



## Study about Indian Political Thoughts and elaboration of political thought of *All-Round Democracy* by Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar

Dr. Rav. S. Dharpawar, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science  
Chintamani Mahavidyalaya, Ghugus, Dist.Chandrapur

**Abstract** : Indian political thought were evolved by great intellectuals in ancient times. Manu and Kautilya, the ancient Indian philosophers had devised highly valuable political and administrative ideas and policies. In the era that began with the philosophical movements which are expressed in the mystical texts known as Upanisads and ended in the government of the emperor Asoka, whose rule extended over all but southernmost India, the dimensions of Indian social thought were established. During these influential centuries, approximately from the seventh to the middle of the third century B.C., new approaches of economic production, the incorporation of indigenous peoples into the Aryan community, and other social changes rendered the old agencies of integration and new social relationships demanding new justifications. People were faced with challenges of life that needed to re-evaluate basic values and institutions. Numerous ideas about the nature and destiny of human life began to challenge outmoded religious notions.

Many Indian thinkers from ancient times have offered thoughts on politics and political institutions. The tradition in India originally has been that state and state-craft and politics were viewed as a part of the general philosophical tradition of the Vedas and Upanishads. Kautilya represents that tradition among ancient thinkers most prominently. Even in the views of Gandhiji one can see traces of the Indian tradition. Nehru and Ambedkar were educated in the west and were influenced by the European political traditions and were thus interested in the political philosophy of equality and liberal freedoms that is the focus of the western traditions.

**Key Words** : Ved, Upanishad, Kautilya, Amatyas, Swami Vivekanand, Gandhi, Ambedkar , Political thinkers

**Introduction** : Parliamentary government is recognized as responsible government mainly because the executive is constantly watched and controlled by the opposition. Respect and official status for the opposition means absence of absolute power for the executive. The other condition is a neutral and non political civil service. A neutral civil service means that officers would be permanent - not dependent on the fortunes of the political parties - and that they would not take sides with political parties. This will be possible only when appointments of civil servants are not made on the basis of political consideration. Success of democracy depends on

ISSN 2454-308X





several ethical and moral factors also. A country may have a constitution. But it is only a set of rules. These rules become meaningful only when people in the country develop conventions and traditions constant with the constitution. People and politicians necessity follow sure norms in public life. Likewise, there necessity also exist a sense of morality and conscientiousness in the civilization. Law and legal remedies can never replace a voluntary sense of responsibility. No amount of law can enforce morality. Norms of honest and responsible behaviour necessity develop in the civilization. Democracy can be successful only when every citizen feels duty bound to fight injustice even if that injustice does not put him into any difficulty personally. This will happen when equality and brotherhood exist in the civilization.

To create democracy successful in India, Ambedkar suggested a few other precautions also. Democracy means rule of the majority. But this should not result into tyranny of the majority. Majority necessity always respects the views of the minority. In India there is a possibility that the minority society will always be a political minority also. So, it is very essential that the minority necessity feel free, safe and secure. Otherwise, it will be very easy to convert democracy into a permanent rule against the minority. Caste system could therefore become the mainly hard obstacle in the successful functioning of democracy.

### **DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR**

Dr. Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar (14 April 1891 – 6 December 1956), popularly also recognized as Babasaheb, was an Indian jurist, political leader, philosopher, anthropologist, historian, orator, economist, teacher, editor, prolific writer, revolutionary and a revivalist for Buddhism in India. Ambedkar campaigned against social discrimination, the system of Chaturvarna – the categorization of Hindu civilization into four varnas – and the Hindu caste system. He converted to Buddhism and is also credited with providing a spark for the transformation of hundreds of thousands of Dalits or untouchables to Theravada Buddhism. Ambedkar was posthumously awarded the Bharat Ratna, India's highest civilian award, in 1990.

Overcoming numerous social and financial obstacles, Ambedkar became one of the first Dalit (untouchables) to obtain a college education in India. Eventually earning a law degree and doctorates for his revise and research in law, economics and political science from Columbia University and the London School of Economics, Ambedkar gained a reputation as a scholar and practiced law for a few years, later campaigning by publishing journals advocating political rights and social freedom for India's untouchables.

He is regarded as a Bodhisattva by some Indian Buddhists, however he never claimed himself to be a Bodhisattva. Ambedkar said at a public function in 1956, while he was converting, that, "accepting Buddhism does not only mean getting into new religion it means entering into new shape of life where everybody has responsibility to cultivate wisdom, compassion and morality in this life moments, Buddha's dhamma is here to guide and protect humanity, what we have to do is to strive for creating a moral order" Ambedkar's View on the British Rule in India



Ambedkar was aware of the drawbacks inherent 'in foreign rule. The British government had introduced some representative organizations in India.

But full self-government could not have any alternative. Besides, Ambedkar always complained that the plight of the untouchables did not change under British rule. The British rulers were not interested in removing untouchability. Their policy had always been careful in the matter of social reform. Reforms were likely to anger the upper castes and provide them an opportunity to rally against' British rule. So, British rulers did not encourage rapid social reforms. Even in the field of education, Ambedkar felt that the government was not sincere in spreading education in the middle of the untouchables. All educational facilities were utilized by the upper. castes only. Moreover, the interests of the upper castes and those of the untouchables were opposed to each other. Ambedkar' wanted the British government to mediate on behalf of the untouchables. But the government neglected this responsibility. Because of this attitude of neglect, the untouchable society could not get any benefit from the British rule. He was also not very happy in relation to the British management. He was particularly critical of the management on explanation of its in excess of expensive character and common neglect of public welfare. But he knew that abrupt departure of the British would result into political power of the upper castes. So, a political resolution was necessary clearly mentioning the powers of and safeguards for the untouchable society.

Without this, independence would be meaningless for the untouchables. In short, Ambedkar criticized the British rule for failing in its duty to uplift the untouchables. For this cause he supported the cause of self-government. But he insisted that in free India, the untouchable society necessity get a proper share in the power structure; otherwise independence would merely mean rule by the upper castes.

### **Ambedkar on Democracy**

Like several other national leaders Ambedkar had complete faith in democracy. Dictatorship may be able to produce results quickly; it may be effective in maintaining discipline but cannot be one's choice as a permanent shape of government. Democracy is superior because it enhances liberty. People have manage in excess of the rulers. In the middle of the dissimilar shapes of democratic government, Ambedkar's choice fell on the parliamentary shape. In this case also he was in agreement with several other national leaders.

### **Social and Economic Democracy**

Ambedkar viewed democracy as an instrument of bringing in relation to the change peacefully. Democracy does not merely mean rule by the majority or government by the representatives of the people. This is a formalistic and limited notion of democracy. We would understand the meaning of democracy in 8 better fashion if we view it as a method of realizing drastic changes in the social and economic spheres of civilization. Ambedkar's thought of democracy is much



more than presently a scheme of government. He emphasizes the need for bringing in relation to the an allround democracy. A scheme of government does not exist in vacuum; it operates within the civilization. Its usefulness depends upon its connection with the other spheres of civilization. Elections, parties and parliaments are, after all, formal organizations of democracy. They cannot be effective in an undemocratic atmosphere. Political democracy means the principle of 'one man one vote' which designates political equality. But if oppression and injustice exist, the spirit of political democracy would be missing. Democratic government, so, should be an extension of a democratic civilization. In the Indian civilization, for example, so extensive as caste barriers and caste-based inequalities exist, real democracy cannot operate. In this sense, democracy means a spirit of fraternity and equality and not merely a political arrangement. Success of democracy in India can be ensured only by establishing a truly democratic civilization.

Beside with the social foundations of democracy, Ambedkar takes into consideration the economic features also. It is true that he was greatly influenced by liberal thought. Still, he appreciated the limitations of liberalism. Parliamentary democracy, in which he had great faith, was also critically examined by him. He argued that parliamentary democracy was based on liberalism. It ignored economic inequalities and never concentrated upon the troubles of the downtrodden. Besides, the common tendency of the western kind of parliamentary democracies has been to ignore the issues of social and economic equality. In other languages, parliamentary democracy accentuated only liberty whereas true democracy implies both liberty and equality. This analysis becomes very significant in the Indian context. Indian civilization was demanding freedom from the British. But Ambedkar was afraid that freedom of the nation would not ensure real freedom for the people. Social and economic inequalities have dehumanized the Indian civilization. Establishing democracy in such a civilization would be nothing short of a revolution. This would be a revolution in the social structure and attitudes of the people. In the lay of hereditary inequality, the principles of brotherhood and equality necessity are recognized. So, Ambedkar supported the *thought of all-round democracy*.

#### References :

1. U.N. Ghoshal, A History of Indian Political Ideas, London, Oxford University Pres, 1959.
2. K.P. Jayaswal, Hindu Polity, Calcuta, Butterworth, 1924.
3. R. P. Kangle, Arthashastra of Kautilya, Delhi, Motilal Bansarsidass, 1965.
4. M.J. Kanetkar, Tilak and Gandhi: A Comparative Study, Nagpur, Author, 1935.
5. V.B. Karnik, M.N. Roy: Political Biography, Bombay, Jagriti, 1978.
6. K. P. Karunakaran, Modern Indian Political Tradition, New Delhi, Allied Publishers, 1962.
7. V.R. Mehta, Foundations of Indian Political Thought, New Delhi, Manohar, 1992.



8. T. Pantham, and K. Deustch (eds), Political Thought in Modern India, New Delhi, Sage, 1986.
9. B. Parekh and T. Pantham (eds), Political Discourse: Exploration in Indian and Western Political Thought, New Delhi, Sage, 1987.
10. D.P. Roy, Leftists Politics in India: M. N. Roy and the Radical Democratic Party, Calcutta, Minerva, 1989.
11. B.S. Sharma, The Political Philosophy of M.N. Roy, Delhi, National Publishing House, 1965.