

those who are against the party system and who must be taken also on that very account to be against opposition, seem completely to misunderstand what democracy means. What does democracy mean? I am not defining it. I am asking a functional question. It seems to me that democracy means a veto of power. Democracy is a contradiction of hereditary authority or autocratic authority. Democracy means that at some stage somewhere there must be a veto on the authority of those who are ruling the country. In autocracy there is no veto. The King once elected is there with his inherent or divine right to rule. He does not have to go before his subject at the end of every five years to ask them, "Do you think I am a good man? Do you think I have done well during the last five years? If so, will you re-elect me?" There is no veto on the part of anybody on the power of the King. But in democracy we have provided, that at every five years those who are in authority must go to the people and ask whether in the opinion of the people they are well qualified to be entrusted with power and authority to look after their interest, to mould their destiny, to defend them. That is what I call veto. Now, a democracy is not satisfied with a quinquennial veto that the Government should go at the end of five years only to the people and in the meantime there should be nobody to question the authority of the Government. Democracy requires that not only that the Government should be subject to the veto, long-term veto of five years, at the hands of the people, but there must be an immediate veto. There must be people in the parliament immediately ready there and then to challenge the Government. Now, if you understand what I am saying, democracy means that nobody has any perpetual authority to rule, but that rule is subject to sanction by the people and can be challenged in the house itself. You will see how important it is to have an opposition. Opposition means that the Government is always on the anvil. The Government must justify every act that it does to those of the people who do not belong to its party. Unfortunately, in our country all our newspapers, for one reason or other, I believe, it is the revenue from advertisements, have given far more publicity to the Government than to the opposition, because you cannot get any revenue from the opposition. They get revenue from the Government and you find columns after columns of speeches reeled out by members of the

ruling party in the daily newspapers and the speeches made by the opposition are probably put somewhere on the last page in the last column. I am not criticising what is democracy. I am saying what is the condition precedent for a democracy. *The opposition is a condition precedent for democracy.* But do you know that in England not only is the opposition recognised, but the leader of the opposition is paid a salary by the Government in order to run the opposition. He gets a secretary, he gets a small staff of stenographers and writers, he has a room in the House of Commons where he does his business. In the same way, you will find that in Canada the leader of the opposition gets a salary in the way as a Prime Minister does, because in both these countries democracy feels that there must be someone to show whether the Government is going wrong. And this must be done incessantly and perpetually and that is why they do not mind spending money on the leader of the opposition.

Condition No. III

I think there is a **third condition** which may also be called a condition precedent for the success of democracy and that is **equality in law and administration**. One need not at this stage delite too much on equality before the law, although there might be cases here and there when there is no equality before the law. But what is important is equality of treatment in administration. It is quite possible for good many of you to imagine or to recall cases where a party Government is carrying on the administration for the benefit of the members of the party. At any rate, I can recall a great many instances of this sort. Suppose there is a law which says that nobody shall deal in a particular commodity without a licence. Nobody can quarrel with that law because it is universal. There is no discrimination in that particular piece of legislation. But let us go further and see what happens when a man goes to a particular officer or to the Minister with an application for licence in trading in a particular commodity. I do not know, it is quite possible again that probably the Minister may first look at his hat. What sort of a coloured hat he is wearing? If he is wearing a hat which appeals to him and it assures him that he is a party man and another man goes with another sort of dress or belonging to another party and in making his decision the licence is given to the first and refused to

the second, although both of them on merits are equally qualified to have that licence, then obviously this is a discrimination in administration and there is no equity. Of course the question of licence, i.e. the granting of this privilege and that privilege is perhaps small thing and affects only a very small class of people. But let us go further and see what would happen if this kind of discrimination enters administration. Supposing a member of a certain party is being prosecuted for a certain offence for which there is abundant evidence, and suppose the head of the party in that particular area goes to the District Magistrate and tells him that it is not right for him to prosecute this man because he belongs to his party and says, "well, if you don't do it, I shall refer the matter to the Minister and get you transferred from this place to some other place." You can just imagine what chaos and injustice would result in administration. The sort of a thing which used to happen in the United States which is called a Spoil System, that is to say, when one party came in office, it removed all the employees that were employed by their predecessor including even the clerks and the peons and they filled their vacancies by those gentlemen who helped the new party to go in power. The United States as a matter of fact, had no administration worth speaking of for a number of years. Subsequently, they themselves realised that this was not helpful to democracy. They abolished this Spoil System. In England, in order that administration should remain pure, impartial, away from politics and policy, they have made a distinction between what is called political offices and civil offices. The civil service is permanent. It serves all the parties whichever is in office and carries out the administration without any kind of interference from the Minister. Such a thing at one time did exist in our country when the British were here. I recall very clearly an incident in my own career as a member of the Government of India. You perhaps will recollect that every Viceroy has got in Delhi some street or club named after him. The only Governor General who does not get his name attached to some street or institution is Lord Linlithgow. His Private Secretary was my friend. I was then in charge of P. W. D. and there were plenty of works I was in charge of. He came and quite said to me "My dear Dr. could you do something for naming some institution or work after the name of Lord Linlithgow?" He

said it is looking very glaring that everybody's name is there but not his. I said "I will consider." I was then discussing the construction of a barrage over Jamuna in order to provide water to the city of Delhi in summer, because it goes dry in summer, I told my Secretary who was a European by name Priar. And I said, "Mr. Priar look here, this is what the Secretary to the Governor General has said to me. Do you think we can do something?" What do you think was his reply? His reply was "Sir, we must not do any such thing at all." Such a thing at any rate in this country to do would be quite impossible. For any officer to say something which is contrary to the wishes of the Minister is, to my mind, utterly impossible. But in those days it was quite possible, because we too in India like Great Britain had made that wise decision that administration must not be interfered with by the Government, and that the function of the Government was to lay down policy but not to interfere and not to make any discrimination. This is very fundamental and I am afraid we had already departed from that and may completely abnegate and abolish the thing we have had so far.

Condition No. IV

The fourth condition precedent, in my judgement, for the successful working of democracy is the observance of constitutional morality. Many people seem to be very enthusiastic about the Constitution. Well, I am afraid, I am not. I am quite prepared to join that body of people who want to abolish the Constitution, at any rate to redraft it. But what we forget is that we have a Constitution which contains legal provisions, only a skeleton. The flesh of that skeleton is to be found in what we call constitutional morality. However, in England it is called the conventions of the constitution and people must be ready to observe the rules of the game. Let me give you one or two illustrations which come to my mind at this moment. You remember when the 13 American colonies rebelled, their leader was Washington. It is really a very inadequate way of defining his position in the American life of that day merely to say that he was a leader. To the American people Washington was God. If you read his life and history, he was made the first President of the United States after the constitution was drafted. After his term was over, what happened? He refused to stand for the second time.

I have not the least doubt in my mind that if Washington had stood ten times one after the other for the Presidentship, he would have been elected unanimously without a rival. But he stepped down the second time. When he was asked why, he said, "My dear people, you have forgotten the purpose for which we made this constitution. We made this constitution because we did not want a hereditary monarchy and we did not want a hereditary ruler or a dictator. If after abandoning and swerving away from the allegiance of the English King, you come to this country and stick to worship me year after year and term after term what happens to your principles? Can you say that you have rightly rebelled against the authority of the English king when you are substituting me in his place? He said, "Even if your royalty and fidelity to me compels you to plead that I should stand a second time, I as one who enunciated that principle that we should not have hereditary authority, must not fall a prey to your emotion." Ultimately, they prevailed upon him to stand at least a second time. And he did. And the third time when they approached him, he spurned them away. Let me give you another illustration. You know Windsor Edward the VIII whose serial story has now been published in the Times of India. I had gone to the Round Table Conference and there was a great controversy going on there as to whether the King should be allowed to marry the woman whom he wanted to marry, especially when he was prepared to marry her in a morganatic marriage, so that she may not be a queen or whether the British people should deny him even that personal right and force him to abdicate. Mr. Baldwin was of course against the King's marriage. He would not allow him, and said, "If you do not listen to me, you will have to go." Our friend Mr. Churchill was the friend of Edward the VIII and was encouraging him. At that time the Labour Party was in the opposition. They had no majority and I remember very well the Labour Party people considered whether they could not make capital out of this issue and defeat Mr. Baldwin; because there was a large number of conservatives who in their loyalty wanted to support the King; and I remember the late Prof. Laski writing a series of articles in the 'Herald' condemning any such move on the part of the Labour party. He said, "By our convention we have always agreed that the king

must accept the advice of the Prime Minister and if he does not accept the advice of the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister shall force his ejection.” That being our convention, it would be wrong on our part to defeat Mr. Baldwin, on an issue which increases the authority of the King. And the Labour Party listened to his advice and did nothing of the kind. They said, they must observe the rules of the game. If you read English history, you will find many such illustrations where the party leaders have had before them many temptations to do wrong to their opponents in office or in opposition by clutching at an issue which gave them temporary power, but which they refused to fall a prey to, because they knew that they would damage the constitution and damage democracy.

There is one other thing which I think is very necessary in the working of democracy and it is this that in the name of democracy there must be no tyranny of the majority over the minority. The minority must always feel safe that although the majority is carrying on the Government, the minority is not being hurt, or the minority is not being hit below the belt. This is a thing which is very greatly respected in the House of Commons. Good many of you must be remembering the results of elections in England in 1931 when Mr. Ramsay Mac Donald left the Labour Party and formed the National Government. When the election came, the Labour Party which I think numbered somewhere about 150 or so, had only 50 members out of 650 with Mr. Baldwin as the Prime Minister. I was then there. But I have never heard of a single instance of this small minority of 50 members belonging to the Labour Party under the huge majority of the conservatives ever complaining that they were denied their due rights of speech, or opposition or making motions of any kind as you probably know. You take our own Parliament. I am not justifying what the members of the opposition are doing by constantly bringing in motions of censure or adjournment motions. It is not a very happy thing to work in parliament to be constantly dunning these adjournment motions. All the same, you must have noticed that there is hardly any motion, whether of adjournment or censure which has been admitted for the debate. It surprises me considerably. In my reading of the English parliamentary debates I have very seldom come

across a case where a demand for adjournment has been refused either by the Speaker, provided of course it is an order by the Government. When I was a member of the Bombay Legislative Assembly, there were a few of our friends Mr. Morarji, Mr. Munshi and Mr. Kher and others who were in office. They never allowed a single motion of adjournment to be discussed. Either our friend Mr. Mavlankar who was then the Speaker helped them by ruling it out or as he admitted, the Minister objected to it. You know what happens when a Minister objects? When a Minister objects, the man who proposes the adjournment motion has to produce 30 or 40 people, whatever the quota is. It may be that if Government were constantly to oppose adjournment motions of the small community which is represented in the house by a group of few members such as 4, 5 or 6, such small minorities can never get a chance to ventilate their grievances. What happens is that these minorities develop a contempt for parliamentary people and develop a revolutionary spirit something unconstitutional. It is therefore necessary that when democracy is working, the majority on which it is based, must not act in a tyrannical manner.

One other point I will refer and then close. I think that democracy does require the functioning of moral order in society. Somehow, our political scientists have never considered this aspect of democracy. Ethics is something separate from politics. You may learn politics and you may know nothing about ethics as though politics can work without ethics. To my mind it is an astounding proposition. After all, in democracy what happens? Democracy is spoken of as a free Government. And what do we mean by free Government? Free Government means that in vast aspects of social life people are left free to carry on without interference of law, or if law has to be made, then the law maker expects that society will have enough morality in it to make the law a success. The only person who, I think, has referred to this aspect of democracy is Laski. In one of his books he has very categorically stated that the moral order is always taken for granted in democracy. If there is no moral order, democracy will go to pieces as it is going now probably in our own country.

The last thing that I refer to is that democracy requires ‘public conscience.’ There is no doubt about it that although there is injustice in every country, the injustice is not equally spread. There are some where the impact of injustice is very small. There are some against whom the impact is very great. And there are some who are absolutely crushed under the burden of injustice. One might very easily cite the case of Jews in England. They were the people who suffered certain injustice which the Christians never did. What happened was that the Jews alone had to struggle in order to get this injustice removed. But the English Christians never helped them. In fact, they liked it. The only man who helped the Jews in England was the King. This may be extraordinary. But the reason also is extraordinary and the reason is this: Under the old Christian law the children of the Jews could not inherit the property of the father for no other reason except that he was a Jew and not a Christian, and the King being the residuary legatee of the State received the property of a dead Jew. Now the king liked that sort of thing. He was very happy. When the children of the dead Jew went to the King in application the King handed over to them a little bit of the property of their dead father and kept the rest for himself. But as I said, no English man ever helped the Jews, and the Jews continued to struggle for their liberation. This is the result of what is called “public conscience.” Public conscience means conscience which becomes agitated at every wrong, no matter who is the sufferer and it means that everybody whether he suffers that particular wrong or not, is prepared to join him in order to get him relieved. You take South Africa, the most recent example. Well, the people who are suffering there are the Indians. Are not they? The white people are not suffering yet you find this Reverend Scott who is a white man doing his level best and in order to get this injustice removed. Recently, I have been reading that a large number of young boys and girls belonging to the white race are also joining the struggle of the Indians in South Africa. That is called “public conscience.” I do not want to shock you, but sometimes I feel how forgetful we are. We are talking about South Africa. I have been wondering within myself whether we who are talking so much against segregation and so on do not have South Africa in every village. There is; we have only to go and see. There is South Africa

everywhere in the village and yet I have very seldom found anybody not belonging to the scheduled class taking up the cause of the scheduled class and lighting, and why? Because there is no "public conscience." Myself and my India is the only world within which I am bound. I this sort of thing happens, the minority which is suffering from injustice gets no help from others for the purpose of getting rid of this injustice. It again develops a revolutionary mentality which puts democracy in danger. Now, as I said, what I have said is not a series of dogmas which have been worked out by any political scientists, but the result of what is impressed upon me as a result of reading the political histories of various countries, and I believe that these are the most essential conditions I or the purpose of preserving democracy.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I have no idea what has been the underlying purpose or motive which led you to give me this invitation. It might be that you wanted to add something to your programme. I hope I have discharged that function. But so far as I am concerned, I have no doubt about it that the subject about which I have spoken this evening, to my mind, is a subject of the greatest importance to this nation. We have somehow developed the idea that we have got independence. The Britishers have gone. We have got a constitution which provides for democracy. Well what more do we want? We cannot rest as we say on our ears, and do nothing more. Let me warn you against this kind of smug feeling that with the making of the constitution our task is done. It is not done. It has only begun. You must remember that democracy is not a plant which grows everywhere. It has grown in America. It has grown in England. To some extent it has grown in France. Yes these are examples by which we can take a certain amount of courage to ourselves to see what has happened elsewhere. You must be remembering that as a result of the first European War and the break-up of the Austria-Hungarian empire, Wilson created, on the basis of self determination, small nationalities independent of Austria. They all began with democratic constitution, democratic government and (hey had also fundamental rights provided in their constitution which was made obligatory for them to have the Peace Treaty of Versailles. My friends, what has happened to that

democracy? Do you see any trace of it there now? It has all gone. It has all vanished. They are probably under the dominance or surveillance of other countries. There is no democracy left. Take some of the most recent examples. Syria had got a democratic government. After a few years there was a military rebellion and the Commander-in-Chief of Syria became the ruler of Syria and democracy vanished in air. Take another example. What happened in Egypt ? There too, they had been a democratic government beginning right from 1922 for 30 years. In one night Faruk had to leave and Nagib became the dictator of Egypt and he abolished the Constitution.

With all these examples before us, I think we ought to be very cautious and very considerate regarding our own future. You ought to consider whether we ought not to take some very positive steps in order to remove some of the stones and the boulders which are lying in our path in order to make our democracy safe. If, as a result of these few observations I have made, I have effected in you a consciousness that this is a problem on which we cannot afford to sleep, I think I would thank myself for the work I have done. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I do not wish to detain you long and I thank for the kind attention with which you have listened to what I have said.” ¹

●●

¹ : Booklet Printed by D. D. Gangal, Lokasangraha Press, 624 Sadashiv Peth, Poona 2 and Published by V. B. Gogate. LL. B., Pleader, Hon. Secretary Poona District Law Library, Poona 5.

KNOWLEDGE IS THE FOUNDATION OF MAN'S LIFE

On December 24, 1952, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar addressed the annual gathering of the students of the Rajaram College, Kolhapur. In the course of his speech he observed :

“Knowledge is the foundation of a man’s life and every effort must be made to maintain the intellectual stamina of a student and arouse his intellect.” He asked the students to develop their thinking power and make use of the knowledge they had gained.

● ●

¹ : Keer, Pp. 445-446.

WOMEN LEADERS ARE NOT INTERESTED IN THE SOCIAL PROGRESS OF WOMEN

The women organisations of Kolhapur presented an address to Dr. B. R. Ambedkar on 25th December 1952. The programme was arranged at Rajaram theatre. Large number of women and men were present for this programme. Mrs. Vimlabai Bagal made an introductory speech and read, the address. Various women organisations welcomed Dr. B. R. Ambedkar and Mrs. Maisaheb Ambedkar, Major Dadasaheb Nimbalkar also welcomed Dr. Ambedkar and Mrs. Ambedkar.

Replying to their address Dr. B. R. Ambedkar referred to the Hindu Code Bill and said,¹

“None of the prominent Indian women leaders were really interested in the social progress of women and staled that the Hindu Code Bill was now just like milk spoiled by mixture with a bitter acid. He added that if they wanted to have the Hindu Code Bill passed, they should find two fat women to fast.”²

●●

¹ : Janata, dated 3rd January 1953.

² : Keer, P 446.

..... I SHALL TAKE STERN MEASURES

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar addressing a rally of 50,000 people under the auspices of the Belgaum district branch of the federation, at Nipani, on December 25th, 1952 said,

“The misery, starvation, and squalor of the backward classes would bring dreadful results, and recalled the French and Russian revolutions.

He warned the ruling party that if the lot of the backward classes was not improved by the next elections, the Scheduled Castes Federation would take stern measures, which might upset the Government, and anarchy might follow.

“I shall wait for two more years, or even till the next elections, for the alleviation of the misery of my people-, and if a new deal is not forthcoming through negotiations, I shall take stern measures,” he added.

He refuted Mr. Nehru’s statement at Nagpur recently that there was no Untouchability in India.

Elections Losses

The election reversals of” the Scheduled Castes federation. candidates were not due to any weakness in the organisation, but due to lack of companions.

He would abandon politics if anybody could prove that the organisation was faulty. Its candidates secured hundred per cent votes from the Scheduled Castes people.

Earlier, Mr. P N. Rajbhoj, General Secretary of the federation, who presided over the meeting, announced that the Working Committee of the federation would meet in Delhi in February.....PTI.¹

● ●

* : Keer, P. 440.

¹ : The National Standard, dated 27th December, 1952.

**OSMANIA UNIVERSITY HONOURED
DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR**

As Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, the Chief Architect of the Constitution of India rendered yeomen services to the country. His work was acknowledged by Columbia University, America where he was a student. Columbia was the first University which conferred L. L. D. on Dr. Ambedkar in a special convocation. Through out the Country only Osmania University Hyderabad Dn. has conferred D. Lit. (Doctor of Literature) on Dr. B. R. Ambedkar on 12th January 1953.

On the eve of this convocation Decon Chronicle, Hyderabad Dn. in its issue dated 13th January 1953 stated,

“Dr. B.R. Ambedkar described as one of the ablest lawyers and the champion of the Downtroddens who had taken the main burden of framing the Indian Constitution.”

“Procedure for the Convocation, Osmania University, Monday 12th January 1953.”

“The Chancellor shall say :

“This Convocation of Osmania University has been called to confer Honorary Degrees on (1) Dr. S. Radha Krishnan, Vice-President of India , (2) Shri M. K. Vellodi, (3) Dr. B. R. Ambedkar and also to confer Degree upon the candidates who have been certified of these Degrees, Let them now be presented.”

(7) The Vice-Chancellor will then read the citations and present the above persons.

(8) At the end of each citation, the Chancellor shall present the degree and say : —

“By virtue of the authority vested in me as Chancellor of the Osmania University, I admit you to the degree of..... Honoris Causa on account of your eminent position and attainments.”

The Citation about Dr. B. R. Ambedkar stated in the para 8 is as follows : —

“Mr. Chancellor,

I have the honour to present you Dr. B. R. Ambedkar for conferment of the Degree of Doctor of Literature Honoris Causa.

Born in 1893, Dr. Ambedkar was educated at Satara and Bombay. After Graduating from the Bombay University, he went to the United States of America, for further studies, and received the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in 1917 at the young age of 24. After returning to India he served for some time as Finance Minister of the Baroda State and later as professor of Political Economy at Sydenham College, Bombay. Again, he went abroad, this time to England and enrolled himself for the Doctorate degree in Science at the London School of Economics. His, treatise, entitled 'The Problem of the Rupee' was acclaimed by Economist the World over.

The political career had started early, but his legislative career started when he entered the Bombay Legislative Assembly in 1926. He gave evidence before the Lothian Committee on Indian Franchise; Royal Commission on Indian Currency and many other important Committees and Commissions. Dr. Ambedkar has been a staunch supporter of all the down-- trodden people from the beginning of his career. Such people evoked his sympathy and he became the Founder-President of the All India Scheduled Castes Federation. He was invited to attend the Round Table Conference at London (1930-1932) to represent the scheduled Castes.

Dr. Ambedkar held the high office of Labour Member in the Viceroy's Executive Council from 1942-46. In 1947 when India became an independent country, he was taken in the Cabinet as Law Member. The responsibility of framing the India Constitution devolved upon him and the part played by him in this matter is well known.

Dr. Ambedkar is a voracious reader. He knows seven languages. He is an author of distinction and published several books. 'What Congress and Gandhi Have Done For Untouchables'; 'Annihilation of Caste'; 'Federation Vs. Freedom'; 'Pakistan and Partition of India'; 'Ranade and Gandhi'; etc. are among them.

Mr. Chancellor, in presenting Dr. Ambedkar, I am presenting a person of great eminence, high attainments and distinguished services, one of the ablest lawyers, a preeminent legislator, a champion of the backward and down-trodden people of India. I request you now to confer the Degree of Doctor of Literature Honoris Causa on Shri B. R. Ambedkar.'

Honourary Degree conferred on Dr. B. R. Ambedkar is as follow :

Osmania University
The Degree
of
Doctor of Literature
Honoris Causa
Has Been Conferred At The Convocation Upon
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar

In recognition of his Eminent Position And Attainments.

Hyderabad-Deccan.

Chancellor

January 12, 1953.

●●

IF BUDDHIST GOSPEL IS NOT ADOPTED HISTORY OF CONFLICT IN EUROPE, WILL REPEAT IN ASIA

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar while speaking at a reception given by Shri P. N. Rajbhoj, General Secretary of the Federation and delegate to the world *Buddhist* Conference in honour of Shri M. R. Murti, Vice-President of the Indo-Japanese Cultural Associations in Japan at New Delhi on February 15, 1953, expressed the view that either the present generation or future generations would have to choose between *Budhism* and *Marxism*.

“In the present condition of the world “said Dr. Ambedkar,” so far as I have been able to study the situation, I have come to the conclusion that the conflict, whatever form it may take, will ultimately be between the Gospel of the *Buddha* and the Gospel of *Karl Marx*.”.

“It is from that point of view, that I have been attracted by Japan, by China and by other Eastern countries,” he said.

Dr. Ambedkar said that the East had already become more important than the West, but he feared that if the *Buddhist* Gospel was not adopted, the history of conflict in Europe would be repeated in Asia.

Religions other than *Buddhism* concentrated on the problems of the Souls, of worship, but they forgot man. Dr. Ambedkar added that the *Buddha* alone when pressed for his views on the souls, said, “Such discussions are unprofitable. Nobody can prove the existence of the souls. I am concerned with man. I am concerned with establishing righteousness between man and man.”¹

● ●

¹: The Free Press Journal, dated 16th February, 1953.

.....THE SO CALLED UPPER CLASSES WILL BE WIPED OUT OF EXISTENCE

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, leader of the Scheduled Castes, told the Youth Assembly in Bombay on Saturday the 2nd May 1953 to go to the masses and rid them of their superstitious inheritance.

He was inaugurating the summer school of the Assembly at the Siddharth College:

Dr. Ambedkar deplored mere academic proficiency and advised modern youth to select one or two contemporary problems and tackle them in a rational manner.

He was bewildered by the number of political ideologies which had infiltrated the student world, probably due to foreign influences.

He asked the assembly to formulate a plan with definite objects in view and eschew lectures in Philosophy or European history if it sought concrete results.

Dr. Ambedkar warned that unless the so-called upper classes made an immediate and balanced appraisal of present times, they would be 'wiped out of existence.'

"The time has come when small groups of students must go to the masses and teach them to lead a rational life," he remarked.

He described modern society as a mangled one, living in modern times the ideals of ancient society.

He observed that we had adopted a Constitution totally different from the principles and rules which really governed our pattern of life.

Dr. B. G. Gokhale, President of the Youth Assembly, welcomed Dr. Ambedkar.¹



¹: The Sunday Standard, dated 3rd May 1953.

UNLESS CASTELESS AND CLASSLESS SOCIETY IS CREATED, THERE WILL BE NO PROGRESS IN INDIA

“Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, former Law Minister of the Union Government, said in Bombay on Wednesday, May 27th 1953 that he would devote the rest of his life to propagate *Buddhism*.

Dr. Ambedkar, who was addressing a meeting organised by the All-India Scheduled Castes Federation at the Nare Park-maidan, to celebrate *Lord Buddha's* birthday, condemned the Caste System and said that unless a casteless and classless society was created, there would be no progress in the country.

He was happy to note that Hindus also were participating in large numbers in the celebration.

He was sure that *Buddhism* would rapidly spread in India.

Among the other organisations which celebrated *Buddha's* birthday were the *Buddha* Society and the *Boudh Dharma Prachar Samiti*.

The offices of the Government of India in Bombay remained closed on Wednesday on account of *Buddha Jayanti*.

The day was also a postal holiday.

Banks and offices of the State Government worked as usual as the day was not a public holiday.’¹

C. I. D. report of the meeting is as follows—

“Dr. B. R. Ambedkar presided over a meeting held under the auspices of the Buddha Dharma Prachar Samiti, on May 27th 1953 at Nare Park, Parel, Bombay. While addressing the audience (5,000) he said that there were many points of difference between the Hindu religion and the Buddhistic religion and that be remaining in the Hindu religion, the Harijans would not improve their lot. He also declared that he had determined to carry on propaganda of the *Buddhistic* religion.”²



¹ : The National Standard, dated 28th May 1953.

² : Bombay City, S. B; (i), C. I. D; dated 27th May 1953.

DON'T GET MISLED BY CRITICISM

“Dr. B. R. Ambedkar addressed an audience of about 3,000 persons on June 3, 1953, in a public meeting held under the auspices of the Scheduled Castes Mahila Mandal at Rawli Camp, Sion, Bombay. He said that there was much criticism on his speech made on the “Buddha Jayanti” day and advised the audience not to be misled by the criticism.” ¹

“Dr. B.R. Ambedkar addressed a meeting (3,000) on behalf of the Scheduled Caste Mahila Mandal in Bombay on June 3rd, 1953 and advised them to carry on their programme of emancipation in spite of adverse criticism. The Mandal contributed Rs. 401 as its first instalment towards the Building Fund of the Federation.” ²

●●

¹ : Bombay City. S. B; (i), C I. D; dated 28th May 1953.

² : Bombay State Police (Secret) Abstract of Intelligence.

**“POLITICS IS NOT THE BE-ALL AND END-ALL
OF THE NATION’S LIFE”**

“Dr. B. R. Ambedkar was fully engaged in the work of his colleges in July and August 1953. For most of the days in July and August, he stayed in Aurangabad. There he addressed a meeting of the Hyderabad Scheduled Castes Federation workers and leaders.

He said,

Politics was not the be-all and end-all of the nation’s life. He urged them to study diligently the Indian Problem in all its aspects, political, social, religious and economic, and then fight with own accord for the salvation of the downtrodden. At this meeting he sounded a note of warning to his people that he would ex-communicate those who would make pilgrimages to Hindu places of worship. He said it did not do them any good.” ¹

●●

¹: Keer, Pp. 447-448.

WE WILL CARRY ON ALL INDIA LAND SATYAGRAHA EVEN AGAINST CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

“Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, President of the Scheduled Castes Federation, today, the November 16th, 1953 at New Delhi, has asked his partymen in Marath wada of Hyderabad State to withdraw their land *Satyagraha* in Aurangabad district.

He complimented the Hyderabad Government for the good treatment they meted out to the *satyagrahis*.

The State Government had issued orders to restore the land and was considering a proposal to allot to the Scheduled Castes the forest areas cleared during the days of communist activity.

“I think this is a good response to a legitimate grievance” Dr. Ambedkar said.

Out of 1,700 *satyagrahis* some 1,100 had been released unconditionally without trial by the State Government. “I must say that this is a very gracious act.”

Dr. Ambedkar added: “I have heard that some of the *satyagrahis* cut down trees for which I express my regret. Our object was to get land for cultivation and not to cut trees.”

Dr. Ambedkar said he was issuing the statement to clear two misunderstandings.

It had been suggested by some members of the Federation, that the *Satyagrah* in Hyderabad State had not been authorised by him. This was wrong. “This *Satyagraha* was authorised by me and for very good reasons.”

“The Scheduled Castes people all over India have been living in dire poverty without land and without work and when I found that the Hyderabad Government had in the first instance, granted them some waste land to cultivate and had taken back the land after the grantees had ploughed, sown and were only waiting for gathering the harvest, there was no other way left except to take action.”

The first and foremost duty of the leaders was to advance the interest of the Scheduled Castes and when a situation arises which jeopardies the interest of the Scheduled Castes it is treason for a leader not to be stir himself into doing something," he added.

Dr. Ambedkar said: "We will carry on an All-India *Satyagraha* even against the Central Government when our patience is exhausted. If the Sikhs can do it why cannot the Scheduled Castes ? "

Those, therefore, who objected to the *Satyagraha*, had better get out of the Federation, Dr. Ambedkar added.

The second misunderstanding related to the reorganisation of the Hyderabad State Scheduled Castes Federation. The statement of Mr. P. N. Rajbhoj, General Secretary of the All-India Federation, that the working committee of the Federation had decided to break up this branch into four separate branches was a fact and the decision was final.

This pattern of organisation had not been devised for the Hyderabad State only, but adopted throughout the country wherever this Federation existed, he added. He warned members of the Federation that while so far the organisation had been very lenient to those who have been violating the orders of the Federation, hereafter no mercy will be shown to any one who acts contrary to them." ¹

● ●

¹: The National Standard, dated 17th November, 1953.