

in drafting the Constitution. There could be no greater lie than this, he said, and added that he was prepared to prove by documentary evidence how his colleagues on the Drafting Committee had showed little interest in the drafting of the Constitution. They rarely attended the meetings of the Committee and the whole burden, therefore, fell on him and the Secretary of the Committee.

He detailed a long list of instances to show the indifferent attitude of Congress to the grievances of the Scheduled Castes and he said that even the foreign British Government was more sympathetic and generous to them and sincerely worked for their amelioration.

Dr. Ambedkar referred to the recent electoral alliance of the Socialist Party and the Federation and called upon Scheduled Castes voters to cast their votes for Socialist and Federation candidates. He was confident that his community would stand solidly behind the alliance and return the candidates put up by the two parties to the legislatures.

The alliance, he said, had been entered into a spirit of 'give and take' and they must abide by it. However, the Federation would not give up its separate political entity.

Dr. Ambedkar was presented with a purse containing collection made from the sale of tickets at the meeting. The amount was not announced.”¹

●●

¹ : The Times of India, dated 23rd November 1951.

THE HINDU CODE BILL WOULD IMPROVE CONDITION OF WOMEN

“Addressing a meeting of women in Bombay on November 24, 1951 Dr. B. R. Ambedkar declared that the Hindu Code Bill would improve the condition of women and give them more rights and requested them to support the Bill and vote for candidates who would bring real democracy in the country. He regreted that some Congressmen were against the bill, trying to delay it some way or other.”¹

● ●

¹ : The Bombay Secret Abstract, dated 1st December 1951.

IT IS BAD FOR PEOPLE TO REMAIN IDLE AND INDIFFERENT

“Dr. B. R. Ambedkar in an election meeting in Bombay on Sunday the 25th November 1951, invited Mr. Nehru to leave Congress and “Join hands with socialists and people like me for the good of the country.”

More than two lakhs of people gathered at Shivaji Park for the meeting called by the Socialist Party and the Scheduled Castes Federation.

The blue star-studded flags of the Federation and the Red flags of the Socialist Party were very much in evidence. Hundreds of volunteers, in blue and red caps of the two parties, regulated the crowd which caused a traffic jam near Shivaji Park.

The former Law Minister appealed to the people to vote for him. He said he would fight for United Maharashtra in Parliament if he were elected. The two objectives of his life were the betterment of the Scheduled Castes and good Constitution for the country.

Referring to Mr. Nehru's Chowpatty speech in which the Prime Minister had denied his accusations, Dr. Ambedkar asserted that the Congress had not bettered the condition of the Scheduled Castes and that “the foreign policy of the Government regarding China and Russia is disastrous.”

He stated that he had made these charges two and a half months ago when he resigned from the Cabinet, but Mr. Nehru had not taken notice of them and had only come out with his denial after reading Friday's newspapers which reported his (Dr. Ambedkar's) repetition.

About his differences on foreign policy, Dr. Ambedkar said he had not thought it important enough to make his difference of opinion on a Cabinet issue. Moreover, he was completely absorbed in the more important and laborious work of drafting the Constitution.

He thought the Prime Minister had cut a very sorry figure when denying his charges.

“It is a matter of fact though Mr. Nehru has denied it,” Dr. Ambedkar said referring to the Government’s alleged indifference to the Scheduled Castes. The right course for the Prime Minister was to issue a Press Statement detailing what the Government had done for the betterment of the Scheduled Castes and let the people decide whether he was wrong or the Government.

He challenged Mr. Nehru’s claim that Congress alone would be able to form a stable Government in the country. There were many internal differences in the Congress and he cited several instances. “The equation that Mr. Nehru is Congress is not true,” he said.

“Mr. Nehru is living in a dream world. The sooner he realises it, the better.” Dr. Ambedkar asserted, observing that Congressmen had deposed the Congress President, Mr. Tandon, and elected Mr. Nehru in his place only for the sake of the elections.

“Mr. Nehru, who is a naive man, cannot understand this. I am afraid about what his position will be after the elections are over. “Because I am a realist, know better than Mr. Nehru what other Congress leaders think about him.” Dr. Ambedkar declared.

He thought that when the election of the President of the Indian Republic was due, the Prime Minister would have to accept defeat or choose any of his own men from outside Congress.

Dr. Ambedkar told the meeting that when Mr. Rafi Ahmed Kidwai left the Congress, he had told Mr. Kidwai: “Take people like Nehru with you and I am with you.”

Stressing the importance of having a strong opposition Dr. Ambedkar said no party should have unlimited power and it was bad for the people to remain idle and indifferent if that stage of affairs came into being.

The Socialist Party and the Scheduled Castes Federation were fighting the elections for democratic socialism for freedom and equality.

He thought though they would not be able to form a Government, they would be able to form a strong opposition.

“Numbers do not matter. It is the quality of opposition that counts”, he added. He appealed to the people to elect at least the best, if not all, of the candidates put up by the Socialists and the Federation, so that the opposition might be of good quality.

Mr. Asoka Mehta could not address the gathering as he was unwell and Mr. M. Harris spoke in his stead. He declared that interested parties had tried to misinterpret the alliance of the Socialists with the Federation.

Earlier, processions from a number of constituencies, from Kurla to Colaba were taken out and they converged on Shivaji Park. The two main processions started from Byculla Bridge and the Docks area.”¹

●●

¹: The National Standard, dated 26th November 1951.

PURITY OF ADMINISTRATION IS NECESSARY FOR WELFARE OF THE PEOPLE

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar delivered a speech in the joint and crowded meeting of the Praja Socialist Party and the Scheduled Castes Federation, held in the Sir Cawasji Jehangir Hall, Bombay, Fort on 26th November 1951. Mr. Purushottam Trikamdas presided over meeting.

The charge that the Nehru Government and the Congress Party had failed to give to the people, a pure and incorruptible administration was made on Monday by Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, former Law Minister of the Government of India.

The Congress had been rightly accused of not providing food and clothing to the people. But there was something greater and important than food and clothing which the present Government had failed to give to the people. That was pure administration, free from corruption, bribery, nepotism and favouritism.

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar supported his charge by citing several instances of corruption and bribery in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Madras and asked the Congress High Command why it did not think it fit to institute an enquiry into the allegations made against the Ministries of those states by Congress legislators.

It seemed extraordinary to him that the Congress Party which ruled the country, should be so indifferent to its own reputation, honour and integrity and should not appoint an enquiry committee to go into these charges made against the Government by its own members.

He stated that it might be difficult to provide food and clothing to the people but why should it be difficult to give the people a pure Government, he asked. It was a matter which entirely rested in the hands of the Government. If the Government was determined to make its administration fool-proof and knave-proof, nothing could have stood in its way. But really what stood in its way was the Congress itself, because it did not believe in purity of administration.

He was particularly pained at the statement made by Mr. Nehru, as President of the Congress, at the recent Delhi session in which he practically defended corruption prevailing in the country. Mr. Nehru had said that corruption in India was not such a great evil as would demand great attention.

He also referred to a storm raised against him by Congress members of Parliament for certain disqualification clauses for elections which he wanted to introduce into the Representation of the People's Act. He wanted black-marketeers and holders of permits and licences to be disqualified from contesting elections alongwith contractors. But he was forced to remove the clause because of strong opposition from Congress members. Another battle which he fought bitterly but lost in the end was in regard to expenses incurred during elections by parties.

"Is this conduct and attitude of the Congress compatible with the maintenance of purity of administration?" he queried, and said: "Nobody can have trust and faith in a party which play a fast and loose with the question of purity of administration."

Purity of administration was very necessary for the welfare of the people because the public was more concerned with how the law was administered and not with how the law was made.

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar said that he had received several complaints alleging that Congress workers in the districts were influencing judicial officers.

Stressing the need for a strong opposition in India Dr. Ambedkar called upon the Congress to allow other political parties to function as opposition parties and not to suppress the political voice of the people. To the moneyed class he uttered a note of warning not to subscribe to the funds of the Congress Party.

The former Law Minister made a reference to the accusation which he alleged, had been made by Mr. S. K. Patil, that he (Dr. Ambedkar) was ungrateful because he had resigned from the Cabinet. Mr. Patil seemed to have funny notions about

gratefulness, he said and quoted a citation from Irish philosopher which read: “No man can be grateful at the cost of his honour. No woman can be grateful at the cost of her chastity. And no nation can be grateful at the cost of its liberty.”

Gratefulness had its own limitations. Dr. Ambedkar said, He did not want to be a slave in the Government of India.

Replying to the claim made by Mr. Patil, that it was through his efforts that Dr. Ambedkar found a place in the Central Government, Dr. Ambedkar said that it was one of the greatest surprises of his life how he got into the Cabinet, particularly when the Congress was determined and practically vowed not to permit him to enter even the portals of the Constituent Assembly.¹

●●

¹: The Times of India, dated 27th November 1951.

ALLIANCE TO OPPOSE

“Mr. Ashok Mehta, General Secretary of the Socialist Party, told an election meeting at Chowpatty on Sunday the 23rd December 1951, that the Party’s alliance with the Scheduled Castes’ Federation has created a new force.

He was followed by Dr. Ambedkar, the leader of the Federation, who said the alliance was merely to oppose the Congress.

Mr. Mehta attacked Mr. Nehru’s criticism of the alliance.

Dr. Ambedkar said the Congress had done nothing during the last four years.

Several processions from different parts of the city joined the public meeting at Chowpatty.”¹

●●

¹: Bharat, dated 24th December 1951.

I ALWAYS HAVE THE INTEREST OF THE COUNTRY AT HEART

“The renowned University of Columbia of America in an unequivocal decision in 1950 decided to honour Dr. B. R. Ambedkar by conferring a prestigious degree of LL. D. upon him for his pivotal role in drafting the constitution of the independent India. Dr. Ambedkar’s joy knew no bounds to get this news from his alma mater from where he had obtained M. A. and Ph. D. degrees in 1915 and 1917 respectively. But there were many problems before the newly formed Government of India. These were constitutional problems and had to be solved by the expertize of Dr. Ambedkar. Knowing his responsibility Dr. Ambedkar could not accept the invitation. Moreover, his ill health would not allow him to go to America. He, most humbly, informed the University about his inability to attend the ceremony. General Eisenhower was the President of the Columbia University at that time who later served America as her President. He was going to preside over the convocation function. The University was ready to award the degree in absentia. But Dr. Ambedkar informed the University that he would come in one or two years to accept the degree personally. The University was happy to honour this illustrious son of India and conceding to his request decided to hold the function on June 5, 1952. The list of the proud recipients of the degrees in which figured the name of Dr. Ambedkar appeared in the fourth week of May. There was a flood of letters by his friends, fans and well wishers congratulating him on his grand success. Even, Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, the then Vice-President of India, took pride in his achievement and congratulated Dr. Ambedkar with the following words. In his letter, he said,



2, King Edward Road,
New Delhi.
26th May 1952.

My dear Dr. Ambedkar,

I am very pleased to see in the papers that the Columbia University is conferring on you the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws. It is an appropriate recognition for your great work in regard to our Constitution. My warmest congratulations.

There will be no time limit today and tomorrow for the first hour or so. So, if you wish to speak on the General Budget, it will be convenient if you do so today or tomorrow forenoon.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,
Sd/- S. Radhakrishnan.

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar,
Member, Council of States,
Parliament House, New Delhi.”
4001-4003.

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar's reply,

“26, Alipore Road,
Delhi,
the 27th May 1952.

Dear Dr. Radhakrishnan,

Thank you very much for your letter of the 26th May 1952 containing your congratulations on the project of the Columbia University to confer an Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws on me.

I am very glad to say there were at least some in India who are prepared to appreciate the honour that is being done to me.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,
Sd/- B. R. Ambedkar,

Dr. S. Radhakrishnan,
Vice-President of India,
New Delhi.”

Pollux praised Dr. Ambedkar for his achievement in the following words published in the Illustrated Weekly of India, dated June 15, 1952.

“THESE NEWS MAKE NEWS”

“Whether in office or out of it, Dr. Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar is always news. Earlier in the week he once again hit the headlines with a ruthless speech in the Upper House, in which he attacked the Government’s Kashmir policy towards the formulation of which he is supposed to have taken a share as Minister in the last Cabinet. The Treasury Benches will, no doubt, have a sign of relief at the news that the formidable Doctor is going out of the country on June 1. He is flying to New York to receive the Honorary Degree of LL.D. from his old University, Columbia.

He should have received this degree three years ago, at the hands of General Eisenhower who was then President of the University, but Cabinet responsibilities and, later, electioneering came in the way of the trips and the university was reluctant to confer it in absentia. Dr. Ambedkar will be visiting the United States of America, after 20 years. He told Pollux that Mrs. Ambedkar was not accompanying him on the trip for lack of an adequate supply of dollars. While in New York he plans to enter a clinic for medical treatment.” [Column 4 of the article by “Pollux” in the Illustrated Weekly of India, Sunday, 1-6-1952, page 8].

Dr. Ambedkar was to leave for New York on the night of Sunday, the 1st of June 1952. His friends, well wishers, fans and the employees of People’s Education Society arranged a Grand Dinner in his honour, on the night of Saturday the 31st May 1952, the previous day of his departure at specious lawns of the Cricket Club of India. Many eminent personalities like Principal Dr. V. S. Patankar, the Secretary of People’s Education Society, Mr. K. V. Chitre, Mr. Prabhakar Padhye, Mr. B. H. Rao, Mr. W. Alfred, Chairman of the Union of Journalist graced the dinner by their august presence. On this occasion. Patankar said that many among Indians feared that

Dr. Ambedkar would launch a scathing attack on Untouchability in India during his stay in America to draw the attention of the world to this unjust practice and thus would expose the Indian Government's failure in tackling the problem. But this fear was baseless. Because Dr. Ambedkar was an Indian first and would do nothing disgraceful to damage the reputation of his motherland.

Dr. Ambedkar while expressing his gratitude towards all said that he had not arranged any lecture programme in the United States and therefore no one need be under the apprehension that he would say anything harsh there about this country.

Dr. Ambedkar said that although it was said that he possesses a vitriolic temperament and had on many occasions crossed the floors and come into conflict with those in authority he had not on a single occasion been a traitor to the country. He always had the interest of the country at heart. Even at the Round Table Conference, he said, he had been '200 miles ahead of Mahatma Gandhi' so far as the interests of India were concerned". (The Times of India, Monday, 2-6-1952, Page 7, Column 3).

While throwing light, on this dinner party hosted in honour of Dr. Ambedkar a columnist of The Evening News of India observed thus :

"A GREAT MAN"

It is an irony of fate—to quote Principal U. S. Patankar of Siddhartha College—that none of the Indian Universities has so far taken the initiative in honouring Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, one of the Chief Architects of our Constitution, by conferring an honorary degree on him. Even Bombay University of which Dr. Ambedkar was an alumnus, has been "slow and halting"

It has fallen to the credit of Columbia University, to which also the learned doctor was a student, of being the first to honour Dr. Ambedkar by conferring on him the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws.

Dr. Ambedkar left for the United States last Monday by a T. W. A. plane. He will stay in the States for only a few weeks during which he hopes to get some treatment for his legs.

Dr. Patankar and Mr. Chitre, of Siddharth College, gave a dinner at the C. C. I. to Dr. Ambedkar on the eve of his departure. No one has ever seriously questioned Dr. Ambedkar's patriotism, and he made it plain during an after-dinner talk that it was never his intention to run down India during his stay in the United States.

During an interesting conversation, the doctor revealed that he liked Maulana Azad's Hindi very much. "If that is the type of Hindi which we are asked to follow, it will be a very good thing, and not the highly Sanskritised kind," Dr. Ambedkar said adding that the Maulana's Hindi hardly contained any Arabic or Persian words nor any Sanskritised expressions and yet was chaste, polished and dignified.

The plane carrying Dr. Ambedkar took off from Bombay Santacruz Airport around mid-night. He was carrying an overcoat on his arm, a hat on his head and had put on a black neck tie. He bade 'Good bye' to the people with his known smile. All this has been captured in a photograph published on the front page of Free Press Bulletin of June 2, 1952.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY HONOURS DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR

New York, June 6, 1952. Columbia University Yesterday hailed Dr. B. R. Ambedkar as "one of India's leading citizens—a great social reformer and a valient upholder of human rights," in awarding him an honorary degree at its 198th commencement exercises.

Dr. Ambedkar received the honorary doctorate of laws and letters before the large crowd assembled to watch 6,848 graduates of Columbia's 17 schools and colleges received degrees for completing courses of study. Honoured, among with Dr. Ambedkar were Mr. Laster B. Pearson, Canadian Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Daniel Mornnet, the noted French literary historian, and eight American citizens." (The Times of India, Saturday 7-6-1952, page 6)

The news appeared with a photograph of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar and Mr. Wallace Stevens, a poet and Executive from Hartford, Connecticut who were honoured with the honorary degree of letters, "Doctor of Laws".

“DOCTOR OF LAWS”

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, who received the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from Columbia University, New York, on June 5, is seen above with another recipient. Mr. Wallace Stevens, poet and Insurance Executive from Hartford, Connecticut, who received the honorary degree of Letters.”

(The Times of India, 13-6-1952, with a photograph of Wallace Stevens and Ambedkar).

The citation of this degree of Doctor of Laws is both in Latin and English and it was read out by Hon'ble Grayson Kirk, the then Vice-President and provost of the university. The citation is as follows :

CITATION

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK BHIMRAO RAMJI AMBEDKAR, LL. D.

Born in India and schooled there under heavy hardships : B. A. of the University of Bombay at twenty and for three years a graduate student in this University, receiving the doctorate in political science, subsequently a student of the Inns of Court and the University of London obtaining a doctorate in economics ; for the past three decades as barrister. University professor and member of the legislative council as a framer of the Constitution, member of the cabinet and of the Council of State, one of India's leading citizens, a great social reformer and a valiant upholder of human rights.

In the exercise of the authority conferred upon me by the Trustees, I gladly admit you to the degree of Doctor of laws, *honoris causa*, in this University and confer upon you all the rights and privileges which attach thereto, in token whereof I hand you this diploma.

Sd/- Grayson Kirk,

Vice-President and Provost.

June 5, 1952

**SURATORS UNIVERSITATIS COLUMBIAE NEO
EBORACENSIS**

**OMNIBUS ET SINGULIS QUORUM INTEREST
SALUTEM HIS LETTER'S TESTAMUR NOS
UNANIMI CONSENSU**

Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar

AD GRADUM

DOCTORIS IN LEGIBUS

HONORIS CAUSA PROVEXISSE EIQUE OMNIA IURA
ET PRIVILEGIA QUAE AD ISTUM ATTIENTENT DEDISSE
ET CONCESSISSE IN CVIVS REI PLENIVS TESTI
MONIUM SIGILLO HVIVS UNIVERSITTIS ET PRAESIDIS
CHIROGRAPHO DIPLOMA HOCCE MUNIENDUM
CURAVIMVS DATUM NOVI EBORACI DIE

MENSIS IVNII

ANNOQUE DOMINI

MILLESIMO NONGENTESM

QUINQUAGESIMO SECUNDO

Seal of the University of Columbia.¹

QUINTO,

Sd/- Grayson Kirk,

PROPR AE SES

●●

¹: Khairmode, Vol. 10, Pp 280-288.

ALL MY ATTENTION IS CONCENTRATED ON BUILDING OF HALL FOR FEDERATION

“It was decided to hold a gathering of ‘Untouchables’ on Sunday, the 28th September 1952 at 4 p.m. on Nare Park Ground at Bombay. (Opposit to GIPR work shop). It was also decided that Dr. Ambedkar would address it. Accordingly a hand bill was issued jointly duly signed by J. G. Bhatankar, Secretary Scheduled Castes Federation and Mumbai Municipal Kamgar Sangh; L. F. Hindlekar, General Secretary Mahar Dnyati Panchayat Sangh Mumbai; S. A. Upshyam, Secretary Scheduled Castes Improvement Trust and M. M. Sasalekar, J.O.C. Samata Sainik Dal.

The ground was overcrowded by the ‘Untouchables’. Exactly at 5.30 p.m. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar came to attend the gathering. The ‘Untouchables’ greeted him with thunderous applause.

After introductory remarks, Upshyam requested Dr. Ambedkar to address the gathering.”¹

At present Dr. Ambedkar said, all his attention was concentrated on the building of a hall for the Federation. He was leaving for Delhi next week and would not return for some days. He had a fear that his absence from Bombay, the work of swelling the fund would not progress.

While making an appeal for generous donations from members of his community, Dr. Ambedkar said that the common people would support him in the case.

In the last few months, a sum of Rs. 22,000/- had been collected. Dr. Ambedkar had once thought that a hall had to be built even if it necessitated raising a loan. Now, he had changed his mind and the hall had to be constructed out of the funds donated by members themselves.”²

●●

¹ : Janata, 4th October 1952.

² : The Times of India, dated 29th September 1952.

**RECOGNISE UNIVERSITY EDUCATION TO
MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF
THE MODERN WORLD**

On December 16, 1952,* Dr. B. R. Ambedkar addressed the students' annual gathering at Elphinstone College on "the problems of modern students".

He appealed to the students to reorganize university education to meet the requirements of the modern world, and to make the University a place for knowledge and not a centre for training clerks:"¹

●●

* As per 'Janata' the date of fuction was 15th December 1952.—Editors.

¹: Keer, P. 445.

CONDITIONS PRECEDENT FOR THE SUCCESSFUL WORKING OF DEMOCRACY

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar was invited by the Members of the Poona District Law Library on 22nd December 1952 for :

- (i) Unveiling the portrait of late Shri L. R. Gokhale.
- (ii) For declaring open the collections of books donated by Shri A. B. Sethna and Shri H. V. Tulpule, two senior members of the Bar and preserved as separate sections in the Law Library.

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar and Mrs. S. Ambedkar were kind enough to accept this invitation.

Shri P. C. Bhat, District and Sessions Judge, Poona who as the President of the Poona District Law Library presided over the function.

Sangeet Kalanidhi Master Krishnarao Fulambrikar sang a welcome song in honour of Dr. and Mrs. Ambedkar. The welcome song was composed by one of our brother pleaders Shri S. G. Bhat.

The Vice-President Shri K. S. Choubal delivered a welcome speech.

Shri V. B. Gogate, Hon. Secretary read the report of the Library.

Shri B. D. Bal requested Dr. B. R. Ambedkar to unveil the portrait of the late Shri L. R. Gokhale and to declare open the sections of the books donated by Shri A. B. Sethna and H. V. Tulpule.

Then Dr. B.R. Ambedkar unveiled the portrait of late Shri L. R. Gokhale and also declared open the said sections.

On that occasion President Shri P. C. Bhat observed as follows :

“Ladies and Gentlemen, members of the Bench and the Bar.

I have a pleasant function to perform and that is to request the Chief Guest to speak a few words on the subject of today. You will kindly excuse me for not making a long speech because of my ill-health. I now request the Chief Guest to address us on the subject.”

Dr. Ambedkar's Address

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,

When the invitation came, I wrote to your Secretary that I would very much like to know what are the subjects in which the members of this District Library are interested, because I may come here and speak on a subject in which they may have no interest. If so, the visit would be of no value either to you or to me. He was kind enough to send me a list of four subjects. He said "You can select anyone of them." I was in a hurry to reply to him and could not convey to him my actual decision as to what subject I would select. But I told him in a general way that I would select one of the four and if I did not select one of the four, I will not travel beyond the ambit of the four which he had prescribed. The one subject which attracted me which he had mentioned was Parliamentary Democracy, and I thought that that was a subject on which I might speak. The subject which I have selected is not Parliamentary Democracy, but something which is very closely associated with Parliamentary Democracy and which from my point of view, and I believe from the point of view of the country, is a very important subject. Now, the subject which I am going to speak to you this evening is according to my wording of the subject: "Conditions Precedent for the Successful Working of Democracy." What are the conditions precedent which must exist in order that the democratic form of Government may continue to work without any kind of hindrance. That is the subject on which I propose to make a few observations.

Setting for the Subject

Now, before I actually deal with the subject-matter I propose to make a few preliminary observations in order to provide, what I call, a setting for the subject.

The first preliminary observation I propose to make is this that democracy is always changing its form. We speak of democracy, but democracy is not always the same. The Greeks spoke of Athenian Democracy. But as everyone knows, the Athenian Democracy was as different from our modern democracy as chalk is from cheese. The Athenian Democracy consisted of people

50 per cent of whom were slaves. Only 50 per cent were free. The 50 per cent who formed slaves had no place in the Government at all. Surely our democracy is quite different from the Athenian Democracy.

The second thing to which I would like to draw your attention by a preliminary observation is that even in the same country democracy is not always the same. You take the history of England. Nobody can say that the English Democracy before the English Revolution of 1688 was the same as the English Democracy which came after the revolution of 1688. Nor can anyone say that the English Democracy as existed between 1688 and 1832 when the first Reform Bill was passed, is the same as the democracy that developed after the passing of the Act of 1832. Democracy keeps on changing its form.

The third thing that I would like to draw your attention is that democracy not only undergoes changes in form; democracy always undergoes changes in purposes. You take the ancient English Democracy. What was the purpose of that democracy? It was to curb the King, to prevent the King from exercising what we now in law call his prerogative rights. The King even went to the extent of saying that although parliament may be there, as an enactment making body, "I as a King have got the prerogative to make the law and my law shall prevail." It was this kind of autocracy of the King which made democracy to come into being.

Today what is the purpose of the democracy? *The purpose of modern democracy is not so much to put a curb on an autocratic King but to bring about the welfare of the people.* That is a distinct change in the purpose of democracy. You will therefore see that in the title which I have given to my subject, I have deliberately used the words "conditions precedent for the success of modern democracy."

Democracy Defined

Again what do we mean by democracy? Let us have a clear understanding before I proceed to my subject. Democracy has been defined, as you know, by various people, writers of political science and philosophers, sociologists and so on. I take only two for the

purpose of illustrating my point. I do not know whether any of you is acquainted with that famous book by Walter Bagehot on the English Constitution, the first modern attempt to give a clear picture of democracy. If you refer to that book of Walter Bagehot, his definition of democracy is "government by discussion." That is how he defines democracy. Take another illustration that is of Abraham Lincoln. In his famous Getisburg speech which he made after the conquest of the Southern States, he defined democracy as "A government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Well, many other definitions could be added in order to give an idea what people mean by democracy. Personally for myself, I define democracy in a different way, in a much more concrete way, I think. My definition of democracy is "*a form and a method of government whereby revolutionary changes in the economic and social life of the people are brought about without bloodshed.*" That is my definition of democracy. If democracy can enable those who are running it to bring about fundamental changes in the social and economic life of the people and the people accept those changes without resorting to bloodshed, then I say that there is democracy. That is the real test. It is perhaps the severest test. But when you are judging the quality of a material, you must put it to the severest test. And this is how I propose to define democracy at any rate so far as today's address is concerned. Now, how can such a democracy be successful? This is the main subject matter of my address. Now, unfortunately there are no dogmas laid down by any of the authors who have written about this subject of democracy which can give us any idea in concrete, as to what are the conditions precedent according to their judgement to make democracy a success. One has to read history and as a result of reading history to find out the break-down period in democracy's life in the different parts of the world where it had functioned and come to one's own conclusion.

Condition No. I

The first condition which I think is a condition precedent for the successful working of the democracy is that there must be no glaring inequalities in the society. There must not be an oppressed class. There must not be a suppressed class. There must not be a class which has got all the privileges and a class which has got all

the burdens to carry. Such a thing, such a division, such an organization of a society has within itself the germs of a bloody revolution, and perhaps it would be impossible for the democracy to cure them. Lincoln once said, although people have not understood his meaning, in the same Gatisburg's speech that "a house divided against itself cannot stand." He was of course referring to the conflict between the Southern States and the Northern States. He said, "If you of the Southern States and we of the Northern States are divided, we shall not be able to stand together when a foreign enemy comes." That was probably the meaning that he wanted to convey when he said that the house divided cannot stand. But I think that phrase of his or sentence of his is pregnant with much deeper meaning and it means, as I understand it, that the deep cleavages between class and class are going to be one of the greatest hindrances in the success of democracy. Because in democracy what happens? In democracy, everybody, even the oppressed, the suppressed, those who are deprived of their rights and those who carry the burden, they have the right to vote in the same way as those who have all the privileges, and probably those who are privileged are fewer than those who are unprivileged and since we adopt a majority rule as the rule of decision, it is quite possible that if the privileged few will not willingly and voluntarily surrender their privileges, then the distance between them and the lower orders will destroy democracy and bring into existence something quite different. There is, therefore, no doubt in my mind that if you examine the history of democracy in various parts of the world, you will find that one of the causes for the breakdown of democracy is the existence of these social cleavages.

Condition No. II

The second thing which a successful working of democracy requires is the existence of opposition. Now, I have seen many people not only in this country but in England condemning the party system. I was just recently reading, just before I came, a small little book published by the Hansard Society on the party system in England and here is one whole chapter devoted to this question whether the party system is a good system and should be tolerated. There is a variety of views. Now, it seems to me that all