



REIMAGINING DEMOCRACY AND ECONOMY: THE VISION OF DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR

Hareet Kumar Meena¹, Sangeeta Dhayal²

¹Dr Hareet Kumar Meena, Associate Professor, Department of History, Central University of Punjab.

²Sangeeta Dhayal, PhD Scholar, Department of History, Central University of Punjab.

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra19912>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra19912

ABSTRACT

Dr Bhimrao Ambedkar, a visionary leader and social reformer, was a staunch advocate of democracy and economic equality. This research paper examines the democratic framework of Dr Ambedkar, with a particular focus on its economic structure and underlying principles. It explores how the political ideology of Ambedkar was shaped by his commitment to social justice, equality, and economic freedom. The study delves into his belief that political democracy is incomplete without economic democracy and highlights his emphasis on equal opportunities, fair resource distribution, and the eradication of caste-based discrimination. The paper also analyses Ambedkar's critique of hereditary systems, the role of functional opposition in parliamentary democracy, and the significance of free and fair elections in ensuring transparency and accountability. By contextualising the vision of Ambedkar within the broader framework of democratic governance, this research underscores the relevance of his vision in addressing contemporary issues of inequality, social exclusion, and economic injustice.

KEYWORDS: *Dr. B. R. Ambedkar; Democratic Framework; Economic Structure; Parliamentary Democracy; Social Justice; Caste and Discrimination; Inclusive Governance.*

INTRODUCTION

Dr Bhimrao Ambedkar is one of the most influential thinkers and leaders in Indian history. He was recognised for his significant contributions to shaping the democratic system of India. His role in drafting the Indian Constitution is well-known, but his ideas on democracy and its relationship with economic structures deserve deeper exploration. The thoughts of Dr Ambedkar on democracy were not just political but also economic. He believed that for democracy to thrive, it needed a foundation of economic equality. According to him, political freedom without economic justice is incomplete and ineffective.

Ambedkar was a strong advocate for the protection of Dalits and marginalised groups, but his vision for democracy was broader. His support for a parliamentary system was grounded in his belief that it could provide the framework for equality, justice, and participation for all citizens. However, he also recognised that a mere political system was not enough. He understood that without addressing economic inequalities, democracy could not function in its true sense.

The democratic framework of Dr Ambedkar was intricately connected to his ideas about economic freedom and justice. He argued that democracy must ensure equal opportunities for economic advancement, remove barriers created by the caste system, and prevent the concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a few. In his view, the structure of governance and the distribution of resources were key to maintaining a just and functioning democracy. He believed that a true democracy should not only ensure political freedom but also provide the conditions for economic and social equality.

This research paper aims to examine the democratic framework of Dr B.R. Ambedkar, focusing on how his economic ideas were integral to his vision for a just society. By studying his thoughts on democracy, economic equality, and the role of the state, this paper seeks to understand how his economic structure supported the idea of a true democratic system. Through this exploration, the paper will show that the democratic ideals of Ambedkar were not just political in nature but deeply rooted in the economic realities of society, which he believed must be addressed for democracy to succeed.



METHOD AND MATERIALS

This study employs a qualitative methodology to explore the economic and democratic vision of Dr Ambedkar. Primary sources, including his writings, speeches, and legislative contributions, were analysed to understand his advocacy for economic equality and democratic governance. Archival records, such as government reports and historical accounts, provided context for his efforts to combat economic oppression and promote resource democratisation. Secondary sources, including books, research articles, and critiques, offered additional perspectives. By combining primary and secondary sources, this study provides a detailed understanding of the vision of Dr Ambedkar on the democratic framework and its economic structure.

The Essence of Parliamentary Democracy

Ambedkar was a strong proponent of parliamentary democracy. For him, the essence of democracy lay in the ability of people to freely choose their leaders through fair elections. He rejected the idea of hereditary rule, which was prevalent in many monarchies and autocratic regimes. From the perspective of Dr Ambedkar, parliamentary democracy was the most suitable system for modern society. A person cannot become a ruler simply because they are a hereditary ruler. To become a ruler, one must be elected by the people, and it is essential for the ruler to have the support of the populace. This ensures that the government is responsive to the needs and aspirations of the people.

The support for the parliamentary democracy of Ambedkar was not just theoretical. He understood the practical challenges of implementing democracy in a diverse and complex society like India. He believed that democracy could only function effectively if it was backed by economic equality. Without addressing the economic disparities that existed within society, political democracy would remain hollow. The vision of democracy that Ambedkar advocated was closely connected to economic reforms. that would provide equal opportunities for all citizens, particularly the marginalised and lower castes.

The Role of the Opposition

One of the key elements of the democratic framework of Ambedkar was his emphasis on the importance of the opposition in a parliamentary system. In any democracy, it is essential that the opposition plays a constructive role in holding the government accountable. Ambedkar believed that a healthy democracy requires a vibrant opposition to challenge the policies of the ruling party and propose alternative solutions.

He viewed the opposition as an essential part of the democratic process. A government that is not challenged by a strong opposition risks becoming authoritarian or complacent. The opposition ensures that the views of different sections of society are heard and considered in the decision-making process. Ambedkar recognised that the role of the opposition was not just to criticise but also to offer meaningful alternatives to the policies of the government. This ensures that the policies adopted by the government are in the best interest of all citizens. Furthermore, Ambedkar believed that the opposition should be free to express its views without fear of repression. A democracy cannot function effectively if political dissent is suppressed. He argued that the existence of a functional opposition was necessary for the health of the democratic system.

Freedom and Fair Elections: A Pillar of Democracy

Dr Ambedkar considered freedom and fair elections as the cornerstone of parliamentary democracy. He believed that democracy could only be successful if elections were conducted in a free and fair manner. Elections, according to Ambedkar, should not be influenced by money, power, or other external factors. He warned that if elections were controlled by wealthy industrialists or businessmen, the outcome would not reflect the true will of the people. Instead, the government would serve the interests of the rich and powerful rather than those of the common people.

Ambedkar was particularly concerned about the growing influence of money in politics. He observed that big industrialists and businessmen were increasingly donating large sums of money to political parties, especially the ruling ones. This, he argued, could distort the democratic process by giving undue influence to the wealthy classes. If the rich could buy elections, they could control the political system and use their power to further their own interests. To clarify this fact, he provided the example of the *Mahabharata* in a speech delivered at D.A.B. College in Jalandhar, Punjab, on October 28, 1951. 'In the war between the Pandavas and the Kauravas, Bhishma and Drona supported the Pandavas. Bhishma acknowledged that the Pandava side was just and the Kaurava side was unjust. When someone asked Bhishma why he supported the Kauravas despite their unfair behaviour, he replied that he had eaten the salt of the Kauravas. Therefore, despite their unjust actions, he felt obligated to support them.



He emphasised the need to keep politics free from the influence of money, as this would ensure that elections were truly representative of the will of the people. His concerns were not limited to the political class but extended to the larger economic structure. He believed that economic inequality could result in political inequality, where the wealthy would exert an excessive amount of influence over the political process. This, in turn, would undermine the fundamental essence of democracy, which is rooted in the principle of equal participation for all citizens.

Ambedkar was adamant that parliamentary democracy could not succeed if it relied on the support of the wealthy classes, particularly the Baniyas, Marwaris, and millionaires. He argued that these groups had a vested interest in maintaining the status quo and preventing any reforms that could challenge their economic power. He warned that if these groups were allowed to influence the political system, the result would be the perpetuation of economic inequality and the concentration of power in the hands of a few.

According to Ambedkar, the only way to protect the democratic system from the dangers of external money was to ensure that elections were held without the involvement of wealth and money. This would require political parties to be accountable to the people rather than to the wealthy donors who funded their campaigns. The warning of Ambedkar about the dangers of black money is as relevant today as it was during his time. In many democracies, the influence of money in politics remains a critical issue, and the insights of Ambedkar continue to offer valuable lessons on how to safeguard the integrity of the electoral process.

Distribution of Resources in a Democracy

The form of democracy is constantly evolving. In England, for example, democracy underwent significant changes after the Revolution of 1688. Later, in 1832, reforms were introduced, reflecting the shifting goals of democracy. The earlier objective of British democracy was to limit the special privileges of the king, who had the power to make laws outside of parliament. By restricting this power, democracy was established in opposition to the unitary system of governance, where the king held absolute control.

Today, the goal of democracy is not to reduce the rights of the ruler but to protect the interests of the people. In the dynamic world of today, the purpose of nations is to safeguard democracy. Democracy, in this sense, means that the structure of governance should allow for significant changes in the economic and social conditions of the people without resorting to violence. If those in power can bring about fundamental changes peacefully, then true democracy is achieved. History teaches us that one of the main reasons for the failure of democracies is inequality. When one class, like the Dalits, bears the burden of hard work while another class enjoys privileges, the system becomes unbalanced. The unequal distribution of resources often leads to political unrest and even revolutions. This is why, according to Ambedkar, a parliamentary democracy must be built on the principle of equality.

Ambedkar also referred to the famous quote of the Abraham Lincoln, 'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' The intention of Lincoln was to warn that if there were deep divisions between the Northern and Southern states in the U.S., the country would not be able to face external threats. Ambedkar, however, interpreted this differently, focusing on social divisions. He believed that the real threat to democracy comes from the division between different classes within society. Dalits and the oppressed classes carry the burden of work, while the privileged classes enjoy the benefits and resist giving up their advantages. In such a scenario, democracy cannot succeed.

For parliamentary democracy to be successful, the distribution of resources must be fair. Ambedkar argued that the struggle for equality is a fight for the fair distribution of resources. He believed that the history of class struggles over resource distribution had reshaped the values of democracy. Therefore, ensuring equal access to resources is essential for the survival and success of democracy.

Urbanisation and Industrialisation

Dr Ambedkar saw urbanisation as a key factor in development, especially for the upliftment of Dalits. He believed that urbanisation is essential for economic progress, as it provides new opportunities for work and social mobility. In contrast, rural life, with its limited resources and rigid social structures, keeps people in a state of immobility. Industrial growth opens up new avenues of employment, allowing Dalits to move away from their traditional occupations. When Dalits begin to live in cities and engage in technical or non-traditional jobs, it leads to their economic and social advancement.

Dr Ambedkar also believed that life is short, and one should strive to achieve a meaningful purpose. He cautioned the Dalit community about the dangers of following the teachings of Gandhi. According to Ambedkar, the vision of Gandhi was not beneficial for Dalits. His focus on rural life and the idealisation of simple, village-based living, according to Ambedkar, was outdated and impractical. He viewed the approach of Gandhi as reactionary from both an economic and social perspective. Ambedkar criticised Gandhi for not having a concrete program to address the issues faced by the Dalit class.



Equality of Interests and Opportunities

Economic equality and equal opportunities are essential for the survival of a true democratic system. Without addressing the economic slavery faced by Dalits, democracy loses its meaning. The foundation of democracy lies in providing economic equality and equal chances for advancement to all citizens. A society that tolerates economic slavery and limits opportunities for the upliftment of certain groups cannot truly be considered democratic. The essence of democracy is lost when people from specific classes are forced to depend on others for their basic needs without the freedom to pursue a dignified life.

Dr Ambedkar argued that slavery goes beyond legal oppression. It represents a societal condition where certain individuals are forced to accept conditions that are controlled by others, stripping them of their freedom and agency. In societies where slavery exists, the democratic spirit is effectively dead. Ambedkar emphasised that until Dalits are freed from their economic oppression and given the same opportunities as others, democracy will remain incomplete.

Ambedkar drew a parallel between the oppression of untouchables in India and the discrimination faced by Jews in Nazi Germany. Although the methods of repression might differ in severity, the results were equally harmful. The caste system, particularly through its connection to Brahmanism, deprived Dalits of their rights and opportunities. The caste system was designed to enforce a rigid social order, which limited the economic freedom and social mobility of Dalits. By enforcing a system where certain people were denied their fundamental rights, Brahmanism undermined the core democratic principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

Dr Ambedkar made it clear that Brahminism was not just about the power and privileges of the Brahmin community. It referred to the violation of the democratic ideals of equality and freedom. Brahminism, as Ambedkar saw it, was present in all classes of society, not just among Brahmins. The wealthy and powerful classes, united by their social and economic status, denied Dalits their rights and opportunities. This system led to the destruction of the democratic form of the caste system and turned it into a tool for maintaining ignorance and social inequality.

The caste system became a mechanism for denying basic rights, such as access to education and the right to bear arms. In a society where only one class has the right to education, knowledge, and even weapons, democracy cannot thrive. Dr Ambedkar argued that a democratic country cannot be protected or progress if its citizens are deprived of these essential rights and opportunities. Without the equal distribution of resources and rights, democracy cannot function as it should.

CONCLUSION

The democratic framework of Dr B. R. Ambedkar was deeply rooted in his vision of social and economic equality. He believed that political democracy could not thrive without economic democracy. Through his emphasis on fair distribution of resources, equality of opportunity, and the eradication of economic disparities, Ambedkar sought to create a system where every individual could participate meaningfully in the democratic process.

His advocacy for free and fair elections, the need for a strong opposition, and the dangers posed by black money highlighted his commitment to safeguarding democracy from corruption and exploitation. The focus of Ambedkar on industrialisation and urbanisation as tools for the economic upliftment of marginalised communities demonstrated his pragmatic approach to achieving social and economic justice.

The democratic vision of Ambedkar extended beyond political structures. It sought to transform society by eradicating caste-based discrimination and ensuring that all citizens enjoyed equal rights and opportunities. His belief that equality of opportunity is the lifeblood of democracy remains relevant in addressing contemporary challenges of inequality and injustice. In essence, the democratic framework of Dr Ambedkar was a powerful call for an inclusive society where the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity formed the foundation of governance and economic development. His ideas continue to inspire efforts toward building a more just and equitable world.

REFERENCES

1. Ambedkar, B.R. (1955). *The Rise and Fall of the Hindu Woman*. India: Ambedkar Publ. Soc.
2. Ambedkar, B.R., & Moon, V. (2014). *Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar: Writings and speeches*. Dr Ambedkar Foundation.
3. Ambedkar, B.R., Anand, S., & Ilaiah, K. (2016). *Riddles in Hinduism: An Exposition to Enlighten the Masses: The Annotated Critical Selection*. Navayana.



4. Ambedkar, B.R. (2022). *Annihilation of Caste: Annihilation of Caste by Dr B.R. Ambedkar: A Landmark Discourse on Equality and Social Justice*. Prabhat Prakashan.
5. Ambedkar, B.R. (1990). *Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar: Writings and Speeches*. Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
6. Das, Bhagwan. (1969). *Thus, Spoke Ambedkar (volumes 1-4)*. Ambedkar Sahithya Prakashana.
7. Datta, R. (2019). *Emancipating and Strengthening Indian Women: An Analysis of B.R. Ambedkar's Contribution*. *Contemporary Voice of Dalit*, 11(1), 25-32.
8. Gandhi, M. (1983). *Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments with Truth*. Courier Corporation.
9. Ghosal, D. (2023). *B.R. Ambedkar: The Messiah and Emancipator of Indian Women*. *Contemporary Voice of Dalit*, 15(1), S19-S32.
10. Gupta, S. S. (1994). *Economic Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi (Vol. 10)*. Concept Publishing Company.
11. Jaffrelot, C. (2006). *Dr Ambedkar and Untouchability: Analysing and Fighting Caste*. Orient Blackswan.
12. Keer, Dhananjay. (1995). *Dr. Ambedkar: Life and Mission*. Popular Prakashan.
13. Omvedt, G. (2004). *Dalits and the Democratic Revolution: Dr Ambedkar and the Dalit Movement in Colonial India*. New Delhi: Penguin
14. Zelliott, E. (1992). *From Untouchable to Dalit: Essays on the Ambedkar Movement*. New Delhi: Manohar.