

Postcolonial Governance and Social Stratification: Revisiting Ambedkar to Imagine Inclusive Society

MUSTAKIM ANSARY¹

ABSTRACT

This paper intends to revisit Ambedkar to counter countless exclusionary measures reinforced by the postcolonial state as it continues the legacy of caste and religion-based discriminations and injustices in various forms. It extensively engages with empirical studies drawing from various contemporary incidents to look into how the present ruling regime constantly appears to be much more exclusionary by relegating multiple identities. This paper argues for a scholarly investigation into how the complete failure of implementing various Constitutional policies and frameworks envisioned by Ambedkar. The primary concern of the paper is to foreground Ambedkar's ideas and theorisations regarding the formation of an egalitarian society by building an inclusive state that will necessarily sustain all diversities specifically in the time when the questions of citizenship rights, democracy and republic have reappeared seriously. Hence, it rationalizes the necessity of re-engagement of Ambedkar's ideology to install an alternative model by establishing an inclusive society.

KEYWORDS: *Ambedkar, postcolonial state, caste system, inclusive society, Dalit atrocities, minority rights.*

¹ Mustakim Ansary (ansarymustakims@gmail.com) is PhD Research Scholar in the Department of English, Kazi Nazrul University, West Bengal, India. His current area of research addresses social justice, social inclusion and exclusion, contemporary Dalit and Minority politics in India.

Copyright © 2021 Mustakim Ansary. This is an open access article licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

Introduction

This paper proposes a re-reading of Ambedkar in a specific phase which can be identified with “ruled by decree”² (Thakur) of Indian politics where serious questions on governance, democracy, and citizenship rights have been resurfaced in an extreme manner and which can be addressed properly through our reengagement with the crucial and significant ideas raised by Ambedkar in his writings and theorisations of the Indian state and state policies. As postcolonial Indian state tends to be more exclusionary in its imagination of policy formation and governance mechanism, one of the primary concerns of this reading pertains to envisioning an egalitarian and equal society as proposed and advocated by Ambedkar in his conceptual framework of an inclusive Indian state. In order to draw an in-depth theoretical understanding, this essay intends to anchor Martha Nussbaum’s conceptualization of the Indian state’s characteristic as *singularity* to portray its exclusionary attitudes. To counter these anomalies, according to Nussbaum, an alternative sculpt is required which she addresses as *plurality* that calls for an in-depth inclusive model. Keeping in mind Nussbaum’s epistemic understanding regarding an imagination of inclusive state, this reading delineates in India a renaissance of Ambedkar and his ideas are highly required to stall the menace of high caste atrocities against Dalits, various communal hostilities, intra-subaltern conflicts and the glorification of the caste system. To substantiate the central arguments of this reading it necessarily refers to certain incidents that can be identified exactly with Nussbaum’s idea of *singularity* which calls for an exclusionary majoritarian state. The Una incident in 2016 in which some Dalit youths were chained and brutally beaten for their alleged skinning of a dead cow proves that atrocities against Dalits are growing as governance in India continues to be structured in Brahminical ideology. The Una incident also exposes the dichotomies and ambiguities of the Indian state vis-à-vis its policies and treatment of the Dalits. Drawing on Giorgio Agamben’s expostulations of the notion of *Homo Sacer*, which signifies a state ordained marginalised figure who is deprived of all state-protections and governance safeguards and this analysis argues that the Dalit in India is *Homo Sacer* who is socially excluded

² The phrase ‘ruled by decree’ has been taken from an editorial piece published in editorial column of *The Telegraph* to refer to the Indian State’s fascist and undemocratic affiliation.

and stigmatised in such a way that the privileged sections can persecute the *Homo Sacer* with impunity while the state remains silent. Again, one can immediately refer to the incident of the killing of a 43 year old man. Lokesh, a biriyani seller, was thrashed by a group of people in Noida, Uttar Pradesh because he was a Dalit. Besides that, the sudden announcement of the National Register of Citizenship (NRC) proves its communal character that threatens the minority Muslim and Dalit communities. It proves the most notable strategy of the Right-wing political regime as their constant persuasion is to fracture the fabric of the Dalit-Minority harmony and its syncretism. And this attempt can easily be exposed in 2020 communal hostility in Delhi. Again, when the whole world is fighting against the pandemic situation due to the spread of Covid-19, in India one can easily understand how poor people and migrant labourers who are from the lower caste, Muslim and Dalit families become the worst victims because of the state's indifference and tactful negligence. All these incidents testify to confer the Indian state as a majoritarian state where there is a complete deficit of democracy, cultural cohabitation, social solidarity and inclusiveness. In order to understand these caste-ridden and communal attributions of the state, one has to pay serious attention to the fact that how the legacy of caste-based discrimination is continuing and growingly sustains day by day. As many of the historiographies are contested and debated regarding the eradication of the caste system in India and Ambedkar's attempts in this process of eradication. To understand these incidents of oppression in a more comprehensive way, it is important to engage with a genealogical discussion of Ambedkar's ventures to emancipate the downtrodden from these practices of the Indian society. Critics and thinkers address the nation as 'Republic of Caste' because of its inability to liberate itself from the casteist stranglehold. Similarly, the presence of Islamophobic management and the state-sponsored speech of hatred and acrimony against Muslims, can be simultaneously identified as 'Republic of Religion'. One can trace back the genesis of caste and religion-based violence and persecution in the process of the nation's building. The following section elaborates the incidents of injustices and discriminations against Dalit-untouchables and religious minorities.

Historicizing Caste and Religion based Discrimination

Indian society is rooted in a complex pattern known as 'unity in diversity'. But incidents and events are there that threaten this composition constantly. Its complexity precisely

is based on multiple identities including caste, class and religion etc. The tussle and jostling among these identities have a long history and attempts have been taken to end all those conflicts by engaging and addressing various constitutional and policy measures. Renowned social thinkers and analysts delineate the Indian society as casteist as it originated and classified with its *varna system*. Therefore, the myth of unity is conflicting and inconsistent. One can come across this discussion of the communal identity of the Indian state and its casteist characteristics which are multi-layered and diversely textured through a close reading of Partha Chatterjee, Bidyut Chakrabarty, Joya Chatterji, and Sekhar Bandyopadhyay who sharply expound in their writings the Congress' exclusionary governance mechanism and the upper-caste's continuous discriminatory practice of untouchability. Interestingly the Britishers played the game of 'divide and rule' in the disguise of bestowing recognition to all castes, classes and religions. The Britishers' view on communal identity which was codified in the communal award, is baffled by its complex nature since it was defined absolutely in terms of religion. As a result, communities of Hindus, Muslims and other religious groups were kept and settled in neat compartments. The colonial rulers, by declaring equal status to all religions, placed these identities in antagonism with each other. Again, the situation took its turn with the addition of a new dimension in the form of the Poona Pact of 1932, which, for the first time, placed the backward classes (later classified as the scheduled castes in the 1935 Government of India Act) on the centre stage of Indian politics with a separate identity. Hence, it would be fair enough to say that the post-colonial legacy of communal and caste-based division and discrimination originated with the execution of Communal Awards in colonial India in 1932 that witnessed the Britishers' policy regarding the electoral representation according to caste and religious line. Besides that, the Upper caste Hindu Mahasabha and other mainstream political party's strategic discrimination against the depressed and the schedule caste people hatched countless disappointments and despairs.

The complex social structure of Indian society got acceleration of complexity with the Communal Awards that promised India to keep its stratified nature of the society. Though it was decided to create a fair space and a platform of justice for the so called depressed people and minorities, ultimately it ended with a muddle. Ambedkar had an avenue of socio-political and economic justice for the marginalized schedule

castes and he fought for these justices accordingly. However, gradually all those novel attempts and struggles came to an end with trauma and anxiety associated with the partition and its substantial violence as the partition took place according to the contour of religion. Besides, the killing of innocent people was also there in the process of the transfer of population as the immediate consequences of the declaration of freedom. This utter confused and muddled situation haunted both the minority Muslims and the lower caste people and this situation caused a huge transitional phobia for both of these communities. In this critical and crucial context, Ambedkar took the initiative to safeguard all those communities by placing significant and remarkable provisions by taking the initiative to draft India's Constitution.

India was recognized as a free nation in 1947 through what is known as 'the transfer of power'. Yet certain issues and incidents are there and what we are witnessing in independent India can be attributed to 'legacies' of one kind or another. From this juncture point, one can be curious to know certain significant queries—was independent India disentangled from the past or it is still in its continuity? Again, did India, as Nehru claimed, 'step out of the old to the new'? These are the primary questions that cause dilemmas to historians by proving undoubted continuities of legacies in terms of institutions of governance. Therefore, the year 1947 cannot demarcate a total disjuncture between the colonial and post-colonial.

In this context, Bidyut Chakraborty's observation in *Indian Politics and Society since Independence: Events, Processes and Ideology* (2008) is worthwhile to refer to. He explains "although the political system of independent India draws its sustenance from universal adult franchise and political sovereignty, the governing rules are undoubtedly derived from its colonial past" (3). He continues "post-colonial India was therefore hardly a nation-state, but rather a state-nation, simply because the institutions of governance, very much part of British legacy, were already in place when the 1947 transfer of power took place" (4).

Post-colonial India began its journey with the Congress as a central governing body which is known for its ruling system as Rajni Kothari, an eminent Indian political scientist who termed it as a 'party system' in his discussion *The Congress 'System' in India* (1964) that call for a 'patron-client relationship'. It hardly recognized the 'margin'. In spite of all these issues, there was a time when the country's first Backward Classes

Commission was set up which was headed by Kaka Kalelkar in 1953. This was also called the *Kalelkar Commission*. In 1955, the commission submitted its report which stated that there were 2399 backward groups in India out of which 837 were the 'most backward' and the major evidence of backwardness cited was caste. However, the Union Government, in its pursuit of showing a casteless society, rejected its recommendations. Again, in the year 1979, the Mandal Commission was established to recognize the socially or educationally backward classes of India and to provide reservations as a means to annihilate caste inequality and discrimination to those backward classes. But as usual, all of its crucial and significant recommendations were refuted and placed them in a much more neglected zone as its primary intention was to prove an upper-caste majoritarian state. This discourse, therefore, argues for relocating of the Ambedkarite conceptualizations that help the Indian society to counter the upper caste's notion of the Indian nation characterised by traits like beef-ban, upper-caste glorification, communal leaning, ultra-nationalism etc. To comprehend the Indian state's exclusionary characteristic and majoritarian aspiration, the subsequent section elucidates various political symbols such as *love-jihad*, beef-nationalism etc. which are posed as a mark of national identity and then it intends to expose the fallacy and diabolism in such engineered tropes of nationalism that encourages the killing of innocent Dalits and Muslims.

Contemporary Conjectures: Continuation of the legacy

Indian society is culturally mosaic and diversified since its beginning and therefore, it would be not only wrong to turn its socio-cultural frames forcefully into unified, one-dimensional practices of a particular community but it would also be tyrannical and oppressive terrain. The heterogeneous culture of India can never be forced into a homogenous model because it is inevitably important to recognize every culture equally. But the current ruling regime cunningly addresses the country as a democracy, independent and republic whereas on the contrary, some people are killed or persecuted by its hegemonic political groups and this is happening because of the lack of a fair governing system. Dominant groups think that their culture is sacrosanct and others have no right to tread. It suggests that some groups of people are reduced into half/non-citizens and such non-citizens can be persecuted in an almost legitimate way. The non-

citizen Dalits are flogged, lynched and beaten to death and the ruling party is silent on all these incidents and such persecutions make India a virtual heart of darkness.

We are living in such a nation where a law of cow protection is executed even at the cost of the lives of human beings. If there is a law of cow protection why not a law for the Dalits' protection? If the state has the potential to maintain the *Cow Democracy* why is it silent about human democracy? Dalit repression has been rampant in Gujarat and the state also ranks high in terms of atrocities against them. The supporting Hindutva agenda with its casteist prejudices allows brutal attack and endless affliction against the Dalit youths and they considered it laudable that makes the whole climate of cow-centric politics in India shameful. On 11 July 2016, four Dalits were publicly flogged by a Hindutva vigilante group in Una, Gujarat. Members of the *Gau Raksha Samiti* came across a Dalit family skinning the carcass of a dead cow in village Mota Samadhiyala in Una taluka of Gir Somnath district. Accusing them of cow slaughter, these men beat up the entire family and then picked up the four youths, stripped them up to the waist, chained them to a back of a car and drove it to the Una town, where they were again beaten up close to a police station. The *Gau Rakshaks* made a video of the entire act and uploaded it on the internet. Are the vigilantes fully confident that the state appreciates the act? Or do the police legitimize such atrocities against Dalits? Are all these atrocities and afflictions the hallmark of a democratic nation? However, this act of the upper castes backfired, as enraged Dalits came out on the streets in protest and there was condemnation from many quarters. The ruling regime replied that these acts disturbed them by showing its crocodile's tears. It seemed that the ruling party has never heard of atrocities on Dalits in Gujarat before. At the root of all these atrocities and consequent flare-ups lies the suspicion of cow slaughter by the self-appointed vigilantes who directly derive their power from the ruling regime. This atrocity reminds one of the Jhajjar episode in Haryana, where on 15 October 2002 five Dalits were lynched and set ablaze by a Hindutva mob in front of the police station in Dulina on similar suspicions of cow slaughter. It appears the most terrible when the police, instead of acting against the lynching, had registered a case against the victims under the Prevention of Cow Slaughter Act. The Hindutva outfits openly justified it. Again, another barbaric scourge conspired on 28 September 2015 when a Muslim family was attacked by a similar vigilante mob in Bishara village near Dadri, Uttar Pradesh,

following rumours that the family was storing and consuming beef. They lynched Mohammad Akhlaq and seriously wounded his aged mother, his young son Danish and caused widespread destruction to the place. A case of cow slaughter has been registered against the family of Mohammad Akhlaq by the police at the instance of a local court in Surajpur. Later, a forensic case proved that it was not beef that was in the refrigerator but mutton. The Dalits and minorities who depend on the leather business to earn their livelihood have become the new political targets of the upper castes and state colludes with such heinous acts of barbarity.

There is a quite similar incident, Pehlu Khan, a 55-year-old farmer from Alwar was lynched by cow protection vigilantes in broad daylight on 1 April 2017. The most shocking aftermath is instead of condemning the act of killing, the chief minister of Rajasthan declared that the cow vigilante groups did the rightful act and it is a crime after knowing the fact that cow trafficking is not allowed. So, the state of India protects the cow vigilante groups even at the cost of human beings. In India, the so-called cow belt, the Indian cow's rights have gained precedence over human rights. In a hideous twist to this brutal tale, the victims are arrested while the aggressors are either let off or charged as 'unknown persons'.

Following these incidents, one can see that the fate of the Dalits and minority Muslims remains unchanged. The only thing that has changed in the preceding years is the advent of multiple persecutions of the Dalits and the minority Muslims. This consistent torture against these communities and the Indian state's strategic silence remind us of Giorgio Agamben's notion of the *Homo Sacer*. Keeping in mind the wretched conditions of the Dalits and Muslims in India, the next section discusses how the Dalits and Muslims in India can be equated with the Agambenian figure of the *Homo Sacer*.

Dalit and Minority in Contemporary India: Failure of the Vision of Inclusive Society

Giorgio Agamben has explicated the *Homo Sacer* as a figure of Roman law, a person who is banned and maybe killed by anybody. It is also defined in legal terms as someone who can be killed without the killer being regarded as a murderer. Hence, Agamben's *Homo Sacer* is a close reading regarding the relation of the state power and its citizens. In the context of the Indian state, we may refer to both the Muslims and the Dalits as *Homo*

Sacer as they are indeed parts of the society but they are excluded from their basic rights. The Una incidents and their aftermath proved that how these communities are excluded from all sorts of rights, safety and security and are brutally oppressed, lynched and killed. All these exclusions, jingoism and chauvinism based on the issue of cow-democracy and *beef-nationalism* considerably degrades the country and ultimately fails to establish India as a Democratic and republic nation at its true value. As Kancha Ilaiah has rightly expressed the point when he said about the exclusionary imaginations of this state—“This is the only nation in the world to have passed laws that protect one animal and its progeny even if it means the death of human beings, Dalits and Muslims” (Shepherd).

The present ruling regime is continuing the legacy of the Indian politics of inequality and discrimination by following atrocities and oppression towards these communities. Therefore, it is necessary to engage with Ambedkar’s thoughts and theorization regarding the Indian state to end all caste and religion-based atrocities. The following section delineates with the Ambedkarite ideologies to deepen and strengthen Indian democracy because it is none other than Ambedkar who wanted a radical transformation of Indian social and political structures and had we done that since independence, there might not have been any Una incident or any incidents of persecution at all.

Indian State and Its Sectarian Governance

The governing apparatus of the Indian state leans towards its majoritarian escalation by reinforcing various unjust measures. For instance, one can immediately refer to its forceful imposition of one’s food habit that proves its hidden exclusionary imagination within its ruling strategy. A climate of vicious politics has been manufactured in India where if you approve of the issue of beef consumption you will be stigmatised as anti-national and if you have hatred towards beef consumption, you will be a pro-nationalist. Should it be possible to accept the forceful dictation of someone’s food habits? D. N. Jha’s *The Myth of Holy Cow* (2016) has sharply illustrated that beef consumption is not a new fact, it is as old as the Hindu religion. But the sudden beef-banning announcement of the ruling party appears that they either do not know about their ancestors’ food habit or they knowingly concoct history to gain their political mileage. We may subsequently take note of Kancha Ilaiah’s *Untouchable God* (2013) that analyses

how Indian politics is biased in favour of majoritarian state politics. In this analytical writing, he engages with the untouchable character called Pariah who is inflicted and lynched by the upper-caste Brahmins because of his attempt to access the mainstream Gods. Pariah himself utters and complains to god for offering him such a way of life. The upper caste Brahmins celebrate the continuation of inequality, the most perfect system of discrimination and oppression against the citizens who are fashioned by them as lower caste to increase their hypocritical nature. For a long time, they have been thinking that it is their birth right to keep the sanctity of their *shastras* and scriptures even at the cost of the lives of human beings. In order to demonstrate and implement their sanctity, they excluded the elements (so-called Dalits) from their exclusionary model. So, the barbaric and cruel incidents we are witnessing today are the very replica of all these upper-castes' forceful governing mechanisms in order to establish their spiritual and divine association to their *Untouchable God* (God, not for everybody). The present ruling regimes accord with the Brahminical ideology that results in the Indian state's politics of biased and these biased politics generates enormous crimes and impunities against Dalits as it happened in Una (2016), Hathras (2020) and various other places in numerous forms. Being a majoritarian state, it only listens to the majority and continuously creates a terrain of injustices, inequality, oppression and marginalities in countless measures. Therefore, the rest of the people are degraded as the 'Other' and excluded from all kinds of rights. In the following section, I will discuss how majoritarian politics leads the country towards the governance of legitimised sectarianism.

Rethinking Social Inclusivity: Ambedkarites' Renaissance

Social inequality and Dalit oppression are not new in India but they are growing as various incidents with their horrific and barbaric nature proved so. In order to eradicate marginalization, a scholarly engagement is necessary and this scholarly investigation takes us to the direction shown by Ambedkar. According to Ambedkar, one of the most serious problems that acts as conflict-ridden is social stratification and what we need with the immediate effect is the abolition of such divisive norms. He has rightly observed in his work *Annihilation of Caste* that "The path of social reform, like the path to heaven" (210). Therefore, he aspires to build a society that sustains all sorts of diversities. Again, in order to conceptualize the Indian nation as a pluralistic model, he

talked about the inclusivity of religions, embracing of different castes and a radical aspect of making economy in its egalitarian vision. Gail Omvedt, following Ambedkar's imagination, articulates, "the process of creating a nation as linked to a thorough critique of the Brahmanic aspects of Indian tradition and a recognition of non-Brahman contributions, such as those of Buddhism, as a basis for religious plurality" (100). As it is now, during the pre-independence era in India, there were two different sects to be reformed—the social sector and the political sector and there was a huge controversy between these two groups about the prioritisation of one domain over the other. The majority of the educated Hindus were for the exclusive reform of the political domain and they were indifferent to the cause of social reformation. Ultimately the claim for the political reformation won and the foundation of social reformation was defeated and forgotten. The mainstream political leaders in India forgot that the Dalits were treated in India in such a dangerous way that they were not allowed to use the public streets, the village wells, besides that they were compelled to have a black thread either on their wrist or around their neck, as a sign or a mark to prevent the Hindus from getting themselves polluted by their touch by mistake. The upper-castes who claim to be educated and enlightened do not feel the necessity for the abolition of caste. They did not stand up for the reform of Hindu society which is deeply rooted in the caste system. It is only through the implementation of various Ambedkar's thoughts concerning the socio-political vision that aims to establish an inclusive sphere. Hence it is significant to call for Ambedkarite's renaissance which is based on breaking the internal differences, division, and barriers from the formation of the Indian society. According to one of his speeches, "my confident hope is that we can be a nation provided proper process of social amalgamation can be put forth," (DBAWS 31) Ambedkar pointed out that it is a social system that embodies the arrogance and the selfishness of the Hindus who were always trying to establish their superior social status and who ensured that they have the authority to force it upon their inferiors. Why has no attempt been made to civilise these aborigines and to lead them to take to a more honourable way of making a living? Does the caste system help to improve society, economy and justice? The caste system has done only one thing. It degraded, demoralised and disorganised the Hindus. How Ambedkar defined a democratic nation with its ideal

characteristics is very much relevant today. He continues to elucidate an ideal society by referring—

An ideal society should be mobile, should be full of channels for conveying a change taking place in one part to other parts. In an ideal society there should be many interests consciously communicated and shared. There should be varied and free points of contact with other modes of association. In other words there must be social endosmosis. This is fraternity, which is only another name for democracy (*Annihilation of Caste* 57).

Ambedkar envisioned the preference of reservation for the equal representation of various religions as well as Hindu untouchables in legislatures, executive and public service. Besides that, Ambedkar sought to resolve the communal problems through representation in the legislature, executive and in services. But the prevailing model of Indian politics is purely exclusivist and individualist in nature as it has also been traced by Martha Nussbaum, a political philosopher, in her *The Clash Within: Democracy, Religious Violence and Indian's Future* (2009) as *purists* who advocate policies and moral codes specific to their own social category, which they strive to make universal. What we need to think for the formation of a democratic nation, is the inclusivist model followed by Ambedkar and the inclusivist model is the exact form of the *pluralists* who promote political principles and moral codes acceptable to people who differ in terms of religion, region and ethnicity which is also described as cosmopolitan. Ambedkar has rightfully found out the most significant anathema of our society that continuously made impediments to build an inclusive and just society. Following this observation, he also noted that the political arena is completely dominated and dictated by the exclusionary models created by the upper-caste ideology, hence, deconstructive ideology should be necessary to give a counter reply to it. Ambedkar warned that there is nothing irreligious in working for the destruction of such a religion. Ambedkar deals with the practice of inter-caste marriage through which there is a possibility to demolish the caste system. Another plan of action for the abolition of caste has to begin with inter-caste dining. He prescribed that caste is a notion; it is a state of mind, and therefore the destruction of caste does not mean the destruction of a physical barrier. It means a notional change. He further insisted that the real remedy is to destroy the

belief in the sanctity and sacredness of the *shastras*. Without questioning the authorities of the *shastras* it is impossible to think of social reformation. He has also argued that discarding the *shastras* is not enough; the denial of their authority is also needful as Buddha and Nanak did. The subsequent section focuses on his visions about a political reformation that helps in implementing and actualizing those socio-cultural aspects in more effective ways.

Ambedkar as a Crusader of Political Reformation

The ruling party in India today defines secular democracy and freedom according to their self-fashioned political optic, and hence it is high time to think and rethink Ambedkar's state policies and political principles. Ambedkar raised many crucial points such as—the existence of untouchability, decolonisation or plurality of religious belonging, shared solidarity, questions on freedom, human equality and representation etc. to take note of all these issues on a prior basis. His political questions are based on a day-to-day basis in order to enhance and deepen democracy and freedom. He made a critical review of texts and historiography to look into the social as well as political space of the people. Besides, there are texts and traditions such as Buddhism which not only expose the sanctity and truth of dominant texts and traditions but also propose alternatives to them as well. Valerian Rodrigues argues that “a critical reading of *tika* and interpretative engagement with *vyakhyana* texts and traditions was central to Ambedkar's political perspectives” (103).

For Ambedkar, human equality is a superseding principle and his writings advance some of the most complex arguments in defence of this principle. Ontologically, all human beings, irrespective of race, gender and culture, share certain foundational attributes in common—feelings and sentiments, love and compassion, reason and reflection, solidarity and bonding. Ambedkar draws all these principles to justify equality and to struggle against untouchability, the caste system, colonialism and class domination. He is very critical of liberal democracy for its inability to institute equality in a meaningful sense. He finds the notion of equality before the law and there is an inadequacy of equality in treating humans equally in social relations. Ambedkar tried to reformulate the idea of democracy, by trying to rescue it from the economic binary of liberal and social democracy and proposing it as the only defensible mode of public life appropriate for human dignity and equality. Democracy is not merely an

institutionalised arrangement, but the only way of life befitting human fulfilment. There should be a demand that one treats others with respect and dignity. He has also pointed out by referencing Burke that true religion is the foundation of society, and also rejected the liberal idea that religion is a private affair but saw it as the anchor that holds a society together. He made a distinction between the *true religion* and the *false religion*—the former is based on ‘principles’ while the latter appeals to rules and rituals. The former is centred on society and appeals to morality, while the latter is centred on the individual and makes morality an instrument of one’s purpose. Again, he said that true religion cannot be a set of fixed beliefs laid down for all times, but that which remains open for contestation and renewal. Ambedkar articulated that social relations should be based on mutual communication, and diffusion of power. In order to bring this spirit, he also mentioned that there should be a celebration of human agency, community relations, and protest traditions. The representation also must be based on fair associations, adequate representation from the minorities. The electoral system should be considered according to the social considerations and not religious affiliation. He considered the argument that separate electorates will reinforce anti-national spirit baseless, as every group that demands a separate electorate was not anti-national. The demand does not necessarily need to have religious or communal considerations. However, a majority, according to him, cannot have a separate electorate as it would be permanent domination of the majority over the minorities. Ambedkar’s second argument for preferential representation is based on social inclusion and the significance of the public presence. He has also said that the representation of opinions and preferences alone is not an adequate measure for democracy. It requires personal representation as well.

Conclusion

In conclusion, one can immediately draw certain conjectures and understanding regarding the drastic failure of the Indian state that fails to establish India as a democratic nation with its effective sense. And even after his 130th birth anniversary, we are rotating with certain crucial points that can be challenged and contested by considering and actualizing the Ambedkarite ideology. Because, if the prevailing state model is witnessing the increasing form of Dalit and Minority oppression, atrocities and suppression then should we continue this model? Or we should think of a different

model altogether based on an inclusive nature. Do all the 'marginalized sections' including the Dalit and Minority need a different electoral system to give a counter reply against the majoritarian state? We have to think about it collectively. If any governing body is unable to be reformed, it is the governing apparatus that has to go and suffer and not the humans who has been enslaved, oppressed and lynched for years. All those ideas and conceptual frameworks of Ambedkar who enlightens us about a just and inclusive society through his life and works are necessarily significant in the firmament of the Indian socio-cultural and political sphere and today's India needs to revisit this Ambedkarite principle of reformation as quickly as possible to counter all these vicious activities.

WORKS CITED

- Ambedkar, B. R. *Annihilation of Caste*. Rupa, 2019.
- . *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: Writings and Speeches*. Edited by Vasant Moon, vol. 1, Education Dept., Govt. of Maharashtra, 1979.
- Chakrabarty, Bidyut. *Indian Politics and Society since Independence: Events, Processes and Ideology*. Routledge, 2008.
- Omvedt, Gail. *Ambedkar: Towards an Enlightened India*. Penguin Books, 2008.
- Rodrigues, Valerian. "Ambedkar as a Political Philosopher." *Economic & Political Weekly*, vol. 52, no. 15, 15 Apr. 2017, pp. 101-107., doi: https://www.epw.in/system/files/pdf/2017_52/15/SA_LII_15_150417_Valerian%20Rodrigues.pdf.
- Shepherd, Kancha Ilaiah. "Cow Democracy: How Protection of Cow Has Come to Mean Oppression of Dalits." *The Indian Express*, The Indian Express, 1 Aug. 2016, indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/gujarat-dalit-protests-una-gau-rakshaks-modi-govt-2946721/.
- Thakur, Sankarshan. "Ruled by Decree Corona and Other Clouds Darken." *Telegraph India*, Telegraph India, 2 Apr. 2020, www.telegraphindia.com/opinion/coronavirus-cao-nrc-failing-economy-and-other-grave-issues-looming-large-over-india/cid/1761512.