

Indian Experiments With Social Justice: A Status Report

Rajkumar Singh^{[a],*}

^[a]Professor, Department of Political Science, State University, Saharsa, India.

*Corresponding author.

Received 18 August 2016; accepted 8 October 2016

Published online 26 November 2016

Abstract

Social justice means both psychological and social needs based on equality, liberty and fraternity as properly incorporated in various provisions/directives of the Constitution of India which ultimately reflects an uncompromising respect for human dignity with an overriding concern for the poorest and weakest in the society. Gandhi and Ambedkar, the chief architects of social justice in India, furthered the themes and as a result, social processes are constantly changing while in globalisation, the Government of the day is bound to refresh the old and start a needed new to get the fullness of life. The research paper aims to examine the various constitutional provisions which provide social justice to a large section of people in the country. In addition to keeping in view the political philosophies of Gandhi and Ambedkar it seeks the answer of several questions asked about the implementation of social justice in India. It is an innovative paper and hence it may be useful for many countries aiming to achieve social justice for weaker sections of society.

Key words: Constitution; Provisions; Implementation; Development & challenges

Singh, R. (2016). Indian Experiments With Social Justice: A Status Report. *Canadian Social Science*, 12(11), 52-58. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/css/article/view/8874>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/8874>

1. SOCIAL JUSTICE AND CONSTITUTION

“Social Justice” means availability of equal social opportunities for the development of personality to all

the people in society, without any discrimination on the basis of caste, sex or race. No one should be deprived, because of these differences, those social conditions which are essential for social development. The issue of social justice is associated with social equality and at the time of independence, the constitution makers were highly influenced by the feeling of social equality and social justice. For the same reason, they incorporated the words, like Socialist, Secular, Democratic and Republic in the Preamble. Especially the word justice in the Preamble is explained as justice, social, economic and political. The term justice is secured in the constitution through various provisions of Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles. Social justice denotes the equal treatment of all citizens without any social distinction. It means absence of privilege being extended to any particular section of the society, and improvement in the conditions of backward classes (SCs, STs and OBCs) and women. In line economic justice denotes on the non-discrimination between people on the basis of economic factors. It involves the elimination of glaring inequalities in wealth, income and property. A combination of social justice and economic justice denotes what is known as “distributive justice”. The Preamble secures to all citizens of India equality of status and opportunity.

The Indian Constitution is unique in its content and spirit. Though borrowed from almost every constitution of the world, the constitution of India has several salient features that distinguish it from the constitution from other countries. However, social justice is the foundation stone of Indian Constitution. Indian Constitution makers were well known to the use and minimality of various principles of justice. They wanted to search such form of justice which could fulfil the expectations of whole revolution as Jawaharlal Nehru reminded the Constituent Assembly, ‘First work of this assembly is to make India independent by a new constitution through which starving people will get complete meal and clothes and each

Indian will get best option that he can progress himself" (Minarva Mills Vs. Union of India, 1980). Social justice was found useful for everyone in its kind and flexible form. Although social justice is not defined anywhere in the constitution but it is an ideal element of feeling which is a goal of constitution. Feeling of social justice is a form of relative concept which is changeable by the time, circumstances, culture and ambitions of the people (Iyear, 1987, p.53). But the inclusion of the word "Socialist" in the Preamble by the 42nd Amendment Act has strengthened the constitutional ethos of social and economic justice.

Under the Indian Constitution, the use of social justice is accepted in the wider sense which includes social as well as economic justice. According to Chief Justice Gajendragadkar, in this sense social justice holds the aims of equal opportunity to every citizen in the matter of social and economic activities and to prevent inequalities. The Constitution of India does not completely dedicate to any traditional ideology and it is embedded in progressive concept of social justice and various rules of justice such as-quality, transaction, necessity, options etc. are as its helping organs. In fact, dedication of the constitution is in such type of social justice which can fulfil the expectations of the welfare state according to Indian conditions. Keeping in view the value of equality our constitution boldly mentions that the state shall not deny to any person equality before the law or the protection of the laws within the territory of India (Article 14 of the Indian Constitution). The original principle of equalitarian justice is propounded/ derived by Aristotle that is equal behaviour in equal matter. If there is unequal behaviour between equal, there will be injustice. On the issue of "Equality" the Supreme Court of India delivered several judgements defining the concept itself and in the context recently in the case of E. P. Royappa vs. State of Tamil Nadu (AIR, 1974). Justice P.N. Bhagwati has held that equality is movable concept which has many forms and aspects. It cannot be tightened in traditional and principalities circle. Equality with equal behaviour prohibits arbitrariness in action.

1.1 Spirit of Democracy

Democracy, as we know, is not only a form of government but focuses on human rights and human dignity in turn implies rule of law, equality, liberty and freedom from oppression, exploitation and arbitrary interference. The constitution of India has accepted right to equality as an essential element of justice and sought to realise the various components of social justice. In addition, to make the principle of equality more effective, the system of special provision for backward classes of society several provisions have been made in the constitution. Under Article 15(4) the state shall make any special provision for the advancement of any socially and educationally backward classes of citizen or for the Scheduled Castes

and Scheduled Tribes (SCs and STs), and in the same manner by accepting the opportunity of equality to employment under state in Article 16(1), it has excepted the principle of equalisation under Article 16(4). If it is in the opinion of the state that any class of citizens has not adequately representation under state employment, state shall make any provision for the reservation of appointments. Likewise according to Article 46 the state shall promote with special care the educational and economic interests of weaker sections of the people, and in particular of the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes and shall protect them from social injustice and all forms of exploitation (Article 46 of the Indian Constitution). In a very important case of Indra Shahni vs. Union of India (Supreme Court Judgement, 1992). The Supreme Court of India declared 27% reservation legal for socially and economically backward classes of the society. Basically protective discrimination is used to fulfil those lacks which arise due to a long time deprivation. It is a part of corrective and compensatory justice. It has been told that peoples of backward class of society have been bearing injustice for generation to generation. Some peoples of the society made supremacy on the benefits of the society and made deprived to others. So this provision of protective discrimination has been made for those deprived people who are living in unbeneficial circumstances.

At large, apart from the Preamble which ensures social justice in multi-dimensional direction Part III and IV of the Constitution provide detailing of social justice under the titles of Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles of State Policy respectively. Article 23 relates to the prohibition of traffic in human beings and forced labour and Article 24 forbids the employment of children in factories under which no child below the age of fourteen years shall be employed to work in any factory or mine or engaged in any other hazardous employment. In line in Articles 37, 38, 39, 39A and 46 of the Directive Principles of State Policy the states were given a large number of governing guidelines relating to promotion of welfare of the people in society. It includes certain principles of policy to be followed by the State, providing equal justice and free legal aid and promotion of educational and economic interests of Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other backward classes. Thus, realising that the masses had suffered for long and recognising the reality of prevailing social inequalities, the founding fathers placed the mandate of social equality at the helm of Constitution and attempted to create a system where every member is empowered to participate in the liberties and the freedom provided under the Constitution.

1.2 Implementation of Constitution

After the adoption of our Constitution, large scale social and economic changes have taken place. It is true that in many areas, we could not achieve the desired results, but even then the powers of law and legislation have

tremendous impact in society. Law is essentially marginal to the process by which society changes; law is an effect rather than a cause. Legislation is always based on the quintessence of the public opinion. But inevitably, it often lags behind the real life and Goethe once said of law as the rule of dead over the living. This is to a conservative view and sees laws as passive and reactive, something that accommodates change rather than causes it (Narayanan, 2007). India after attaining independence by a series of social welfare legislations based on the mandate of our Constitution proved that law could be active and dynamic. No longer was the State seen as standing to one side of the society and performing the role of a night watchman, but as a manager of social and economic interests. The State has become the centre of political and economic power and source and distributor of basic legal rights and material standards. Society is constantly in motion, economies strengthen and fail technology moves on, new social institutions emerge, even there is fundamental alteration of the structure of society. In the process, the Courts have taken recourse to these provisions often, in their crusade to bring justice to the poor. Through innovative and creative strategies, they have expanded the scope of the Fundamental Rights, in order to render justice to women, children, bounded labourers and other oppressed sections of society.

Justice is called a total value. This is why the fathers of our Constitution stressed that the positive/constructive aspect of political freedom has to be instrumental in the creation of a new social order, based on the doctrine of socio-economic justice (Mahapatra, 2011, p.33). A number of practical measures have been taken from the beginning, to create more favourable social conditions for the millions of downtrodden. First of all, the Constitution had been amended when experience with its working made such change necessary. In 1950 itself, arising out of the Supreme Court decision in the State of Madras vs. Champakam Dorairajan, clause (4) was added to Article 15, dealing with prohibition of discrimination on grounds of religion, race, etc. The new clause said that nothing in Article 15, nor in clause 2 of Article 29, nothing in either shall prevent the State from making any special provision for the advancement of any socially and educationally backward classes of citizens or for the SCs and STs (Menon, 1970, p.32). Similarly, when it was found, on the basis of ten years' progress in respect of the conditions of Scheduled Castes and Tribes, and also Anglo-Indians, that the reservation of seats for the former and the provision for nomination in respect of the latter, for a period of ten years prescribed in Constitution of 1950 was inadequate, a clause in the 8th amendment, passed in 1960, extended both to 20 years. In many other way best possible was done to improve the conditions of the weaker sections of the community. Politically too, these weaker sections of the community have been able to make their influence felt

as, for example, in the composition of Cabinets both at the Centre and in the States.

In the years following independence of the country, India planned for a welfare State and attempted several welfare schemes in general. Especially for Jawaharlal Nehru, the ideal was to be not only all-round national economic development, with its associated characteristics of a more general social progress, but also more specifically, the improvement of the lot of the poorer sections of the population and of the rural areas which Gandhiji had always emphasized (Menon, 1970, p.33). The Harijans, in particular, are in most areas in a social situation for which there is no parallel in the world. Gandhi realised that, if our national movement was to become a mass movement, these sections of our society which constitute the large majority of our population have also to be brought into it. And they will not come into it unless the historic injustices, negative and positive, things undone and things done, are rectified, and even more important, they feel that they are being rectified and justice done to them at last. In this connection two important protective legislations in operation for people belonging to SCs are the Protection of Civil Rights in 1955 and the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989. However, despite these constitutional position, atrocities and crimes members of SCs, especially the women, continue to occur in all parts of the country in varying degrees. As per the National Crime Records Bureau Report 2005, the crimes against SCs in the last few years were mainly atrocities followed by hurt and rape.

2. SOCIAL JUSTICE PLANNERS: GANDHI AND AMBEDKAR

Earlier with the rise of Gandhi who combined the fight for independence with a radical social reform agenda through his constructive programme, these concerns acquired a new dimension in coming years. The Gandhi-Ambedkar debate on the best way to tackle the old caste divisions in the Indian Society provides good evidence of this. Two opposite frameworks of Gandhi and Ambedkar in advancing the cause of group rights find an echo in the contemporary India. Ambedkar's basic contention against the Congress under Gandhi's leadership was that the Congress claim of representing the entire population of India was false as the Muslims, except for once during the Khilafat agitation and the untouchables have stood outside the movement. Individuals in the movement under Gandhi's leadership joined only for personal gains. The overwhelming majority of the untouchables, asserted Ambedkar, stayed out of the freedom movement for some valid reasons. He thought that the Gandhian movement for India's independence was both unnecessary and unjustified. Ambedkar's position was nullified

by the election results of 1937 in which the Congress did extremely well in the seats reserved for Harijans. However, they both-Gandhi and Ambedkar, fought to eradicate India's internal apartheid manifested in the pernicious caste practice of untouchability and was committed to a vision of modernised India free of caste and colonial oppression. Both were champions of untouchables or dalits, both considered untouchability the most shameful smear on the Indian social fabric and both thought that social reform in India ought to precede political freedom (Ganguly, 2006). Both were also highly charismatic national leaders who carried the masses with them. But the two- Gandhi and Ambedkar held different opinions on many issues including the social justice.

2.1 Views on Social Justice

On his notion of social justice Gandhi was more influenced by the Indian tradition than by Western liberal ideas. In fact, it is difficult to categorise him as a liberal or as a socialist thinker, but his concept of social justice he included the ideas of both positive liberalism and democratic socialism. For example, he accepted the view that every individual should have the means to secure his freedom and to develop his personality; and he also believed that means of livelihood should not be monopolised by any one section of society. But Gandhi unlike the supporters of positive liberalism and for democratic socialism, did not look towards the state to achieve these ends.

Unlike Gandhi, Ambedkar's concept of social justice was influenced by the Western liberal ideas and the conditions that prevailed in the Indian society. His stay in America for three years (1913-16) and in England for two years (1920-22) enabled him to come into direct contact with the ideas of liberal thinkers. He had also personal experience of the curse of untouchability which prevailed in the Indian society. Naturally, it became the first concern of his life to fight against it at all levels, social, economic and political in order to establish in India a society based on social justice (Tiwari, 2009, p.430). Thus, Ambedkar's circumstances forced him to be a revolutionary and simultaneously put his foot in the door of the establishment whenever he got a chance to. But Dr. Ambedkar's vision did not end at the horizon of Dalit Power; rather, he envisaged an India liberated from caste consciousness, a futuristic society no longer trapped in the feudal binaries of master and slave, privilege and privation (Hoskote, 2006). Unfortunately, Ambedkar's vision has been negated by the perpetuation of caste attitudes in an electoral democracy whose political dynamics are fuelled by group antagonism. With group identity and interest raised to the cornerstone of political struggle, India now faces the long running scenario of caste war fought out on various social and economic fronts, at varying intensities.

Socially Gandhi believed in varnashrama vyavastha in the Vedic sense and not in the present popular sense

in which it is divided into innumerable castes. The four varna system, according to Gandhi, was based on scientific principles. It is inherent in human nature and Hinduism has simply reduced it to a science. It does not attach to birth...The division, however into innumerable castes is an unwarranted liberty taken with the doctrine (Gandhi, 1921). As a result of the four divisions, he believed, defined a man's calling, but did not restrict or regulate social intercourse. They defined duties but referred no privileges. He, therefore, thought that inter-dining or even inter-marriage did not deprive an individual of his status that his birth had given him. On the basis of this opinion Gandhi thought that though a Brahman was born to serve God's creation with his knowledge, he was not absolved from bodily labour. Similarly, though a Shudra was born to serve a God's creation with bodily labour, there was nothing to prevent the Shudra from acquiring all the knowledge he wished. He admitted that a Hindu who refused to dine with another from a sense of superiority misrepresented his dharma. And in the sense there is no place for untouchability in Hinduism. Untouchability is repugnant to reason and to the instinct of mercy, pity or love-Hindus will certainly never deserve freedom nor get it, if they allow their noble religion to be disgraced by the retention of the taint of untouchability. In essence, Gandhi also opposed any claim of privileges by any of the four varnas and condemned particularly the curse of untouchability which, though not an essential part of Hinduism, had continued in tradition.

Educated at the London School of Economics and Columbia University, New York, Dr. Ambedkar was one of the most highly educated members of his generation. Heir to the traditions of rationalism and liberalism, he was a believer in constitutional means but also deployed the theatre of public protest to considerable strategic effect. In society Ambedkar wanted to reorganise the society on equality and rationality and therefore, opposed the caste-based social structure which, he thought was characterised by graded inequality. He considered Indian society made up of four classes-the Priestly class (Brahmans), the military class (Kshatriyas), the merchant class (Vaishyas) and the artisan and the minial class (Shudras). It was an open class system in which individuals, when qualified, would change their class. In course of development over the years, these classes lost their open door character and became self enclosed units called castes and brought with it unequal distribution of privileges and benefits (Ambedkar, pp.17-18). With the development of untouchability, the Shudras had to suffer discrimination and oppression unparalleled in human history. He said that in order to reorganise society on the basis of equality and fraternity the caste system must go. There was a close relation between the caste system and untouchability. It was, therefore not possible to abolish one without abolishing the other.

However, in the context, Ambedkar fundamentally departed from the liberal paradigm of rights and justice. On the issue Ambedkar sought to accomplish two unusual results. First, his theory of rights was addressed more to civil society than to the state; rights do not just appear as constraints and limits on the power of the state. Rather, they emerge as legal entitlements casting corresponding obligations on the members of civil society, rights, atypically, in Ambedkar's thought legitimate an interventionist state, even the dominant colonial formation. As one scholar puts it, Ambedkar's essential justice strategy was to innovate jural relations: The Depressed Classes had a right, and the state a duty, to eradicate obdurate discriminatory practices in civil society; and the State had the power and members of civil society were under a liability to have their cultural practices redefined (Baxi & Parekh, 1995, pp.143-44). And secondly Ambedkar presented the problem of rights and basic needs. The basic human needs were both material and non-material. The latter comprises dignity and fraternity while the former includes immunity from bodily and psychic aggression, access to public facilities, a share in resources and participation in government employment (Ibid., p.145). It is considered a unique theory of representation; political representation goes beyond legislative reservations and extends to reservation in administration.

2.2 Economic Justice

From the beginning Mahatma Gandhi was very much concerned with the economic well-being of the weaker section and for the purpose, he, even transformed the character of the Indian National Congress. Prior to Gandhi's emergence as a national leader of the party was dominated by the middle class interest but under Gandhi became identified with the masses. Throughout his life Gandhi sought to develop ways to fight India's extreme poverty, backwardness and socio-economic challenges as a part of his wider involvement in the Indian independence movement. His championing of Swadeshi and non-cooperation were centred on the principles of economic self-sufficiency. He was opposed to the exploitation of one class by another but wanted to put an end to such an exploitation by peaceful means (Tiwari, 2009, p.432). Contextually, Gandhi espoused the notion of "trusteeship" which centred on denying material pursuits and coveting of wealth, with practitioners acting as "trustee" of other individuals and the community in their management of economic resources and property (Mathur, 1971, p.165). He laid equal emphasis on the moral development of the individual and he opposed large scale industry because it hurts the moral well-being. According to him the value of an industry should be gauged less by the dividends it pays to shareholders than by its effects on the body's soul and spirits of the people employed in it. The first basic principle of Gandhi's economic thought is a special

emphasis on "plain living" which helps in cutting down your wants and being self-reliant. He vehemently opposed the economy that ignored considerations of social justice and as Gandhi said it could never be regarded as good economics.

In the sphere of economic justice Dr. Ambedkar was a strong proponent of land reform and of a prominent role for the state in economic development. He recognised the inequities in an unfettered capitalist economy. He was not oblivious of the fact that economic injustice was a major factor in social injustice. In order to secure the interest of the weaker section of society he emphasised the role of the state. In the "States and Minorities" Ambedkar stated that industries which were key industries should be owned and run by the state or by corporations established by the state, insurance should be a monopoly of the state and agriculture should state industry (Ambedkar, 1979, pp.396-397). He thought that in order to provide for the equitable distribution of wealth it was necessary to put an obligation on the state to plan the economic life of the people. Such an obligation should not be left to the will of the legislature but should be prescribed by the law of the constitution. Thus, in order to establish a society on the principle of social justice he emphasised that the economic structure should be based on the principles of democratic socialism. He categorically stated,

State socialism is essential for the rapid industrialisation of India. Private enterprise cannot do it and if it did, it would produce those inequalities of wealth which private capitalism has produced in Europe and which should be a warning to Indians. (Athreya, 2002)

He strongly pleaded in favour of his economic thinking and argued that the individual should not be required to relinquish any of his constitutional rights as a condition precedent to the receipt of a privilege and that the state shall not delegate powers to private persons to govern others. He points out that the system of social economy based on private enterprise and pursuit of personal gain violates these requirements.

2.3 Political Justice

Gandhi believed politics a part of human nature and for him all life was one piece. A man who aspired to attain Truth or God which was the ultimate end of human life could not ignore any field of life. Different fields of life were necessarily related to each other. Politics and religion were, therefore, inseparably related to each other and could not be divorced. He was dedicated to the attainment of Swaraj but Swaraj for him did not merely signify replacement of the foreign rule by Home Rule. He wrote in the *Hind Swaraj* in 1908, 'We do not want the tyranny of either English rule or Indian rule. He was emphatic that Swaraj did not mean English rule without the Englishmen. In fact, Swaraj of his dream was the poor man's Swarajya in which the common man will be

guaranteed all necessities of life, in which everyone will have freedom of religion, faith and worship, in which the landlord and capitalist will cease to exploit the tenant and the labour. "Justice" and "equality", wrote Gandhi, "mean the establishment of just and equitable relations between capital and labour, between the landlord and the tenant" (Jain, 2005, p.134). According to him the state's functions and powers should be decentralised. As such he favoured participation by all in the governance of the country and supported, therefore, adult suffrage. The authority symbolising the state must not be a privilege of the few at the cost of the many. If there was abuse of authority it must be resisted with the soul force-Satyagraha. He viewed untouchability as basically a social problem and was opposed to its solving by special representation. Throughout his life he was committed to remove the blot of untouchability from the society and preserve the unity of Hindu Society. At best, he wanted to establish in India an egalitarian society based on social justice.

In the sphere of political justice, in contrast to Gandhi, Ambedkar believed that a centralised polity with a strong central government was necessary for India to ensure building up of the Indian nation and also to protect the interest of the weaker section of society. It was from this point of view that he supported a unitary government for India at the Round Table Conference.

I am a strong believer in the unitary form of Government and the thought of disturbing it-does not please me very much...However ---I shall be prepared to consider federal form if it can be shown that in it local autonomy is not inconsistent with central unity. (Ambedkar, 1979, pp.507-08)

Although he favoured adult suffrage and in his opinion every section of society should participate in it. On the issue of representation he argued in favour of joint electorates with reserved seats as stated before the Simon Commission,

Territorial electorates and separate electorates are two extremes which must be avoided in any scheme of representation that may be devised for the introduction of a democratic form of Government in this most undemocratic country. The golden mean is the system of joint electorates with reserved seats. (Ambedkar, 1979, p.357)

In the context, he strongly pleaded adequate representation in the legislature, executive and public services. For him, the cause of the weaker section of society was upper most, particularly of the Scheduled Castes, to enable them to lead a life with dignity in the Indian Society. He provided them protective discrimination because they had suffered from structural inequality inherent in the Indian social structure.

The two undisputed leaders-Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. B. R. Ambedkar believed in social justice and endeavoured throughout their life to establish in India an egalitarian society based on the principle of equality and rationality. They dreamt an India, free from evils such

as untouchability and inequality in social, economic and political spheres.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

Justice, social, economic and political is the spirit and vision of our Constitution, implemented on 26 January 1950. Now it became the duty of the State to secure a social order in which the legal system of the nation promote justice on a basis of equal opportunity and in particular ensure that opportunities for securing justice are not denied to any citizen by reason of economic or other disabilities. In essence social justice means a way of life with monumental liberty, equality and fraternity as the principles of life. A true essence of social justice cannot be established without removing the inequalities in income and making endeavour to eliminate inequalities in status through the rule of law. Social justice is a core constitutional objective. Without social justice the constitution would not be able to secure economic and other justice to the people. In addition, the social justice ideas of Gandhi and Ambedkar have left its imprint on the social tapestry of the country after independence, and shaped the socio-political fabric of India today. As a result of their opinion and role the independent India attempted to forge India's moral and social foundation as a new and strove for a political order of constitutional democracy that is sensitive to disadvantaged, inherited from the past or engendered by prevailing social relations.

However, Policies and politics of social justice have reached a near dead end in contemporary India. In post-independence era India's bold experiment with politics of social representation and policies of affirmative action in the twentieth century is among the largest and more successful examples of social engineering across the globe. The system of reservations for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in government jobs and legislatures continues to yield positive outcomes, better than anything that existed earlier or any scheme that seeks to replace it. After independence, though the context changed, the justification did not. The presence of a middle class outside the upper castes and its rise among dalits further strengthened the search for representational basis of affirmative action policies. The principle of proportionality of representation requires singular identities and thus reinforces the obsession with caste. Competitive politics furthered the drive towards seeking political representation (Yadav, 2012). From the valid argument that political representation is necessary to serve the interest of the disadvantaged, there was a leap into believing that political representation was sufficient.

Especially with the coming of globalisation which has affected all aspects of human life, the social institutions, protecting and expanding the concept of social justice, underwent a significant change. It operates in an uneven and unequal manner. The neo-liberal economy

with liberalisation, privatisation and globalisation, has further compounded the unevenness and inequality in society. The small minority of world's population holds maximum resources and majority of people are grapple in poverty. The state, as an institution guarantees social welfare and social justice to the marginalised groups but globalisation has not only threatened but it also made it weak. It has now retreated back from its welfare role. In the contemporary context social justice agenda is taken over by non-state organisations that is critical. The older theories of social justice, which are either inadequate or inapplicable, today cannot cover the new developments that have taken place in the era of globalisation and therefore they have to be reviewed specifically in the Indian context.

For future work and research themes of global era based on latest information technologies, has opened a vast scope for more relevant and prospective works in sphere of social justice. Today, it is considered more challenging because the concept itself and its genuine implementation are becoming difficult, for the focus of development shifted from social goals to profit motives. Now, the state is considered neither a positive instrument for social transformation nor an agency for resource allocation. Thus, today social justice provides both, prospect as well as challenges.

REFERENCES

- All India Reporter (AIR). (1974). *Supreme Court*, 587.
- Ambedkar, B. R. (1979). *Caste in India-writing and speeches* (Vol.1, pp.17-18, 396-397). Bombay: Education Department, Government of Maharashtra.
- Article, 14 and 46 of the Indian Constitution (1950).
- Athreya, V. (2002). *Reappraisal—a new resonance*. *Frontline*, 19(15), 20.
- Baxi, U., & Parekh, B. (Eds.). (1995). *Crisis and change in contemporary India* (pp.143-144). New Delhi: Sages Publication.
- Dutta, B. B. (2014). The end of Nehruvian Republic. *South Asia Politics*, 13(3), 13.
- Gandhi, M. K. (1921). Hinduism. *Young India (Weekly Journal)*.
- Ganguly, D. (2006). Convergent cosmopolitics in the age of empire: Gandhi and Ambedkar in world history. *Borderland, E-Journal*, 4(3).
- Hoskote, R. (2006). Ambedkar's Legacy. *The Hindu*, 10th December.
- Jain, N. (2005). *The problem of justice, political theory and state practice* (p.134). Anamika Publishers & Distributers Pvt. Ltd.
- Jha, P. S. (2014). Dance of democracy on a Razor's edge. *Tehelka*, 11(16).
- Krishna Iyer, V. R. (1987). *Social justice: Sunset or dawn* (p.53). Eastern Book Company.
- Mahapatra, A. K. (2011). Basic objectives and values of the Indian constitution. *Orissa Review*, 33.
- Mathur, J. S. (1971). *Industrial civilization & Gandhian economics* (p.165). Retrieved from <http://www.gotcited.org>
- Menon, V. K. N. (1970). *India since independence from the preamble to the present* (p.27). New Delhi: S. Chand & Co.
- Minarva Mills Vs. Union of India. (1980). 3, SCC 625.
- Narayanan, K. R. (2007). *Dr. K. R. Narayanan memorial lecture*. NewDelhi: Jamia Millia Islamia University.
- Singh, R. (2014). *Be update and face to face with Indian republic* (p.140). Delhi: Kalpaz Publications.
- Tiwari, S. K. (2009). Social justice: Gandhi and Ambedkar. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, LXX(2), 430-434.
- Yadav, Y. (2012). *Rethinking social justice*. Retrieved 2015, December 7 from <http://www.countercurrents.org>