International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar's Vision: The Constitution as an Instrument for Democratizing Indian Society and Polity

Dr. Mangesh H. Kadam

Asst. prof.-cum-Asst. Director in Social Sciences, Centre for Distance and Online Education, SNDT Women's University, Santacruz West, Mumbai-400049, Maharashtra

Abstract

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar is universally acknowledged as the chief architect and "Father of the Indian Constitution,". His profound understanding of India's complex social, economic, and political systems, coupled with his personal experiences of discrimination and untouchability, served as the driving force behind his lifelong struggle for social justice and the establishment of a truly democratic system. Born into a marginalized community, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar dedicated his life to challenging the deeply ingrained caste system and striving for equality among all citizens. As India's first Law Minister and the Chairman of the Drafting Committee, he meticulously applied his vast experience and extensive knowledge in framing a Constitution designed to be the blueprint for a democratic and egalitarian India. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, acknowledging Ambedkar's exceptional contribution, observed that "No one took greater trouble and care in framing Constitution than Dr. Ambedkar". This article undertakes a comprehensive analysis of Ambedkar's constitutional philosophy, exploring how he envisioned the Constitution as a transformative instrument for democratizing Indian society and polity. It will systematically examine his views on the role of the modern nation-state, the principles of constitutionalism, his unique conception of state socialism, and his expansive understanding of social democracy. Furthermore, it will delve into the foundational principles of liberty, equality, fraternity, and justice as articulated by him. The report will also address contemporary debates surrounding constitutional amendments, particularly the contested terms 'socialism' and 'secularism' in the Preamble, and critically assess the pervasive influence of capitalism on India's political and policymaking landscape.

Keywords: constitutional Morality, rule of law, social democracy, state socialism, equity, fairness, rule of majority, citizenship, limited power, fraternity, equality of opportunity, justice, liberty, rights, Caste, egalitarian, capitalism, economy

The Constitution's Role for a Modern Nation-State

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar understood the Constitution as a fundamental document indispensable for establishing a robust and enduring democratic system in India. He conceived of democracy not merely as a political system but as a comprehensive "way of life" encompassing political, social, and economic dimensions. The Constitution, meticulously drafted under his chairmanship, was designed to define the precise position and power of the three organs of the state—the legislature, executive, and judiciary—thereby providing free India with its essential legal framework and securing the basis of its people's freedom.

He viewed revolutions as inherently uncertain methods of change, fraught with high risks of confusion and disaster. Instead, he championed a constitutional mechanism capable of facilitating a transfer of political power that was simultaneously accompanied by a fundamental redistribution of that power, leading to genuine social change and altering the relative strength of forces operating within society. The Constitution was thus intended to guide all legislative, executive, and judicial actions, ensuring stability and ordered progress, reflecting a "Government by Law" approach.

Constitution as an active agent of social transformation and re-formation:

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar placed special emphasis on ensuring dignity, unity, freedom, and rights for all citizens, enshrining these core values within the Constitution. He was a staunch champion of Fundamental Rights, ensuring their robust guarantee against the state in Part III of the Indian Constitution, a concept notably borrowed from the USA. These rights were deemed crucial for integrating all citizens, particularly the Dalits and socially backward classes, into the national mainstream on an equal footing.

The Indian Constitution is notably described as the "first and foremost sociological document". This designation signals that the Constitution's purpose extends beyond mere legal or political governance; it is deeply concerned with societal structure and change. To understand why it is considered "sociological," one must connect it to Ambedkar's personal experiences and overarching mission. Driven by his profound experiences of social discrimination and untouchability, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar explicitly designed the Constitution to address and eradicate deep-seated social evils like the caste system and untouchability. It was conceived not just as a rulebook for governing an existing society but as a powerful tool for engineering a new, egalitarian social order. The goal was to fundamentally alter existing social relationships and power dynamics, bringing about "revolutionary changes in economic and social life... without bloodshed". This goes significantly beyond the typical constitutional roles of defining state organs or outlining political processes; it positions the Constitution as an active agent of social transformation and re-formation.

The principles of liberty, equality, fraternity, and justice formed the absolute bedrock of Ambedkar's constitutionalism and his comprehensive vision for India. He equated fraternity with democracy, calling it "only another name for democracy". He argued that these **three principles—liberty, equality, and fraternity—form an indivisible "union of trinity,"** asserting that to separate one from the others would "defeat the very purpose of democracy". Justice, which he viewed as fairness and equity, was to be secured through just laws and institutions, encompassing crucial social, political, and economic dimensions.

A core idea underlying the Constitution, according to Ambedkar, was the **intrinsic interdependence of citizenship, rights, and the rule of law**. With the Constitution's implementation in 1950, Indians became citizens of a sovereign nation for the very first time. From his early interventions, starting with the Southborough Commission in 1919, he consistently advocated for full rights for Indian citizens, linking citizenship directly to a comprehensive bundle of rights. This emphasis underscored his preference for "Government by Law" over "Government by People," ensuring that governance was always constrained and guided by legal principles.

Ambedkar's Constitutionalism:

Limiting Power and Ensuring Justice

Constitutionalism, for Ambedkar, was intrinsically linked with liberalism and unequivocally centered on

the rule of law. It rigorously demands that elected representatives and government officials operate strictly within the limitations and procedures meticulously set out in the Constitution. This framework ensures that "all authority is subject to and constrained by law", thereby preventing arbitrary rule and promoting accountability across all branches of governance. The essentials of rule of law, as he articulated them, included the absolute supremacy of regular law, equality before the law, and unfettered access to justice. Dr. B.R. Ambedkar famously described the Constitution's legal provisions as merely a "skeleton," with its vital "flesh" being constitutional morality. This concept refers to a collective readiness to obey the "rules of the game" of democratic governance. He candidly acknowledged that constitutional morality is "not a natural sentiment" but rather "has to be cultivated," recognizing that Indian society, which he deemed "essentially undemocratic," had yet to fully internalize it. For the parliamentary system to succeed, both the populace and the governments must adhere to these constitutional morals, which include respect for the form of government, obedience to law, free thinking, and observance of majority rule (for citizens), and a willingness to peacefully surrender power upon losing confidence, respect for minorities, and impartial administration (for governments). The explicit need to cultivate constitutional morality, particularly in an Indian society he characterized as "essentially undemocratic", reveals Ambedkar's deep concern about the potential for majoritarian excesses or the erosion of democratic norms. He foresaw that in a historically hierarchical and diverse society, the mere existence of electoral democracy might not guarantee justice or protection for minorities.

Role of Opposition and Constitutional Morality:

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar viewed democracy functionally as a **"veto of power,"** a direct and fundamental contradiction to hereditary or autocratic authority. This vital "veto" manifests in quinquennial elections, where rulers must periodically seek re-election and popular sanction. Crucially, it also resides in the immediate veto provided by a vigilant opposition in Parliament. He emphatically stressed that "the opposition is a condition precedent for democracy," ensuring that the government is "always on the anvil" and compelled to justify its every act to those who do not belong to its party. The "veto of power" (through elections and opposition) and the **insistence on a strong opposition** are not just procedural elements but practical mechanisms designed to enforce this constitutional morality. They ensure that the "rules of the game" are adhered to, even when popular sentiment might lean towards unchecked power. Thus, **constitutional morality** acts as a critical, albeit fragile, safeguard against the inherent risks of **majoritarian rule**, preventing it from devolving into a tyranny that undermines the very principles of liberty and equality. This highlights Ambedkar's profound foresight regarding the challenges of implementing democracy in a deeply stratified society. He understood that legal frameworks alone are insufficient; a robust civic culture of adherence to constitutional principles is paramount to prevent the abuse of power and to genuinely protect vulnerable groups, ensuring that democracy is not just a "top-dressing" but deeply rooted in the social fabric.

Idea of State Socialism: Towards an Egalitarian Economy

Ambedkar's economic vision was fundamentally driven by the urgent need to **eradicate poverty, inequality, and exploitation, particularly for the vast masses of the Indian population**. He articulated a sharp critique of the **caste system, which he believed perpetuated economic inequality by restricting occupational mobility and enforcing unpaid or underpaid labor, especially for Dalits in agrarian economies**. He contended that private enterprises, primarily guided by profit maximization, could not

effectively achieve these societal goals and would instead exacerbate existing wealth inequalities.
He was a strong proponent of **"State Socialism,"** proposing that the state should own and control key and basic industries, and that agriculture should be treated as a state industry. This included advocating for collective farming as a means to counter Brahminical land monopolies and ensure equitable distribution of agricultural produce. He also suggested the nationalization of life insurance, viewing it as a crucial mechanism to provide the state with the necessary resources for financing its economic planning.
The objectives of this strategic state intervention were multifaceted and aimed at comprehensive societal upliftment: promoting rapid economic development through the creation and expansion of infrastructure, facilitating the redistribution of income and wealth, generating more employment opportunities, mobilizing financial resources, and fostering small-scale industries. The state's duty, in his view, extended to redistributing land to poor farmers and abolishing oppressive systems like Zamindari.
He also **cautioned against state control devolving into "state capitalism**," emphasizing that the state's economic control should operate on a socialistic pattern, conforming to the establishment of a discrimination-free egalitarian society, rather than the state owning all resources. **He favored a "Mixed Economy**," allowing private enterprise to flourish while ensuring state guidance and control to prevent monopolies and exploitation. The pragmatic and democratic nature of his socialism (e.g., advocating a mixed economy, parliamentary democracy, and explicitly rejecting totalitarianism) is a direct, tailored response to the specific, deeply entrenched nature of economic exploitation in India. Unlike Marx, whose focus was primarily on class struggle in industrial societies, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar recognized that in India, **the caste system was the primary and unique mechanism of economic oppression, restricting occupational mobility and enforcing unpaid or underpaid labor for millions.** Therefore, his state socialism was not merely about economic efficiency or universal class struggle; it was a targeted, strategic intervention designed to dismantle caste-linked economic hierarchies and ensure **"opportunity for equality"** for the historically exploited Dalits and other marginalized communities. It was a means to achieve social liberation and dignity through fundamental economic restructuring, making his economic vision inseparable from his social reform agenda. This reveals that Ambedkar's economic thought was not simply theoretical but deeply practical and context-specific, meticulously designed to address the unique socio-economic injustices prevalent in India. His "state socialism" was a powerful tool for social emancipation, demonstrating the profound interconnectedness of his economic and social philosophies in his holistic vision for India. Dr. B.R. Ambedkar warned unequivocally that unfettered capitalism could become a potent force of oppression and exploitation.

Social Democracy: A Way of Life for Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar accepted democracy not merely as a formal system of governance but as a comprehensive "way of life". This expansive definition extended beyond the formal control of elected representatives to ensuring the active participation of all people in governance and decision-making processes. He believed that the true roots of democracy are to be found in social relationships and the associated life among people who constitute society.
While a staunch advocate for political democracy (embodying "one person, one vote"), Dr. B.R. Ambedkar unequivocally stressed that it "cannot last unless there lies at the base of it social democracy". **He considered political freedom to be meaningless and incomplete without the concomitant achievement of social freedom and equality**. **Social democracy**, for him, recognized liberty, equality, and fraternity as the fundamental principles of life, ensuring that no discrimination could be made in

society on the basis of caste, creed, religion, wealth, region, or language.

A core and non-negotiable tenet of his social democracy was the comprehensive empowerment of all sections of society, particularly historically marginalized communities. He fought tirelessly against the deeply ingrained caste system, advocating for its complete "annihilation". His vision aimed to eradicate social injustices and create a society founded on equal rights and opportunities for all, ensuring meaningful representation for historically marginalized communities through policies like reservations.[3] He firmly believed that the liberation of India was intrinsically linked to, and indeed dependent upon, the liberation of the Scheduled Castes.

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar emphasized that democracy, while inherently the rule of the majority, and must never devolve into a "tyranny of the majority". He insisted that the majority must always take the minority into confidence before making any significant decision, ensuring their safety and their feeling of being an equal partner in power. His idea of equality transcended the mere absence of discrimination (formal equality); it was about "substantive equality," which necessitated the active elimination of social, economic, and political disparities, and the equitable redistribution of resources and power. He argued for creating "opportunity for equality" rather than simply providing "equality of opportunity".

Ambedkar's unwavering insistence on social democracy as the indispensable foundation for political democracy reveals a deeper, strategic understanding of national cohesion and stability. He foresaw that merely granting formal political rights (like "one person, one vote") without fundamentally addressing the deeply entrenched social inequalities (such as the caste system and pervasive discrimination) would lead to a fragile, unstable, and ultimately unsustainable democratic system. If a substantial segment of the population (e.g., Dalits and other marginalized groups) feels perpetually excluded, exploited, or disrespected socially and economically, their political participation becomes superficial, and their fundamental loyalty to the democratic framework itself could erode. Therefore, achieving "one person, one value in all aspects of life" was not merely an ideal of individual justice but a strategic imperative for building a unified, stable, and truly democratic nation-state. The struggle of the lowest strata was seen as beneficial for the entire societal structure, as shifting the bottom-most stone would inevitably shake those above it. This highlights Ambedkar's holistic and pragmatic approach to nation-building. He recognized that social integration and equality are not just moral aspirations but practical necessities for the long-term viability, strength, and legitimacy of a democratic polity. His vision underscores that a nation cannot truly flourish if its foundational social relationships are fractured by inequality and discrimination.

The Pillars of Indian Democracy: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, and Justice

These four principles—liberty, equality, fraternity, and justice—are unequivocally the very "core" of Ambedkar's constitutionalism and his comprehensive vision for India. **He precisely defined democracy as a way of life founded upon liberty, equality, fraternity, justice, and human dignity**. The Indian Constitution, meticulously drafted under his guidance, was explicitly based on these principles, which he saw as having been historically suppressed by older societal norms and practices.

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar profoundly emphasized that liberty, equality, and fraternity do not stand in isolation but form an indivisible "union of trinity". He argued that to separate one from the others would fundamentally "defeat the very purpose of democracy". For instance, he warned that liberty without equality might lead to the liberty of the powerful to exploit the weak. Conversely, equality without liberty could lead to a totalitarian state, and both would remain hollow and unsustainable without the pervasive spirit of fraternity, which fosters an essential attitude of respect and reverence for fellow human beings.

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar viewed justice in a comprehensive and integrated perspective, meticulously connecting it to society, polity, and economy. His vision was relentlessly focused on eradicating deeply entrenched social injustices, particularly the pervasive caste system and untouchability. He passionately fought for the "annihilation of caste" and the systematic upliftment of marginalized communities. This involved ensuring equal rights and opportunities for all citizens, irrespective of caste, creed, religion, or birth. He championed political equality through the principle of "one person, one vote" and actively fought against discriminatory practices in the political system, ensuring meaningful representation for Dalits and marginalized communities through reservation policies. He firmly believed that political power was essential for these communities to effectively claim their rights and shape their destinies. He advocated for the equitable distribution of resources, comprehensive land reforms, equal employment opportunities, and the eradication of poverty. He recognized economic empowerment as an indispensable prerequisite for achieving true social and political equality. His concept of "distributive justice" was explicitly aimed at uplifting disadvantaged groups and bridging the gap between the rich and the poor. He believed in "substantive equality," which fundamentally required the active elimination of social, economic, and political disparities, and the equitable redistribution of resources and power within society. He argued for creating "opportunity for equality" rather than merely providing "equality of opportunity," emphasizing the need for proactive measures to level the playing field.

In a society historically fractured by the rigid caste system and profound social divisions, merely legislating formal liberty and equality might not be sufficient to overcome deeply ingrained prejudices and foster a unified national identity. Fraternity, understood as an "attitude of respect and reverence for fellow human beings", acts as the essential moral and emotional glue. It is the psychological and social precondition for the effective and meaningful functioning of legal equality and political liberty. Without a pervasive sense of shared humanity, solidarity, and mutual recognition, the formal rights enshrined in the Constitution might remain unexercised or be subtly undermined by persistent social realities and discriminatory practices. This suggests that Dr. B.R. Ambedkar understood that constitutional principles, to truly take root in India, needed a profound cultural and attitudinal transformation. This emphasizes the profound sociological and psychological dimensions of Ambedkar's constitutional vision. He recognized that legal reforms, while necessary, must be accompanied by a fundamental transformation in societal attitudes and interpersonal relationships to achieve genuine democracy, social justice, and lasting national integration. Fraternity, in this sense, is not just an ideal but a practical necessity for the Constitution's transformative potential to be fully realized.

Influence of Capitalism on Indian Political Process and Policy Making

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar was acutely aware of the "ills of capitalism," issuing a stark warning that "unfettered capitalism could turn into a force of oppression and exploitation". He argued that an economy driven purely by the profit motive fundamentally violates the tenets of political democracy. He powerfully articulated that without robust state intervention, "liberty" would become merely "liberty to the landlords to increase rents, for capitalists to increase hours of work and reduce rate of wages," thereby perpetuating exploitation.

Corporate political engagement, broadly defined as lobbying, encompasses all activities undertaken by an organization with the objective of influencing public policy, regulations, and decisions that directly affect their operations, profitability, and strategic goals. This influence can manifest through various channels. Companies directly communicate with government representatives, either through their own dedicated

public affairs departments or by contracting professional lobbying firms. This also includes supporting industry organizations that lobby on their behalf, influencing public opinion through traditional or social media campaigns, participating in official advisory groups and multistakeholder forums, or financially supporting NGOs and think tanks that further their specific agenda. Financial and systemic influence, such as contributing to political parties and campaigns, offering gifts to influence policymakers, and facilitating the movement of public officials and business executives between public and private sectors (the 'revolving door' phenomenon), are also common methods used to exert influence.

The unregulated and often opaque nature of corporate lobbying directly threatens and potentially undermines Ambedkar's vision of the state as a benevolent guardian for the marginalized and a primary mechanism for achieving equitable distribution. If powerful capitalist interests can informally and opaquely influence policy decisions primarily for their private profit, they can effectively circumvent, dilute, or even obstruct state efforts to implement crucial land reforms, enforce labor rights, or enact welfare measures that would otherwise protect the poor and redistribute wealth. The formal democratic process and the constitutional mandate for social justice can be subtly but powerfully undermined by unchecked corporate influence, thereby perpetuating the very inequalities and exploitation that Dr. B.R. Ambedkar fought so relentlessly to eradicate. This highlights a critical area where the constitutional ideals face practical challenges in implementation.

Conclusion: Ambedkar's Enduring Legacy and Future Challenges

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar's contributions to democratizing India through the Constitution are unparalleled and foundational. He envisioned a holistic democracy encompassing political, social, and economic spheres, meticulously anchored by the indivisible principles of liberty, equality, fraternity, and justice. His constitutionalism emphasized limited government, the absolute supremacy of the rule of law, and the critical, though often elusive, role of constitutional morality. His pragmatic "state socialism" was a unique and tailored approach designed to dismantle deeply entrenched caste-based economic exploitation and ensure equitable distribution through strategic state intervention, all while rigorously preserving parliamentary democracy and unequivocally avoiding totalitarianism. He meticulously crafted a Constitution that was not merely a legal document but a profound "sociological instrument" explicitly designed for transformative social change, particularly for the systematic upliftment and empowerment of marginalized communities.

The ongoing and often heated debates surrounding the terms 'socialism' and 'secularism' in the Preamble vividly highlight the dynamic tension between the original framers' intent, subsequent constitutional amendments, and the evolving national identity. Furthermore, the pervasive and largely unregulated influence of corporate lobbying on policymaking presents a significant and growing challenge to Ambedkar's vision of a state that actively protects the vulnerable and ensures economic justice for all. The stubborn persistence of caste-based violence and economic disparities, despite robust constitutional provisions, underscores the continuing imperative to cultivate constitutional morality and ensure that the spirit and transformative potential of the Constitution are truly embodied in societal practice, not just in its text.

The enduring power and foresight of Ambedkar's legacy lie in his profound understanding of the intricate and inseparable relationship between legal frameworks, social realities, and economic structures. His constitutional blueprint provides the essential tools and a clear moral compass, but its full realization depends on continuous vigilance, concerted and sustained efforts to dismantle systemic barriers, and a

collective, unwavering commitment to the ideals of substantive equality and inclusive democracy. The path to a truly democratized Indian society and polity, as so meticulously envisioned by its chief architect, remains an ongoing and evolving journey, requiring constant dedication to its foundational principles.

References:

1. Ambedkar, B. R. (1994). Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: Writings and speeches (Vols. 1–17). Government of Maharashtra.
2. Austin, G. (2003). The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a nation. Oxford University Press.
3. Chatterjee, P. (1999). Dr. B.R. Ambedkar and subaltern studies. Economic and Political Weekly, 34(14), 995–999.
4. Gandhi, A. (2015). Democracy and social justice: The Ambedkarian perspective. International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies, 2(7), 1–7.
5. Omvedt, G. (2004). Ambedkar's vision of economic development and the Indian Constitution. Social Action, 54(1), 1-18.
6. Rodrigues, V. (2002). The essential writings of B. R. Ambedkar. Oxford University Press.
7. shaping India's foreign policy outlook. Journal of Contemporary Politics, 4(2), 87-93.
8. Zelliot, E. (1992). From untouchable to Dalit: Essays on the Dr. B.R. Ambedkar movement. Manohar.
9. Jaffrelot, C. (2005). Dr. Ambedkar and untouchability: Analysing and fighting caste. Permanent Black.
10. Teltumbde, A. (2018). Republic of caste: Thinking equality in the time of neoliberal Hindutva. Navayana.
11. Austin, G. (1999). Working a democratic constitution: A history of the Indian experience. Oxford University Press.
12. Galanter, M. (1984). Competing equalities: Law and the backward classes in India. University of California Press.
13. Kumar, A. (2015). Ambedkar's idea of social democracy: A perspective from below. Economic and Political Weekly, 50(15), 41–48.