

The Question of Violence: Gandhi's Non-Violence and Ambedkar's Revolutionary Constitutional Transformation Compared

Daksh¹ and Shubham²

¹Department of Political Science, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Haryana, India

Email: dakshdahiya360@gmail.com

²Department of Political Science, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Haryana, India

Email: shubhamjcrp77@gmail.com

Abstract

The paper will analyse the issue of violence in contemporary Indian political thinking using the comparative approach of Mahatma Gandhi and B. R. Ambedkar. It purports that Gandhi ethics of Satya and Ahimsa explains a moral-spiritual revolution, which aims at defeating domination via self-suffering uncerebral mass mobilization, and renewal of moral community. In contrast, to him caste is structural violence and encourages a revolutionary constitutional project which seeks institutional restructuring, social democracy and protection under rights of historically oppressed groups. The paper examines their variant philosophical anthropologies, their different opinions on human nature, power and warfare and competing theories of social change, namely, their suspicion of state power and preoccupation with constructive work on the one hand versus their insistence on a strong constitutional state, rule of law and constitutional morality on the other. Although the paper seeks to bring out profound normative and strategic tension between the two approaches, common pledges to equality, dignity, and life under democracy are also identified. It finds that the existing discussions of violence, justice, and democratic futures in India can only be comprehended by maintaining a combination of those who are concerned with Gandhi and his non-violent moral politics as well as those who are concerned with Ambedkar and his institutional-constitutional revolution as complements but irreducibly separate.

Keywords: Gandhi, Ambedkar, non-violence, structural violence, constitutionalism

Introduction

The issue of violence in colonial India was not short-lived or purely physical but rooted in the moral, social and institutional landscape of the society of imperial control and solid hierarchies. The structural violence based on caste oppression, economic deprivation, and political exclusion that political theorists and social reformers had to deal with was not the coercive violence of the British state but rather its structural violence. Among this controversial ground, two of the most engaging, philosophy-wise, most opposite thinkers, Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, surfaced, who wanted to envision India without its ordeal of systemic injustice. Their opposing answers to the problem of violence still generate the controversies on the principles of political morality, democracy, and social equality.

Gandhi expressed an extreme reconsideration of political action by ethics of Satya (truth) and

Ahimsa (non-violence). Since the Hind Swaraj, Gandhi believed that the new civilization justified any kind of violence which is still presented as progress, industrialization and even the state power (Gandhi, 1909/1998). In his case, violence did not only include physical violence but it also went beyond this to extents of exploitation, falsehood and deprivation of human dignity. He called poverty and inequality the worst kind of violence several times in Young India (Gandhi, 1925, in CWMG, Vol. 28). Ahimsa, thus, was not only a political approach to changing the oppressor but it was also a moral path to change the oppressed. Gandhi was adamant in his belief that the only way to end the domination cycles without creating more coercion like those being exploited was through satyagraha, or non-violent resistance. He explained in Harijan that the real non-violence demanded fearlessness, purifying self and ready to suffer instead of making others suffer (Gandhi, 1938, in CWMG, Vol. 67). Violence was therefore what Gandhi criticized and never separated it with his swaraj vision of morally upright self-rule and political emancipation founded on inner moral discipline.

Ambedkar took the issue of violence in a thoroughly different perspective; the reality of caste oppression and structural violence of social hierarchy. In his Annihilation of Caste, he made an argument that caste was a system of graded inequality that is promoted by ritual authority, economic welfares, as well as social exclusion (Ambedkar, 1936/2014). According to Ambedkar, violence was not just a part of blatant discrimination but institutional set ups that did not afford equality, fraternity, and individual free will. His meddling in the Constituent Assembly Debates shows an evident belief of the necessity of social democracy to be guaranteed by constitutional protection, redistribution and state intervention (Ambedkar, 1948, CAD Vol. VII). Ambedkar unlike Gandhi was of the opinion that any moral persuasion was not going to tear down the oppressive systems; what was needed was a revolution in the political and social systems. His proposal, the blue print in States and Minorities offered rights protections, labour protection, and state restraint by having the marginalized groups overcome the systemic violence (Ambedkar, 1947).

Despite their common focus on justice and human dignity, Gandhi and Ambedkar viewed it through radically different prisms, and each had his own: Gandhi by a moral-spiritual rebuilding of society on the basis of non-violence, and Ambedkar on a constitutional-revolutionary restructuring in the name of structural inequality abolition. The paper believes that their divergent answers to the question of violence shed light on two groundbreaking directions of contemporary Indian political thought, including ethical non-violence and institutional transformations, whose conflicts and complements are the focus of the current discussions on democratic, rights, and social justice.

1. Philosophical Foundations of Violence and Non-Violence

The philosophical difference between Gandhi and Ambedkar is rooted in their unique ideas on human nature, moral agency and causes of structural conflict. Gandhi bases his argument against violence on a metaphysics of Satya (Truth) and Ahimsa (Non-violence), whereas Ambedkar bases the question of violence in the normative constitutional philosophy based on justice, equality, and fraternity. This plurality of ontologies also throws light upon their different political prescriptions as well as their incompatible suppositions regarding the existence of domination and the ways of subduing it.

1.1 Gandhi's Metaphysics of Satya and Ahimsa

To Gandhi, Satya is not only an agreement of fact, but also the final ontological law that is the order of the universe. In *Hind swaraj*, he states that Truth is God and that making moral and political freedom requires the human being to first clear themselves internally before reforming the institutions (Gandhi, 1909/1998). The implication of this metaphysical statement is Ahimsa: since everyone is sharing the Truth, then to harm someone is equal to trespassing the ultimate solidarity of things. In the articles that follow, *Young India* and *Harijan*, Gandhi repeats himself that egoism, fear, and the desire of the modern civilizational power and possessions are the roots of violence (Gandhi, 1925, in CWMG; Gandhi, 1938, in CWMG).

His religious anthropology is played out on the conviction that men have an inherent moral ability that is deluded by societal and political vice. Conflict in this model arises out of moral failure, but not structural inequity, and the politics should bring about self-restraint, moderation and sympathetic interaction. The anthropology of satyagraha is put into practice: in accepting the suffering voluntarily, the practitioner convinces the conscience of the oppressor and tries to convert him instead of coercing him. Gandhi considers non-violence as ethical, spiritual, and political at the same time hence, he emphasizes in *Hind swaraj* that self-regeneration is required in the Indian context which must precede regeneration of institutions.

1.2 Ambedkar's Normative Philosophy of Justice, Equality, and Fraternity

All ideas of solving oppression with the help of moral cleansing are denied by Ambedkar. According to *Annihilation of Caste* he describes violence as being systemic to the caste order which he describes as a system of graded inequality, and which is supported by social sanctions, ritual authority and economic dependence (Ambedkar, 1936/2014). To him, human condition is not influenced by metaphysical unity but by relations of power that are historically produced and which result in humiliation, exclusion as well as what he refers to as spiritual degradation.

Ambedkar has given a rational-materialist ethics, in which a moral transformation cannot be achieved without a social reorganization in Buddha and His Dhamma. In the interpretations of Buddha, Buddhism advanced an ethic based on reason, compassion, and common good instead of metaphysical elements (Ambedkar, 1957/1992). This moral disposition underlies the role of fraternity as a political virtue that is paramount to democracy that Ambedkar holds. As opposed to the inner-looking character of the turn of Gandhi, Ambedkar focuses more on the institutional assurances of rights, representation, labour protections, as requiring to remake systemic violence.

His vision of human nature is pragmatic: people are influenced by their social situation issues, and the oppressive structure could not be defeated without changing the legal and economic basis, which supports the structure. On this opinion, violence is not the failure of morals rather a result of exclusionary institutions.

1.3 Divergent Views on Conflict, Power, and Social Change

Conflict is a moral follow-up to be done through spiritual solutions as Gandhi understands it; it is the result of established hierarchies to be changed constitutionally the way Ambedkar understands it. Gandhi does not trust centralized power of the state as he sees it as innately

violent and Ambedkar is demanding that it is a strong right protecting state that is able to counteract caste oppression. The difference in their divergent thoughts implies incompatible theories of agency reformative ethos and emancipatory politics as expressed by Gandhi and Ambedkar respectively.

It is enhanced by the contrast of secondary scholarship. Bilgrami (2014) displays the moral self-rule principle by Gandhi as the pillar of political community. Raghavan Iyer, in 1973, highlights that there were ethical absolutism in the Gandhian non-violence. In comparison, Rodrigues (2002), Omvedt (1994), Zelliott (2005), and Jaffrelot (2005) explain how the political philosophy of Ambedkar is based on the materialist concept of caste and the demand to protect the person by institutional means as the foundation of justice.

Each of these philosophical groundings shows that the two philosophers are approaching the issue of violence not to the same ontological and ethical grounds: Gandhi with spiritual non-violence, Ambedkar with constitutional revolution in seeking to tear down the systemic domination.

2. Gandhi's Non-Violence as Moral–Political Praxis

In one way, Gandhi non-violence as a philosophy is a moral exercise and political tactic at the same time based on his reconsideration of violence, coercion, and the essence of political power. His non-violence -Ahimsa is not a lack of physical injury, but a lifestyle, an overall moral philosophy that denies domination of any kind. The praxis of Gandhi can be seen on the basis of the belief that the process of social and political change should start not by force but with truth, suffering self and moral awakening of the people.

2.1 Reinterpreting Violence and Coercion

Under Gandhi, Hind swaraj, Gandhi believes that modern society institutionalizes violence by pursuing material progress, competition, individualism as well as the power of a centralized state (Gandhi, 1909/1998). To him, violence is not only a physical power, but it is also the financial power, technological dependency and self-rule suppression. Violence hence involves both structural aspects in form of poverty, fear, and lack of freedom conditions that, according to Gandhi, became even stronger, through capitalist-industrial modernity. In his opinion coercion decays both the oppressed and people who exercise coercion since it is based on compulsion and not persuasion.

Gandhi is opposed to the use of coercion even in the political arena. He writes on several occasions in Young India that, means are ends in the making (Gandhi, 1924, in CWMG), and holds that violent means must have violent effects. To Gandhi, the more significant one is the moral one; violence corrupts the character of the agent and kills the potential of the real community. This moral stand is the basis of his belief that the process of liberation must be carried out through non-violence since only the non-coercive action can restore the social relations.

2.2 Non-Violence as Ethical Discipline and Political Strategy

Gandhi differentiates passive and active non-resistance and non-violence. Being a strict ethical

discipline, Ahimsa, in the practice of Gandhi requires strict ethical discipline, such as truthfulness, self-restraint, courage and patience to endure suffering instead of harming other people. In Harijan he defines non-violence as power of the spirit, which relied on inner power as opposed to the physical power (Gandhi, 1938, in CWMG). Yet this is not an individual, social discipline: people develop non-violence in order to provide the grounds to collective awakening of morals.

Non-violence is now a political tool to organize the masses without the need to create coercive systems. According to Gandhi, a non-violent cause is more challenging to the violent one since it demands that the followers would conquer anger, hate, and fear. He believes that mass non-violence can only take place when there is a political action that is based on the moral self-transformation. Spiritual resistance and passive non-cooperation through Satyagraha and Civil Disobedience and the Constructive Programme.

2.3 Satyagraha, Civil Disobedience, and the Constructive Programme

The non-violence of Gandhi is an embodiment of operational force Satyagraha -truth-force. It does not work by destroying the opponent but through his/her moral conscience. The satyagrahi invites change and also points out injustice by making her suffering voluntary. This was initially practiced and perfected by Gandhi in South Africa and in India which was during the Non-Cooperation Movement, Salt Satyagraha, and Quit India Movement.

The use of civil disobedience is accepted by Gandhi where the laws are against the ethical code. Civil disobedience is not related to revolution as it does not seek to overthrow the state as opposed to restoring justice by questioning the oppressive laws through disciplined non-violent resistance. He carries on to affirm that civil disobedience must be harmless and civil-type (Gandhi, 1921, in CWMG), which is to drive home its ethical nature in Young India.

The constructive programme is added to the satyagraha programme as it establishes non-violent social institutions -khadi, village industries, communal harmony, sanitation, education and elimination of untouchability. Gandhi feels that political opposition should go with positive reconstruction otherwise the political liberty would replicate the colonial modernity violence.

2.4 Gandhi's Critique of Violent Revolution and Marxism

Gandhi plays with Marxism both as a criticism and opposition vision. Although Gandhi does not ignore Marxian treatment of the issue of exploitation, he disapproves the fact that the idea of violent revolution being useful in creating a just society is true. He cautions in Hind swaraj that the current revolutions only shift the lathi wielding elite to another lathi wielding elite (Gandhi, 1909/1998). Exploitation can never be killed through violence since it is based on the same reasoning of domination.

In addition to this, Gandhi criticizes Marxism as it is full of materialist determinism. He points out that human beings are moral agents whose change cannot be determined as one of the class struggles. The Marxist aspect of using the state as a tool of the inherent justice is, according to Gandhi, misplaced; the concept of centralization inevitably leads to coercion.

2.5 Mass Mobilization Without Violence

The reason why Gandhi was able to coordinate the masses in the absence of armaments was because he presented moral values that correlated with the political method. His mass actions had a valid basis of legitimacy in terms of disciplined non-violence, moral persuasion, and symbolic actions like salt-making, spinning khadi, and seek arrest. This contrasted revolutionary movements which organized to annihilate the state but Gandhian mobilization to turn rulers, as well as subjects, into ethical beings.

The intricacy of the praxis of Gandhi has been highlighted in the secondary scholarship. Judith Brown (2003) underscores his skills to combine spiritual discipline with innovation in an organization. Dalton (1993) breaks down satyagraha as an ethical power theory that draws its basis on moral autonomy. According to Parrel (1997), the political idea of Gandhi is a combination of spiritualism and activism. Skaria (2016) understands non-violence as a radical alternative conceptualization of sovereignty whereas Bakshi (1999) places the project of Gandhian praxis in ethical dissent traditions. All these foundations show that non-violence on the part of Gandhi was not a flight back into politics but a radical re-creation of politics; one that aimed at destroying coercion and using collective power through the truth, discipline and moral transformation.

3. Ambedkar's Revolutionary Constitutional Transformation

The development of Ambedkar political philosophy can be regarded as a continuing critique of the caste, as well as the shortcoming of the model of moral-spiritual reform of Gandhi. In contrast to the personal moral failure as the cause of violence (as considered by Gandhi), structural violence by Ambedkar is decisive in the life of Indian society, and it forms a part of the caste system, the social order, and the institutional organization governing power. His project is not an inner-purification project and not an institutional revolution project, but the reorganization of the legal, political and economic principles of the society in order to make justice, equality and fraternity a material project. The constitutionalism that was proposed by Ambedkar is one of the radicaest forms of reimaginings of democracy in the modern world.

3.1 Ambedkar's Rejection of Gandhi's Model of Social Change

The basis of the argument made by Ambedkar against Gandhi is that the two hold a fundamental disagreement on the sources of domination. In his work, *Annihilation of Caste*, Ambedkar (1936/2014) suggests that social norms, endogamy, religious authority, and economic subordination are all protecting caste, which cannot be destroyed by using its emotional appeal to the conscience or spiritual discipline. He denies the views of Gandhi that uplifting of Harijan can be attained through repentance, by reforming the attitudes of the upper castes, or by developing Ahimsa in the individual. To Ambedkar the issue lies in the law and not in the heart and thus these are to change the structure of the social order.

To Ambedkar, the appeal by Gandhi to hold onto the varna-system (albeit in a diluted moral version of the same) runs the risk of supporting the hierarchies themselves which breed humiliations, service, and structural violence. To Ambedkar, decentralized, non-statist reconstruction of villages as a choice of Gandhi looks romanticized in his view of the free and

perfect caste system that existed in traditional social setups. Social change cannot be based on bhakti in politics as he later states in the Constituent Assembly Debates because hero-worship and moral persuasion are shaky columns of democracy (Ambedkar, CAD Vol. XI, 1949).

3.2 Caste as Structural Violence and Graded Inequality as Social Tyranny

Ambedkar thinks about caste as structural violence- a network of graded inequality where every group with the exceptions of the lowest group will dominate over the bottom and will obey the people at the top. This progressive scale of adoration and retrogressive scale of disdain (Ambedkar, 1936/2014, pp. 3536) expresses a kind of social tyranny of more permanent and more repressive oppression than political despotism. Violence, in this context, does not only imply the act of physical force but it is the deprivation of dignity, autonomy and fraternity.

Buddha and His Dhamma (1957/1992) also contain a rational and materialistic ethics developed by Ambedkar. The anti-caste, anti-sacrifice and anti-divine order of the Buddha develops, in the case of Ambedkar, into the basis of a democratic popular righteousness. The new ethical orientation, which is needed by the social transformation, is one that does not just do away with the visible discrimination but the structures of inequality as an institution as well.

3.3 The Necessity of Institutional Restructuring

Ambedkar is realistic as regards to power, and that is why he focuses on institutional change, rather than the moral conversion. According to him, political democracy is thus impossible without social democracy -nourished by liberty, equality, and fraternity (Ambedkar, CAD Vol. XI, 1949). These values should be institutionalized in enforceable legal guidelines and not on voluntary moral behaviors.

In his book States and Minorities (1947), he proposes a constitutional scheme that aimed at sheltering vulnerable people by ensuring basic rights, labour rights and state accountability in the economic life. It is in this regard that social majorities are not to be trusted to ensure protection of minorities hence the need of the checks and balancing mechanisms in the constitution. The state is made the guarantor of justice, not a strong arm leviathan state but a democratic mechanism of redistribution and defence.

That is why Ambedkar opposes anti-statist ideal of moral communication of Gandhi with his voluntary collaboration. The village republic, which Gandhi idealized, was a place of caste domination; this was where Gandhi eulogized the republic. The actual swaraj needs the presence of institutional machinery which does not create the hierarchies, but destroys them.

3.4 Constitutional Morality, Rule of Law, and Rights-Based Revolution

The revolutionary vision of Ambedkar occurs under the constitutional morality, which he derives out of the tradition of constitutionalism of Greeks and modifies it to suit the Indian context. Constitutional morality is conformist to the rule of law, deference of democratic processes, as well as denial of extra-legal rule. In the Assembly, the warning that India had to develop this morality or face the prospect of degenerating into an authoritarian form of government was given by him (Ambedkar, CAD Vol. XI, 1949).

The Constitution, as seen by Ambedkar, is not a document but a revolutionary tool or an instrument of bringing social revolution democratically. The main pillars of his right-based revolution are fundamental rights, parliamentary democracy, affirmative action and federal protection. The current revolution opposes violence not due to its being morally impure, but to the fact that violence is ineffective politics and normatively inconsistent with the ideal of fraternity.

Ambedkar thereby refuses to see revolution as institutional restructuring which would be carried out not through armed conflict but through legal agreements. The enforceability, justiciability, and structural accountability are imbued in his design of the Constitution qualities lacking in the model of a voluntarist which was designed by Gandhi.

3.5 Insights from Secondary Scholarship

This interpretation is supported in the secondary literature. It is demonstrated by Rodrigues (2002) on how the texts of Ambedkar evolve a critical approach of caste as social power. Omvedt (1994) emphasizes on the fact that Ambedkar was also committed to democratic radicalism and demanded institutional solutions. Zelliott (2005) follows the intellectual growth of Ambedkar in the anti-caste movements. Jaffrelot (2005) places Ambedkar in the broad context of egalitarian thinking world over. Gopal Guru (2012) stresses the importance of dignity being the normative centre of his political philosophy; whereas Pai (2002) shows that in fact his vision of a democratic state needs to be supported by a solid constitutional state. Taken together, these readings verify that the constitutionalism of Ambedkar is one of the most ambitious efforts of non-violent revolution in the contemporary political thought revolution, not using arms but with rights, institutions, and the normalized restructuring of the society.

4. Comparative Analysis: Violence, Social Transformation, and Democratic Possibilities

The clashing philosophies of Gandhi and Ambedkar are two of the most significant, and in any case, the conflicting, perspectives of how to tackle the issue of violence, social change, and democratic politics in contemporary India. Their arguments shed light on different epistemologies, morality systems and political policies. A moral-spiritual revolution that is founded on non-violence, self-purification, and ethical transformations are developed by Gandhi, whereas an institutional-constitutional revolution that dismantles structural domination by developing legal protection, rights-based processes, and democratic accountability is developed by Ambedkar. Comparative analysis of their thinking helps to see that their differences are substantive and can never be reconciled at a lot of areas, and at the same time they also find some limited grounds of convergence enriching the possibilities of democracy.

4.1 Competing Visions of Transformation: Moral-Spiritual vs Constitutional-Institutional Revolution

The approach used by Gandhi is based on a desire that the social and political life will eventually be determined by the character of individual morals. Violence arises out of ego, desire, fear and lie thus the change has to start at the individual level. Under Hind swaraj, he insists that to be free, one needs to know how to control his impulses and renounce the violent

tendencies inherent in modern civilization (Gandhi, 1909/1998). Satyagraha, civil disobedience, and constructive work are some of the methods aimed at sensitizing both the oppressed and the oppressor on their moral conscience.

Ambedkar believes that this would not be enough to address the problem of structural domination in societies. Annihilation of Caste also presents the argument that caste is not perpetuated by personal moral failures but due to institutional, religious and social structures that subject people to an ascending scale of reverence and a descending scale of contempt (Ambedkar, 1936/2014, pp. 3536). Institutions, and not hearts, must be restructured in social revolution. His constitutionalism in the Constituent Assembly Debates is according to entrench the ideas of justice, equality and fraternity in binding legal frameworks (Ambedkar, CAD Vol. XI, 1949). The project made by Ambedkar is revolutionary since it aims to bring a break in relation to the social order through inherited means that are democratic and constitutional.

4.2 Agency, Resistance, and Justice

There is a moral and transformational conception of agency by Gandhi. Satyagrahi is one who transforms himself to be a source of change by just being the truth and the power of non-violence, by illustrating the power of suffering and employing moral persuasion. Justice can be achieved by letting people themselves refuse using coercion and develop mutual respect. Gandhi thus becomes distrustful of the concept of justice that is based on state-centred models; through this mode of justice, he thinks that political coercion will just recreate state violence.

The agency developed by Ambedkar is rights based, institutional, and institutionalized. He can develop agency when he instils in marginalized groups some rights, representation and safeguards against tyranny of majority rule. He suggests the protection in the form of socio-economic rights and restrictions on executive authority in the States and Minorities (1947) due to the necessity of justice to reorganize material circumstances and reallocate power. When the struggle is made against those institutions that outline inequality and dignity, resistance is considered legal. Ambedkar thereby substitutes with a democratic ethic of rights, responsibility and institutional empowerment that was formerly the ethics of self-suffering (Gandhi).

4.3 Diagnosing Violence: Personal vs Structural

The theorists are very divergent over what violence really is. Gandhi posits violence in individual spirits, anger, and greed, and social habits resulting out of the modern industrial society. To Gandhi, violence can be seen as a form of moral rupture that is visible in domination and exploitation whether in the colonialists or in the community itself.

Ambedkar points to violence where the caste plays a role. Caste is structural violence since it denies independence, honour, and equality. Its processes endogamy, ritual purity, hereditary status are systemic coercion which have nothing to do with the intentions of the individuals. Unlike Gandhi who focused on conversion inwardly, Ambedkar emphasizes that structural violence has to be solved by institutional guarantees and state intervention and not by moral conversion.

4.4 Disagreements on Caste Reform, Social Democracy, and State Power

Their greatest point of disputes relates to the caste system. Gandhi differentiates between caste (as an act of abuse) and varna (moral division), and tries to reform the caste by abolishing untouchability whilst maintaining the occupational order in a non-assertive ethical manner (Gandhi, 1921, in CWMG). Such difference is untenable to Ambedkar who claims that all defence of varna justifies hierarchy and spiritual inequality (Ambedkar, 1936/2014). In the case of Ambedkar, social democracy involves destroying the caste instead of reforming it.

Their hostility goes to democracy models. To Gandhi, the vision of the state should be that of a decentralized republic of the villages, limited power of the state, and a moral citizenry which can govern itself. Ambedkar puts in counterargument that villages are a sink of localism, a den of ignorance, narrow mindedness and communalism (Ambedkar, CAD Vol. VII, 1948). He is in support of a powerful constitutional government that is strong enough to break down hierarchies and security of minorities. Gandhi is scared that the state is a tool of coercion; Ambedkar considers it an inseparable way of achieving equality.

4.5 Limited Areas of Convergence: Ethical Citizenship, Equality, and Dignity

Even though Gandhi and Ambedkar have vehement differences in their perspectives, they have certain commitments which are moral. Human dignity is considered central to both of them. Both the views of Gandhi on the sanctity of life and the idea of humiliation by Ambedkar are merged on the core idea of respecting personhood. Both of them imagine the society based on the principles of equality and moral responsibility, but they strive to achieve them in various directions. Their ethical citizenship, as seen in their disciplined lives by Gandhi and their civic liberty by Ambedkar is a complementary presentation of democratic life.

This can be read up by secondary scholarship. Judith Brown (2003) points out the moral reorientation of politics by Gandhi, and Rodrigues (2002), Omvedt (1994), Jaffrelot (2005), and Guru (2012) point out at the structural approach of Ambedkar concerning the justice. The combination of their ideas throws different light onto two directions: ethical and institutional, both of which must be taken into consideration to strengthen democracy and fight violence.

Conclusion

The intersecting but divergent visions of Gandhi and Ambedkar shed some light on two major ways of responding to violence and creating the image of the democratic change in India. The political thing is based on Satya and Ahimsa, which Gandhi declared in his Hind swaraj, Young India and Harijan and caused the political action to be based on ethical self-transformation and moral regeneration of society (Gandhi, 1909/1998). To him, non-violence, is a spiritual discipline and a form of resistance that could upset domination but not copy the process of coercion. In his turn, Ambedkar finds violence in the realities of caste, economic dependence and social isolation. Annihilation of Caste, States and Minorities, and the Constituent Assembly Debates are his works promoting the constitutional revolution based on destroying the hierarchy through the institutionalised hierarchical order and gaining justice by means of enforceable rights and democratic protections (Ambedkar, 1936/2014; 1947; CAD Vol. XI, 1949).

The conflict between the two paradigms arises due to ruling out the diagnosis of violence, and the alternative approaches to the theory of agency. Conflict, as seen by Gandhi, is based on personal moral failure and domination as seen by Ambedkar is part of a systemic condition which involves reorganizing the law and political arrangements. However, in spite of such dissimilarities, both philosophers have a strong belief in equality, dignity, and ethical principles of democratic lives. Their projects also concentrate on the assumption that democracy demands not only the political involvement but a shift in the norms of the social interaction.

Their ideas gain fresh relevance in the present-day discussions of violence, justice and inequality, be it the discrimination based on caste, coercion by the state, polarisation of communities, or marginalisation of the economic group. The ethical duty of moral responsibility and non-violent participation presented by Gandhi provides terms of language against hate and the development of civic compassion, and constitutionalism presented by Ambedkar provides the institutional framework needed to ensure substantive equality. They provide complementary and divergent channels of thought together, with Gandhi anticipating ethical citizenship as the precursor of freedom, and Ambedkar anticipating institutional justice as the precursor of dignity. The democratic future of India is not a choice between two sides but a critical involvement of both sides of implementation of moral responsibility and benefits of the constitution to combat old and new forms of violence.

Reference

1. Ambedkar, B. R. (1936/2014). *Annihilation of caste* (Annotated critical edition, A. Roy & S. Anand, Eds.). Navayana.
2. Ambedkar, B. R. (1947). *States and minorities: What are their rights and how to secure them in the Constitution of free India*. Government of India.
3. Ambedkar, B. R. (1948–1949). *Constituent Assembly Debates* (Official Reports). Lok Sabha Secretariat, Government of India.
4. Ambedkar, B. R. (1957/1992). *The Buddha and his Dhamma*. Oxford University Press.
5. Bakshi, R. (1999). *Bapu Kuti: Journeys in rediscovery of Gandhi*. Penguin Books.
6. Brown, J. M. (2003). *Gandhi: Prisoner of hope* (2nd ed.). Yale University Press.
7. Dalton, D. (1993). *Mahatma Gandhi: Nonviolent power in action*. Columbia University Press.
8. Gandhi, M. K. (1909/1998). *Hind Swaraj and other writings* (A. J. Parel, Ed.). Cambridge University Press.
9. Gandhi, M. K. (1921–1925). *Young India* [Various issues]. In *Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi* (CWMG). Publications Division, Government of India.
10. Gandhi, M. K. (1938). *Harijan* [Various issues]. In *Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi* (CWMG). Publications Division, Government of India.
11. Guru, G. (2012). *Humiliation: Claims and contexts*. Oxford University Press.
12. Iyer, R. N. (1973). *The moral and political thought of Mahatma Gandhi*. Oxford University Press.
13. Jaffrelot, C. (2005). *Dr. Ambedkar and untouchability: Analysing and fighting caste*. Permanent Black.

14. Omvedt, G. (1994). *Dalits and the democratic revolution: Dr. Ambedkar and the Dalit movement in colonial India*. Sage Publications.
15. Parel, A. J. (Ed.). (2006). *Gandhi: Hind Swaraj and other writings* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
16. Pai, S. (2002). *Dalit assertion and the unfinished democratic revolution: The Bahujan Samaj Party in Uttar Pradesh*. Sage Publications.
17. Publications Division, Government of India (Ed.). (1958–1994). *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi* (Vols. 1–100). Government of India.
18. Rodrigues, V. (Ed.). (2002). *The essential writings of B. R. Ambedkar*. Oxford University Press.
19. Skaria, A. (2016). *Unconditional equality: Gandhi's religion of resistance*. University of Minnesota Press.
20. Zelliott, E. (2005). *From untouchable to Dalit: Essays on the Ambedkar movement*. Manohar.