

AMBEDKAR'S VISION ON SOCIAL JUSTICE, DEMOCRACY AND EDUCATION ON BUDDHIST PERSPECTIVE: AN ANALYSIS

***SIDDHARTHA SARKAR & **DR. ARJUN CHANDRA DAS**

**Student, NSOU*

***Assistant Professor, Department of Education, University of Kalyani, Nadia, 741235, W.B*

ABSTRACT

Dr. Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar, one of the greatest founding fathers of modern Indian Constitution and an eminent scholar was a great leader and humanist India had ever produced. He fought for minimizing not only the grievances of the untouchables, but to give improvements in every aspect of human life may it be social, political, cultural, anthropological, or religious. It will be wrong to call him merely a humanist; instead he was a social humanist. Democracy is a form of Government to maintain a better society wherein maximum amount of liberty is ensured for individuals consistent with the attainment of order and security within the State. Truly speaking, democracy takes the form of government wherein the sovereignty vests with the people in general. The vision of Dr. Ambedkar is more significant in countries which witness many deviations from the above basic principle of democracy. With a noble intention to make participation of major citizenry Dr. Ambedkar put forth a broader perspective than the generally perceived idea of political liberty, equality and fraternity. His emphasis was on social and economic dimensions of democracy. He was also emphasis on democracy and social justice.

Since ancient time, the Hindu social system based on caste has proclaimed a social order which was the main cause of injustice in Indian society. All human beings are equal by birth but few people constructed caste system based on occupations which contributed to the evil practice of untouchability. Certain sections of society whom we call dalits were denied access to the natural resources and denied right to livelihood, this practice excluded them from the mainstream political participation which further added to vulnerability. Later, their Ambedkar, the great social reformer had addressed these issues in a different way during the independence movement period and thereafter Ambedkar's leadership provided a fresh path for over all development of scheduled castes and his whole life was a constant struggle against injustice in society. He addressed the problem of untouchability and came out with concrete proposals for the removal of untouchability and the upliftment of the marginalized and the

excluded. Ambedkar's contribution is now in a critical juncture to create the just and casteless society. He believed that the root of untouchability lies in the caste system and caste in the hands of the orthodox has been a powerful weapon for persecuting the reformers and for killing all reforms. He felt that no socio-political reform movement could be successful without the annihilation of caste. He wanted justice for untouchables as well as the weaker sections of the society by making provision in this regard in the Constitution itself. He said that the society is based on three fundamental principles viz., Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. Dr. Ambedkar attracted by buddhism and he rebuild vision of buddhism. Ambedkar called his version of Buddhism Navayana or Neo-Buddhism. This study would discuses on Ambedkar's vision on social justice, democracy and education on Buddhist perspective.

Key words: Social Justice, Democracy, Equality, Buddhist perspective.

INTRODUCTION:

Dr. Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar, one of the greatest founding fathers of modern Indian Constitution and an eminent scholar was a great leader and humanist India had ever produced. He fought for minimizing not only the grievances of the untouchables, but to give improvements in every aspect of human life may it be social, political, cultural, anthropological, or religious. It will be wrong to call him merely a humanist; instead he was a social humanist. Democracy is a form of Government to maintain a better society wherein maximum amount of liberty is ensured for individuals consistent with the attainment of order and security within the State. Truly speaking, democracy takes the form of government wherein the sovereignty vests with the people in general. The vision of Dr. Ambedkar is more significant in countries which witness many deviations from the above basic principle of democracy. With a noble intention to make participation of major citizenry Dr. Ambedkar put forth a broader perspective than the generally perceived idea of political liberty, equality and fraternity. His emphasis was on social and economic dimensions of democracy. He was also emphasis on democracy and social justice.

Dr. Ambedkar wanted democracy as an instrument of bringing about change peacefully. Political democracy was explained as the principle of 'one man one vote'. Democracy means a spirit of fraternity and equality and not merely a political arrangement. Considering the economic aspects, he argued that if economic inequalities are ignored as the western type of parliamentary democracies do cannot bring a holistic development. Democracy, in his opinion should be an attitude of mind, an attitude respect and equality towards their fellows.

B.R. Ambedkar's idea on democracy is show that the roots of democracy lie not in the form of Government but in the social relationships. The intellectual contribution of Dr. Ambedkar to the growth of democracy as a means of

emancipation is noteworthy. Successful functioning of democracy necessitates an ideal society for conveying a change taking place from one part to other parts. It is even after the six decade of independence, the Indian society as well as political democracy has been unable to generate the ideal conditions essential for the smooth functioning of democracy as per Dr. Ambedkar's perspective.

He envisioned that the society must be based on the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity. But the journey of Indian democracy has not been smooth and easy and larger part of Indian population has not enjoyed the fruits of democracy. Proper implementation and observance of rule of law and constitutional principles is the only solution to address this challenge. The future of Indian democracy depends a great deal on a revival of Dr. Ambedkar's visionary conception of democracy.

Since ancient time, the Hindu social system based on caste has proclaimed a social order which was the main cause of injustice in Indian society. All human beings are equal by birth but few people constructed caste system based on occupations which contributed to the evil practice of untouchability. Certain sections of society whom we call dalits were denied access to the natural resources and denied right to livelihood, this practice excluded them from the mainstream political participation which further added to vulnerability. Later, their Ambedkar, the great social reformer had addressed these issues in a different way during the independence movement period and thereafter Ambedkar's leadership provided a fresh path for over all development of scheduled castes and his whole life was a constant struggle against injustice in society. He addressed the problem of untouchability and came out with concrete proposals for the removal of untouchability and the upliftment of the marginalized and the excluded. Ambedkar's contribution is now in a critical juncture to create the just and casteless society. He believed that the root of untouchability lies in the caste system and caste in the hands of the orthodox has been a powerful weapon for persecuting the reformers and for killing all reforms. He felt that no socio-political reform movement could be successful without the annihilation of caste. He wanted justice for untouchables as well as the weaker sections of the society by making provision in this regard in the Constitution itself. Ambedkar's just society is based on three fundamental principles viz., Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. Dr. Ambedkar attracted by buddhism and he rebuild vision of buddhism. Ambedkar called his version of Buddhism Navayana or Neo-Buddhism. This study would discuss on Ambedkar's vision on education, social justice and democracy on buddhist perspective.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

The objectives of the present study are as follows:

- To know Ambedkar vision about Social Justice
- To know Ambedkar vision about Democracy
- To know Ambedkar vision about Equality
- To know Ambedkar vision about Buddhist perspective
- To know Ambedkar vision about Education

SOME RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY:

Some review on this topic,

Raghavendra R.H (2016) in his research paper name, “Dr B.R. Ambedkar’s Ideas on Social Justice in Indian Society” discuss about, Social justice is the spirit and vision of the Indian Constitution. It is the duty of the state to secure a social order in which the legal system of the nation promotes justice on the basis of equal opportunity and, in particular, ensures that opportunities for securing justice are not denied to any citizen by reason of economic or other disabilities. This article makes an attempt to explore Ambedkar’s ideas on social justice. Thereafter, it focuses on Ambedkar’s struggles and ideas on social justice in the Indian context and it finally explores the relevance of his mission for social justice in the present times.

Dr. H. Abdul Azeez(2017) In his research paper name, “Democracy, government and society: Vision of Dr. B.R Ambedkar” discuss about, Dr. Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar, one of the greatest founding fathers of modern Indian Constitution and an eminent scholar was a great leader and humanist India had ever produced. He fought for minimizing not only the grievances of the untouchables, but to give improvements in every aspect of human life may it be social, political, cultural, anthropological, or religious. It will be wrong to call him merely a humanist; instead he was a social humanist. Democracy is a form of Government to maintain a better society wherein maximum amount of liberty is ensured for individuals consistent with the attainment of order and security within the State. Truly speaking, democracy takes the form of government wherein the sovereignty vests with the people in general. The vision of Dr. Ambedkar is more significant in countries which witness many deviations from the above basic principle of democracy. With a noble intention to make participation of major citizenry Dr. Ambedkar put forth a broader perspective than the generally perceived idea of political liberty, equality and fraternity. His emphasis was on social and economic dimensions of democracy.

Ishita Aditya(2014) In his research paper name, “B. R. Ambedkar’s idea on equality and freedom: An Indian perspective” discuss about, B.R.Ambedkar, the chief architect of Indian Constitution, came at the appropriate moment in British ruled India to assume the natural leadership of his kinsmen and participated in social movement and got involved in founding the constitutional edifice of the country. The present study is an attempt to make an objective analysis of the strand of the ideas of Ambedkar on equality and freedom in Indian context while keeping in minds the gaps and lapses in the existing literature on Ambedkar. Indians, especially, downtrodden people of India consider him as immortal soul whose memory will even guide the nation on the path of social justice, liberty and equality. It can be said that *Ambedkarism* is of great relevance to Indian society even today in achieving social justice, removal of untouchability, in establishing equality and freedom and true democracy.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY:

There are two types of data used in study. These are (a) Quantitative and (b) Qualitative. Here the researcher used Historical method as well as qualitative approach for this research paper. In this type of qualitative research, the researchers are supposed to discuss past and present events in the context of the present condition.

Sources of Data:

Historical data are usually classified into two main categories:

(a)Primary sources are eyewitness accounts. They are reported by an actual observer or participant in an event. “Finding and assessing primary historical data is an exercise in detective work. It involves logic, intuition, persistence, and common sense....” (Tuchman, 1994, p.319)

(b)Secondary sources are accounts of an event not actually witnessed by the reporter. The reporter may have talked with an actual observer or read an account by an observer, but his or her testimony is not that of an actual participant or observer. Secondary sources may sometimes be used, but because of the distortion in passing on information, the historian uses them only when primary data are not available, which unfortunately is frequently. As Tuchman (1994) points out, finding the secondary source is only the first step. The researcher must then verify the quality of the source material.

In this research paper the researcher prefer secondary sources for data collection.

Delimitation's of the Study:

Here only discuss about Ambedkar's vision on social justice, democracy and education on Buddhist perspective.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION THE OBJECTIVES:

◆ Ambedkar vision about Social Justice

Ambedkar is also one of the proponents of social justice in modern India. According to Ambedkar, the term “social justice” is based upon equality; liberty and fraternity of all human beings. The aim of social justice is to remove all kinds of inequalities based upon Caste, race, sex, power, Position, and wealth. The social justice brings equal distribution of the social, political and economical resources of the community Ambedkar was the chief architect of the Indian Constitution. He was fully aware of the pattern and problems of the Indian society. It was the aspiration of the different sections of the society and their conflicting interests. He tried to achieve social justice and social democracy in terms of one man-one value. He treated social justice as a true basis for patriotism and nationalism. Ambedkar did not accept the theories of social justice as propounded by the Varna system, the Aristotelian order, Plato's scheme, Gandhian sarvoday order and not even the proletarian socialism of Marx.

The contents of Ambedkar's concept of social justice included unity and equality of all human beings, equal worth of men and women, respect for the weak and the lowly, regard for human rights, benevolence, mutual love, sympathy, tolerance and charity towards fellow being. Humane treatment in all cases dignity of all citizens, abolition of Caste distinctions, education and property for all and good will and gentleness, He emphasized more on fraternity and emotional integration. His view on social justice was to remove man-made inequalities of all shades through law, morality and public conscience; he stood for justice for a sustainable society. According to Dr. Ambedkar the root cause of social injustice to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes is the Caste system in Hindu society. He observed, Castes are enclosed units and it is their conspiracy with clear conscience that compels the ex-communicated to make them into a Caste. The logic of their obdurate circumstance in merciless and it is in obedience to its force that some unfortunate groups find themselves closed out with the result that now groups by a mechanical law are constantly being converted into Castes in a widening multiplicity. He further maintained that the root of untouchability is the Caste system and the root of the Caste system is religion, the root of the religion attached to varnashram and the root of the varnashram is the Brahminism, the roof of Brahminism lies with the political power. Dr. Ambedkar's social vision is reflective in his own words. As an economic system permits exploitation without obligation untouchability is not only a system of unmitigated economic exploitation,

but it is also a system of uncontrolled economic exploitation. That is because there is no independent public opinion to condemn it and there is no impartial machinery of administration to restrain it, there is no check from the police or the judiciary for the simple reasons that they are all down from the Hindus, and take side of exploiters. To the Ambedkar real democracy was a social democracy. According to him, it is essential to realize that political democracy cannot succeed where there is no social and economic democracy. He pleaded the realization of economic and social democracy in India, for political democracy was unreal preceded by economic and social democracy. Dr. Ambedkar said, we must begin by acknowledging the fact that there is complete absence of two things in Indian society, One of these equality is on the social plane. We have in India a society based on the principle of graded inequality which means elevation for some and degradation for others. On the economic plane, we have a society in which there are some who have immense wealth as against many who live in abject poverty-How long shall we continue to live this life of contradictions? How long shall we continue to deny it for long, we will do so only by putting our political democracy in peril, we must remove this contradiction at the earliest possible moment or those who suffer from inequality will blow up the structure of political Democracy. His philosophy was occupied with social amelioration, political enlightenment and spiritual awakening. For this it attached due importance to the economic well-being of the masses. To him, Political thought embodied a social dynamism because of man's attitude animal and social being. He had deep faith in fundamental human rights in the equal rights of men and women, in the dignity of the individual in social economic justice in the promotion of social progress and better standards of life with peace and security in all spheres of human life. His study of social facts enriched his political philosophy. Dr. Ambedkar was dead against the Hindu Caste structure as he was of the view that this structure has been primarily responsible for committing all sorts of atrocities on the various sections of the society particularly the weaker sections Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes. He was against Manusmirthi as it gives a blank Cheque to the Brahamins to commit all sorts of atrocities on Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and justify their evil designs.

◆ Ambedkar vision about Democracy

According to Ambedkar, democracy means fundamental changes in the social and economic life of the people and the acceptance of those changes by the people without resorting to disputes and bloodshed. He wanted to establish the principle of one man, one vote and one value not only in the political life of India but also in social and economic life. He wanted political democracy to be accompanied by social democracy. He gave central importance to social aspects of democracy over political aspects, unlike many others whose discourse on democracy is confined to the political and institutional aspects. Ambedkar paid greater attention to social linkage among people than separation of powers and constitutional safeguards for democracy. The concept of power

contained in his thinking has a direct relationship between social power and political power. He was conscious of the social and economic inequalities which corrode the national consciousness of the Indian people. Ambedkar said, "We must make our political democracy a social democracy as well. Political democracy cannot last unless there lies at the base of it social democracy". Ambedkar paid serious attention to religious notions that promote democracy. Ambedkar viewed the religious foundation of caste as the fundamental obstacle to democracy in India on the one hand and the Buddhist doctrine of liberality, equality and fraternity as the foundations for democracy on the other hand. He writes, "It is common experience that certain names become associated with certain notions and sentiments, which determine a person's attitude toward men and things. The names, Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaisha and Shudra are hierarchical divisions of high and low caste, based on birth and act accordingly". Ambedkar thinks of democracy from the viewpoint of practical life. He belongs to the realistic school of political scientists. He is not bothered about the principles and theories of political science. During the national improvement, his aim has to have justice and freedom for the people in the real sense. He aspired for having a government of the people, for the people and by the people. According to Ambedkar, democracy means no slavery, no caste, no coercion. He wants free thoughts that choice and capacity to live and let live, which his conscience, would be the right path to democracy. Ambedkar says "Democracy is a mode of associated living. The roots of democracy are to be searched in social relationship, in terms of the associated life between the people who form the society". Ambedkar is the greatest political thinker. Outwardly this may seem strange that in India, life was the monopoly of the Brahmin caste and was completely denied to other castes for thousands of years. However, here no contradiction is involved. It was the very privileged position assigned to the Brahmin that became the cause of the retardation. In Indian society, property, illiteracy, castes were distinctions as the positive dangers to democracy. In these situations, educational facilities and economic help should be provided for those who are illiterate and backward on one hand and on the other, who want to wipe out the roots of caste system in order to safeguard the interest of democracy. Ambedkar says, "If you give education to the lower strata of the Indian society which is interested in blowing up the caste systems, the caste system will be blown up". At the moment, the indiscriminate help given to education by the Indian Government and American foundation is going to strengthen the caste system. Giving education to those who want to blow up caste system will improve prospect of democracy in India and put democracy in safer hands. In Indian society, class structure is a positive danger to democracy. This class structure made a distinction of rich and poor, high and low, owners and workers, permanent and sacrosanct parts of social organization. "Practically speaking in a class structure there is, on the other hand, tyranny, vanity pride, arrogance, greed, selfishness and degradation on the other, insecurity, poverty, loss of liberty, self reliance, independence, dignity and self respect." According to Ambedkar, the aim of democracy is essentially need for the interest of society as a whole, and not for any class, group or community.

Therefore, Dr. Ambedkar, while speaking on “conditions precedent for the successful working of Democracy”, in Poona, emphasized that, “The first condition which I think is a condition precedent for the successful working of democracy is that there must be no glaring inequities 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 the entire privileges and a class which has got all the burdens to carry. Such a thing, such a division, such an organization of society has within itself the germs of a bloody revolution and perhaps it would be impossible for democracy to cure them.” To him, real democracy is opposed to the suppression of minorities. The suppression and exploitation of minorities in any form is the negation of democracy and humanism. If suppression is not stopped, then democracy degenerates into tyranny. Ambedkar holds that the individual in society is an end in himself and he has certain inalienable right in social relationship, which must be guaranteed to him by the constitution on certain reasonable conditions and be protected by the state. The democratic principles of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness are considered to be the essentials of human life in Ambedkar’s concept of democracy. He attaches more importance to human well being and human rights. The effective opposition is an important factor in the working of a successful democracy. Democracy means a veto power. There are two aspects of the veto power; one is the long term veto of five years and the other -an immediate one. There must be people in the parliament immediately ready there and then to challenging Government. Secondly, there must be equality in law and administration for efficient functioning of democracy and there is need of a permanent civil service for implementing the policy of the Government. The importance of free opposition and consent is a needful requirement of popular Government, Ambedkar says “Democracy is unrealizable without freedom of political discussion. A right to vote gives a man no real part in controlling government unless he is free to form his own opinions about his vote, to hear what others have to say about the issues and to persuade others to adopt his opinion.” Democracy to Ambedkar 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.” In democracy, there should be no tyranny of the majority over the minority. The minority must always feel safe that although the majority carries on the Government, the minority will not be hurt and that the minority will not be imposed upon. Ambedkar appreciated Harold Laski for his insistence on the moral order as a basic necessity of democracy. He says that if there is no moral order, democracy will get to pieces. It requires a “Public conscience”. “A political democracy without an economic and social democracy is an invitation to trouble and danger”. Social democracy alone can assure to the masses the right to liberty, equality and fraternity. So, democracy is not only a form of government but a way of life through which social justice can be established. Social justice ensures that society should promote the welfare of all. Democracy is a dynamic attitude towards human life. It attaches a great importance to virtues like tolerance and peaceful methods. Thus, parliamentary democracy involves non-violent methods of action; peaceful ways of discussion and acceptance of

decision with faith and dignity, There are two other pillars on the parliament system rests. This system needs an opposition and free and fair elections. Ambedkar says, "In a Parliamentary democracy, there should be at least two sides. Both should know each other well. Hence a 'financial opposition', is needed opposition which is the key to a free political life. No democracy can be without it." In modern times, Dr. Ambedkar appears to educate and enlighten people to adopt the fair means for a change of government. "Election must be completely free and fair. People must be left themselves to choose whom they want to send to the legislatures." The consequences of the caste system on politics and election are quite obvious. Caste are so distributed that in any area there are major castes carrying the seats of Assemblies and Parliament by sheer communal majority voting is always communal, because the minority communities are coerced and tyrannized for casting their vote in former of a particular candidate. The democratic principles of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness are considered to be the essentials of human life in Ambedkar's concept of democracy. He attaches importance to human well being and human rights. The essence of democracy, to Ambedkar, is that as many members of a society as far as possible should share in the exercise of human rights. It means that there should be equal opportunities for all citizens and harmony among the claims of each person. Discrimination in human rights is the very negation of social and political democracy. Thus, Ambedkar puts emphasis on equality, and liberty of human rights. According to Ambedkar, parliamentary democracy has all the marks of a popular Government, a government of the people, by the people and for the people. In parliamentary democracy, there is the executive who is subordinate to the limitative and bound to obey the legislative. The Judiciary can control both the executive and legislative and keep them both within prescribed bounds. Ambedkar says, parliamentary democracy has not been at a standstill. It was progressed in three directions. It began with equality of political rights by expanding in the form of equal suffrage. Secondly, it has recognized the principle of equality of social and economic opportunities. Thirdly, it has recognized that the state cannot be held at bay by corporation which is anti-social in their purpose. Parliamentary democracy produces the best result in the long run, because it assigns great significance to virtues like ability and cooperation, mutual respect and self help, discipline and devotion to work, for the happiness of the millions of people. The system of parliamentary democracy, thus, embodies the principle of change and continuity to which Ambedkar attaches great importance. To him, only the spirit of the people can help parliamentary democracy to function well. People and democracy are closely related to each other. Ambedkar says, democracy is another name for equality. It is, therefore, a matter of some surprise that there has been a revolt against parliamentary democracy although not even a century has elapsed since its universal acceptance and inauguration. There is revolt against it in Italy, in Germany, in Russia and in Spain, and there are very few countries in which there has not been discontent against parliamentary democracy. Why should be this discontent and dissatisfaction against parliamentary democracy? There is no country in which the urgency of considering this question is greater than it is in India. India is

negotiating to have parliamentary democracy of the erroneous ideologies which have been responsible for the failure of parliamentary democracy. I have no doubt that the idea of freedom of contract is one of them. The idea became sanctioned and was upheld in the name of liberty. Parliamentary democracy took no notice of economic inequalities and did not care to examine the result of freedom of contract on the parties to the contract, in spite of the fact that they were unequal in their bargaining power. It did not mind if the freedom of contract gave the strong opportunity to defraud the weak. The result is the parliamentary democracy in standing out as a protagonist of liberty has continuously added to the economic wrongs of the poor, the downtrodden and the disinherited class. Ambedkar says, the second wrong ideology which has initiated parliamentary democracy is the failure to realize that political democracy cannot succeed where there is no social and economic democracy. Some way question this proposition. To those who are disposed to question it, I will ask a counter question. Why parliamentary democracy collapsed so easily in Italy, Germany and Russia? Why did it not collapse so easily in England and the U.S.A? To any mind, there is only one answer – namely, there was a greater degree of economic and social democracy in the latter countries than it existed in the former. Parliamentary democracy developed a passion for liberty. It was never made even a nodding acquaintance with equality. It failed to realize the significance of equality and did not even endeavor to strike a balance between liberty and equality. Ambedkar says, ‘I have referred to the wrong ideologies which in my judgment have been responsible for the failure of parliamentary democracy. All political societies get divided into two classes – the rulers and the ruled. If the evil stopped here, it would not matter much. But the unfortunate part of it is that the division becomes stereotyped and stratified so much so that the rulers are always drawn from the ruling classes and the class of the ruled never becomes the ruling class. People do not govern themselves, they established a government and leave it to govern them, forgotten that it is not their government. That being the situation parliamentary democracy has never been a government of the people or by the people, and that is why it has never been a government for the people. Parliamentary democracy, notwithstanding the paraphernalia of a popular government, is in reality a government of a hereditary subject class by a hereditary ruling class. It is those vicious organizations of political life which have made parliamentary democracy has not fulfilled the hope it held out the common man of ensuring to him liberty property and pursuit of happiness.’ Dr. Ambedkar was one of the admirers of freedom and self-government of India. And he stood for a democratic system of administration. Dr. Ambedkar preferred the elected rulers or the government to hereditary rulers for a good and democratic administration. He emphasizes that the administration must be free of corruption and dishonest ways of administering things. He says, everyone must share the responsibilities for the successful working of the democratic institutions in the land, otherwise; the feelings of public welfare and co-operation would not be strengthened. He says, “Democracy cannot function in the absence of basic civil liberties – which enables the

community to vindicate itself against the state furthermore, the right to criticize, if it is to be effective, must include the right to organize opposition through political parties. Representative democracy is essentially procedural. It is characterized by free expression, free parties and free election.” To Ambedkar, “Political parties are indispensable in parliamentary democracy, for democracy without a party system is unconceivable. There should be a regular party system.” Ambedkar preferred that at least two parties are essential in democracy for its fructification. “A party is necessary to run government. But two parties are necessary to keep government from being a despotic. A democratic government can remain democratic only if it is worked by two parties – a party in power and a party in opposition.” Ambedkar fought against caste and injustice because he found that there were no human rights for a large majority of the people. He rebelled against such a social organization. He wanted to vitalize the masses in India, for equal human rights. For removing the social, economic, political and religious disabilities of the untouchables, it was necessary to establish Government of the people, for the people and by the people. Only under a democratic system of government could social economic, political and religious freedom be ensured equally to every man and woman. His ultimate aim of life was to create a “real social democracy”. The concept of his social democracy included human treatment and human rights to all, without which it can be no sure and stable political life anywhere. The 19th century meaning of democracy is that each individual should have a vote, does not stand up to full test of social and political democracy. Without social democracy, neither political liberty, nor the unity of the nation can be maintained. According to him, political democracy rests on four premises: - these are –

- i) The individual is an end in himself.
- ii) The individual has certain inalienable rights which must be guaranteed to him by the constitution.
- iii) The individual shall not be required to relinquish any of his constitutional rights as a condition precedent to the receipt of a privilege.
- iv) The state shall not delegate powers to private persons to govern others.”

The dignity of the individual, political liberty, social progress and human rights are necessary constitutional safeguards which form Ambedkar’s basic decent democratic ideals in the political democracy. To him, the ground plan means the social structure of a community to which the political plan is sought to be applied. Political democracy and liberty are nothing if not beaked and bucked up by equal social patterns, because the political structure rests on the social structure. “Indeed, the social structure,” he says “has a profound effect on the political structure. It may modify it in its working. It may nullify it or it may even make a cherry of it.” It is therefore, essential that before passing any Judgment on any scheme of political relationship even making plans for economic reforms, the people must consider the ground plan that means social relations; Democracy should be

regarded as both a social and a political method. “The soul of Democracy”, he says, “is the doctrine of one man, one value”. This principle finds intrinsic worth in the individual personality of each man in political and social relation. This stands for the economic well being of the people, without which democracy, to him, has no value.” The sum of democracy, according to him, essentially consists in the economic welfare of all men living in a particular society, besides its realization in political relation. Otherwise, democracy would kill its own soul and democracy without soul would be useless, unrelated to human aspirations. In India, to Ambedkar, the people have not realized that it is equally essential to prescribe the shape and form of the economic structure of society for the benefit of the majorities of men. They have not escaped hopes for economic democracy and emancipation, one vote after the long five years, has no meaning to the starving man. It has no significance to the man who is always exploited, rebuked and repressed. It has no value to him for whom there is no sympathy, no love and no give and take of life’s hopes.

◆ Ambedkar vision about Equality and Freedom

The Hindu Social Order in India has often been accused of being an undemocratic and unjust order wherein a large section of its members are doomed to a permanent degraded life by reason of birth. Ambedkar was a bitter critic of Hinduism. The impact of the principle of inequality is quite apparent and glaring in the Hindu social order. In view of Ambedkar, the Hindu social order does not recognize equal need, equal work or equal ability as the basis of reward for labour. Its motto is that in regard to the distribution of the good things of life, those who are reckoned as the highest must get the most and the best and those who are classified as the lowest must get least and worst. The Hindu social order comprises of castes, namely, Brahmins, Khatryias, Vaishyas and Shudras. Ambedkar observed: “In Hindu social order, there is no room for individual merit and no consideration of individual justice. If the individual has a privilege, it is not because it is due to him personal. The privilege goes with the class, and if he is found to enjoy it, it is because he belongs to that class. Contrarily, if an individual is suffering from a wrong, it is not because he by his conduct deserves it. The disability is the disability imposed upon the class and if he is found to be labouring under it, it is because he belongs to that class.” According to Ambedkar, there are two fundamental tenets of a free social order. They are: (i) individual is an end in himself and the aim and object of society is the growth of the individual and the development of his personality. Society is not above the individual. But, the individual has to subordinate himself to society because such subordinate is for his betterment and (ii) the terms of associated life among members of society must be based on the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity. The question is whether Hinduism believes in equality. The cancerous caste system is at the root of it. The caste system and equality are incompatible to one another. The principle of gradation and rank is the essence of caste system. The caste system has recognized slavery in inverse order of

status and maintained inequality in every sphere of human activity-social, political, economic, legal, religious etc.

a) In social hierarchy, Hinduism places Brahmin at the first rank. Kshatriya is assigned the second rank. Vaishya and the Shudra have been assigned the third and fourth rank. It does not stop with mere gradation but injects the principles of graded inequality by ordaining descending scale of contempt and ascending scale of reverence. b) In the political field, the members of the caste system have no political rights to elect a government of their choice. c) In the economic sphere, the members of caste system have no economic independence or economic security and there is no choice of avocation. They have to merely follow their ancestral callings. Avocation being pre-ordained, individual merit, capacity or inclination to work has no place in such a system. d) In the legal domain, an irrational and obnoxious criminal jurisprudence based on the principle of inequality is prescribed. Punishments are inflicted on the organ concerned of procreation as if the offending organ has a will of its own. Inhuman character of punishment is pronounced, the punishment being disproportionate to the offence committed. Inequality is ingrained in the Hindu criminal jurisprudence. Despite offence being the same, higher punishments are inflicted on the lower castes and lower punishments for the superior castes. In other words, social inequality is the solid foundation of the Hindu Social Jurisprudence. e) In the realm of religion, Hinduism prohibits initiation (Upanayanam) to Shudras. Initiation is effected by the investiture of a person with the sacred thread. Hinduism does not allow a Shudra to read the Veda. He cannot become a Sanyasi. The reason for such a prohibition is that if a Shudra becomes a Sanyasi, the higher castes are automatically deprived of his service without which they cannot live in comfort and luxury. Shudras are not allowed to read the Veda, or chant Gayatri Mantra because such acts are believed to purify one's body and soul. The priestly caste has conspired and contrived to see that a Shudra does not sanctify his body and soul. This is a glaring instance of how Hinduism not only denied equality but also denied sacred character of human personality. Hindus claim a great "social utility" to the caste system. This claim lacks sound foundation. Far from having "social utility", it acts as a divisive force. According to Ambedkar, the caste system is not only a division of labour but also an unnatural division of labourers in which the divisions of labourers are graded one above the other with a spirit of superiority and inferiority. Elsewhere than in India, the division of labour is based on individual aptitude, efficiency and capacity. Hinduism ordains that one should follow his ancestral calling. Ambedkar observed: Caste devitalizes man. It is a process of sterilization. Education, wealth, labour are all necessary for every individual if he is to reach free and full manhood. Mere education without wealth and labour is barren. Wealth without education and labour is brutal. Each is necessary for the growth of man. In Hindu social order, there is no place for individual merit and individual justice and the spirit of fraternity and equality absent in the Hindu social order. The following are the three principles underlying the Hindu social order: a) principles of graded inequality; b) fixity of hereditary occupation for each caste; and c) fixation of people within their respective classes. Brahmin may become the

slave of another Brahmin, but he cannot be the slave of those lower in his social status. The effect of this rule is that it prohibits enslavement of the superior castes by the inferior castes. However, Manu was particularly careful to ensure that this permission does not violate the principle of inequality. He, therefore, proclaimed that inter-caste marriage was permissible but in the inverse social order, as done in the case of slavery. Even in the matter of law, inequality is striking and apparent. The treatment given to a witness in the court of law differs depending upon the caste to which a person belongs. Under the Hindu social order, the nature and quantum of punishment depending upon the caste to which the offender belongs although the nature of offence might be the same. Severest punishments were prescribed for the lowest castes in respect of the same offences. According to Ambedkar, "Does the Hindu social order recognize equality"? He said, "The answer is negative". That men are born equal is a doctrine which is repugnant to the Hindu social order. According to the Hindu social order thought, it is true that men are the children of prajapati, the creator of the universe; they are not equal on that account. They were created from the different parts of the body of Prajapati. The Brahmins were created from the mouth, the Kshatriya from the arms, the Vishya from his thighs and Shudra from his feet. In the Biological sense, the Hindu social order does not bother to examine whether the doctrine is founded in a fact. If it was not a fact, i.e., men were not equal in their character and natural endowments, of character and intelligence so much the better. On the other hand, if it was a fact, i.e., men were equal in character and natural endowments, so much the worse for the doctrine. This critical evolution of the various characteristics of caste leaves no doubt that prohibition or rather the absence of intermarriage-endogamy; to be concise, is the only one that can be called the essence of caste when rigidly understood. But some may deny this on abstract anthropological ground, for there exist endogamous groups without giving rise to the problem of caste. The various races of India occupying definite territories have more or less fused into one another and do possess cultural unity, which is the only criterion of a homogeneous population. Caste in India means an artificial chopping off of the population into fixed and definite units, each one prevented from fusing into another through the custom of endogamy. Thus the conclusion is inevitable that endogamy is the only characteristics that peculiar to caste. The study of the caste problem by Ambedkar involved four main points: That in spite of the composite make-up of the Hindu population, there was a deep cultural unity; that caste was a parceling into bits of a large cultural units; that there was one caste to start with; and that classes had become castes through initiation and excommunication. In this time, British colonialism and western education gave Indian society a very peculiar twist. They gave some new outlook to the people of India and personally think that Ambedkar himself was a product of this age. In colonialism, many nationalist freedom fighters wanted the establishment of an independent India but Ambedkar was different from the rest. His task of emancipation of the Indian people did not end with the liberation from British colonialism but went to the extent of seeking to wipe out the structures of oppression within the Indian

social system. In his reply to Mahatma Gandhi, Ambedkar states that “the Hindu society must be reorganized on a regional basis which would recognize the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity”. For him, caste is the real reason why there is no equality in the Hindu society. Once again in his reason why there is no equality in the Hindu society. Once again in his reply to the Mahatma, he says: Caste has ruined the Hindus, the reorganization of the Hindu society on the basis of Chaturvarna is impossible because the Varna Vyavastha is like a leaky pot or like a man running at the nose. It is incapable of sustaining itself by its own virtue and has an inherent tendency to degenerate into a caste system unless there is a legal sanction behind it which can be enforced against everyone transgressing his Varna That the reorganization of the Hindu society on the basis of Chaturvarnya is harmful because the effect of the Varnavyavastha is to degrade the masses by denying them opportunity to acquired knowledge and to emasculate them by denying them the right to be armed. Ambedkar’s solution to his problem is the destruction of the caste system. In ‘The Annihilation of Caste’, Ambedkar opines: Yours is more difficult than the other national cause, namely Swaraj. In the fight for Swaraj, you fight with the whole nation on your side. In this, you have to fight against the whole nation and that too, your own. But, it is more important than Swaraj. There is no use of having Swaraj, if you cannot defend it. More important than the question of defending the Swaraj is the question of defending the Hindus under the Swaraj. In my opinion only when the Hindu society becomes a casteless society that it can hope to have strength enough to defend itself. Without such internal strength, Swaraj for Hindu may turn out to be only a step towards slavery. Ambedkar’s vision of a new social order can be summed up in the way in which he so often did, with the great slogan of the French revolution, “liberty, equality, fraternity.” In sum, it can be said that in view of Ambedkar, the society must be based on reason, and not on atrocious traditions of caste system. Therefore, in ‘The Annihilation of Caste’, he suggests as a means, the annihilation of caste maintained through Shastras, “Make every man and woman free from the thralldom of the Shastras, cleanse their minds of the pernicious notions founded on the Shastras and he or she will inter-dine and inter-marry”. He found education, inter-caste marriage and inter-dine as methods, which may eliminate castes and patriarchy, maintained through endogamy. He earnestly eradicate Brahmanism because in view of Ambedkar, Brahmanism does not mean the power, privileges and interests of the Brahmans as a community but actually it is the negation of the spirit of ‘Liberty, Equality and Fraternity’. In that sense, it is rampant in all classes and is not confined to the Brahmans alone, though they have been the originators of it” (reported in Times of India, February 14, 1938). In taking these Brahmanism and capitalism as the focus of struggle, Ambedkar was inclined to accept a Marxist explanation of social-economic exploitation with only the necessity of adding an appreciation for the role of caste as an autonomous, exploitative and oppressive social structure. Ambedkar was a liberal thinker who believed that rights were necessary for full development of human personality. But, he was particularly concerned with the condition of the Scheduled castes that were facing

discrimination not only by the British but also by the local feudal class. The growing consciousness among the dalits regarding their rights and liberties was a major source of influence on the thinking of Ambedkar. But, at the same time by his various statements on rights and liberties of the Scheduled castes he also contributed to the development of this consciousness. In all his statements and memoranda that he submitted in the earlier phase, he laid emphasis on the rights of the scheduled castes and their necessary safeguards. He advocated effective rights, like end of discrimination and also special safeguards for them. Throughout his life, it was the values of the French revolution, liberty, equality and fraternity (community), summed up in “social justice,” which defined Ambedkar’s orientation. A detailed analysis of his life and mission reveals that Ambedkar held the basic and fundamental norm, to be equality- social, economic and political, from which he proceeded to lay down a collection of ‘ought’ propositions; in this hierarchy of ‘ought’, the initial fundamental ‘ought’ on which the validity of all the other ultimately rests, the fundamental norm seems to be the social equality, the justification for the rest of the legal reforms and changes he persistently fought for. It was a society full of social inequalities in which Ambedkar was born. The humiliation he experienced in such an in egalitarian society bore on imprint in all thought his life.

◆ Ambedkar vision about Buddhist perspective

Conversion as a means of escaping the caste system had already been tried by many Untouchables. It is worth mentioning that conversion to another religion was a way to escape from the disabilities of untouchability in Hinduism. Dr. Ambedkar reckoned that social hierarchy was essential to the Hindu religion. To get out of it meant attainment of equality and self-respect. More than political and religious man is social animal. He may not have or need not have religion; he may not have, needed not have politics but he must have a society. The wretched society based on Caste and Untouchability, had for ages treated the untouchables of India worse than serfs and slaves. Dr. Ambedkar was convinced that there is no salvation within Hinduism for untouchables. He rightly attributed the low-status, degradation and low-esteem of untouchables to a social system that was backed by Hinduism. Hence, conversion to Buddhism was the only way to get emancipation from the age-old caste-ridden Hinduism. Socio-political Reasons for choosing Buddhism for the Untouchables: The conversion of the Dalits from Hinduism to other religions was one of the main agendas of Dr. B.R Ambedkar’s life since he fully believed that this was the only way for their liberation. He reached this conclusion after struggling for more than two decades for the basic human rights of the Dalits within the Hindu fold. It is true that on 13th October, 1935, he declared in a Conference held at Yeola in Nasik, his definite intention of changing his religion in the presence of more than 10,000 Dalits but his struggle towards his end began much earlier in the Mahad Satyagrahas in 1927.

The Jalgaon Conference of 29 May 1929 passed a resolution and called all the Depressed Classes people to embrace any religion other than Hinduism.

1. Ambedkar addressed the Dalits present in the Yeola Conference in these words: The disabilities we have suffered, and the indignities we had to put up with, were the result of our being the members of the Hindu Community. Will it not be better for us to leave that fold and embrace a new faith that would give us equal status, a secure position and rightful treatment? I advise you to sever your connection with Hinduism and to embrace any other religion. But, in doing so be careful in choosing the new faith and see that equality in treatment, status and opportunities will be guaranteed to you unreservedly. Unfortunately for me I was born a Hindu Untouchable. It was beyond my power to prevent that, but I declare that it is within my power to refuse to live under ignoble and humiliating conditions. I solemnly assure you that I will not die a Hindu.
2. Dr. Ambedkar asked his people to ponder over the causes for their sufferings extending over long period of two thousand years. He asserted that the Hindu Dharma was the main cause. Of all religions in the world it was Hinduism that recognized caste distinctions and Untouchability. This was the cover, the cloak, for all injustices perpetrated on the Scheduled Castes by Caste Hindus. The position even today, he regretted to say, was that in villages they could not live with self-respect. He, therefore, reiterated his conviction that they must discard Hinduism and refuse to submit to indignities any longer.
3. The social degradation of the Untouchables having had religious sanction under Hinduism, the untouchables have nowhere to go but to get out of this gas chamber of Hinduism and seek fresh-air under other liberating religions like Christianity, Islam, Sikhism, Buddhism, etc. Therefore, conversion to other religions had become popular among the untouchables. Not because after conversion to Christianity and Islam the “problem of poverty” would be solved. And for them poverty is not the number one problem. Man cannot live by bread alone. He wants self-respect which is denied under Hinduism. They will get it the moment they get out of Hinduism and convert to other religions. Untouchables have discovered that conversion helps them as they will no longer be subjected to atrocities. Conversion to other religions, therefore, helps the Untouchable to gain dignity and self-respect.
4. Dr. Ambedkar emphasized (a) the need of the untouchables for self-respect (b) the reality of the division between caste Hindu and Depressed classes, which had to be acknowledged if any justice was to be done

- (c) the belief that the Brahmin's deep ingrained ethnocentrism has prevented a reconstruction of Hindu society and stood in the way of aversion of vested rights for the common good.
5. Dr. Ambedkar envisaged that the Hindu society was static, Untouchability was recognized by Hindu religion and caste was the corner-stone to the arch of Hinduism. He weighed the merits of the Hindu dharma as against the merits of Buddhism and finally resolved to embrace Buddhism.
 6. However, the reasons for which Dr. Ambedkar preferred the Buddhism can be summarized thus:
 - (1) He tried to prove that the Untouchables were Buddhists. In his thesis on the Origin of
 - (2) Untouchability, he made it clear that today's Untouchables were once Buddhists.
 - (3) Buddhism was an Indian religion and the Buddha was nearer to the Untouchable masses.
 - (4) The Untouchables would join with the World Buddhist community and thus pave the way for World brotherhood.
 7. Dr. Ambedkar believes that all right minded people and Buddhist the world over will hail the return of the Buddha to his homeland without much formalism, traditionalism and protocol.
 8. Ambedkar pointed out that Buddha sought to raise the social status of the servile classes and he delivered sermons relating to the socio-religious reforms which the poor, the fallen, and the weak needed. He added that, "Buddhism teaches social freedom, intellectual freedom, economic freedom and political freedom....equality not between man and man only but between man and woman also. The day before his conversion he added that the greatest benefit he had conferred on the country was by embracing Buddhism. Buddhism is a part and parcel of Bharatiya culture. He said "I have taken care that my conversion will not harm the tradition of the culture and the history of this land".
 9. These show his Leadership quality. Deep insight was into the psyche of the common people. Respect for his own culture and realization that one can stay natural by staying close to his roots. The Buddha stood for equality and he was also the greatest opponent of Chaturvarna. He preached against it, fought against it and strived hard to uproot it. According to Hinduism, neither a Shudra nor a woman could become a teacher of religion nor could they take Shanyasha and reach God. Lord Buddha on the other hand, admitted Shudras to the Bhikkhus Sangha and even women were allowed to the Sangha. Ambedkar's conversion to Buddhism was an attempt to re-establish the marginalized section of the society by pushing it upward towards modern, democratic values. It was a movement that was anti-traditional because it

opposed Hinduism but very much pro-Indian. He believed that Buddhism would give the Untouchables the sense of self-respect and freedom from the domination of caste Hindu groups-a platform from which they can aspire for higher social and economic status.

10. The conversion oaths devised by Dr. Ambedkar at the Nagpur ceremony not only contained positive statements about Buddhism such as taking a vow to follow the Eight-Fold Path of Lord Buddha, but also negative statements against Hinduism; such as negating the Hindu gods, negating the scripture-prescribed roles of the Brahmanism. This gives a release from the concept of pollution which he found to be so central in Hinduism. However, by conversion, the Untouchables became non-Hindus and they feel that Dr. Ambedkar won the governmental benefits for them and which are recompense for the ill-treatment of the past.
11. The path shown by Dr. Ambedkar was the salvation of the down-trodden classes through taking refuge in the Buddha-Dhamma. Ambedkar views that the Untouchables had a glorious past and that was said to be the glorious Buddhist period of Indian history. Henceforth, Buddhism can provide the Scheduled Castes instant rich historic past, spiritual heritage and cultural pride; which are the essential ingredients for any society to survive. Moreover, Buddhism can unify the splinter groups in the shape of various castes. Lord Buddha once said that if a drop of water is to be saved from extinction it must be dropped in the ocean which will never dry. Similarly, if the members of these smaller groups desire to live as respectable human beings they must become one with the Buddha's religion which is like a big ocean of equality, and it is only in this ocean of equality that they can live with self respect and dignity. Buddha's way is not only good for the down-trodden but also good for the country as well as for the whole mankind. To follow this path means freedom from serfdom and freedom from Caste rigidity as Buddhism enables its votaries to inter-mingle freely in all walks of life. Lord Buddha has been one of the greatest revolutionaries in the socio-emotional as well as the spiritual sphere of life. He was a fundamental revolutionary and Babasaheb Ambedkar gave a call not only to these down-trodden and oppressed but to all Indians to break down their shackles and bonds by seeing the truth in the Buddhist way of life and creating a new society of harmony and happiness around them. To sum up, Buddhism is ideally suited for the purpose of egalitarian justice as it is based on the concept of liberty, equality and fraternity. It can elevate the downtrodden, oppressed and suppressed sections to the highest level and give them social equality along with spiritual solace what they want.

◆ Ambedkar vision about Education

Ambedkar's knew that education was the necessary precondition for the reconstruction of the society on the principles of equality and justice. Studying the development of education in Indian Society he found that during the rule of Peshwa in Maharashtra and even during the earlier period of British Raj, right to education was restricted to higher castes. He fought for the education of masses without discrimination of caste and sex. Participation in the budget to debate he said, Education is something which ought to be brought within the reach of everyone. The education department is not a department which can be treated on the basis of quid pro quo. Education ought to be cheapened in all possible ways and to the greatest possible extent. Taking active part in the discussion on Bombay University Act and Primary Education Amendment Bill, he contributed his views in the reform of Education. He founded the people's Education society, and started colleges at Bombay and Aurangabad. He was repeatedly with the government that providing equal educational opportunities to all without discrimination.

CONCLUSION:

Resting on Ambedkar's thoughts, the Indian Constitution guarantees equal rights to all, based on social justice and human dignity. It is observed, however, that Ambedkar's ideas of social justice could not be realized in a proper manner over the years. As such, his concept of justice will have to be propagated by institutions through civil society. Ambedkar was concerned about the overall development of the vulnerable sections of the Indian society and he chose to demolish existing caste discrimination by enacting the Constitution. Therefore, Ambedkar's ideas of social justice remain relevant in contemporary Indian society in promoting constitutional and legal methods for upholding the rights and dignity of the vulnerable sections. In conclusion, it can be said that this research gives closer and analytical insight into the thoughts of Ambedkar on equality and freedom and provides an answer to the question of whether we achieve religious tolerance, human equality and freedom, true democracy in the society, justice and peace in the light of political philosophy of Ambedkar whose memory will ever guide the nation on the path of justice, liberty and equality.

Ambedkar has deliberately included Article 45 in the Directive Principles of State Policy that, "the state shall endeavour to provide, within a period of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution, for free and compulsory education for all children until they complete the age of fourteen years." The government of India has passed the bill of Right to Education Act 2009 and paid a great tribute to the contributions of Ambedkar to mass education. The policy of the Government of universalization of elementary education focusing particularly on marginalized groups, poorer sections and the girl child, enhancing enrollment in secondary education as well as

its commitment to expand education facilities will empower and equip youth to face the future with hope and confidence. There are several challenges to cherish Ambedkar's vision of universal education. There is need to frame such policies starting from the primary stage to the higher stage that help to realize the vision of Ambedkar.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Keer Dhananjay, Dr. Ambedkar. (2003), *Life and Mission*, Popular Prakashan, Mumbai. pp. 251-252.
2. Narake Hari, ed. (2003), *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches*, Higher Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Mumbai. vol-17,part-3, pp.94-95.
3. Rajsekhar V.T & Gopinath .M. (1994), *Dalit Movement in India, Meaning &Message*, Dalit Sahitya Academy, Bangalore. p.35.
4. Zelliott Eleanor (2005), *From Untouchables To Dalits, Essays on the Ambedkar Movement*, Manohar. New Delhi. p.130.
5. Deva Shanty & Wagh.C.M (1965), *Dr.Ambedkar and Conversion*, Dr.Ambedkar Publications Society, Hyderabad. p.29.
6. Koul,L. (2016). *Methodology of Educational Research*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. LTD.
7. Best, J. W. (2018). *Research in Education*. India: Pearson India Education Services Pvt. Ltd
8. Singh, A. K. (2016). *Tests, Measurements and Research Methods in Behavioural Sciences*. New Delhi: Bharati Bhawan.
9. Mangal, S.K., & Mangal, S. (2015). *Research Methodology in Behavioural Sciences*. Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.
10. Creswell, J.W. (2015). *Eucational Research Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. India: Pearson India Education Services Pvt. Ltd.