committee would have welcomed him in their midst if the Assembly had thought him worthy of being appointed to it. If he had no place in the making of the Constitution it is certainly not the fault of the Drafting Committee.

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmed has coined a new name for the Drafting Committee evidently to show his contempt for it. He calls it a Drifting Committee. Mr. Naziruddin must no doubt be pleased with his hit. But he evidently does not know that there is a difference between drift without mastery and drift with mastery. If the Drafting Committee was drifting, it was never without mastery over the situation. It was not merely angling with the off chance of catching a fish. It was searching in known waters to find the fish it was after. To be in search of something better is not the same as drifting. Although Mr. Naziruddin Ahmed did not mean it as a compliment to the Drafting committee, I take it as a compliment to the Drafting Committee. The Drafting Committee would have

been guilty of gross dereliction of duty and of a false sense of dignity if it had not shown the honesty and the courage to withdraw the amendments which it thought faulty and substitute what it thought was better. If it is a mistake, I am glad the Drafting Committee did not fight shy of admitting such mistakes and coming forward to correct them.

“I am glad to find that with the exception of a solitary member, there is a general consensus of appreciation from the members of the Constituent Assembly of the work done by the Drafting Committee. I am sure the Drafting Committee feels happy to find this spontaneous recognition, of its labours expressed in such generous terms. As to the compliments that have been showered upon me both by the members of the Assembly as well as by my colleagues of the Drafting Committee I feel so overwhelmed that I cannot find adequate words to express fully my gratitude to them. I came into the Constituent Assembly with no greater aspiration than to safeguard the interests of the Scheduled Castes. I had not the remotest idea that I would be called upon to undertake more responsible functions. I was therefore greatly surprised when the Assembly elected me to the Drafting Committee. I was more than surprised when the Drafting Committee elected me to be its Chairman. There were in the Drafting Committee men bigger, better and more competent than myself such as my friend Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar. I am grateful to the Constituent Assembly and the Drafting Committee for reposing in me so much trust and confidence and to have chosen me as their instrument and given me this opportunity of serving the country”.

(Cheers)

The credit that is given to me



does not really belong to me. It belongs partly to Sir B.N. Rau, the Constitutional Adviser to the Constituent Assembly who prepared a rough draft of the Constitution for the consideration of the Drafting Committee. A part of the credit must go to the members of the Drafting Committee who, as I have said, have sat for 141 days and without whose ingenuity of devise new formulae and capacity to tolerance and to accommodate different points of view, the task of framing the Constitution could not have come to so successful a conclusion. Much greater share of the credit must go to Mr. S.N. Mukherjee, the Chief Draftsman of the Constitution. His ability to put the most intricate proposals in the simplest and clearest legal form can rarely be equaled, nor his capacity for hard work. He has been an acquisition to the Assembly. Without his help, this Assembly would have taken many more years to finalize the Constitution. I must not omit to mention the members of the staff working under Mr. Mukherjee. For, I know how hard they have worked and how long they have toiled sometimes even beyond midnight. I want to thank them all for their effort and their co-operation (Cheers)

The task of the Drafting Committee would have been a very difficult one if this Constituent Assembly has been merely a motley crowd, a tessellated pavement without cement, a black stone here and a white stone there in which each member or each group was a law unto itself. There would have been nothing but chaos. This possibility of chaos was reduced to nil by the existence of the Congress Party inside the Assembly which brought into its proceedings a sense of order and discipline. It is because of the discipline of the Congress Party that the Drafting Committee was able to pilot the

Constitution in the Assembly with the sure knowledge as to the fate of each article and each amendment. The Congress Party is, therefore, entitled to all the credit for the smooth sailing of the Draft Constitution in the Assembly.

The proceedings of this Constituent Assembly would have been very dull if all members had yielded to the rule of party discipline. Party discipline, in all its rigidity, would have converted this Assembly into a gathering of yes' men. Fortunately, there were rebels. They were Mr. Kamath, Dr. P.S. Deshmukh, Mr. Sidhva, Prof. K.T. Shah and Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru. The points they raised were mostly ideological. That I was not prepared to accept their suggestions does not diminish the value of their suggestions nor lessen the service they have rendered to the Assembly in enlivening its proceedings. I am grateful to them. But for them, I would not have had the opportunity which I got for expounding the principles underlying the Constitution which was more important than the mere mechanical work of passing the Constitution.

Finally, I must thank you Mr. President for the way in which you have conducted the proceedings of this Assembly. The courtesy and the consideration which you have shown to the members of the Assembly can never be forgotten by those who have taken part in the proceedings of this Assembly. There were occasions when the amendments of the Drafting Committee were sought to be barred on grounds purely technical in their nature. Those were very anxious moments for me. I am, therefore, especially grateful to you for not permitting legalism to defeat the work of Constitution-making.

As much defense as could be



offered to the constitution has been offered by my friends Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar and Mr. T.T. Krishnamachari. I shall not therefore enter into the merits of the Constitution. Because I feel, however good a Constitution may be, it is sure to turn out bad because those who are called to work it, happen to be a bad lot. However bad a Constitution may be, it may turn out to be good if those who are called to work it, happen to be a good lot. The working of a Constitution does not depend wholly upon the nature of the Constitution. The Constitution can provide only the organs of State such as the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary. The factors on which the working of those organs of the State depends are the people and the political parties they will set up as their instruments to carry out their wishes and their politics. Who can say how the people of India and their purposes or will they prefer revolutionary methods of achieving them? If they adopt the revolutionary methods, however good the Constitution may be, it requires no prophet to say that it will fail. It is, therefore, futile to pass any judgment upon the Constitution without reference to the part which the people and their parties are likely to play.

The condemnation of the Constitution largely comes from two quarters, the Communist Party and the Socialist Party. Why do they condemn the Constitution? Is it because it is really a bad Constitution? I venture to say 'no'. The Communist Party wants a Constitution based upon the principle of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. They condemn the Constitution because it is based upon parliamentary democracy. The Socialists want two things. The first thing they want is that if they come in power, the Constitution must give them the freedom to nationalize / socialize all

private property without payment of compensation. The second thing that the Socialists want is that the Fundamental Rights mentioned in the Constitution must be absolute and without any limitations so that if their party fails to come into power, they would have the unfettered freedom not merely to criticize, but also to overthrow the State.

These are the main grounds on which the Constitution is being condemned. I do not say that the principle of parliamentary democracy is the only ideal form of political democracy. I do not say that the principle of no acquisition of private property without compensation is so sacrosanct that there can be no departure from it. I do not say that Fundamental Rights can never be absolute and the limitations set upon them can never be lifted. What I do say is that the principles embodied in the Constitution are the views of the present generation or if you think this to be an overstatement, I say they are the views of the members of the Constituent Assembly. Why blame the Drafting Committee for embodying them in the Constitution? I say why blame even the Members of the Constituent Assembly? Jefferson, the great American statesman who played so great a part in the making of the American constitution, has expressed some very weighty views which makers of Constitution, can never afford to ignore.

In one place he has said:-

"We may consider each generation as a distinct nation, with a right, by the will of the majority, to bind themselves, but none to bind the succeeding generation, more than the inhabitants of another country."

In another place, he has said:-

"The idea that institutions established



for the use of the nation cannot be touched or modified, even to make them answer their end, because of rights gratuitously supposed in those employed to manage them in the trust for the public, may perhaps be a salutary provision against the abuses of a monarch, but is most absurd against the nation itself. Yet our lawyers and priests generally inculcate this doctrine, and suppose that preceding generations held the earth more freely than we do; had a right to impose laws on us, unalterable by ourselves, and that we, in the like manner, can make laws and impose burdens on future generations, which they will have no right to alter; in fine that the earth belongs to the dead and not the living.”

Every social history in the society has background reservation has its own background when people into high and low on the basis of their birth and not on the basis of merit were divided by the law book of Brahmins i.e., Manu Smriti.

The Britishers left the culture & inequality and suppression which the governing class after partition of the country accepted with hatred in hearts and untouchability in minds practices such as segregation in housing schools and cremation grounds. Defacto prohibition of caste marriage, limitation or prohibit of access to public places such as water taps, health care & education, restriction on occupation, assignment of the most mental, dirty & dangerous jobs as defined by the caste hierarchy, brutal killing, parading naked dalits (SCs & STs) women everyday particularly in rural areas of the country. Most of the law enforcing agencies in the states are controlled under supervision of the upper caste officials who do not want to lend a sympathetic ears to the suffering Dalits. Nothing has stopped in India against SCs

& STs even after independence despite of constitutional safeguards beet terminology of atrocities changed like honour killing, stone death, house burning & so on.

The respective governments at the centre have failed in upholding the constitutional obligation for the betterment of the weaker sections of the society.

We the people of Bahujans the majority should always authority but the educated and elite SC, ST & OBCs people are not pay back to their society and organized them as well as not followed the cautions, directions and path of the Dr. B.R.Ambedkar. “Political power is the master key by which we can open each and every lock.” And, not understand the “One man one vote and one value.” As long as these people realize their strength, and power of the vote. They may not come to the one agenda and one party can’t form the Government with workers and peasants. So long as they will not get protection of their lives in the country.

Conclusion

It is observed that nothing has stopped in India against SCs & STs even after independence despite of constitutional safeguards beet terminology of atrocities changed like honour killing, stone death, house burning & so on. The respective governments at the centre have failed in upholding the constitutional obligation for the betterment of the weaker sections of the society. Thus, there is an need of honour of social democracy to the hahujans as stressed the Dr. B.R.Ambedkar.



References:

1. Thus Spoke Ambedkar Vol-II edited by Bhagawandas Bheem Patil. Pub-Jilinder Page 175-176
2. This is the final speech dated 25-11-1949 of Bharat Ratna Dr. B.R. Ambedkar in Constituent Assembly.
3. Rahul Kumar Balley Director, Budha education foundation, New Delhi.
<http://www.countercurrents.org/balley24091.html>

E-Mail:- s.ambedkar9@gmail.com,

Mobile No: - 94401 43510