ECONOMIC GROWTH AND SOCIAL JUSTICE IN INDIA: DOES RAPID ECONOMIC GROWTH TRULY REFLECT JUSTICE FOR DALITS?

Swetangi Ranjan, WBNUJS, Kolkata.

ABSTRACT

In this era of Globalization, economic growth is seen as the very primary indicator of a Country's growth and development. India's post-liberalization economic growth has been celebrated at the global level because of increasing upward ascent and rapid growth and integration into the global economy. Still, beneath the aggregate success stories of India, now the country having one of the largest GDP, lies a persistent question: does this growth reinforce or dismantle deeply rooted caste hierarchies, particularly for Dalits, who have historically occupied, the lowest levels of India's socio-economic order? This study critically examines this growth model of India from the perspective of two theoretical approaches of John Rawls Difference principle and Amartya Sen's Capability approach. Through this dual lens, this paper would examine whether India's constant rise in GDP making it 4th largest economy in the world has advanced distributive justice and equity for historically marginalized communities.

The study advocates that while India's economic growth has generated many new opportunities in various sectors, both domestic and at global level, yet the benefits are unequally distributed due to caste based exclusions embedded in labour markets. Growth, when calculated in an aggregate fashion, reinforces perpetuating historical injustices rather than eradicating them. Ultimately, the paper aims to find an answer to a normative question of justice: Can economic growth be just if it systematically sidelines the freedoms and wellbeing of Dalits, which form a considerable part of Indian Society?

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Increasing Indian Economy: Does it picture the real Indian Society?

India's development and growth story has been nothing but a celebratory phenomenon. After the introduction of their LPG policy, the economy showed tremendous boom in the preceding past three decades. Borders opened and trade expanded which led India to become one of the largest and fastest growing economies in the world, as of 2025. According to most civilians, its continuous and steady growth has been a great tale that rightly portrays success and modernization.[1]

Although, if we look at the situation of India a little more minutely, it is quite evident that beneath that economic prosperity lies a very dark and complex reality of Indian Society. The economic growth that you see is not distributed equally between the different sections of society. For the so called "Dalits", this economic growth means nothing more than mere set of numbers that has nothing to do with them. It is so because unfortunately, the social bifurcation that the Constitution of India wanted to abrogate, still persists, and it very much affects the target of such benefits of India's social as well as economic prosperity.[2] For many Dalits, this growth has changed nothing as in their condition with respect to decent work, land, education, social status, etc., has yet to change.[3]

These numbers only let in on the surface. The increase in Gross Development Product or Foreign Investment might tell you about the National Growth, however, it doesn't necessarily mean collective well-being of the society. Is there even a meaning to such a growth if a large part of society remains stigmatized and excluded from even the basic necessities. The concept of Social Justice which is very much central in the constitution of India calls for a little more than just the Economic Growth for the real development of India, it calls for fairness, inclusion, and dignity for all citizens.[4]

[1] PLANNING COMMISSION, *INDIA: ECONOMIC SURVEY 2013–14* (Gov't of India 2014).
[2] Sukhadeo Thorat & Paul Attewell, Blocked by Caste: Economic Discrimination in Modern India, 42 *ECON. & POL. WKLY.* 4146, 4148 (2007).
[3] NAT'L SAMPLE SURVEY OFFICE, *Employment and Unemployment Situation in India*, Rep. No. 554 (2012).
[4] B.R. AMBEDKAR, *Constituent Assembly Debates*, Vol. VII (1948).

1.2 Economic Growth and the Idea of Social Justice

The Indian Constitution and its drafters envisioned an India where equality was not just on paper but in practice too. Articles 14 to 17 guarantee equality before the law and prohibit discrimination on grounds such as caste, religion, or sex.[5] Article 38 directs the State to promote welfare by minimizing inequalities, and Article 46 specifically obliges it to protect the interests of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.[6] This constitutional framework recognizes that justice is inseparable from development.

However, after the liberalization phase, India drifted away from this vision. Although Privatization and globalization increased the opportunities, but it came at the cost of redistributive policies. Public-sector employment, where the reservation policies were prevalent in order to uplift the underprivileged sections of society, declined, whereas the private sector employment increased where no such obligatory condition existed.[7] As a result, structural problems persisted even when the economy kept growing.

The paradox is clear: India's rise as a global economic power exists alongside enduring internal disparities. India advocates principles like equality, equity, justice, inclusion etc., internationally and when such a country fails to deal with its domestic inequalities, development for such a nation becomes bleak and meaningless which in turn, diminishes the credibility of its growth. John Rawls's *Difference Principle* offers a moral lens here, insisting that inequality is acceptable only when it benefits those who are worst off.[8] Similarly, Amartya Sen's *Capability Approach* reminds us that true development expands people's real freedoms the ability to live with dignity and make meaningful choices.[9] If we take a look on Indias current growth model with these lenses, it evidently appears incomplete as the country has successfully obtained wealth but social and economic disparity has yet to change.

The following chapters explore this contradiction in depth. They trace how India's economic transformation interacts with its constitutional promises, and how theories of justice illuminate the continuing exclusion of Dalits. The purpose is not to reject growth but to question its reach,

---

[5] INDIA CONST. arts. 14–17.
[6] Id. arts. 38, 46.
[7] Thorat & Attewell, supra note 2, at 4150.
[8] JOHN RAWLS, *A THEORY OF JUSTICE* 75 (Harv. Univ. Press 1971).
[9] AMARTYA SEN, *DEVELOPMENT AS FREEDOM* 3–4 (Oxford Univ. Press 1999).

to ask whether prosperity that bypasses the marginalized can ever fulfill the constitutional ideal of social justice.

Chapter 2: The Constitutional and Legal Framework of Social Justice

2.1 Constitutional Vision of Equality and Justice

When India became independent in 1950 and enacted its Constitution, it did something more than establishing a political system it established a moral compact between the State and the citizenry. The drafters realized that all of those centuries of disparity, and especially on the grounds of caste, could not possibly be eliminated by a simple achievement of freedom from the shackles of colonialism. Social justice was placed at the center of constitutional imagination, to be both end and policy guideline. The Preamble itself strives to assure to all its citizens social, economic, and political justice, so that freedom without fairness shall not mean true democracy.[10]

Articles 14 to 17 are the foundation in this aspect. Article 14 is the personification of entrenchment of equality before the law, and Article 15 prohibits discrimination on grounds of caste, religion, or sex.[11] Article 16 demands equality of opportunity in government employment, hoping that formal equality will not be sufficient if there is structural disadvantage.[12] Article 17 takes the further step of abolishing untouchability and criminalizing the act of such untouchability, an extreme measure that attempted to go to the very nucleus of hierarchy of castes.[13]

Besides these justiciable rights, the Constitution also enumerates the Directive Principles of State Policy which constitute the obligations of the State towards the promotion of substantive equality. Articles 38 and 46 bind the government to bring about welfare by lessening inequality in income, status, and opportunities and specifically to protect the interest of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes.[14] Altogether in total, these provisions set forth an energetic constitutional pledge to that philosophical cliche that justice and development go hand in hand.

---

[10] INDIA CONST. pmbl.
[11] Id. art. 14.
[12] Id. art. 16.
[13] Id. art. 17.

[14] Id. arts. 38, 46.

Practice of such principles, however, has been characterized by several setbacks throughout the years. With India's expanding economy, structural inequalities that the Constitution aimed to abolish continued to define social and economic life. Caste-based exclusion, most insidiously of Dalits, continues to characterize Indian society despite constitutional guarantees.[15] The laws are on the books, but their aim routinely unravels in the face of social convention and institutional resistance. Courts, in a series of rulings, have insisted that equality must be substantive and not just formal. In State of Kerala v. N.M. Thomas, the Supreme Court defined, that true equality entails granting to underprivileged groups the aid which helps them achieve actual equality with others.[16]

Nonetheless, in the push toward market model, distributive justice was diluted to some degree. Liberalization and privatization measures highlighted efficiency and competition at the expense of sideline constitutional mandates of the State to deliver equity. While in the public sector affirmative measures were incorporated in institutions, private enterprise's expanding ascendancy clipped these controls, relegating Dalits to the periphery of the emerging economy.[17]

2.2 The Judiciary and the Idea of Social Justice

The Indian judiciary has been instrumental in extending the scope of social justice through interpretation. The Supreme Court has characterized equality, through its detailed jurisprudence, as a living principle rather than a straightjacketed rule, responsive to the harsh realities of social existence. In Indra Sawhney v. Union of India, a judgment expanded the principle of equality to uphold reservations for backward classes, explaining that affirmative action was not against equality, but part and parcel of it.[18] In the same case, the Court reiterated that social and economic inequality 'must be addressed to make justice meaningful'.

Over the years, the Court has also connected the idea of justice with dignity and human development. In Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India, it held that the right to life with dignity also includes the right to sustenance and conditions of work which are respectful, safe, and humane.[19] These judgments embody a vision of constitutional justice wherein

[15] Thorat & Attewell, supra note 2, at 4151.
[16] *State of Kerala v. N.M. Thomas*, (1976) 2 S.C.C. 310 (India).
[17] PLANNING COMMISSION, *INDIA: ECONOMIC SURVEY 2013–14* (Gov't of India 2014).
[18] *Indra Sawhney v. Union of India*, A.I.R. 1993 S.C. 477 (India).
[19] *Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India*, (1984) 3 S.C.C. 161 (India).

constitutional rights are no longer only pieces of paper, but realities in the daily lives of citizens. Nevertheless, despite the progressive era, the reality of social justice is crooked at best.

The Capability Approach to development propounded by Amartya Sen is a valuable one here. For Sen, the aim of development is to enlarge people's actual freedoms, or their real opportunities to live the types of lives they care about.[20] This conception of justice is much in the spirit of rights provision in the Constitution. Rights are irrelevant unless people are capable of exercising them. For the Dalits, their economic marginalization tends to restrict their freedoms, such as education, mobility out of the village, and economic possibilities. The Difference Principle, defined by John Rawls, is consistent with constitutional morality in that inequality is allowed if it helps those who are least well-off or are underprivileged.[21]

In the Indian context, if economic policies don't improve the position of Dalits and other economically backward marginalized sections, such economic paths could be imagined as breaching Rawl's principles of fairness and the letter and spirit of the Constitution. Economic Indicators persistently indicating priest caste-based deprivation indicate the gap between constitutional ideals and economic reality.

While economic growth remains the favored indicator of progress, social justice is a government objective on paper. To satisfy our constitutional ideal for India, justice cannot remain an idea confined to our legal documents or judicial decisions, rather it needs to be operationalized in the everyday economic and social lives of India's most disadvantaged citizens.

Chapter 3: Application of Theoretical Framework: Rawls and Sen on Social Justice and Development

3.1 Rawls' Difference Principle and the Question of Fairness in Growth

Understanding the debate regarding whether economic growth in India has contributed towards justice for the Dalits can be enhanced by John Rawls' Difference Principle. Rawls asserts that inequality is only acceptable if it benefits the least well-off members of society.[22] This principle provides a moral test for any economic system that advocates it is just. Thus, growth cannot be

[20] SEN, supra note 9, at 36.
[21] RAWLS, supra note 8, at 75
[22] Id.

justified simply because it expands total wealth; rather, it must improve the lived realities of those who begin in the lowest social and economic circumstances.

Applying this to India's experience complicates the picture. Liberalization and globalization have undoubtedly expanded general prosperity. The upper and middle classes have experienced great gains in income, education, and access to technology. However, the least well-off Dalits have not seen equivalent gains. According to a report Dalits remain economically disadvantaged as they earn much less than what the national household average income is i.e., 1.13 lakh per year.[23] Their upward mobility is still limited by the historical structural limitations of caste, and unequal access to markets, education, and capital.[24]

Ultimately, Rawls' framework helps to some extent explain the discrepancy between aggregate progress and distributive justice. Economic inequality as it is manifest in India does not appear to work, in any real sense, in favour of disadvantaged classes.[25] For example, Dalits are restricted and still earn informal work, often without benefits or security and restricted access to the expanding sectors of the economy.[26] The degree of moral justification centered around the difference principle is clear. There can conceivably be no moral justification that labeling this type of arrangement as "fair" growth.

Furthermore, the Indian policy regime has systematically prioritized efficiency over equity. Economic growth, measured in GDP, has been prioritized over the issue of distribution of social and economic gains. Rawls reminds us that justice requires institutional structures to ensure that social and economic inequalities are arranged for everyone's advantage, particularly those who start from the least favorable conditions.[27]

Under that, the growth model for India seems to be morally incomplete because it rewards advantages without creating any substantial shifts for the margins of society. The situation only shows the banal nature of inequality. Unless there are structural and social interventions to adjust market mechanisms, the mechanisms merely reproduce existing hierarchies. In India, caste serves as the principal mechanism and gateway for reproducing social and economic

[23] Nitin Kumar Bharti, *Wealth Inequality, Class and Caste in India, 1961–2012*, WID.world Working Paper No. 2018/14 (2018).
[24] Thorat & Attewell, supra note 2, at 4152.
[25] Id.
[26] NATIONAL SAMPLE SURVEY OFFICE, *Employment and Unemployment Situation in India*, Report No. 554 (2012).
[27] RAWLS, supra note 8, at 79–80.

hierarchies.[28] India is considered one of the most inequal country in the world as the top 10% of the population controls almost 55% of the total wealth of the country, and the bottom 50% control only 15.33% of this wealth.[29]

Structural barriers to entry, with lack of access to credit, land, or business networks by Dalit entrepreneurs, keep them living along the periphery of the economy. This is where the difference principle becomes not simply a philosophical guide but rather a charge of ethical obligation on the State. Growth cannot be deemed just growth unless it consistently and systematically works on behalf of the needy.

3.2 Sen's Capability Approach and the Measure of Real Freedom

Amartya Sen's Capability Approach changed the discussion of economic development from thinking about output to examining what people are actually able to do and be, real freedoms.[30]In his argument for linking development with capabilities, Sen distinguishes between output in the economy and expanding people's capabilities namely, their ability to live a valued life. The Capability Approach firmly situates itself at the level of people and introduces a more serious outlook on the relationship between development, economic growth, and the issue of justice for the Dalits in India.

Sen argues that two individuals with the same level of income do not have the same degree of freedom if either is subject to social discrimination, or if one person has a lesser access to public commodities in relation to the other.[31] This is an important distinction in the Indian context, as, for instance, Dalits might identify segments of the total economy in which they are being compensated an income equivalent to a non-Dalit, but the experience of social exclusion and prejudice to restrict their access to an education, stable housing, and dignified working conditions. For years, dalits have been engaged in jobs that apparently related to their ancestry, as per the Indian Society. Almost 92% of Septic sewer workers belong to SCs, STs, and OBCs, and around 72% of them belong to Dalit communities alone.[32] No matter how negligible the

---

[28] Thorat & Attewell, supra note 2, at 4153.
[29] Facundo Alvaredo, Lucas Chancel, Thomas Piketty, Emmanuel Saez & Gabriel Zucman, *World Inequality Report 2018* (World Inequality Lab 2018).
[30] SEN, supra note 9, at 3.
[31] Id. at 36–37.
[32] "92% of workers cleaning urban sewers, septic tanks are from SC, ST, OBC groups," *The Hindu* (Sep. 29, 2024) (India).

income differentials, the Dalit will never be able to pursue their full potential.

The Capability Approach reveals blind spots in the traditional story of the economy, whereby public policy often increases in per capita income as evidence of development, while neglecting (not to mention misunderstanding) the different experiences of different constituencies in a system of public goods.

Sen's viewpoint also supports the constitutional mandate of social justice. For example, the Directive Principles of State Policy speak to the State to create conditions for its citizens to live in dignity and equality.[33] In this sense, citizenship is not only about redistributing resources; it is about empowering people, about giving them options to choose from. Social Justice, in this sense, allows Dalits to be not only recipients of state policy, but citizens participating equally in their economic lives. When combined, Rawls and Sen provide a means for measuring what progress means beyond a strict economic measure.

When brought together, Rawls and Sen provide a way of measuring progress beyond strictly economic measures. Rawls supplied a route for fairness with respect to the distribution of goods; while Sen was more interested in the quality of human life (including the quality of the goods distributed) made possible by such a distribution. In analyzing India, both provide a conceptual route for understanding the difference between India's booming economic growth story and its social and economic realities for a large proportion of its population.[34] India is positioned globally as an economic powerhouse, yet large portions of its population cannot take advantage of the very freedoms the development process may offer.

Thus, the challenge lies not in creating wealth, but in converting it to justice. Economic growth should be evaluated not by the degree to which it increases national output but in the degree to which it increases the space for freedom, dignity, and equality for those who have been denied it for so long. Until that time, "development" will be more of a dream than a reality.

Chapter 4: Persistence of Caste-Based Inequality in the Era of Globalization

4.1 Market Reforms and the New Face of Inequality

The international economic environment was assumed to enhance competitiveness, openness,

[33] INDIA CONST. arts. 38, 46.
[34] SEN, supra note 9, at 10–11.

and equity in India. The rationale was straightforward as markets expanded, opportunities would flow among all social categories, and that inequalities would diminish as modernization progressed.[35] Even now, over thirty years of liberalization later, the evidence is otherwise. Caste-based inequalities have not vanished; however, they adapted to contemporary capitalism, often in subtle and less conspicuous ways.

The economic reforms of the 1990s were an effort to reduce governmental control and encourage private practices. They produced a new urban middle class, increased consumption, and linked India closer into global trade networks.[36] However, it also changed the dynamics of the employment landscape. Public sector jobs with reservation quotas for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes started declining as privatization intensified.[37] The private sector, which as the principal driver of economic growth during this period, has remained largely untouched by affirmative action policies.

As a result, it has had an adverse effect on Dalits that has shrunk their access to stable wage work and upward mobility in the economy. Technology, finance, and services have been the industries that benefitted the most from globalization, and these are the industries where Dalits remain under-represented.[38] Discrimination still exists, albeit mostly in less obvious ways, through hiring bias, or informal networks of upper castes that support upper-caste connections over a Dalit candidate. Thorat and Attewell administered a field experiment where applicants with Dalit-identifying names received significantly fewer interview callbacks than applicants with identical credentials but upper-caste last names.[39]

This form of exclusion is precisely what Rawls warned about inequalities that do not incur to the benefit of the least advantaged.[40] Growth, shaped or otherwise, cannot be termed fair or just in situations like this. In many ways, instead of disbanding old hierarchies, the market has merely reproduced them in new ways. Those who possess social capital, the right family, education, and connections have taken advantage of globalization for their purposes. Those without such capital remain in a cycle of low wage labor and insecurity.

---

[35] PLANNING COMMISSION, *INDIA: ECONOMIC SURVEY 2013–14* (Gov't of India 2014).
[36] Id.
[37] Thorat & Attewell, supra note 2, at 4150.
[38] Id.
[39] Id. at 4152–53.
[40] RAWLS, supra note 8 at 75.

Thus, globalization has increased economic freedoms, but by and large, not social justice. While the economy may be more open, the opportunity it offers is still limited for those on the fringes of opportunity. This phenomenon indicates that markets alone will not generate the equalities imagined in the Constitution. Economic growth occurring without structural reform most often leads to privilege simply being repackaged as modern.

4.2 Globalization, Social Mobility, and the Limits of Capability

The Capability Approach Articulated by Amartya Sen offers an additional explanation as to why caste inequalities persist, despite evidence of some progress. Sen draws a distinction between means and freedoms, in other words, what people have vs. what people can actually do with what they have.[41] In a globalized economy, there are new opportunities that have been created, all benefits of which are not necessarily realized by everyone.

With respect to Dalits in India, structural inequities in education, housing, and access to credit consistently disable them from participating in economic activity that adds significant value to the economy.[42] As a result, many Dalits are confined to low-level informal work without continuity or social protections. The unfortunate reality is that there may be economic growth, but the freedoms and choices of marginalized communities are limited. In this way, growth may not be development.

The persistence of inequality is even true for those who choose entrepreneurial ventures. The government has created a number of different programs that are supposed to support small enterprise efforts, but there is ongoing discrimination in market access and financial resources for Dalit-owned businesses.[43] For example, banks will say that they do not want to lend to an entrepreneur who is Dalit because of "risk" related to the business, while informal networks will actively take steps to not allow Dalits to enter into trade opportunities.[44] As a result, the businesses never grow and remain small, vulnerable, and always just beyond the brink of their own economic autonomy.

---

[41] SEN, supra note 9, at 3–4.

[42] NATIONAL SAMPLE SURVEY OFFICE, *Employment and Unemployment Situation in India*, Report No. 554 (2012).

[43] Sukhadeo Thorat, *Dalits and the Global Labour Market: What Globalisation Means for the Marginalised* 7–8 (Rawat Publ'ns 2015).

[44] Id. at 12.

In terms of capability, the denial of access to Dalits consumes not only the material goods in their life, but their liberty to construct their own lives.[45] While development remains incomplete to the extent to which social barriers limit choices, GDP may be climbing. According to Sen, it would constitute a failure of justice, given that social institutions have not expanded the real freedoms of all citizens and have favored some over others.[46]

Caste inequality remains persistent in an age of globalization, while challenging both moral and economic assumptions. Growth may have lifted millions of people out of poverty at a aggregate level, but millions more remain stratified.[47] The benefits of globalization moved through, and reinforced, larger existing hierarchies of privilege, while change was less visible for Dalits - but no more real.

Economic growth that ignores this reality is, in effect, building an unequal foundation for its particular form of prosperity. Justice requires more than markets that are open; justice also requires social institutions that dismantle the walls of caste and provide a platform for those at the margins to engage as equals through the progress of the nation.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

Economic growth in India is often confused with development, but development without equity is, at best, incomplete. The extraordinary ascendance of India to one of the leading economies of the world tells only half the story. When you look close enough, it seems to be one thing to grow, but it isn't another thing at all, particularly when most of us, the Dalit, indigenous, and tribal communities still go to bed hungry every day. For Dalits, development is always somewhere in the distance, sometimes visible, but rarely within reach.

The Constitution of India envisioned a different type of development capability that was founded on the fact that democracy cannot exist purely on liberty and equality in law, which creates an opportunity for social or economic equity that grants every citizen the ability and capacity to live with dignity. For this reason, the creator(s) of the Indian Constitution crafted Articles 14 through 17, and Articles 38 through 46 to ensure that development and social justice shift and evolve together, yet while India embraced a global economy, the moral gravity of

[45] SEN, supra note 7, at 36–37.
[46] Id. at 42–43.
[47] Bharti, supra note 23,

these provisions began to dissipate. Markets emerged, wealth was created, yet the caste system survived, less visible perhaps but no less influential.

The Contrast of India's global identity and the stark inequalities existing in the nation is striking. On the world stage, India is often considered one of the leaders in terms of fairness in development and fair among countries. At the same time, domestic structures of privilege continue to define those who benefit from growth. This tension undermines the moral claims that progress makes, since justice - in its most sincere definition - is not selective. Development that raises some people up, while leaving others behind, cannot be called just or sustainable.

The imbalances present become more evident when viewed through the Difference Principle of John Rawls. Inequalities should only be justified, if they lead to an improvement in the circumstances of the least advantaged persons. The present model of economic growth for India fails this test. In some cases, certain aspects of economic, social and educational development has advanced faster than other spatial capacities which suffer disproportionately, or in relation to the share of the population those groups represent. For example, many Dalits have benefitted far less than average income populations that do not share the same caste as the Dalit caste. This mean-line evaluation from fellow Indian citizens suggests that progress is inequitable, if not outright unjust.

The Capability Approach from Amartya Sen only reinforces the previous claims by encouraging a view of development as freedom, rather than wealth. Development must be viewed as not just an increase in income, but actual expansion of real choices/capabilities of persons. In the case of Dalits, barriers to social access and freedom remain firmly entrenched. Many people still do not have access to jobs with dignity, quality education, and fair access to credit or markets. Economic growth, no matter how staggering, is meaningless if it does not acknowledge these basic freedoms.

While the judiciary's interpretation of equality and social justice has been exemplary, it cannot address systemic economic exclusion by itself. The law cannot solve this by itself; policy must follow law, so that the few who are privileged cannot benefit by themselves. The State, its constitutional role, must be an enabler, as much as a regulator - that is, opportunity is not to be conferred by birth, but to be earned by fairness.

Thus, India's development story is of achievement, and an unfinished obligation. Growth has opened an avenue for possibility, but justice calls for that avenue to be equitably shared. If it continues to grow without remedying its structural exclusions of caste, expanding the economy will yield prosperity on a bedrock of inequality. True development will only be a realization when Dalits, who have been excluded from society, and the economy itself, for so long can share equally in this new potential of effort, as a nation.

In the end, the test of a just society is not its affluence, but the fairness with which that affluence is shared. Rawls reminds us, fairness begins with what we do with the people at the bottom, while Sen reminds us that freedom is the actual measure of human development.[48] So, India's challenge is to achieve alignment between its economic story and its moral and constitutional one to make growth faster, but, also fairer. Only if that happens, can it be said that India's ascent as a global power appropriately embodies Justice for all its people.

[48] RAWLS, supra note 8 at 79–80; SEN, supra note 9, at 36–37.

REFERENCES

1. B.R. AMBEDKAR, *Constituent Assembly Debates*, Vol. VII (1948).
2. RAWLS, JOHN, *A THEORY OF JUSTICE* (Harv. Univ. Press 1971).
3. SEN, AMARTYA, *DEVELOPMENT AS FREEDOM* (Oxford Univ. Press 1999).
4. SUKHADEO THORAT, *Dalits and the Global Labour Market: What Globalisation Means for the Marginalised* (Rawat Publ'ns 2015).
5. Thorat, Sukhadeo & Paul Attewell, *Blocked by Caste: Economic Discrimination in Modern India*, 42 *ECON. & POL. WKLY.* 4146 (2007).
6. Bharti, Nitin Kumar. *Wealth Inequality, Class and Caste in India, 1961–2012*. WID.world Working Paper No. 2018/14, 2018.
7. Alvaredo, Facundo, Lucas Chancel, Thomas Piketty, Emmanuel Saez & Gabriel Zucman.
8. *World Inequality Report 2018.* World Inequality Lab, 2018.
9. "92% of Workers Cleaning Urban Sewers, Septic Tanks Are from SC, ST, OBC Groups." *The Hindu.* Sep. 29, 2024 (India).
10. PLANNING COMMISSION, *INDIA: ECONOMIC SURVEY 2013–14* (Gov't of India 2014).
11. *National Sample Survey Office. Employment and Unemployment Situation in India. Report No. 554, 2012.*
12. *Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India*, (1984) 3 S.C.C. 161 (India).
13. *Indra Sawhney v. Union of India*, A.I.R. 1993 S.C. 477 (India).
14. *State of Kerala v. N.M. Thomas*, (1976) 2 S.C.C. 310 (India).
15. INDIA CONST. pmbl.
16. INDIA CONST. arts. 14–17, 38, 46.